EvoCS

Evolving Concept of Security

D4.2 – Case Studies Report Compendium

Grant agreement number:	605142	**Due date of deliverable**: 31/07/15	
Start date of the project:	2014-06-01	**Actual submission date**: 31/08/15	
Duration:	18 months	**Deliverable approved**: Y/N	

Lead Beneficiary: TECNALIA (2)

Contributing beneficiaries: HCSS (5), SSSUP (6)

Keywords: Case studies; Evolving concept of security, Perceptions of security

Dissemination level: PU

Release History		
Please give details in the table below about successive releases:		
Release Number	Release date	Released by
0.1	2015/08/19	TECNALIA
1.0	2015/08/31	TECNALIA
2.0	2015/09/12	TECNALIA

Executive Summary

The present deliverable draws the main inputs and conclusion from the regional case studies' reports on the evolving concepts of security of four security regions of the project EvoCS. The regions selected are:

- West-Mediterranean EU: Italy, Malta, Spain

- Eastern EU Border: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania

- North-Western EU: United Kingdom, Netherlands, France

- South-Eastern Europe: Bulgaria, Turkey, Serbia

The methodology used is based on the EvoCS deliverables D3.1 "Finalised analytical framework" and D4.1 "Tools for methodological support: templates, criteria and IT requirements" of this same project.

Each regional report consists of three national reports plus a regionally encompassing view, covering key core values, security challenges, main levels of action, main actors, historical trajectory of the evolving concepts of security, and trends for the near future.

The overview of these results can be found below in Tables 1 to 4. The final chapter of this report summarises the profiles, gives the key findings and formulates recommendations for security decision makers and other relevant stakeholders. In between, the most significant facts about security aspects, including human rights an ethical issues, the historical trajectory, and a compendium of current trends are presented.

This report is meant to be accompanied by the four regional case studies' reports as it establishes some comparisons that are entirely understood when reading them. This report in no way replaces the information contained in the regional reports.

	Italy	Malta	Spain	West-Mediterranean Europe region
Key Values	- Physical safety and security - Social stability and security - Economic prosperity and security	- Physical safety and security - Economic prosperity and security - Information and cyber security	- Physical safety and security - Environmental and ecological security - Economic prosperity and security	- Physical safety and security - Economic prosperity and security - Environmental and ecological security
Security Challenge	- Terrorist attacks - Illegal immigration - Economic crisis - Natural disasters	- Illegal immigration - Information and data loss - Weather and climate change	- International terrorism - Critical infrastructures - Domestic (gender) violence	- Illegal immigration - Natural hazards[1] - Terrorist attacks - Weather and climate change
Levels of Action	- National - International	- National	- National - International	- National - International
Key Actors	- National government - Private sector - Civil society	- Private sector - Civil society - National government	- National government - Private sector - National parliament	- National government - Private sector - Civil society

Table 1 West-Mediterranean Europe: Summary of the national and regional profiles

---

[1] Nearly 40 years ago O'Keefe et al. (1976) stated that the term 'natural disaster' was a misnomer, and questioned how 'natural' so called 'natural disasters' were. They highlighted that many disasters result from the combination of natural hazards and social and human vulnerability, including development activities that are ignorant of local hazardous conditions. Whilst earthquakes, droughts, floods, and storms are natural hazards, they lead to deaths and damages – i.e. disasters - that result from human acts of omission and commission rather than the act of nature (UNISDR, 2010). It is therefore more appropriate to use the term 'natural hazards' when talking about the natural events mentioned above, or 'disasters' when discussing a serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society as a result of an exposure to a hazard.

	Poland	Hungary	Lithuania	Eastern EU Boarder
Key Values	- Physical safety and security - Economic prosperity and security - Territorial integrity and security	- Economic prosperity and security - Physical safety and security - Territorial integrity and security	- Territorial integrity and security - Political stability and security - Social stability and security	- Economic prosperity and security - Territorial integrity and security - Physical safety and security
Security Challenges	- Ukrainian crisis - Energy security - Unemployment - Demographic trends - Eurozone integration - Road safety	- Foreign ownership of land - Energy security - Unemployment - Demographic trends	- Ukrainian crisis - Energy security - Eurozone integration - Cyber crime - Road safety	- Ukrainian crisis - Energy security - Unemployment - Demographic trends - Road safety
Levels of Action	- National - International	- National - Regional - International	- National - International - Regional	- National - International - Regional
Key Actors	- General public or individual citizen(s) - National government	- National government - National parliament	- National government - National parliament	- National government - National parliament

Table 2 Eastern EU Border: Summary of the national and regional profiles

	UK	France	Netherlands	North-West Europe region
Key Values	- Physical safety and security; - Economic prosperity and security; - Environmental and ecological security	- Physical safety and security; - Social stability and security; - Political stability and security	- Physical safety and security; - Economic prosperity and security; - Social stability and security.	- Physical safety and security; - Information and cyber security; - Social stability and security
Security Challenges	- Terrorism; - Climate change; - Natural hazards; - Cybercrime; - Energy supply; - Food supply	- Terrorism; - Social instability; - Natural hazards; - Immigration; - Crime	- Terrorism; - Cybercrime; - Climate change; - Natural hazards	- Terrorism; - Cybercrime; - Immigration; - Natural hazards; - Climate change; - Energy supply; - Food supply
Levels of Action	- National	- National - International	- National - International	- National - International
Key Actors	- National government - Private sector	- National government - National parliament	- National government - National parliament	- National government - National parliament - Private sector

Table 3 North-Western Europe: Summary of the national and regional profiles

	Bulgaria	Serbia	Turkey	South-Eastern Europe
Key Core Values	- Political stability and security; - Economic prosperity and security; - Social stability and security	- Physical safety and security; - Economic prosperity and security; - Social stability and security	- Territorial integrity and security; - Physical safety and security; - Political safety and security	- Physical safety and security; - Political safety and security; - Economic prosperity and security
Key Security Challenges	- Corruption; - Organised crime; - Emigration and demographic crisis; - Relations with Russia; - Delayed reforms in the security and law enforcement sector	- Societal transformation/Civil challenges; - Organized/petty crime; - Discrimination; - Corruption; - Kosovo and aftereffects of Yugoslav wars	- Terrorism; - Syria War; - ISIL; - "parallel state', the Gulen network; - Refugees; - Energy dependency	- Corruption; - Energy security; - Work safety; - Natural hazards; - Discrimination (and other social challenges)
Levels of Action	- National	- National	- National	- National
Key Actors	- National government	- National government; - National parliament	- National government	- National governments; - National parliaments

Table 4 South-Eastern Europe: Summary of the national and regional profiles

Table of content

Index of tables

1 Introduction

This deliverable responds to the central task of WP4 consisting in the enforcement of the coherence of the regional case studies. Enforcement in this case means negotiating with the coordinators of the regional case studies, namely, the leaders of WPs 5 to 8, whether the instructions resulting from the implemented methodological framework[2] produced the expected outcomes. Mostly, the methodological framework has solidly supported the work in the case studies. Some recommendations for improvement agreed with the rest of the partners collaborating in this WP will be presented in the content of the parallel deliverable D4.3.

The veritable result of WP4, as a matter of fact, cannot be a document describing how coherent the work of the regional case studies has been. This effect must actually be perceptible in the outcomes of those case studies that are described in their respective reports, namely D5.2, D6.2, D7.2 and D8.2. In order to offer a view of what coherence has meant over the development of the case studies, in this document the main results are emphasized in a sort of meta-analysis. The objective of this approach is to grant the reader a unifying thread for a work that, subject to identical methodology, allowed some researcher freedom at the time of determine the definitive results.

In consequence, this document can either be read as an introduction to the case studies' reports[3], as it underlines the main outputs in a comparative way, or as a summary report, with the intention of settling the main ideas derived from regional analysis. Another function of the document is to bring forward the remarks and observations that the authors of the regional reports have found valuable to further analysis, especially in an attempt to provide insights for policy makers and other stakeholders about the use of the information gathered regarding the evolving concept of security in the regions addressed, the principal findings of the reports, and the potential replication of the present exercise in the long run.

This document starts off by providing a collection of charts elaborated out of the main results in the coding exercise. The objective is to compile results and provide a quick and effective picture of the core values and how they interplay with other variables. Some considerations about the adequate definition of the core values are also provided. It is followed by a compendium of security challenges with the aim of pointing out the most relevant results and inviting to further consultation in the singular reports.

Finally, key findings and recommendations are compiled. Although the actual work of compiling and evaluating the results of the case studies is committed for WP9, this part of the report will help focus

---

[2] Assessing Evolving Concepts of Security: Coding Handbook "EvoCS Codebook Master.pdf"

[3] Case Study on West Mediterranean EU "evocs_deliverable_5.2_case_study_on_west-mediterranean_europe.pdf"
Case Study on Eastern EU Border "evocs_deliverable_6.2_case_study_on_eastern_EU_border.pdf"
Case Study on North-West Europe "evocs_deliverable_7.2_case_study_on_north-western_europe.pdf"
Case Study on South-Eastern Europe "evocs_deliverable_8.2_case_study_on_south-eastern_europe.pdf"

on the relevant issues from the onset, thus constituting a valuable input for setting up the initial terms of the discussion.

For the sake of usability, this report presents summary tables (see Tables 1 to 4) of the case studies at the very beginning.

2 Characterisation of the core values

2.1 Comparative charts

One of the easiest but also more revealing conclusions from the regional analysis concerns the characterization of core values. After analyzing the different regional reports on 'Characterization of the Core Values', to put the results in simple tables may help lead to interesting conclusions.

Firstly, let's take a look in comparative manner at how the core values rank according to the country reports (Table 5):

	UK	France	Netherlands	Lithuania	Poland	Hungary	Italy	Malta	Spain	Bulgaria	Serbia	Turkey
Physical safety and security	1st	1st	1st	7th	1st	2nd	1st	1st	1st	4th	1st	2nd
Economic prosperity and security	2nd	5th	2nd	4th	2nd	1st	3rd	2nd	3rd	2nd	2nd	4th
Environmental and ecological security	3rd	6th	5th	6th	7th	6th	5th	4th	2nd	6th	7th	7th
Information and cyber Security	4th	4th	6th	5th	6th	8th	7th	3rd	5th	7th	5th	8th
Social stability and security	5th	2nd	3rd	3rd	5th	5th	2nd	6th	4th	3rd	3rd	5th
Political stability and security	6th	3rd	7th	2nd	4th	4th	6th	8th	8th	1st	6th	3rd
Territorial integrity and security	7th	7th	4th	1st	3rd	3rd	4th	7th	6th	8th	4th	1st
Cultural identity and security	8th	8th	8th	8th	8th	7th	8th	5th	7th	5th	8th	6th

Table 5 Core values per country

Complementarily, a Table 6 representing the relevance given in average to the core values per region expands the perception of all the area while illustrating internal differences:

	North-West Europe Region	Eastern EU Border	West Mediterranean	South-Eastern Europe
Physical safety and security	1st	3rd	1st	1st
Economic prosperity and security	2nd	1st	2nd	2nd
Environmental and ecological security	5th	7th	3rd	7th
Information and cyber Security	4th	6th	5th	8th
Social stability and security	3rd	5th	4th	4th
Political stability and security	6th	4th	8th	3rd
Territorial integrity and security	7th	2nd	6th	5th
Cultural identity and security	8th	8th	7th	6th

Table 6 Core values per region

A rough perception, but still significant, can be drawn from the frequency scored by each core value in each rank position in the country analysis (Table 7).

Core Values	Frequency							
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th
Physical safety and security	8	2	0	1	0	0	1	0
Economic prosperity and security	1	6	2	2	1	0	0	0
Environmental and ecological security	0	1	1	1	2	4	3	0
Information and cyber Security	0	0	1	2	3	2	2	2
Social stability and security	0	2	4	1	4	1	0	0
Political stability and security	1	1	2	2	0	3	1	2
Territorial integrity and security	2	0	2	3	0	1	3	1
Cultural identity and security	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	7

Table 7 Rank frequency of core values

Finally, frequency and rank points are convoluted to obtain a discrete value for each of the core values (Table 8):

Rank	Points	Core Values	Total Points (Frequency X Rank points)
1st	8	Physical safety and security	85
2nd	7	Economic prosperity and security	76
2rd	6	Environmental and ecological security	44
4th	5	Information and cyber Security	40
5th	4	Social stability and security	62
6th	3	Political stability and security	50
7th	2	Territorial integrity and security	53
8th	1	Cultural identity and security	22

Table 8 Core values per frequency

The following chart offers a homogeneous assessment of the importance of the core values (Table 9):

Core Value	Final Ranking
Physical safety and security	1st
Economic prosperity and security	2nd
Social stability and security	3rd
Territorial integrity and security	4th
Political stability and security	5th
Environmental and ecological security	6th
Information and cyber Security	7th
Cultural identity and security	8th

Table 9 Final ranking of core values

2.2 Comparative analysis of core values

In light of the charts established in the precedent section, some indications can be extracted in order to prompt a further elaboration for consumption of the relevant stakeholders.

Summarizing, the abovementioned tables demonstrate at least that three relevant elements emerge from the reports:

- the overall salience of physical safety and security;

- the common concern about economic prosperity and security;

- the differentiation among national/regional security discourse.

Firstly, the '**physical safety and security**' core value stands on top of the security discourse in eight out of twelve countries and in three regions out of the four analyzed . This element is an interesting indication of a somehow narrow perception of security within the popular discourse, which cares first and foremost for the physical integrity of human beings, both individuals and groups, as well as the spaces where they live and the systems or infrastructures they use in their everyday life.

Therefore the main concern lies in security challenges related to premature deaths, human suffering, and/or destruction or degradation of critical assets, such as terrorist attacks, natural hazards or human-induced security challenges, and epidemics, but also domestic violence, and other more frequently associated with safety, like petty crime or traffic safety. This perception of security can be considered as the "ordinary citizen" security, which primarily focuses on the individual, his/her family, dwelling, working place, village, or neighborhood.

Such a focus is not surprising in countries which have been at peace for around 70 years, except for Serbia, that means most citizens do not have direct personal memory of war or foreign occupation and therefore don't voice concerns explicitly, for instance, about Territorial Integrity and Security – a situation different for example in the Eastern EU Borders region and South Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, although expectable, the results could be further scrutinized to explore whether the core value of 'physical safety and security' is adequately defined or the mere broadness of its meaning and the time period in which the documents have been analysed contributes to high scores as well.

In particular, in the France, Spain and UK cases studies, it is reported that terrorist attacks influenced national security discourse by stressing the salience of physical safety and apparently[4] reducing relatively the salience of territorial integrity. In most of the cases the 'Territorial integrity and security' core value scored fourth in the ranking position by focusing on illegal immigration presented in the media and political discourse as "invading" national borders and territory, far from the classical concept of fear to armed aggression by another state. Moreover, as safeguarding national boundaries against the invader appears a typical task of the military, this association establishes a controversy between reckoning immigration and immigrants as a humanitarian problem or as a

---

[4] Though it was never correlated the increase in one and the reduction in another.

warlike one, especially risky when most operations are a jointly civil-military effort due to the enormous resources needed.

The second interesting element is the common concern about '**economic prosperity and security**'. Whilst this core value ranks second in six countries and first in one country, and in three regions ranks second, and first in the other one according to the coding exercise, it is not perceived to be at the very top of the security agenda (although its salience is underlined by the qualitative analysis). The economic crisis is largely and explicitly perceived as one of the most prominent security challenges. The top concerns linked to this core value are unemployment and economy performance, risk of poverty, illegal immigration, and security (for the future). This perception is more or less common in all the countries analyzed. Additionally, its influence on the next core values in the ranking – 'Social stability and security' and 'Territorial integrity and security' – is apparent.

The third interesting element emerging from the coding is the differentiation among the national discourses in all the countries: it was expected, on the one hand, due to the historic and political situation of each country, and on the other hand, due to the prevalence of the internal political affairs over the common European affairs. Elections, political antagonism, and efforts to gain support from the masses are still settling in the domestic realm. Although any country is bound to overlook the general evolution of several phenomena (racist outburst, migratory disasters and their aftermaths, economic convulsion), political parties' tactical and even strategical moves are still markedly internally oriented.

As a final remark, the diversity of security challenges is not surprising since economic prosperity, according to the EvoCS Codebook, is not strictly defined, and therefore it is likely to be conceived in different ways across different countries and regions.

All in all, it can be stated that 'Physical safety and security" is the most reported core value, except for countries in the Eastern EU Border, where territorial tensions are still alive and unresolved, and that 'Economic prosperity and security" not only ranks second in a majority of countries but also obtains a high relevance in most cases. 'Cultural identity and security' is the least addressed core values according to the reports, and 'Territorial integrity and security" offers great variability as it shifts from prominent to imperceptible as one moves westward. 'Environmental and ecological security" keeps a low profile in three regions but reveals itself as an increasing worry in the West Mediterranean area.

The rest of the core values are more homogeneously distributed regarding relevance, though every country and region maintains some particularities usually linked to historical backgrounds and their current evolution and development. It is interesting to note that countries that appear very similar in some respects diverge suddenly owing to very specific events, which reflect the usual national heterogeneity in the approach to security concepts.

3 Compendium of the Security Challenges

3.1 Security aspects

3.1.1 Security Challenges

A large number of security challenges or salient issues have been identified in the coding under each category in the different country/regional reports (Table 10):

- Terrorism, terrorist attacks
- International crises
- Cyber terrorism, internet security, cyber attacks
- Crime, local crime
- Social protection, health care system
- Unemployment
- Road security
- National security
- Illegal immigration
- Climate change
- Natural hazards, natural disasters (like floods, big fires, earthquakes)
- Food security
- Energy security

Table 10 Compendium of security issues

Whilst most of these security challenges may readily be understood as common security challenges, –since they are either too generic (local crime or road security), or correspond to an increasing view of the interrelated nature of the current world (cybercrime or climate change)–, there are precise references to some salient challenges due to the historical and political situation of some countries (Table 11):

- Organised crime (Bulgaria)
- Relations with Russia (Lithuania)
- Delayed reforms in the security and law enforcement (Bulgaria)
- Syria War (international conflicts) (Turkey)
- The Islamic State of Iraq and The Levant (ISIL) (Turkey)

- ▪ "Parallel state", the Gulen Network (Turkey)
- ▪ Refugees (Turkey)
- ▪ Kosovo and aftereffects of Yugoslav war (Serbia)

Table 11 Some particular security challenges collected

This is intended not as an attempt to subvert the natural approach of dealing with security challenges, but to point out that trying to gain support for the common issues must be somehow combined and negotiated with the countries considering that there are less extended problems that should be solved to satisfy not only but also global expectations, thus reassuring that particular problems make also to the common agenda.

3.1.2 Actors

According to the coding results, the landscape of actors across the all countries and regions presents some worth-noticing important similarities.

Firstly, the national government and parliament are the main addressors, but noticeably both also play a role as an addressee in most of the cases. In the three predominant core values in the national security discourses the national government and parliament appear as the main interlocutors. Further analysis may be needed to discern whether there was a misunderstanding of the addressee/addressor couple of terms, or it actually responds to an assumed situation.

Secondly, in all the countries/regions the private sector has an important say, particularly on 'Economic prosperity and security' core value, playing a role as an addressor in some countries and an addressee in others. Again, some exploration to corroborate if this responds to the particularities of the cases at stakes or a reformulation of the questions is in order to refine the results.

Thirdly, the general public is the prominent object actor across the regions, playing a role as addressee together with the general government. Is it worth mentioning that some actors do not play any role at all, although it was anticipated they would, e.g. academia.

3.1.3 Levels

Concerning the levels of the security discourse, all the countries analized show important similarities according to the coding results. The national level is the main one, being the principal dimension for actions by any addressor.

However, it is surprising that very little discussion is taking place at subnational and local levels, with the only exception of the Italian case. In the latter, the whole security system is shaped in a very important way by the local level –municipalities, provinces, and regions– which plays an important role in creating a general framework of security perceptions, identifying some specific challenges, potential risks and threats as well as providing tailored responses.

If the above is the case for a relatively little decentralised country, then the question emerges of why this was not detected in other countries that present a governmental layout either totally or partially federalized. The hypothesis to work out may be that the several levels are assigned different roles in treating security issues, but, on the other hand, there must be some inherent or explicit cohesive discourse to avoid overlaps and increase efficiency. The question remains if this framework, in case it exists, is actually perceived by the actors in a way that they can separate every layer's mission, or it is all encompassed under a single figure (the "government" or the "administration").

Finally, it should be noticed that the international role plays a secondary but not marginal role, in particular with references to the EU in relation to a number of policies. It is thus perceived that the EU is meant to bear a function in the security field, especially regarding borders and common policies in the international arena, but it is not a frequently identified actor in charge of specific tasks, which probably has to do, again, with the difficultly in differentiating each actor's duties.

3.1.4   Human Rights and ethical issues

All sources raise human rights and ethical issues, however different publications find different security challenges as a matter of human and ethical concern. Human rights are largely mentioned in NGO's reports and quite often in the academic papers, and are mainly discussed when it comes to the environmental and natural hazards.

Data also demonstrates the importance of NGO's as addressors because of their involvement on issues dealing with human rights and freedoms, together with their interaction with Government along the agenda-setting process (securitization). In NW Europe though, newspapers purely focus on terrorism, whereas parliament publications mention human rights and ethical issues across all of the security challenges. In the SE Border, six actors are virtually never the addressor in the ethical context, surprisingly "Private sector", "European Union", "Regional state apparatus (domestic)" (all zero), "Think tanks and policy institutes", "Foreign Government" (each 1 time) and the "Media" only twice.

Although terrorist attacks could be seen as closely related to human rights and ethical issues, this was rarely discussed by the government publications. For instance, terrorist attacks is not explicitly mentioned such as a relevant topic of human rights and ethical issues, but the related issue of human smuggling is a relevant topic for human rights.

Emerging economies, on the other hand, are often linked with an alternative approach to democratic values, ambiguous approach to human rights standards, labour and welfare rights or environmental issues. Another human rights issue appearing in relation to security is discrimination, specifically in relation to national and social minorities, in particular Roma, but also to persons with disabilities and the elderly. Linked to the former, a considerable part of the Serbian public security discourse has an ethical and fundamental human rights aspect, especially the discussions from the "discrimination" cluster.

Lately the media has been giving a closer attention to the human dimension of the phenomenon of illegal migration and today it seems to be generally portrayed in correlation to its dimension of humanitarian emergency. Human rights and ethical issues are not discussed in the context of extreme weather events and climate change, and are only perceived as the main issue when it comes to illegal immigration.

However, the most common problem when it comes to published sources are surveillance and data retention, which pose risk of unjustified limitation of one's right to personal freedom, privacy and data protection.

Overall, in all the regions and countries human rights are most prominently discussed under the 'Physical safety and security' and 'Social stability and security' core values. Human rights and ethical issues are mentioned when it comes to security challenges of terrorism and climate change, however they are hardly ever perceived as a main topic. This finding may be a result of a methodological limitation, as human rights and ethical issues were only coded when explicitly stated.

3.2 Historical Trajectory

The historical trajectories of the twelve countries present obvious specificities, and every country is deeply influenced by its own history and course in the definition of its national security discourse.

By taking into account these different historical paths, some considerations can be made in terms of commonalities as well as differences, as both are necessary to establish an inevitably complex security common position, when needed, and, more importantly, to support policies and resource allocation:

- Countries from West Mediterranean EU had similar experience in terms of increase of illegal immigration, even though it has sometimes shifted from one country to another one depending of the fluctuation of the main bulk of migrants' origin; in general, they constitute accessible entry points for the EU due to their geographic position and other cultural proximity related factors.

- Another commonality is the economic recession experienced to a greater extent by Italy and Spain, with the dramatic consequences in terms of unemployment, poverty risk, economic insecurity, social tensions, and uncertainty. In other countries, the impact of the 2007/2008 crisis may not have fallen under the security discourse, but the economic stability is still weak.

- The UK, France, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands and Turkey have witnessed an increase in the perception of terrorist security challenge, but with a fundamental difference so far: France, Spain, Turkey, and UK (in alphabetical order, without any hint on severity or chronology) were directly targeted by attacks in the recent past; this has had a profound impact on their security discourse.

- Another relative similarity between some countries refers to the role of the Armed Forces: the shift from territorial defense to military operations abroad has been important for the security discourse of France, the Netherlands, Spain, and the UK, for example, mainly due to the experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, along with the involvement in international missions ranging from the Balkans to Middle East, Horn of Africa and Central Asia. The image projected is that the geostrategic disappearance of inter-EU boundaries has displaced defense farther, mostly in support for EU borders operations, like fighting against illegal immigration or organized crime.

- Serbia still observes the conflict with Kosovo and Metohija as an important security issue, but is now in a process of changing the focus. While it was –and to a certain but much weaker degree still is – an issue of territorial integrity and security, current discussions concentrate on the situation of the Serbian community in Kosovo and their well-being. Turkey has a comparable issue with its Kurdish minority, which may have been weakened in recent years due to an ongoing peace process. Serbia, Bulgaria and Hungary are both struggling with the integration of their Roma communities, even though Serbia and Bulgaria countries have adopted national strategies for this endeavor. All of these issues are probably prone to be extended to long-term ones.

- Finally, some countries have witnessed an increased importance of natural hazards and human-induced threats, although different in nature: the Prestige sinking in Spain, the two earthquakes of 2009 and 2012 in Italy, the extreme weather events linked to climate change in Malta (droughts, storms, etc.), and the floods in France, the Netherlands, and UK, are increasingly perceived as deserving major attention regardless the originating factor..

3.3 Compendium of current trends

A good indicator of current trends is the acknowledgement of the most salient security challenges in national security strategies and other strategic and policy documents, since the elaboration of these documents traditionally reflects a process of consultation within the government and with stakeholders aimed to identify relevant trends, security challenges and risks, beyond the latest media headline. This doesn't immediately equal to abandoning the temptation of act on account of a sudden and apparently imperious concern in some cases when the media ignites public opinion.

Most of the countries have a National Security Strategy which makes it easier to identify which are the relevant current trends, at least at declaration level, identifying the vulnerabilities and risks at a national level, incorporating single-risk and multi-risk scenarios.

- The core value of **physical safety and security** receives greater attention in most of the countries by means of the effort dedicated to *illegal immigration* and *terrorist attacks*.

- **Cybercrime** receives 'special treatment' as a Digital Strategy in UK, Netherlands, Spain and Malta[5]. Cyber security as an area has been introduced in the 2010s in different national strategies, confirming the trend of growing importance of this issue. Nevertheless, in some cases the concern will result in rhetoric declaration with unsubstantiated plans. On the other hand, for countries like Bulgaria, Turkey and Serbia, cyber and information security are not perceived as very important; since these countries have been dealing with more pressing problems, like security of its borders, the physical security of its citizens, or economic prosperity

- **Climate change** is one of the main drivers for some countries' economic prosperity, including 'strengthening competitiveness in energy and climate policy'. Moreover, *security of energy supply* is often mentioned with regards to different countries' economic prosperity (UK, Netherlands, Malta, Spain), since these countries are highly dependent on imported energy sources for the generation of electricity.

- In some of the analyzed countries (such as Poland or Spain) national strategies will likely continue to focus on **securitizing economic prosperity** instead of delegating its responsibility to the freedom of market or to the international governance as they did before. It is still to be proven that both EU internal and international dynamics favor some degrees of liberty in that aspect. In any case, this reflects a preoccupation with respect to security like an area that can be threatened both by **financial instability and the lack of adequate global economic governance,** which has certain implications also at EU level.

---

[5] It is worth noting that the adoption of these strategies is linked in some cases to the introduction of a European strategy on cyber security and the consequent EU call to Member States to do likewise. In other cases, though not with precisely called Digital Strategy, some steps have been taken in that direction, like Italy with its (" National Strategic Framework for Cyberspace Security " and the "National Plan for Cyberspace Protection and ICT Security".

4 Compendium of findings and conclusions

4.1 Key findings

It is possible to outline a regional security discourse for the four regions studied by drawing from the national discourse. This does not mean that every country shares the same security perceptions, or that each core value or security challenge enjoys the same degree of salience in every single country. Instead, the findings underline commonalities and complementarities among the national security discourses, and provide an overview that aids a deeper understanding of the popular security discourse.

In general terms, the core value 'Physical safety and security' has a relative greater salience compared to the other core values across all the studied countries and it can be arguably considered the most important one if the appropriateness of the sample is accepted. It is followed by the 'Economic prosperity and security' core value, which is salient in the countries security discourse but not really on top of the security agenda. This can be caused by the lack of acknowledge of the potentiality of economic distress to trigger instability to a degree where security is affected.

The security discourse is marked by two complementary characters. Firstly, a perception of security primarily focused quite narrowly on the individual, his/her family, house, working place, village or neighborhood. This individualized view of security is frequently exploited by proponents of extreme ideologies to ground aggressive policies against minorities as happens when it is related to illegal immigration and terrorism across the region. But it is also true that individuals feel equally affected by other challenges like natural hazards and climate change, as a reflection of the diverse forces operating in the society that claim that global problems are also countered with individual actions and that the effects in case of neglecting them would irremediably impact on any of us. Secondly, the economic crisis has been increasingly securitized due to its dramatic and enduring consequences for unemployment and poverty – and therefore economic security. However, it has still to be proven an insecurity factor in the classical sense of provoking political turmoil or misappropriations.

Yet, the security discourse is not at all limited to those core values: social stability and security, territorial integrity and security, political stability and security, environmental and ecological security, cyber and information security are the other core values well represented in the security discourse, which points out that the initial selection at the onset of the methodological course of the project has been satisfactorily useful to describe the security snapshot of the selected countries and regions. Only 'Cultural identity and security' has clearly fallen behind with the best score as low as 5th most important value which can be interpreted as a unimportant concern nowadays or perhaps demanding an adapted definition.

For the most part, the picture shows a great degree of interrelation, since in many cases a single security challenge simultaneously affects a number of core values. For example, illegal immigration is related to 'Physical safety and security', 'Economic prosperity and security', 'Social stability and

security' and 'Cultural identity and security'. Similar results are found for natural hazards and human-induced threats, correlated to 'Physical safety and security', 'Environmental and ecologic security', and 'Economic prosperity and security'. This reveals the key nature of multidimensionality, and the fact that threats may cause many effects in various areas, thus requiring early stakeholders' participation in analyzing effects and suggesting prevention, mitigation and response measures.

Another couple of key finding regards the actors and levels of the regional/country discourses. The national governments are the main addressor across the countries followed by the national parliament and private sector, while general public is the prominent object actor. With regards to levels, in all the countries the national level is the most salient. Due to the type of sources used in the coding exercise, this may manifest certain concern with the identification of the actual accountability of the actors with respect to the missions. In fact, there has been repeatedly reported that joint operations with different stakeholders, even in the same countries, are burdened by inefficiencies sometimes arising from technical problems like lack of interoperability, but also from more organizational deficiencies like non-unified command or clear responsibilities.

Coupling these two findings on actors and levels tells something interesting about the dominant political framework for the countries analyzed. Indeed, it seems to be that national level and national government are still the two main points of reference for the security discourse. Despite the pressure towards EU level to address challenges which are by nature global or at least European, as well as the shift towards local identities, interests, and levels experiences by several EU countries while the political class and the private sector still talk mainly to the national audience, most probably because of electioneering and short-sighted supply-push oriented mindsets.

As any analysis that occurs at a given moment, there are some temporary factors that have slipped into it, affecting partially some relative values, but overall the results of the regional/country analysis demonstrate that the existing security challenges will remain salient in the nearest future and addressing them require thinking about the global context. Security has been theoretically reframed from national interest to a more local human security-oriented discourse, while simultaneously giving more importance to faraway problems that conspicuously have showed to be able to impact also in the nearest area. However, the national, even intra-national interests are still important if only because there is a sharing sovereignty in many aspects of the EU and actors empowered to plan solutions and assign resources conduct their work still at that level, especially in Security.

4.2 Considerations on the Regional Reports findings on Ethics and Human Rights

The analysis of the different national and regional reports demonstrates that the human rights and ethical dimension is not present uniformly; nonetheless a common trend can be found with regard to NGOs which, in most countries, explicitly deal with the human rights and ethical implication of security policies and measures.

In some countries, most of the sources do hardly consider human rights and ethical principles as explicitly associated to security. In other countries, it emerges clearly that some core values which are considered either particularly relevant due to contemporary events (e.g. terrorism, illegal immigration, natural disasters, climate change) or pressing issues which, in most cases, are legacy of a recent past (e.g. minorities, discrimination), are dealt as related to human rights and ethics only by Parliament publications.

The fact that human rights and ethical principles are not homogenously considered by all the sources (e.g. Government and Parliament publications) as associated with given core values, does not automatically mean that they are not inherent to security policies. It should be furthermore underlined that explicitly acknowledging ethics and human rights as related to security in 'de jure' official documents has implications in 'de facto' policies.

The coding analysis demonstrated that while at the EU level security is considered in broader terms, at the national level, the notion of security is still focused on identifying strategies and initiatives to counteract compelling challenges. In this regard, the European Union should try to pave the way forward for national security strategies and initiatives that take in due account the human rights and ethical dimension. More projects should focus on instilling such values at national level in order to make national security strategies consistent with ethical and human rights requirements.

4.3 Recommendations for decision-makers and stakeholders

The analysis of the security discourses cannot be in any case sufficient per se to formulate concrete policy recommendation. It rather helps understand how the popular discourse perceives actors, levels, core values and most prominent security challenges instead of offering immediate support to formulation and implementation of specific policies. All that notwithstanding, decision makers and stakeholders interested in the regional security discourse and the related security policies, and in particular EU institutions, can benefit from some recommendations.

The following set of recommendations is composed mostly of broader observations on security governance roughly extracted from an overall perception of the results in the regional reports. It is conceived as an introductory collection of themes to be handled in higher detail in WP9 and specifically in its resulting deliverable D9.1 "Final report on the evolving concept of security". Topics are not listed according to any predetermined relevance criteria.

- **Most of the salient security challenges linked to the salient core values should enjoy a reconnaissance at the EU level policies**. Overall, there is little positive consideration in the regional discourse for the contribution given by the European Union to address the threats on the spotlight, concerning economic crisis, illegal migration and natural hazards/extreme weather linked to climate change. For example, it is worth noticing that the EU Civil Protection Mechanism has undergone a reform since 2013 to ensure 24/7 monitoring of request for assistance, and to ensure a set of response capacity tools (the so-called "Modules") pre-committed by Member States that are also available for deployment in non-

EU Member States. Despite such improvements, the state of the art regional discourse includes the perception of an inadequate role played by the Union on several policy areas related to predominant threats.

- **The national level should be the target of actions from policy-makers and stakeholders since it is the main level for the security discourse**. Although initiatives at local level may have a certain impact depending on the policy-area, the target audience and the circumstances, the national level is where the security perceptions are shaped and therefore should be considered as the main arena for action.

- **National governments and the private sector should be considered the main interlocutors for policy-makers and stakeholders,** since they are the main actors in the regional security discourse. This is not to say that other actors like NGOs, think tanks, academia, etc., should be neglected in the national and EU-wide security discourse, but the largest say belongs to these two actors, which therefore deserve a priority engagement. Initiatives must be promoted to facilitate this dialogue, and, from the EU perspective, this may entail increasing mutual visibility and cooperation.

- **Engagement of different stakeholders by national government is critical**. The analysis of national security strategies or security-related documents highlighted the limited contribution by non-institutional stakeholders to their development, and this aspect should be addressed. Risk assessment as well as the definition of an adequate prevention, mitigation or response mechanism would need to be elaborated through an inclusive dialogue among central governments and other relevant actors, including the private sector but also the broader public.

- **National institutions should devote more attention to their communication strategies**, and work for the convergence of their perceptions of security and those of other relevant stakeholders. Indeed, the positions and attitudes of all the actors may be interrelated, thus the dialogue must be seen as an evolving exercise and not an occasional clash of interest. For such a process to become instrumental, it should lead to the elaboration of documents reporting shared visions and convergent perceptions in the security domain, thus ensuring a broader support to the resulting public policies, less prone to be altered by political vagaries, though facing up the exceptional is also an unavoidable part of Security mission.

- **Breaking the myths about security concerns is important.** Otherwise the debate is prone to den up in platitudes and inefficiencies. This affects for instance the public debate of hot issues like illegal immigration and/or terrorism that can be distorted by extreme (sometimes racist) positions. More specifically, the logic behind this suggestion is to dispel some myths through the explanation of concrete facts and figures provided by academia and think tanks, with support of national institutions in terms of communication tools. This recommendation doesn't attempt to yank the controversy out of the political debate, but to increase transparency, accountability, and, in the long-run, resilience.

- **The degree of convergence among national historical trajectories should be taken in high consideration.** It will be easier to accept quid pro quo allocations and dedications at higher level if it is demonstrated that they tend to curb common problems instead of trying to make believe it just by the force of facts or mere declarations. Insisting on the commonalities of certain missions may be vain if not supported by factual evidence that the consequences are shared. In other cases, a subtle support to the enforcement of particular policies by one or two countries faced by the same problem can be enough for the EU institutions.

- **As in most complex situations, the one-solution-fits-all approach rarely applies, and in Security even less so.** The regional reports openly show that each country has its particularities when it comes to the security discourse, even in countries with parallel histories and geographical proximity. Internal dynamics count too, and the sum of past experiences can make apparently similar countries a very different actor in front of common security challenges. Recommendations can be justified, but promptly application belongs to countries.

- **From a European Union point of view, any security strategy should consider different history, culture and geopolitical situation of the different countries but the past cannot drive our present**. History has forged notable particularities which make the impact of a given action in different countries even less predictable. The key is then not so much to be able to join forces but to be able to elicit commitment underpinned by deeply discussed stakeholders support nationally. Only then a common approach based on assuming its share of the responsibility can be built.

- **Security lessons learnt in one country are not always shared regionally**. While some countries have suffered significant losses when confronted by attacks or disasters, the absorption of the experience and the countering measures remains apparent only in their own initiatives but they don't pervade abroad. For example, concerns for cyberattacks in Lithuania has not spread similar concerns in other countries, even in the regional area, though regional condition in the field of cybersecurity can be plainly useless.

- **Lack of homogeneity in basic principles can derail shared efforts**. In some regions there are still clear gaps in the basic structures of their political and economic systems, which negatively influence any attempt to reach a common understanding including the appraisal and assessment of security challenges. Adopting shared solutions would be more efficient if they are supported in the progress towards adequate governance, law enforcement, critical infrastructures protection, and other non-military issues. In some case, this will entail smoothening petty particularities at the EU level.

- **Balance between addressing events and trends is highly recommendable**. In general terms, more attention is usually paid to 'hard security' challenges that can be associated with specific events than to sustainable but less immediately perceptible ones. For example, terrorism is highly visible, the actions of prevention are clear and sometimes pervasive, and thus it is easier to prioritise such events over, for instance, climate change, the impacts of

which do not occur on a regular basis, and even becoming more frequent, are not completely understood under the same umbrella.

- **Increasing the awareness not only of consequences but also of causes**. Security discourses in the media or even in the political arena sometimes dramatically differs from the discourses in the academy or in policy trends. For example, climate change is seen as a cause which has to be mitigated in the policy documents whereas media mainly focuses on its impacts (i.e. natural hazards such as flood). This causes certain perplexity in the public that may react unevenly confronted with security expenditures or resource mobilizations. Though complete alignment would be against the expectable mix of interests in complex societies, informed based decision making and communication is advisable if only to avoid swaying objectives.