

**From:** HOME NOTIFICATIONS B4  
**Sent:** 05 July 2016 15:31  
**To:** HOME NOTIFICATIONS B4  
**Subject:** informal mtg MR/ Luigi Rebuffi, EOS - our mini contribution

**From:** PYKE Belinda (HOME)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 16, 2014 12:18 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] (HOME); HOME DIR C  
**Cc:** HOME DG ASSISTANTS; [REDACTED] (HOME); [REDACTED] (HOME); [REDACTED] (HOME); [REDACTED] (HOME); [REDACTED] (ENTR)  
**Subject:** informal mtg MR/ Luigi Rebuffi, EOS - our mini contribution

Thanks [REDACTED]. Rebuffi wants to tap the Juncker investment plan so Matthias knows about that. On the border management pt, here is C1's input. I'd add that Rebuffi knows the security research programme well and was in Genoa at the conference last week

- It is true that Europe needs to **better connect research and practice**. The challenge in this regard is to make the two sides (supply and demand) talk to each other, i.e. how to make sure that what research has to offer is what the practitioners need. *[We are currently piloting a new approach in this under an FP7 Closeye project, which looks at improving the performance of surveillance tools. It represents a change in the research and development model, since it is the users who define the operational needs and user requirements that are then followed up by the industry's technical solutions in pre-operational validation during real operations. In other words, it is the users who steer the innovation process. I think this is a right way to better associate the authorities with the R&D that we should further explore.]*
- **Bringing the research unit into DG HOME** structure should also create the tighter links between research and practice.
- **It is not the amount of funding for research that we should focus on but the way we use the funding already available**, notably the aforementioned link between researchers/developers and end users. I am convinced that our financial instruments and funding already programmed can sufficiently contribute to this task.
- **Security Research in Horizon 2020 can support the development of new projects and technologies, that can be later taken on board and brought into wider application under ISF borders.** Note that the new Internal Security Fund (under the Union Actions) envisages a.o. supporting particularly innovative projects developing new methods and/or technologies with a potential for transferability to other Member States, especially projects which aim to **test and validate research projects** [under the Union Actions]. However,

whether and how we address this objective will also depend on policy priorities.

- Your **proposals on "Integrated Border Management"** (including the creation of technology and capability roadmap and additional funding) **should also be seen in this context**. The challenge is not the funding but the way we programme it and assuring its connection with the user needs. Horizon 2020 and the Internal Security Fund are the two arms which can interact and provide a good framework for bringing new innovative tools into border management. The challenge is to use those funds efficiently rather than to get an extra funding.
- Furthermore, and most importantly, as far as **integrated border management** is concerned, we are currently **reflecting on redefinition of the concept at European level**. We should now thus prioritise our action on the contents of the concept itself. [Note the EOS was suggesting that the European technology and capability roadmap that they are suggesting would a.o. define the integrated border management model)]