



## Policy Recommendations

Overview of the analysis and conclusions identified in the project's lifetime – Identifying challenges and good practices for moving forward

Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



## Policy Recommendations

Overview of the analysis and conclusions identified in the project's lifetime – Identifying challenges and good practices for moving forward

### IO8.1 Report presenting Analysis and conclusions

**The 'Needs-based education and studies in societal security' (NEEDS) project**  
**No: 2020-1-SE01-KA203-078013**

Intellectual Output 8 (IO8) Policy Recommendations  
Task 8.1

August 2023 version to be published online

**Compiled by:**

Hamburg Fire and Rescue Services (Jürgen Krempin)  
Council of the Baltic Sea States (Franziska Seufert)

With the support of NEEDS project partners

**Project note**

NEEDS – Needs-based education and studies in societal security was an innovative project aiming to strengthen the quality, attractiveness and scope of education in societal security through tackling the mismatches between the focus of education, and the knowledge needs in the field. As an EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region's Flagship project under Policy Area Secure, NEEDS was exemplary for cross-sectoral, multi-level and transnational cooperation on the joint approach for the education of future professionals in the field of societal security.

For further information on NEEDS, see: <https://cbss.org/projects-cbss/needs/>

**Disclaimer**

*The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

## Table of Content

Preface: about the NEEDS project.....	4
1 Introduction.....	5
1.1 Objective .....	5
1.2 Methodology .....	6
2 Description of project outputs .....	6
2.1 Intellectual Outputs.....	7
2.2 Activity Outputs.....	11
3 Analysis of challenges.....	12
4 Good practices.....	14
5 Conclusions for moving forward .....	16
Summary .....	18
Annex.....	20

## Preface: about the NEEDS project

(based on preface by Prof. Christer H. Pursiainen, University in Tromsø - UiT)

The 'Needs-based education and studies in societal security' (NEEDS) project addresses the skills gap and mismatch between higher education and the knowledge needs in this field, as well as the fact that there is a lack of structured transnational cooperation and dialogue between higher education institutions, practitioners, and experts in tackling these issues.

The project is co-funded by the EU Erasmus+ Strategic Partnership (project code 2020-1-SE01- KA203 078013) and runs from September 2020 through August 2023. It is led by the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) Secretariat, an intergovernmental regional organisation with ten member states. The project partners represent a variety of higher education institutions, regional organisations, and national authorities from Finland, Germany, Norway, Poland, Latvia and Sweden. The objective of NEEDS is to better prepare the next generation working in the field of societal security by boosting their educational experiences with the most relevant, field-specific and up-to-date knowledge and skills. This objective will be achieved through the co-creation of educational materials by cross-sectoral, multi-level and transnational teams, where the input for developing such material is collected directly from those working in practice in the field.

The NEEDS project focuses on the Baltic Sea Region (BSR), made up of ten countries (i.e., the full members of the CBSS: Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, and Sweden). Even though the NEEDS project focuses primarily on the BSR, the results may also be relevant for other regions. The project will meet societal security challenges by 1) developing common learning materials for a short online course on societal security for the BSR, as well as 2) establishing a professional networking community and an interface for collaboration. Transnational and cross-sectoral teams will be at the centre of these efforts and will draw upon an innovative pedagogical approach. Nurturing strategic partnerships and cooperation will strengthen trust and deepen understanding between sectors and countries in the BSR, helping to improve common efforts and reduce the risk of conflict and misunderstanding.

The report at hand – using Erasmus+ vocabulary – represents the NEEDS project's Intellectual Output 8 (IO8) Task 1 (IO8.1). In this work package, it stands together with and serves as basis for two other tasks:

- IO8.2 – *Documentation of Discussions* regarding the NEEDS project and the Policy Area Secure Steering Group
- IO8.3 – *Policy Brief* to report back on developments in the NEEDS project

The report at hand (Task 8.1) is a first basis to the IO8 work in general. Its aim is to create a report giving an overview of the analysis and conclusions identified in the project's lifetime. The report will include an analysis of the challenges identified especially but not exclusively during the project activity Intensive Study Programmes (ISPs). The main issue will be to lead up to the formulation of policy recommendations. To find those, it describes the outputs of the project, the analysis, what good practices were identified and what conclusions were reached to move forward.

## 1 Introduction

The ‘Needs-based education and studies in societal security’ (NEEDS) project, being led by the CBSS Secretariat, is closely connected to the work of CBSS’s Civil Protection Network (CPN) which brings together the Directors General and their experts from the field of civil protection in the BSR to exchange views and experiences, as well as collaborate on developments and challenges.

In May 2017, all Directors General adopted the [“Joint Position on Enhanced Cooperation in the Civil Protection Area in the BSR”](#). The Joint Position was developed through broad consultations with civil protection stakeholders from across the BSR; the participants in the consultations discussed, mapped and analysed the needs for future cooperation. Thus, the Joint Position is the result of the needs analysis conducted through the consultations.

One of the prioritised areas in the Joint Position is developing demand-driven and well-tailored training and education. The NEEDS project is a concrete operationalisation of this priority area, and a concrete action for implementation of the priority. The Joint Position also highlighted the need for a “common societal security culture” in the BSR; the NEEDS project contributes to this through developing a joint approach for the education of the future professionals in the field of societal security. The need to bridge the gap between professionals working practically in the field and higher education institutions is also emphasised in the Joint Position; the NEEDS project addresses this with the methodology used for the ISPs. During the ISPs experts, practitioners, policy makers, teachers, professors, and students met and discussed issues from a practice-oriented perspective, where those working with the issues today shared their knowledge, insights and experience as well as highlight the gaps for tackling certain issues effectively.

IO8 will deliver a concrete response and follow up to the previous discussions among the Directors General in Civil Protection in the BSR, based on the insights accumulated throughout the NEEDS project. Recommendations will be presented to the Annual Meeting of the DGs with the request to endorse and/or support them. Through the endorsement/support there will be a commitment from the civil protection authorities to continuously contribute to developing needs-based education and studies in the field of societal security.

### 1.1 Objective

The overall objective of this output (IO8) is that the policy recommendations will contribute to a broader discourse in the Civil Protection Network and Policy Area Secure Steering Group regarding developing a joint approach for the education of the future professionals in the field of societal security. The NEEDS project brings together teachers and students from Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), practitioners, and experts. The HEIs in the project realise that studies in societal security requires a more practice-oriented perspective. On the other hand, the Directors General for Civil Protection have recognised the need for improved cooperation between academia and national civil protection authorities, as well as the need for developing demand-driven and well-tailored training and education in societal security. The NEEDS project partnership represents a cross-sectoral approach to address these needs.

The objective of this report more specifically, meaning task 8.1, is to contribute to producing the policy recommendations by creating this report which summarises and analyses the challenges and the good practices and conclusions for moving forward that were identified in the ISP discussions and overall project’s lifetime. The report is set to bring further discussions among the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR) Policy Area Secure and CBSS CPN experts about, on needs-based education and the NEEDS project in general (as per IO8 task 2).

## 1.2 Methodology

This report is based on information, perspectives and experiences as discussed and shared during the project's four Learning Teaching Training (LTT) events which included a Teachers Training (TT) and three Intensive Study Programmes (ISPs) for students, as well as the so-called Multiplier Events (ME). These activities were organised partly online (due to the pandemic) and partly in person, hosted by project partners in Germany, Finland, Latvia, Norway and Sweden. Participants were: the project partners (both teachers and practitioners), students from the partnering higher education institutions (HEI), and expert practitioners from the field acting as trainers and representing Hamburg Fire and Rescue Service and Union of the Baltic Cities Safe Cities Commission.

During the ISPs (and other activities), discussions around current issues from a practice-oriented perspective were held between the participants. The knowledge, insights and experience shared to tackle certain issues effectively are gathered in this report (task 8.1). Other work processes of the project included for example surveys to collect data in information. Surveys related to the content and conduction of the activities, as well as to topics and field-related needs. They were replied to by internal (students, partners) and external (wider network) sources. This method was also used to gather feedback from the LTTs. Therefore, surveys are another output which is taken into consideration in this report. In short, data base of this report was collected during the project activities (LTTs, MEs) and through surveys. Data means results and opinions from discussions, work sessions and surveys. Notes were taken from discussions, papers and presentations saved after sessions and survey results compiled. The process from data to report is to condense information through the practice of text mining or content analysis.

The scope of this report is the description of project outputs (chapter 2), analysis of challenges (chapter 3) and good practices (chapter 4), and presentation of ideas for moving forward (chapter 5). It looks thereby at the input or feedback regarding both the work processes, structures and activities of the project itself, and the topical content (current issues from a practice-oriented perspective: climate, youth and security, pandemic, cyber security – based on the IO3 case studies). The primary source material for the analysis is said information from above mentioned discussions and surveys. Other sources are referenced if needed for a wholistic context, but this report does not aim to analyse societal security education or overall data. Its aim is rather to present the views and concluded recommendations of student, practitioner, and teacher participants from the NEEDS project from around the BSR.

This focus is important to mention, as the overall objective is to draw well-founded policy recommendations from the analysis.

## 2 Description of project outputs

As developed and set in the project concept and introduced above, this report starts by describing the project outputs. This includes the to this point existing (or developing) Intellectual Outputs, as well as outputs that took form of an activity. The descriptions are a summary of the project concept, the externally expressed expectations where applicable, and the actual work process. It is important to have this base of information to continue with challenges and good practices that stem from or relate to the outputs.

## 2.1 Intellectual Outputs

### 2.1.1 Glossary of terms in Societal Security Education

The project's IO1 (first Intellectual Output) is the so-called Glossary of Terms – a multilingual glossary developed for HEI to be used in courses on societal security, and beneficial for national agencies, practitioners and experts, or policy makers in the field. The preparation (in form of seminars, seed-funding project, discussions) for the NEEDS project proposal concluded that, at the time, there was no single, easy to use, agreed upon, glossary to support cooperation in the field of societal security in a transnational context in the Baltic Sea Region. There are of course existing and related glossaries and terminologies (UNDRR, CIPedia, ISO Vocabulary, EC CBRNE Glossary). However, during discussions in various fora, such as in the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region's (EUSBSR) Policy Area Secure Steering Group and in the CBSS Civil Protection Network, both consisting of the representatives from the national competent authorities responsible for civil protection, the issue of definitions of concepts used in the BSR cooperation had been brought up. So far reality is that key concepts are discussed from scratch each time a new cooperation initiative or project is about to be launched. While drawing upon above mentioned existing sources, the innovation this IO would contribute with, was creating one regional and relevant combined glossary by adapting and complementing this existing terminological work to the needs of HEIs in the field of societal security. This would make cooperation easier by saving time and increasing the common understanding and contributes to bridging the gaps between countries and sectors. The aim is to increase the cooperation through greater cohesion in the understanding of the relevant concepts.

The Glossary of Terms was developed as a task under the leadership of Main School of Fire Service (MSFS), Warsaw, early in the project. It was decided to create a glossary document consisting of a list of terms, and then a section for each term including the term in English, translations into all partners' BSR languages and their definitions with sources. As task leader MSFS was responsible for driving the process, starting and coordinating the development, compiling a draft glossary based on the input and needs identified by all partners and finalising the glossary accordingly. All partners contributed by participating in the planning meetings, by brainstorming also when it came to the selection of terms, and by giving feedback and comments throughout the process. Once the terms and content were set, all partners contributed furthermore by translating the terms into their languages and adding adequate sources that would explain the term in the respective languages. Partners would also work on identifying potential target groups and support the initial use and dissemination. MSFS received support especially from Liepaja Municipal Police who next to the general development of the glossary like all partners, developed the layout and final version of the output.

The Glossary was used in other project activities, such as the Intensive Study Programmes (ISPs), was presented to stakeholders, is part of the Online Course and Community and can also be accessed via the project presentations on the partners' websites.

Klick [here](#) to access the NEEDS Glossary of Terms in Societal Security Education.

### 2.1.2 Guidelines and Recommendations for Societal Security Education in the Baltic Sea Region

IO2 is a collection of reports, including a final report as Guidelines and Recommendations for Societal Security Education in the BSR. With Societal Security not being considered a traditional academic discipline, and moreover, being taught under a variety of titles, faculties or even institutions; relying on multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches; as well as missing an established dominating theory or debate culture in the field, the latter is rather practice oriented. Tasks and professional goals were found to be of the more operational and managerial kind. This IO would address four challenges

where joint solutions would be in the interest of the participants, despite their different national backgrounds and while still respecting the autonomy of organising the future of their Societal Security education. These challenges are establishing a better picture about the existing practices of Societal Security higher education in different countries and campuses, combining the available theoretical and practical perspectives into a useful whole and contribute to the establishment of the field as theory-informed and evidence-based academic discipline with a clear practical relevance, identifying the interfaces where students could receive field-related work experience, and looking at the study programmes through international and cross-border lenses to see how cross-border issues are or could be dealt with already at the educational level.

The Guidelines and Recommendations were developed as a number of reports under the leadership of the University in Tromsø (UiT). The reports are on “Societal Security as Higher Education: State of the Art in the Baltic Sea Region”, “Enhancing societal Security Graduate Employability in the Baltic Sea Region” and in total the “Key Observations and Recommendations” deriving from the research. As the task leader, UiT had the main responsibility for coordinating and leading the planning meetings for this IO. They drafted the three published deliverables (reports) and finalised the reports for publication after input and consultation with the partners. Partners supported the process of collecting data by, for example, mapping the nationally existing study programmes in the field and analysing their concrete curricula. Partners reported their findings and provided further input and feedback when reading and commenting on the outcome (reports).

The reports will serve as guidelines and recommendations. They were shared with stakeholders, can be accessed on the partners’ websites, and will be available in the project’s Online Course and Community.

Klick [here](#) to access the reports.

### 2.1.3 Case Studies

IO3 answers to a previously conducted needs analysis of the societal security culture in the BSR and contributes to the development of demand-driven and well-tailored training and education activities by creating case studies and learning material based on those. The case studies and any connected material would highlight the main societal security concerns and challenges in the BSR, are published as learning materials for the online course (to students, researchers, practitioners and other HEIs), and would serve as material for practitioners’ educational and crisis preparedness activities. The focus and innovative aspect of the IO would establish the foundation for a new approach in societal security education where international cooperation and the consideration of cross-boundary risks are integrated. The fact that different organisations and nations pursue sometimes radically different policies and approaches to the same crises bear witness to the fact that there is a need to discuss and analyse case studies and to produce common learning materials. IO3 and its practice-oriented perspective therefore also feed into other outputs such as the course or community.

The case studies were developed under the lead of the Swedish Defence University (SEDU) with RTU, SEDU, LAUREA and Liepaja contributing one or two case studies each. An overall questionnaire was sent to stakeholders across the networks and region to gather best possible input on multiple aspects – including IO3. From the external input, partners analysed and narrowed the suggestions down to four topics for four case studies: climate, cyber security, pandemics and youth. All partners supported this planning and decision process and gave expert thematic input where applicable. SEDU did then design a framework for the case studies, wrote or supervised the writing of the case studies and repackaged the studies into learning material for the online course. In this IO, student contribution



was especially relevant, with some of the case studies being developed by NEEDS-affiliated students. The students wrote the case studies as their thesis or as a form of internship placement with the project in their universities. This process was supervised by SEDU and other partners, like Liepaja Municipal Police and CBSS were especially involved in regularly brainstorming, teaching and advising to the process. Liepaja did furthermore write one of the case studies (about youth and security).

The case studies were used in other project activities, especially in the Intensive Study Programmes (ISPs). They were presented to stakeholders, are a part of the Online Course and will be available in the Online Community and on the project presentations on the (partners') websites presenting NEEDS.

Klick [here](#) to access the Case Study publication.

#### 2.1.4 Pedagogical Approach

The project's IO4 deals with the Pedagogical Approach both in the process of designing and later conducting the online course. This work package picked up on educational debates and existing learning objectives, weighing arguments on traditional and innovative teaching to then examine and develop a joint pedagogical approach to meet the learning needs in Societal Security online, in the project ISPs and otherwise. It is based on the consideration that Societal Security students need both instructive teaching and more tailored and interactive 'learning-by-doing' in their studies. The target groups include the HEI partners' students participating in the ISPs and anyone joining the online module in the online community.

The Joint Pedagogical Approach was a common work effort under the lead of Laurea University of Applied Sciences, Finland. Laurea started the process by writing about different pedagogical approaches used at their university and collected input from all partners on further approaches, various pedagogical styles, and tools used by partners and across the region. All partners provided feedback on the compiled and developed approach and supported the effort of applying and implementing it through ISPs and online learning materials. The output consists of a report on digital solutions (drafted by UiT) and most importantly the Pedagogical Approach for NEEDS – jointly created and jointly used during the ISPs. Connected to the output was a Teacher Training (which SEDU assisted in organising and running), to agree with the trainers on the approach for the ISPs.

The outcome, the pedagogical approach was concrete but intangible in the sense that it was the way of teaching and working together. The joint pedagogical approach cannot be shown in a publication or other, but part of the research and preparation to the approach was looking at digital tools and solutions. You can [click here](#) to see a report on the results of this part of the IO and teaching approach.

#### 2.1.5 Online Course

To respond to the skills gap in societal security in the BSR and respond to the identified need to find common ground and a shared understanding of societal security in the BSR, IO5 establishes an Online Course – meaning an innovative online module for self-study that aims to increase knowledge of resilience (societal security). Addressed at students of HEIs and young professionals from practitioner organisations across the BSR (and globally), the online module provides a transnational perspective, drawing on the joint pedagogical approach (IO4) from HEIs in the partnership who are pioneers and leaders in education and research in the field of Societal Security. Apart from drawing on IO4, the self-study module includes parts or results from many of the IOs, such as the glossary of terms and case studies, providing the accumulated knowledge on societal security. The course is also interesting to students wanting to gain a better picture of resilience especially in the BSR. For reaching out to as

many interested people as possible, the online course will be integrated into the online community (IO6).

Laurea was also task leader for the creation of the Online Course, meaning the partner led the planning, work, editing and finalisation of the output. The overall output “Online Course” consists of eight modules:

- Concepts of societal security
- Shared understanding of the societal security culture in the BSR
- Societal security values functions and services,
- Crisis management cycle
- Risk assessment
- Risk landscape in the BSR
- Crisis diagnosis and Crisis management
- Resilience

All partners contributed by participating in the planning and development phases, and concretely by producing content for modules or entire modules. Some partners were involved in the technical parts of the course creation (uploading and editing) or testing phase (finding testers and collecting and analysing the test results), as well. Students and practitioners have considerably contributed to the course creation through steering discussions, ideas and testing the material in connection with and during the ISPs.

The Online Course is situated in the e-learning platform Canvas, hosted by SEDU. More information is available [here](#).

#### 2.1.6 Online Community

With IO6, a platform for eLearning has been established as well as an online community for the enrolled students, project partners, associated partners, other key societal security institutions and practitioner organisations around the BSR. According to the preparatory research and stakeholder opinions, the societal security community in the BSR lacks a common digital platform for knowledge and experience exchange between practitioners and academia, but even overall between professions, organisation, countries, and sectors. Today’s societal security challenges require greater dialogue and stronger cooperation between individuals and responsible organisations in order to produce results, in this case adapted to the BSR. Such a platform also furthers networking, discussions, and collaboration, leading to more projects, common initiatives and in the long run to harmonised policies in the region. The community (to consist of students, researchers, practitioners, and policy and decision makers) will make use of the existing HEIs e-learning platform Canvas as its foundation. Canvas is being tailored to the needs of the community and it being already used by HEIs is considered an advantage when working towards a user friendly and accessible solution with longevity. At the same time other existing platforms will be used and connected to Canvas to create synergies and widen the community across existing networks.

The Online Community output creation is led by SEDU (- at the time of writing this report, the IO6 development is still ongoing). The task leader takes main responsibility in driving the process from planning to implementation, while all partners support the process in form of research, input discussions, and partly technical support. Especially the practicing project partners are involved in inviting users. This output benefitted heavily of the previously mentioned questionnaire to external stakeholders which was developed, shared and analysed by the project partners in order to gather

information on needs and dislikes for an Online Community. Basically, an inventory of needs for various functions was created which is now being put into practice.

The Online Community will lean on different e-platforms to create synergies with existing platforms and avoid duplication. It is therefore set up in SEDU's Canvas (like the Online Course), and on the platforms [TUOVI](#) and [CMiNE](#). TUOVI is a free online collaboration space by the Finnish Ministry of Interior, aiming for stakeholders from across the field of internal security to share knowledge among members. CMiNE is a free and informal network (maintained by a Resilience Advisors Network) that is focusing on safety and security topics and especially connecting projects in the field.

## 2.2 Activity Outputs

### 2.2.1 Learning Teaching Training Events

Learning Teaching Training (LTT) Events include two different kinds of event. At first, a teacher training (TT) took place for the NEEDS project partners' staff to co-create and develop the joint pedagogical approach that was then used during the next events. Theoretical concepts and learning material were discussed and were given feedback by the participants, namely teachers, practitioners and other experts who provide education on the field. The same (or similar) group would then go on to teach the students during the project's second kind of LTT, the Intensive Study Programmes (ISP).

The ISPs brought together experts, practitioners, teachers, and students for structured cooperation and dialogue on the topic of knowledge and education when it comes to resilience and better preparing the next generation of societal security experts. Through these events, the project could both test the prepared material and observe the knowledge exchange between students and practitioners in action. Not only the previously identified skills gaps and mismatches can be taken into account but also, through evaluation, the experiences, knowledge and insights (especially about the presentation of learning materials) from the events themselves.

A total of four events was held, with one TT and three ISPs. The ISPs were guided by the outcomes of the project but specifically by the planning and discussions from the TT. The three ISPs worked each under a different topic of one of the case studies. The about 60 students (ca 20 in each ISP) met the group of a dozen trainers (teachers and practitioners) and discussed over the course of a week different points and angles towards their topic of societal security. An important component is the transnational character of the LTTs, reflecting the work in a field that is inherently international in its nature. From developing content and methodology in transnational teams of a multi-level and cross-sectoral project partnership from across the BSR, to furthering internationalised work and courses, the aim is to contribute to realistically preparing the next generation of cross-border risk and crisis managers.

### 2.2.2 Multiplier Events

The project outcomes of NEEDS and its pedagogical and digital solutions are beneficial for various stakeholders in the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) as well as other regions. During what is called a Multiplier Event (ME) in Erasmus+ lingua, the project results, in particular the intellectual outputs, are disseminated to a wider audience of practitioners and students. The NEEDS project had two Multiplier Events – one conducted in Hamburg, Germany and a second in Tromsø, Norway.

The Tromsø event was directed more towards students and presented to them the project as such, an overview of the outputs and especially the ISPs and other ways in which students were involved in the NEEDS project or could be involved in the development of societal security studies. Through meeting

practitioners, teachers and other experts and through being in dialogue with them, the students learned more about the project and its results. At least as important: the Multiplier Event put into practice what the project aims to achieve – dialogue and collaboration between academia/education and practitioners while building a community.

The Multiplier Event in Hamburg achieved similar, however, it targeted experts and practitioners as audience. The event took place back-to-back with the UBC Safe Cities Commission's (UBC SCC) meeting and the EUSBSR Policy Area Secure Steering Group meeting, leading to participation from the UBC SCC and PA Secure SG networks. They were introduced to the NEEDS project as such, as well as certain outputs more specifically (IO1 Glossary of Terms, IO3 Case Studies, IO5 Online Course). During this ME, the participants also had the opportunity to discuss the results of NEEDS further from their own organisational/country perspectives through workshop sessions on IO6 Online Community and IO8 Policy recommendations. This was done to produce long-term multiplier effects within the NEEDS partnership and the wider professional societal security network, by them contributing to the development and making the results more needs-based, as well as creating ownership through said contribution.

While not all the project IOs were finalised at the time of the Multiplier Events, the progress and status of the time was presented. Consequently, the task leaders of the IOs were able to draw on the input from the participants of (especially the first) ME.

The language of the events and all materials provided was English.

### 2.2.3 Surveys

Through the lifetime of the project, the findings and work have also been gathered and backed through conducting surveys both internally (project partners, consortium) and externally (wider networks, practitioners and participants). These were to collect concrete input to fulfil the tasks feeding into outputs or to document impressions and discussions held during some of the activities.

## 3 Analysis of challenges

This chapter will, as decided and set in the project concept and previously introduced, analyse the challenges of societal security studies and the NEEDS project that were identified over the course of the project duration. The analysis looks at topics and structures that were identified as challenges to societal security studies and a common societal security culture in the Baltic Sea Region (BSR). Data was extracted from all the sources/material (chapter 1.2). It was then clustered according to the issue or topic and categorised to find the most pressing challenges. (The categories and examples used in this chapter refer to the data compilation presented in the Annex of this report.)

The feedback from project partners, connected teachers, practitioners and students on the one hand, as well as the wider network of BSR experts on the other hand, brings up challenges that fall under the following categories:

- Contacts
- Cooperation
- Definitions, concepts
- Differences
- Dissemination
- Education

- End of the NEEDS project
- Expertise
- Knowledge/ experience exchange
- Network
- Opportunities
- Outreach
- Platform (IO6 Online platform and community)
- Policy
- Relevance
- Stakeholder groups
- Synergies
- Time
- Topics/ content
- Understanding the work/ each other

Considering how interlinked many of the topics and findings are, and in order to provide a meaningful and relevant overview, this report concentrates on the categories or thematic groups of categories that were most mentioned in the discussions and surveys:

1. Based on the analysis results, it is not the question of whether to work together on societal security studies in the BSR or which content to address, but the question of how to tackle this. Numerous comments and statements were made regarding **understanding each other and the work**, having **differences**, and common **definitions or concepts** being needed.

In the data, claims were made for “better understanding of societal security”, and to address “intangible/ invisible factors of societal security”. Problems were pointed out, such as language-related differences, different understandings of “collaboration”, or “understanding each other when working online” as a concern and difficulty in comparison to face-to-face meetings. Also, questions were brought up, such as “What does region and regional cooperation mean exactly?” and people still asked, “What is societal security?”.

2. Provided there were understanding and a common basis, people still feel unsure or unaware of relevant **contacts**, **stakeholders** and **network**, and state that the questions or work (like projects) lack **outreach** and **dissemination**.

Data shows that people have a need for “list with right point of contacts” or “a platform to ask for help without knowing anyone, getting help in return and therefore knowing the right person”. Despite wanting more cooperation between practitioners and HEIs, a challenge seems to be “who will take first step” and to “keep connections”. Despite the need or interest for different backgrounds, it is also listed as a challenge to have “mixture of students, teachers, practitioners”. A question is also how to reach stakeholders beyond project participants or “How to get new members join the community?”. In connection to outreach or dissemination it was stated that it were “hard to know what is out there”, pointing out the challenge of sticking out, similarly to statements along the lines of “NEEDS needs more visibility” and it “could have been disseminated more”. This challenge was mentioned both concretely for NEEDS, as well as for platforms in general.

3. Challenges are seen to both the overall BSR **cooperation**, as well as to **education** specifically (with NEEDS having an educational focus).

Questions about “how to become/ get an initiator of cross-border cooperation?”, and statements on different approaches to cooperation or opportunities (“we don’t know all opportunities”) pointed to the challenges when it comes to cooperation. Many concerns related to educational cooperation more specifically. To name only a few of the mentioned challenges, the data included statements like: “feedback and support should be available”, “making expectations clear (to learners)”, also pointing out the difference between ISPs having been guided whereas “online course is completely autonomous”, or “meeting different skill levels and expectations”, as well as the general expectation of a “more encompassing approach of teaching children up to professionals”.

4. The NEEDS project and its outputs are not disputed in their importance, but challenges are seen when it comes to **time** (inherent **end of project**) and strength in providing outputs of **relevance** (especially the **online platform**).

The aspect of time was a matter for the project implementation where outputs and activities were impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic, or getting used to partners took time so that “cooperation was more successful towards the end of an activity”. Time is important as well for the overall process, where “learning and bridging differences takes time” as “some students were not aware of the challenges we have to cope with in the BSR”. This is connected to relevance, because the project has limited time while there are “too many topics of interest” and challenges to deal with. A big question throughout, discussed both internally and externally was about the maintenance after the end of the project. Statements included “learners do not like old information”, “upkeep of course material”, or “how to keep users interested/active?”. Repeatedly expressed was also the “challenge to stand out from countless other platforms” leading many questions along the lines of “how to get people to join (yet another) community”.

## 4 Good practices

Similar to the analysis of challenges, and as foreseen for this report, this chapter will look at what stakeholders discussed and identified over the course of the project duration as good practices in the societal security studies and NEEDS project work. Data was extracted from all the sources/material mentioned in chapter 1.2. It was then clustered in the same way as for the challenges and categorised in order to – in this case – find the most mentioned good practices. (The categories and examples listed in this chapter are quoted from the data compilation given in the Annex.)

Below are aspects and structures that were identified as such examples or potential working ways to further societal security studies and a common societal security culture in the Baltic Sea Region (BSR). Stemming from the same discussions and questions, many good practices relate to the same or similar categories as the challenges:

- Communication
- Contacts
- Cooperation
- Definitions, concepts
- Education
- Expertise
- Instructions
- Knowledge/ experience exchange
- NEEDS outputs

- Network
- Outreach
- Platform (IO6 Online platform and community)
- Policies
- Practice/ practical
- Projects
- Stakeholder groups
- Synergies
- Transnational work
- Youth

The analysis shows that there are not only many challenges, but many good practices exist already, as well. In line with the previous chapter and the scope of this report, the good practices that were mentioned most in discussions and surveys relate to these categories or thematic groups of categories:

1. As the project is international and draws upon cooperation, input came from more and less experienced people (multi-level and cross-sectoral involvement), still proving that good practices around **cooperation** and **transnational work** are known already.

As an international project with data from transnational activities, there is inherently data of good experiences. Learners for example, stated being influenced by the project when it comes to “recognising similarities, importance of cooperation, connection to other participants”. Comments further included having positively “lessons learned from host country [*ed. note: country hosting the ISP or activity*]”, saying that “presentation of existing intergovernmental cooperation mechanisms in the BSR” is always valuable, as well as “a cross-sectorial component”, synergies are often used, or meetings and projects are mentioned as good practices.

2. When using the strength of the project consortium and thereby proving the point and importance of the project, it is not surprising that good practices link to **education** and **practice**.

Various tools, pedagogical approaches and different kinds of material were mentioned, always pointing out that variety and practice are wanted and best practice in education. Educational opportunities that offer workshops and practical learning sessions (even short-time, internships, etc.) as part of the programme are mentioned as needed and well accepted formats. Formats that include multi-level and cross-sectorial components, “case studies”, “guest lecturers (practitioners go to universities)” and programmes that prepare future colleagues for different aspects of the field, from “IT skills, language skills, communication skills”, to content and “practice, not only theory”. Although not always practiced, the knowledge and demand is there that best practice are and would be: internship opportunities, “exchange programmes”, and “common educational programmes in many universities”. A general undertone is the understanding that “collaboration from early on even on non-field-related aspects” is needed between academia and practitioners.

3. Even the **project outputs** (results from NEEDS work on its Intellectual Outputs) that were developed so far or could be visualised, were disseminated and presented to stakeholders who in turn considered those (especially the **Online Platform**) and found good practices around those.

Students were requesting more practical aspects to studies and practitioners stated that case studies are exactly what is needed for daily tasks and to improve management of – in this case – disasters. Case studies also “helped to deepen own knowledge. Therefore “intensive work on case studies” is mentioned in relation to good practices. Other NEEDS outputs are also repeatedly mentioned as part of good practices, such as glossary, or community. When it comes to online platforms data showed that many stakeholders “use digital tools, platforms and online communities already” on daily to regular basis.

4. Despite the challenges in this area, there were also good practices mentioned when it came to **contacts, communication, outreach** and **network**. This is a dichotomy that might root in among other the complexity of the digital world and pandemic times in which the NEEDS project took place.

Networking is one of the main and best practices in general. Both surveys as well as statements such as “already 25 years’ experience but expand my network and acting as contact point myself is always very helpful” are data supporting this as a good practice. Social media, going into schools and workshops are repeatedly mentioned as good ways for communication and outreach.

## 5 Conclusions for moving forward

From the discussions and findings of challenges as well as good practices derived conclusions on how to move forward when it came to the work of the NEEDS project and the approach to societal security studies in the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) in general. Again, data was extracted from all the sources/material mentioned in chapter 1.2. It was then clustered in relation to the issue or topic the statements related to and categorised to find out about the ideas for moving forward. (The references to listed categories and examples in this chapter are also the annexed data compilation.)

Consequently, very much in line with the fields of challenges and good practices, conclusions for moving forward were put in the following categories:

- Communication
- Communities
- Contacts
- Cooperation
- Education
- Expertise
- Knowledge/ experience exchange
- NEEDS outputs
- Network
- Opportunities
- Outreach
- Platform (IO6 Online platform and community)
- Policies
- Practice/ practical
- Projects
- Skills
- Topics/ content
- Transnational work
- Understanding the work/ each other



- Youth

The conclusions for moving forward that were mentioned most, align with categories or thematic groups of categories that were again similar to challenges and good practices, but not exclusively so. Considering that the participants might also (logically) have picked up on aspects that were missing in their opinion and experience, this section will also look at less prominent, more specific aspects.

1. As broad, but overarching fields **cooperation, projects** and **transnational work** were mentioned even in view of moving forward.

Uncountable voices related to using NEEDS project results and contacts. It was also stated that e.g. the course could “always be further developed” and there should be “more projects like NEEDS”. But other/ new projects were considered in general in connection to working together across the BSR also. Much of the data related to multilevel and cross-sectorial and cross-border cooperation, “promot[ing] the same societal security understanding in all BSR countries” and create transparency and enhance cooperation between different parts of society. Concrete suggestions that came up repeatedly were “to have yearly exercises between the BSR states to ensure a good cooperation between them, and to test policies and frameworks that the BSR shares” and to have more meeting opportunities for academia and practitioners, as well as “regular meetings between different countries’ experts and businesses”.

2. Conclusions related to moving forward when it comes to **education, practice, skills** and **expertise**.

Educational activities seemed to be the main interest for many respondents. It was suggested that authorities should “encourage the professionals to learn/teach” to support closing the gap between teaching and needs in the field. Concrete skills that were mentioned were for example: “networking skills, digital skills, international cooperation skills, communication skills” or “analysing skills, critical thinking, willingness to be an initiator, intercultural understanding”. The format of such education was suggested as “holding/ participating in interesting, goal-oriented courses with different participants helps become aware of different approaches, disciplines etc. which is crucial for problem solving”. Expertise was considered important both in connection to overall education as well as concrete project where it was recommended to “include more externals (experts, technical experts, existing platform users) from earlier on”. All in all, such activities for moving forward should aim towards “a universal education for schools in the BSR on sustainable risk management”, and “to create a common understanding of what civil security includes via education”.

3. Because of having many statements with both challenges and good practices, there are also examples for conclusions for moving forward **outreach, opportunity, communication** and other relevant related aspects.

Outreach and communication seem to be relatively closely interlinked. For example, it was mentioned to “communicate about authorities work (and its limitations)” or “civil protection authorities as guest lecturers” as concrete actions for civil protection authorities to continuously support the development of relevant education and studies in the field of societal security. Also, “outreach activities to local communities through multipliers (schools, church, volunteer organisations)” and offering “trainings and exercises” were to help society reach a secure ‘new normal”. Regarding communication it was also stated to “improve means of communication (adapt to audience, horizontal chains of communication, official communications channel)” and to “advertise the region/ work more”. It became also clear that more community outreach was considered needed (peer-to-peer teaching, international

'club' for children and youth on societal security), similar to (educational) opportunities. "Educating children via different, non-scholar formats (apps, stories, comic series etc.)", "[authorities and practitioners, *ed. note*] going into schools" or "holding more workshops and study programmes for young people", were suggested as educational outreach opportunities in moving forward.

4. Various conclusions for moving forward could also be deducted from discussions and input on concretely the **project outputs** (such as the **online platform**).

Most recommended and requested was to use the "valuable" NEEDS project outputs which related to the different outputs. Concretely about a platform or community it was recommended to make a platform stand out/ concentrating on a few/ specific good platforms: "Create ONE platform or channel which decision makers are using to create cohesion and transparency to the actions and their impacts". It was also made clear that it was important to give a focus to connecting educators and practitioners.

5. Numerous comments were also made regarding **youth, policies, community (local) and understanding the work and each other**. These topics were not (all) mentioned as prominently before in connection to challenges or good practices and stand out clearly for that reason.

The strongest recommendations were to "work towards similar policies" especially when it comes to "integrating societal security studies into the wider educational system (other study fields)". Concrete suggestions towards including or addressing youth and achieving better understanding were: to "give citizens basics of crisis management" when it comes to society and communities, to let international or cross-sectorial colleagues do "job shadowing" to learn and understand other organisations better, and to "engage students as researchers and interns", as well as making sure that one reaches out to young people in an appropriate way (language, youth-friendly channels,...).

## Summary

The NEEDS project supports exchange between HEI and practitioners in order to address the skills gap and mismatch between the societal security education and the knowledge needs in the field. Apart from developing a glossary, reports on the state of higher education in the field, case studies, a joint pedagogical approach, an online course module and online community, as well as a handbook on transferability, the project provides policy recommendations that will feed into a wider discourse in among other the CBSS Civil Protection Network (CPN) and EUSBSR Policy Area Secure regarding the development of a joint approach for the education of societal security's future professionals. In order to support this work and as a basis for developing these policy recommendations, this report was composed.

This report includes the overarching analysis of project results, challenges, good practices and suggestions for moving forward. As elaborated above, the main challenges were understanding the work and each other, having the relevant network and knowing which channels and tools are out there, having opportunities for cooperation and keeping outputs up-to-date (relevance). The preeminent good practices were knowledge and experience exchange, providing educational and practical opportunities, using existing outputs and tools, as well as networking. The conclusions for moving forward that stood out particularly, were to use and promote NEEDS outputs and having more projects

along the same lines, to create more meeting and training opportunities, to promote one platform or channel for cooperation, and to include expert societal security (skills development) in educational policies from early on all throughout (life-long) learning.

The specific aspects or logically resulting topics identified by this report and to be further developed into the policy recommendations are therefore:

- For civil protection authorities to promote the course and community and encourage staff to complete the course and/ or build a community.
- To have more opportunities for HEI and practitioners to get together (e.g. regular meetings),
- Working on policies and cooperation with educational ministries to establish security in curricula for schools.
- Understanding the need for one clear channel or tool (platform) for collaboration and acting upon it, as there are too many platforms leading to loss of overview and relevance.

A policy brief of the recommendations (to be formulated/ finalised at the stage of writing this report) will be given to the Directors General of the CPN. The goal is for them to support the recommendations, leading to commitment from the civil protection authorities to continuously contribute to improved cooperation between academia and national civil protection authorities and to demand-driven and well-tailored training and education in societal security. The idea is also to inspire the academic and practicing stakeholders in the field of societal security to find ways of working together internationally and continue or strengthen their efforts in developing the cooperation and common understanding in an ever-changing world.

## Annex

Data tables with input collection for analysis

### Analysis of challenges

More from an internal perspective or about project/working ways? (internal replies) (TT, ISP feedback, IO 7+8 questionnaire)

challenge	issue/ topic	category
Understanding each other when working online	Understanding each other	Understanding
ISPs guided by teachers – online course completely autonomous	Differences between ISPs (project) and final online course	Education / end of project
Mixture of bachelor/master + teachers, practitioners	Learners have different backgrounds	Stakeholder groups / differences
Teaching or learning (too many) theories		education
Learners do not like old information (considering how no updates are done after project ends)	Being current & engaging	Relevance / end of project
Feedback and support should be available (supervising/ mentoring from teachers/ practitioners/ other students = peer learning)	Knowledge exchange, peer learning / educational structures	cooperation
Various learning activity formats (videos, texts, case studies, concrete project ideas, group work,...)	Learning material/ format	Education
Emphasis on adult learning approaches to avoid too much passive learning	Life-long learning/ adult learners	Definition, concept
What is societal security?	definitions	Definition, concept
Intangible/invisible factors of societal security	Definition? Concept?	Definition, concept
New challenges for societal security	Concept? Topics?	Definition, concept
How to involve the community?	Communities	Stakeholder groups / cooperation
How to involve local communities?	Local communities	Stakeholder groups / cooperation
More cooperation is needed between practitioners and HEIs to improve societal security BUT both ways needed: who will take first step?	HEIs. practitioners	Stakeholder groups / cooperation
<b>List with right point of contacts</b> vs privacy issues ( <i>easier via an “endorsed” community?</i> )	Knowing right contact Privacy/ GDPR issues	Contacts / cooperation

It would be nice to have a platform to ask for help without knowing anyone, getting help in return and therefore knowing the right person (lowers the hurdle/ embarrassment) ( <i>question forum?</i> )	Knowing right contact	Contacts / cooperation
How to become/ get an initiator of cross-border cooperation?, joint understanding of cross-border/ cross-sector aspects	Transnational/ international/ cross border component	Cooperation
How to put theory into practice?		Understanding the work
How to get new members join the community? ( <i>“having prepared invitation text, have existing members invite colleagues etc.”</i> )	Widening community	Network / outreach
How to keep students/users interested/ active? ( <i>focus on not too many platforms etc.</i> )		Relevance
Time, access, intensity of taking such a course ( <i>vs. the results: more knowledge, better understanding, networking</i> )		Relevance
Working online leaves out a big part of experience exchange and networking	Ways of working/ educating, networking opportunities	Network
Reaching people/ raising awareness beyond participants of one of the NEEDS activities	Widening community	Network / outreach
Putting societal security studies into the wider educational system (other study fields)	Lobbying education policies	Policies
Meeting different skill levels/ expectations/ etc. ( <i>maybe actually advantage of individual online course since participant can go at own pace etc.</i> )		Education
Different preferences for learning (very subjective)		Education / differences
Even after ISP definition and concept and better understanding of societal security wanted		Definition, concept / understanding
What does region and regional cooperation mean exactly?	Not understanding the concept of regions/ regional cooperation	Understanding the work
NEEDS needs more visibility	Project visibility, promotional activity	Dissemination
Hesitant of the importance of regional cooperation	Is sth. important?	Relevance
Keep connections		Contacts
Working still a lot within country borders and not making maximum	Missing regional, cross-border cooperation	Cooperation

use of common (EU) resources and connections		
Creating better understanding (language-related differences)	Understanding each other	understanding
Different working methods und understandings of “collaboration”	Understanding each other	Understanding
Different professional etc. backgrounds when working together	Colleagues have different backgrounds ( <i>should be advantage at the same time but if not only students but professionals say it as well, does it mean it can only be bridged to a certain degree?</i> )	Differences
Learning and bridging differences takes time	Process of learning	Time
Collaboration more successful towards the end of an activity	Process of collaboration	Time
“Some students were not aware of the challenges we have to cope with in the BSR (but in the end existing knowledge gaps could be eliminated)”	Process of learning	Time
Making expectations clear (to learners), assistance needed rather than expected self-reliant work	What are the expectations?	Education
Accessing Canvas with pre-sessions = difference between project duration and thereafter ( <i>should after project end organisations “collect/gather” new users and course takers + be able to approach e.g. SEDU for booking a planned intro session for a certain number of newbies?</i> )	Differences between ISPs (project) and final online course	End of project
Hard to have people join yet another online community		Relevance
Challenge to stand out from countless other platforms/ communities; needs to be userfriendly, easily accessible, stay updated and interesting in the long run	Accessibility, attractiveness	Relevance / outreach
Could have been disseminated more + “hard to know what is out there” ( <i>basically regarding all: topics, tools, work, contacts,...</i> )	Visibility/ dissemination	Dissemination
IO1 Glossary could have been more innovative, different expectations regarding novelty (added value)	attractiveness	Relevance
IO1 Glossary starting point should have been others’ efforts and then our efforts beyond that	Using existing resources, creating synergies	Synergies

Partners did not work that much together, had different ideas of form or amount of collaboration	Collaboration, breaking silos	Cooperation
(Different approaches and backgrounds leading to) lack in quality of content, missing rules and interlinkages when it came to collaborative content creation <i>(defining and agreeing on the non-/or importance of academic excellence vs. practicality)</i>	Expectations, collaboration	Understanding the work / cooperation
Include more externals (experts, technical experts, existing platform users, etc.) from earlier on	Involvement in work processes	Expertise / outreach
Not always easy to find reliable sources/ get all needed information <i>(otherwise: if it all existed already NEEDS and outputs were not deemed needed and had not been initiated)</i>		
IO3 differences in opinion when needed to agree on case study topics, with more difficult/delayed decision making and work	Agreement and timeline	Time / cooperation
IO5,6 free access for all? But security needed for Canvas/ data security needed/ privacy	accessibility	
Pedagogical approaches in different countries can be very different and availability of equipment and apps might influence access/sharing of such approaches	Different national standards	differences

More about content/ topics, input from experts and stakeholders? (external externals, not at all related to project) (questionnaire 1, ISP outputs, ME workshop results)

<b>challenge</b>	<b>Issue/ topic</b>	<b>category</b>
Finding out what kind of topics, which focus is needed and what is most difficult to deal with in the field of societal security	Outreach, project preparation	(solved because of questionnaire)
Stakeholders feel they are missing/ need information or focus on: - other countries' systems for dealing with societal security issues, - prevention and preparation when dealing with risks, threats, vulnerability,	Stakeholder opinions regarding which societal security issues to focus on	Topics / content

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- international organisations' systems for dealing with societal security issues incl. frameworks, responsibilities, decision making processes and resources,</li> <li>- learning, changing and reforming of own organisation and procedures,</li> <li>- crisis management toolbox incl. diagnostic and analytical tools</li> </ul>		
Finding out about needs for course, community, tools in general etc.	Project preparation	(solved because of questionnaire)
Stakeholders indicate the most difficult topics are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- time pressure,</li> <li>- information management incl. disinformation,</li> <li>- uncertainty regarding the development of events,</li> <li>- taking all the different priorities and interests into consideration,</li> <li>- mobilising, delegating and coordinating the necessary (human) resources</li> </ul>	Stakeholder opinions regarding which issues to focus on	content
Many stakeholders use digital tools, platforms and online communities already on a daily to regular basis ( <i>which makes it challenging to compete</i> ) vs. <i>below??</i>	One of many	Relevance
Stakeholders indicate what is preventing an individual of using a platform/ community: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- tools are not relevant or suited for work,</li> <li>- not being aware of the existence of such tools or where to find them,</li> <li>- membership fees,</li> <li>- lack of agreement among colleagues which tools all should use,</li> <li>- organisation does not allow tools</li> </ul>	Knowledge, awareness, access	Opportunity
Stakeholders indicate what is preventing an organisation of using a platform/ community: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lack of knowledge on what tools are available,</li> <li>- not had the opportunity yet,</li> <li>- technical infrastructure does not support such tools,</li> <li>- the tools currently used are sufficient,</li> </ul>		opportunity



- lack of funds and/or general resources for such tools		
Survival of such a subject-matter specific platform – relevance is key – how to ensure that?		Relevance
Too many tools and too little time – ensuring added value?		Relevance
Visibility and accessibility and maintenance of platform?	How will it be dealt with especially after the end of the project?	Dissemination / relevance
Stakeholders indicate needed functions of online community are: - creating and maintaining professional network, - educational activities, training or competence development, - sharing information, - finding new opportunities for cooperation, - networking	Network, education, knowledge exchange, cooperation  (project work, IO6, complexity of platform)	Network, education, knowledge exchange, cooperation  platform
Having relevant user-generated content (creating an environment that encourages users to produce useful content) while being secure and respecting digital integrity	Relevance, privacy, complexity of platform	Platform
(too) many different topics of interest – how to address them?		Relevance / understanding
Question from ME: Which needs / gaps do you see when it comes to future cooperation for training and education in the Baltic Sea Region? - Lack of time - Right people at the table - Planning and money (funding) - Language skills - More encompassing approach = teaching children,... Up to professionals - Too much information leads to difficulty to choose right - There is still a quite big gap between universities and practitioners and we don't know all opportunities (mainly money, accessible funding) how to cooperate - Bureaucracy	Stakeholder opinions regarding the issues/challenges	Opportunity, contacts, education, relevance, cooperation

Effective incorporation of research questions, project results and dialogue with young people into national systems	Youth on all levels	Stakeholder groups
Increase involvement and empower youth to make decisions that affect them and their security	Youth involvement	Stakeholder groups

### Good practices

More from an internal perspective or about project/working ways? (internal replies) (TT, ISP feedback, IO 7+8 questionnaire)

Good practice	issue/ topic	category
Highlighting/ vocalising learning outcomes clearly (and explain how material and assignment are linked)	Precision in teaching	Education
Colour-coding for different topics/ levels of interest	Working ways, educational tools	Education
Problem-based learning – case studies	Educational tools	Education
Working together on practical things (incl. practical examples)	Educational tools, practical	Practical
Various learning activity formats (videos, texts, case studies, group work, concrete project ideas...)	Educational tools, variety	Education, relevance (interest)
Using real-world societal security examples	Case studies, being current, examples	Practical
Knowledge exchange, learning from each other (internationally)	International knowledge exchange	Transnational work
Lessons learned from “host country”	Intercultural knowledge exchange	Transnational work
What is societal security?	definitions	Definition, concept
Presentation of existing intergovernmental cooperation mechanisms in the BSR	Knowledge gain on (transnational) cooperation	Transnational work
<b>Glossary</b>	Project, IO work, IO1	NEEDS outputs
<b>Case studies</b>	Project, IO work, IO3	NEEDS outputs
networking		Network
<b>Learners report being influenced by project:</b> experience gain, knowledge gain, network, broadened perspectives, open-mindedness, better understanding of regional collaboration		
Working in multicultural teams (intercultural exchange) very important		Transnational work

(international) networking very important		Transnational work
Applying/ making use of various & varying learning methods, including practical ones (table-top exercises, group work, etc.)	Working ways, educational tools, practice	Practical education
Having a known, stable platform where one has discussion fora / uploaded material is considered useful	platform (discussion, material) is wanted	Platform
Expert panels considered useful – very useful	Exchange with experts	Expertise (exchange)
Interaction with experts considered useful – very useful	Exchange with experts	Expertise (exchange)
Cross-border component		Transnational work
Cross-“sectorial” component	Cooperating among different sectors and backgrounds	Cooperation
“already 25 years experience...expand my network...and acting as contact point myself is always very helpful”	Continuous networking	Network, contacts
To have such activities in general where future experts participate, learn, form connections	Multilevel knowledge exchange, youth as the stakeholder group	Youth
<b>Learners report being influenced by project:</b> recognising similarities (priorities, core values,...), importance of cooperation, connection to other participants		Cooperation
Agreeing on same terminology before meetings/ activities/ collaboration	definitions	Definition, concept
Highly interesting combination when having practitioners, teachers and students	Multilevel and cross-sectorial knowledge exchange, different parties	Stakeholder groups, cooperation
Collaborating with students (youth) during the process (example: student interns in IO3)	Cooperation with young people	Youth
Practitioners learning about pedagogical approaches, ~collaboration from early on even on not-field-related aspects	Skills development, life long learning	Education
Combination of community and course highlighted as good value for the platform	Attractiveness of course/platform	Platform /NEEDS outputs
Different partners researched/ gave that information/ input from their different countries	Knowledge sharing, contributing, sharing best practices	Expertise ( <i>bridging differences</i> )
Intensive work on the case studies is valuable ( <i>students requesting more practical aspects and practitioners</i> )	Project, IO work, Case studies, practical base	NEEDS outputs

<i>stating that case studies etc. are exactly what is needed for daily tasks and to improve management of – in this case – disasters)</i>		
It would be good to have pattern/ structures/ guidelines on how material should look like	Have templates and clear info on what is needed	instructions
IO3 had great involvement of students (+ transnational supervision of said students)	Cooperation with young people	Youth
Case studies helped to deepen own knowledge	Case studies = tool and outcome	Needs outputs

More about content/ topics, input from experts and stakeholders? (external external, not at all related to project) (questionnaire 1, ISP outputs, ME workshop results)

<b>Good practice</b>	<b>issue/ topic</b>	<b>category</b>
Applying/ making use of various & varying learning methods (reading materials, video clips, ppts, livestreaming, audio materials incl. podcasts)	Teaching tools, variety	Education ( <i>how to, by practitioners</i> )
Many stakeholders use digital tools, platforms and online communities already on a daily to regular basis ( <i>which makes it challenging to compete</i> )	Using tools, platforms, communities	Platform
<p>Question from ME: How would you close gaps and increase cooperation between professionals and higher education institutions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mediator</li> <li>- Synergies – gaps / field / data = bridging</li> <li>- Constant communication + glossary again</li> <li>- Joint events and invitation to courses, events, exercises, etc.</li> <li>- Informal meetings</li> <li>- Internships in institutions – thesis themes based on practitioners needs</li> <li>- Common educational programs in many universities – exchanges are easier to arrange</li> <li>- Guest lecturers (practitioners go to universities)</li> </ul>	Stakeholder opinions regarding how to bridge gaps	<p>Synergies, communication, NEEDS outputs, cooperation, projects</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Invite researchers to professional groups / networks</li> <li>- Projects</li> </ul>		
<p>Question from ME: How do we create a joint societal security culture in the Baltic Sea Region?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cooperation – it has to be easier to contact others (on all levels) to cooperate</li> <li>- Producing popular content (movies, podcasts, social media, etc.)</li> <li>- Agree on values or accept differences and try to find common ground across the Region (because of different starting points)</li> <li>- People to people contacts on all levels (decision makers and legislators, management, practitioners)</li> <li>- International institutions cooperating together</li> <li>- Creating understanding between different countries</li> <li>- Education</li> <li>- Creating common glossary</li> <li>- Exchange of experience</li> <li>- Increasing language and communication skills</li> <li>- Intercultural respect/ understanding</li> <li>- Life-long learning (both topical and soft-skills)</li> <li>- Exchange programs for everyone (not just for students)</li> <li>- Be less theoretical and use concrete examples</li> <li>- Focus on bringing people together</li> </ul>	<p>Stakeholder opinions on joint societal security culture</p>	<p>Cooperation, outreach, differences, understanding (each other), transnational work, education, NEEDS outputs, experience exchange</p> <p style="color: red;">Recommendations</p>
<p>Questions from ME: What would you like your future colleagues to learn for the work in your field of societal security? (especially when it comes to aspects</p>	<p>Knowledge, skills, expertise</p>	<p>Education / cooperation / educational policy</p>

of climate change, pandemic, youth, cyber security) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preparedness for crises</li> <li>- How to make a community to help each other (I.e. neighbours)</li> <li>- IT skills, language skills, communication skills</li> <li>- Adapted crisis management and risk assessment</li> <li>- flexibility</li> <li>- Existing (and new) tools</li> <li>- Know your commander / chain of command</li> <li>- To learn practice not only theory</li> <li>- Perspectives from different fields</li> <li>- communicate effectively to different groups</li> <li>- Cascading effects</li> </ul>		
Social media	Outreach, dissemination, cooperation	Outreach
going into schools	Outreach, dissemination, cooperation	Outreach
Workshops/ study programmes	Outreach, dissemination, cooperation	Outreach / education

### Conclusions for moving forward

More from an internal perspective or about project/working ways? (internal replies) (TT, ISP feedback, IO 7+8 questionnaire)

Conclusion for moving forward	issue/ topic	category
Feedback and support should be available (supervising/ mentoring from teachers/ practitioners/ other students = peer learning)	Teaching aspects, controlled teaching	Education
Networking skills, digital skills, international cooperation skills, communication skills,.... ( <i>being part of an online community can support to acquire those skills</i> )	Needed skills, skills acquisition, being allowed/ given the chance for skills acquisition	Skills
Having a glossary ( <i>experts/ externals expressed such also – e.g. ME</i> )	Project work, understanding	Project outputs
<b>Using glossary</b>	Project work, IO1	Project outputs
<b>Using case studies</b>	Project work, IO3	Project outputs

Analysing skills, critical thinking, willingness to be initiator, intercultural understanding, intercultural communication,... <i>(being part of an online community can support to acquire those skills)</i>	Needed skills, skills acquisition, being allowed/ given the chance for skills acquisition	Skills
Network components for online community: databank with right points of contact, question forum		Platform
Networking is the key!		Network
Learning about intercultural differences	Teaching content	Education
Holding/ participating in interesting, goal-oriented courses with different participants/ backgrounds helps become aware of different approaches, disciplines etc. which is crucial for problem solving	Relevant skills acquisition	Skills / expertise
Integrating societal security studies into the wider educational system (other study fields)	Study content, outreach of the topic, lobbying for integration	Educational policy
Integrating societal security studies in relevant other fields/studies <i>(interesting where several opinions were more negative in general, "crises do not stop at borders")</i>	Study content, outreach of the topic, lobbying for integration	Educational policy
Practitioners (many) interested in a course like IO5 or community like IO6	Project work, IOs	Project outputs
Standing out from countless other platforms/ communities; be user-friendly, easily accessible, stay updated and interesting in the long run	Requests to a relevant platform  <i>(students requesting more practical aspects and practitioners stating that case studies etc. are exactly what is needed for daily tasks and to improve management of – in this case – disasters)</i>	Platform
case studies are valuable	Project work, IO3	Project outputs
Include more externals (experts, technical experts, existing platform users, etc.) from earlier on	Make use of networks and expertise	Expertise
Build upon existing online community instead of trying to re-invent the wheel and create something new	synergies	Community
Positive side the course can always be further developed <i>(vs. not really because work ends when project ends? But it could be taken up in another project or users could</i>	Future of the work	Projects

<i>develop or HEI that use it in their programmes?)</i>		
---	--	--

More about content/ topics, input from experts and stakeholders? (external external, not at all related to project) (questionnaire 1, ISP outputs, ME workshop results)

<b>Conclusion for moving forward</b>	<b>issue/ topic</b>	<b>category</b>
Educational activities are the main interest for the majority of stakeholders (respondents)		Education
Generally, more interest in a broader interaction format (discussion forums, sharing information etc.) than peer-to-peer exchange so if to be chosen focus should be on community building aspects	Wishes for the community/ platform	Platform
Having some content in users' language	Language barriers	Understanding the work
Concentrating on a few/ specific good platforms	Relevance of platform	Platform
<p>Question from ME: Which concrete actions could the civil protection authorities commit to, to continuously support the development of relevant education and studies in the field of societal security?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- communicate about the authorities work (and its limitations)</li> <li>- Civil protection authorities as guest lecturers</li> <li>- Offering school kids practical exercises (I.e. preparation bag)</li> <li>- Authorities should provide feedback ("reality check") on research findings (before funding ends)</li> <li>- promote the same societal security understanding in all Baltic Sea Region countries</li> <li>- Share and provide problems, case studies, challenges and research questions to fill the gaps and needs</li> </ul>		<p>Communication, transnational work, create opportunities, youth</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Encourage the professionals to learn/ teach</li> <li>- Informal meetings between all stakeholders (at least practitioners and researchers)</li> <li>- Sign up the professionals (staff / practitioners) to teach and give courses to students</li> <li>- engage students as researchers and interns, Competitions / fundings / projects / hackathons to engage students in identifying solutions</li> </ul>		
<p>Question from ME: How can societal security education help society reach a secure “new normal” or securely be prepared to the challenges it will experience?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Give citizens basics of crisis management</li> <li>- Knowledge about “new” and emerging risks</li> <li>- Outreach activities to local communities through multipliers (church, schools, volunteer organizations)</li> <li>- From crisis to crisis – society learn how to be in a “new normal”</li> <li>- Keep teaching and training</li> <li>- Manage publics expectations regarding support from authorities. Everyone can help in some way (with knowledge, equipment, network, recourses, funding, etc.)</li> <li>- Trainings and exercises</li> <li>- Learn form others experiences and draw upon them</li> <li>- Not prepare for “normal” or specific crises, but give the tools (communication, etc.) to deal with whatever comes up</li> </ul>		<p>Outreach, life-long-learning, cooperation, local communities</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p>
<p>Question from ME: How can you use the NEEDS project and its outcomes to support your work in the societal security field</p>	<p>Future of the project (project outputs)</p>	<p>Contacts, outputs, projects, platform</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p>

<p>and the development of societal security in general?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Find solutions on certain topics, find right people who know solutions / professionals</li> <li>- Immediate contact to a person (expertise) needed in the moment (direct and straight connection)</li> <li>- Job shadowing for couple of days to get information and to see how other organizations works</li> <li>- Use materials from NEEDs for training, I.e. Baltic Excellence programme, volunteer network, classes</li> <li>- Utilize contacts from NEEDs network for scientific / educational support</li> <li>- There are a lot of meaningful materials and also contacts from academic and practical field</li> <li>- Use the specific outputs (I.e. glossary, community)</li> </ul>		
<p>Topics to focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a strong and agile BSR</li> <li>- Educational politics</li> <li>- agricultural policy (climate positive agriculture)</li> <li>- decreasing carbon footprint</li> </ul>	Content, topics	Content/ topics <b>Recommendations</b>
<p>Summit once a year with Baltic Sea region representatives addressing the main problems their represented country has faced during the previous year and work on possible solutions</p>		(existing?)
<p>Transnational organisations in the Baltic Sea Region should focus more on improving resilience to climate change-induced hazards/ threats</p>	Topics or working ways for cooperation	Topics
<p>This could involve simulating large-scale flooding, forest fires, landslides or other crises that would require a transnational response</p>	Topics for cooperation	Topics
<p>To have a yearly exercise between the Baltic Sea Region states to ensure a good cooperation between</p>	Topics or working ways for cooperation	Transnational work

them, and to test out policies and frameworks that the Baltic Sea Region shares		
Non-formal meeting to build bridges and friendship	Working ways for cooperation	Cooperation
Make more countries to be involved and encourage the countries to involve themselves		(existing?/ outside the BSR framework?)
Transpublic/private cooperation to ensure that key stakeholder companies and organizations can work towards the same goal	Cross-sectorial cooperation, more cooperation with businesses	Cooperation
Cooperation on a national and international level between the organizations that produce the same valuable resources to ensure a good social security and resilient system		Cooperation
Create ONE platform or «channel» which decision makers are using to create cohesion and transparency to the actions and their impacts	Relevant platform, one because of too many	Platform
Aim: Create Transparency & Enhance the cooperation among society and organizations		Cooperation
The Baltic Sea Councils (probably CBSS) should promote their work and upcoming projects to stakeholders in order to be able to participate in these projects	Visibility/ outreach – more promotional activities	Outreach
Efforts must be made to promote a perception of how the gains outweighs the potential costs of a cooperation between the Baltic region states, which goes beyond the scope of national security	Visibility, value of cooperation, understanding the added value of BSR cooperation	Understanding/ cooperation
A dynamic framework should be developed which gathers the member state in an organizational body such as the ERCC (Emergency Response Coordination Centre) that is given the mandate and ability to act quickly and promote resilience		
Need for exchange of earlier lessons learned	Opportunities to exchange knowledge/ experience	Experience exchange
More projects like NEEDS	Projects, future of the project	Projects
Peer-to-peer teaching, word of mouth teaching	Outreach, ways of teaching	Community outreach
International “club” (like scouts) for children and youth on societal security	Ways of working with and in society	Community outreach

Cross-border awareness projects on not being alone with issues	Outreach, transnational cooperation	Cooperation
Educating children via different non-scholar formats (apps, stories, comic series etc.) ( <i>partly existing? But to be further developed? Or better dissemination?</i> )	Community outreach, educational tools, children, awareness – integrating “teaching” from early on	(educational) opportunities for youth
Going into schools (and hearing from young people themselves what their needs, questions, interests, priorities are)	Community outreach, education, youth/children	(educational) opportunities for youth
Hold more workshops and study programmes for young people	Community outreach, youth, education	Opportunities for youth
Researchers, practitioners and organisations should acknowledge the responsibility to improve security for future generations and should actively consider the impact on young people in all decisions they make (main goals and core values should always include the youth perspective)	Youth, future	Cooperation with youth
Having a database where you can find research projects from all the Baltic countries within the topic Civil Security. Also a possibility for practitioners to request research topics. Within this database there could be competitions for the best research project or if researchers needs to receive help or funding for their project.	Search base, data, accessibility	Platform
By welcoming researchers to practitioners meetings and letting practitioners talk to researchers when they are deciding their topics. Create a communication link between them so researchers decide on topics that are needed and that when the research is done, the researchers will present them back. Closing the circle.	Close connection between HEI & practitioners	Knowledge exchange
Improve means of communication, Horizontal chains of communication. Develop a shared warning system.	Communication, topics	Communication
Education programs, training for practitioners Resource bank: experts, material, equipment. Platform on available resource in the event of a crisis.	Education, knowledge	Education / Platform

Work towards similar policies	legislation	Policies
An official communications channel	Connection, communication	Communication
Governments should aid cooperations on a lower level – for instance give money to cities (for increasing cooperation)	Ways/ ideas for cooperation	Cooperation
Regular meetings between different countries' experts and businesses	Cross-sectorial meetings	Cooperation
A universal education for schools in the BSR on sustainable risk management	Regional class/course	Education
To create a common understanding of what civil security includes via education	Include civil protection in education systems	Education
Advertise the BSR to make more popular ( <i>do they mean to make people more aware of that there is regional thinking and regional actions? Or indeed to attract more people?</i> )	Awareness raising, visibility	Outreach
Reach out to youth through social media and courses	Community outreach, courses on the topic	youth, education
More practical cooperation which is communicated and advertised	Making practical cooperation known	Cooperation/ practical
Create educational material in every language so that it is easy to apply it in school	Accessibility, languages, educational material	Understanding the work



## Partners

Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) Secretariat – **Lead Partner**

Hamburg Fire and Rescue Service (Germany)

Laurea University of Applied Sciences (Finland)

Main School of Fire Service (Poland)

Riga Technical University (Latvia)

Swedish Defence University

UiT The Arctic University Norway

Union of the Baltic Cities, Safe Cities Commission (represented by the Liepaja Municipal Police - Latvia)

More information on [www.cbss.org/projects-cbss/needs/](http://www.cbss.org/projects-cbss/needs/)

Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

