[PRACTICE]

D8.2 COMPARATIVE MAPPING OF LEGAL AND POLITICAL CONTEXTS OF DIFFERENT EU COUNTRIES

PRACTICE WP8 deliverable

Dissemination level: Public

Nature: Other

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

Title:	D8.2 Comparative mapping of legal and politicxal cotexts in	
Date:	June 14, 2013	
Author(s):	Dzenan Sahovic	UMU
	Jan Engberg	UMU
	Dianne van Hemert	TNO
	Rebecca Nyström	UMU
	Karin Lindgren	UMU

1. Executive Summary

This report provides a descriptive comparison of the national crisis management systems in 14 EU member states. When comparing the organizational structure of crisis management in these countries, the report considers aspects such as centralization/decentralization, mechanisms for civil-military cooperation in crisis response, risk communication structures, orders of responsibility, and to some extent the level of CBRN preparedness.

The countries included in the mapping which makes up the base for this report are: Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, and the UK.

Results of the mapping show that there is great fragmentation in crisis management systems and CBRN preparedness and resilience systems across Europe. The analysis shows that most national systems are multiple agency and multiple authority systems, with a few exceptions of centralized national agencies in charge of management of CBRN incidents.

The reasons for the fragmentation are found in the differences between national political systems and national political cultures. Yet, the main determinant of the variation is the nature of CBRN field as such.

The main conclusions of the studies behind this report are that a) PRACTICE Toolbox must take into account the differences between national context, b) PRACTICE Toolbox should allow for two types of users, centralized planning and response and decentralized multi-agency multi-authority planning and response, and c) PRACTICE Toolbox should aim to be implemented at the EU level as well, as there are EU authorities tasked with planning for CBRN cross-border preparedness and CBRN cross-border crisis management.

The contribution of this report is threefold. First, the empirical findings about differences of crisis management systems in 14 EU member states and on the EU level are useful to PRACTICE project WP4, WP5 and WP7, as they outline the details and nuances of CBRN preparedness and resilience throughout Europe, knowledge useful in the work on design of the toolbox. Second, the analysis of possible reasons for the diversity and the systematizing of variation according to agency-authority divide provides new knowledge about the fragmentation of the CBRN management system in Europe. Third, the knowledge about different modes of organizing in the field provides the project with knowledge about the potential market and possible operators of the toolbox, i.e., defines the end-users in different national (and EU) context who would most benefit from implementation of the toolbox.