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Preface

H.E. the Minister of Defence of the Republic of Cyprus

The assumption of the Presidency of the Council of the European Union by Cyprus has been a turning point for the Republic of Cyprus and a major challenge, as the European Union is still defining its foreign and security policy in the post-Lisbon era, while facing at the same time increasing international, financial and security challenges.

In this context, the Ministry of Defence has launched a multifaceted programme consisting of several seminars and workshops, aiming at supporting the role of the High Representative of the Union and the European External Action Service in the field of the Common Security and Defence Policy - CSDP. We have structured our contribution on four interrelated levels: i) the development of military capabilities; ii) the promotion of international security, with particular emphasis on maritime security and the Middle East; iii) the promotion of a common military culture through the European Security and Defence College; and iv) the publication of books related to the field of CSDP.

Pooling and Sharing has been acknowledged as a promising track for addressing the identified capability shortfalls in the most cost-efficient manner. Not limiting ourselves to this initiative, we strive to expand our potential through the institutional options provided by the Lisbon Treaty. The Summit of the EU Council in 2013 should be seen as a milestone for giving the necessary political impetus in this direction. It is in this context that this book aims at constructively contributing to the ongoing discussions and efforts for further enhancing the development of military capabilities.

The book provides a comprehensive overview of the bottom-up approach of the EU Military Capability Development, through the eyes of our practitioners at the EU institutions and bodies and our national delegates to the military working group Headline Goal Task Force. In tandem, key stakeholders from the academic, diplomatic and military community share their insights explicitly, in a top-down approach, in relation to the upcoming challenges and trends we will face in the respective domain. We should draw lessons from the recent past of advances and challenges. In the new age of accountability, we should take into consideration the perspectives of both approaches and undertake effective measures in order to maintain our operational capacity for strengthening international peace and security.
It is an honour to provide a preface, along with my counterpart, the German Minister of Defence, Dr. Thomas de Maizière, to this outstanding book, edited by two excellent military officers coming from our Ministries, Dr. Jörg Hillmann (DE) and Mr. Constantinos Hadjisavvas (CY). Notably, the uniqueness of this book is attributed to the 30 participating authors, representing more than 15 Member States and all the EU entities which are deeply involved in the domain of military capabilities.

Finally, I wish to express my deepest appreciation to all of the contributors to this book and also share our Presidency’s common vision for a better Europe and a better world and our common belief that a better world needs a better Europe.

Demetris Eliades  
Minister of Defence of the Republic of Cyprus
Preface

H.E the Minister of Defence of Germany

I am honoured to have been invited to contribute to this ambitious publication. Indeed, this volume is not only ambitious; it is also of paramount importance. It deals with one of the most critical fields of European Security Policy – the development of military and civilian capabilities to make the European Union a more competent actor in crisis management.

This book offers a unique opportunity to reach a wider audience and provide fundamental information on capability development within the European Union. Written by authors deeply involved in the processes, authors who strive every day to find innovative solutions to some of the most intractable problems in this field, the book offers the highest degree of authenticity.

I thus have no doubt that this book will foster discussion not only in Brussels but also in the other European capitals. And I am convinced that it will contribute to a better and more coherent development of crisis management capabilities. Moreover, I am hopeful that it will give new impetus in this area: this is exactly what the European Union needs at this stage. We need to bring capability development to a new level of coherence if we want to be ready to meet the challenges ahead.

This is why I would like to take the opportunity to thank the Cyprus Presidency of the Council of the EU. In these past months, I believe we have taken the European Union a good step forward. Cyprus has hosted a wide array of seminars and conferences, which have been of great benefit to us all. This holds especially true for the topic of maritime security. Cyprus plays an important role for the European Union, and the security architecture of the Mediterranean Sea. In the same vein, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Cypriot government for the hospitality it has shown the German Navy units in the past.

As we all know, partners are vital to the common effort in shaping the European future. That is why Germany along with other EU member states were ready to give the Cypriot Presidency all the support we could. This is what partners do.

Dr. Thomas de Maizière
Minister of Defence of Germany
Military capability development is a complex and sometimes little understood process. Yet, it is of great importance to the success of foreign policy. In EU terms, the delivery of military capabilities through the Common Security and Defence Policy is essential to underpin the EU’s credibility as a security provider in the world.

Current developments in Europe and beyond have made the development of military capabilities even more important. In the beginning of 2012, the Obama Administration announced its pivot to East Asia and the Pacific and called for more European leadership in crises in its neighbourhood. At the same time, Europe is struggling to close the shortfalls that still exist in its combined military inventories, as the 2011 intervention in Libya made clear. European military assets alone would not have been able to sustain this high-intensity operation without critical U.S. capabilities. In light of the U.S. shift of focus and the continued instability that Europe faces on its Southern and Eastern flanks, developing the necessary military capabilities is absolutely critical.

This is not an easy task in view of the financial crisis that has engulfed the Western world. European governments need to cut public expenditure in order to get their economies and public finances back in order. Throughout Europe, defence budgets are under pressure and armed forces are being reduced. Fortunately, EU Defence Ministers have realised that this crisis needed to be turned into an opportunity, an opportunity to reform and to increase multinational defence cooperation. More cooperation among European armies is needed to ensure interoperability and to increase effectiveness by reducing the currently fragmented defence efforts. In 2010, during an informal meeting in Ghent, they launched the so-called “Ghent process” to strengthen the Pooling & Sharing of military capabilities. This has led to a number of promising new initiatives and projects, for example in the area of Air-to-Air Refuelling as a direct lesson of the Libya campaign. More is needed, and Defence Ministers have already called for a more sustainable and systematic approach to Pooling & Sharing.

A sound understanding of the complexities of military capability development is needed if we want to forward these ambitions. The process involves several steps and multiple players. Close interaction with the Member States, where the capabilities reside, is essential throughout the process, both at the stage of determining the operational needs of CSDP and at the stage of defining collaborative projects to deliver
those capabilities. Cooperation with other actors like the European Commission is equally necessary to avoid unnecessary duplication and ensure mutual reinforcement of respective activities.

It is therefore very timely and very welcome that the Cyprus EU Presidency has taken the initiative to prepare this book on Military Capability Development in the framework of the Common Security and Defence Policy. It will help to ensure political attention and will foster an understanding that we need to work hard and with discipline over a number of years, to harvest the fruit that will grow from the seeds that we are now sowing.

Maciej Popowski
Deputy Secretary General
European External Action Service
Introduction

Cpt (N ) Dr. Jörg Hillmann
Capability Manager Engage
(European Defence Agency)

Considering that one of the European Councils in 2013 will be dedicated to Security and Defence, the discussions on the future of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) will speed up in the next months, in the context of responding to upcoming crises and the role of the European Union (EU) as a global actor as outlined in the European Security Strategy. Always bearing in mind that the former Communities and the Union as such have been focusing on the free will of Member States and therefore trusting in common and shared responsibilities, this is more than challenging, especially in times of decreasing budgets and financial constraints.

The decision of the Member States of the Union to establish and finally improve their ability to act in a more coherent manner, to be more active and more capable as a global actor in the end of the nineties of the 20th century, as well as the foundation of a European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), has to be seen as an answer to upcoming and foreseen changes within Europe, due to the announcement of the United States to reduce its European footprint, the general necessity of Europe's engagement in the Balkans and the upcoming crisis in Middle East. 9/11 changed the United States and the World.

However, ESDP was on the way as goal to be well addressed by the Europeans. “We solve our problems by ourselves”; this was a sentence articulated by European politicians nearly fifteen years ago, showing the enthusiasm and the need behind this new concept. It could be added that Europe had no other option but to react at that time.

In establishing their Security and Defence Policy, the Member States decided to go a different way, ensuring future operations by closing capability shortfalls jointly in due time. They opted for a transparent procedure for identification and prioritisation, giving Member States the right to decide freely to mitigate common shortfalls within Member States themselves. Capability Development, not being assets-driven nor driven by any authority, follows the general idea of the Union regarding free will and each Member State’s responsibility towards the Union as such. This was a new idea in
comparison to the mechanisms being used by NATO in defining force goals.

The Capability Development Mechanism (CDM) paved the ground for a commonly
developed process under the guidance of the respective Presidencies and with the
participation of Member States in the Headline Goal Task Force (HTF), a capital-
driven Working Group within the responsibility of the EU Military Committee (EUMC),
supported by the EU Military Staff (EUMS). This group developed all capability-related
processes and finally elaborated on the basis of the still relevant “Headline Goal 2010”
a Requirements (2005), Force (2006, 2009) and Progress Catalogue (2007) in order to
identify shortfalls, which are to be closed after prioritisation by all Member States,
with the support of the European Defence Agency (EDA). This group was founded
twelve years ago and, after the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty, it is presided
by a permanent Chairman. Most of the Member States have changed their way of
participation by establishing permanent posts within their respective delegations in
Brussels.

Meanwhile, the process has been further developed, and the outcome of the shortfall
prioritisation of Member States paves the ground, together with three other strands
(“future needs”, “Lessons Learned out of operations” and “ongoing capability projects
in the Member States”), for the creation of an overall picture of shortfalls within the
European Union, elaborated through the Capability Development Plan (CDP) under
the lead of the EDA.

It is thus very interesting to have a closer look at this process, its development, the
state of play in 2012 and its future. All the above will be illustrated in this book by those
involved in the process – as delegates of the European Union Military Committee
(EUMC) Working Group / HTF or as members of those entities being involved in
capability development. They are all experts in their respective working domains
contributing to an overall picture, which will allow those who are interested in this
topic to obtain an in-depth view. This will be of high interest especially for those
dedicated to this domain in the capitals of Member States and those designated as
future delegates. The different articles will also offer new views on this process for
those countries having the status of acceding Member States of the EU.

Capability Development in the EU does not exist for its own sake, but for reinforcing
Member States in developing those capabilities which are necessary for fulfilling the
requirement of the Union’s Level of Ambition regarding operations. This remains the
basis for all further planning, which sometimes seems to be contrary to the plans implemented in Member States for meeting national needs. If national capability-building projects were brought into connection with international needs, large efforts could be achieved. The Pooling & Sharing Initiative is heading towards this direction and, for the time being, is identifying possible common projects, while also bringing forward real projects. Compared with that, if Member States fail to coordinate their efforts, there seems to be a risk that new, unforeseen shortfalls will be created by reducing forces due to Member States’ financial constraints. The need to share seems obviously necessary, also enclosing a need to trust.

**Trust and Responsibility** are the qualities which make the EU as institution and organisation unique, and Member States’ governments expect their inhabitants to demonstrate them as well. These qualities have been significant to European countries after World War II, including their ability for self-reflection in order to improve and to be better in the future and for the future. This quality will be reflected in the book with respect to capability development within the EU as well: self-reflection, in order to be prepared for the future, provided by experts. This should contribute to ongoing discussions within the Union, especially focusing on next year’s European Council.

Cyprus put a special view on maritime security questions during its Presidency, and this is more than understandable due to its geostrategic position. Two articles in this book reflect on this issue from different perspectives: one concerns the transatlantic link, providing a global view, while the other focuses on the upcoming maritime challenges, stressing the need for elaborating an European Maritime Strategy.

Having mentioned this, it is also deemed of utmost importance to take into consideration, as regards future developments, the different opinions of organisations which are in charge of security issues, such as the United Nations, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) or NATO, in order to avoid duplications and to head towards a common direction. Strategic partners such as the United States and the BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South-Africa) should be always taken into consideration in order to go forward in an unhurried but defined and trustful way.

Since the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty, the role of the Presidencies has become less important. The driving factor, the motor of the Union has been given to EU entities. Nevertheless, the Presidencies can play an important role, if the respective
Member States want to play this role. Cyprus has decided to play this role – this book is a contribution to that engagement of the Presidency. It is up to the individuals taking this book into consideration to judge on the contents and its value. The book as such provides an enlarged overview of capability development within the EU as it stands in 2012 and contributes to ongoing discussions. However, this book is a visible sign of the will to bring specific topics forward and to actively contribute towards the Union’s future. This is also one of the several qualities of the Union.
PART I

EU-Entities and their Responsibilities within EU Military Capability Development
The complex nature of the security challenges and the rampant global financial crisis has not left the realm of Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) unaffected. Amidst these unstable conditions, the EU entities have a political, an institutional and a moral responsibility to collectively collaborate for enabling the Union to improve and draw on credible capabilities for strengthening international peace and security. This chapter presents the insights of people working in the EU, deeply involved in the field of military capability development.

Increasing financial constraints and international security threats are augmenting the pressure on the EU entities to better exploit the Union’s comprehensive toolbox (politics, diplomacy, humanitarian aid, development cooperation, trade, economy and military) for a more robust response and action on the international scene. Beyond the political and institutional obligations, as stipulated by the Treaties, Member States, the EU Institutions and the Union as such possess an ethical responsibility for preventing conflicts, preserving international peace and security, responding to man-made or natural disasters and ultimately consolidating democracy and protecting human rights.

Undoubtedly, the Union’s operational capacity for implementing such level of ambition depends on its credibility to conduct efficiently CSDP civilian missions and military operations. All actions taken within the field of CSDP are subordinated to that task. However, a considerable number of EU Member States are facing severe functional impediments to contributing and sustaining their deployed forces and capabilities, due to the shrinking defence expenditures which inter alia are causing gradual reductions in their forces and assets. Their extensive commitments, not limited to the CSDP framework, but also expanded to other organisations, exacerbate even further the situation in terms of capability availability. Against the backdrop of these circumstances, the Union’s decision-makers find themselves at a turning point of the EU military capability development. It is deemed to be of utmost importance to get really serious.

Unless the EU takes concrete measures to address the financial recession within its Member States, the national defence budgets will continue to shrink. Consequently, alternatives should be collectively sought by the EU entities for ensuring the viability of the operational capacity of the CSDP. This issue is further highlighted by the fact that many of the national niche capabilities are gradually diminishing, as the majority of the Member States cannot any longer afford maintaining them on a unilateral
basis, and consequently they are reluctant to dispose or deploy them.

In retrospect, the EU needs to develop strategies on how to better respond to the demanding evolving operational environment with a diverted political interest in economy. Moreover, apart from the financial repercussions, the Union is asked to deal with additional factors hindering military capability development. For instance, how to convince EU Member States to do more together on defence and security, whilst assuring them that their sovereign rights in the respective areas will be preserved? How the EU Institutions and the EU bodies/agencies could be better engaged in the field of military capability development without disregarding the CSDP intergovernmental nature? Last but not least, which post-Lisbon responsibilities are to be further assumed by the EU stakeholders in ensuring that the Union will be able to dispose in time interoperable, synchronised and reliable military capabilities?

Though the answers seem to perplex the way forward, one could assert that there is optimism; not at least due to the new institutional structures set up by the Lisbon Treaty in the domains of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and CSDP, but new practices are also being under development, aiming at further enhancing the coherence of the EU’s external actions. In respect to military capability development, the Treaty enables the concerned EU entities, the Member States, via their preparatory Council bodies, the EU Institutions, via the European Parliament and the European Commission, as well as the EU bodies, via the European External Action Service (EEAS), and the European Defence Agency (EDA) to work closer in a consistent, coordinated and transparent working environment. These communicative channels have been consolidated under the multidimensional responsibilities assigned to the High Representative (HR) for the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy: as Vice President of the Commission, as head of the EEAS and the EDA, but also as the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Council (FAC)/ FAC in the Ministers of Defence format and of the EDA’s Steering Board in its respective format.

Although defence and security issues remain within the exclusive competences of the Council, these structures are still enabling the linkage throughout the intergovernmental and inter-institutional level of CFSP / CSDP (Council - Commission). Additionally, in a lesser degree, the Treaty extents the relation of the Council with the European Parliament towards military capability development, since the HR of the Union is bound institutionally to regularly update and duly take into its consideration the views of the Members of the Parliament in the respective area (Article 36, Treaty of the European Union -TEU).

Apart from the above mentioned institutional structures, the Lisbon Treaty also envisages several provisions which enable the enhancement of military capability development (i.e. Permanent Structured Cooperation, definition of a European Capabilities and armaments policy, Multinational Forces, Solidarity Clause). Although
structures and provisions are indispensable elements for ensuring the operational capacity of the EU, are not adequate still. Complementarily, a common conceptual and cultural understanding of the internal functions within the Union and its external strategic objectives is necessary to be fostered across the respective entities. Similarly to the case of pooling and sharing, such collaborative practices require “...a change of mindset and continuous political momentum and commitment” (Council, March 2012). This will gradually manage more comprehensively and coherently the development and improvement of national resources and will – in long term – ensure subsequently capability planning responding to the CSDP tasks.

This chapter aims at contributing to the ongoing discussions on how to transform military aspects of the CSDP more efficiently and make them more relevant within military capability development. It aims to identify those tracks that will enable the EU Member States, in cooperation with the relevant EU Institutions and bodies, to better collaborate and conceptualise their common strategic objectives. The following pages outline the ontological role and the responsibilities of the most relevant EU entities towards military capability development in the post-Lisbon era amidst the above mentioned unstable conditions. This outlook is illustrated through the collection of separated articles reflecting the insights of politicians, diplomats, practitioners and military personnel working in the EU community.

Initially, the Chair of the Sub-Committee on Security and Defence (SEDE) of the European Parliament delineates the relation of this Committee with military capability development and the prospects in view of the amendments of the Lisbon Treaty. The instrumental influence of the industrial and technological dimension within the EU internal market is expertly depicted by the Director General of Enterprise and the Deputy Director General of Internal Market of the European Commission. Hence the chapter continues with the perspectives of national delegates at preparatory Council bodies, expressed by the Cyprus Representative to the Political and Security Committee (PSC), the Military Assistant of the Chairman of the European Union Military Committee (EUMC) and the Chairman of the EUMC Working Group Headline Goal Task Force (HTF). These bodies represent and ensure the vested interests of the EU Member States at the intergovernmental level of CSDP, including military capability development. The fundamental role of the EEAS in EU military capability development is adeptly presented by the Head of the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD) and the Force Capability Branch Chief of the European Union Military Staff (EUMS). The chapter concludes with the presentation of the primary role of the EDA in the field of military capability development, procurement and research by the former Capabilities Director of the Agency.
References:


Chapter 1

1.2 Main Part – Inputs

European Parliament’s Responsibilities towards the EU Military Capability Development

Arnaud Danjean
Chair of the Subcommittee on Security and Defence (European Parliament)

The role played so far by the European Parliament in the field of military capability development has been quite modest until the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. European Parliament’s role has been mostly that of a political compass putting pressure on Member States / the Council to really take stock of the financial challenges and let go of old national primacy, in order to cooperate more closely in the field of military capabilities and therefore bring political support to the work of the European Defence Agency (EDA).

The 27 Member States spend an estimated 200 billion Euro per year on defence, which represent a considerable amount of money. It would be wrong to think that these are not enough resources to have credible and robust European military capabilities. The problem lies more in rationalising spending to avoid duplication and overcapacity in certain areas than in needing more funds. This is what the European Parliament called for in its report on the impact of the financial crisis on the defence sector adopted in December 2011. The pooling and sharing initiative is certainly a first step, but, as a Parliament, we can only call on Member States to raise the level of ambition and to speed up the pace.

Since national defence budgets go through national parliaments, it is also our responsibility to raise the level of awareness among national parliaments so they can exercise a tighter budgetary control on their governments and force them into cooperating more closely with European partners. Notably, we relayed this message to the Interparliamentary Conference for the CFSP and CSDP, which took place on 9-10 September in Cyprus.

European Parliament’s responsibilities towards the EU military capability development should considerably increase with the Lisbon Treaty. Under this new legal framework, the pillar system which previously separated defence from other policies has been abolished, increasing possibilities for the Parliament to support military capabilities. Defence can and should now be a full part of EU industrial, research and space policies. This aspect is all the more crucial now that we are entering at the core of the negotiation of the next multiannual financial framework as well as the horizon
2020 research programme, which will be the base for the prosperity of research and development for the rest of the decade.

In the field of research, the first stage of military capability development, it is essential that part of EU funds be allocated to dual-use technology to avoid duplication of efforts between civil and military research projects, but also to purely defence research projects to foster cooperation at EU level. This will have leverage for European companies to commit for cooperation beyond the research and development stage. The European Parliament has an important role to play in the following months with the adoption of the Horizon 2020 package. The current proposal of the Commission states that the focus of the programme should be exclusively civilian. This would virtually put defence research on shakier grounds than it was within the 7th Framework programme. The European Parliament as co-legislator in this field will put pressure to keep a flexible and inclusive framework for research to pave the way for greater cooperation in the future.

As usual, the European Parliament will also make use of its budgetary prerogatives to raise the level of ambition in terms of military capabilities. In particular, the Parliament bears a responsibility in raising the status of the EDA, which plays an essential role in developing and implementing a European capabilities and armaments policy which should be a key actor in military capability development as laid down in the Lisbon Treaty. The annual report on CFSP adopted on September 2012 therefore “calls on the Council to strengthen the institutional character of the EDA and to unleash its full potential, as provided for in Articles 42 (3) and 45 TEU.” The European Parliament will also put pressure on the HR and Member States to provide sufficient funding so the EDA can function properly. This could be done by financing the Agency’s staffing and running costs from the Union budget, starting with the forthcoming multiannual financial framework. It would make sense to have an appropriate budget line under the CFSP budget.

In the same vein, it could be envisaged to include, within the CFSP budget, a line for co-financing the procurement of military equipment by several Member States as an effective incentive for cooperation. This will be an ambitious goal for the budgetary negotiations and should be brought up to the heads of States, hopefully during the December 2013 European Council, which will address defence issues more specifically.

European Parliament’s responsibilities are to increase considerably with the Lisbon Treaty and notably via its enhanced budgetary powers. The months to come will be a crucial period that will determine the pace of European military capability development for the rest of the decade. It is of utmost importance for the European Parliament to have an ambitious vision and to rally the other institutions to its ambitions.
In his State of the Union speech last September, President Barroso underlined the need for a Europe that is capable of deploying military missions to help stabilise the situation in crisis areas. He called for the launch of a comprehensive review of European capabilities and the beginning of a truly collective defence planning. This also calls for a reinforcement of our Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and a common approach to defence matters.

This is particularly needed in these difficult times marked by an economic downturn and a crisis in the financial markets. Against this background, it does not come as a surprise that many Member States have significantly reduced their defence budgets. The consequent lack of resources to invest in new major defence and research programmes is putting in question Europe’s capability to produce the next generation of military equipment. This is not just an issue for each Member State, but also for Europe’s ambition to have an effective Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). President Barroso has committed the Commission, to do all it can, within its competencies, in order to develop the single market and industrial base in the European defence sector.

The need for an effective CSDP is just as strong as it has ever been with Europe facing a wide range of threats in the form of terrorism, international piracy and regional instability. The means to deal with these threats increasingly require state-of-the-art technology, e.g. communications and surveillance, and the use of highly mobile and well equipped professional forces. None of this is cheap.

The existing market structures are far from optimal as regards their ability to generate the capabilities that the CSDP needs. Most defence purchases have traditionally been made giving preference to national suppliers rather than seeking the best value for money, and this has given rise to costly duplications and inefficiencies.
The cuts in defence budgets and the fragmented defence markets are already adversely affecting Europe’s military capabilities and Europe’s Defence Technological and Industrial Base (EDTIB). For the time being, many European defence companies are still doing well, with exports to third countries at least partly compensating for the shrinking of home markets. This proves that in many areas European industries are at the cutting edge of technology and are also competitive on a global scale. However, current strengths are the fruits of investments which were made many years ago. The challenge today is to maintain, in spite of severe budget constraints, the capacity to develop, at affordable prices, the military capabilities of tomorrow.

To achieve this objective, far reaching structural reforms are necessary. Given their key role with regard to defence and security policy, the main responsibility for reforms remains in many areas with Member States. In this context, it is crucial to consolidate the demand side and to ensure jointly the necessary investments in key technologies of the future. The European Defence Agency (EDA) has a major role to play in this area.

The European Commission can, and should, play an important role in this context, contributing through regulation and policy-making in areas which have, directly or indirectly, a bearing on defence markets and industries. The most prominent examples of this are the two Directives on defence procurement and defence transfers which were adopted in 2009. These Directives introduce specific rules to streamline regulatory frameworks, enhance EU-wide competition, increase transparency and foster cooperation. In short, these Directives are today the regulatory backbone of a European Defence Equipment Market.

The Commission has set up a Defence Task Force which aims at further strengthening the competitiveness of the defence industrial base and the efficiency of the defence market. The establishment of this Task Force was initiated last summer by Vice-President Tajani and Commissioner Barnier with strong support from President Barroso.

The Task Force is first and foremost a project of the Commission. However, key stakeholders such as the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the EDA are also closely associated with the work of the Task Force. In many areas, discussions are also being held directly with Member States, industry and other stakeholders.

The Defence Task Force has identified three priority areas: Internal Market, Industrial Policy and Research & Innovation. In the internal market priority we are focusing on ensuring that the objectives of the defence directives are fully achieved. This includes making sure that the *acquis* is effectively applied and market distorting practices like offsets are phased out.
In the field of industrial policy, we are concentrating on the need to develop, with all the concerned stakeholders, a European approach to the on-going changing defence industrial landscape, its social impact and the protection of essential skills. Such an approach needs to be based on increased inter-dependencies and support for existing European centres of excellence. Leaving industrial change simply to market forces and to national initiatives risks losing essential capabilities and technologies which can only be maintained through co-operation and specialisation. Moreover, we are also analysing what we can do to support the SMEs (small and medium-sized enterprises) in this sector. SMEs are an important source of employment and innovation in all sectors, and defence is no exception.

Finally, as regards research and innovation, we plan to see what can be done to limit the impact of the cut in funding for defence R&T (Research and Technology), which is an essential element of industry competiveness. The main objective is to develop greater synergies between dual technologies funded in the different Commission’s research programmes and the defence research activities of the EDA.

We should not necessarily spend more but spend better together. Even if the industry will need to go through further restructuring, if this is done with a collective understanding of Europe’s capability needs, we will be able to maintain in the future the critical role played by defence in achieving the EU 2020 objectives of generating the technology and skilled jobs on which Europe’s industrial future depends. The objective of the Task Force is to ensure that the Commission does all it can to support Member States to achieve this objective.
In their efforts to enable the Union to be capable of assuming and accomplishing tasks on crisis management and conflict prevention outside the EU, the EU Member States decided to establish permanent political and military structures. The determinant step for ensuring that the EU will have the capacity to decide and conduct such missions was taken during the Cologne European Council (3-4 June 1999) following the joint British-French declaration at the Saint Malo Summit (December 1998). Inter alia, the necessity of establishing “a permanent body in Brussels (Political and Security Committee) consisting of representatives with pol/mil expertise” was then identified. Hence, the Helsinki European Council (10-11 December) and the Santa Maria Da Feira European Council (19-20 June 2000) led progressively to the Nice European Council (7-9 December 2000) and the subsequent decision to establish permanent political and military structures within the EU. On 22 January 2001 the Council set up the Political and Security Committee (PSC) within the General Secretariat of the Council.

The intergovernmental dimension of the EU foreign policy in the domain of security and defence nexus is reflected in the structure of the PSC. The fact that the majority of the decisions taken by the PSC require unanimity underlines how important is for the Member States not only to have a common understanding, but also to agree on the EU’s foreign and security policy.

In December 2009 the endorsement of the Lisbon Treaty introduced a new institutional regime in the EU rotating Presidency. According to article 16.9 of the TEU, the Presidency of the Council configurations, other than that of Foreign Affairs, shall be held by the representatives of the Member State in the Council on the basis of equal rotation. As a result, the Chair of the PSC shall be held by a representative of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (see Article 4, par. 4, L 201/30, 3.8.2010 and Article 2, Number 9 Declaration on Article 16 (9) of the Treaty on European Union concerning the European Council decision on the exercise of the Presidency of the Council). This new institutional arrangement has given a renovated impetus to the capacity of the Committee.

The PSC is part of the Council’s bodies and deals predominately with issues within the domain of CFSP and CSDP. It acts on the basis of the decisions and the strategic guidelines which are taken by the Foreign Affairs Council (FAC) and the FAC in the format of Ministries of Defence where matters particularly have defence implications.
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The PSC is the body reflecting and expressing the Member States’ national positions and visions towards the EU’s external policy and the domain of foreign and security policy, on a day to day basis.

The PSC role is vital within the CFSP domain, including the CSDP, since it is the only authorized body in the EU to “…monitor the international situation in areas covered by the common foreign and security policy and contribute to the definition of policies” (Article 38, TEU). As for its connection with the military side of the house, the PSC sends guidelines to the EUMC and receives military advice or recommendations of the Military Committee on all military aspects. Additionally, under the auspices of the Council, the PSC takes responsibility for the political direction of the development of military capabilities, taking into account the opinion of the Military Committee assisted by the EUMS (L 27/2, 30.1. 2001).

Regarding the domain of crisis management, the PSC is the Council body which deals with crisis situations and examines the options and the necessity for the EU to respond. In the case of exploring a military option, it coordinates closely with the Chairman of the Military Committee, who sits in the relevant PSC meetings in that capacity. The PSC also proposes to the Council the political objectives to be pursued by the Union and the options for an integrated and coherent response to an imminent crisis. Above all, the PSC exercises the political control and the strategic direction of the EU’s military response to the crisis, under the responsibility of the Council and the High Representative. The fact that the military commanders of the EU operations report back to the PSC ensures that the Committee has an update and global picture of the management of all EU-led crises on a daily basis.

Furthermore, the PSC plays a significant role regarding the military capability development of the EU. At the institutional level, the PSC is the relevant Council body to agree with all the decisions which are related to the domain of defence policy. Complementarily, the PSC takes responsibility for the political direction of the development of the military capabilities. Additionally, the PSC, assisted by the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD), has the overall responsibility for the consultations which are conducted with other international organizations and the Third States for further enhancing the potentiality of the EU in the domain of the military capabilities. Consequently, the majority of all military related projects, i.e. Information Gathering Tool, Civ/Mil Synergies, Common Annual Lessons Learned Report, Pooling and Sharing of defence capabilities, are promoted to the PSC either for approval or endorsement, or for further elaboration or guidance.

Recently, the scope of the Committee in the domain of the internal security has been extended following the December 2011 Council Conclusions (par. 15) “in strengthening ties between the Common Security and Defence Policy and the area of Freedom, Security and Justice”. In this regard the PSC and the Standing Committee
on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security (COSI) need to establish a regular exchange of views through their meetings, aiming to develop synergies between the internal and external dimensions of security. More specifically, the role of the two Committees will be fundamental concerning the ongoing discussion about the conditions of implementing the Solidarity Clause (Article 222, TFEU). Taking into account that the latter article creates the possibility of mobilising military resources for actions concerning the EU internal security, it is obvious that the PSC’s role will become even more instrumental in the field of the military capabilities.

The PSC is bringing the EU in close cooperation with other entities which have military capabilities that the EU can use or with whom it may cooperate within the CSDP domain. In addition to NATO, there are ongoing initiatives for enhancing this cooperation with the African Union (Amani African Cycle) or African States (Libya, Niger, Mali, Somalia, RDC Congo etc). Moreover, there are ongoing developments and actions to enhance EU CSDP support to UN peacekeeping. The participation of Third States in the CSDP and the meetings of the PSC+10 also constitutes another example of the dynamic and determinative role of the PSC in further developing – inter alia – the military capabilities of the EU and ultimately its capacity to respond and manage the international crises using a more efficient and comprehensive approach.

In conclusion, the PSC works in close coordination with the EUMC and with the EDA aiming at boosting the development of the national capabilities of the Member States, in view of enhancing the EU’s capacity of using them pursuant to the MS’ consensus and the EU’s strategic priorities and objectives. Notwithstanding that the Member States are responsible in all circumstances to decide how far they want to develop their national capabilities and where and when to use or deploy them, the PSC can exert its influence in a positive and decisive mode.

References:

EEAS, CSDP structures and instruments,(taken on July 5th, 2012)


When reading the phrase “EU Military Capability Development”, one might be led to think that, here in Brussels, some supranational organ would define a binding plan to be followed by the 27 Member States (MS). This is far from the truth. During the Helsinki European Council, in December 1999, MS decided to set themselves an ambitious objective, reviewed in 2004, which aimed to provide the military capabilities to conduct the Petersberg Tasks of humanitarian intervention, peacekeeping and peacemaking. The political and military bodies established since then (i.e. European Defence Agency / EDA, EU Military Committee / EUMC, EU Military Staff / EUMS and Crisis Management and Planning Directorate / CMPD) jointly support MS in their efforts to maintain and develop the required capabilities. Among them, the EUMC plays a significant and specific role.

The EUMC in few words

Created by the 22 January 2001 Council Decision, the EUMC is composed of the MS’ Chiefs of Defence (CHODs), represented routinely by their Military Representatives. Its Chairman (CEUMC) is a Four-star officer. This Committee is responsible for providing the Political and Security Committee (PSC) with military advice and recommendations on “all military matters within the EU and exercises military direction of all military activities within the EU framework”. The second body with which it can formally interact is the EDA, through the establishment of Collegiate Views and the participation in some of the Agency’s meetings (i.e. Steering Boards and associated preparatory committees). The EUMC is supported by the EUMS, the EUMC Working Group (EUMCWG) and the EUMCWG/Headline Goal Task Force (EUMCWG/HTF).

The 2001 Council Decision underlines EUMC’s specific role in the elaboration, the assessment and the review of capability objectives. This function is indeed in the Committee’s core business. However, bearing in mind that its mandate is to provide advice on “all military matters within the EU”, it addresses a much wider scope of capability-related issues.

The EUMC’s responsibility on the Headline Goal Process

The Helsinki European Council decided to “develop a method of consultation through which [MS’ collective capability] goals can be met and maintained and through
which national contributions [...] can be defined by each MS, with a regular review of progress made”. The subsequent EU Capability Development Mechanism (CDM) agreed by the Council in 2003 defined a central role for the EUMC. Under the political supervision of the PSC, the Committee is responsible for defining the detailed requirements, collecting and evaluating the overall result of the national capability pledges and defining the subsequent shortfalls. This led to the Council’s approval of the Requirements Catalogue 2005, Force Catalogue 2006 and 2009 and finally the Progress Catalogue 2007. According to the CDM, “assessment of the military capabilities required to meet the [headline goal], would be performed as often as necessary under the guidance of the EUMC”. MS will therefore be invited to contribute to the Force Catalogue in 2013, enabling the EUMC to assess the shortfalls in the light of the significant budget cuts currently faced by Armed Forces.

The EUMC-EDA cooperation: Key point for a successful EU capability development

In many regards the EUMC-EDA cooperation should be considered as a “win-win” situation for the benefit of MS. In essence, the Committee brings to the Agency its military expertise and a privileged access to the CHODs. In return, the EDA contributes to the development of new military capabilities for direct use in operations (e.g. Counter-Improvised Explosive Devices / C-IED laboratory deployed in Afghanistan) or further development through armament programmes (i.e. to be conducted in the framework of the Organisation for Joint Armament Cooperation - OCCAR).

At the end of 2006, the EDA Steering Board tasked the Agency to develop a Capability Development Plan (CDP), based in particular on the Headline Goal 2010, which was agreed in July 2008. The CDP intends to inform national plans and programmes, but is not a supranational plan. It provides a significant corpus of analysis of capability needs, trends and potential shortfalls up to 2025, as well as a database of national plans and priorities. It will be reviewed in 2014. The EUMC is responsible for providing the short-term military requirements and identified shortfalls, based on the Headline Goal Process (CDP – Strand A) and lessons from military operations related to capability (CDP – Strand D). The EUMC also supports the EDA’s work by agreeing concepts (e.g. Cyber Defence and protection of air assets against Man Portable Air Defense System/ MANPADs) required for the development of MS’ projects.

But it is probably through the Pooling & Sharing initiative launched in Gent by Ministers of Defence in September 2010 that the EUMC-EDA cooperation best demonstrated its importance. In 2011, the EUMC collected, and tasked the EUMS to analyse, Chiefs’ of Defence views on this initiative and in particular on possible projects to be developed. This important contribution was then shared with the EDA, which integrated it into its work, with the aim of providing the best possible support to MS in their efforts towards greater multinational cooperation. Since then, this EUMC-EDA cooperation has been maintained, and regular inputs are provided to the Agency. The EUMC’s
initiative on the specific domain of Training & Education is conducted in this vein, in close cooperation with the Agency. On capability related issues and in particular on Pooling & Sharing, the informal contacts that the EUMC has (as well as the EDA and the other relevant EU bodies) with NATO are essential to avoid duplication and to identify synergies that mutually reinforce both organizations.

EUMC’s involvement in initiatives conducted by the European Commission

As underlined above, the EUMC has the ability to have a direct and formal dialogue only with the PSC and the EDA, while the European Commission has launched many initiatives with military dimensions and implications. Without mentioning initiatives related to Research & Technology and to the Defence Industry which are, to a large extent, out of the scope of the EUMC, the Radio Spectrum Policy Programme (RSPP), the Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE) and Single European Sky (SES) projects are of undoubted interest for this Committee.

CISE, by integrating existing maritime surveillance networks, aims to give all relevant authorities access to the information they need for their missions at sea. Its military part is being developed by 15 MS with the support of the EDA. The EUMC has been informed regularly on this Commission project and, more specifically, on its military dimension.

In September 2010, the Commission released a Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the first RSPP. This document, in its initial version, did not properly reflect the associated military needs and constraints. Fully aware of the significant impact that it could have had on Armed Forces, the EUMC seized the opportunity of the November 2010 EDA Steering Board to raise Ministers’ of Defence and the Commission’s awareness on this issue and to express its support to the work conducted by the EDA to ensure proper consideration of the military inputs. Another option enabling the EUMC to express its views could have been to release a military recommendation to the PSC with a view to inform the Council, as it did to help shape Ministers’ of Defence debate on Pooling & Sharing in May 2011. Thanks to the EDA’s effort, the Commission’s proposal on the RSPP was subsequently amended.

Beyond these first two programmes, Single European Sky (SES) - an ambitious initiative to reform the architecture of European air traffic control to meet future capacity and safety needs - remains high on the agenda of the EUMC. Because of the significant consequences that SES will have on the military, the Committee, with the support of the EUMS, is regularly informed of the latest developments, brings its support to the EDAs’ work and contributes to raise CHODs’ awareness.
To conclude, while not having in its mandate the ability to directly interact with the European Commission, the EUMC contributes, to some extent, to the programme that the Commission conducts.

**Concluding remarks**

The effective development of military capabilities remains a national decision. EU bodies’ aim is to cooperate closely, in order to support MS in their efforts as best as possible. In this vein, the EUMC, being the voice of the EU CHODs, is an important player that is able to provide significant impetus to capability-related topics. MS’ involvement in identifying European solutions to their capability shortfalls, through the auspices of the EUMC, is essential if the EU is to retain the ability to contribute to security and stability through operational engagement.
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The driving Machine of the Military Capability Development:  
Headline Goal Task Force Working Group

Col. Celestino Di Pace  
Chairman of the Headline Goal Task Force Working Group

In the beginning, God made an individual - and then he made a pair. The pair formed a group, together they begat others and thus the group grew. Unfortunately, working in a group led to friction, the group disintegrated in conflict and Cain settled in the land of Nod - there has been trouble with groups ever since...

Certainly this is not the case for a Working Group (WG) such as the Headline Goal Task Force (EUMCWG/HTF), which has established a reputation as a very open and transparent body, where honesty towards each other is the foundation for enduring collaboration, work and friendships as a true interpretation of a common European conscience. This WG has a “secret” in the way it works, using a truly radical democracy method, as all delegates have a direct voice and veto power: CONSENSUS. This decision-making process works creatively to include all opinions, in order to generate a decision. It is the most powerful decision process, as all Member States agree to the final decision with equal right and dignity. These could seem obvious reflections on a generic “modus operandi”, but in reality this is not as clear-cut as it might appear. The consensus I am referring to is the clear acknowledgment and authentic transparent sharing of a commonly recognised target among all delegates, which is the determination to constantly progress in the domain of military capabilities development.

HTF: The body where the DNA of the EU military capabilities was generated

Lots of information and facts on the CSDP domain are illustrated by many protagonists in this ambitious booklet. To explore such a complex and articulated matter, it has been presented in a way never done before – by accurately sharing one’s daily experiences from the individual perspectives of each of the main actors.

It is also the first time the ongoing pro-CSDP activity of the EUMCWG/HTF has been so vividly highlighted and shared with a wider audience than just the military community. This is certainly a well deserved attention, if one considers that the HTF is the body where the DNA of the EU military capabilities was generated.

The energy and enthusiasm that has animated and motivated this WG since its beginning is still present and constitutes a rare blend of flavours coming from 27 Member States (and 28 as of 1 July 2013) harmoniously committed to a clear mission:
to express the EUMC’s role in the capability domain via the use of the Headline Goal process and procedures. This is still and will continue to be a valid mission of great amplitude and responsibility.

The new working methodology of the HTF, after a trial during an interim period of 18 months, has proved its validity in moving from a rotating chair to a permanent Chairman. Such a decision has allowed the natural process towards a “mutual trust” and interrelationship among delegates, dedicated to the area of acquisition and development of military capabilities. Due to the current financial situation, the HTF area of competence has been expanded to include a consideration of what capabilities are in danger of being nationally reduced or deleted. For this purpose, the HTF has been tasked to have an active role in the initiative of Pooling and Sharing (P&S) in the domain of Training and Education (T&E).

During these last 12 years, the role of the HTF has been re-examined several times but has enduring value, since the EUMC remains the only body that is capable of defining capability requirements, which have to be prepared by an ad hoc EUMC working body - the HTF - supported by the EUMS.

The foundation of the EDA has had its consequences, since the participating Member States (pMS) are developing the Capability Development Plan (CDP) in the context of the Agency, and will consequently develop capabilities. This CDP has a 2030-2035 horizon. Notwithstanding the fact that efforts should not be duplicated, a question might arise regarding the evolution of the relation between the Capability Development Process and the development of the CDP. More explicitly, should the procedure / methodology be modified to improve the way of developing EU military capabilities in the future?

Even if this issue could be considered potentially important, from my point of view, the Requirements and Progress Catalogue and the related procedure / methodology will remain a solid basis for inputs to the CDP. This is the case in the 2013 / 2014 timeframe, when new inputs will be delivered for the planned CDP revision.

I also argue that, given the political realities and the increasing financial limitations, the EU has almost reached its zenith in developing a capability development methodology and that this methodology is mature, well functioning and adaptable to any future development process / cycle. With the annual inclusion of the CSDP and non-CSDP MS’s lessons learned, the entire process has reached its completeness and, from a methodological perspective, there is no need for substantive changes.

It is worth highlighting the unique role of the EUMCWG/HTF in the context where it seeks to prevent duplication of capability development between EU and NATO. According to the Capability Development Mechanism, known as “CDM”, the HTF
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Plus format (recourse to NATO expertise) ensures transparency of work in progress between the two Organizations in the domain of military capabilities and thus minimises any risks of divergence between the works of the two organisations. In this regard, we contribute to the work of the EU-NATO Capability Group and the efforts conducted by the CMPD, which is responsible for the EU-NATO relationship; at the same time we try to adopt a clearly defined yet informal approach, while supporting the mutual complementarity between the two organisations, whenever appropriate and deemed necessary.

HTF: One Team for the EUMC mission

The HTF is a group which performs its task whilst permanently balancing between the obligation to follow national indications and decisions and keeping alive the “European conscience” as a source of reference and inspiration and as a unifying factor for cooperation, expressed via the EUMC tasking. This Group has learned from the experience of the past years that work can be frustrating if expectations are not clearly spelt out. Therefore, in order to avoid wasting precious time, we have adopted an annual programme with more than a glance to future envisaged obligatory commitments and tasking.

The EU’s astonishing evolution, occurring within only a decade, has created new entities such as the EDA, CMPD, and finally the EEAS, with the clear intent to be involved and contribute to the capability development. Nowadays the HTF is not alone in bearing the heavy burden of progressing in the Capability development domain, to produce concepts and draw up documents on the development of military capabilities for the highest political and military bodies of the EU. The task of supporting the identification and selection of capabilities to be acquired and delivered is executed by an entire network of institutional and MS’ Excellencies.

In the last two years the HTF has reshaped the way of performing its duty, aiming for more operation and implementation efforts, while putting less emphasis on concepts and procedures development. This change in pace has been determined in coincidence with the EUMC decision to establish a permanent HTF chairmanship instead of the six-month rotating Presidency one. The management change that has occurred has produced a considerably different modus operandi: a clearer sequence of activities, an enlargement of tasking competences, a full alignment with all the EDA works and actions, and in synthesis a more dynamic involvement with every step correlated to the capability domain. Interpreting and projecting towards the future, the HTF’s role can be understood as “one team for the EUMC mission”.

21
Role of the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate in CSDP and military capability development

Amb. Walter Stevens
Director of the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate
(European External Action Service)

With its engagement in Balkans, in Africa, and off the coast of Somalia, the EU has become an important security provider over the past decade.

The changing strategic context raises expectations for the EU to do more in its neighbourhood but also globally, in close cooperation with partners. In order to meet this demand, CSDP needs to be increasingly focused, effective, and comprehensive. The EU’s comprehensive toolbox, involving diplomatic, development but also CSDP instruments, is one of the EU’s major strengths, unique in addressing crises in all their phases - conflict prevention, crisis management, and post-conflict reconstruction - CSDP activities are well integrated with other EU instruments, which results in valuable synergies. This is demonstrated, for instance, by the comprehensive approach we are developing in the Horn of Africa.

EU’s commitment to act should be backed up by robust and interoperable military and civilian capabilities available for CSDP operations, and the political will of Member States to generate such capabilities.

In the context of financial austerity, European cooperation is all the more necessary. There is widespread recognition that Europeans need to spend better and do more together, in order to acquire capabilities that are out of reach individually. Pooling and Sharing of military capabilities represents a common response to European capability shortfalls, aiming at enhancing operational effectiveness in a context of financial austerity and a changing strategic environment.

EU Defence Ministers in their recent meetings sent a strong signal by endorsing a Political Declaration on Air-to-Air Refuelling and adopting a set of Conclusions on military capabilities. The concrete cooperative initiatives facilitated by the European Defence Agency (EDA) on Air-to-Air Refuelling, Medical Support, Training (Counter-IED, Helicopter Training Programme, Air Transport Crew, Fast Jet and Naval) and Maritime Surveillance underline the commitment of Member States to strengthen European military capabilities. The political momentum and commitment is high and it is progressively being translated into concrete actions. We should maintain it.
However, much remains to be done. We need to go beyond this and develop other Pooling and Sharing projects, mainstream Pooling and Sharing into our national planning and develop a longer-term Pooling and Sharing strategy. In times of scarce resources, significant budget cuts, ongoing reform efforts in various EU countries, which all are based on similar security assessments, the issue of combining, even merging national efforts, resources and forces should be on the agenda more than ever.

Working closely with partners, including NATO, is essential. We should avoid duplication and develop complementarities. Cooperation with NATO proves very fruitful in this regard. The EU and NATO combine together different strengths in a complementary manner.

But also civilian capabilities require our full attention. Indeed, most of our missions are of a civilian nature, and are particularly valued by our partners. Military means alone do not suffice to bring peace, security and stability to troubled areas. We also need civilian assets that can help, inter alia, rebuild state structures, monitor peace agreements, help reform the security sector, restore the Rule of Law and foster economic development.

With the creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS), the EU is, now more than ever, in a position to mobilise and engage the different instruments of its toolbox, in a closer interaction and better synergy with Member States and in cooperation with international actors, as a part of the comprehensive approach. That should help achieve the agreed objectives using scarce resources more effectively and efficiently.

The Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD) is a key player in that regard, as it is in charge of planning new CSDP missions and operations, reviewing existing ones, building closer CSDP partnerships and helping to develop CSDP capabilities for our missions and operations. It is at the core of moving from comprehensive approach to comprehensive action by translating strategies into CSDP action, in concert with the use of other EU instruments.

Ensuring the civilian/military perspective from the very outset of planning, the CMPD also looks further ahead in its planning, from a wide political-strategic angle, at possible scenarios and at the needed capabilities, allowing for putting forward possible options for EU action to the High Representative and the Member States.

With regard to the military capability development, the CMPD is in close consultation and cooperation with the EDA (key player), the EU Military Staff (EUMS) and the EU Military Committee (EUMC) to continue to support the development of European
defence capabilities, focusing in particular on the most critical gaps in the field and keep Pooling and Sharing high on the political agenda. This is key to sustain and enhance CSDP. Work continues on the basis of the Council strategic guidance for the EU civilian and military capability development beyond 2010 as well as regular Council and EDA Steering Board taskings. Supporting this work, the CMPD provides, as necessary, politico-military advice and perspective regarding the overall capability development.

The CMPD is also leading and coordinating the work in fostering the development of the necessary civilian capabilities for our civilian missions. They remain challenging to mobilise and deploy. Current efforts focus on the implementation of the multi-annual work programme recently approved, aiming, in synergy with other EU instruments, at helping our missions to be properly staffed. Civilian personnel for missions are drawn from Member State’s Ministries for Justice, the Interior, and political authorities. The CMPD works on enhancing these actions’ understanding of the strategic objectives of CSDP and the wider EU foreign policy, with a view to strengthening ties between internal and external security and underlining their interconnectedness.

Furthermore, the CMPD works on the policy aspects of the EU Battlegroup development, designed to act as a capable and credible military tool. Our efforts have led to a further proposal to enhance the usability and flexibility of Battlegroups which Member States will be asked to approve. But even more challenging work lies ahead if the available capabilities are to fit with the overall ambition of the EU to be or become a global actor.

The CMPD is also at the centre of developing greater civil-military synergies in EU capability development. Acting as focal point and central coordinating body for all ongoing work involves several departments and services. The quest for achieving synergy is also enhanced through the processes of concept development, training and exercises, and lessons learned from missions and operations, as a fundamental driver of capability development.

Last but not least, the CMPD is the focal point and coordination platform for the EU-NATO staff-to-staff contacts and supports the work of the EU-NATO Capability Group. Currently cooperation on the EU Pooling and Sharing and NATO Smart defence initiatives is the main focus of the excellent staff contacts that have been developed and intensified, playing a key role in enhancing transparency, avoiding unnecessary duplication, as well as achieving complementarity between activities.

The EEAS has an important role to play in bringing CSDP forward and in implementing smart (and realistic) approaches. But the EEAS cannot step in for Member States. CSDP is an issue of the 27 Member States. It is up to the Member States to commit forces and resources. And it is up to Member States to demonstrate the political will
to make a difference in the world. **CSDP can only be as ambitious as Member States allow it to be.** We need your continued support and contributions to achieve the objectives and make a difference.
The role of the EU Military Staff in capability development

Cpt (N) Helmut von Schroeter
Chief of the Force Capability Branch
(European Union Military Staff)

The EUMS – a short history

The EU Military Staff (EUMS) was formally established on 11 June 2001. Its roots reach back to the European Councils in Cologne and Helsinki in 1999. For the first time in the long history of the European Union, it had military expertise available within its structures. From the outset, the design of the EU’s military domain was founded on the following main guiding principles: lean military structures, light processes with strong involvement of Member States, voluntary contributions provided and capabilities developed by Member States.

The mission of the EUMS had originally been defined in Helsinki: the EUMS “…will provide military expertise and support to the CESDP …will perform early warning, situation assessment and strategic planning …including the identification of European national and multinational forces” (European Council, Helsinki, 10 – 11 December 1999). Mission, role, tasks, functions and organisation of the EUMS were further refined by the European Council in Nice, December 2000 (European Council, Nice, 7, 8 and 9 December 2000). The Terms of Reference (ToR) of the EUMS, last defined in 2008, still reflect this mission; however, they still do not consider the role of the EUMS within the European External Action Service (EEAS).

On 1 January 2011, less than 10 years after its establishment, the EUMS became part of the EEAS. From that date, the EUMS has, de facto, a threefold mission: to “implement policies and decisions under the direction of the EU Military Committee” (EUMC), to support the High Representative as regards CSDP, being “placed under his/ her direct authority and responsibility”, and “to be the source of the EU’s military expertise”.

The role of the EUMS in capability development

Although contributing to EU military capability development is not specified in the mission of the EUMS, it is a clear principal implied task without which the mission could not be achieved. Due to its rather technical and complex nature, the work is often not that visible but nonetheless important to support Member States in their effort to deliver modern, relevant and interoperable capabilities for EU military crisis management operations.
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The Concept and Capability (ConCap) Directorate, comprised of about 30 personnel in total, is the principal Directorate within the EUMS dealing with all aspects of capability development. However, the Intelligence, Operations, Logistics and Communications and Information Systems (CIS) Directorates also play key roles in supporting capability development within their respective competencies. Overall, the broad portfolio of issues covered by the small team ranges from supporting the EUMC in the definition of the EU military requirements to elaborating strategic and operational concepts across the whole spectrum of military operations; to planning and conducting exercises on the strategic-operational level; to organising training and education; to conducting the military Lessons Learned process, including extracting lessons for capability development purposes; and to developing specific capabilities and supporting tools, in particular in the training, logistic and CIS domains.

One of the core tasks in capability development is the elaboration, assessment and review of the capability goals described in the EU Headline Goals. Subject matter expertise across the whole spectrum of military capabilities is needed to conduct this work. Originally, this was in the hands of the Headline Goal Task Force (HTF) working group, chaired by (and facilitated by) the Presidency, and supported by the Force Capability Branch within ConCap, which has had an increasingly central role. Today, it is the main source of all the preparations within the Headline Goal Process. However, due to its limited resources, the EUMS is not able to tackle this task alone and thus it is critically dependant on external Member States’ support.

Cooperation with others

The establishment of the European Defence Agency (EDA) in 2004 had a fundamental influence on the work of the EUMS in capability development. Until then, the HTF coordinated the activities within the so-called European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP), a Member States’ initiative launched in 2003 to address capability areas, in order to develop common approaches to mitigate shortfalls. From 2005 onwards, a number of the ECAP Project Groups were transferred to the EDA, whose purpose is to address capability areas of concern and to support Member States in the development of military capabilities, including its industrial dimension. Today, the EUMS is fully involved in EDA’s work by providing the military strategic view as well as expertise in many of the capability related EDA fora. Currently, the EUMS is involved in 29 EDA Project Teams and 10 ad hoc Working Groups. This offers the EUMS the opportunity to reinforce the EDA’s efforts and to promote work strands aimed at mitigating the capability shortfalls, as prioritised by the EUMC.

Another EUMS’ focus of work in military capability development is close staff-to-staff contacts with NATO according to its Terms of Reference, “to ensure consistency with NATO’s DPP (Defence Planning Process) and the PARP (Planning and Review Process for Partners)…”. In the recent years this staff-to-staff relationship has blossomed, and
in some areas, such as Smart Defence/Pooling and Sharing, the development of the Capability Codes and Statements and the Information Gathering Tool, it has now reached a high level of coordination and improved coherence.

Furthermore, in the area of the civil-military dimension of capability development, civil-military cooperation has gained high momentum with the initiative of “promoting civil-military synergies in capability development”, launched by the PSC in 2010. Since then, the collaboration on many capability-related matters between the EUMS, the CMPD and the CPCC within the EEAS structures and with the EDA as well as with other EU stakeholders, such as the European Commission and the European Space Agency, has significantly increased, aiming at identifying and encouraging synergies in both capability development domains.

The EUMS - lean and capable

With only 200 personnel, the EUMS is a very lean structure that has rapidly adapted over its short history to changing needs. In particular, the EUMS has become a key advocate of EU military capability development to ensure Member States’ aspirations are addressed, especially with respect to the ambitions described in the EU Headline Goals.
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The European Union’s expressed intent to be an influential global actor commensurate with its economic size requires an appropriate investment in military capability. The “Soft Power” of diplomacy and economics, which constitute the crisis management instruments of choice, needs to be backed by the “hard edge” of an effective military. This military element remains sovereign and is provided by the Member States. The Balkans campaigns, culminating in the Kosovo Crisis in 1999, illustrated key deficits that dramatically limited Europe’s ability to act militarily. As there was no effective entity at a European level for remedying these deficits, the European Defence Agency (EDA) was formed in 2004 in order to support Member States and the Council by improving the defence capabilities required to meet the needs of CSDP operations. Importantly, the EDA was given the role of looking to the future. This has allowed a broader view to be taken on those capabilities needed for CSDP and has shaped collaborative developments for a less benign world, thereby aligning work with the major national defence capability development drivers (and investment priorities).

Defence capabilities are complex and multi-faceted, and are not confined to military forces alone. They reach into the supply chain and the industrial base and they need long-term investment to be sustained. This sustainment starts with specialist Research and Technology (R&T) investment and is further enabled through industry producing the world-class military products needed for future operations. Starved of focused investment, the industrial base will ultimately fade away, and with it the autonomy to act. Hence, the EDA was built as an enabling organisation with the four elements needed to bring capabilities into service; Capabilities, Armaments, R&T and Industry & Market. As a Brussels-based hub, funded and supported by participating Member States’ (pMS) Ministries of Defence – MOD (26 of 27), it was set up to facilitate European collaborative investment in the capabilities needed for tomorrow. The direct link with pMS MOD decision makers and facilitators is a unique and a powerful driver of the Agency.

Building defence capabilities from scratch is a long and involved task, but improvements can be achieved relatively quickly. EDA has therefore focused on the short, medium and longer terms in order to build momentum for its work. A focus on output in priority areas has been the hallmark of EDA, with these priorities defined by the national Capability Directors through the EU Capability Development Plan (CDP). The CDP was built by the Member States, the European Union Military Staff (EUMS), the European Union Military Committee (EUMC) and the Council. This combined
collaborative effort, chaired and hosted by EDA, was a major enabler for securing a common understanding of capability-based planning and for unifying the approach to address the key capability deficits. The exercise underpins much of the EDA’s work programme and emphasises that military capability is not just defined by equipment held in inventories.

Work has been undertaken in developing areas as diverse as Strategic Transportation and Counter Improvised Explosive Devices (C-IED). Everything was designed to have an immediate effect on operational capability as well as building longer term links and structures to bring Europe’s militaries closer together. “Quick wins” have been important to gain pMS “buy-in”, and concept development (improving the way we do things by sharing best practice) and training in key areas have proved most successful.

Outcomes have seen operational enhancements in helicopter crew training for Afghanistan, which started with exercises spreading current operational best practice, has moved on to fielding a “cutting edge” tactical simulator system and is now working on a multi-national helicopter wing. A C-IED forensic capability has been deployed to Afghanistan in order to assist in building the wider European “Prevent” capability through the provision of intelligence, contractor support to current operations has been enabled through a web-based Third Party Logistic Support platform built and hosted by EDA, and operational radio spectrum has been successfully defended from legislative restrictions. Considerable enabling work has been undertaken on operational networks and Command & Information Systems.

Longer-term armaments projects have been initiated and facilitated in the areas of Maritime Mine Counter Measures, Biological agent defence and jet pilot training. Links with OCCAR (Organisation for Joint Armament Cooperation) have been established in order to facilitate a project pipeline through the EDA, in such a way that a requirement harmonised in the Agency can be moved through to delivery. Significant work has been done in the area of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, especially as regards integration into air traffic, and the wider Defence implications of the Single European Sky are being staffed through the EDA. All of this work, and particularly the R&T dimension, has utilised the collaborative commercial tools developed for the Agency in order to maximise the efficiency of pMS working together in areas from common studies to the delivery of sophisticated technical demonstrators. Flexibility and the ability to develop multiple geometry solutions to suit pMS needs makes the Agency an attractive option for collaboration.

Importantly, the European institutions are investing heavily in civil / military “dual use” areas, and this investment can be leveraged to support military requirements. For example, the huge investment in space-based technologies and systems give capabilities that, if harnessed correctly, will provide capabilities to Defence Forces. Security research across the piece from cyber to surveillance could also benefit
Defence through development of the European Framework Cooperation initiated by EDA’s R&T Directorate. However, all this requires the building of trust and confidence and this has been best illustrated through work on Maritime Surveillance (MARSUR), where EDA has worked closely with the European Commission and other Agencies. The linkage of the MARSUR networks of 15 pMS will form the pre-cursor to a military layer of the Commissions’ Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE) and is very much a “win / win”.

As the spotlight falls on the longer-term development of Pooling and Sharing, particularly through the direction of the EDA’s Ministerial Steering Board, the building of linkages that will ultimately bring pMS closer together becomes more important. The financial crisis makes it critical that the Member States have a mechanism to build deeper and more effective collaboration. Their capabilities need to be able to meet the demands of a host of challenges and be usable in a wide range of settings from national to CSDP, NATO and coalition operations. EDA must continue to work effectively with that premise and support Member States accordingly. Our Member States still spend over 190Bn Euros a year on Defence, and this investment needs to be made to best overall effect. In due course, it is inevitable that deeper integration in coalitions of the willing will continue and move to role specialisation in the fullness of time.

Europe needs to defend its values and way of life in an uncertain world, and it has produced an innovative and proven tool in EDA to assist. The challenge is now to use that tool to best effect and move forward together.
1.3 Way Ahead with more cooperation

_Cpt Constantinos Ch. Hadjisavvas_  
Military Advisor - Delegate to the HTF  
(Permanent Representation of the Republic of Cyprus to the EU)

The combination of the selected articles in the main part of this chapter present a common but also diverse picture and perspectives of the role and the potentials of the EU entities and actors in the field of EU military capability development. All of these perspectives have a common ground due to the defence budget reductions and the challenges of the strategic operational environment, which cannot be currently managed by the Union in an adequate way, unless all available instruments and tools are employed and used. In the same context, and without prejudging the competences of the respective stakeholders, there is a growing conception that defence cannot be limited to the exclusive boundaries of the military community. Neither niche military capabilities can be afforded to be sustained or to be developed by a single actor. Definitely, Libya is an apt illustration of the Union’s limitations, as a single entity, to cope with a frontline crisis using its own capabilities, and an example for the dependencies within the Union, if a common understanding for action cannot be achieved.

Nevertheless, the picture is not so gloomy. Although there are many limitations and obstacles, Member States and the Union in general seem to move towards a positive direction in mitigating EU military capability shortfalls. The Lisbon Treaty enables, at the institutional level, Member States, supported by the EU bodies, if they wish so, to establish Enhanced or Permanent Structured Cooperation within the Union, to develop those military capabilities which are indispensable for responding to the most demanding missions, to define a European Capabilities and armaments policy and, going even one step further, the capacity for mobilising military resources for the purposes of the internal security (Articles 20.2, 42.3, 42.6 - TEU and Article 222 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union - TFEU). Despite the fact that some of these provisions have not yet been activated, there are ongoing substantial discussions within the Union for their implementation.

Another positive dimension is the Union’s conceptual approach on Pooling and Sharing of national defence capabilities, which is currently being developed towards specific projects and actions (air-to-air refuelling, medical support, maritime surveillance, training and education). Not being limited to defining and implementing ad hoc projects, there is now a mounting demand for more systematic and long-term structured commitments. Complementarily, there is a vigorous impetus for further investments in research, innovation and technology for strengthening the European
Defence Technological and Industrial Base. The Defence Task Force, set up recently by the Commission, is an encouraging step towards remedying the fragmented defence market in Europe and bringing all relevant stakeholders, the EEAS, the EDA and the Member States together, in a comprehensive working environment. Having this in mind, it becomes more evident that these projects or actions are not limited exclusively to the military community, but are of mutual inter-institutional interest, primarily when it is about dual-use capabilities, research and industrial projects.

If the EU entities involved in the domain of military capability development are to be productive and relevant to the Union’s requirements, they need to work closer, in a transparent and trustful spirit, assuring that they do not duplicate their practices and do not produce more than they need. Inevitably, these approaches will lead to more solidarity and more interdependency among Member States. Notwithstanding that such discourses, especially when they are related to the defence sector, infiltrate the contentious realm of national sovereignty, they should not be perceived as mutually exclusive. Rather, amidst the financial slowdown, the EU represents a solid and structured framework for integrating, at the extent that the Member States decide, the intergovernmental cooperation into a more credible, sovereign and autonomous CSDP (Agapiou – Josephides, Georgiou, Hadjisavvas, 2012). A sovereign CSDP means that the Union will have the autonomy to act at the time and place it deems necessary for securing its own interests. This decision-making autonomy will consolidate the sovereignty of the Union and, in fact, of its Member States on the international scene.

In this context the EU bodies could play a catalytic and mainly facilitating role in assisting the cooperation among Member States, given that some of them cannot acquire specific capabilities unilaterally due to ongoing budget cuts. Alternatively, structured cooperation within the Union framework could ensure in the long term that critical or expensive capabilities will not be lost. Certainly, the incremental interdependency means less sovereignty at the national level but more sovereignty at the Union’s level. This prospect should be seen positively since in the long term, as General Håkan Syrén (former Chairman of the EUMC) acknowledges, “Relying on capabilities and support from other Member States may in fact imply less loss of national sovereignty than having no capabilities at all” (“The Challenges ahead”, 2011). It is thus crucial that the EU Institutions, within their respective competencies, provide the legal framework for Member States to better rationalise and reallocate their national defence expenditures, taking into consideration the Union’s ambitions and requirements. Ultimately, this process will ensure in the long term the generation of interoperable, cost-efficient, complementary and affordable capabilities to be deployed in crisis zones.

As the following part of this book outlines, the EU has developed the appropriate tools and methodologies, i.e. Capability Development Mechanism, Information Gathering Tool (IG Tool), Progress Catalogue and Capability Development Plan,
(CDP) for identifying the capability shortfalls for implementing the full spectrum of the CSDP tasks. Moreover, the Member States are aware of the future EU capability requirements for being capable of addressing the forthcoming challenges. However, it is upon the respective Member States to harmonise their capability plans according to the Union’s requirements. Such an approach will be determinant in sustaining the CSDP operational capacity to respond effectively to an international crisis, when such decision will be taken. Notwithstanding that Member States commit their capabilities to the Union on a voluntary basis, they are, however, institutionally bound “...to undertake progressively to improve their military capabilities” (Article 42.3, TEU).

The Union is at a decisive turning point. Decisions have to be taken whether the Union will continue to further marginalise the CSDP at the expense of the efforts concentrating in restoring the Eurozone downturn, or will invest for developing credible capabilities. The urgent need for the Union to cure the Eurozone in order to allow the improvement of the EU functioning and the reinforcement of its CSDP has been deeply acknowledged by eleven EU Ministers of Foreign Affairs in their Final Report of the Future of the Europe Group (Final Report, 17 September 2012). In the same context, it seems that there is now a growing demand for the EU to revise the European Security Strategy (ESS) and define clear strategic objectives matching its aspirations pursuant to the available capabilities. Additionally, it had been outlined within different seminars conducted during the Cyprus Presidency of the Council of the EU that there is an urgent need for a Maritime Security Strategy, subordinated to the ESS.

Moreover, and specifically referring to the CSDP domain, many scholars, diplomats and practitioners from the military community advocate that the EU should reflect on the necessity for developing a *White Paper on Defence and Security*. The decision of the President of the EU Council to devote the Summit in December 2013 to defence and military capabilities (EUCO 133/12) is thus now more relevant than ever. It will be up to Member States and the relevant EU entities to elaborate on credible contributions for this Summit, in order to subsequently pave the ground for the future.

Recapitulating, it is time for Member States to expand the notion on State’s “sovereignty” to a wider concept materialised also in the framework of the Union. Nonetheless, it is upon to the individual Member States to decide the degree of yielding their sovereign rights in the domain of security and defence, and in particular to military capabilities. However, it is their responsibility – as in the case of keeping alive the Eurozone – to protect and sustain collectively the operational capacity of the CSDP. As the European Parliament’s report (2011/2177) warns, “...uncontrolled defence budgets cuts could result in the complete loss of certain military capabilities in Europe”. This is in line with the general fear that the reduction of capabilities will create new shortfalls, not foreseen for the time being. It is thus fundamental that the EU Institutions and the respective bodies foster a trustful and transparent
environment enabling Member States to increase their cooperation in the field of military capability development, for ensuring the Union’s operational capacity to address not only the external, but also the internal security challenges.
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PART II

Headline Goal Process: Context and Reflections
2.1 The EU Headline Goal Process
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The EU Headline Goal Process is a systematic approach to developing the necessary military capabilities to meet the EU Level of Ambition. The Headline Goal 2010 translated the political objectives of the European Security Strategy into military strategic / operational objectives. The EU Headline Goal Process assists with the identification of the military capabilities that would need to be developed by the Member States in order to fulfill the EU Level of Ambition.

This essay provides an overview of the EU Headline Goal (HLG) Process starting from strategic-political documents, describing the HLG Process in broad outlines and showing further possibilities for the use of the HLG Process, and ends with personal reflections.

Capability Development Mechanism

In March 2003, the Council approved the document entitled “Capability Development Mechanism” (CDM), which describes in detail the process of EU military capability development. The aim of the document is threefold: to enable the EU to monitor and facilitate progress in achieving the overall goal, in both quantitative and qualitative terms; to enable the EU to evaluate and, if necessary, to review its defined capability goals in order to meet the requirements of the full range of Petersberg tasks in the light of changing circumstances; and finally to help achieve consistency between the pledges undertaken in the EU framework and, for the countries concerned, the force goals agreed to in the context of NATO planning or the Partnership for Peace (PfP).

Relations with NATO

The basic principles of EU - NATO relations were defined by the EU at the European Councils of Feira in June 2000 and Nice in December 2000 and by NATO at the Washington Summit in April 1999. After long discussion and several attempts to find an agreement, in December 2002 the EU High Representative Javier Solana and
NATO Secretary General George Robertson finally adopted a common declaration that formed the basis for cooperation between the two organisations. The aim of the declaration was to ensure the most appropriate and effective military response in any given crisis. It was based on arrangements between NATO and the EU in the areas of security, capability goals, access for the EU to NATO assets and capabilities – the so called BERLIN+ agreement – and permanent arrangements for consultation and cooperation, which led, amongst other things, to the establishment of the EU-NATO Capability Group.

Now that the mechanism to develop EU capabilities had been agreed, one thing was still missing: an agreement on what should be the ambition of the EU as an international actor.

European Security Strategy

After 4 years as the first High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), Javier Solana was tasked by the informal meeting of the General Affairs and External Relations Council in Greece, in May 2003, to produce a draft strategic European security document. In December 2003, the European Security Strategy (ESS) was adopted by the European Council with the title: “A Secure Europe in a Better World”. It is after all the first strategic document covering EU foreign policy in its entirety, from aid and trade to diplomacy and the military. It was the very first statement of the EU’s ambition as an international actor. The ESS focused on a better identification of threats in order to define the strategic objectives of the Union and identify political implications for the EU. In December 2008, the Council confirmed the threats identified by the ESS: WMD (weapons of mass destruction) proliferation, terrorism and organised crime, and identified new ones, such as: cyber security, energy security or climate change. Additionally, it also noted the problems of piracy and trafficking in small arms, ammunitions and landmines.

The ESS had been agreed but EU member states still had to establish their level of CSDP ambition.

Headline Goal

The first Helsinki Headline Goal (HLG) was adopted by the European Council in 1999. This political objective, essentially quantitative, was aimed at enabling the EU to carry out various military missions of crisis management with the deployment, for the most ambitious, of an army corps size force (50,000 to 60,000 men) within 60 days, at 4,000 km from Brussels and for a minimum period of 1 year. To determine the necessary military capabilities, the EU implemented a process that led to the establishment of a Requirements Catalogue (RC), a catalogue of Member States’ contributions called the Force Catalogue (FC) and a catalogue of shortfalls, the Progress Catalogue (PC).
In June 2004, following the publication of the ESS, the Council approved the Headline Goal 2010 (HLG 2010), which translated the political objectives of the ESS into military strategic/operational objectives. In contradiction to the previous HLG, the emphasis this time was on qualitative rather than quantitative objectives: interoperability, deployment and sustainment. The HLG 2010 also set the basis for the establishment of, amongst others, the European Defence Agency (EDA), the EU battle group concept, an EU strategic lift coordination centre and a European Airlift Command. By December 2008, the Council adopted a document on strengthening capabilities. The latter emphasised the synergies between civilian and military in capability development and EU operations. This document merely restated the EU’s CSDP level of ambition.

In December 2010, the Council approved the document called “EU Civilian and Military Capability Development Beyond 2010”, which reaffirms the EU Level of Ambition (LoA) as described in the Council Declaration of 2008 on Strengthening Capabilities. The Council also extends the implementation of the respective existing civilian and military HLG beyond 2010. According to the document, in the framework of deploying 60,000 troops within 60 days for a major operation (LoA), the EU should be able to plan and conduct simultaneously a series of military operations and civilian missions of varying scope. The document underlines the importance of a greater coherence between civilian and military processes and describes additional military, civilian and Civ-Mil capability objectives. It emphasises the importance of exploiting innovative methods for collaboration, such as pooling, sharing and role specialisation, reinforces the role of the EDA in helping Member States to deliver the needed military capabilities and encourages the EU to develop its cooperation with NATO on military capability development.

EU Headline Goal Process

The EU HLG Process is a systematic approach to developing the necessary military capabilities for CSDP based on the LoA. It aims to identify the capabilities to be developed by Member States and to create synergies between their forces, in order to facilitate a more rapid and effective EU crisis response.
In order to identify the military capabilities required to pursue the European Union’s CSDP goals as described in the ESS and the HLG 2010, the Requirements Catalogue 05 (RC 05), which replaces the Helsinki Headline Goal Catalogue 2002, has been created.

Five Illustrative Scenarios, translating the ESS and the HLG 2010 into possible situations for EU operations, were developed for the RC 05. This comprises:

**Strategic Planning Assumptions:** Distance, Reaction Time, Duration, Rotation and Concurrency. These cover the principal indicative planning parameters used for planning purposes in the development of the RC 05. They are the key drivers in the military planning process and are in no way intended to impose limitations on the EU’s capacity for action.

**Five illustrative Scenarios:** Separation of Parties by Force; Stabilisation, Reconstruction and Military Advice to Third Countries; Conflict Prevention; Evacuation Operation in a non Permissive Environment; and Assistance to Humanitarian Operations. These scenarios outline possible military tasks for the EU and formed the basis for the military capability development process. The Illustrative Scenarios take into account a realistic threat level, including the terrorist threat.

**Detailed List of Required Capabilities (DLRC):** Defines in a detailed and qualitative manner the required military capabilities needed to achieve the military tasks drawn from all of the Illustrative Scenarios. This list represents the transition to capability planning, because talking about capabilities through all scenarios provides the cornerstone of the capability-based approach. The DLRC constitutes the first of the two main outputs contained in the RC 05 and forms the backbone of the Scrutiny-Assessment-Evaluation-Prioritisation (SAEP) Process.

**Total Force Requirement (TFR):** Based on the forces required for each of the five illustrative scenarios and taking into consideration the three concurrency options selected as part of the Strategic Planning Assumptions, the TFR was developed and constitutes the second main output contained in the RC 05.

In order to keep track of the studies that led to the elaboration of the data and information contained in the DLRC and TFR, and to allow for a better understanding of the rationale behind the requirements in terms of capabilities and force elements listed in the RC 05, relevant working documents are grouped in the RC 05 Supplement. The establishment of the RC 05 presents the first part of the HLG Process and delivers the requirements according to the Level of Ambition.
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Scrutiny – Assessment – Evaluation – Prioritisation (SAEP) Process

The RC 05 was developed using a capability-based approach: in the framework of the DLRC, only capabilities are assessed, evaluated and prioritised, and not units or platforms. Based on the comparison of Member States’ contributions against the requirements, a series of connected and sequential functions takes place: the SAEP Process. It presents the second part of the HLG Process and consists of four steps:

The starting point for the **Scrutiny** is the “Compilation of Member States’ Contributions”. This step provides a qualitative and quantitative measurement of each MS’ contribution translated into capability terms. It also provides an understanding of the total forces and related capabilities that could potentially be made available to the EU for CSDP operations. The Force Catalogue reflects the contribution of the Member States and the results of the scrutiny procedure.

The **Assessment** is a quantitative and qualitative analysis of required capabilities, taking into account the scrutinised contributions by MS, with the aim of identifying capability shortfalls. On the basis of the qualitative and quantitative analysis of each capability, a determination of a capability shortfall is assigned. Any deficit of a contributed capability in total, remaining after having conducted the Assessment, will be designated as a capability shortfall and will be analysed during the Evaluation.

The **Evaluation** identifies the operational risk of each capability shortfall. This is achieved by examining the identified shortfalls against the key parameters, laid down in the Illustrative Scenarios and the associated Strategic Planning Assumptions, thus leading to the weighting of capability shortfalls for the analytical approach to prioritisation.

The **Prioritisation** arranges the capability shortfalls based on a combination of the operational risk and the likelihood of a capability shortfall in single, concurrent and across the whole set of scenarios. The Prioritisation is the final step of the SAEP process and also the HLG Process.
The results of the Assessment, Evaluation and Prioritisation are collected comprehensively in the Progress Catalogue. It constitutes a reference document providing a cascading effect of evidence-based analysis to support Member States resource prioritisation and planning. The Prioritisation of capability shortfalls represents the EUMC guidance for addressing shortfalls within the context of the HLG. The Prioritised List of capability shortfalls forms the main EUMC Input to the Capability Development Plan. In this context, the prioritised shortfalls are also called Strand A based on the structure of the Capability Development Plan.
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In comparison to the development of the Requirement Catalogue, the SAEP process could be conducted several times to the predefined requirements, i.e. when there are significant changes in Member States (MS) contributions. A derivation of the requirements depicted in a RC has to be done, i.e. when the LoA changes.

Output of HLG Process

The HLG Process is one of the main responsibilities of the EUMC in capability development. This input to the Capability Development Plan, being the list of prioritised capability shortfalls, serves as the basis for further work in the whole EU capability development process.

The HLG Process reflects the short-term requirements and prioritises the shortfalls of the EU for CSDP operations. The basis for defining the EU Capability shortfalls is the comparison of the requirements and the contributions of MS, which are collected via the Information Gathering Tool. As 21 EU Member States are participating in both NATO Defence Planning and the EU HLG Process; it was consequently decided in 2010 to use a software commonly used by NATO and EU for collecting Member States’ contributions. This has no impact on the HLG Process itself, but will increase its compatibility and visibility.

The findings from the HLG Process are based on a traceable and logical process and will provide solid and sound results - reflecting short-term capability shortfalls. Considering the structure of the HLG Process, three further findings could be determined and would offer additional perspectives.

A mid-term capability shortfall perspective could be achieved by setting a second target year. This target year, e.g. plus 5 years, could be chosen in order to get a second picture of forces potentially available to the EU. The HLG Process itself would remain unchanged and would provide a list of prioritised capability shortfalls in the mid-term.

When comparing short-term and mid-term capability shortfalls, the HLG Process could deliver trends on how each capability will develop. This would offer an additional perspective, besides those already provided in the Capability Development Plan. A trend analysis is currently not part of the HLG Process, but, based on the short and mid-term findings, it could be developed and implemented in coherence with the existing procedures.

The aspect of overcapacities is only partially covered in the HLG Process to substitute and compensate capability shortfalls in certain domains. Based on the Force Catalogue, the HLG Process could also list overcapacities of the Member States rather than just focusing on capability shortfalls. This could be a new aspect to help Member States to reduce the “right capabilities”. This analysis will have already be
conducted in the Assessment during the determination of a capability shortfall. All the capabilities which are not determined as a capability shortfall are either just sufficient or do have overcapacities. The only additional step is to distinguish between adequate capabilities and overcapacities. A list of overcapacities could be attached to the Progress Catalogue.

Figure 3: Summary

Personal Reflections

Capability development and the HLG Process are a long-term endeavour where quick wins are nearly impossible. In addition, Capability Development is perceived as a difficult subject. In contrast, the HLG Process can be described in three words: Simple, modern and flexible. Why?

Simple: The HLG Process was developed and used over a longer time period but never with the intention of getting more complicated and too detailed. This simple process requires only limited manpower, e.g. within the EUMS, the Force Capability Branch assists the EUMCWG/HTF with expertise to manage the HLG Process.

Modern: The HLG Process has its roots in the Capability Development Mechanism (CDM), which has already celebrated its 10th anniversary. The guidelines in the CDM
for the HLG Process are broad and general but also future-oriented. As a best example, the capability-based approach is still up to date and will be used also in the future.

**Flexible:** Since first results were published, two major developments have affected the HLG Process and underlined its flexibility. In 2006, a mandate was given to the European Defence Agency to draft a Capability Development Plan. This was finally presented in 2008, incorporating the findings from the HLG Process as Strand A. The output of the HLG Process was modified to the EDA needs. Secondly, Member States are able to use the Information Gathering Tool to input to the HLG process, making the process relatively simple and underlining its flexibility.

**Conclusion**

The HLG Process is one part of the Military Capability Development in the CSDP domain. The traceability from high political documents like the ESS to a concrete list of capability shortfalls in a simple, modern and flexible procedure is a characteristic trait of the HLG Process. With the HLG Process, the EUMC has at its disposal an important, successful and flexible tool.
2.2 The EUMC Working Group «Headline Goal Task Force – HTF»

2.2.1 Origins, Tasks and Potentialities

LtCol Thomas Panagis  
Former Greek Delegate to the HTF Working Group

Introduction

People involved in the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) business usually consider the HTF as a subgroup of experts within the framework of the EU Military Committee Working Group (EUMCWG), dedicated to dealing with capability-related issues. Although this is true, it is not but a small part of the HTF’s contribution to the building of CSDP, should someone consider that the HTF was there from the very beginning, in year 2000, when the European Union Military Staff (EUMS) did not exist, the European Union Military Committee (EUMC) was not yet officially established (Council Decision of 22 January 2001) and the European Defence agency (EDA) did not even exist in the deepest thoughts of Member States officials.

Started from scratch, in conditions of uncertainty and inexperience, the HTF built the basis of military capabilities of the EU, provided the fundamental structured institutional documents for that purpose and lighted up the spark for every further initiative in that field, such as the European Capability Action Plan (ECAP) and the establishment of the EDA.

In the following pages, readers will find a condensed record of the origins, the contribution, the way of working and the current state of play of the HTF, as well as an assessment about the future dynamics and potentialities of that group, through the eyes of a national expert who vividly participated in the HTF business for a 3 years’ time.

Format and principal working methods

Originally, the HTF was chaired by the six-monthly Presidency, but, after the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty (since July 2010), it is chaired by a permanent Chairman, elected by the EUMC amongst the available Member States nominates. This Chairman is assisted in his work by an action officer seconded by a Member State of the “Trio Presidency” and an NCO seconded by the Member State of the Chairman. The above mentioned action officer has undertaken also the mandate of deputising the Chairman in case of his absence.
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Regarding the organisation of the meetings, until 2011 the Presidency, assisted by the General Secretariat, used to make all the subsequent arrangements for the meetings, and the General Secretariat was responsible for issuing calling notices and draft agendas prepared in liaison with and as advised by the Chairman. After the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty and the establishment of the European External Action Service (EEAS), this task became one of the permanent Chairman’s responsibilities, in cooperation with the EEAS.

Usually, the group is convened in capability experts’ format with delegates representing each Member State, but when appropriate it may be convened in specialist technical panels to undertake work on specific issues as required by the EUMC. Officers from the EUMS could be tasked to lead the panels according to the expertise needed and the item of discussion. The results are being reported to the plenary meeting. If considered appropriate by the EUMC, the HTF can be reinforced by experts from NATO (“HTF Plus” format).

Until 2011, based on the EUMC Workplan, the HTF program of work used to be presented in May and November each year and was approved by the EUMC, taking into account the tasks as described in the Capability Development Mechanism (CDM) and covering a six months period (Ref: 6805/03, dated 26 February 2003). Based on the fact that the chairmanship of the HTF is no longer rotating, from 2012 the HTF work program is presented and agreed in the EUMC once a year. The result of this work forms the basis for the initial workplan for the next year, developed under the responsibility of the Chairman.

The HTF is assisted by the EUMS as directed by the EUMC. The Chairman provides the experts with draft and preparatory documents as considered appropriate to optimise working sessions. The Chairman reports to the EUMC, either in his discretion or as required by the HTF members.

In plenary session, Member States’ representatives strive to reach agreement whenever possible. Where consensus is not possible, the Chairman reports the situation to the EUMC. The specialist expert panels are not to be considered as a consensus building format. The results of their technical work are reported back in plenary session. Diverging views amongst experts are reflected in an objective report presented by panel’s spokesman in the plenary sessions.

The Chairman or his deputy inform and update other Council bodies on the work related to force development/capabilities as requested by the EUMC and coordinate with the EDA and the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD), as appropriate.
Key tasks through time

Under the Headline Goal 2003, the HTF has developed three documents (catalogues) that support the planning process of EU force.

- **Helsinki Headline Goal Catalogue (HHC):** The HHC is a catalogue that reflects the needs of the EU in terms of operational capabilities in order to run the “Petersberg” tasks. A first version of HHC was developed in 2000. This catalogue was revised in 2002.

- **Helsinki Force Catalogue (HFC):** The HFC is a document which sets voluntary contributions of the various Member States. A supplement to this catalogue lists the contributions of European countries outside the EU. The first version of the catalogue was published in 2000. Revised versions were published in 2002 and 2004 (with the incorporation of military capabilities offered by new Member States).

- **Helsinki Progress Catalogue (HPC):** The HPC includes a comparative analysis of the contributions of Member States vis-à-vis the needs expressed. It identifies the shortfalls and provides an overall assessment of the ability of the EU to carry out the “Petersberg” tasks. A first version of this catalogue was released in 2001. A revised version was published in 2003.

Nowadays, according to the Capability Development Mechanism (CDM), the HTF is responsible for:

- the expression of requirements (Requirements Catalogue - RC);
- the development of a Headline Goal Questionnaire (HGQ) to format the responses of Member States regarding their contribution of forces and assets to the capabilities of EU;
- the assessment of the voluntary contributions and their compilation into a summary document (Force Catalogue - FC);
- the comparison between the required capabilities and the contributed ones and the impact analysis of the established shortfalls in achieving the overall objective, reflected in a detailed list (Progress Catalogue - PC);
- The outcome evaluation process through the European Capabilities Action Plan Progress Report;
- The monitoring of the evolving capacities of the EU and the biannual revaluation of achieving the overall objective (Single Progress Report - SPR).
- The reporting periodicity of SPR was initially ordered to be every six months to reflect the achievements of the six-monthly Presidency. After the implementation of the permanent chairmanship of the HTF, SPR’s periodicity
was consequently amended to one year, according to PSC decision (Ref: 5763/12, dated 27 January 2012); and any other task given by the EUMC.

Origins

At the December 1999 Helsinki European Council meeting, EU Member States set themselves a military capability target known as the Headline Goal. It called for EU Member States to be able to deploy 60,000 troops within 60 days and sustain them for a year, in support of the “Petersberg” Tasks.

To operationally meet the requirements established by the Headline Goal, a Capabilities Commitments Conference (CCC) was organized in late 2000. For the preparatory work to be carried out, the June 2000 European Council meeting held in Santa Maria da Feira ordered the creation of a working body, a task force, to deal with that very demanding and significant job.

So, the “Headline Goal Task Force” (HTF) officially created on 4 July 2000 within the Action Plan of the Portuguese Presidency concerning the elaboration of the Headline Goal (Ref: 10023/00, dated 4 July 2000), had as its first mission to prepare the initial reviews of available, expected, and required forces and assets discussed in July 2000, known as the Helsinki Headline Catalogue (HHC), as the basis document for the CCC to specify the assets in support of the Headline Goal. The Conference also made it possible to identify a number of areas in which efforts were needed to upgrade existing assets, investment, development, and coordination to enhance the capabilities required for autonomous EU action.

The HTF started to work immediately with delegates from all Member States (15 at that time). It was chaired by the rotating presidency, and it was provisioned that when EU-NATO relations were to be addressed, it would be reinforced through the participation of NATO experts under the “HTF-plus” format (EU Member States delegates + appropriate experts from the NATO bodies).

The contribution – Historical key points

From the Beginning to the Headline Goal 2003

The HTF started working towards the development of the first draft of the HHC in early 2000, when the military infrastructure within the Council was still extremely poor. The only initial arrangements that existed were those that had taken place during the French Presidency of 1999, when three interim military bodies where established to prepare and to organise the involvement of the military community in the business of the EU:
• The interim Military Body (iMB) was an unofficial predecessor of the EUMC, tasked to coordinate military business and to prepare the institutional documents needed for the foundation of EUMC, as well as to facilitate the development of EUMS.

• The second body, iMB Working Group (iMBWG) was tasked to prepare the documents that needed to be endorsed by the PSC and the Council. Delegates were officers usually originating from the military representations of EU Member States in the Western European Union (WEU).

• The third body, the interim Military Staff (iMS), was a group of initially 7 officers, having experience in the Western European Union Military Committee, tasked to illustrate the organisational chart of the EUMS, to organise the initiation of business and to prepare the appropriate terms of reference for that purpose.

Although the above structure appears to be very similar to the final situation that exists today (EUMC - EUMCWG - EUMS), the truth is that things were in a status of infancy. Those interim bodies were just the nucleus of the military infrastructure, trying to set up things from scratch. Characteristically, in many cases there was only one officer representing a Member State in all three of them. No further bureaucratic mechanism existed to support the development of military capabilities. Therefore the contribution of Member States was of high significance for the accomplishment of the mission of the HTF. Moreover, much different expertise was needed for accurate planning at that stage, and specialists from many different national branches and services had to become involved for the venture to succeed.

The job was not easy. The generic requirements described in the Headline Goal had to be translated into military capability requirements, and, furthermore, into concrete specifications of military assets. Thus, in early 2001 the HTF found itself to be the master hub of numerous subcommittees, each one dealing with a specific category of military requirements. Those subcommittees were being guided and tasked by the HTF Chairman and used to coordinate amongst themselves during the plenary meetings of the HTF. Briefly, those subgroups and the capabilities they had to assess and plan accordingly were the following:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Army operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>Naval operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Army operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Command and Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>Logistic Support Planning Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Lift</td>
<td>Strategic Air and Naval lift procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA Tool</td>
<td>Search for service available to support the whole process with a tool of mathematical modeling, appropriate for defence planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTAR</td>
<td>Intelligence, Surveillance, Target Acquisition, and Reconnaissance capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHC</td>
<td>Gathering data and coordinating all the other subgroups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant characteristic of that period of work is that HTF sessions used to be crowded enough. Except from the fact that each Member State participated with an average of 4-5 experts, the NATO participation was also decisive, due to the fact that the EU military community, in an effort to take advantage of the NATO experience, used to organise “HTF plus” format meetings very often. There are records reflecting that meetings usually exceeded 70 participants and sometimes reached 90 (!), which is a rather remarkable number, should someone consider that the EU Member States were still 15.

The first report on the progress of capability development, the predecessor of today’s Single Progress Report, was launched in 5 April 2001, titled as “HTF Progress Report” (Ref: 15433/01, dated 17 December 2001). The group delivered the final versions of HHC, HPC and HFC in 15 June of the same year. After the initial contribution of Member States, there was a first assessment of shortfalls within the Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS), Combat Search and Resque (CSAR), Intelligence, Surveillance, Target Acquisition and Reconnaissance (ISTAR), Attach Helicopters, Suppression of Enemy Air Defence (SEAD), Deployability and Mobility capabilities for “Petersberg” tasks. These results forced the Chairman to distribute a letter for a second round of contribution of forces from the Member States. Additionally, as the significance was not equally balanced, it became apparent that the implementation of a method for prioritising shortfalls was essential.

It is worth noting that there are many “déjà vu” issues in the history of EU military capability development; that is to say, debates and situations that appeared to be repeated during the years and ideas that kept coming on the table under different
titles, which nevertheless had the same meaning and objectives. Such an issue is that of the “Leading Nations” initiative for the development of capabilities. In particular, as the EDA appeared in the picture much later, the HTF was also tasked with making proposals for the remedy of shortfalls. A first proposed solution to the problem of shortfalls was the synergic development of mission capabilities within a framework of “Leading Nations” willing to take over the initiative for cooperation in the capabilities development area, an idea that someone could easily consider as the predecessor of the modern idea of “Pooling and Sharing”.

Nevertheless, the “déjà vu” issues of that time are more; equally intense was the debate on the use of an Operational Analysis Tool, with the contribution of NATO Consultation, Command and Control Agency (NC3A), which was an issue that attracted the interest of the HTF many times over the years, not only at the beginning of the HFC, but also later on within the development of the HLG 2010, and even today.

The above mentioned idea of “Leading Nations” found an official endorsement when the Laeken European Summit in December 2001 decided to launch the European Capability Action Plan (ECAP). From March 2002 onwards, 19 panels of national experts developed possible solutions, all coordinated by the HTF. At the same time, Member States realised that the “ad hoc” development of practices was good to initiate things, but the time had come for the establishment of a permanent mechanism of capability development. Thus, the HTF started a difficult and time-consuming debate concerning the Capability Development Mechanism (CDM) that lasted two years.

In parallel with the ECAP developments, the year 2003 was marked by two main issues towards capabilities: the finalisation of the CDM in March, which remains the ultimate guidance for the processes and mechanisms followed for capability development in the European Union, and the discussions towards the creation of the EDA. The involvement of HTF in the latter issue consisted in investigating the areas that the new agency had to elaborate further in the field of defence capabilities development, in order to determine the boundaries between the responsibilities of the EUMC and the Agency on that field. It was the first time for another “déjà vu” issue to arise; that of the role of the EUMC and, consequently, of the HTF, in the capability development area.

The Council decided on the creation of the EDA on 17 November of the same year (Council Conclusions November 2003), with a view to be established in the course of 2004. Nevertheless, the role of the HTF in the field as the expert body of the EUMC to deliver capability requirements, contributions of Member States, amount of progress achieved and lessons learned relating to capability shortfalls, remained untouched. As the remedy of shortfalls became the mandate of the Agency, the ECAP projects were passed from the HTF to the responsibility of the EDA.
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From the Declaration of the HLG 2010 onward

In May 2004, the Council agreed to update the Headline Goal 2003 and set a new headline goal for 2010. The HLG 2010 reflected the new security strategy of the EU and considered the evolutions in the geo-strategic and technological areas. The focus was on the qualitative aspect of the EU military capabilities, mainly expressed in interoperability, deployability and sustainability terms. Moreover, the target was that in 2010 the EU should respond more quickly and effectively to crises when they occurred. The fight against terrorism was also largely taken into account through all scenarios.

In collaboration with the EUMS, the HTF has undertaken the revision of the Requirements Catalogue (RC). The steps leading to the publication of this very significant document at the end of 2005 were:

- the definition of illustrative scenarios and “Strategic Planning Assumptions”, and
- the creation of CJCPPs (Combined Joint Capability Planning Panels) composed of experts from capitals and charged with developing:
  - the Detailed Tasks List;
  - the Detailed List of Required Capabilities; and
  - the Generic Force Packages and Total Force Requirement.

The entire process was validated using computer tools supporting operational analysis. During the development of the Requirements Catalogue 2005 (RC05), NATO had made the computer resources of the NC3A available to the EU. Based on the RC05, Member States offered their capabilities through the Headline Goal Questionnaire (HGQ). Offers of Member States were compiled in the Force Catalogue 2007 (FC07). The entire process took place according to the CDM, and the circle of Headline Goal Process (the so called Scrutiny-Assessment-Evaluation SAE process) was successfully implemented. For the SAE process to fly, the HTF drafted and finalised manuals for each phase accordingly.

From 2008 onwards, after the initiation of the Capability Development Plan (CDP) in the EDA, the above process followed by the HTF was enriched by adding the “Prioritisation” phase after “Scrutiny-Assessment-Evaluation” (SAEP process) of the Member States contribution analysis. The new SAEP process, based on the results reflected in the Progress Catalogue (PC), which is the delta between RC and FC, aims at producing a valuable input to the CDP, in particular to Strand “A” (Shortfalls). These inputs, together with the analysis of Lessons Learned from operations (Strand “D”), are the main contribution of the EUMC to the CDP. The responsible body for delivering these inputs is the HTF.
Very important documents that play a major role in the capability development process were drafted and finalised during that period by the HTF. Indicatively, we can mention:

- the Methodology for Measuring Progress and Reviewing priorities (Ref: 16531/08, dated 28 November 2008);
- the Report on Lessons Identified from the HLG 2010 (Ref: 16512/08, dated 28 November 2008);
- the First Lessons Learnt Report from the HLG 2010 (Ref: 11206/09, dated 22 June 2009); and
- the EUMC Interoperability Study - Final Report (Ref: 16741/09, dated 26 November 2009).

Moreover, within the last circle of SAEP (2008-2010), the debate concerning the establishment of the Information Gathering Tool (IG Tool) was also of great significance. This remarkable effort aimed at the unification of the HGQ with the corresponding NATO questionnaire (Defence Planning Questionnaire - DPQ), in order for Member States participating in both organisations to have the opportunity to organise themselves after making their contributions to both EU and NATO, so as to avoid the duplication of efforts. In addition to the acceptance of the relevant software (Ref: CON/CAP 5433/10, dated 20 May 2010), this effort required a lot of technical work in the HTF, mainly towards the tuning of capability codes and statements used by the two organisations. This work is ongoing and is expected to reach concrete results in early 2013, when a new circle of Member States contributions to the FC will occur, and a new SAEP process will start. Results will be reflected in the EUMC input to the CDP revision in 2014.

After the expiration of the HLG 2010, instead of declaring a new Headline Goal, EU Member States decided to postpone the validity of the last one (Council Conclusions December 2010). The reasons behind this decision lie both in the ongoing developments in the EDA and the financial crisis in Europe, which left no space for a different level of ambition. Thus, the HTF’s mission did not change. Nevertheless, continuous pressure for more financially efficient solutions turned focus to synergic techniques and ideas such as the “Pooling and Sharing” initiative and the “Civilian/Military Synergies”, which now engross the interest of Member States and EU Institutions. In this context, the HTF continues making efforts towards the mitigation of existing shortfalls, under the tasking given by the EUMC. In parallel, the Headline Goal Process remains valid and, as already mentioned, a new SAEP process is about to run, starting at the beginning of 2013.
Current tasks and Potentialities

For more than twelve years now, the HTF has been proving its value in many different ways:

- its work is directly related to the responsibilities of the EUMC in capability development;
- it provides valuable expertise in capability related issues, including the global picture of the relevant developments within different EU bodies (EDA, CMPD, EUMS) in behalf of the EUMC;
- it ensures transparency for the Member States within the EU military capability development process;
- it offers remarkable experience, incorporating the knowledge of how capability development ever started and where it aims to go; and
- it facilitates the work of the EUMC by providing preconcert solutions and documents which have already been agreed within the group.

Currently the EUMCWG/HTF is tasked to:

- elaborate the Strand A input to the CDP, in particular to conduct the Translation and Adaptation Process to establish a basis for the S-A-E-P Process;
- continue working on Strand D of the CDP, based on the analysis of the Lessons Identified (LI) which are relevant to capability development purposes;
- draft Collegiate Views (CV) to express the view of the EUMC regarding the work of the EDA, based on an agreed methodology, mainly for the format of Steering Boards;
- contribute to the evaluation of EU capability development by producing a yearly Single Progress Report (SPR);
- increase Member States’ awareness of the work of the EDA Integrated Development Teams; and
- enhance the coordination between the EU and NATO via the “HTF plus”.

HTF will keep focusing on those activities. Furthermore, given the high level of experience and expertise of the group, the HTF could intensify its efforts and become deeply involved in many areas with regard to addressing capability shortfalls, as follows:

- in the context of Pooling and Sharing; this could include a continuous analysis of the expected output of the P&S initiative in view of the prioritized shortfalls derived from current and future products of the HLG process and/or identifying concrete projects and Lead Nations on the basis of e.g. the EUMS analysis, in close cooperation with and in support of the EDA;
by contributing, at a technical level, to the harmonisation of Member States capability requirements in support of the EDA’s work, utilising the established well functioning network of HTF delegates;

by exploring ways to address role specialisation;

by being in a status of readiness for the work needed after the potential declaration of a new Headline Goal; and

by providing expertise in the area of new threats analysis (such as Cyber Defence) and by specifying capability requirements for those threats in the context of existing scenarios.
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2.2.2 National Delegates’ Perspectives

I. Introductory Chapter

*Col Günther Hessel*

*Former Austrian Delegate to the HTF Working Group*

Welcome to the Headline Goal Task Force, welcome to Europe. Yes we are Europe, because delegates from various capitals of the European Union meet about twice a week on behalf of our Generals, the national Military Representatives to the EUMC. As a member of the HTF, in which I participated for 3 years, from 2009 to 2012, I perceive each person involved as a tiny cogwheel out of many thousands of elements, making up the huge machine named “European Union”. Although, sometimes, the machine threatens to become stuck because of rusty, almost broken or insufficiently oiled pieces, surprisingly enough, it is still moving forward - also in the areas for which the HTF is responsible, i.e. Capability Planning, which is part of the overall Capability Development process.

In the following pages you will find personal impressions and experiences of seven HTF members as examples of how the HTF seems to work. The saying “A patient consulting seven different doctors will obtain seven different diagnoses” is also valid for the HTF. As different as the European countries may be, with their unique histories, different country sizes and geographical locations, unique societies, certain political traditions and present political situations, the delegates along with their contributions, based on their knowledge, experiences and advice from the capitals, are different just as well.

As a matter of course, sometimes this complex situation leads to lengthy discussions with few concrete results or, rarely, even to showstoppers during a project; but I am of the opinion that instead of perceiving this unique European constellation primarily as an obstacle, we should rather consider it as a unique chance with a large variety of possibilities. In order to overcome obstacles, developing our Europe, our European Union, which I perceive as the biggest peace project after two World Wars in the last century, is part of the process; a process to realise that only together we will be able to solve today’s problems and those of the future.

This process is still in its initial stage, and, beyond our concrete tasks, I see our work here in the HTF as a significant part of this European process.

Being aware of the guidance by our capitals and differing personal viewpoints, it is amazing to see how highly our work is appreciated and how much respect it meets,
also in fierce debates. As we all know very well: never take anything personally, conform to what is feasible and accept the fact that something might still need some more time.

Thus, the variety of EU Member States represented in the HTF implies also a certain complexity with regard to all pertinent challenges. The different countries are only one aspect; the other is the multitude of actors in the field of Capability Development. In addition to the European Union Military Committee (EUMC), the European Military Staff (EUMS) is one of the main actors concerning our responsibilities, comprising all the experts who usually deliver the first drafts of the documents which will be subsequently discussed within the HTF as preparation of the decision-making body of the EUMC. Other players are the European Defence Agency (EDA), the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD), the Political and Security Committee (PSC), the Political Military Group (PMG), the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM) and many more. We must not forget additional actors, like NATO, and the permanent effort of preventing duplications between the EU and NATO.

Under optimal circumstances, HTF delegates are in a position to follow everything that is going on within the different bodies and working groups, becoming thus competent advisors to their respective Military Representative and, obviously, their capital. Although capitals are trying to influence us, this also works the other way round – in this way, also we, the delegates, the workers and experts in the European Union bodies, try to influence our capitals with the advice we provide, based on the experience gained here in Brussels.

By the way, one thing was really remarkable for me: every HTF member I met during my three years in Brussels was more or less a supporter of the European idea. I really gained the impression that almost everyone works – of course, first and foremost, for the benefit of his/her capital – but in the second place to help develop our Europe too. Now, after that period, returning to my home country and its capital, I see myself also as a multiplier of the European idea and the possibilities in our field, namely Capability Development.

Dear readers, maybe you have caught a glimpse of the challenges HTF members face day to day. Therefore, it is of utmost importance for the people working here in Brussels in Capability Planning to gain experience, especially in our HTF working group, but also to be aware of the work being done in all the other working groups and forums. As for me, during the first year I rather listened, observed and learned, except for the situations where I had to put my national position into the discussion. Gradually, I learned about all interconnections, details, methodologies, backgrounds, principle national positions and history of topics, and eventually I started to discuss in a more active and constructive way. Therefore, I support the idea that every HTF
delegate be allowed to stay at least 2 or even 3 years, because the HTF depends principally on the contributions of its experienced members, who are already there for 3 years or longer, or who have already served in similar functions before this assignment, either in their respective capital or Military Representation, the EUMS, the EDA etc.

Now, I would like to invite you to read about the individual experiences, impressions and thoughts of some of my comrades! The following articles represent personal perspectives and opinions of the authors and do not necessarily correspond with the official national positions.
II. Main Part – Personal Experiences and Reflections

LtCdr Demitris Kasinis
Deputy Chairman EUMCWG/HTF

In 2004, the European Council endorsed the *Headline Goal 2010* as tangible proof of its will to establish a mechanism for common defence and security. Developing common capabilities and conducting CSDP operations and missions was a clear sign that the EU was looking for the role it deserved amongst the global key players. The fact that the EU is a global actor is the key element of the 2010 Headline Goal. More recently, as demand was growing for the EU to become more capable, more coherent and more strategic as a global actor, in 2010 the European Council agreed the *EU civilian and military capability development beyond 2010*, in order to improve the ability to foster civilian-military cooperation and to use CSDP as part of coherent EU action. That means that the EU is ready to share responsibilities for global security.

As of January 2012, I have been called to contribute to this effort, conducting my duty as Deputy Chairman of the European Union Military Committee Working Group/Headline Task Force (EUMCWG/HTF), whilst the Republic of Cyprus is to undertake the Presidency of the EU in the second semester of 2012. My previous experience in CSDP involved serving as a member of the Support Cell in Brussels for the European Union Training Mission in Somalia (EUTM Somalia) which was very beneficial, since I had already acquired the knowledge of the EU structures and more specifically the role of the working bodies. I started conducting my duties bearing always in mind the ultimate goal of the HTF working group: “*Capabilities Development for the Common Security and Defence Policy*”.

The role of the EUMCWG/HTF is vitally important to help transforming the above political declaration into action and tangible military outcomes. Its main objective is to elaborate the collective military requirement and bring military technical expertise in those capability activities. This necessitates a collective approach and analysing and compiling all the different approaches of the MS regarding capabilities. Close cooperation with the EUMS, the EDA and the EEAS is essential and helps to streamline all efforts towards the main goal. The discussions in the working group are invaluable, since it is very important to provide the European Union Military Committee (EUMC) with the most efficient solutions for each topic, ensuring an agreement or at least a compromise between MS, respecting also all MS’ national points of view or concerns.

During my short experience in this new and extremely interesting working environment, I can advocate that the key role of chairing the HTF working group is to
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be proactive and to consolidate different views on various issues related to Capabilities Development, taking into account the sensitivities and sometimes the strong views of each MS. This task cannot be considered easy, especially when different opinions are coming from MS with different cultures, history, experiences and objectives on military activities. For this reason it is very important for all the military people serving the chairmanship to “abandon”, at least temporarily, their national hats and work on behalf of all MS.

The willingness of the delegates to cooperate in the working group, the particular personality of the permanent Chairman of the HTF working group, Col Celestino Di Pace (IT), and also the fairness of the chairmanship’s team and the EUMS all help to eliminate the more extreme views and behaviours during the meetings. As a result, all delegates contribute constructively to achieve a common position for almost every topic covered.

The agenda of the HTF working group is based on an annual programme which has been elaborated by the Chairmanship of the EUMCWG/HTF, in collaboration with the EUMS and in accordance with the EUMC guidance. The working programme for 2012 is paving the way for the revision of the Capability Development Plan (CDP) in 2014, related mainly to the revision of Strands “A” and “D”.

In addition, the HTF Chairmanship has to be coordinated with the Chairman of the EUMC, and this is why we participate in all internal meetings of the CEUMC Office and also in the EUMC meetings. The Chairmanship of the HTF conducts weekly meetings with the Chairman of the European Union Military Committee Working Group (EUMCWG) and the EUMS Force Capability Branch, in order to clarify all the related issues concerning “Capability Development” and prepare thoroughly the meetings for the coming week. This very close cooperation of the HTF Chairmanship on behalf of the MS with the EUMC Chairman and the EUMS in order to prepare all the topics for the HTF meetings is vital in minimising the workload during the meetings. This saves valuable time for really constructive discussions, providing MS with better, more efficient and effective outcomes.

The main issues that are being discussed in the working group during the present year are related to the processing of the lessons learned; the assessment of new threats (especially concerning the Cyber Defence); the identification of the requirements for an Operational Analysis Tool and the way ahead regarding its future use; the revision of the EU Capability Codes and Statements; and the discussion of collegiate views for the EDA Steering Board meetings. Since the beginning of the year, the HTF working group, supported by the EUMS, is conducting very promising work on the Pooling and Sharing initiative in the domain of Training and Education. This effort, apart from the obvious advantages of cost reductions in the field of training and education for the participating MS, tests also the further development of trust and confidence between
all MS in the EU. It will of course be the basis for further strengthening CSDP and the vehicle to get even closer to a common culture in the EU military forces. This effort should succeed in order to trigger deeper, more systematic and productive cooperation between MS within the field of CSDP.

Moreover, in the near future the HTF working group will deal with the incorporation of the results of the lessons learned from CSDP and non-CSDP Operations; the national lessons and the studies from the European Defence Agency (EDA); the development of the Information Gathering Tool, which would cover current and future needs of both EU and NATO processes; and the update of the SAEP (Scrutinising-Assessing-Evaluating-Prioritisation) Process handbooks.

The HTF Chairmanship routinely maintains awareness regarding the ongoing work in the EDA, which keeps us updated on the development of various significant initiatives and programmes and avoids any duplication. The Chairmanship also follows the ongoing activities concerning the synergies between the EU Civil and Military Capability development.

By the end of this year, the HTF working group, with the support of the EUMS, will elaborate the Single Progress Report, evaluating the progress in the area of EU military capabilities. The working group will update the Capability-related terminology and also develop the work programme for 2013, which has to take into account the next revision for the Capability Development Plan (CDP) in 2014.

To conclude, the HTF has a key role as a working forum which deals with very significant and essential issues, adding real value to “Capability Development” which, from my personal point of view, is one of the main pillars of the Common Security and Defence Policy for the EU.
I won’t pretend to be amongst those who know best the HTF. I have taken the seat of the French delegate since the summer 2011 and therefore a number of my colleagues have a deeper knowledge of this Task Force.

I remember well, however, taking on the role. I felt a mixture of honour and apprehension in the face of the new responsibilities confided in me; for the first time in my career, I was to take the French chair in an international setting; modest to be sure, but nonetheless a participatory role in European cooperation, a project to which my country has always been particularly attached.

In fact France, founder member of the European Union, has never ceased in the pursuit of the goals set by its illustrious citizens, Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman. France still seeks a prime position in this drive towards progressive political unification, and particularly encourages a stronger and more unified Europe, able to implement a comprehensive approach capable of harnessing the economic, mercantile, diplomatic and military instruments necessary to resolve crises. Additionally, noting that “the role of the EU, both in the field of domestic security and in the management of external crises, was for many years embryonic,” (French White Paper on Defence and National Security), France actively supports the development of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and more generally promotes a greater presence of the Union in the fields of security and defence.

To achieve such a level of ambition, my country has always considered that “the first priority must be given to enhancing our means of action” by expanding the available military capabilities. It is for that reason that France fervently supported the famous Helsinki 1999 ”Headline Goal”, itself inspired by a Franco-German initiative to create Eurocorps in 1992.

There you have it, this is the background, in a few sentences, to my assuming the mantle of French representative in the HTF; a new task in support of a project in which my country is firmly engaged. Thus is the profession of the military man, rich in diverse and often unique experiences!

However, and perhaps most importantly, the apprehension that I felt in the beginning was swiftly dispelled by the warmth of the welcome I received from the Chairman and my fellow delegates. The HTF immediately felt like a large family, whose conviviality did nothing to dilute the professionalism of the work in hand. The HTF is, in fact, served by a Chairman and committee members whose characters are marked by openness, friendliness, professionalism and the overwhelming desire to further develop CSDP.
Notwithstanding that the Headline Goal process has largely reached its conclusions, the HTF maintains its raison d’être. Its work is set in the long term; European construction is a long haul process to which the HTF contributes, alongside other entities, to the establishment of the defence cornerstone.

Today, the HTF remains the sole forum tackling the deep and complex military capability aspects under the authority of the EU Military Committee. It takes part notably in the Pooling and Sharing initiative, a clear opportunity to the wider benefit of European cooperation. Indeed, stringent financial constraints effectively prevent access to certain capabilities without some form of bilateral or multilateral cooperation. Pooling and Sharing is a particularly inviting challenge, as, if developed in an intelligent manner, it should allow Member States to become more effective whilst concurrently becoming more interdependent. Every cloud has a silver lining!

Last, but by no means least, beyond those subjects laid down in its meeting agendas, the HTF represents a powerful network for the informal exchange of information. The friendly links between delegates allow a full and frank exchange of ideas across a wide diversity of subject areas. I have particularly appreciated this modus operandi thanks to which I can ask a question, air a problem informally or coordinate an intervention with my HTF colleagues.

Such is the HTF, one big family in support of un grand dessein!

But this positive state of play does not mean that there are no possible areas of improvement. As stated before, the Headline Goal process has largely achieved its objectives and the HTF has therefore broadened its workload to new topics of interest. However, in my opinion the daily programme remains sometimes too much focused on conceptual and theoretical works related to CSDP issues and especially to the only Headline Goal process. Actually, the EU military aspects are not limited to the CSDP activities and therefore the HTF should still extend its area of interests to more concrete but not less substantial projects.

For example, the HTF could have a look over all the major civilian programmes led by the EU commission (Single European Sky, Galileo, CISE - Common Information Sharing Environment, etc), that have impacts on military capabilities. It would not necessarily lead to major discussions inside the HTF, but only to regular briefings provided to the delegates. Such presentations would give further interest to the meetings of the Task Force and could help to raise the level of awareness on particular issues related to these projects. Last but not least, they would provide an overview on the holistic military capability development inside the European Union.
The contribution which an organised and living Europe can bring to civilisation is indispensable to the maintenance of peaceful relations.


Europe has an interesting history of unification. During centuries (especially the last one), all kinds of countries tried to unify the continent by conquering force. After World War II this came to change. Starting with 6 countries in 1950, the European Union nowadays consists of 27 Member States which are located all over the continent. This enlargement took place by “will” and not by “force”. The statement of Mr. Robert Schuman is still viable, but, more than 6 decades later, we have to get our act together or, even better, it is now time to act together.

I personally experienced the expansion and growing feeling of international military cooperation from 1980 till 1994 when I was stationed in Western Germany. During those years I served in the Royal Netherlands Airforce (RNLAF) Ground-based Air Defence (GBAD) units of the 3rd and 5th Missile Group. Together with Germany, Belgium and a lot of other countries, we guaranteed a safe Inner German Border via the so-called HAWK and NIKE belt. There was a lot of cohesion and cooperation with all the GBAD units, which were part of the multinational missile belts. International military cooperation was really a binding factor. At working level we experienced a kind of multinational sovereignty.

In 1991, almost instantly after the termination of the Cold War, the 5th NL Missile Group got involved in its first out-of-area operation. This was during the 1st Gulf war. The strategic deployment as such and the operation itself were a real proof of the international military cooperation concept. Right after this promising international military cooperation experience, Europe got caught in the uproar in the Balkans, where several countries started independence wars. The fact that the European Union at that time was not capable to contain the situation in former Yugoslavia increased the need for greater effectiveness in foreign affairs. The terrorist attacks in New York in 2001 speeded up the EU work in relation to the development of a new foreign policy strategy. In December 2003 a clear European Security Strategy (ESS) was adopted. The strategy acknowledged that in order to address existing threats, EU Member States would be required to coherently and effectively utilise the full spectrum of diplomatic, political and military means at their disposal.
After completion of the Netherlands Defence College and years of different activities in the International Military Cooperation Branch at the NL Defence Staff, to my luck, I was appointed to Brussels (end of 2008). Since then I have the privilege of being part of the EUMC Working Group Headline Goal Task force (EUMC / WG/HTF). From 2008 till now, I have experienced the respective Presidencies of France, Czech Republic, Sweden, Spain, Belgium, Hungary, Poland, Denmark and Cyprus, which had and have their own priorities and focus. When starting as a member of the HTF I had a lot of operational background from the time in Germany and experiences in the field of international military cooperation at the NL defence staff. And with that baggage I felt the need and urge to organise the Capability Development in the EU. After the first few months of “sitting on the fence” and trying to understand the formal and informal structures, I came to the conclusion that this was a totally different arena. On this playing field a lot of different players (and coaches...) were active. Politics, industry, national interests and the military itself determine the pace forward. Since 2008 we had a lot of meetings in the HTF to coordinate Capability Development, and more specifically to manage the Military Capability Shortfalls. All kinds of activities directly or indirectly related to Capability Development were taken up but sometimes put aside again.

However, we do experience crucial and decisive times. With all the current and future defence reductions (in almost all Member States), it now is really time to act. Discussions on long term perspectives for Pooling & Sharing and other ways of multinational cooperation are of utmost importance. But, again, it is time to act. In the Netherlands we gained some experience with multinational cooperation. For instance, the Belgian and Netherlands navy (for many years now) are integrated in the operational, educational, materiel and personnel domain. This is all laid down in a bi-national agreement. And, interesting to notice, the sovereign right of both countries to deploy their national assets in operations, as pointed out in the document, was never an issue when it came to actual deployment. The Royal Netherlands Army has an intense bond with the German Army in the 1st German Netherlands Corps (1GE/NL). Finally, the Royal Netherlands Air Force has strong ties with Belgium in the Deployable Air Task Force (DATF). And last but not least, in my own league (Ground Based Air & Missile Defence) there is a real strong bond between the German Air Force and the Royal Netherlands Air Force, which is visible in the European Air Defence Taskforce (EADTF). With all the ongoing developments, one could even imagine that there are opportunities for the development of a bi-national (or even European Multinational) Missile Defence Unit.

As a member of the EUMCWG / HTF and being involved in the Military Capability Development, I am convinced that in the Common Security and Defence domain of the European Union there is no single nation that is able to operate or afford the full range of capabilities needed to cope with the requirements linked to the execution of all required tasks. In this era of reduced defence budgets and known shortfalls,
Pooling and Sharing is inevitable. One can argue that this is a threat, but with a more optimistic view we can turn it into an opportunity to really cooperate. And as an HTF delegate, I dare say that in the end this may be the push that a lot (if not all) Member States need in order to really strive for more binding cooperation. And in this way, Capability Development may be the catalyst. Personal experiences of working (very) close together in all kinds of situations (especially during real military operations) were very promising and convinced me that military cooperation really binds people, countries and even cultures. As often stated, the best way to success is to commence in regional cooperation arrangements (e.g. the recently signed BENELUX arrangement).

In these arrangements one should be aware of and resolve political barriers such as sovereignty, assured access and assured availability. And this also counts for organisational, financial and other barriers which constrain the realisation of the full potential of pooling and sharing (or even task and role specialisation). In the end it all comes to willingness and trustfulness. The will (and trust) has to be there to start new or further develop known cooperation models. Multinational military cooperation needs a multinational sovereignty feeling which brings us back to the “One for all and all for one spirit” we experienced in our Missile Defence Community in Germany during the Cold War.

Traditional views on sovereignty do limit and in a certain way even block possibilities and opportunities for international military cooperation. Once we are able to widen and broaden the limits of sovereignty, then we will be able to create a credible basis for a deepened international military cooperation. And this will lead to very capable multinational units where all counties will contribute to and benefit from. And with this in mind, I come back to Mr Schuman’s statement, which I would personally like to rewrite as follows: An organised Europe which contributes to internal and external civilisation will be able to maintain peaceful relations.
The “Headline Goal process”, defined in the early years of the second millennium, was the result of the firm willingness of the European Union to play an active role as global actor in the framework of an adequate level of ambition.

Not having a solid experience in military planning, the European Union decided to proceed by steps: setting up the methodology first and then proceeding to the identification of estimated needs, which was consolidated with the compilation of the catalogues. The document “Defining the EU Capability Development Mechanism (CDM)”, compiled in 2003, explicates the procedure to carry on and maintain the efficiency of the process. The practical task of giving substance to the delineated process was assigned to the Headline Goal Task Force (HTF), an ad hoc expert group in the capability domain, expressing the full involvement of Member States.

I was called “on board” as a member of the HTF in July 2010, when I was appointed to the Italian Military Representation to the EU Military Committee. The aim of this short writing is to try to share my personal reflections on the HTF experience through my personal feedback, and to this aim I intend to underline the character and the role of the HTF in the field of the capabilities domain. In these last two years I have had the opportunity to see the “HLG process” from the inside and to contribute to its development. The drawing up of the catalogues was the most important aim achieved during the EU’s first experience. But after this, the ongoing challenge is to maintain, day by day, the EU capacity of managing the different capability issues and to improve, at the same time, the experience gained in this specific sector, especially after the establishment of the “European Defence Agency” (EDA). The EDA has completed the framework of the “EU Capability Development process”. The subsequent decision to carry on a “Capability Development Plan” (CDP) has definitely contributed to the definition of a “holistic system”, in which the “European Union Military Committee” (EUMC), with the competence of the HTF supported by the “European Union Military Staff” (EUMS), has the unique responsibility to address any specific need, exploiting all necessary military advice in the capability-related matters. The EDA’s mandate is to stimulate Members States to develop, in a common framework, the needed capabilities to fulfill the shortfalls.

After my first experience “on the ground”, I understand the mission of the HTF as the ability to:

- manage the military capability issues and all related matters, and
- sustain EUMC in its role of advisor to the political body as expression of EU
Military at the highest level; this is normally exploited by underlining with an unique voice, in synthesis of the national visions, the MS’ (Member States) positions as regards military capabilities.

The sensitive work finalised to define a focused list of prioritised shortfalls in terms of operational risk and capacity to fulfill a mission, is one of the most demanding activities aimed at creating a shared awareness and delivering the first substantial part of the CDP, “Strand Alpha”.

At the same time, in my capacity as member of the HTF, I have had the opportunity to contribute to the HTF’s essential role in the compilation of the last important part of the CDP called “Strand Delta”. In this work, the HTF’s members are called to extract, valuate and validate the acquired Lessons from EU and non-EU operations. This work is an essential, key part of the whole picture, linked to the “Strand Alpha” in a sort of “rational stream”; if we have shortfalls, we should find the correlation, in large part, in the capability validated lessons.

All these competences confirm the importance and the sensitiveness of the work performed by the HTF, an expert body which can contribute giving rationality, consistency and coherence to the HLG process in a bottom-up approach.

But these activities are only a part of the competencies that I was called to deal with, in the context of “capability development”. In my capacity as member of an ad hoc working group, I am also called to give my support in a large number of capability-related matters (i.e. Pooling & Sharing, collegiate views to the EDA, etc), which are the result of a broader concept of “capability environment”. In this regard, my experiences as member of the HTF is without doubt one of the most qualifying opportunities I have ever had. The opportunity to participate in the shaping of the “Headline Goal process” gives me the advantage to actively contribute to the “capability environment”, where the HTF can be defined as the “engine” of a living ongoing process in the “strategic military policy” domain.

In this vein, the issue of capabilities development implies the initial evaluation of the desired level of ambition, a pragmatic advanced planning and an adequate long-term strategic vision.

This challenging environment stimulates my interest, giving me the opportunity to increase my experience even more and, at the same time, it spurs me to make use of all my skills in every circumstance, both for my country and for our European Union.
The European Union, as a prominent actor in crisis management activities, is nowadays confronted with not such an easy role. On the one hand, Member States are challenging the pressure to expand the usability of their forces; on the other hand, Member States are facing the impacts of world financial crisis resulting into the defence budget cuts. But, it is necessary to admit that there is a discrepancy between the resources allocated to the development of Member States’ capabilities and the expectations derived from remedying capability shortfalls. This led to the establishment of a working body named “Headline Goal Task Force” (HTF), aiming at the overall promotion of the mitigation of capability shortfalls. The HTF represents a group of experts dealing with capability development, ensuring a high degree of transparency towards Member States.

As regards the role of the HTF in supporting the military capability development process, beyond its clearly defined responsibilities, the HTF also covers wide capabilities-related issues in terms of the relation of the European Union Military Committee (EUMC) with the European Defence Agency (EDA). As far as the capability development is concerned, in the year 2008 the EDA created the initial version of the “overall strategic tool” named “Capability Development Plan” (CDP). The aim of the CDP is to help Member States identify the priorities of development of their armed forces and thus reduce the operational and financial risks.

The HTF working group was tasked by the EUMC to conduct its work and utilise its expertise to define the capability shortfalls, drawing elements from the Headline Goal and Lessons Learned, which are collected from crisis management operations.

In particular, the Lessons Learned process (so-called Strand D) is considered a very promising area, which could have a significant impact on the EU capabilities development. The HTF activities in the Strand D framework are focused on evaluating lessons extracted from the operations. The final version of the database should include lessons from various sources (CSDP operations, national lessons from the non-CSDP operations, EDA studies, etc). Newly added lessons confirmed preliminary conclusions regarding the communication, civilian-military cooperation, comprehensive approach, Counter Improvised Explosive Devices / C-IED, logistic support and many others.
Enhancing the EU–NATO Cooperation

A very useful tool for the cooperation between EU and NATO would be the reactivation of the HTF+ format, which would promote the common effort of both organisations in the field of capability development. This format assists delegates in the de-confliction of duplication in the framework of capability development process. From my point of view, the HTF+ format is a logical outcome of the “Berlin Plus Arrangements”, and, to be precise, with regard to its part in the development of military capabilities. Cooperation in this area is nowadays limited by the institutional document named “Capability Development Mechanism” created in 2003. It specifies how Member States of both organisations should develop military capabilities, focusing on the crisis management area. It defines the way in which the EU and NATO could complement each other in the areas where both organisations have the same requirements and the same capability shortfalls. And this is exactly the place where I see a significant role the HTF+ could play: that of a forum for defining proposals for complementary solutions.

It could be said that military cooperation between the organisations is at a good level. Units of the armed forces are trained on the basis of mutual cooperation, and training is carried out according to the NATO standards in the majority of cases. Even the countries of the EU which are not NATO members use, more or less, the Alliance’s standards during the training. Therefore, the main obstacle for the HTF+ reactivation does not consist in the different training standards or procedures, but in extending the agreement of exchanging classified information between the EU and NATO to all EU countries.

It is interesting that, as the EU absorbed the military standards and procedures by creating its own military structures in the past, nowadays NATO absorbs the EU standards and procedures for the operations focusing on the civilian crisis management. It even goes so far, that one study of the Centre for Strategic and International Studies in Washington DC (and several other analysts) suggests creating a ‘Berlin Plus in reverse’, where NATO could use the EU crisis management structures for planning the civilian and police capabilities. It just proves that the cooperation between EU and NATO could be (and in fact is) mutually highly beneficial.

Pooling and Sharing of Capabilities

Nevertheless, from my point of view, the most important and most promising part of the work of the HTF is its contribution to the Ghent initiative focusing on pooling and sharing cooperation. Because of the financial crisis, international cooperation in the defence area is not only an option (or question of willingness), but a necessity. Due to giving preference to national solutions, modernisation processes are characterised by duplication of research, redundant industry capacities, different defence interests at
the political and/or military level and, moreover, country-specific legal environments. All these differences result in small and expensive production runs and in the ineffective use of input resources.

Given the very limited financial resources of most countries, the question of integration and specialisation of Member States’ armed forces comes to the fore. At this stage, the multinational solutions and initiatives could play a very significant role. The aim of these initiatives should be the synergy of states’ common efforts for the realisation of financially demanding projects. This could be the way in which smaller countries might be able to have availability of resource-intensive capabilities at a significantly lower price. The main risk within this concept for individual Member States lies in partially loosing the possibility of autonomous decision-making. The pooling and sharing concept therefore requires a high level of mutual trust, transparency and communication between the parties involved.

During the last several weeks, we have conducted several informal meetings of the HTF focusing on the analysis of the most promising domains of cooperation in the domain of Pooling and Sharing, with the aim to mitigate the identified capability shortfalls. This analysis clearly showed which capabilities could be offered and which capabilities are necessary for several Member States. The preliminary results indicated that those categories of “offers versus requirements” are largely overlapping. The analysis also showed that the presence of subject-matter experts on discussed domains is essential. Doing so, these informal meetings could serve as some kind of “clearing house” by specifying the needs of the countries. However, gained results promisingly paved the way to boost the cooperation amongst Member States. At least, despite several obstacles, I strongly believe in that.

Conclusion

The European Union plays an important role in world policy in many fields. It was based on the principle that each country has the right to express its opinion to all and for all matters. By keeping the rule “one country – one vote”, no one can be either discriminated or preferred. The truth is that sometimes it is very challenging to meet the requirements and find compromises which are acceptable for all EU Member States. But the true nature and modus operandi of all working groups within the EU framework consists in working together, sharing and respecting each other’s views and reasons. And this is also the case for the HTF.

Nonetheless, it is the people who make this working group. It is natural that in a group of people who meet at least two or three times a week, informal relationships are also established. These are extremely important in terms of interpersonal relationships and mutual respect, not only as representatives of countries, but also as personalities. In this respect, the decision to create a permanent post of the Chairman of the HTF
working group was of utmost importance. The Chairman (as “the first between equals”) needs to be a wise leader as well as an excellent professional advisor, always focused on keeping the ideas and thoughts on the right track towards achieving the common goal.

Concerning the performance of the HTF, there is one thing which could, from my point of view, help to promote its effectiveness. I personally feel that the HTF is lacking a decision-making authority. I am aware that some discussions have already taken place regarding this subject when considering the future chairmanship of the HTF, but I believe it is worth coming to this issue again. By implementing this, drafting and approving the documents regarding capability development will be much more streamlined. Moreover, it would also rather simplify the capabilities-related process, since it would not be necessary to discuss several issues within the regular EUMC working group again.

Regardless of having a decision-making authority or not, the HTF fulfils its role in the mitigation of capability shortfalls very well. The results of the work all across the range of issues speak for themselves. Someone said once that “in fact, it is a very prestigious working group”. As far as I’m concerned, I feel the same way.
I have worked as Finland’s deputy military representative to the EU from 2008 to 2012. During the first two and half years, I worked in operations in the European Union Military Working Group (EUMCWG) and, since April 2011, I have been a member of the HTF and responsible of capability issues. With this background in mind, the points that I will bring up are thoughts mixed with experiences from both of these working groups.

Before I go deeply into the world of capability development and work in the HTF, I would like to explain what is meant by the term “capabilities”. It is not only a matter of material, like a tank or a radio. Capabilities also consist of numerous other elements such as concepts, manpower, training, the ability to deploy, sustainability and interoperability. Military capabilities are a complex system and it takes a lot of time and effort to build them up. With that in mind, my first thought is that the HTF is a good and appropriate forum (of the EU Military Committee -EUMC) for working on capability building, in very close coordination with other bodies like the European Defence Agency (EDA).

The EUMC is the highest expert body in the EU that handles military aspects. The EUMC advises Member States’ representatives in the Political and Security Committee (PSC) on military issues such as crises management operations and capability development. The PSC then guides the overall work from the political-military point of view. This is clear, but we should always remember how and which body is giving advice to the EUMC on capability issues: it is the HTF, and, therefore, our work is a crucial part of EU capability development, because EU conclusions or statements finalised in the HTF and agreed in the EUMCWG or the EUMC itself will come out in exactly the same format on the high political level.

In this connection, I have the impression that we could link the work of the HTF to a wider, broader picture (for example, civilian aspects in the wide framework of Comprehensive Approach or Research and Technology / R&T). The reasons why we do not meet those additional aspects are multi-layered. The fact that the HTF is not a decision making body is one of the main obstacles. Another one is that all work is based on the rather limited Terms of Reference - TORs (basically only HLG-process), and of course work based only on formal tasking impedes innovations to some extent. From my point of view, there is room for improvement in this respect.

I was asked to write about work in the HTF and I will try to do so. But, as I said in the previous paragraph, we must look at the big picture. That is why I am trying to present you with a different point of view. My short text aims at showing opportunities rather
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than what is being done at the moment. For me, a good starting point would be the Capability Development Plan (CDP) being the link and the bridge between strategies and capabilities and, therefore, one of the key products. It is long-term vision and reality in the same package. The EDA has the overall responsibility for the process, but the EUMC (the HTF in concrete) contributes two parts to the plan. The first part is the Products of the Headline Goal 2010 process and the second part is the Lessons drawn from the operations. Both parts are produced by the HTF.

The Headline Goal 2010 derives from the European Security Strategy. Based on the Headline Goal, EU Member States report their troop contributions to the EU on a voluntary basis. These contributions and capabilities are then evaluated in the light of potential scenarios and requirements to find out what is lacking or will be lacking and how this affects the goal. The most important outcome of this process is the prioritised list of capability shortfalls. It is formulated by the EUMC, but intended for the Capability Development Plan.

The EU Military Committee’s second contribution to the CDP is Lessons Learned. The importance of these facts of real life in the field cannot be over-emphasised either in training or capability development. Especially in relation to these two central tasks, the HTF has proven its professionalism and expertise throughout the last years.

From a military commander’s point of view, it is fundamental to get concrete results out of the CDP process. The CDP should lead to a situation where actual capabilities are fielded into the operations. What is important to note here is that along the process Member States have several possibilities to influence the final CDP list and, further on, the process’s benefit in real life operations, where the developed capabilities are used. Keeping that in mind, this should encourage nations to commit to fulfilling the plan. One place or forum where nations can influence, if they want, is the work done in the HTF in the framework of the CDP and the Headline Goal Process.

Reductions in military budgets are perhaps the most challenging obstacle to tackle. Even if there is a political will to start a CSDP operation, there might not be any will to invest in proper capabilities. We can name several examples of this. Without naming any operation, we can think, for example, of the lack of helicopters in operations and see what our real challenges are. With that in mind, the HTF can play a bigger role in bridging theoretical work with the real world. The Headline Goal Process is important, but maybe we should try to focus more on work which is aiming at using our existing capabilities more effectively. One concrete proposal in this area is to use the HTF as a forum or network of experts who can help to start cooperating in different areas of capability development, and also with the existing capabilities. There are different ways and tools to do it, for example Pooling & Sharing, which must be seen also as a part of the capability process, and not as the process itself.
From a capability development perspective, the last one and half years have shown that the Lisbon Treaty is a positive thing, giving clearer roles and responsibilities to each actor in the field of CSDP. Another good thing and strength of ours is civilian-military cooperation, i.e. the Comprehensive Approach. And I am not only referring to speeches, but to reality as well. This method is the jewel the EU can offer to global crises management. We have the ideas and the tools, but we have to find a way to put all the existing pieces together. The HTF could play a vital role in this, much bigger than the one it plays now. We could use the HTF as a bridge between different actors, start organising joint meetings with our civilian partners and perhaps explore again the possibility to have a “civmil” HLG or an agreed level of ambition. Of course it is obvious that all this needs a change of mindset and also changes in TORs and Aide Memoires.

In conclusion, in my view, the EU has been able to establish effective working methods and processes in bridging the gap between strategy, capabilities and the real world in a relatively short time. However, a lot still needs to be accomplished. Considering budgetary and political constraints, we constantly need to seek more efficient and cost-effective solutions so that the EU can use all available means in an optimal way when implementing its security strategies. With new thoughts and different scopes, such as working in a really comprehensive manner with civilian partners or thinking Pooling and Sharing (P&S) as a unique chance, the HTF, as the working body in the capability area of the EUMC, in close connection with the EDA and other bodies, could do more, with the main goal to influence our masters and capitals more in the urgent field of capability development in Europe (for example). Capacity, will and expertise are already there; now is time to start using this unique body, the HTF, in an even more effective way.
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Cdr Rui de Oliveira da Encarnação
Portuguese Delegate to the HTF

The participation in the EUMCWG/HTF should be seen by Member States (MS), in addition to the institutional tasks of the working group, as an external guide on capability development at national level, as a complementary mechanism for national force planning cycle and as a way of assembling capabilities. This modus operandi is even more important for those MS with similar dimensions to those of Portugal.

Portugal, within its geopolitical space, is committed to contribute to a variety of international organisations within the framework of security and defence. As a member of both NATO and the EU, with strong interests in CPLP (“Comunidade de Países de Língua Portuguesa” – Community of the Portuguese-Speaking Countries) and contributing to United Nations operations, it has to ensure that its responsibilities are conducted in a coherent manner in national strategic space, having the ability to be expeditionary, to strengthen sovereignty and to build security by acting outside its national territory.

For Portugal, sovereignty becomes the ability to guarantee national interests in the international fora, whose members use their own military contributions in a decisive way. Facing this spectrum of required capabilities in the most possible complementary mode, it is necessary to be flexible, efficient and capable of sharing and setting up the available pool of capabilities and assets internally, and also with all the partners.

The EU’s level of ambition and its cultural matrix, which shape the way of executing operations/military missions, are more focused on the security role which complements NATO’s defence role and brings an added value to security tasks.

Consequently, the majority of MS should pursue a capability building approach oriented to defence matters when it is required to focus on the transatlantic link, and to be more leaning towards security when it is required to operate under the EU flag, avoiding duplication and using flexibility. For a long time, Portugal has been building capabilities that could be used for both military and non-military purposes. Many of the non-military missions are carried out by military means, acknowledging thus a correct and accurate dual role purpose. Today, countries are facing different kinds of challenges that require actions to be provided by different capabilities. Therefore, this dual role approach allows greater efficiency, without affecting the economy of means and assets.

This concept of maximising resources and capabilities is being dealt with under a similar approach within the EU policy, specifically in the Common Security and
Defence Policy (CSDP), as well as in the Comprehensive Approach concept and in initiatives like Pooling and Sharing.

To achieve this goal, it is essential that Portugal directs its involvement in the EUMCWG/HTF towards working to better follow and accomplish the ongoing processes and to be in line with the current partners’ capability developments. In this context, the EUMCWG/HTF working group is likely to become a pivotal point between the EU and MS.

The main task of the EUMCWG/HTF has been the relevant work of identification and prioritisation of capability shortfalls. Looking at the near future (with new threats and risks arising), it is predictable that the EUMCWG/HTF will start a new process to determine probable new capability shortfalls, as a result of a likely change in the EU’s political and military ambitions.

Despite the aforementioned important activity of the EUMCWG/HTF, it is suggested that the working group should seek ways to assist in the reduction of capability shortfalls. This task should be accomplished through the initiative of the MS; however, the working group should use its know-how and community network in order to facilitate and promote all individual initiatives, which, as whole, could bring more added value to the EU and consequently reduce existing shortfalls.
A few days ago I sat in a cafe in Vienna and listened to a discussion on the table next to mine, between some youngsters, who were exchanging their views on studying and working somewhere around the European Union. They dropped names like Barcelona, Brussels, Sweden, and I thought to myself: Maybe, to older generations, the European Union is merely a far-away concept or, to the middle-aged generation, a vision that might probably come true at some point in the future; but to the young generation it is already a reality, and the European Union already plays a big role in their minds and hearts.

Nowadays, Pooling and Sharing are the big issues for the HTF and Capability Development, but I am certain that some other tasks are still ahead of us: a new level of ambition, for example, as the basis for a new planning process for EU Capability Development. Continued political decisions or questions and discussions of sovereignty, which should hopefully pave the way towards more cooperation, may lead to further very important working strands in the HTF. Following this line of thought, let me conclude with one statement in favour of our work, in favour of Europe:

Despite all difficult discussions led in the working groups, up to highest political levels, we should never forget that our chance, our opportunities, our strength lies in the variety of Europe. Let us never give this up, let us never try to equalise, and let us never be impatient if sometimes things develop slowly. I am convinced that, in times of great challenges, it will be exactly this variety that will help us go ahead. The more variety we have, the greater the number of possible ideas, solutions and answers to the challenges we will get. I really do hope that the European Union is wise enough to progress and reap the results of its visions, instead of succumbing to external pressure, which might increase in the future.

In conclusion, I would like to get back to the beginning of my introduction, where I wrote, “Welcome to the HTF, welcome to Europe” and add a special note by saying, “welcome to the variety of the HTF and Europe”.
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2.3 From Headline Goal to an EU Capability Development Plan
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Introduction

The 1999 Council decision in Helsinki on Headline Goal 2003 started an evolution whose end we have not yet seen. The Headline Goal provided and sustained the momentum that in just over ten years has installed *de facto* a defence planning process in the European Union - albeit a very light process. Building on the outcome of the Headline Goal, Member States have come together and established a common and first picture of what is needed to meet the collective defence requirements of CSDP today and in the future. Importantly, agreement has been reached on which domains to focus efforts. The catalyst and tool for this achievement is the EU Capability Development Plan (CDP). In this article, the linkages between the Headline Goal and the CDP will be clarified, as well as the aim and structure of the CDP. Future challenges to EU capability development will also be addressed.

The input from the Headline Goal

With reference to the ambitions stated in HG 2003 and later HG 2010, the Headline Goal Process established the detailed requirements for EU crisis management operations. Based on this and on Member States’ declared contributions of forces for CSDP, the shortfalls in EU military capability were identified. It was when Member States started reflection on mitigating these shortfalls, and made their first not too successful attempt through the European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP), that the very rationale for the European Defence Agency (EDA) was developed. The first paragraph of the Mission of the EDA summarises this rationale:

The mission of the Agency is to support the Council and the Member States in their effort to improve the EU’s defence capabilities in the field of crisis management and to sustain the CSDP as it stands now and develops in the future (Council Decision 2011/411/CFSP).

The Headline Goal gave a very detailed and useful picture, but further work was necessary in order to expand the time perspective and the scope.

Regarding time, there was a need to look beyond 2010, some 20-30 years into the future, not only because development of defence capabilities takes time far beyond the short term, but also because (long term) guidance was needed for defence
research and for the development of the European Defence and Technological Base, without which there would be no autonomous European defence capability.

Concerning the scope, from a capability planner’s perspective, it was evident that it had to be broader than what the Headline Goal provided. There was a need to have leverage for possible evolutions of the EU ambitions, as stated in the mission quoted above. Furthermore, it was necessary to have a look at the full arsenal of EU Member States’ capabilities when planning for future capabilities, not only the ones declared for the Headline Goal.

The Long Term Vision – a Test Case

As a first step towards establishing the CDP, an exercise was undertaken in order to have a common view on the future. This was achieved in 2006 and it was a collaborative venture under the EDA’s lead with broad Member States’ input of expertise, and also major contributions from the EU Military Committee and the EU Institute for Security Studies. The document was to be called An Initial Long Term Vision for European Defence Capability And Capacity Needs (LTV). The LTV was presented in September 2006 and provided the long term perspective which is necessary for capability planners. It extracted implications of the future global context on capability development and addressed key issues for Capability development, covered under headings such as Synergy, Agility, Selectivity, Sustainability, Knowledge Exploitation, Interoperability, Manpower Balance, Rapid Acquisition and Industrial Policy. A similar document had never been written before and therefore the LTV was a major step forward for EU military capability development, providing a stepping stone for continued work on an EU Capability Development Plan.

The Capability Development Plan – Aim and Structure

Aim

Member States were happy with the outcome of the LTV exercise and wished to proceed. At the EDA Steering Board in December 2006, the EDA was tasked to prepare a Capability Development Plan for Ministers.

Extract from the Operational Conclusions of the Dec 2006 Steering Board:

The Steering Board:

a) endorses the aims of the exercise:

- to make the LTV capability guidance more specific and thus more useful;
- to identify priorities for capability development;
• to bring out opportunities to pool and cooperate;

_and thus_

• to frame efforts of those operating the comprehensive capability development process;
• to guide research and industry; and
• to provide metrics on collective progress;

b) notes that the CDP is not intended to be some over-arching, supranational plan – and that national defence planning and investment decision-taking will of course remain subject to the sovereign processes of each pMS;

While the operational conclusions emphasise the full sovereignty of Member States with regard to development of defence capabilities, one main objective of the CDP is to inform the capitals about European capability development and through this convince Member States to make decisions in line with the priorities identified for capability development. The priorities for capability development are evolved from the picture painted by the CDP.

**Structure**

Two important building blocks for future work were in place at the time for the Steering Board tasking on the CDP: the Headline Goal, which provided the short-term perspective, and the LTV, which gave a broad and initial common view on the long-term implications for defence planners. A common denominator of these two building blocks was that they both were planning perspectives. What was missing was information from the “reality” – experiences from current operations and knowledge about what capabilities were already planned by Member States and would be delivered in the mid-term (i.e. within some ten years). This would help cover the mid-term perspective. It was also apparent that all this information would have to be gathered in one place, so that a comprehensive and auditable picture to guide EU capability development could be provided.

**The CDP became thus structured with input from four major strands:**

**Strand A:** *Establishing the baseline of shortfalls and their relative priority from a strategic planning exercise.*

This strand is in essence the Headline Goal exercise under the lead of the EUMC. It provides a picture of the short term: requirements and availability of capabilities for CSDP. The identified shortfalls are prioritised.
Strand B: *Developing the long-term capability guidance*

This strand focuses on potential trends in military capabilities in the perspective of 2030 and beyond. The future context is analysed and implications for defence and capability planning are extracted. The lead is assured jointly by the EDA and the EUMC.

Strand C: *Analysis of Member States’ defence plans and programmes*

This strand assesses planned capability developments in the mid-term. One important tool for this is the collaborative database (CoDaBa), where Member States volunteer information about future plans and projects. Another is the landscaping exercises that are undertaken (land, navy and air) in order to investigate whether Member States’ planned capabilities are in line with the trends for future requirements. The lead for this strand lies with the EDA.

Strand D: *Harvesting lessons for future capability from current experience*

This strand harvests lessons from current experiences to inform future capability development. The EUMC has the lead, and the input comes primarily from the EU Military Staff - EUMS (the EUMS Lessons Management Application - ELMA database). The EDA is conducting supplementary studies in support of this strand.

The CDP is a collaborative effort with all major stakeholders involved, ensuring in particular Member States’ involvement in all stages of the work, so that the final product has credibility and legitimacy in the eyes of the capitals, which is a prerequisite for later agreement on priorities. Having an audit trail, where all statements are backed up by underpinning documentation, remains a characteristic of the CDP. The overall coordinating responsibility for the CDP is entrusted to the EDA.

The information in the CDP is presented along a list over generic military tasks that in practice cover all relevant military activity for the EU, today and in the future. The task list consists of 143 tasks structured along the capability domains: Command, Inform, Engage, Protect, Deploy and Sustain. Statements with regard to future relevance are made for each task along the three time periods: Short Term (2013-2018), Mid Term (2019-2025) and Long Term (2030+). This is illustrated in the figure below, where also the contributors to each time period appear.
Priorities – the Litmus test of the CDP

The main aim of the CDP is to facilitate Member States’ agreement on priorities for capability development. This was never achieved before the CDP and is pivotal in order to have progress and establish collaborative capability development.

The CDP has twice engineered this agreement on priorities: the first time was in July 2008, when the “CDP 12” priorities were agreed. The second time was in March 2011, when the priorities were revisited through an iterative method elaborated at the EDA. Described in a very simplified manner, the method uses the information in the CDP by establishing agreement on what are the most important and promising areas to address. The agreed actions are underpinned by the information on each task. However, it must also be said that at the end of the day there is always an element of political negotiation in order to have agreement. A guiding principle in these negotiations is to find actions that have support both from a collective point of view as well as from the national perspectives. Success is found where the collective and national priorities overlap. In 2011 the priorities were expressed in the following way:
### Conclusion and Challenges for the Future

As has been described above, the EU has now developed a capability planning process for CSDP purposes. The CDP is the comprehensive tool for this, building on the results and experiences of the Headline Goal. It is a light and flexible process: there is no fixed cycle for review; it is done as required and when Member States find it necessary. It has involved the Member States and other stakeholders all along the way, and established a community of European defence planners in the capitals. In the long term this will have great impact since a common understanding has developed about the need for underpinning reasoning, from political objectives all the way to the actual capability to be developed. Priorities for capability development have been agreed and collaborative efforts have commenced yielding results in a wide area of activities.

The main issue for the future is to convince Member States that future capability development must be collaborative to an ever greater extent. If not, very little capability will remain for European crisis management operations. The implications of the present cuts in defence budgets can partially be mitigated by increased collaboration. In this respect, Pooling and Sharing is a very promising method to ensure the availability of necessary capabilities as identified in the CDP. It is also a sign of political will to go down the avenue of collaboration. On this path, important obstacles for success, such as sovereignty issues and industrial aspects, will have to be overcome. The difficulties cannot be denied, but, on a more positive note, let us also recognise that the current financial difficulties could also lead to a great leap forward for collaborative defence efforts.
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I. Introduction

Since December 2009, when the Lisbon Treaty was put into effect, a new institutional framework has been introduced in the realm of the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), including the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). Along with the multifaceted challenges for implementing the structural and procedural amendments for forging a coherent foreign policy, the Union has had to cope with the interactions of the evolving strategic environment. In particular, (i) the ongoing global financial crisis, with its destabilising effect on the Eurozone and subsequently to the national defence budgets; (ii) the “Arab Spring”, which exposed the inadequacy of the Western world to address its root causes and consequences; and (iii) the pivotal geostrategic shift of the US (Asian-Pacific region and Middle East), which signalled to the Europeans that it is time to autonomously produce their own security, are mapping the fundamental trends where the security and defence policy of the Union is being developed.

Whereas the financial crisis and the events within the “Arab Spring” have to be assessed as being more or less surprising to the EU and its Member States, the announcement of the US to reduce its footprint within Europe has to be perceived as being similar to the one made towards the end of the nineties, which was one of the facilitators for creating a European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). 9/11 changed the mindsets of the Western World and revised the previously taken decisions by the US government, ensuring an ongoing involvement, especially in the Balkans. Nowadays, the US urges Europeans to share the burden of their security and presses for a further increase of their defence capabilities. Consequently, the Union is being pushed to reinforce its operational capacity, in order to be able to assume its responsibilities on the international scene. The critical question is whether the Union and its Member States are ready for such a role and, if yes, how to illustrate it. This chapter argues that the Lisbon Treaty provides the institutional structures enabling Member States and
the Union as such, as a single entity, to respond to the manifold security challenges in a collective, coherent and coordinated manner. Though, admittedly, the Treaty is not a panacea to all the challenges, it should be seen as stepping stone for consolidating a coherent foreign policy in the long term. The Union’s legal personality, the enhanced role the High Representative (H/R) of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice President of the Commission, the establishment of the European External Action Service (EEAS), as well as the separation of the Foreign Affairs Council (FAC) from other Council configurations are tangible and indicative evidence for the strategic direction of the EU’s foreign and security policy in the post-Lisbon era. To this effect, the abolition of the rotating Presidency of the Council of the EU in the domain of foreign policy, hence chaired by the HR of the Union, reflects the determined decision of the EU Member States to establish a systematic and long-term policy in this area and to further strengthen the functions of the respective EU entities.

Building on the Lisbon Treaty’s institutional and structural amendments, the Member States could enhance the Union’s military capability development even more and subsequently ensure its CSDP operational capacity. Starting from the essential articles of the Treaty on Enhanced and Permanent Structured Cooperation, to the definition of a European Capabilities and armaments policy, the mutual aid and assistance, as well as the Solidarity Clause, the Member States, in cooperation with the EU bodies, have the opportunity to advance their cooperation at the institutional level, enabling the Union in this respect to address comprehensively and coherently the different security challenges on its own.

II. The impact of the Lisbon Treaty on the Union’s Military Capability Development

With its entry into force, the Lisbon Treaty signified the transition from the European to the Common Security and Defence Policy (ESDP to CSDP), reconfirming the long-term objective of the gradual “...framing of a common Union defence policy that might lead to a common defence” (Articles 24.1 and 42.2, Treaty on the European Union -TEU). Yet not all EU Member States share the same enthusiasm for establishing an EU common or mutual defence. Indeed, many of them wish to preserve their specific character on national security and defence policy unaffected, whereas the majority seem to conceive that their common defence is realised within the realm of NATO.

Apparently, the intergovernmental nature of defence is still far away from being integrated into the Community’s political and economical acquis. Unless the EU Council takes a different decision, the scope of the defence and security nexus will be predominately limited to using and deploying military and civilian assets outside the Union for peacekeeping, conflict prevention and strengthening international security, while being aware that problems may become serious at its borders as
well. Remarkably, since 2003 the EU has established permanent civilian and military structures enabling it to autonomously take decisions for planning and conducting EU-led operations. However, the Union has not yet acquired any common military assets (i.e. Standing Military Operational Headquarter) and, indeed, there is no willpower of creating a European Army (*Nice European Council*, 2000 and *Laeken European Council*, 2001), though some politicians never get tired of expressing this intent or vision. Consequently, the operational capacity of the CSDP depends exclusively on the voluntary contributions made available by Member States and, indisputably, on their political determination to address an imminent crisis.

As pointed out, the Lisbon Treaty was adopted at a time when intense efforts by the EU were underway for restoring the Union’s credibility and whilst the strategic environment was going through tremendous alterations. Under these circumstances, a considerable number of Ministries of Defence are shifting their efforts towards how to better balance the demands for less defence expenditures with the incremental necessity of maintaining the appropriate capabilities for accomplishing their national mandates and/or their international commitments.

The following two sections, *Opportunities for more CSDP Operational Capacity* (TEU) and *Beyond the realm of CSDP* (*Treaty on the Functioning of the EU - TFEU*) outline the most pertinent articles of the Lisbon Treaty towards the EU’s military capability development. Not limiting to external security, both Treaties (TEU and TFEU) contain provisions allowing the possible mobilisation of military resources for internal security purposes.

### a. *Opportunities for more CSDP Operational Capacity* (TEU)

The CSDP Chapter in the Treaty of the EU (TEU) encompasses six specific articles (42 until 46) enabling Member States to closely work together and collaborate with the EU Institutions, and enhancing the Union’s capacity to implement its strategic objectives, as explicitly defined by the Treaty. Notwithstanding that, as already noted, Member States commit their forces and capabilities to the EU on a voluntary basis, this should not deter them from assuming their institutional, political and ethical responsibilities towards the realm of CSDP. In essence, Member States are bound to “undertake progressively to improve their military capabilities” and to make them available, when they decide so, for the implementation of the full spectrum of the CSDP tasks (Article 42.3, TEU).

The major concern, not only for Member States, but also for the Union’s bureaucrats who are deeply involved in the field of capabilities, is how to ensure that the Union will be able to realise its strategic visions amidst the challenging conditions developing ahead. As this article asserts, the Lisbon Treaty might not be the answer to all the challenges evolving ahead of the Union, but it provides the institutional channels for
enabling Member States to generate military capabilities which are more effective and affordable to be sustained.

In this context, the CSDP operational capacity could be further strengthened through the deployment of *Multinational Forces* which are established by Member States (Article 42.3, TEU). Additionally, a group of Member States which disposes the necessary capabilities could be assigned by the Council to assume a specific task “in order to protect the Union’s values and interests” (Article 42.5, TEU). These possibilities offer the institutional prospect to the concerned Member States to pool and share capabilities in a complementary and interoperable manner. Furthermore, their engagement is expected to significantly contribute to mitigating the identified EU military capability shortfalls, whilst ensuring the avoidance of duplicative practices and, primarily, the cost-efficient allocation of the deployable capabilities. Similarly, the involved actors will benefit by cooperating more closely and hence will gradually develop a common culture in the way of performing their tasks.

Although the EU Battlegroups have not been deployed yet, many lessons can be drawn from their rehearsals in relation to the development of the *Best Management Practices*. However, the reluctance of Member States to fill the EU Battlegroup Roster is evident, enhancing discussions on the further need to have these rapid response forces in high readiness. “*Use it or lose it*”, was and is a commonly used expression initiating these discussions.

Needless to say, the EU’s general philosophical approach is to avoid creating two-gear processes within the Union in the domain of military capability development. Nevertheless, it seems that the EU cannot cope with the most demanding missions unless Member States decide to deploy the appropriate capabilities. Hence, apart from the depicted options, an institutional possibility has been also availed to those Member States with higher criteria in military capabilities and who “*have made more binding commitments*” to establish together a *Permanent Structured Cooperation* (PESCO) within the Union framework (Article 42.5, TEU). It is worthwhile clarifying that such an establishment is subject to a Council decision *by a qualified majority*, after consulting the HR, in contrast to the general rule that CSDP decisions must be adopted by the Council acting unanimously, on a proposal by the HR (Articles 42.4 and 46.2, TEU). Certainly, this provision on qualified majority for establishing PESCO enables the Council to adopt decisions more easily and faster, allowing the interested Member States to advance their multinational cooperation at the Union’s institutional level.

Although the provision on PESCO has not yet been put into effect, there are discourses advocating its implementation (see Part II, Chapter 2 “*Permanent Structured Cooperation Light: Less Formal, No Less Necessary*”). Nonetheless, due to national defence budget cuts, it is anticipated that this provision will become a major subject
in the coming days, with the criteria of participation being the most controversial. Hitherto, the Member States have not provided a definition of what exactly PESCO means. Some academics argue that PESCO has been overcome by events, while others argue that PESCO has been realised through the foundation of the European Defence Agency (EDA).

The EDA was established earlier (2004) than the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty (2009), and was therefore first governed by a Joint Action – nowadays a Council Decision describes the role of the Agency. The Lisbon Treaty acknowledges the EDA, at the institutional level, as the appropriate body to contribute towards the optimisation of the military capabilities of Member States and to identify future trends. Essentially, the Agency has been tasked with “...defining a European capabilities and armaments policy...” (Articles 42.3 and 45, TEU), but most importantly with assisting the Council “...in evaluating the improvement of military capabilities” (Article 42.3, TEU). The Capability Development Plan (CDP), which is elaborated under its auspices, constitutes the catalyst for closing the identified military capability shortfalls of the EU and for developing the capabilities which will be necessary in the future.

Whilst national defence budgets are shrinking, the EDA’s role is becoming even more vital in harmonising the operational needs of Member States, ensuring the avoidance of duplications and improving the effectiveness of their military expenditures. Ongoing initiatives or projects such as the Pooling and Sharing, the Single European Sky and Cyber Defence are only a few examples of the areas in which the EDA is currently actively engaged. For the Union to continue to be credible in the field of CSDP, it is significant to obtain operational and deployable capabilities. It is thus vital for the Agency to be adequately reinforced in order to be capable of further engaging in research projects and ensuring the competitiveness of the European Defence Technological and Industrial Base.

The next article has been introduced in an EU Treaty for the first time, and, in substance, it opens the possibility to Member States, like in the case of the “solidarity clause”, to mobilise their military resources for internal purposes across the Union. Specifically, if a Member State is “...the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other Member States shall have towards it an obligation of aid and assistance by all means in their power...” (Article 42.7, TEU). However, this provision on mutual aid and assistance “does not transform the EU into a military alliance” and “does not amount to a mutual defence clause” (Piris, 2011). Additionally, it does not envision any institutional obligation neither for the EU Institutions nor for the EU Member States to coordinate their practices within the Union framework. Actually, it plainly asks for respect towards the specific character of security and defence policy of certain Members, while taking into account NATO’s collective defence.
Despite the absence of any institutional bindings of Member States to respond, this should not be a pretext for turning them away from undertaking their political and ethical responsibility to act in a spirit of solidarity when a Member State is in need. Hence, taking that provision to a higher stage could contribute to the enhancement of the Union’s capacity, particularly if Member States include in their capability planning processes the associated requirements in order to implement it. Such a prospect could lead to the generation of interoperable, complementary and versatile capabilities for the purposes of the Union’s internal security. In tandem, the appropriate Council preparatory bodies, supported by the EU bodies, could be assigned to coordinate the Member State’s possible responses by providing their structures and expertise at the institutional level. Nevertheless, the reason why the Lisbon Treaty stresses the mutual aid and assistance issue, which is most probably a relic of the old Western European Union (WEU) contract, remains of high interest.

b. **Beyond the realm of CSDP (TFEU)**

Although the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) does not include specific provisions in the CSDP Chapter, it has several articles that are particularly related to military capabilities. In this sense, this part of the Lisbon Treaty should be conceived as a building block of a more comprehensive cooperation among the EU entities, aiming at using or producing *dual-use capabilities* (Satellite communications, Surveillance, Logistics etc) for the purposes of the external and internal security of the Union, especially within military operations and civil missions. Thus, the active engagement of Member States to the ongoing actions undertaken by the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD) for promoting the synergies between the EU Civil and Military Capability Development will be a determining factor in fostering a common conceptual understanding of the EU Comprehensive Approach, while ensuring the diminishment of internal duplications in the long term.

Notably, the military capabilities disposed by Member States are deployed for CSDP purposes (outside the EU). Exceptionally, the *Solidarity Clause* (Article 222, TFEU) foresees the mobilisation of the respective military resources inside the Union, in the event that a Member State is “...*object of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or man-made disaster*”. Unlike the case of *mutual aid and assistance*, the Union is asked to be actively involved in mobilising all available means, including military capabilities, to assist “in a spirit of solidarity” those Member States in need. Although the arrangements for the application of the respective Clause have not yet been defined, Member States are explicitly asked to coordinate between themselves at the Council level (Article 222.2, TFEU).

The particular provisions for coordinating at the institutional level and mobilising military resources for EU internal security purposes create considerable potentialities which exceed the CSDP realm. In fact, they enable the concerned EU stakeholders (HR
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of the Union, Commission, Council; Political and Security Committee - PSC; Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security - COSI; European Union Military Committee - EUMC; EEAS; CMPD; European Union Military Staff - EUMS; and Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability - CPCC) to work more closely, not only for defining the conditions for activating this provision, but also on how to better coordinate their practices in a harmonised and cost-efficient manner (Article 222.3, TFEU).

In such difficult times, it is imperative for Member States to spend less money, to better allocate their national resources and to ensure that they have the capabilities to address security challenges in a complementary manner at the level of the Union, such as terrorist or cyber attacks and natural or man-made disasters. The EEAS could work on elaborating an Illustrative Scenario to provide for the mobilisation of civilian and military or dual-use capabilities for the purposes of the EU internal security, including cyber security. This could also lead Member States to develop capabilities for responding to the requirements of such Scenario, ultimately enhancing the Union’s capacity as a security provider.

Even though the Lisbon Treaty enables the interested Member States to develop more sophisticated capabilities for addressing the most challenging missions via the establishment of PESCO within the CSDP context, it seems that they are inclined to establish bilateral or multilateral projects steered by themselves. Certainly, PESCO does not constitute the sole option at the institutional level for Member States to advance their capabilities. As a matter of fact, they are also enabled to establish an Enhanced Cooperation (Article 329, TFEU) between themselves within the CFSP framework, but such prospect should be the last resort (Article 20.2, TEU).

Interestingly, the procedures for the establishment of the Enhanced Cooperation are harder than those of the PESCO. Whereas the establishment of the former option requires a unanimous decision by the Council and the participation of at least nine Member States in it, the latter asks for a qualified majority, and there are no limitations regarding the minimum number of the participants. Taking into account, as already highlighted, that decisions relating to the CSDP require unanimity, remarkably, the decision-making process for establishing PESCO constitutes an exception. This flexibility, particularly since it is associated with the domain of defence, should be interpreted as another boost for Member States to further enhance their military capabilities in a cost-efficient manner. However, this creates some critical questions in relation to the reasons why both provisions have not yet been activated.

Last but not least, in relation to the provision on Humanitarian Aid (Article 214, TFEU) acknowledges that the Union’s operations should be conducted in respect of the principles of impartiality, neutrality and non-discrimination. One could assert that when military capabilities and forces are engaged in the context of this article, it is
probable that these principles will be compromised, endangering in this respect the credibility of the Union. Rightfully, this provision is not included in the CSDP Chapter.

Nevertheless, the EU foresees the deployment of the Member States’ military capabilities for assisting humanitarian and rescue operations. Indeed, the recent events in Libya, where the EU could have been requested by the United Nation’s Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) to conduct a CSDP Operation (EUFOR Libya) for supporting humanitarian assistance in the region, confirmed the need for the Union to develop relevant capabilities to this kind of operations. Taking into consideration the soft power profile that the EU is globally exporting, Member States could further reflect the development of capabilities pertinent to the requirements of such scenario on their national capability planning. However, this prospect should not be understood as an effort of “militarising” the humanitarian sector, but as the last option when other means turn to be unsuccessful.

III. Building on the Lisbon Treaty – What next?

Whilst this article advocates that the Lisbon Treaty provides the structural framework for the Union to implement its CSDP tasks and even more to respond to the most demanding missions, it does not imply that the Treaty is perfect, but that it constitutes a common ground for Member States to advance their cooperation at the institutional level. It contains specific provisions based on which Member States, if they decide so, could have an instrumental and determining role towards the strategic direction of the Union in the CSDP domain. Hence, it is really upon the individual Member States to undertake the appropriate decisions for further improving their national capabilities.

Since several Member States are facing severe difficulties in sustaining their capabilities on a unilateral basis - due to the ongoing defence budget cuts and their extent national or international commitments, it is fundamental for them and the Union as such to take precise decisions for ensuring the viability of the most critical capabilities and subsequently the Union’s military operations. The Summit of the EU Council in December 2013 is an unique occasion to further reflect on the Lisbon Treaty’s provisions for addressing the future security challenges in a more comprehensive approach, engaging all the relevant stakeholders who are involved in the domain of capabilities and the defence sector. The EU needs to undertake its responsibilities for producing more security and ensuring its own interests. Such vision asks for a competitive industrial and technological base of the defence sector, sophisticated and deployable capabilities and more solidarity among Member States. It remains evident that Member States have a vision on the way ahead which will pave the ground for preparatory discussions for shaping a common view. The challenge, however, lies in
whether they will be determined enough to agree and share the burden for illustrating such vision.

The EEAS should further probe the ongoing developments at the politico-strategic level and determine whether there is indeed a necessity for revising the European Security Strategy (2003) or even developing a White Book on Defence, as several voices from the diplomatic and academic community advocate. In such a case, the implications for military capability development should be taken into consideration, particularly in relation to the availability of the required capabilities. The EU Council should also address the critical question whether the 60-60-1 Level of Ambition (to deploy within 60 days and sustain for at least 1 year 60.000 military forces) remains valid or even feasible.

Amidst the financial recession there is an urgent need for advancing the most promising options offering alternatives to Member States for sharing burdens and avoiding unnecessary expenses. The Pooling and Sharing initiative should be further promoted in a more systematic, institutional and long-term basis, enabling Member States to maintain those niche capabilities that would not be feasible to attain otherwise. In this sense, the notion of sovereignty on national defence capabilities should be re-conceptualised within the framework of the CSDP sovereignty, allowing the enhancement of potential cooperation. Insightfully, the President of the Commission in his State of the Union Address 2012 discerns that “Sharing Sovereignty in Europe means being more sovereign in a global world”.

To sum up, the Lisbon Treaty should be seen as the stepping stone enabling Member States to enhance – inter alia – their military capabilities and ensuring the CSDP operational capacity. The major challenge for the Union is to achieve to build on the Lisbon Treaty, whilst defining its strategic objectives for the future so as to assure that Member States will be capable of supporting it with next generation capabilities. Given the fact that involved Member States within the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) operation in Afghanistan will probably be more reluctant in the future to put boots on the ground, it is deemed necessary to reflect on the question how the EU will play its defined role as a global actor effectively, if it omits to build further upon its existing foundations and Treaties.
References:


Chapter 3

3.2 Permanent Structured Cooperation Light: Less Formal, Not Less Necessary

Prof. Dr. Sven Biscop
Director of the “Europe in the World”-Programme at Egmont and the Royal Institute for International Relations in Brussels

Introduction

2010 saw an arduous debate about the implementation of Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO), the new mechanism for capability development introduced by the Lisbon Treaty. The idea of PESCO is that a group of Member States would volunteer to generate more deployable capabilities more quickly, by deepening cooperation among them and agreeing on criteria for their defence effort. In practice, the far-reaching defence cooperation envisaged through PESCO would inevitably lead to the strategic coordination of national defence planning of the participating Member States. Several Member States were unconvinced of the need to activate the Protocol on PESCO, however, and as no real champion of PESCO emerged to persuade them, the debate ended in stalemate.

Urged on by the financial crisis and the immediate need for coordination in view of the defence cuts throughout Europe, on 9 December 2010, the Ministers of Defence of the 27 were nonetheless able to reach agreement on a concrete method by avoiding any explicit reference to PESCO: the “Ghent Framework”. Member States were encouraged to “systematically analyse their national military capabilities”, aiming at “measures to increase interoperability for capabilities to be maintained on a national level; exploring which capabilities offer potential for pooling; and intensifying cooperation regarding capabilities, support structures and tasks which could be addressed on the basis of role and task sharing”. This pragmatic approach created a positive atmosphere and Pooling & Sharing became the new buzzword in CSDP town. A few months later, at the February 2011 Munich Security Conference, the NATO Secretary-General followed suit and announced Smart Defence, which was very much a reaction to the dynamic initially generated in the CSDP.

Pooling & Sharing and Smart Defence pursue similar aims through similar ways – and both struggle with a lack of means. In times of austerity, the aim is to do more with less: stimulating Europeans to pool their efforts; enhancing cost effectiveness, in order to maintain and upgrade relevant capabilities; but also undertaking new capability initiatives addressing the strategic shortfalls in the European arsenal. The aims are, therefore, quite ambitious – as they have to be. The Libya campaign once again highlighted the well-known European deficiencies, especially as concerns strategic enablers – 90% of which had to be provided by the US. And the latter have
now repeatedly made it clear (in Defence Secretary Robert Gates’ Brussels farewell speech of 10 June 2011, and in the January 2012 *Sustaining US Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense*) that in the future they expect Europeans to take charge of crises in their own neighbourhood on their own.

Thus Pooling & Sharing and Smart Defence cannot just be about preserving the capabilities that Europeans have – it is about getting more.

**Smart Pooling?**

In an essentially Member State-driven process, capitals proposed opportunities for new cooperative schemes, on which the European Defence Agency (EDA) and Allied Command Transformation (ACT) built to generate project proposals in the most promising areas. Excellent informal staff-to-staff contacts ensured that work on both sides was coordinated to a much greater extent than before, and de-conflicted as much as possible. Each process yielded hundreds of potential projects, yet each somehow left the proponents of a major leap forward wanting. Of course, the mass of proposed projects were all positive in themselves, but overall there was a certain lack of ambition.

On the EU-side, Pooling & Sharing paved the only way in which an ambitious collective endeavour can, potentially, work: as a political initiative of the combined EU Ministers of Defence. It was then up to each Minister, in his / her country, to, steer national defence planning in the direction agreed upon with his / her colleagues, in a top-down manner. However, in all too many countries, follow-up appeared lacklustre, and the national defence apparatus was left much leeway. Predictably enough, this was used to slow down the integrative dynamic created at the political level. This was especially the case in Germany, although it had been instrumental in launching the Ghent Framework – a rare but welcome example of Germany acting as an engine of the CSDP. The focus of the key Member States in the military field, France and the UK, was on their bilateral cooperation, and so they did not initially assume a driving role.

Even more than before, as defence budgets are under heavy pressure across Europe, contributing to new collective capability projects is only possible by cutting national capabilities. Member States fear contributing too much of their limited budgets to a collective capability as compared to the extent to which they expect to have to draw on it, and invoke sovereignty to resist pooling even existing capabilities. This reluctance is understandable, but not justifiable. Many of the national capabilities that conservative-minded defence establishments cling to, to the detriment of new programmes, are in fact not capabilities at all, for they cannot be employed for any expeditionary operation. The sovereignty thus protected is largely illusory: without usable capabilities, national governments can decide in which operations not to take part, but they cannot launch significant operations on their own. They have
full freedom of inaction, in other words. By contrast, the examples of European Air Transport Command (EATC) and Admiral Benelux prove that far-reaching yet flexible pooling is perfectly reconcilable with maximal sovereignty. Pooling in reality increases sovereignty, empowering Member States to operate at levels and in capability areas which they could never hope to achieve on their own.

Shared Defence?

Nevertheless, in the course of 2011 Pooling & Sharing seemed to be fizzling out. This was when Smart Defence kicked in and gave new impetus to the same process in a different organisation – which soon went the same way though.

An indispensable (though not in itself sufficient) condition for a NATO capability project to work is that the US contribute with money, personnel, and equipment. Then the European Allies can be convinced to put in their share. For the US, however, the point of Smart Defence is exactly the opposite: to convince the Europeans to solve the European capability problem, without American support. Why would the US pay for, say, European air-to-air refuelling capacity, of which it already has an abundance, when its defence budget is undergoing a major cut? (Even so, “abundance” remains an apt term to describe the US budget when compared with the rest of the world.) The aim is for Europeans to pay for a European capacity, not simply to “do more together”, but to acquire their own enablers, thus allowing US capacity to be diverted elsewhere – that would be true burden-sharing. Therefore the prerequisite for the US to safely shift their strategic focus from Europe’s neighbourhood to the Asia-Pacific and redeploy their means accordingly, is European strategic autonomy, at least regionally.

Rather than an American threat, this strategic shift is a desire which is partly dependent on Europe’s ability to defend itself. If Europe were seriously threatened, the US would have no choice but to intervene because of its own vital interests. In that sense, the US remains a European power. Nonetheless, European capitals, all too well aware of this, ignore at their peril that the US might decide to make the point by withholding its military support for a crisis management operation of importance to Europeans without threatening vital interests – like Libya. On the face of it, the US is now more supportive than ever of European military cooperation. But old ways die hard and, in reality, certain American attitudes continue to undermine it.

Unlike the Cold War era, European Allies no longer have the scale to generate significant new national capabilities, certainly not in the field of strategic enablers, hence the need for collective initiatives. Logically, a new collective level will have to be introduced into the NATO Defence Planning Process: instead of dealing only with individual Allies, it will have to take into account collective targets and contributions by the European Allies. The need for both European strategic autonomy and a collective
European defence planning level is not the evident conclusion that this level already exists – we call it the CSDP. Yet for the moment the US appears reticent to put two and two together, for fear of losing the initiative and leadership over the process. The European autonomy which their new strategy requires, however, cannot be achieved without a platform for European coordination, for which NATO is not configured for the moment. How else can Europeans decide on capability priorities, which are a function of their interests and foreign policy priorities – which if and when they define them collectively, they do so through the EU? The natural US desire to steer everything through NATO at 28, because it allows Washington to steer the decisions of the Europeans, now stands in the way of US strategy.

Similarly, US industrial interests risk getting in the way of the wider strategic objective. Using Smart Defence to stimulate Europeans to fill their shortfalls through pooling to buy American equipment only serves to reinforce the existing divides among Europeans. With reluctance to invest in collective projects being considerable already, those Europeans with defence industrial interests will certainly not be convinced by the prospect of equipping Europe with American enablers. Those without a significant defence industry might be so enticed, but without participation of the former, they lack the critical mass to acquire enablers at the level required for European autonomy. Continued fragmentation will be the logical result. Europe risks ending up without an autonomous Defence Industrial and Technological Base. Are Member States without significant defence industry today certain that their interests will be better served then? And is the US certain that in the long term Europeans will then always buy American – rather than Indian, Brazilian...?

In short, European strategic autonomy in terms of capabilities can neither exist without autonomy in terms of strategy-making nor without defence-industrial autonomy. Meanwhile, however, in the absence of American money, European enthusiasm for Smart Defence began to ebb away once concrete projects, and therefore budgets had to be defined.

**An European Solution**

Real autonomy cannot be handed down – that would be somewhat of a contradiction in terms – but should be created through effective autonomous action. Europe itself holds the key, in other words. Thanks in large part to a new prevalent drive in the EDA, and to the initiative of specific Member States, among others France and Italy, towards the end of 2011 Europe did finally make an important step towards unlocking its capability problem.

On 1 December 2011, the Foreign Affairs Council welcomed Member States’ commitments to 11 “specific concrete projects” (8 new, 3 based on existing initiatives) facilitated by the EDA. These projects directly address some of the key shortfalls in
terms of enablers, among others: air-to-air refuelling; smart munitions; intelligence; surveillance and reconnaissance including space situational awareness; and military satellite communications.

Europeans must ensure through concrete follow-up that the momentum is not lost. They must charge ahead and pool their efforts to make the announced projects a reality. Just like launching the Ghent Framework itself, this requires collective and top-down political decision-making. Only the top political leaders of the Member States have the authority to order their defence establishments to make this happen, by reorienting both investments and cuts in function of the need to participate in collective projects. Perhaps the time has come to lift defence up to the level of the European Council, which until now has never taken charge of the CSDP. Under its President, Herman Van Rompuy, the European Council has started the practice of preparing the key summits between the EU and the great powers. As Pooling & Sharing in effect is all about strategic autonomy, this is really about EU-US relations – certainly a topic worthy of consideration by the European Council. Putting Pooling & Sharing on the agenda of the European Council would create the best chance of starting a political dynamic that would stimulate sufficient Member States to sign up to one or more of the key projects. Even if not all of the 27 would be able and willing to join in from the start, it could create the critical mass for each individual project to start for real.

As the capability problem NATO faces is a European one, it is probably logical that it proved more easy to find (the beginnings of) a solution among Europeans, through CSDP. There is no need for Schadenfreude or envy on the part of the respective bureaucracies though. What counts is that European Member States, at the service of which both the CSDP and NATO are, have agreed on what could be the first step towards a major enhancement of Europe’s capabilities. Many might instinctively draw back before what they see as the dreaded “European caucus” within the Alliance. Yet this evolution is inevitable, for, unless they do so collectively, Europeans do not have the means to address their capability shortfalls. It is but logical that it proves slightly easier to solve a European problem among Europeans in the framework that was purpose-built to that end: the CSDP. And, though not all EU Member States are NATO Allies, is this not the era of NATO partnerships, of working closely with non-members?

More importantly, capability development through the CSDP and NATO is 100% compatible. Capabilities developed by Member States with the EDA or NATO acting as facilitator can be deployed in any framework. NATO remains the forum to initiate those programmes to which Europeans and Americans want to contribute together. The new collective targets and capabilities which Europeans set and create among themselves, through the CSDP, can be incorporated as such in NATO defence planning. CSDP would thus function, on the one hand, as the operational arm of the EU and, on the other hand, as the European capability development platform of both the EU
and NATO. Unlike the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) envisaged in the early 1990s, though, which was a purely technical platform politically anchored in NATO and subservient to the North Atlantic Council (NAC), CSDP as the capability pillar is politically anchored outside NATO, because it is steered by the EU.

**Defence in 3D**

The aim is not for all European Member States to contribute to all projects. European capabilities will remain a complex puzzle of national and multinational capabilities. In some multinational areas, pooling will take place in several clusters of a few Member States; in others requiring a larger critical mass, there will probably be just one capability constituted by a dozen or more Member States. Tactical-level coordination of cooperation and working on project-by-project basis only will not suffice to manage this puzzle and make sure that in the end the sum of it all produces a coherent set of European capabilities. In fact, both the Ghent Framework and Smart Defence explicitly call for a three-dimensional approach. Besides (1) pooling, or Cooperation, on which both processes now focus, there is a need to decide (2) which capabilities are to be maintained in the first place, or Prioritisation, and (3) which capabilities will be provided by role and task sharing, or Specialisation. This can only be achieved if the Member States willing to contribute in order to complement the current project-by-project approach with strategic-level coordination of national defence planning as a whole.

Today, Member States do their national defence planning in splendid isolation, without really taking into account either EU or NATO guidelines. In the future, a national defence white book ought no longer be the end of the process, but the starting point for an open dialogue. As defence planning concerns the long term, such a dialogue should be permanent. It is the only way of creating the certainty and confidence that capitals need in order to really align their national defence planning with fellow Member States and to focus it on the commonly identified shortfalls. The aim is not in any way to transfer sovereignty over defence planning to the EU level. National governments and Chiefs of Defence will still decide in which capabilities to invest or disinvest. The aim is to restore the sovereignty that each individually we have lost, being unable to sustain significant crisis management operations on our own – something that Pooling & Sharing cannot remedy unless seen in 3D (Defence - Development - Diplomacy).

Only a permanent and structured dialogue at the political level, between the EU Ministers of Defence, can produce transparency, certainty and confidence. What would amount to a “permanent capability conference” would provide Member States with a bird’s eye view of all participating Member States’ plans and intentions and allow them to reliably assess the relevance of their national capabilities. It would function in effect as a peer review mechanism of national defence planning. In such a
framework, Ministers of Defence can each effectively and convincingly instruct their Chief of Defence to integrate national defence planning into the collective effort:

(1) Member States can confidently choose to strengthen their relevance by focusing their defence effort on those capabilities required for crisis management operations that are in short supply and therefore critical at the EU level.

(2) Member States can safely decide not to expand or even to disinvest in national capabilities of which there is overcapacity at the EU-level already. Actually, Member States spent far more money on maintaining redundant capabilities than what would be needed to solve the priority shortfalls. Doing away with those redundancies in a concerted way is the most effective cost-saver imaginable. Furthermore Member States can decide without risk to disinvest in a capability area either because existing national capabilities are obsolete and non-deployable or because, always on a voluntary basis, participating Member States have agreed on specialisation among them.

(3) In those capability areas in which they do remain active, Member States will be easily able to identify opportunities for increased pooling and sharing of capabilities, allowing them to organise them in a more cost-effective manner and increase operational effectiveness.

(4) Pooling & sharing, specialisation, and doing away with redundancies will create budgetary margin allowing Member States to find partners to launch multinational programmes to address the strategic shortfalls and generate new capabilities, including in those areas which go beyond the means of any individual nation and thus demand a combined initiative at the EU-level.

The EDA can and should act as the organiser and the secretariat of such a process. A permanent capability conference would thus also result in a permanently relevant EDA.

Conclusion: The Indirect Approach to Permanent Structured Cooperation

In this strategic dialogue between national defence planning lies the true added value of the CSDP. All concerned would be wise to encourage it. The question can be asked: does this constitute PESCO? It certainly looks very “PESCO-esque”. What is relevant here is not the label, but whether a mechanism similar to PESCO is necessary for the Ghent Framework to be successful. In all likelihood, not all Member States will be willing from the start to subscribe to a permanent and structured process along the lines of the Ghent Framework. It is crucial that those who are willing can do so within the EU and can make use of the EU institutions, notably the EDA. That will ensure
that something like a permanent capability conference remains fully in line with the overall development of CSDP, and will easily allow other Member States to join at a later stage, whenever they are able and willing.

To allow that, the Protocol on PESCO annexed to the Lisbon Treaty could be activated, without necessarily starting the difficult debate on criteria, or Member States could agree to consider this as one of the subgroups established in the EDA. As long as the experience and expertise of the EDA can be put to use and the permanent and structured strategic coordination of defence planning can be achieved, that is a *sine qua non* condition for a capable Europe. PESCO light will be less formal, but it is no less necessary.
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3.3 Comprehensiveness in civil and military capability development in the European Union

LtGen Ton van Osch
Director General of European Union Military Staff

The strength of the EU is its inherent comprehensiveness. It has all the instruments of power under one roof. The military instrument is one of those. Civilian and military capability development for crisis management should be focussed on this comprehensive strength. The EU should not duplicate what other organisations already do well, but concentrate on how the role of the military can be optimised in concert with its civilian counterparts and find synergies between the different parts.

The EU is inherently comprehensive

The EU is unique in its inherent design for comprehensiveness. Many partner multinational organisations do not have a similar range of instruments of power embedded within their structures and are required to contract-in comprehensiveness when required. As foreseen by Dr. Javier Solana in November 2000, the then EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), the EU is by its very nature Comprehensive:

Military capabilities, civilian capabilities, diplomacy, and our extensive programme of development assistance and humanitarian aid – the European Union is and will be in a unique situation to draw on a comprehensive range of instruments to support its’ interests world-wide.

The Lisbon Treaty has greatly assisted in formalising his vision by the creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS).

The EEAS, formed on 1 January 2011, is a coordinating and supporting body that develops coherent external policies, coordinates between the different EU bodies and draws together relevant EU stakeholders at the early stages of crises or conflicts in order to prepare effective, holistic and truly comprehensive EU strategies and concepts. The Lisbon Treaty (of 2009) states, in this regard, that,

The Union shall ensure consistency between the different areas of its external action and between these and its other policies“ and that “the Council and the Commission, assisted by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, shall ensure that consistency and shall cooperate to that effect.
The EEAS is thus the embodiment of the EU’s pursuit of the comprehensive approach to crisis management by combining the coordination of diplomatic, civilian and military means in one institution, whilst keeping close links to the Commission with its means for development cooperation and humanitarian aid.

**Comprehensiveness in EU crisis management**

It is an increasingly recognised fact that military measures will mainly address symptoms but not the roots of a crisis. Other means such as political, diplomatic, economic, humanitarian aid, development cooperation, police, civil administration and justice will be needed to (re-)establish governmental structures, rule of law, human rights and economic stability. However, the military do offer a wide range of options for contributing to crisis management and resolution, as defined in article 42 of the Treaty on the European Union:

*joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilisation. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting third countries in combating terrorism in their territories.*

As an example, we can use the EU strategic framework for the Horn of Africa. Political dialogue, EU support to regional cooperation and support from the EU Development Fund are elements to stabilise the region. Militarily we have the EU maritime counter piracy operation ATALANTA in place since 2008, and since 2010 the EU’s efforts to train Somali Armed Forces in conjunction with other partners. In addition, an EU mission is planned to support the build-up of regional maritime capacities in the region. This, still incomplete, picture of numerous lines of action falling under the umbrella of a comprehensive strategic framework clearly demonstrates that the EU’s intent to pursue comprehensiveness is not just theory, but increasingly the reality in EU crisis management.

**EU military capability development – a complex task which needs a common effort**

The EU conducts military capability development principally to assist EU Member States in achieving their own capabilities synchronised in an EU context. It is important to recognise that these military capabilities remain owned by Member States. They can therefore still decide whether to use these capabilities under EU or other organisations, including of course UN and NATO. So EU military capability development does not compete with other organisations. It synchronises military capability planning within the EU and between EU Member States and therefore allows us to more efficiently use our defence budgets. This increases the possibilities for the EU to act in an EU context and also makes EU Member States more relevant.
within other security organisations. The Helsinki Headline Goal of 1999 established a commitment,

_to be able, by 2003, to deploy within 60 days and sustain for at least one year military forces of up to 50,000-60,000 persons capable of the full range of tasks (including) humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking._

The next milestone was the European Security Strategy of 2003, that defined the threats and challenges the EU faced, and linked these with its political ambition. A declaration on strengthening capabilities in 2008 defined a more specific Level of Ambition, and this was re-affirmed in 2010.

The planning for the military capabilities needed by the EU to address its Level of Ambition started in 2000, and the Political and Security Committee (PSC), the EU Military Committee (EUMC) and the EU Military Staff (EUMS) were formally established in 2001. It is a technical endeavour which has to take into account all the above mentioned tasks and all subject matter areas that military operations encompass, ranging from combat capabilities to logistics, intelligence and communication support. Due to its complexity, military capability development requires a well structured process, including a specific “common language” within the EU Capability Development Plan. As far as possible, for obvious reasons, this language is shared with NATO. This approach also applies to addressing capability areas, i.e. defining ways and means to address capability shortfalls and areas of concern, in which all aspects of a capability have to be considered.

The EU Military Staff, under the direction of the EU Military Committee, facilitates this work. It does so in concert with the European Defence Agency (EDA) - whose role is to support Member States’ development of capabilities whilst ensuring coherence with the EU concepts and EU military requirements, and concurrently promoting development of the EU defence industrial sector. Cooperation between EUMS and EDA is excellent. Pooling and Sharing of capabilities is a good example of this: the EDA plays the key role in Pooling and Sharing initiatives and they have taken some of the proposals resulting from the national analyses by Chiefs of Defence into their portfolio, while the EU Military Staff has started work on specific aspects of education and training and is supporting the EDA with military expertise. In all, military capability development is a common effort between Member States, the EDA, EU Military Staff, Industry and partner organisations.

**Comprehensiveness in civilian and military capability development**

Military and civilian capability development progressed for many years on separate paths - there was a civilian Headline Goal and a military one. Capability planning was
conducted in parallel even though the military planning scenarios of “Stabilisation and Reconstruction”, “Conflict Prevention” or “Humanitarian Assistance” implied civilian aspects. Consequently, capability shortfalls were addressed separately. Since the formation of the EEAS, this has changed. The EEAS is headed by Baroness Cathy Ashton, who also heads the Steering Board of the EDA. The declaration on “EU civilian and military capability development beyond 2010” demanded “that in addition to continuing with civilian missions and military operations, the EU has to improve its ability to foster civilian-military cooperation”. Civilian-military capability objectives were, for the first time, explicitly defined. Additionally, the economic and financial crisis led to the conclusion that existing means, be they civilian or military, will have to be used more efficiently.

This fostered work on possible synergies between the civilian and military capability development which led, inter alia, to the initiative of “promoting civil-military synergies in capability development”, launched by the PSC in 2010 and coordinated by the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD). Until now 31 actions have been launched, in many of which the EU Military Staff is involved. Coherent civil and military reporting on capability development will be explored, and a shared civilian and military lessons database has already been established. In other work strands, concepts are being developed in areas where civilian and military have common needs, e.g. personnel recovery and evacuation and security and force protection requirements. Furthermore, synergies are being investigated in other areas of common interest, such as use of space capabilities, medical, logistics, Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS), Communication and Information Systems (CIS), Information Sharing and Intelligence. The initiative covers a very wide spectrum of areas where finally civilian and military capability development can both benefit.

Of course, civilian and military capability development have specificities which result from their differing natures. Therefore, closer civil-military cooperation will always be conducted in the clear understanding of those inherent differences. In the framework of EU crisis management, both civilian actors and military are present in the same area of operation and face similar threats and challenges. This should offer sufficient opportunities for a closer civilian-military cooperation and for investigating synergies, where they make sense and where both can take advantage. Especially in times of austerity, there is no other choice.
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3.4 The European Defence Agency’s Role in Pooling & Sharing

Claude-France Arnould
Chief Executive European Defence Agency

The need for Pooling & Sharing

Economic storms are battering the walls of Europe. Deficits mount, and governments are battling to implement painful austerity measures. Virtually every European Union Member State has sought to make significant cost savings. What is more, for many these cuts come on top of two decades of steady post-Cold War reductions, with defence spending often taking a back seat in a period without an identifiable threat.

Yet defence is the first duty of a nation state. It is not simply that Europe’s military power helps keep it at the top table in global debates. The world is as uncertain as ever, and threats may re-emerge as nations outside Europe develop their economies and militaries. If so, military power (and the technical expertise to build it) cannot be conjured in a month or two; investment must be sustained now, in order that European states may defend themselves in the future. This has become still more urgent in recent years, as the United States engages with Asia and looks to Europe to take care of itself and become a security provider; as Hilary Clinton put it in her November 2011 Foreign Policy article,

...our post-World War II commitment to building a comprehensive and lasting transatlantic network of institutions and relationships has paid off many times over – and continues to do so. The time has come for the United States to make similar investments as a Pacific power.

Some solution must therefore be found. Defence is crucial, but barely affordable. Closer defence cooperation in Europe presents a way forward. It is for this reason that the EU has launched the Pooling & Sharing initiative, which looks to pool resources, training and expertise, and share capabilities, as well as research. Through this, Europe may have military power commensurate with its global political and economic importance.

The formation of the European Defence Agency

Efforts to improve European defence capabilities through collaboration have existed for as long as the European Union itself. Projects such as the Eurofighter Typhoon, the Transall C-160 transport aircraft and the Ariane launch rocket have provided ad hoc examples of European defence and space cooperation. The Common Security and
Defence Policy (CSDP) is the product of a steadily building political consensus through the 1990s and 2000s that Europe must cooperate on defence. It was as part of this shift that the European Defence Agency (EDA) was created in July 2004.

Defence is a uniquely sensitive field, and concerns about sovereignty and operational independence are entirely understandable. Consequently the design of the Agency makes it a unique body within the European Union. First of all, it is an agency of the Council, and the only agency whose steering board meets at the ministerial level; this gives it a unique political momentum. Second, it brings together the whole capability development process under a single roof, from research to industry to operational deployment. Third, flexibility is built into its structure, with opportunities for participating Member States to both opt in and opt out of projects, and a small staff and budget that are supplemented by a network of experts and project-specific funding requests. Finally, the overall ethos is one of facilitation, aiding Member States’ own sovereign efforts.

The EDA Steering Board has mandated the EDA to move forward on Pooling & Sharing, helping formulate high-priority opportunities, and providing steady political pressure for progress in this field. In this context, the September 2010 meeting of European defence ministers in Ghent provided a crucial impetus to European defence cooperation under the rubric of Pooling & Sharing.

**Achievements of the European Defence Agency**

All this has combined to deliver concrete results in a range of areas. One of the clearest examples is improvised explosive devices (IED), which have posed the greatest threat to European forces operating in Afghanistan and elsewhere. The importance of greater capabilities in this regard was identified by defence ministers on the EDA’s Steering Board; a project team was formed, which swiftly began offering advice and training to the relevant military personnel. A ministerial decision was taken in April 2010 to create a Counter-IED forensic laboratory, responding to the challenges of disrupting IED networks in today’s conflict zones. Work began immediately, and in July 2011 the new forensic team were deployed to Afghanistan. Meanwhile, training to help tackle the IED threat is continuing in 2012, with a course held for participating Member States in April. The Counter-IED project demonstrates the EDA’s ability to deliver pragmatic solutions to pressing problems.

Another considerable success by the EDA lies in the field of helicopter training. Under the European Helicopter Training Program, some 1,300 personnel consisting of 114 crews have been taught to operate in multinational formations, with 63 of those crews using that experience in Afghanistan. These major helicopter training exercises were continued in 2012, with July’s Hot Blade 2012 exercise, in Portugal, and September’s Green Blade 2012, in Belgium. Such has been the success of this strand of Pooling &
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Sharing that training has received new emphasis from the EDA Steering Board, and the first EDA-facilitated multinational fixed wing exercise, which took place in Spain last June, drawing together heavy lift aircrews and personnel from across the continent. These exercises have built expertise and continent-wide links in scenarios far broader than most Member States could fund alone, and are great examples of the work the EDA can do in increasing capacity through bringing Member States together.

Not all the EDA’s work can be quite as photogenic, and considerable progress has been made in the vital area of improving national procurement practices. The EDA has helped facilitate the creation of the intergovernmental regime aimed at encouraging application of competition in defence procurement, the main purpose of which is to inject transparency and competition into defence procurement procedures and to reinforce mutual trust between the subscriber Member States, while taking account of the particular sensitivities surrounding defence procurement. This is supported by government and industry-agreed codes of conduct, and by the EDA-operated European Bulletin Board, which has seen the publication of tenders worth €26.3bn, improving information sharing and competition in the European defence market.

Meanwhile, the EDA has been steadily building relationships with all other interested parties, and has worked on the defence implications of EU-wide projects, such as Radio Spectrum and Single European Sky, and offered expertise in cyber security, unmanned aerial systems and space issues. Agreements have been formalized with Norway and Switzerland, and a formal Administrative Arrangement has been signed with the European Space Agency and the Organisation for Joint Armament Cooperation (OCCAR) as well. Links have also been established with NATO. This allows the EDA to provide the maximum possible value for money by limiting duplication and sharing expertise to the mutual benefit of the European Union and participating Member States.

Current priorities of the European Defence Agency

The EDA has achieved a number of successes so far. However, there is no cause to rest on our laurels; indeed, at the March 2012 Steering Board meeting, the Agency was tasked to develop Pooling & Sharing further.

One key Pooling & Sharing priority for the next few years is air-to-air refuelling. The existing capability gap was confirmed in operations over Libya, where European states relied heavily on US support. Indeed, there is a high level of fragmentation, with a large number of different tanker makes and models in operation. Ministers endorsed a political declaration in March 2012, committing themselves to continued efforts in this area of Pooling & Sharing, and work continues at the EDA. Ultimately, the EDA will support the project from acquisition to deployment.
Another project which is well under way seeks to establish modular, multinational medical field hospitals. A Declaration of Intent was signed on this project in March 2012, and a pre-deployment training centre should be delivered by 2014. The breadth of Pooling & Sharing initiatives currently being facilitated by the EDA is testament to the Agency’s flexibility and expertise, and bodes well for future such projects.

Current Agency priorities also include developing maritime surveillance capabilities, a project in which 14 states will take part, and a European Satellite Communications Procurement Cell. In January 2012, a project led by the Republic of Ireland got underway to review naval training across the 11 participating Member States, seeking to deliver value for money through reducing duplication. The highly successful EDA-facilitated air training exercises will continue, incorporating ever more Member States, and covering both fixed and rotary-wing aircraft.

Ensuring the proper funding of research for future technologies is especially vital in such economic conditions, and much good work is being done in this field. On the ever-important issue of defending against chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) threats, defence ministers signed the Programme Arrangement of the Research & Technology Joint Investment Programme on CBRN Protection, which will build increased cooperation between the EDA, the European Commission and the European Space Agency. In a similar vein, excellent progress is being made with the Second Joint Investment Programme on Innovative Concepts and Emerging Technologies, which is expected to have a two-year duration and a total budget of about €10m. These initiatives will once again use pooled resources to help fill clear gaps in European capabilities.

Four other Pooling & Sharing strands also require attention: intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, future military satellite communications, smart munitions, and naval logistics. These will sit alongside other longer-term EDA projects in cyber security and efficient procurement methods, as well as pilot initiatives such as Go Green, which aims to reduce costs and dependence on fossil fuel sources.

The future of Pooling & Sharing

The dynamics that have produced serious defence cooperation are here to stay: budgets will be constrained for many years, but we in Europe will still need to defend ourselves and what we stand for. The achievements of the EDA so far are indisputable, but there is so much still to do. The Council Presidency of the Republic of Cyprus is doing valuable work by promoting understanding of European defence, because still more political investment, from ministers and their citizens, will be necessary to sustain the work we do, and to help prepare European forces for the challenges of the coming decades.
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3.5 Maritime Security

I. A Global Challenge: New thinking as a need for global maritime security

Ken Hansen
Resident Research Fellow
(Dalhousie University, Canada)

The range of issues related to maritime security is daunting. Demographic shifts due to climate change, natural disasters, shortages of commodities and social upheavals are manifesting themselves at appreciably higher rates. While military confrontations have not disappeared, they occur less often and are far less destructive than historical precedents. The human dimension of the security environment is of far greater importance than the material military force equations from the hot and cold wars of the past century. To accommodate for these radical factors, a new approach to education, training and planning is required to meet the demands of all security operations. A new and broader way of thinking about maritime security is a critical requirement to meet the challenges that will confront the world in the future.

While the complexity of our personal lives increases steadily, most people have the freedom of choice to select their circumstances and focus on issues as they arise. Risk management at the personal level is limited to the nature and consequences of our choices. Innovation by individuals has societal limits that set the bounds of personal and familial change. This is not the case in the world of multinational business and interstate relations. The consequence of poor choice making for business is corporate failure. Such an outcome, as recent events in the financial industry are showing, can have budgetary repercussions for governments everywhere. The inability of individuals to manage the consequences of these risks closes the circle by driving political outcomes for governments. The globalised economy connects all people, the sea is the main common denominator, and the future for peoples and governments is inexorably tied to this process. What, then, is the key to maritime security? Some suggest that predictability is the vital element. In this view, standardised regulations and practices promote confidence, which allows business systems to profit, people to prosper and governments to remain in power. The problem is that stability is both relative and transient. Risk associated with change is a common factor that is necessary for profit, prosperity and power (Peter L. Bernstein, 1996). Without risk, there will be neither profit nor loss: nobody will be deterred by the conditions, but neither will anyone accept them. To seek equilibrium is to defend the status quo, which is a self-defeating strategy. In the life of organisations, “equilibrium leads to death” and “innovation often occurs on the edge of chaos” (W. Warner Burke et al., 2009). Despite that uncertain prospect, there is no choice but to accept some degree of risk and go forward.
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The key to any future rests in the attitude of the perceiver. How best to accommodate for changes, both large and small? The ability to learn and adjust both collective practice and individual behaviour in response to change is vitally important to success. So, a paradox exists between the desire to prosper through incremental improvements to our standard practices and the need to innovate in major ways to outpace competitors.

If change, in response to new stimuli, is viewed as a threat, the assumptions upon which force structure and capabilities were built could conceivably occur again. The uncertainty in future security assessments will be seen as justification for preservation of the status quo. The strategic stability of the past will be seen as a firm foundation and proof of the value of the current organisational construct. If change is viewed as essential, then new stimuli will be viewed as opportunities. The assumptions upon which force structure and capabilities were built cannot be relied upon to occur again. The ability to imagine new goals, institutional structures and processes is largely a question of our willingness to accept risk.

Studies of bureaucratic change within government found that the departments most able to take advantage of change had put effort and resources into advanced thinking. Research into alternatives to the status quo, testing them against the judgements of external experts and best practices elsewhere, as well as seeking out the views of stakeholders and interested parties, were essential to successful change and managing risk. “The crucial importance of strategic research” was a key lesson of the entire review process and “good intentions, hard work or even a willingness to contemplate major change [were] not adequate to overcome the absence of advanced planning” (Peter Aucoin and Donald Savoie, eds, 1998). Shifting thinking habits from old patterns to new ones is as important as retiring old equipment when confronted with the need to change. There is, therefore, a major intellectual aspect to change management.

The new security environment, the broader human definition of security and the wider array of national strategic security goals all present challenges to existing maritime security institutions. Changes of this magnitude would challenge the identity and purpose of any comparable organisation whether it was military, civil or commercial. Strategic assessments are identifying the need for profound institutional change (The Future Security Environment 2008-2030, 2010). However, the idea that new security environment means “knowledge – as opposed to military might or GDP – is gaining momentum as the new currency and passport to success,” and “the diplomacy of knowledge, defined as our ability and willingness to work together and share our learning across disciplines and borders,” will be the key to success (Johnston, “The Diplomacy of Knowledge”, 2012). While we are always without absolute certainty and much of the information we have is incomplete (Bernstein, Against the Gods)
risk can be managed by rational decision-making as we work toward building new capabilities.

Resistance to new ideas and practices by traditional conservative bureaucracies is an important aspect in the study of change management. It often relates to a phenomenon known as goal displacement, which happens when an organisation reverses its goals and means. A ‘means-ends inversion’ results in the means being elevated to become a goal and the goal being subordinated to the interests of pursuing the means (Hari Das, 1990). Protecting the status quo is viewed as loyalty to service organisation and values. This attitude ignores that change is inevitable and necessary. After a century of narrowly focused, threat-based planning, maritime security forces have become materially oriented and ideologically chauvinistic. With a new focus on ‘learning across disciplines and borders’ as the guide, new professional priorities are required to shift away from traditional views and towards the human-centric paradigm of security. Such profound shifts in orientation and purpose will inevitably conflict with the existing culture of maritime security institutions.

The culture of an organisation cannot be changed outright, only deflected in small increments from its normal path (Burke et al., Organization Change). To build new capacities and add value to existing practices, entire new curricula and developmental processes will be required for all levels of education and training in maritime security organisations. Superlative tactical proficiency cannot serve any longer as the ultimate goal of the maritime security professional. Rather, a broadly based education in multiple streams will be required (Mark Hagerott and James Stavridis, 2009). The second-highest commitment of all maritime security institutions, after the attainment of a general condition of security, must be to become learning institutions that are compelled by ‘the diplomacy of knowledge’ to build trust and understanding with the widest possible number of partners.

Partnership in open architecture and unclassified international information sharing arrangements is an essential first gesture in ‘knowledge diplomacy’. However, understanding transcends simple factual cognisance in the same way that analysis requires comprehension of concepts and their application. To achieve the type of insights necessary for international and interdisciplinary collaboration requires the building of new relationships at the national, institutional and personal levels. The best and brightest individuals an organisation possesses need to be selected for a diversifying and broadening set of educational, exchange and internship experiences. Once so endowed, an organisational commitment is also required to protect and empower these ‘disciples of knowledge diplomacy’, so that they can analyse and codify their insights into new doctrine.
The value of doctrinal debate in generating new ideas and capacities cannot be overstated. The concepts that guide and inform planning efforts should be easily exportable due to their clarity of language and usefulness in operational design. The concepts that relate to interagency cooperation and multi-departmental collaboration must be comprehensible and relevant to all parties concerned with the undertaking. It is at the conceptual level that political engagement will drive the setting of objectives, and capabilities will determine the nature of tasks. Without doctrinal clarity, activity may produce emotionally satisfying rewards but will seldom amount to goal accomplishment. If knowledge is indeed the new currency of success, then doctrine is the passport to it.

Institutions need to be encouraged to build excess capacity for the sake of resilience, but also to enable the insertion of members from partner countries and other national institutions to ‘learn by doing’ and, ultimately, to ‘understand by teaching’. Where exchanges of personnel cannot be reciprocated, the diplomatic goals of knowledge require that allowances be made to enable the learning process for others. This will be one of the important but indirect benefits of institutional resilience.

A budgetary contest for resources will inevitably result when the needs of the learning institution demand more information, more analytical capacity and more robustness to assist others with their voyage of discovery. Inevitably, the persistent culture of the materialist school will clash with the new knowledge movement and it will come down to a question of priorities over traditional capital procurement objectives or new knowledge. Without a sincere commitment from institutional leaders, the innovation of a new organisational principle cannot be expected to overcome the influence of institutional culture created by over a century of global conflict. However, preserving existing structures and capabilities at the expense of increased logic and utility will result in isolation from the people and friction with the government.

To build capacity that is effective both at home and abroad requires a forthright declaration of vision, the establishment of new goals and the dedication of both energy and resources to creating a culture of learning and sharing of knowledge. This is the challenge the world now confronts; this is the new thinking the world needs.
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Any **Vision of European Maritime Security** has to consider what those words mean individually today. Unrealistic or utopian visions are of little practical use. A vision should provide the focus for collective endeavour within an organisation and be understandable and acceptable outside it. Identifying a viable, sustainable end state helps transcend short-term crises and enable the right kind of strategy to get you to that end state, but the terms need to be commonly understood.

**European** can be a heavily loaded term – does it imply Eurozone MS heading for federation or is it a larger geographic Europe with a mix of democratic and authoritarian states and an undefined eastern border? Is the maritime security vision to be another means towards a deeper, wider, more integrated Europe or is it simply a necessary and worthwhile end in itself? Does the CSDP apply within Europe? Despite the Lisbon treaty, CSDP remains an ill-defined, case by case sort of policy, which makes it hard for both Europeans and non-Europeans to understand and predict how Europe will respond. It lacks a supporting European Maritime Security Strategy.

**Maritime** is not just seawater and ships, it encompasses the marine environment, and everything civil, military, private, commercial, legal and illegal, above and below the surface as well as on it. All globally connected things have a maritime dimension, even if it is not immediately evident to the landlocked European citizen consumer, although when maritime policy is not integrated its influence is weak and diffuse.

**Security** is ambiguous because in some languages it means both safety and security, which are critically distinct issues for policy makers. The concept and use of the word security has also become broader and more elastic, and, with the rise of asymmetric threats, the relationship between defence and security is also less clear cut. Responsibilities for safety, security and defence are allocated differently in every MS – hence the need for a term like “coastguard function” to cover the span of non-defence security tasks, which some navies conduct like offshore patrol, counter narcotics, counter terrorism or fishery protection.

As the existential threat of external aggression has declined in Europe, so politicians have emphasised the **security of the citizen** over the **security of the state**. Government funding follows popular concerns and political priorities, so spending on personal, energy, food and cyber security has leached funding from traditional defence capabilities. Low economic growth and austerity in government spending has discouraged new initiatives, accelerated the withdrawal of older equipment and created unexpected and thus incoherent capability gaps. Even when economic
recovery does permit expansion, the new security priorities will have left defence further down the list of government priorities. As long as the prospect of war within and against Europe continues to diminish, so will the means to wage it – irrespective of what is happening in other hemispheres.

Once we are clear about the words, we need to identify some shared assumptions, even if they appear unpalatable because they reflect a retreat from some historic national perceptions.

Although we cannot yet point to a Common European foreign policy nationally, collectively in the EU and in the West generally, we tend to subscribe to some common principles like democracy and free markets and unhindered trading access to the high seas. In order to ensure safety, fair and sustainable exploitation of marine resources, we also strive to achieve sensible governance of the common marine resources through a rule-based world order and progressive consensus. However, with no unified international legal code to resolve disagreement, we tend to accept the authority of UN-based regulatory institutions such as UNCLOS (United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea), SOLAS (Safety of Life At Sea), IALA (International Association of Marine Aide to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities), IMO (International Maritime Organisation), ITU (International Telecommunication Union), STCW (Standards of Training Certification and Watchkeeping), ISPS code (International Ship and Port Security) and so on.

However, the UN cannot deliver global maritime governance by itself – It has to subcontract delivery to its member states and regional organisations. The UN’s maritime remit is not universal. By September 2012, 164 nations had ratified UNCLOS, but the US still has not, and China declines to submit its various maritime and territorial claims to UN arbitration. There remains plenty of scope below the level of the UN for other regional and bilateral agreements amongst those who have accepted UNCLOS principles. Even if the US did ratify UNCLOS, there would still be a powerful logic for regional approaches to maritime security.

While land borders divide countries and limit access, the sea connects them. Countries around sea basins such as the Baltic, Black Sea or Mediterranean or indeed the South China Sea have historic common interests as joint stakeholders in terms of access and trade as well as for SAR (Search and Rescue) and the sustainable exploitation and preservation of the environment. These common practical interests in mutual prosperity, good order and safety can transcend transient diplomatic and political friction. While the EU functions as a tight institution ashore, at sea all the European sea basins have significant numbers of third party stakeholders, including non EU and non NATO countries, which have to be taken into account in any maritime security vision or strategy.
There is also a widely shared implicit assumption that collective security is the most potent and effective approach, certainly the best value for money and possibly the only option for small and medium-sized states like those of the EU. Being secure but isolated carries a high price in defence and diplomatic terms, hence the enduring attraction of an organisation like NATO for delivering the costly common defence element of security and increasingly for the EU and other regional groupings to meet a broader security remit. When defence forces have been hollowed out as Europe’s have for over two decades, this collective approach moves from being a convenient option to being essential. Sadly, because the degradation in EU defence capability has been a gradual collective response to economic stress rather than a conscious shift in strategic policy, public debate has been limited. Despite that, it is difficult to encourage public debate. Debates on national security seem to remain solely in the hands of experts. Defence pundits and military experts are seen as self-interested, so defence continues to be a relatively uncontentious source of savings, particularly in the wake of two distant and protracted wars increasingly perceived as unsuccessful and unnecessary.

The key question is whether the continuing financial crisis will turn the current so-called “capability holidays” into permanently diminished capability. It probably has already, even if not yet formally admitted. But when will it finally force states, their navies and other maritime security services to really cooperate? What is now required is not just more ad hoc, low level pooling and sharing or small scale smart defence projects, but broader and deeper consolidation - really dismantling some of the traditional political barriers so as to achieve deeper cooperation, such as in protecting domestic employment, the industrial base, Research and Technology (R&T) establishments and so on.

The recent EADS/BAE debacle shows how very short-term, local concerns still trump strategic and commercial logic. There seems to be a reluctance to acknowledge that a dawning period of significant historic geopolitical adjustment has been unexpectedly accelerated by stalling growth and the West’s declining ability to set the economic and diplomatic agenda. Globalised competition in wage rates is squeezing EU living standards as is a sustained rise in the real cost of resources and primary products driven by burgeoning demand elsewhere. Import growth is affected by weaker domestic demand for consumer goods from ageing populations and perhaps by the increasing desire to source more locally and sustainably. Growth in trade therefore, if and when it happens, is more likely to be with relatively distant countries by sea routes that are now much less secure. Somalian piracy became the poster child for maritime insecurity, but it is indicative of what more might follow elsewhere in the Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Guinea. To whom can we expect to subcontract the maintenance of EU maritime security between Suez and Shanghai?
Sovereignty is frequently invoked, but it is now increasingly difficult to exercise sovereignty in any absolute sense, both because of the web of treaties and conventions to which we have voluntarily subscribed and because for sovereignty to be respected, the ability to enforce it must be credible. Behind the pretext of sovereignty as a reason not to accept interdependencies, there is often not real constitutional sensitivity or democratic resistance, but simple protectionism – the traditional refuge for the politically and economically weak.

There are also cultural assumptions such as the fear of using the military instrument internally. This lies at the heart of EU MS’ concerns about the applicability of CSDP in Europe. This fear stems from a reluctance to see soldiers on the streets conducting law enforcement heavily handed against fellow citizens. At sea there are no visible borders and the threats are not of mass protests and strikes, but a different spectrum including trafficking, organised crime and terrorism involving relatively small numbers of actors with few innocent bystanders. International law enforcement against slavery and piracy on the high seas is a long-standing naval obligation; outside territorial waters, counter terrorist, safety enforcement and environmental protection should logically follow. Flag state regulation on the High Seas is accepted, but the processes for moving towards more effective and cohesive maritime governance remain slow, traditional and fail to recognise the scale of the increasingly complex, multifaceted maritime challenges now being faced.

Navies’ concepts of Maritime Security Operations (MSO) stem largely from post 9/11 US activism and the surge in Somalian piracy, but despite these powerful drivers, finding common ground for MSO has been difficult. There is a fear that over-optimising naval capabilities purely for MSO will lead to the erosion of high intensity warfare skills or competition with other authorities involved in exercising coast guard functions. This fear should be kept in proportion. Even if we could afford to build high capability warships, how appropriate would they be against the more likely threat of asymmetric attack by terrorists? Navies have often built ships for one role and adapted them for another. While it is generally true that a high capability warship is capable of low intensity tasks like MSO, but not vice versa, there is a limit to how much and how often out-of-role activity can be pursued before undermining the primary role. Balance of investment analysis demonstrates that a high / low capability mix is needed either nationally or in alliance. When a broad, seamless span of defence capabilities is no longer affordable, honesty is required to face the fact and reprioritise, while conducting a structured dialogue with allies about how emerging capability gaps are to be collectively managed.

Such transparency does not come naturally to governments or navies who for decades have been shrinking in capability if not ambition. All navies face capability gaps, even the USN and China’s PLAN, but the EU urgently needs a process to mitigate and manage its currently uncoordinated capability gaps, just as it is developing a
process for Pooling & Sharing remaining capabilities. Formally acknowledging the need for such a process could open minds to sharing best practice, more affordable, off-the-shelf solutions, sharing common platforms, examining non-traditional approaches involving chartering, mixed military and civilian manning and shifting to a greater focus on surveillance and C2 (Command and Control) at the strategic and operational levels. Both navies and Law Enforcement (LE) agencies deliver their deterrence and effect through presence and reactive capability – the better they are connected to a wide-area surveillance capability that cues them to be in the right place at the right time, the more potent their effect and the less time is spent in empty patrolling. Fewer hulls and aircraft need strengthened command, control and information systems to optimise their employment. On its own, naval intelligence is too parochial and often over-classified, maritime traffic data is too trade and market-focused, criminal intelligence is too prosecution-focused and financial intelligence is still underdeveloped. But stitching these intelligence silos together into a proper awareness of the maritime domain in the round is a force multiplier which builds the capability to prevent, to constrain and to respond much more effectively. At the tactical level, this could imply similar kinds of OPV / UAV (Off-shore Patrol Vessel / Unmanned Air Vehicle) combinations being operated by different services and with mixed military and civilian manning, augmented by LE detachments or international representatives when required, hoisting whatever flag the exercise of that authority requires at the moment of execution.

The prosperity dividends of a globalised world come with globalised threats such as organised crime and cybercrime. Purely national responses to these global threats may reap short-term benefits by displacing the problem to less secure neighbours. Permanent or at least enduring solutions require routine cooperation between states, navies and other maritime security services. But even amongst EU navies who share a common strategic perception, there are still limits to cooperation. Increasingly, navies are not only unable to afford all of the capabilities they need, but also to sustain the platform intensive task of a continuous presence at long range, even though force multipliers like support tankers are relatively cheap and suit common ownership. Even in extremis, MS still find it difficult to rely on another state for the capability required for missions of critical national interest. Even if mutual dependency is accepted in planning deployments, because there is no other option in the present financial climate, cooperating on equipment programmes may still be politically unacceptable if it leads to the loss of jobs, industrial capacity or export potential. In other words, it is not because defence is so important that Member States are reluctant to cede control of it; it is because there is no pressing need to maintain a credible defence capability that governments don’t feel the need to engage in deeper cooperation. Nevertheless they evoke the emotive language of sovereignty to legitimise the maintenance of shrinking national defence structures and the preservation of national industrial champions they know to be no longer viable. Certainly, this is short-sighted and irresponsible, but as long as their electorates remain poorly informed and otherwise
preoccupied, what else is to be expected?

This process of EU MS hanging separately rather than hanging together is particularly sad in a wider sense, because maritime power is good at integrating nations – consider how a common purpose has drawn China, India, Japan and Russia into cooperating on counter piracy. The Malaccan Straits nations overcame serious traditional hostility to cooperate and fight piracy collectively. The African Union (AU) has a Maritime Security Strategy, and West African countries are now working together to protect their offshore resources. Interoperability comes naturally to maritime forces – as the 16-nation maritime element off Libya last year, or the 25 navies in the Combined Maritime Force in the Middle East have demonstrated.

In conclusion, maritime forces instinctively understand the integration of joint capability, delivering joint effect not just between military forces, but together with the wider security and civilian community in a comprehensive way. Weaving the considerations above together into a vision and a strategy therefore might include the following:

- building on UN legitimacy and using UN tools, but with a greater effort to improve delivery of UN outputs by developing a clearer and more cohesive maritime voice at national, regional as well as EU level;

- ending the process of allowing each sector within the security spectrum to carve out its own laws and policies in isolation;

- integrating or balancing the security community’s interests with the interests of the other maritime communities - commercial shipping, energy and other civil communities in a way it has not traditionally been inclined to do;

- accommodating defence alongside the wider, predominantly civilian security policy development community;

- ensuring a comprehensive approach amongst maritime security stakeholders through talking, formulating policy, finding synergies and efficiencies by routinely, not exceptionally, working together;

- focusing on shared interests at the regional/sea basin level – not just with fellow MS, but also with neighbouring third party countries in the same sea basin, exploiting the forces of geography and history that bind Mediterranean, Baltic and Atlantic countries independently of the EU, which can often provide the intitial basis for building mutual trust and confidence;
• acknowledging that every country cuts its maritime security cake differently, and that unified services – whether a European Navy, Coastguard, Border Guard or Police – are not a realistic prospect in the foreseeable future;

• accepting that Unified Services are not essential in providing that EU civil and military communities cooperate intelligently and do not waste resources in competition with each other;

• agreeing that effective cooperation requires politically led and driven cultural change, and an European Maritime Security Strategy is a prerequisite for that;

• funding particular security missions from a common pot, collectively defining the challenges and the capabilities required to meet those challenges and then, together with industry, developing the most cost effective way of delivering those capabilities;

• recognising that platform ownership and the uniform of the person in command is not the starting point but the end of a collective capability process and that it is the effectiveness of the capability in the eyes of the opposition that counts;

• agreeing that in general the longer the range, the more sophisticated the C2, surveillance and weapon systems, the greater the likely intensity of conflict, the more likely it will be that the military is involved and, if necessary, in the lead;

• agreeing that the closer to home, the more regular the enforcement required, the more likely it will be civilian-led with the military in support, either visibly over the horizon or simply in reserve;

• recognising that maritime threats are often hybrid ones combining crime with threats to the state security and almost inevitably reach beyond a single MS’s jurisdiction;

• accepting that any operation responding to such threats could include representation from different services in different states to ensure that criminals and terrorists do not exploit the organisational seams between them and recognising that the same platform with different manning can be a force multiplier;
• understanding that the re-emergence of private armed security companies at sea signifies a security vacuum which navies can no longer afford to fill alone; and

• accepting this outsourcing of security requires that the companies be properly regulated and internationally accepted standards applied and enforced, which is still a maritime security task for MS.

Fewer barriers to cooperation now exist and there is increased willingness to overcome the remainder, but, although the remaining barriers are largely in the mind – whether through tradition, habit, culture, competition, jealousy, or turf protection, the responsibility to share information and the readiness to respond with the most suitable capability without national fear or favour is not yet embedded. But it can be, with relatively little money, using existing technologies. In short, there is much more potential for EU maritime security capability to be squeezed out of existing and foreseeable resources.
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A Strategic Outlook for the Military Capability Development in the European Union
Facing realities – in search of a more European mindset!

General Håkan Syrén
Former Chairman of the EU Military Committee

My period as Chairman of the EU Military Committee (EUMC) has approached its end. Therefore it is a very good opportunity, to draw some conclusions on Member States’ military capabilities and on the challenges ahead. Before doing so, I want to express my appreciation of the wide spectrum of contributions to this book. Many actors with very different horizons, but all involved, in one way or another, in military capability development issues, are demonstrating here, along these pages, their commitment towards a stronger CSDP. Very appropriately, most of them are placing these efforts into the wider context of EU’s role and responsibilities as a security provider. The reader will easily understand that military capability development is not only addressed by the EU Military Committee (EUMC), the EU Military Staff (EUMS) and the European Defence Agency (EDA). The European External Action Service (EEAS), the European Parliament, the Commission and its agencies also play an increasing role in this field. The comprehensive approach under development in crisis management is becoming gradually a reality also in the domain of capability development for the benefit of Member States and of the EU as a whole.

I am also pleased to read several times in this publication that the EU “soft power” needs to be backed by credible military capabilities. The EU needs to enhance its capacity to be and act as a security provider. This is an essential ambition which should guide our actions when trying to solve, among Europeans, our shortfalls.

Let me underline that, in these pages, I do not speak on behalf of all the 27 Chiefs of Defence. But of course the shared experience with my 27 colleagues in the EU Military Committee is a very important input.

My commitment to enhancing international cooperation dates back to my period as Swedish Chief of Defence and in fact was one of my main motives for taking the challenge to chair the EU Military Committee. Already in 2005, my then Norwegian counterpart General Sverre Diesen and I launched an initiative to break new ground in the cooperation between the Swedish and Norwegian Armed Forces. We had both identified the strategic need for our Armed Forces for a radically new common approach to be able to meet our national challenges ahead. Our initiative has since gained momentum among all Nordic countries and is today firmly anchored in the Nordic Defence Cooperation or NORDEFCO, which is widely recognised as one of the most promising regional cooperations.
Our challenge in the North was to find ways to compensate for smallness and increasingly thin defence structures. We saw the continuously increasing costs of new generations of forces and, looking ahead, we did not need any great mathematical skills to see that our armed forces were quickly approaching a situation where it would simply be impossible for each of our countries to sustain the full spectrum of capabilities that we were striving at.

Pooling and sharing without giving up vital sovereign freedom of action was our immediate answer to gain cost efficiency and to extend our possibilities to maintain critical capabilities. We did not see it as a final panacea, but as one of the steps that could be taken at that point in time.

Following this very rich experience, my three years as Chairman of the Military Committee have given me a close insight into the concerns and challenges of all the Member States’ Armed Forces. It is a picture that in some ways is disturbingly consistent: stagnating or shrinking defence budgets, cost increases and transformational strains leading to serious capability gaps in the near term and serious underinvestment in future capabilities.

The overall picture is painfully clear. The military capabilities of the EU Member States are on a steady downward slope that runs contrary to the strategic development in our surrounding world and contrary to the stated EU goals to be a major actor in the security and defence dimension. The outlook towards 2020 is deeply worrisome.

For sure the economic crisis has brought new and urgent pressures on Chiefs of Defence, but the real dilemma is far more strategic and fundamental. Budgets are too depressed and Member States are using their budgets in ways that are far from efficient when viewed in a European context. They are sustaining what I call “overcapacities”, while failing to invest in critical shortfalls. The costs of new generations of capabilities are continuously increasing. As a Chief of Defence I used the rule-of-thumb that new generations of capabilities double in price every 15-20 years. Rise in quality has partly been able to compensate for losses in quantity, but numbers are now so many times lower, that the whole structures have become extremely fragile. Looking a few years into the future, it is simple mathematics to predict that many Member States will be unable to sustain essential parts of their national forces, air forces being the prime example.

Besides substantial budget increases, broadening the base through cooperation and coordination is the only rational answer. Member States have to develop together, procure together, train and sustain together and - last but not least - to operate together. In this vein, let me quote Sven Biscop when he states that: “it is but logical that it proves slightly easier to solve a European problem among Europeans in the framework that was purpose-built to that end: the CSDP”. Capabilities developed by
Member States would then of course be used in an EU, NATO or UN Framework. We have to think new. There is little room for complacent illusions. Reality speaks for itself. Also the largest Member States are now drawing similar conclusions about the need for higher efficiency and less duplication on the European level.

Without questioning the supreme role of our political leadership to make the final judgement on the ways ahead, I see it as a key responsibility for the Chiefs of Defence of the 27 Member States to provide realistic assessments of where we are and of our alternatives, even if the messages are politically inconvenient.

Two dimensions of the Chiefs’ of Defence responsibilities are of particular importance. First, it is about assuring the efficiency of our forces and the safety of the soldiers in operations. We have to know that our forces are adequately prepared and equipped to perform difficult and risky tasks. As the Armed Forces are increasingly acting together in challenging multinational tasks, international interoperability and cooperation in all dimensions have come to the fore in much of what we are doing.

Secondly, Chiefs of defence bear a major part of the long-term responsibility for capability development. The decisions taken today largely decide our future options ten years from now and beyond. As stated in this book by Claude-France Arnould,

*Military power (and the technical expertise to build it) cannot be conjured in a month or two; investment must be sustained now, in order that European states may defend themselves in the future.*

Of course Chiefs of Defence share this responsibility with our political leadership, but as this responsibility goes far beyond the political mandates of our governments, it is in reality very much a responsibility the Chiefs of Defence have to take extremely seriously. They constantly have to strike the difficult balance between spending on existing capabilities and operations and investing in the future. They have to constantly make the case for the future generation of capabilities.

European defence is at a very critical junction, much more critical than most seem to understand. Defence budgets and capabilities are shrinking while the world around us is changing fast leading to shifting strategic priorities, not least for our main ally, the United States.

The Libya operation a year ago only repeated some lessons we learnt more than ten years ago in the western Balkans but still have not acted on. Europe has to be able to bear a greater part of the burden in its immediate neighbourhood. The blunt statement by the former US Defence Secretary Robert Gates a year ago must not be forgotten. A marginalised Europe is not a risk, but a fact. It is embarrassingly obvious
that long identified European shortfalls like intelligence, precision munitions and air-to-air refuelling still remain to be met. In this the EU and NATO have to move ahead together.

Budget cuts, continuous cost increases linked to new generations of equipment, the transformational burden and, last but not least, the high costs of the ongoing operations have put the Chiefs of Defence in an almost impossible position. They are constantly asked to do more with less!

The recent budget cuts have further exacerbated the situation and made a difficult situation worse. A good thing is that they have increased the visibility and awareness of the problems, but let me underline that the fundamental problems are that defence is getting increasingly costly, our efforts are spread too thinly to be really efficient and, most important, our decisions are taken in 27 different national contexts. The potential for generating a greater capability output is substantial if we are able to coordinate our efforts better. In other words, as expressed by Peer Oppers,

\[
\text{in this era of reduced defence budgets and known shortfalls, Pooling & Sharing is inevitable. One can argue that this is a threat but with a more optimistic view we can turn it into an opportunity to really cooperate.}
\]

I am in no position to judge the sovereign considerations and decisions of any individual Member State, but it is clear to me that if we, the Member States, used less of our national glasses in defence planning, the picture could look very different.

The Ghent initiative by the Ministers of Defence in 2010 set the stage for an ambitious search for new ways to enhance efficiency through better cooperation between the Armed Forces. “Pooling & Sharing” has become the buzz word for our efforts, which are strongly supported by the EDA. In this vein, the EUMC-EDA cooperation should be considered as a “win-win” situation. And I share Claude France Arnould’s views that this Agency constitutes a unique body within the EU, because of its direct link with Ministers of Defence, its ability to address the whole spectrum of capability development from Research and Technology (R&T) to Industry, and also thanks to the flexibility of its structure. I hope that in the coming years Member States will make the best use of their Agency, opting for more efficient and ambitious capability-related cooperation.

We have achieved positive and concrete results. We now have a quite substantial list of promising projects and some of them are already starting to deliver real capabilities. But let me also be very clear. This is only the end of the beginning. We have harvested some low-hanging fruits. If Member States really want to cope with the immediate and long-term economical realities, Pooling & Sharing as well as Smart Defence need
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to be taken to completely new levels.

We must not accept a rhetoric built on wishful or convenient political thinking. We cannot do more with less without taking very difficult decisions and changes. Doing more with less money inevitably means doing more with less people. Being more efficient means that we need less people.

Defence policy has to be founded on realistic analysis. Without increased inputs or radically improved coordination of efforts, the capabilities of the individual Armed Forces will continue to shrink. There will be even less room than today for investing in vital strategic enablers and in the future beyond mandate periods. National industries will lose relevance and at some point will simply quit as they assess they will no longer be able to remain profitable.

So, my message to Member States’ political, military and industrial leaders is the same. We simply have to define a radical new way together. We have to take Pooling & Sharing to a new level. We have to coordinate our efforts, avoiding duplication of national processes that from a European perspective are immensely wasteful. We have to stop pretending that we are safeguarding national sovereignty by maintaining illusory national independence. As Sven Biscop notes, Member States are sovereign to stay out of involvement but will be lacking capability to act either alone or with others. In other words: “they have full freedom of inaction [...] Pooling in reality increases sovereignty”.

As military officer, I think it is essential that we focus more on the security and defence goals, military needs and requirements. It is vital that Chiefs of Defence are asked to make the argument for military efficiency, while others produce the arguments for industry and employment.

We need a change of political and military mindsets. We cannot hide anymore behind general words like sovereignty. We must address these challenges based on a firm common will to find ways to better combine national agendas with a European agenda. We have to identify and pursue common tracks wherever possible. As very rightfully underlined by Arnaud Danjean:

*The 27 Member States spend an estimated 200 billion Euro per year on defence, which represent a considerable amount of money. It would be wrong to think that these are not enough resources to have credible and robust European military capabilities. The problem lies more in rationalising spending to avoid duplication and overcapacity in certain areas than in needing more funds.*

It should be born in mind that if Member States want to better coordinate their national capability development policies, they already have some tools at their
disposal. The Capability Development Plan (CDP) built under the responsibility of the EDA, in a joint effort with Member States, the EUMC, and the EUMS, is one of the most important, by providing a shared view of our key capability shortfalls and on the possible future trends.

In this vein, I would like to mention the valuable role of the HTF. As Thomas Panagis notes, this group which “started from scratch, in conditions of uncertainty and inexperience, built the basis of military capabilities of the EU”. And, it currently continues to bring significant added value to some important capability-related issues such as Pooling & Sharing in the domain of training and education and the 2014 CDP review.

European industry has a key role in reducing duplication on the European level. Industrial restructuring can only come about as a result of a strong common political will at the highest level and it has to be driven by industry itself.

It should be underlined though that Chiefs of Defence have to play their role by constantly pushing for harmonisation of requirements, for coordination of procurement plans and of course for cost efficiency. The Armed Forces are the consumers and they have to take a very proactive role in pushing industry to be able to meet the requirements of tomorrow. Consolidation of supply calls for a parallel consolidation of European demand.

I fully acknowledge that Member States do not have identical interests. Sovereignty concerns do differ between Member States. But it is equally clear that large parts of our security concerns are shared and can only be met by common efforts. So defence planning has to be carried out on the European level as well as on the national level. The recent initiative by President van Rompuy to bring security and defence to the table of the European Council in about a year is very promising. I also welcome the interest of the European Commission to engage in the strengthening of the European Defence Industrial Base. CSDP is part of much broader issues about strategic challenges to European Security and Defence, which need a strong engagement on the highest political level.

At the same time I am the first to understand the constraints and barriers that we have to overcome. Culture, values and deep-rooted sovereignty concerns cannot be turned around over night. But we have to set a clear new direction.

Some words on what I would like to see:

In the short run and as a direct outcome of the European Council on defence next year, I would like to see continued engagement and pressure from the highest political level. Ideally I would like to see agreement of a new Security Strategy already

Conclusion
next year, but more realistically I would expect some clear guidance for a continued process to launch such a strategy in 2014.

To me a new direction means that the EU Member States agree, step by step, to join forces in the development of capabilities. It has to be a long-term and incremental process. Even if we share a large and increasing part of our challenges, we all know that national concerns will prevail over our planning for a long time to come. But we have already identified a number of important areas where we should be able to join forces.

My vision is that we can bring pooling and sharing to a higher level by gradually setting aside an increasing part of our national defence budgets for common European purposes. Let me be concrete and provide an illustrative example: starting with, say, five per cent and setting a goal to increase it to 25 per cent in ten years. At present levels, that would mean ten billion euros today and close to 50 billion euros per year by 2023, and perhaps a total of 250 billion euros over the ten-year period. It would still leave more than 85% for the nationally defined plans during that period.

Some further words on budgets and economy:

Independently of the potential gains from more efficient coordination and cooperation, I see increases of defence budgets as a key ingredient of the European defence policy in the years ahead. The qualitative gains we can reach by Pooling & Sharing will build on using and sharing the same systems, on sharing production and logistic support and finally on a more efficient distribution of the burden without today’s duplication. In a European perspective, we still maintain significant overcapacities in old legacy capabilities. In this vein, I very much support the idea to also list overcapacities, as proposed in this book by Didier Laporte and Johan Fischer.

Let us not have any illusions about the time scales involved. We are talking of at least a decade to bring about substantial change. The steps we take in the near term are critically important, as they define the possibilities for long-term gains. But we have to start now and we have to invest in creating the conditions for staying relevant in the years ahead. But to achieve these long term goals and to make sure that our forces are not forced into default long before, defence budgets have to be increased substantially in the near-term. Only in that way can we break the present vicious circles and assure the necessary common strategic investments in research, development and procurement.

A look at the world around us is illustrative. The total defence expenditures of the EU Member States add up to almost 200 billion euros. It is an impressive figure in most comparisons. Three years ago as I took up my position, our total budget equalled the sum of the defence expenditures of five or six countries trailing the US and the
EU on the world list: China, Russia, Japan, India, Saudi Arabia and Brazil. But the ongoing strategic shifts are very visible. Today a similar comparison would include three countries and, if present trends continue, we will soon see China as well as Russia on almost equal terms. Trends are clearly crossing and we have to understand the implications.

Let me conclude with a quote from the speech of the President of the Commission Barroso at the European Parliament in mid-September 2012:

*The world needs a Europe that is capable of deploying military missions to help stabilise the situation in crisis areas. We need to launch a comprehensive review of European capabilities and begin truly collective defence planning. Yes, we need to reinforce our Common Foreign and Security Policy and a common approach to defence matters because together we have the power, and the scale to shape the world into a fairer, rules-based and human rights’ abiding place.*

The initiatives taken by Presidents van Rompuy and Barroso to bring European Defence issues to the top of the political table, as well as the new report by the Future of Europe Group, give room for cautious optimism about the strong top-down leadership that is needed to break the present downward spiral of defence forces and defence structures in Europe. Only Heads of States and Governments have the authority to decide on guidance to be then implemented not only by Ministers of Defence and Chiefs of Defence, but also by Ministers of Finance and Industry.

The top-down political pressure from the European Council and the Commission has to be translated into a top-down pressure within each and every one of our Armed Forces. A key task will be for the individual Chiefs of Defence to translate and implement the common political aims in the individual national plans. The Chiefs of Defence of the Member States, i.e. the EU Military Committee, will have a vital role in assuring the long term success.
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