Implementation of the European security strategy and the common security and defence policy

2009/2198(INI) - 23/02/2010

The Committee on Foreign Affairs adopted the own-initiative report drawn up by Arnaud DANJEAN (EPP, FR) on the implementation of the European Security Strategy and the Common Security and Defence Policy.

European Security Strategy: the committee reiterates its recommendation for a regular review of the ESS, every five years, coinciding with the beginning of a new parliamentary term and after due consultation with the European Parliament. It stresses that primary responsibility for maintaining peace and security in the world lies with the UN Security Council and reiterates the need for a reform of the United Nations Organisation in order to make it more capable of exercising its functions. Members acknowledge the need for the Union to enhance its own institutional capacity. They emphasise that a White Paper – providing scope for a wide-ranging public debate – would raise the profile of the CSDP and step up security and defence cooperation by defining the Union's security and defence objectives and interests more clearly in relation to the means and resources available, thereby making the implementation of the ESS and the planning and conduct of EU crisis management operations more effective and better defined.

Lisbon Treaty and Common Security and Defence Policy Structures: the committee calls on the Council to enter into a substantial debate with the European Parliament and the national parliaments in 2010 on the implementation of the new provisions in the Lisbon Treaty concerning the CSDP, including the clause on mutual assistance in the event of armed aggression on the territory of a Member State, and the solidarity clause in the event of a terrorist attack or a natural or man-made disaster. It wants the Council to reopen the debate on establishing a European civil protection force that would pool the Member States' resources in order to generate an effective collective response in the event of natural or man-made disasters. The military CSDP should also provide scope for responding to civilian hazards.

The committee also stresses the following:

- the legitimacy and value of setting up a Defence Council within the Foreign Affairs Council, which would comprise the defence ministers, be chaired by the Vice-President/High Representative and play a special role in stepping up cooperation and in harmonising and integrating military capabilities;
- support for the **establishment of a civil-military Crisis Management and Planning Directorate** (CMPD) to take responsibility for crisis management and strategic planning of the Union's civil and military operations and help develop the CSDP, particularly in terms of civil and military capabilities. It deprecates, however, the extremely lengthy delay in setting up this new structure;
- close coordination within the EEAS between, on the one hand, the CMPD and the other CSDP structures and, on the other hand, the crisis platform and other relevant services of the Commission, which should be included in the EEAS, in order to build up a coordinated strategic planning capacity so as to develop a comprehensive European approach;;
- the need for the **establishment of a permanent EU operations centre** overseen by the Vice-President/High Representative, which would be responsible for operational planning and the conduct of military operations, to be attached to the EEAS. A permanent interlocutor in the military sphere is essential for civil and military coordination on the ground.

Military operations and civil missions: Members note that the Union launches civil and military operations under the CSDP in response to threats to international and European security, and that the majority of these missions have been in the field of civilian crisis management. They commend the 70 000 or so personnel involved in the 23 missions and operations in the context of the ESDP, and call on Member States to define the criteria for the deployment of ESDP missions and to consider the subject of national 'caveats'. The committee goes on to discuss missions and operations including the successful contribution made by EU NAVFOR Somalia – Operation Atalanta in combating piracy in the Gulf of Aden and off the coast of Somalia, and the need for the EU to upgrade its activities in the Palestinian Territories.

Gender and human rights mainstreaming: Members recall the importance of systematically addressing human rights and gender aspects in all phases of CSDP operations, during both the planning and the implementation phases.

Non-proliferation and disarmament: the committee calls on Member States to formulate a strong common position for the 2010 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference and stresses the need to reinforce further all three pillars of the NPT, namely non-proliferation, disarmament and cooperation on the civilian use of nuclear energy. It welcomes the commitment of the Russian Federation and the United States to continue negotiations to conclude a new comprehensive legally binding agreement The committee reiterates its misgivings about **the situation in Iran and North Korea**, pointing out that the Union has undertaken to use every means at its disposal to prevent, deter, halt and, where possible, eliminate proliferation programmes, which are a source of global concern. Members recall, however, that the disarmament process started by some states has no direct bearing on whether other states choose to halt or continue their proliferation programmes, meaning that a firm approach is needed in respect of states or organisations prepared to embark on, or having already embarked on, programmes for the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. They underline the importance of all Member States acting accordingly, in line with the Union approach to this matter.

Capability development: with a view to meeting growing operational requirements and ensuring more professional crisis management, the Union needs **to increase its civil and military capabilities**. The committee calls on the Council to set a new headline goal, which could encompass both civil and military dimensions and should focus first and foremost on effective capacity building. It stresses the need to seek synergies between civil and military capabilities and to identify areas in which the Member States can pool their efforts and capabilities at the EU level, using the opportunity provided by the setting-up of **the EEAS which should have a single unit overseeing civil and military capability development**. The Council is asked to give the EEAS a permanent structure centralising common support functions for civil missions and military operations (including recruitment procedures and procurement processes) so that they can concentrate on their primary task.

Members go on to note that the **Battle Groups – despite the significant investment they represent – have not yet been used**, partly for political reasons and partly because their deployment is subject to very stringent criteria. They support more flexible use of the Battle Groups so that they can also serve as a reserve force or as a partial substitute in the event of a disappointing force generation process, subject to proper account being taken of the wishes of the countries that jointly formed the groups concerned. The Council is asked to deploy them as part of full-scale military exercises. Members commend the progress made in terms of military and civil capabilities, and call for rapid advances in respect of projects designed to allow speedier deployment of ESDP missions and EU forces, projects designed to provide better intelligence to military teams deployed by the EU and projects designed to strengthen the EU's maritime dimension, putting the CSDP's military resources at its disposal.

They call on Member States to make greater use of the **EDA's potential in accordance with the new treaty**, to give it a budget commensurate with the expectations placed upon it and to facilitate its planning

by adopting a triennial financial framework and work programme. The committee strongly supports the establishment of synergies between civil and military capabilities and they hope that the **CMPD and the EDA will rapidly define their complementary roles**: under the authority of the High Representative /Vice President, the CMPD within the EEAS should play a strategic role in instigating and coordinating activities, particularly when it comes to identifying common needs, while the EDA should play an operational role in developing dual technologies and civil and military capabilities. The draft resolution goes on to make recommendations on training projects with a view to making it easier for European personnel to work together.

Funding the CSDP: Members recall that the Lisbon Treaty does not fundamentally alter the funding of missions and operations carried out under the CSDP, such that: civil missions are financed from the EU budget, and the common costs associated with military operations are financed via the Athena mechanism. They call on Member States to extend the list of common costs financed via the Athena mechanism so as to generate greater mutual solidarity and encourage more Member States to participate in EU military operations. They also want progress on the High Representative's start-up fund.

Partnerships: Members make some recommendations on the EU's partnerships with NATO, the UN, the African Union and the United States. On NATO, they recommend avoiding blockages and call for a review of the present arrangements for EU-NATO operational cooperation (Berlin Plus agreement) as well as the development of a new functional framework that facilitates broader cooperation when the two organisations are present in the same theatre of operations.

Parliamentary prerogatives: the committee recommends that the European Parliament and the national parliaments, bearing in mind the options available under the Lisbon Treaty, make full use of Protocol No 1 to that treaty to step up their cooperation in relation to the CFSP and the CSDP by developing closer working relationships between their respective competent committees vis-à-vis security and defence matters. It emphasises that this closer cooperation will replace the prerogatives misappropriated by the WEU Assembly.

Lastly, the Council is asked to keep Parliament regularly informed regarding the use of the Athena mechanism and the start-up fund. In the interests of budgetary clarity, all non-military expenditure should be indicated in the EU budget and, as an additional step, after a necessary Treaty amendment, military expenditure should also be shown in the EU budget.