



Basic information	
2015/2275(INI) INI - Own-initiative procedure Peace support operations - EU engagement with the UN and the African Union Subject 6.10.05 Peace preservation, humanitarian and rescue tasks, crisis management	Procedure completed

Key players				
European Parliament	Committee responsible		Rapporteur	Appointed
	<div style="border: 1px solid red; display: inline-block; padding: 2px;">AFET</div> Foreign Affairs		VAN ORDEN Geoffrey (ECR)	15/09/2015
			Shadow rapporteur ZDROJEWSKI Bogdan Andrzej (PPE) PARGNEAUX Gilles (S&D) NART Javier (ALDE) COUSO PERMUY Javier (GUE/NGL) VALERO Bodil (Verts/ALE)	
	Committee for opinion		Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
<div style="border: 1px solid red; display: inline-block; padding: 2px;">DEVE</div> Development (Associated committee)		VÄYRYNEN Paavo (ALDE)	29/10/2015	

Key events			
Date	Event	Reference	Summary
29/10/2015	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
29/10/2015	Referral to associated committees announced in Parliament		
19/04/2016	Vote in committee		
28/04/2016	Committee report tabled for plenary	A8-0158/2016	Summary
06/06/2016	Debate in Parliament		
07/06/2016	Decision by Parliament	T8-0249/2016	Summary

07/06/2016	Results of vote in Parliament		
07/06/2016	End of procedure in Parliament		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2015/2275(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Initiative
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 55
Other legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 165
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	AFET/8/04818

Documentation gateway				
European Parliament				
Document type	Committee	Reference	Date	Summary
Committee draft report		PE575.014	25/01/2016	
Amendments tabled in committee		PE578.460	25/02/2016	
Committee opinion	DEVE	PE575.372	16/03/2016	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A8-0158/2016	28/04/2016	Summary
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T8-0249/2016	07/06/2016	Summary

Peace support operations - EU engagement with the UN and the African Union

2015/2275(INI) - 07/06/2016 - Text adopted by Parliament, single reading

The European Parliament adopted by 491 votes 110 with 73 abstentions, a resolution on Peace Support Operations – EU engagement with the UN and the African Union.

Parliament recalled that Peace Support Operations (PSOs) are a form of crisis response, normally in support of an internationally recognised organisation such as the UN or the African Union (AU), with a UN mandate, and designed to prevent armed conflict, restore, maintain or build peace, enforce peace agreements and tackle the complex emergencies and challenges posed by failing or weak states. The aim of PSOs is also to help create stable, secure and more prosperous environments for the longer term.

Parliament also stressed that **the security landscape in Africa in particular has changed dramatically in the last decade, with the emergence of terrorist and insurgent groups** in Somalia, Nigeria, and the Sahel-Sahara region, and with peace enforcement and counter-terrorism operations becoming the rule rather than the exception in many areas. In this context, it considered that coordinated external actions that make use of diplomatic, security and development tools are necessary to restore confidence and tackle the challenges of wars, internal conflicts, insecurity, fragility and transition.

The deployment of multiple UN-authorized missions in the same theatre of operations, with different actors and regional organisations, is increasingly the reality of modern peace operations. However, managing these complex partnerships, while not duplicating work or missions, is essential to successful operations. In this regard, Parliament called for the **evaluation and rationalisation of the existing structures**.

Better coordination: Parliament urged the EU, given the scale of the challenges and the complex involvement of other organisations and nations, to seek an **appropriate division of labour** and to focus on where it can best add value. It considered that UN and AU missions are in need of a comprehensive approach under which, in addition to deploying military, diplomatic and development instruments, other essential factors are a thorough

knowledge of the security environment, exchanges of intelligence and information and modern technologies. It stressed the importance of the other instruments of the EU in the security field and, in particular, of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions and operations.

Provision of military forces: Parliament noted that the perceived legitimacy of a PSO is key to its success. It believed that the **AU should therefore contribute with support and military forces wherever possible**. It welcomed the UN-EU Strategic Partnership on Peacekeeping and Crisis Management and called on the EU to make further efforts to **facilitate Member State contributions**. It recalled that the EU has engaged in crisis-management activities in Africa. However, only 11 of the 28 EU Member States made pledges at the 28 September 2015 Leaders' Summit on Peacekeeping, while China pledged a standby force of 8 000 and Colombia 5 000 troops. Accordingly, Parliament called on the EU Member States to **significantly increase their military and police contributions to UN peacekeeping missions**.

Prevention of conflicts: recalling the need for a rapid African response to crisis, the resolution emphasised the importance of investing more in conflict prevention. It recognised the critical contribution of the African Peace Facility in developing the triangular partnership between the UN, the EU and the AU, but considered it vital that the EU institutions and Member States remain closely engaged if the Facility is to be fully utilised. It took the view that the Facility should focus on structural support rather than just bankrolling African forces' pay.

Military assistance for African states: Members observed that stepping up European military cooperation would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Europe's contribution to UN peace missions. They called on the EU and its Member States, as well as on other members of the international community, to **assist with training**, including discipline, equipment, logistical support, financial assistance and development of rules of engagement, to encourage and assist the **African Standby Force**.

European missions in Africa: Parliament noted the importance of Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions for Africa's security, in particular training and support missions for African forces, and especially EUTM Mali, EUCAP Sahel Mali and EUCAP Sahel Niger, EUTM Somalia, and EUCAP Nestor. It called on the EU to **step up the capabilities of those training missions**, in particular by allowing African soldiers who have been trained to be monitored on and after their return from theatres of operations.

Parliament also considered that the Official Development Assistance (ODA) needs to be redesigned under the OECD framework through peace building lenses. Similarly, the EDF regulation should be reviewed in order to allow programming design that includes peace, security and justice expenditures.

Parliament insisted that neither the EU nor the Member States, in supporting PSOs, should act in isolation but that they should, rather, take full account of the contributions of other international actors, improve coordination with them, **improve rapidity of response**, and focus their efforts on certain priority countries.

Member States' contributions to the UN system: Parliament noted that the European countries and the EU itself are major contributors to the UN system, and that France, Germany and the UK are the largest European contributors to the budget for UN Peacekeeping Operations. It recalled that the EU Member States are collectively the largest contributor to the UN's peacekeeping budget, with about 37 %, and are currently contributing troops to nine peacekeeping missions (in 2014 and 2015 EU financial commitments to the AU totalled EUR 717.9 million. It indicated, however, that France, for example, trains 25 000 African soldiers each year and separately deploys over 4 000 personnel in African peacekeeping operations.

Targeted funds: Parliament recognised that the problem is often not the lack of funding but, rather, how funds are spent and what other resources are utilised. It backed initiatives such as the Békou trust fund operating in the Central African Republic. It believed the current funding programme is unsustainable, and that conditions should be attached to the African Peace Facility in order to encourage the AU to increase its own contributions to PSOs.

A holistic EU approach: Parliament supported a holistic EU approach, which is the main instrument for mobilising the full potential of EU action in the context of peacekeeping operations and the stabilisation process, as well as for mobilising various ways to support the development of AU countries. It stressed that border management assistance should be a priority for EU engagement in Africa.

Sexual abuse by United Nations personnel: lastly, Parliament took note of the UN Evaluation Report of 15 May 2015 on sexual exploitation and abuse by United Nations personnel. It considered that the AU, the UN, the EU and Member States should exercise strong vigilance concerning such criminal matters and urged the most rigorous disciplinary and judicial procedures and the utmost effort to prevent such crimes.

Peace support operations - EU engagement with the UN and the African Union

2015/2275(INI) - 28/04/2016 - Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading

The Committee on Foreign Affairs adopted the own-initiative report by Geoffrey VAN ORDEN (ECR, UK) on Peace Support Operations – EU engagement with the UN and the African Union.

The Committee on Development, exercising its prerogatives as an associated committee in accordance with [Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure](#), also gave its opinion on the report.

Members recalled that Peace Support Operations (PSOs) are a form of crisis response, normally in support of an internationally recognised organisation such as the UN or the African Union (AU), with a UN mandate, and designed to prevent armed conflict, restore, maintain or build peace, enforce peace agreements and tackle the complex emergencies and challenges posed by failing or weak states. The aim of PSOs is also to help create stable, secure and more prosperous environments for the longer term.

The committee also stressed that **the security landscape in Africa in particular has changed dramatically in the last decade, with the emergence of terrorist and insurgent groups** in Somalia, Nigeria, and the Sahel-Sahara region, and with peace enforcement and counter-terrorism operations becoming the rule rather than the exception in many areas. In this context, Members considered that coordinated external actions that make use of diplomatic, security and development tools are necessary to restore confidence and tackle the challenges of wars, internal conflicts, insecurity, fragility and transition.

The deployment of multiple UN-authorized missions in the same theatre of operations, with different actors and regional organisations, is increasingly the reality of modern peace operations. However, managing these complex partnerships, while not duplicating work or missions, is essential to successful operations. In this regard, Members called for the **evaluation and rationalisation of the existing structures**.

Better coordination: the committee urged the EU, given the scale of the challenges and the complex involvement of other organisations and nations, to seek an **appropriate division of labour** and to focus on where it can best add value. It considered that UN and AU missions are in need of a comprehensive approach under which, in addition to deploying military, diplomatic and development instruments, other essential factors are a thorough knowledge of the security environment, exchanges of intelligence and information and modern technologies. It stressed the importance of the other instruments of the EU in the security field and, in particular, of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions and operations.

Provision of military forces: Members noted that the perceived legitimacy of a PSO is key to its success. They believed that the **AU should therefore contribute with support and military forces wherever possible**. They welcomed the UN-EU Strategic Partnership on Peacekeeping and Crisis Management and called on the EU to make further efforts to **facilitate Member State contributions**. They recalled that the EU has engaged in crisis-management activities in Africa. However, only 11 of the 28 EU Member States made pledges at the 28 September 2015 Leaders' Summit on Peacekeeping, while China pledged a standby force of 8 000 and Colombia 5 000 troops. Accordingly, Members called on the EU Member States to **significantly increase their military and police contributions to UN peacekeeping missions**.

Prevention of conflicts: recalling the need for a rapid African response to crisis, Members emphasised the importance of investing more in conflict prevention. They recognised the critical contribution of the African Peace Facility in developing the triangular partnership between the UN, the EU and the AU, but considered it vital that the EU institutions and Member States remain closely engaged if the Facility is to be fully utilised. They took the view that the Facility should focus on structural support rather than just bankrolling African forces' pay.

Military assistance for African states: Members observed that stepping up European military cooperation would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Europe's contribution to UN peace missions. They called on the EU and its Member States, as well as on other members of the international community, to **assist with training**, including discipline, equipment, logistical support, financial assistance and development of rules of engagement, to encourage and assist the **African Standby Force**.

Members also considered that the Official Development Assistance (ODA) needs to be redesigned under the OECD framework through peace building lenses. Similarly, the EDF regulation should be reviewed in order to allow programming design that includes peace, security and justice expenditures.

The committee insisted that neither the EU nor the Member States, in supporting PSOs, should act in isolation but that they should, rather, take full account of the contributions of other international actors, improve coordination with them, **improve rapidity of response**, and focus their efforts on certain priority countries.

A holistic EU approach: Members supported a holistic EU approach, which is the main instrument for mobilising the full potential of EU action in the context of peacekeeping operations and the stabilisation process, as well as for mobilising various ways to support the development of AU countries. They stressed that border management assistance should be a priority for EU engagement in Africa.

Targeted funds: Members recognised that the problem is often not the lack of funding but, rather, how funds are spent and what other resources are utilised. They backed initiatives such as the Békou trust fund operating in the Central African Republic. They believed the current funding programme is unsustainable, and that conditions should be attached to the African Peace Facility in order to encourage the AU to increase its own contributions to PSOs.

Sexual abuse by United Nations personnel: lastly, Members took note of the UN Evaluation Report of 15 May 2015 on sexual exploitation and abuse by United Nations personnel. They considered that the AU, the UN, the EU and Member States should exercise strong vigilance concerning such criminal matters and urged the most rigorous disciplinary and judicial procedures and the utmost effort to prevent such crimes.

It should be noted that in a **minority report** tabled by the GUE/NGL, Members pointed out that the report aims to increase EU contribution to peace support operations. They felt that the responsibility-to-protect-mechanism should not be used as a pretext for military intervention. They considered that NATO should leave the African continent, and stressed the need for a strict separation of EU from NATO in this context.