

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Committee on Foreign Affairs*

**2008/2003(INI)**

31.1.2008

## **DRAFT REPORT**

on the implementation of the European Security Strategy and ESDP  
(2008/2003(INI))

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Rapporteur: Helmut Kuhne

**CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION .....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.....	11

## MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

### on the implementation of the European Security Strategy and ESDP (2008/2003(INI))

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the European Security Strategy (ESS) adopted by the European Council on 12 December 2003,
- having regard to the Treaty of Lisbon, signed in Lisbon on 13 December 2007,
- having regard to the Conclusions of the European Council on 14 December 2007,
- having regard to the Reports on the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) by the EU Council Presidency of 18 June and 11 December 2007,
- having regard to the joint meeting of EU Defence and Development Ministers on 19-20 November 2007,
- having regard to the Conclusions on Security and Development and the Conclusions on ESDP of the EU Council meeting on 19-20 November 2007,
- having regard to the Madrid Report issued by the Human Security Study Group on 8 November 2007,
- having regard to its resolution of 14 April 2005 on the ESS<sup>1</sup>,
- having regard to its resolution of 16 November 2006 on the implementation of the ESS in the context of the ESDP<sup>2</sup>,
- having regard to its resolution of 27 September 2007 on the ESDP operation in Chad and the Central African Republic (CAR)<sup>3</sup>,
- having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,
- having regard to the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (A6-0000/2008),

#### *General considerations*

- A. whereas in 2007 and early 2008 the Council has taken important operational decisions in the field of ESDP and on the implementation of the ESS, including:
- a. the launching of an ESDP police mission in Afghanistan (EUPOL Afghanistan);
  - b. the decision to launch an ESDP military operation in Chad/CAR;

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 33 E, 9.2.2006, p. 580.

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 314 E, 21.12.2006, p. 334.

<sup>3</sup> Texts adopted, P6\_TA(2007)0419.

- c. the reconfiguration and reduction of EUFOR Althea troops in Bosnia;
  - d. the preparation for a civilian ESDP mission in Kosovo;
  - e. the preparation for a security sector reform mission in Guinea-Bissau,
- B. whereas in 2007 and early 2008 further developments in the field of ESDP capabilities and the implementation of the ESS were achieved, including:
- a. the adoption of a new Civilian Headline Goal 2010;
  - b. the establishment of a Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC) within the Council secretariat;
  - c. the reaching of operational capability by the EU Operations Centre;
  - d. the reaching of full operational capability to undertake rapidly and simultaneously two ESDP military operations using the Battle Groups,
- C. whereas 2007 and early 2008 have also witnessed continued shortfalls in the fields of ESDP and the implementation of the ESS, including:
- a. the lack of an EU Civil Peace Corps, requested by the European Parliament since 2000, and of civil protection and humanitarian relief capabilities, referred to in a number of Commission and Council documents since the 2004 tsunami catastrophe;
  - b. delivery delays and rising costs concerning the much needed long-range airlift capacity in the form of the Airbus A400M military transport aircraft;
  - c. an imbalance in the contributions from Member States, especially as regards the staffing of civilian ESDP missions, thus limiting EU crisis management capabilities;
  - d. problems in recruiting sufficient police officers for the mission in Afghanistan due to security concerns and a lack of individual career prospects on their return;
  - e. delays in the launching of the ESDP Mission in Chad/CAR due to unsuccessful force generation conferences, in particular as regards the lack of helicopters;
  - f. the failure as yet to sign the technical agreements drafted between EU and NATO with a view to ensuring coordination in Kosovo between KFOR and the possible future ESDP mission, and in Afghanistan between EUPOL and ISAF, due to opposition by Turkey,
- D. whereas the Treaty of Lisbon will introduce major innovations in the field of ESDP,
- 1. Reaffirms the conclusions of Parliament's previous resolutions concerning the ESS and ESDP, and thus sees no need to repeat any of them in this resolution;

### ***The Lisbon Treaty***

2. Welcomes the signature of the Lisbon Treaty, which will introduce major innovations in the field of ESDP, in particular by strengthening the office of High Representative, establishing a European External Action Service, introducing an article on mutual defence assistance, a solidarity clause and permanent structured cooperation in the field of defence; urges all Member States to ratify the Lisbon Treaty as quickly as possible; is of the opinion that the European Parliament and national parliaments should jointly debate these innovations; points out that Parliament will uphold its responsibilities under the current Treaty and will closely monitor the implementation of any new innovations;
3. Asks the Member States concerned to bring under permanent structured cooperation, as envisaged in the Lisbon Treaty, existing multinational forces such as Eurocorps, Eurofor, Euromarfor, the European Gendarmerie Force, the Spanish-Italian amphibious force, the European Air Group, the European Air Coordination cell in Eindhoven, the Athens Multinational Sealift Coordination Centre (AMSCC) and all relevant forces and structures for ESDP operations;

### ***Assessing and complementing the ESS***

4. Invites the High Representative to assess in a White Paper the progress made, and any shortcomings, in the implementation of the ESS since 2003, including lessons learned from ESDP operations; the link between external and internal aspects of security (the fight against terrorism); the protection of borders and critical infrastructure including protection against cyber-attacks; the security of energy supply as a challenge facing civilian, economic, technical and diplomatic efforts; unsolved regional disputes in the EU's neighbourhood, e.g. in Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Nagorno-Karabakh; humanitarian and security challenges on the African continent; and the consequences of climate change and natural disasters for civil protection and human security;
5. Invites the High Representative to include in that White Paper proposals for improving and complementing the ESS, such as the definition of common European security interests and criteria for the launching of ESDP missions; invites him further to define new targets for civilian and military capabilities (including structures for command and control, and transportation for all European actors in crisis management for both ESDP and disaster relief purposes) and to reflect on the implications of the Lisbon Treaty with regard to ESDP and proposals for a new EU-NATO partnership;
6. Is of the opinion that such a White Paper should be the basis for a wider public political debate; underlines that a future assessment of the ESS should be made in close consultation with all EU institutions including the European Parliament and national parliaments;

### ***Civilian crisis management and civil protection***

7. Welcomes the new Civilian Headline Goal 2010 launched on 1 January 2008, which

takes account of lessons learned from previous civilian ESDP missions;

8. Welcomes the establishment within the Council secretariat of the CPCC, which will serve as the civilian equivalent of an EU Operational Headquarters and will provide assistance and support in the planning and implementation of civilian ESPD missions, thereby preventing EU civilian missions from being under a military chain of command; calls for such a balance to be reflected in the role and administrative structure of the Civil-Military Cell;
9. Requests the Council, against the background of unsatisfactory planning and deployment of EUPOL Afghanistan, to carry out an immediate review of the decision-making, financing and deployment aspects of civilian ESDP missions and to put forward concrete proposals designed to avoid any repetition of this situation in the future;
10. Acknowledges Member States' efforts to make personnel available for civilian ESDP missions in the areas of civil protection, monitoring, EUSR support and mission support; notes, however, continued shortfalls in the areas of police, the rule of law and civilian administration;
11. Urges the Member States to regularly review the availability of personnel for civilian ESDP missions and to bring their competent national authorities together in order to set up national action plans with regard to possible contributions, as is the case in Finland, including the creation of procedures to secure the career prospects of participants in such missions;
12. Notes the lack of use of the valuable Civilian Response Team (CRT) instrument and regrets that the CRT experts have been deployed almost exclusively on an individual basis rather than, as envisaged,, in the team format for which they were trained;
13. Welcomes the revision of the Council's Decision establishing a Community Civil Protection Mechanism and the new civil protection Financial Instrument, which is designed to improve the mobilisation and coordination of civil protection assistance in the event of major emergencies inside or outside the EU;

#### ***Human security and the security dimension of development policy***

14. Is of the view that human security is a core principle at the heart of the ESS, which – when combined with the principle of "responsibility to protect" – provides the EU with a strong political guideline when it comes to deciding whether an intervention should take place, and with a robust political mandate enabling it to intervene effectively in crises;
15. Reminds the Council of its responsibility under international law to ensure that all civilian and military personnel are fully trained in accordance with international humanitarian standards and that adequate guidelines are reviewed and developed to ensure respect for local populations, cultures and gender;

16. Recalls the importance of human rights and gender mainstreaming, and calls for the nomination of more female candidates for CFSP/ESDP senior management positions, including for EU Special Representatives as well as for ESDP operations in general;
17. Calls on the Member States to continue working towards the goal of an international ban on cluster munitions, and to further develop ways to detect and destroy unexploded ordnance;
18. Is of the opinion that disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration should be an integral part of ESDP operations, and calls on the Council whenever appropriate to include in the mandate of ESDP operations the destruction or safe storage of decommissioned arms and to avoid their illegal transfer as a lesson learnt from the NATO SFOR/EUFOR Althea experience in Bosnia;
19. Welcomes the first ever EU joint meeting of Defence and Development Ministers on 19 November 2007, which was an important step in reviewing the problems faced by the developing world, thus enhancing coherence and consistency in the EU's short-term actions on security and long-term actions on development vis-à-vis the countries concerned;

#### ***Iranian nuclear programme***

20. Notes the revelations of the U.S. intelligence services about the Iranian military and civilian nuclear programmes; regards these findings as a confirmation of the two-track approach, strongly advocated by the EU, designed to persuade Iran diplomatically to comply fully with the IAEA and abandon the potential military use of the civilian programme in a credible and controllable way; concludes that the lack of cooperation with the IAEA in the past justifies suspicion about Iran's potential to build nuclear weapons within the space of a few years; is of the view that the combination of incentives and UN sanctions in the case of non-compliance are the only way forward, thus excluding any military option;
21. In the light of the diplomatic success in the negotiations with North Korea, calls on the U.S. to join the EU-3 in direct negotiations with Iran, since the U.S. is in a position to offer additional incentives such as security guarantees;

#### ***Transport, communication and intelligence***

22. Deplores the delay in delivery and rising costs of the A400M aircraft for long-range transport and the lack of available and operational helicopters for short-range transport;
23. Endorses the work of the European Defence Agency (EDA) on strategic transport, and encourages Member States to do more to make up for the shortfalls; welcomes interim measures such as SALIS (Strategic Air Lift Interim Solutions) and regrets that no operational concept for pooling has yet been developed;
24. Welcomes the Franco-German heavy transport helicopter project, but is also aware of the complex reasons for the shortage of available and operational helicopters, mostly

related to the high costs of flight hours and maintenance; therefore urges the Member States to envisage an increase in defence expenditure for the purpose of being able to make efficient use of acquired helicopters;

25. Calls on the Council and the Commission to keep Parliament informed of current initiatives to address capability gaps in key areas such as helicopters and medical support units, and to put forward joint financial proposals for guaranteed access to such capabilities for both humanitarian and ESDP purposes;
26. Welcomes the EDA project on software-defined radio, which has the potential to improve communication between civil and military authorities in the event of an emergency;
27. Encourages Member States to increase their exchange of intelligence through the EU Joint Situation Centre concerning new threats not covered in the ESS, such as the security of energy supply and the security consequences of climate change;

### ***Military capabilities***

28. Is of the opinion that the Battle Groups are an instrument which is helping the Member States to transform their armed forces, to strengthen interoperability and to establish a common strategic culture on defence; notes that the Battle Groups have so far not been used, due *inter alia* to narrowly defined terms of deployment, and deplores the fact that the present Battle Group concept has therefore not solved the force generation problem for concrete operations;
29. Calls on the Council to examine options to improve force generation, for example through the further development of the Battle Group concept, leading to a larger permanent joint EU Task Force, or through a more extensive catalogue of available capabilities within the framework of the Headline Goal, so as to be in a position to swiftly generate a force adequate to a mission's circumstances;
30. Calls for the creation within the EU Operations Centre of a permanent planning and operational capability to conduct ESDP military operations;
31. Proposes to place Eurocorps as a standing force under EU command and invites all Member States to contribute to it;
32. Calls for continued improvement in interoperability between EU national armed forces; deplores the existing heterogeneity in training and equipment among various armed forces of the Member States and calls for a military 'Erasmus' programme that would include common training for military personnel that could be deployed in ESDP operations;
33. Regrets that the establishment of the EDA came too late to prevent the emergence of three different national programmes on the unmanned air vehicle instead of a single European one, thus enabling some companies to engage in more than one project and thereby to pocket taxpayers' money several times over, leaving the EDA with no option

but to work on the insertion of unmanned aerial vehicles into the regulated airspace; expresses its preference for single European satellite projects, whether in the fields of intelligence or communication;

34. Welcomes the Commission's defence package, in particular its proposals for a directive in the field of defence procurement and for a directive in the field of intra-Community defence equipment transfers; is of the opinion that these are necessary steps in order to provide national and EU military personnel with the best possible interoperable equipment;
35. Welcomes the conclusions of the EDA steering board of 14 May 2007, especially those calling for a reduction of dependence on non-European sources for key defence technologies and underlining the need for the EU to enjoy autonomy and operational sovereignty;

### ***Financing the ESDP – missions***

36. Points out that the growing role of the EU, in particular through ESDP civilian missions, is creating a demand for an ever-increasing CFSP budget, and hence demands a greater and more timely flow of information from the Council, so as to enable Parliament to prepare its decisions on the annual budget;
37. Invites the Council and the Commission to develop proposals enabling flexible procurement procedures appropriate for ESDP civilian missions – which very often require rapid decisions – to be examined and agreed upon by Parliament, the Council and the Commission;
38. Calls on the Council to initiate a dialogue with Parliament on the possibility of transferring the Athena mechanism to the CFSP budget while retaining the flexibility provided by Athena;
39. Calls for a mid-term review under the Financial Perspective 2007-2013 regarding the coherence and complementarities of the use of EU external instruments (the CFSP budget, the Instrument for Stability, the Development Cooperation Instrument and the European Neighbourhood Policy Instrument) across the range of EU crisis-management (military and civilian) actions;

### ***The ESDP and parliamentary scrutiny***

40. Points out that the European Parliament, through its contacts with the national parliaments (Conference of Foreign Affairs Committee Chairs, Conference of Defence Committee Chairs, NATO Parliamentary Assembly) and through the future implementation of the Protocol to the Lisbon Treaty on the role of national parliaments, is the legitimate body at European level in which scrutiny, monitoring and control of ESDP should take place in the first instance;
41. Stresses that Parliament should continue to adopt a recommendation or resolution prior to the launch of any ESDP operation (including the launch of a Battle Group), in close

consultation with national parliaments, in order to impart democratic legitimacy to the operation in question; is of the opinion that, in order to ensure flexibility when Parliament is not in plenary session, its Rules should be adapted with a view to authorising its responsible committee to adopt that recommendation or resolution on its behalf;

42. Asks the Council to include a reference to the recommendation or resolution adopted by Parliament in the Joint Action authorising an ESDP operation, thus demonstrating that the Council is seeking additional democratic legitimacy for its external actions;

***EU-NATO relations***

43. Deplores the fact that the technical agreements already drafted between ISAF and EUPOL Afghanistan as well as between KFOR and the EU (with a view to the future ESDP Kosovo mission) have not yet been signed, putting at risk the security of personnel and threatening the success of those missions; urges Turkey to desist from blocking such signature for reasons unrelated to the two missions;

o

o o

44. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the parliaments of the Member States, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and the Secretaries-General of the United Nations, NATO, the African Union, the OSCE, the OECD and the Council of Europe.

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

On 14 December 2007, the European Council invited the EU High Representative on CFSP, in full association with the European Commission and in close cooperation with the EU member states, to examine the implementation of the European Security Strategy (ESS) with a view to proposing elements on how to improve the implementation and, as appropriate, elements to complement it, for adoption by the European Council in December 2008.

Your Rapporteur concurs on the importance of this task and puts forward the idea of launching an EU White Paper which would assess the progress made and the shortcomings concerning the implementation of the ESS, including proposals to improve and complement the ESS, such as taking stock of the lessons learnt from ESDP operations, making the link between external and internal aspects of security (fight against terrorism), the protection of borders and critical infrastructure, the security of energy supply, the consequences of climate change and natural disasters for civil protection and the concept of Human Security. The White Paper should include as well the definition of common European security interests and criteria for the launching of ESDP missions, the set up of new targets for civilian and military capabilities, including control and command structures, the implications of the reform treaty on ESDP and proposals for a new EU-NATO partnership.

### *The Lisbon treaty*

The Lisbon Treaty signed on 13 December 2007 brings major innovations in the field of ESDP, in particular through strengthening the High Representative, introducing an article on mutual defence assistance and a solidarity clause and the possibility to establish permanent structured cooperation. Without interfering with the national ratification processes, the European Parliament has the endeavour to closely monitor the implementation of these innovations and should jointly debate them with EU national parliaments.

European multinational forces that already exist, such as Eurocorps, Eurofor, Euromarfor, the European Gendarmerie Force, the Spanish-Italian amphibious force, the European Air Group, the European Air Coordination cell in Eindhoven, the Athens Multinational Sealift Coordination Centre and all the forces and structures that can be used for ESDP operations could be brought under the EU umbrella through the permanent structured cooperation envisaged in the Lisbon Treaty.

### *Civilian crisis management and civil protection*

On 1 January 2008, the new Civilian Headline Goal (CHG 2010) was launched in view to take account of lessons learned from the launched ESDP civilian missions and as a tool to improve on qualitative terms the national staff and means put at the disposal of ESDP civilian missions.

The establishment of a Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC) within the Council secretariat will serve as the civilian equivalent to an EU Operations Headquarters and will be essential to provide assistance and support in the planning and implementation of civilian

ESDP missions.

Indeed, there has been a shift in the EU from an integrated civ-mil approach to crisis management that would result in joint civ-mil operations towards a compatible but separate line of decision-making and accountability for ESDP military operations and civilian missions. Your Rapporteur agrees with this new approach as it avoids fears that EU civilian missions would be under the military chain of command and maintains a balanced civil-military approach to EU Crisis Management.

Following the example set by Finland, member states should bring their competent national authorities together in order to set up national action plans with regard to possible contributions to civilian ESDP missions, including the creation of procedures to secure career perspectives of participants in such missions.

On civil protection, the revision of Council Decision establishing a Community civil protection mechanism and the new civil protection Financial Instrument, will improve mobilisation and coordination of civil protection assistance in the event of major emergencies inside or outside the EU. Nevertheless, your Rapporteur calls for an increased attention and dedication from the Commission and Council to this area in the edges of civil protection, humanitarian relief, security policy and environment.

### ***Human Security and the security dimension of development policy***

On 19 November 2007, the first ever EU joint meeting of Defence and Development Ministers took place, which was an important step in tackling the problems faced by the developing world, and enhancing coherence and consistency in the EU short-term actions on security and EU long-term actions on development towards the countries concerned.

The Human Security concept is a core principle at the heart of the ESS, which - when combined with the principle of "responsibility to protect" - provides the EU with a strong political guideline to decide whether an intervention should take place, and with a robust political mandate to intervene effectively in crises.

The Council is responsible under international law to ensure all civilian and military personnel are fully trained in accordance with international humanitarian standards and that adequate guidelines are reviewed and developed to ensure respect for local populations, cultures and gender. More female candidates should be nominated for all levels of CFSP/ESDP positions, including ESDP missions.

Disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration should be an integral part of ESDP operations. Whenever possible, the destruction or safe storage of arms decommissioned should be included in the mandate of ESDP operations in view of avoiding their illegal transfer as a lesson learnt from NATO SFOR/EUFOR Althea in Bosnia.

### ***Transport, communication and intelligence***

The delay in delivery of the A400M for long range humanitarian and military transport and the lack of available and operational helicopters for short range transport is a serious

hindrance to the success of ESDP operations and humanitarian actions. Initiatives such as SALIS (Strategic Air Lift Interim Solutions) and the work of the European Defence Agency (EDA) on strategic transport shall be encouraged.

The Franco-German heavy transport helicopter project, if extended to other interested European nations, could be valuable for the EU as well. Your Rapporteur is aware of the complex reasons for the shortage of available and operational helicopters, mostly related to the high costs of flight hours and maintenance. Consequently, your Rapporteur is of the view that member states could envisage an increase in defence expenditure for the purpose of being able to make efficient use of acquired helicopters.

On communications, the EDA project on software defined radio, will potentially improve communication between civil as well as military authorities in the case of an emergency.

On intelligence, Member States could increase their exchange of intelligence through the EU joint Situation Centre in particular on new threats not covered in the ESS, such as the security of energy supply and the security consequences of climate change.

### ***Military capabilities***

The Battle Groups are an instrument which is helping the member states to transform their armed forces, to strengthen interoperability and to start establishing a common strategic culture on defence. However, the Battle Groups have been never used for an ESDP operation. At the same time, ESDP operations are preceded by complex force generation process which often creates delays in the deployment of force. Therefore, the Council should examine possibilities to avoid inefficient and conflictive force generation processes.

The existing heterogeneity in training, equipment among various armed forces of the EU Member States is an additional handicap and efforts should be devoted for an increasing harmonisation at EU level to the benefit of ESDP. A military 'Erasmus' programme that would include common training for military personnel which could be deployed in ESDP operations would be a positive step forward.

On military structures, a permanent EU planning and operational capability should be created within the EU Operation Centre to conduct ESDP military operations in order to improve effectiveness.

### ***Financing ESDP - Missions***

ESDP operations may demand quick decisions by the EU. For ESDP civilian missions, financed under EU CFSP budget, the Council and the Commission could make to the European Parliament proposals for flexible procurement procedures appropriate for ESDP missions, which could combine flexibility and parliamentary scrutiny. In addition, the Council could initiate a dialogue with the European Parliament on the possibility to transfer the Athena mechanism to the CFSP budget while retaining the flexibility provided by Athena.

### ***ESDP and parliamentary scrutiny***

Scrutiny of the European Parliament over ESDP operations is important and should be in addition, and not in detriment, to the scrutiny exercised by EU national parliaments.

The European Parliament shall continue to adopt a recommendation or resolution before the launching of an ESDP operation (including the launch of a Battle Group) in close consultation with national parliaments, in view of providing democratic legitimacy to the operation.

In order to be flexible and when it is not in session, its Rules could be adapted in order to authorise its responsible committee to adopt on its behalf that recommendation or resolution. The Council could then make a reference to the recommendation or resolution adopted by the European Parliament in the Joint Action authorising an ESDP operation, thus demonstrating that the Council is seeking additional democratic legitimacy for its external actions.