

Crisis Management and Planning

Walter Stevens

Head of Crisis Management and Planning Department of European External Action Service (EEAS)

Resumo

Gestão e Planeamento de Crises

O autor analisa o processo de gestão de crises e planeamento da União Europeia em termos daquilo que foi e deverá ser ainda feito. O treino é sublinhado como um ponto-chave para o desenvolvimento das capacidades civis e não só. A União Europeia, como um todo, tem de fazer muito mais para aperfeiçoar o seu papel como actor global.

Abstract

The author analyses the crisis management and planning process of the European Union in terms of what was done and what should be done. Training is underlined as a key-point for the development of civilian capability as well as others. The European Union, as a whole, still has much work to do to improve its role as a global actor.

Let me first of all, thank you for organising this Course on “Civil Crises Management”, and more particularly this 3rd Module on the essential topic of “Planning a Crisis Management Operation”, which is organised very timely because it is our important issue in Brussels/EU. It is a pleasure to be here and I want to thank you for your warm welcome.

All too often we talk ourselves down in Europe. You all know the refrain of Europe being too divided, too slow and too soft. And yes, there is still much work to do and in many areas we under-perform compared to our potential. But looking back – which is often useful working on things for the future – looking back where we come from, there might be some room and reason for at least a bit of optimism, and encouragement, of some confidence and impetus to double our efforts and move forward, in the spirit of the founding fathers of the EU, the Lisbon Treaty and the creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS).

Indeed, since 2003 – a year to remember because it was the year of the adoption of the European Security Strategy and the year of the launch of the first ESDP mission (EUPM in Bosnia and Herzegovina) – since 2003 the EU has launched a total of 24 civilian missions and/or military operations worldwide in the framework of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).

Some of the progress has been spectacular and is all the more impressive knowing that security and defence matters are, with Foreign Affairs, the areas which national sovereign states are, understandably and historically, the most keen in keeping for themselves and the most reluctant to share with others. That is why in the CSDP all decisions have to be taken by unanimity and by unanimity only. In that sense, CSDP is the operational translation of the political will of 27 Member States with quite a different political tradition and, quite often, a very different view on security and CSDP. And despite the unanimity rule, despite the sensitivity of the matters, despite the differences in tradition and views, we have made tremendous progress. We have managed to find common ground and mount operations together.

Currently, the EU has three military operations and eight civilian CSDP missions deployed in nine different theatres of operation supporting core national capacity to lead the peace-building efforts.

Our CSDP missions, whether patrolling sea lanes, protecting refugees, policing post-conflict societies or monitoring ceasefires, bring together classic peacekeeping with state-building and stabilisation. The EU is promoting peace, fostering stability, building state capacity and protecting the vulnerable in the Balkans, Africa, Asia, the Middle East and in many other places. More than 80,000 people – soldiers, policemen, judges, custom officials, monitors, rule of law experts – have been deployed in a variety of theaters.

These missions are important. They save lives, foster stability, build peace and help rebuild fragile states, in post-conflict situations. But they are also an expression of Europe's ambition, identity, promoting a common European security culture based on our values and believes. We do crisis management the European way: the CSDP context is a unique one combining civilians and military, politics and operational dimensions and demanding many different skills, with an increasingly comprehensive approach, in close co-operation with our partners such as the UN, NATO, the African Union, the OSCE, the Arab League, but also third countries, such as the US, Norway, Turkey and others. So the CSDP has translated into a growing role for the EU as a global actor.

But in order to address the challenges of the 21st century, we can and should improve things. Much remains to be done, especially also because demand for our engagement is growing, our ambitions are high, we need to be more efficient and quick in our response and our presence on actions on the ground have not always been translated into the desired results and real genuine long term influence. And it is exactly to be able to respond more effectively to this challenge that the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty should be seen.

The Treaty is to contribute to further enhance efficiency and coherence of the EU's external action and security policy. It is all about developing a more comprehensive, integrated approach and making the EU a more effective as a world player. Such a comprehensive approach to security implies that we look beyond mere crisis management, and bring together different instruments diplomacy, development and Security and defense into a single, sustainable political strategy.

It is in that framework that I would now like to turn to the crisis management and the planning and conduct structures and mechanisms, as they exist and can be improved.

In fact EU planning and conduct structures have been developing over the past years. The EUMS was the first to be set up, back in 2001. But the first missions and operations were planned and conducted from a very embryonic structure, which grew like a small and medium enterprise into a somewhat bigger company with all the challenges and problems that that entails. It is only in 2007, four years after the launch of the first EU mission, that the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC) was created, followed in 2009 by the Crisis Management and Planning Department (CMPD) after the European Council, in its 2008 conclusions, encouraged the efforts by the then Secretary-General/High representative Javier Solana, to establishment of a new, single civilian-military strategic planning structure for CSDP operations and missions.

The idea behind the CMPD creation was to further rationalise and reinforce our structures of planning and to ensure a better synergy between military and civil means. This department, the CMPD, would be charged with the forward looking,

advance political-strategic planning and bring civilian and military planners together. The CMPD is also to make sure that coherence and efficiency should prevail in each of the stages of the crisis management process, from the conception of an operation or mission till its deployment in the field.

It very much reflects what the CMPD is doing or should be doing today in the field of planning and that is integrated, early advance, political-strategic planning for CSDP missions/operations. It engages in advance thinking and early political-strategic planning of possible CSDP responses to crises, incorporating both the civilian and the military aspects, in order to develop proposals of possible strategic options for consideration by the High Representative and Member States in the Political and Security Committee (PSC) and, under their guidance, develop crisis management concepts as the basis for further planning and conduct of CSDP missions and operations. That means that it looks further ahead in its planning, from a wider, political-strategic angle, at possible scenario's, developments and, on that basis, possible options for EU action. In doing that it takes into account, it integrates civilian and military elements. It is the only integrated structure with military and civilian planners.

The CMPD is also to ensure coherence with the agreed political strategic objectives at all planning stages as well as coherence and effectiveness of EU action. In this regard, it supports Political and Security Committee in exercising its responsibilities in terms of strategic direction and political control, to ensure that policy guidance is incorporated into subsequent planning products.

This being said, and despite undeniable deliverables, there is work to do. Created just prior to the start of the European External Action Service (EEAS) and caught up in structural changes, the CMPD has not been able to live up to its full potential. For that reason it has to focus on its mission – integrated advance, political-strategic planning – better team up with the other parts of the CSDP structures and better link up again with the other relevant departments in the EEAS.

Also, the start of the EEAS offers new opportunities in order to improve our approach and make it more comprehensive and effective, with better results in the field, which should be our ultimate objective. We should build on lessons learnt on how to improve our ability to plan and conduct operations and missions, based on existing structures. And there is much work to do, from the moment we develop options for crisis management up until the actual conduct of the operation. These are areas where such improvement should be pursued.

- Better linking CSDP Crisis management actions with other EU instruments, as part of a comprehensive approach.

Crisis management activities are not taking place in a vacuum. Missions and operations should be instruments to serve a more global policy and a common political objective. It implies that we need to further develop the links between CSDP crisis management structures (CMPD, CPCC, EUMS) on the one hand and EEAS' geographical desks, the European Commission and others, on the other hand through reinforced coordination processes or crisis management platforms, as we have tried to put into practice with regard to the Libyan crisis and the crisis in Ivory Coast.

Also in our approach to piracy and the situation in Somalia and of the Somali coast, my department works together with the Africa desk and representatives from the Commission to try to further develop a strategic plan. I very much believe in such "triangular" cooperation - EEAS' geographical desk, CMPD and Commission, the three "DDSD" - Diplomacy, Development and Security/Defence - in planning and developing strategic options. Even if it remains a challenge to engage all parties in such a joint effort, such a holistic approach, which will also have to be put in place for the implementation of the options and the lessons learned and evaluation of the impact.

- Better articulation and cooperation among the CSDP crisis management structure is also needed

The CMPD, CPCC and EUMS should stand as one, with a clear division of labour.

We need to better work together and get more added value from the expertise that is already present in these crisis management structures. For that reason, the Director General of the EU Military Staff, the new Director of the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC) and I have agreed to meet weekly to work this out and set the sails in the same direction in order to increase efficiency. That could mean that we at CMPD, involve EUMS and CPCC closely from the early stages of our advance political-strategic planning as they have a most valuable input so that the CPCC and EUMS can support us in our strategic planning and we can support them in the operational planning of missions and operations.

We, at CMPD, should also be quicker in the field and closer on the ball for early planning when crises emerge and need a response, with Fact Finding missions, thought - amongst others rapid deployment teams. This is what we are doing now in Libya and Ivory Coast. And we should also better link up with partners at an early political-strategic planning stage with a view to better coordination and cooperation at later stages.

- There is finally the question of (operational) planning and conduct capability especially for military operations.

Here the question is not whether or not we need these capability. There is clearly a difficulty when we switch from the crisis management concept, elaborated by the CMPD, to the more operational planning of Concept of Operations (CONOPS) and O-plan made by the CPCC and military OHQ - an early lesson learned from the Libyan crisis. There is no optimal reaction to a crisis - to say the least - due to the delay related to setting up the military OHQ - we need a Council decision and then can only start with the OHQ.

It also limits the possibility to build corporate knowledge in the Operation Head Quarter as the relationship between the OHQ and the Brussels based structures have to re-established for each operation, in the absence of a permanent access to appropriate planning expertise.

The simplest way to overcome this difficulty would be probably to establish a permanent military planning capability, encompassing required expertise and collocated with the Crisis management structures to enable better coordination. This solution will, of course, have resource implications, which need to be carefully assessed, especially in time of budget constrains and value for money. But perhaps some answers could also be found in better "pooling and sharing", in better using the capacities that we have, building on existing structures and improving mechanisms. Analysis should be based on Lessons learned from previous operation/missions.

Now on Civil Crises Management, let me highlight a few points.

Civilian Crisis Management takes often place in the post-conflict period, which is often characterized by a critical shortage of capacity needed to secure a sustainable peace environment. In this period the prompt identification and the timely deployment of civilian expertise is of key importance. The deployment of international civilian expertise is one of the areas where the EU is a bit of a pioneer and is already strongly involved, both through its civilian CSDP missions and as well as through Development co-operation with an increasing focus on "Governance" and "State-building" as central features of assistance in fragile situations.

As you know, in civilian crisis management, the development of capabilities has been driven by two Headline Goals, that of 2008 and 2010. But mobilising capabilities is and remains a serious challenge. They are hard to find. That is why the EU not only conducts strategic needs-assessment for civilian crisis management, but actually also fosters the creation of strategies and tools in Member States and at EU level to facilitate recruitment and training of civilian personnel for CSDP missions with regular exchange of information between Member States for example on best practices and problems encountered with these issues.

In this regard, I should particularly like to underline *the importance of training for the development of civilian and other capabilities*. The training we carry out today

shapes our capabilities for peacekeeping for tomorrow. Personnel deployed on CSDP missions must not only be experienced professionals in their chosen area of expertise, but must also receive training on the core aspects of CSDP crisis management including understanding the political objectives of CSDP and the role of our missions as well as understanding the principles underlying all peacekeeping, such as human rights and gender mainstreaming.

Pre-deployment training is a responsibility of member states. The work which national academies and institutions, such as the Portugal National Defence Institute, carry out in training is of primary importance in developing the high quality of personnel needed for our missions, and in fostering a broader community of experts in crisis management generally.

Also the European Security and Defence College, with the aim of providing strategic-level education in the Common Security and Defence Policy, actively promotes a European security culture.

We are working also on *synergies between civilian and military capabilities* in areas such as strategic and tactical transportation, logistic support, communications and information systems, medical support, security and force protection, use of space capabilities, unmanned vehicles, warehousing and centralised support systems, sharing information and intelligence, training, exercises and lessons learned.

Also, in crisis management time is of the essence. That is why we are dedicating also much effort to *improving the EU's capability for civilian rapid deployment*. This includes a review of the current parameters for such deployment to take account the changing international strategic context. This should, among other things, lead to further development of rapidly deployable capabilities such as Civilian Response Teams - small teams of civilian experts deployable within five days - and our newly constituted pool of civilian and military experts in Security Sector Reform.

Finally, let me point out that we are currently also exploring *possibilities to strengthen the ties between different EU policy areas, notably between CSDP and the area of Freedom, Security and Justice*, with a view to developing a better interface between external and internal security. As a first step, we need to consult and engage more effectively with internal security actors to achieve improvements on issues such as exchange of information and mutual support, the decision-making and planning process, and the raising of civilian capabilities for CSDP in the areas of Police, the Judiciary and the Prison Systems. I am happy to say that a first meeting of the Political and Security Committee (PSC) and the COSI (Comité de Sécurité Intérieure in French - Standing Committee on operational cooperation on internal security) will take place on Wednesday to launch work in this important domain.

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the EU has made important and substantial progress over the past years. Perhaps because we have realised that there is a need for what we are trying to build together; perhaps because we came to learn that together we can do so much more to improve our security and our stance in a world that is becoming more and more complex, more and more uncertain, more and more insecure.

But much more work needs to be done in order to make the EU a more capable, more coherent, more active and more strategic global player, able to fully take up the role it sees for itself and that others increasingly demand it to play. That is the challenge. Your ideas and future work in that regard, also through this course, would be very much welcome and valued.

I am honoured to have been invited to contribute to this course today.

And I would like to thank you for your attention.