Defence and Security Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Defence and Security Co-Operation*

REPORT

NATO and the European Security and Defence Policy

International Secretariat, October 2001

1. European defence today stands at a crossroads. As NATO continues to redefine its roles and missions in the post Cold War era, it has become clear that the Alliance is most likely to become involved in operations outside the territory of its member states, operations that do not arise from the Article 5 guarantee of collective defence. As a result, the NATO allies, as early as 1994, created arrangements for using alliance capabilities in operations that do not involve all of the allies. At the same time, the European Union, since late 1998 has proceeded to create its own European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), which would give the EU the ability to take military action when NATO as a whole is not engaged.

* Versão on line
http://www.nato-pa.int/publications/comrep/2001/au-200-e.html
"Acedido em 15-05-2002"

2. But the steps taken by the EU have not been without controversy. Some strong proponents of greater EU integration have characterised ESDP as a process that will free Europe from its dependence on the United States for its security or as a step that will help bring about a closer union among the 15 EU member states, four of which are not members of NATO. Some friends of NATO, in turn, have reacted to ESDP as a threat to Alliance unity, a Trojan horse that will undermine the transatlantic link that has helped protect the European democracies for a half-century and facilitated the reconciliation that permitted development of the EU. While both North Americans and Europeans welcome any effort by the Europeans to shoulder a greater share of their defence burden, there is some concern that most of the effort in ESDP has been on building new institutions to rival NATO, while few resources have been put toward developing the capabilities that would enable the Europeans to undertake missions on their own. Those who disagree with this assertion point to the EU's commitment to meeting the capabilities needed for the Headline Goal.

3. The EU's Helsinki summit in December 1999 marked an important step forward for ESDP. The EU agreed to a Headline Goal to create by 2003 a corps-strength rapid reaction force deployable within 60 days and sustainable for at least one year, with appropriate air and naval elements. For the EU governments, this would enable them to implement the ambitions of the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty and the May 1999 Cologne Summit by providing the EU with the capabilities for a common EU policy on security and defence.

4. The May 2000 EU summit in Feira set out the permanent institutional structures that are to govern ESDP, which are discussed as part of Chapter VI:
   - Ultimate responsibility will rest with the EU General Affairs Council, which normally consists of the foreign ministers of the 15 EU countries. This is similar to the North Atlantic Council (NAC) when it consists of foreign ministers during its semi-annual ministerial-level meetings. This structure means that ESDP is an intergovernmental process; that is, it will operate based on consensus of the 15 member governments, rather than the communitarian method of interplay between the Council, European Commission and European Parliament.
   - The Political and Security Committee (known by its French acronym, COPS), will have specific responsibility for ESDP. It consists of permanent representatives holding ambassadorial rank, similar to the permanent representatives to the

NAC but of lower seniority, and it is chaired by the ambassador representing the country that holds the EU's rotating presidency.

- An EU Military Committee, comprised of flag officers, advises the EU on military matters. It is similar to the Military Committee at NATO, and most countries have designated their representative to the NATO Military Committee to sit on its EU equivalent.
- An EU Military Staff informs and prepares the deliberations of the Military Committee and the COPS on defence issues, similar to the role played by the International Military Staff (IMS) at NATO.
- The High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), Javier Solana, will play an essential role in the future EU defence organisation and serves as chairman of the COPS, especially during a crisis. Already, Mr Solana has organised a Policy Unit, consisting of civilian experts who report to him and advise him on defence issues, and containing a Situation Centre, which reports both to Mr Solana and the Military Staff.
- The creation of these institutions is meant to develop the relevant competencies for ESDP, and not to duplicate an institutional structure that already exists within NATO. These nascent institutions will allow the EU and NATO to maximise their co-operative working relationship.

5. At a November 2000 Capabilities Commitment Conference, EU members pledged the forces needed to fulfil the Headline Goal, but some shortcomings still exist and are discussed in greater detail in Chapter III. At the December 2000 Nice Summit, France, which held the EU presidency, issued a report setting out the goals and decision-making procedures for the ESDP. The French proposal gives the EU autonomy in taking decisions on possible future security missions, which will be limited to the Petersberg tasks, which include humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks, and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace enforcement.

6. The Nice Summit conclusions reveal that the EU's Rapid Reaction Force would depend on NATO for its planning capabilities, which are discussed further in Chapter V. The EU Military Staff would have no planning capabilities of its own, and NATO would be the preferred option to engage in a mission. Although this outcome addresses many fears that ESDP would develop apart from NATO, there

are still unresolved issues regarding the role of the non-EU European allies (Czech Republic, Hungary, Iceland, Norway, Poland and Turkey) in the process, which are discussed at greater length in Chapter IV.

7. Additionally, there are several other questions surrounding ESDP that will be addressed in this report. While much talk has centred around the mechanisms of ESDP, not enough thought has gone into describing what ESDP is supposed to do, and Chapter II will examine the basic question of "what for?" At the same time, while there has been much work done on the intergovernmental side of ESDP, there has been little talk of mechanisms for exercising legislative oversight of the process. Chapter VII will review some of the proposals for parliamentary oversight.

II. What for?

8. Before examining the institutions and mechanisms being erected by the EU, it is important to first explore the rationale behind ESDP, to ask "what for?" Is defence simply the next step for the integration of a union that already has developed a common market, a common customs union, and a common currency? Is ESDP ultimately to become a way for European countries to assume complete responsibility for their common defence and end their reliance on the transatlantic link? Is ESDP merely a glorified international police force that will undertake operations that are too minor for Washington to bother with, such as the WEU missions in the former Yugoslavia? Is ESDP an insurance policy for European countries against the day when the United States declines to get involved in an operation that is important to the security of the Europeans?

9. In part, the impetus for ESDP has arisen out of an increased desire for Europe to make itself heard in world affairs, sometimes referred to as "one voice for Europe." That being said, a political will has materialised among Europe's leaders, illustrated in particular with the St. Malo initiative in 1998, where Tony Blair, the UK prime minister, ended Britain's reluctance to give the EU a meaningful role in Europe's security. The need for some military capabilities to lend credibility to European policies has been widely recognised.

10. ESDP is also a pragmatic response to the crises in the Balkans. In particular, it was given impetus when European countries were unable to quickly assemble enough troops to man the NATO peacekeeping force, which entered Kosovo in June 1999. Also, Europe's subsidiary role to the United States in the bombing campaign against Serbia proved that although the EU members spend an amount equal to 60% of the US defence budget, they were only getting a fraction of the capability that such spending would imply. The reason, according to some members of the European Parliament, is that in Europe many structures are redundant, equipment is not standard, the rate of modernisation is not the same, and there is little joint procurement.

11. ESDP can fill a real need in European defence, but it should not and need not become a rival to NATO. That means that the EU should not aim to become a collective defence organisation. NATO has ably filled that role for 50 years, and NATO plays an irreplaceable role in linking the democracies of Europe and North America to defend their systems and values against any future threat. ESDP should seek to give the European democracies the capability to take military action when a threat arises to the stability of Europe and when NATO as a whole is not engaged. The EU should have the ability to make decisions about intervention and have recourse to the assets needed to undertake a crisis management operation along the lines of those envisioned in the Petersberg tasks, which include humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks, and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.

12. The decision of whether the EU should intervene in a crisis must ultimately rest with the 15 member states. However, according to decisions taken in Nice, as soon as a crisis emerges, the EU must intensify regular dialogue and consultation with NATO and with other European nations, especially the non-EU European allies. Inevitably, military capabilities are at the heart of the ESDP and are the test of EU credibility in this domain. The ultimate success or failure of ESDP will depend on whether member states develop the military capabilities needed, beginning with those needed for the Headline Goal.

13. While ESDP will inevitably help deepen the process of European integration, this is likely to remain an intergovernmental process. Only democratically elected governments and parliaments have the legitimacy to undertake a military operation

and thereby put their citizens at risk. There is no European army, no power for the European Commission, and no transfer of sovereignty from the 15 member states. Every EU member retains its right to participate (or not) in a EU operation or a EU exercise and its right to contribute (or not) to the Headline Goal. ESDP is a *common* policy, with the aim of creating a common ground that will rely on strong national policies.

14. ESDP is not designed to create a military superpower. ESDP is part of a comprehensive strategy driven by the EU to deal with potential crises by using a wide spectrum of political, economic and social tools. This strategy pertains to crisis management and not to collective defence, which will remain the sole prerogative of NATO.

15. What remains to be defined are the limits of ESDP and the Petersberg tasks. At least one EU official, speaking to the Assembly's International Secretariat, averred that a possible ground invasion of Serbia during the 1999 Kosovo campaign would have constituted a task of combat forces in crisis management and therefore been a legitimate mission for the EU. For the time-being, the lack of European military capability makes this a theoretical argument for that particular scenario, but the EU countries and the NATO allies may confront such a question in the future. It is important that the links between the EU and NATO be open and wide-ranging to ensure that such future decisions are taken in a way that ensures the security of all of the NATO allies and guards against asking the EU to undertake an operation it is not prepared for.

16. In addition, it will be necessary to indicate more clearly the geographical areas where the EU force may intervene. Otherwise, it would be impossible to plan accurately for the transport, logistics and communication needed for the operation. Such clarification is also necessary in the relationship with NATO, which seems unlikely to act in Africa and Asia, but became actively engaged in the Balkans.

17. Since Belgium assumed the EU Presidency at the beginning of July, it has declared that the establishment of a defence identity will be a high priority during its six-month term. The Belgians are also committed to making the development of that identity as transparent as possible so as to bolster public support for ESDP. This leadership manifests itself at a crucial time as the second capabilities conference will take place under its leadership in November 2001.

18. The new Administration in Washington supports the development of ESDP, one that is not independent of NATO, but will enable the Europeans to act when the United States is engaged elsewhere or does not wish to commit troops. The basis for the US Administration's support for ESDP rests on three factors: 1. ESDP will help correct the existing imbalance of capabilities within the Alliance; 2. European integration as a force will foster support for increased defence spending in European countries; 3. ESDP will not create separate forces.

III. EU force pledges

A. Analysis of the headline goal

19. In December 1999, during their Helsinki Summit, the 15 members of the EU endorsed a Headline Goal, which, for the first time, formally outlined the Union's military objectives. The Headline Goal states that by 2003, the EU will be able to deploy a Rapid Reaction Force to its full strength of up to 60,000 troops within 60 days and be capable of sustaining it for a period of one year for the purposes of the Petersberg tasks, with appropriate naval and air elements. The Headline Goal specifically outlines the need for self-sustainability, with access to necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, and other combat support facilities across all services.

20. Regarding roles and missions, the Headline Goal essentially provides a framework for the EU to establish a limited military crisis management tool, which fills a gap that has arisen in European security between civilian crisis management and higher-end peacekeeping enforcement tasks. Until now, the more demanding of these Petersberg tasks have been undertaken by NATO. The WEU and EU have limited themselves to lower-end military tasks. The EU Rapid Reaction Force will not conduct operations in relation to common defence, though most of the national units that comprise the EU force would also be available to carry out a NATO Article 5 operation. Instead, the force is intended for operations where NATO as a whole would not become involved. Initially, the Rapid Reaction Force might conduct operations that remain below NATO's threshold, such as disaster relief, evacuation of EU citizens from unstable countries, humanitarian aid, and traditional peacekeeping, but not engage in peace enforcement. The Rapporteur wishes to

stress that contrary to some accounts, the ESDP framework does not envision the creation of a separate force. The forces pledged to ESDP will remain available to carry out collective defence or other NATO operations. Likewise, the corps-sized capability envisioned for ESDP should not be compared with the mighty power that NATO could muster if one of its members came under attack. ESDP and the European Rapid Reaction Force will have nowhere near the capability to ensure the collective defence of its members; therefore, the Headline Goal should not be criticised for not having everything NATO possesses.

21. The 50,000 to 60,000 service men and women that will form the Rapid Reaction Force, will not be newly recruited, but will be drawn from existing national forces. They will constitute neither a "European Army," nor a standing force, although on EU missions they may wear an EU insignia. The size of the force, around 15 brigades or 50,000 to 60,000 troops, is not a random figure but is based upon recent expeditionary operations, such as KFOR (50,000) and IFOR (60,000). The Chief of Staff of the permanent EU Military Staff, British Maj. Gen. Graham Messervy-Whiting, indicated that this figure is not static. As the EU's military dimension expands, the size of the force might grow accordingly. While some observers, noting the need to rotate troops deployed abroad, state that the EU force will have to comprise 120,000 or 180,000 troops, it is important to remember that troop rotation will be done in accordance with national practice, as discussed in the following section. The Headline Goal simply calls for a force of 50,000 to 60,000 to be deployed at any one time.

22. Any decision taken by the EU to deploy the Rapid Reaction Force will not bind all 15 members to participate, nor will operations be exclusive to the 15 members alone. The EU will incorporate mechanisms to enable other non-EU countries to participate, which is discussed in further detail in Chapter IV. The Headline Goal does not explicitly define the geographical parameters for deployment of the Rapid Reaction Force. Unlike NATO, the EU Rapid Reaction Force is not limited to deployment in a specified region and, according to the EU, could be sent outside of Europe under mandate of, for example, the UN or OSCE. The benefits of using the force have been described in terms of Europeans being able to demonstrate a unified and stronger commitment to international crises, such as that of East Timor or Sierra Leone.

B. Force pledges and fulfilling the goal

23. In order to be capable of undertaking the full range of Petersberg tasks, the EU has compiled a "capability catalogue". This catalogue, in accordance with agreements made at the May 2000 Feira summit, was compiled with the assistance of NATO, and lists the military capabilities, assets and forces that the EU would require in order to fulfil the Petersberg tasks and meet the objectives of the Headline Goal. The above-mentioned 50,000 to 60,000 troops are included in the catalogue, as well as some 400 combat aircraft and 100 naval vessels. The capability document is a classified document, and the exact requirements for the force have not been published.

24. In November 2000, the EU held its first Capabilities Pledging Conference in Brussels. During this meeting, the 15 member states pledged to make available various military assets and capabilities in accordance with the capability catalogue. Essentially this conference established how close the EU was to achieving the objectives of the Headline Goal and what capability shortfalls remain.

25. All force commitments pledged during the conference were set out in a "force catalogue". The Germans pledged the largest number of troops at 13,500, followed by the United Kingdom with a pledge of 12,500, and the French with 12,000. Italy and Spain each pledged 6,000, The Netherlands committed 5,000 troops and Greece pledged 3,500. Austria and Finland pledged 2,000 respectively and Sweden 1,500. Belgium, Ireland and Portugal each pledged 1,000. Finally, Luxembourg made a pledge of 500 troops. In addition, Turkey, a non-EU country, pledged 7,000 troops, subject to the country's demand to be included in the ESDP process, and other EU candidate states pledged smaller contingents. Only Denmark did not pledge troops on the understanding that it would be likely to provide part of a "Nordic Contingency"; this was in keeping with Denmark's decision to "opt out" of EU defence matters. (Denmark's "opt-out" unfortunately deprives the union of considerable Danish experience and expertise in peace operations and detracts from the political cohesion of EU operations.)

26. The above number of troops is not a figure that includes force mix or force rotation, requirements that have led some observers to offer higher numbers for the Headline Goal commitment. Recognising that different missions might require

troops with different abilities, member countries have offered the EU access to a total pool of 100,000 troops. It is important to have this larger number of troops available as it enables commanders to select the right mix from a larger pool of forces for a specific operation of up to 60,000 troops. For example, heavy artillery units might not be called upon for low-end policing missions, but might make up part of the overall pool. In relation to this, the UK stated it would be ready to provide 12,500 troops at any one time, but this number would be drawn from a wider pool of 20,000.

27. Secondly, the figure of 50,000 to 60,000 does not include troops for force rotation, which is done to allow units to work, train and rest adequately over a sustained period of time. Readers may have seen figures as large as 180,000 for the estimated size of the Rapid Reaction Force. This figure includes force rotation and is based on a 3:1 rotation. That is to say, one unit would be deployed while the second unit trains and the third unit rests. This figure is unhelpful, however, as not all nations rotate their forces in this manner. British troops, for example, spend two years at home after every six-month deployment. The French work in 16-month cycles, built upon four months of deployment, eight months of preparation and four months on alert. Britain and France are among the European countries furthest along in restructuring their militaries; as a result, they plan to have a large proportion of their troops available for deployment. For example, Britain plans to have all of its 77,000 army troops available in a pool for overseas missions, while France plans to have a pool of 100,000 of its 138,000 soldiers available for deployment at some point.

28. In terms of military equipment, wide ranges of assets were made available. The British pledged attack helicopters, air defence assets, 72 combat aircraft, Royal Navy aircraft, 18 ships (including one aircraft carrier, two nuclear-powered submarines and up to four destroyers and frigates), as well as an amphibious task group with a helicopter landing ship and an amphibious brigade. France is contributing armoured forces, engineering units, reconnaissance unmanned aerial vehicles, two AWACS and 12 ships, including its new aircraft carrier. France has also ordered two amphibious assault ships capable of carrying 20 transport helicopters for use by the Rapid Reaction Force. The Belgians have promised a squadron of F-16 combat aircraft and a number of naval vessels.

29. Germany pledged one heavy or light brigade (according to nature of the mission), or elements of an airmobile brigade, some 20 naval vessels, plus adequate tactical and logistic support assets, including Tornado aircraft and 30 C-160s and one A-310 transport. Italy will contribute 19 naval vessels, including the Garibaldi STOVL and 2 San Giorgio-class LPDs, 22 fixed and rotary-wing aircraft, an amphibious battalion, COMSUBIN Special Forces personnel, and two Harbour Authority coastal patrol boats. Italy will also offer 47 combat and support aircraft, including Tornado IDS, six C-130Js and 10 G-222s (later C-27Js), and two B-707TT tankers. The Netherlands pledged two vessels and one to two squadrons of combat aircraft. Spain contributed one light infantry battalion, which at high readiness would be available as an immediate reaction force, as well as one ship and five squadrons of aircraft, including three fighter squadrons. Spain has also offered the EU a divisional headquarters to co-ordinate any humanitarian operations and a brigade headquarters for other operations.

30. Non-EU countries, including NATO allies and EU candidate countries, were invited to pledge contributions to the capability catalogue. These included Turkey, which pledged a mechanised infantry brigade, two F-16 squadrons, eight warship, including two frigates and two submarines, and two C-130 transport aircraft. The EU noted that on first impression the capabilities and assets pledged by this group of non-EU countries constituted an important first step, in particular in building a working relationship between the EU and this group of countries. However, the EU did not feel that the pledges would significantly rectify the shortfalls described below. For most EU countries, the real problem in relation to meeting the requirements of the capability catalogue will be in providing military assets and modern technologies that are either in their developmental stage, or simply do not yet exist.

C. Overcoming the shortfalls

31. During the Capabilities Pledging Conference, the 15 EU members surpassed their goal for the number of ground troops. This is not surprising, as the 15 countries field more than 2 million active-duty servicemen and women. While the armies of many EU countries contain large numbers of conscripts, there are still hundreds of thousands of professional troops. The United Kingdom and France alone field

more 170,000 soldiers that would be available for overseas rotations. However, the conference did reinforce a stark, but enduring reality. While European countries possess a vast number of troops, they lack many necessary key military capabilities and assets, which would ensure easy deployment, full mobility, secure and interoperable communications and sustainability in field via access to adequate supplies. These capabilities are necessary to ensure the EU Rapid Reaction Force can project decisive force beyond their borders. Many members of the EU indicated large shortfalls in relation to the capability catalogue.

32. These shortfalls did not come as a surprise. European capability deficits were catalogued through the WEU Audit of Assets and Capabilities and NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative in 1999. Indeed, NATO had identified shortfalls years prior to this date. Not surprisingly, the capabilities conference acknowledged a very similar set of shortfalls as the WEU Audit and the DCI. Six of the seven capabilities necessary to ensure the EU's effective engagement in crisis management are the same as the capabilities and assets identified by the DCI as being key areas for improvement within the Alliance. Furthermore, one of the four NATO-EU ad hoc working groups established at Feira specifically handles capabilities and provides a forum through which both organisations can consider a combined approach.

33. Key strategic capability gaps highlighted by the commitment conference include strategic shortfalls in air and transport, intelligence collection assets and command-and-control assets. Tactical shortfalls include suppression of enemy air defence (SEAD), combat search and rescue, precision-guided munitions, cruise missiles and medical capabilities. The report by Giovanni Lorenzo Forcieri for the Subcommittee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities considers many of these capability shortfalls. However, one shortage specific to the EU is that of satellites. The EU will need to develop an intelligence policy and capability autonomous of the United States. This issue has proven controversial, as the United States believes that such development of such capability could duplicate existing NATO intelligence resources, especially considering resource limitations and the fact that NATO and the EU are developing a security agreement that will allow them to share intelligence.

34. Although it is unlikely the EU would develop an equivalent to the US Central Intelligence Agency, it would aim to reduce its reliance on the United States,

especially in the field of satellite imagery. According to the EU's objectives for its ESDP, plans have been made to incorporate the WEU Satellite Centre in Torrejón, Spain, into the EU at the end of 2001. The centre should become an EU agency (as opposed to being incorporated into the EU), which would preserve the current access arrangements for non-EU members of NATO and the applicant countries to the EU. Plans have also been made to draw on other national assets possessed by France and the United Kingdom to provide an EU capability.

35. The Torrejón Satellite Centre uses a wide range of images, from broad images with 10-meter resolution for large areas to the recently launched IKONOS satellite with 1-meter resolution. Officials said that 78% of the requests for projects were in support of operations carrying out the Petersberg tasks envisioned for ESDP, indicating that the centre could play an important role in that EU effort. The remainder of work tends to be arms control and other treaty verification work. Given the shortfalls in intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance that the EU faces in trying to meet the Headline Goal, a small additional investment in the Satellite Centre, especially in the field of communications technology in order to allow for quicker, more secure and more dependable information dissemination, could yield a great increase in capabilities.

36. In order to meet some of its capability shortfalls in other areas, European countries are looking to find purely European solutions. The joint development and purchase of the A400M large aircraft by seven European countries is a case in point. However, if the EU is to be capable of acting autonomously from the United States in the very near future, larger assets, such as transport aircraft must be acquired quickly. Arguably, to meet all of the major strategic capability shortfalls by the Headline Goal target date of 2003, the EU would not be able to find a European solution to all shortfalls and would have to purchase or lease at least some equipment from the United States. For example, the A400M will not come into service until 2007, four years after the proposed completion of the Headline Goal. Similar large aircraft, such as the US C-17, are already in production. The British government has overcome this problem by leasing four C-17 aircraft from the US, while committing to the eventual development and purchase of 25 A400M aircraft.

37. Given the high costs associated with development of ESDP, the Rapporteur wishes to raise an important point concerning procurement and spending. Declining, or at

best, stagnant defence budgets make it difficult to meet the Headline Goal, unless spending priorities are substantially adjusted. This process will require careful consideration in co-operation with the NATO defence planning processes in order to promote optimum synergies.

38. A Capability Improvement Conference is due to take place in Belgium in November 2001. At this conference, countries will consider how to quickly acquire the capabilities and assets they do not possess in order to fulfil the requirements of the Headline Goal. Certainly, in order to overcome many of the shortfalls in the long-term, Europeans will have to rationalise their limited defence budgets, as discussed in last year's report by Paul Helminger for the Economic Committee. They also will have to participate in an increased number of joint and co-operative military equipment programmes, as discussed in Mr Forcieri's report. A central issue of debate is how far the EU itself should develop one distinct capability shortfall within the EU, which is military planning. This will be considered in chapter V. (...)

(...) V. Disputes over planning

A. Definitions of planning

58. National governments and their armed services engage in many types of military planning. For the purposes of this paper three will be considered: operational planning, defence planning, and force planning.

59. Operational planning, according to the armed services, is defined as all planning relating to an operation and takes place at three main levels: strategic, operational and tactical. It can be further divided into *advance planning* (long-term) and *crisis response planning* (short-term). Advance planning is conducted by the armed services around *potential* security risks and based around various scenarios and eventualities, involving, for example, both real and fictitious adversaries. Crisis response planning is conducted once an *actual* threat or crisis has been identified. For example, following the March 1999 decision to strike Serbia during the Kosovo crisis, NATO and SHAPE conducted crisis response planning for the air campaign over Kosovo. All operational planning can be conducted at a national level or through NATO and SHAPE.

60. A second type of military planning is that of defence planning. Within defence planning, there are many disciplines. These disciplines include, for example, infrastructure planning, armaments planning, nuclear planning, and communications planning. Defence planning is conducted at both a national level and an intergovernmental level via NATO. Under the auspices of NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI), Qllies have sought to find methods of co-ordinating the work of the disciplines, which tend to develop and progress separately from one another. Today, NATO is working to establish methods to find interoperability and commonality within the defence planning disciplines.

61. NATO force planning focuses on co-ordinating the member armed forces to ensure that they have the correct capabilities and assets to carry out the Alliance's Strategic Concept. A full description of NATO's force planning process was provided in last year's report of the Sub-committee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities. Essentially, the process is a biennial advisory mechanism based upon Ministerial Guidance from NATO member country Defence ministers. This guidance lays out broad priorities and areas of concern for NATO, which is then translated into national Force Goals. Each nation agrees to its Force Goals which enable it to meet its national objectives while assisting the Alliance in its overall objectives.

B. Options for eu military planning

62. One of the most contentious issues facing the establishment of a military dimension within the EU is that of EU access to NATO's military planning capabilities and assets, mainly in operational planning, but also force planning. The central problem focuses around interpretation by both institutions of the concepts of "autonomy" and "assured access". While the EU wishes to establish its own autonomous military capability, it has limited operational planning capabilities of its own and no force planning mechanisms. Furthermore, the establishment of the ESDP, and with it an autonomous decision-making capability, was endorsed by NATO on the understanding that the EU would use NATO planning mechanisms, specifically operational planning at SHAPE and the NATO force planning process, to prevent duplication and take advantage of NATO's considerable expertise.

63. NATO and the EU are now deadlocked in discussions over options for EU access to NATO's operational military planning capabilities. The EU has stated it requires

"guaranteed permanent access (legally binding automatic access) to the Alliance's military planning capabilities, specifically its military headquarters (SHAPE) when conducting EU-led operations." This is because, in practical terms, the EU Military Staff will be small, (about half the size of NATO's International Military Staff), and will possess no structure like SHAPE (which has about 2,500 staff) upon which to draw its expertise. This is a large capability that should not be duplicated. In addition, Turkey modified its previous position that access to NATO capabilities and assets is to be agreed on a case-by-case basis.

64. Should a decision regarding EU access to NATO planning facilities be delayed further, there is a risk that this will create the incentive for the EU to find its own solution, and start to create truly autonomous planning facilities, specifically its own operational headquarters. If EU access to NATO planning were based upon the NAC's case-by-case approval, an option preferred by Turkey, the EU's political objectives (ESDP) would not be truly autonomous. At the May 2001 NAC meeting, no agreement could be reached on modalities for EU access. Until this central problem can be resolved, NATO and the EU have decided to proceed in other areas (building capabilities, for example), working on the basis that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.

65. Your Rapporteur believes that requiring the NAC to issue case-by-case approval is contrary to the very concept of a presumption of availability. A presumption of availability does not require a positive decision to ensure availability. A presumption of availability presumes that the capabilities will be made available unless a decision is made to revoke this availability.

66. The type of planning that the EUMS envisages it will conduct is limited to the strategic level and is known as advanced, strategic-level planning. This very limited EUMS planning capability is intended only to enable the military staff to advise the Council in its selection of an operation commander. The operation commander, for example the Deputy SACEUR or Deputy SACLANT, would then choose the operational headquarters, which would begin operational and tactical level planning. These two levels of planning could be conducted at SHAPE or national joint headquarters, like the British Permanent Joint Headquarters at Northwood or its French counterpart at Creil. This type of operational planning would not be undertaken by the EU.

67. The principal task of the EUMS is to provide in-house military expertise to the EU Military Committee. The EUMS represents a small advisory body that will assist the EU Council bodies discussed above in exercising political control and strategic direction of Petersberg operations. The EUMS will have a maximum size of around 100 officers, with 20 to 30 reinforcement posts to be filled on a case-by-case basis for demanding crisis management operations. This is still approximately half the size of the NATO International Military Staff and can in no way be compared to SHAPE.

68. With regard to force planning, the EU has been discussing the possibility of using NATO force planning capabilities for over a year, and both the EU and NATO have stated the need to make use of structures which already exist. While the EU is attempting to match its capabilities to the requirements of its potential roles and missions, as outlined in the Petersburg tasks, this process does not constitute a detailed force planning process like that at NATO.

69. During a recent visit to SHAPE by the Sub-committee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities, General Ralston noted the possible negative outcomes of duplicating planning resources which already exist at SHAPE: 1. It would be wasteful, and the European countries need to devote resources to developing capabilities, not a planning staff; 2. Having two planning options in a crisis would lead to confusion among decision-makers; 3. It could lead to a case where the EU plans to use a unit that is already committed to a NATO operation. A SHAPE planner later noted, "In these days of limited budgets, I want more forces to plan for, rather than more staff to plan with."

70. SHAPE officials said that NATO would offer planning assistance to the EU through Combined Joint Planning Staff (CJPS), a unit of 70 officers from the 17 NATO countries in the integrated military command that offers planning support to both SHAPE and NATO's Atlantic Command. The CJPS was organised in 1997 to plan all Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) activities and is the core staff to support NATO's European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI). The CJPS conducts strategic operations planning, including planning for European-led operations, and supports the Deputy SACEUR (DSACEUR), always a European officer, in his role as supreme commander of European-led operations. The CJPS would also provide planning support to the commander of an individual operation and the EU

military staff. DSACEUR would have an "accounting role", ensuring that forces pledged to one operation are not counted for another. A SHAPE-EU task force is currently looking at how to ensure EU access to operations planning, the role of DSACEUR and the NATO command structure in ESDP, adaptation of NATO defence planning to incorporated EU requirements, and how to incorporate the four EU neutrals into SHAPE and CJPS.

71. At the Gothenburg EU summit, measures were taken to test the readiness of the EU to undertake crisis-related military operations through the establishment of the Exercise Policy. The Exercise Policy will seek to ensure that command structures, capabilities, procedures and arrangements with NATO are sufficient. These exercises will not utilise troops, but will involve all levels of the command structure. There will be two types of exercises: those using NATO assets and capabilities and those that do not.

72. Related to the issue of planning is access to NATO assets, specifically, the hardware that either NATO or national governments own that the EU will need to implement its operations. NATO has very few assets that are property of the organisation‹most are owned by national governments. Still, the EU is interested in solidifying its access to NATO's AWACS planes and its command-and-control capabilities. While the institutional sketch of ESDP has been developed and progress was made in discussions at the Gothenburg summit, the long-awaited agreement between NATO and the EU on access to NATO assets has yet to be reached. As the deadline for limited operational capability approaches at the end of the year, this will remain an increasingly important item to be negotiated. There is also the question of mixed assets, those jointly owned but not by all Alliance members, to be resolved.

VI. CONTROL OF ESDP

73. An important question for ESDP is who will exercise the ultimate authority over its operations. The EU is a unique amalgam of an international organisation and a confederation, and a mixture of communitarian and intergovernmental decision-making procedures. Currently, the European Council is the ultimate authority over ESDP, meaning that it is a common policy of 15 countries, with little

or no role for the European Commission and the European Parliament. It is important to note that ESDP will be under the control of democratically elected heads of state and government, and financial control will rest with the national parliaments that decide how much to contribute to the Initiative.

74. ESDP is an outgrowth of the EU's efforts to develop a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and gives a defence dimension to what has been a rather toothless endeavour. The appointment of Javier Solana as Head of the General Secretariat of the Council and High Representative for CFSP, as well as Secretary General of the WEU, gave greater visibility to this effort. His task is to assist the member governments by contributing to the formulation, development and implementation of political decisions and to represent the governments in discussions with third countries.

75. To ensure a more coherent approach towards regions that are of vital interest to the EU, there is also the Commissioner for External Relations, Christopher Patten. Essentially, he is the Commission's interface with the EU's General Affairs Council and the Commission's interlocutor with Mr Solana. The treaties that govern the EU stipulate that the Commission is to be fully associated with the work carried out in the CFSP field, but they do not address ESDP. The Commission's foreign policy role, first and foremost, deals with the delivery of external assistance, but also using its resources and civilian expertise to assist EU crisis management operations.

76. ESDP is run by the General Affairs Council, made up of foreign ministers from the 15 member countries. The Political and Security Committee monitors the international situation, contributes to the formulation of policies by giving the Council opinions (either at the latter's request or on its own initiative) and also oversees the implementation of the policies that are agreed. In accordance with the Presidency each term, the EU member governments also hold informal defence ministerial meetings twice a year, as with the North Atlantic Council, so as to achieve objectives for a quickly operational force and fulfilment of the Headline Goal.

77. EU defence ministers announced the leadership of the EU Military Staff at their April 2001 meeting. Gen. Gustav Haggland of Finland was named Chairman of the Military Committee, and as such the EU's Chief military adviser. German Lt. Gen.

Klaus Schuwirth was named the Head of the permanent Military Staff, and Major General Messervy-Whiting became his Chief of Staff. Ministers announced that ESDP would have a "limited operational capability" by the end of 2001, though this was to fall short of the ultimate Headline Goal, envisioned for 2003.

78. At a joint meeting in May 2001 between EU defence ministers and those of the six non-EU European members of NATO, the EU ministers set a timetable for EU military exercises in 2002, though involving only command-and-control procedures, rather than troops in the field. The two exercises will allow the EU defence ministers to assess the operational capability of the ESDP structures. The ministers announced that they foresee joint exercises with NATO in 2003, assuming a formal NATO-EU agreement will be in place.

79. The European Council has already developed the civilian aspects of crisis management with a view to establishing a better balance among the various instruments available to the Union. It thus decided to set up, by 2003, a force of 5,000 police officers to carry out crisis management operations, 1,000 of which must be deployable within 30 days. Moreover, the European Council laid down a work programme embracing conflict prevention, the consolidation of peace and the internal stability of states, areas, or regions in crisis or threatened by crisis. This has been institutionalised with a committee for civilian aspects of crisis management and a mechanism to provide co-ordination between the EU's interim Situation Centre/Crisis Cell. The co-ordination between civilian and military crisis management, however, will remain a soft spot for years to come. (...)