

# **From St-Malo to Nice**

## **European defence: core documents**

*Compiled by Maartje Rutten*

Maartje Rutten is a research fellow  
at the Institute for Security Studies of WEU.

**Institute for Security Studies  
Western European Union**

**Paris - May 2001**

## **CHAILLOT PAPER 47**

*(A French version of this paper is also available from the Institute)*

### **The Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union**

**Director:** Nicole Gnesotto

© Institute for Security Studies of WEU 2001. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photo-copying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the Institute for Security Studies of WEU.

ISSN 1017-7566

Published by the Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union and printed in Alençon, France, by the Imprimerie Alençonnaise.

# *Contents*

<b>Preface</b>	vii
<b>Introduction</b> <i>Maartje Rutten</i>	ix
<b>The texts</b>	
1 <b>Informal European summit, Pörschach</b> , 24-25 October 1998 Press conferences by British Prime Minister Tony Blair (extracts)	1
2 <b>Franco-German summit, Potsdam</b> , 1 December 1998 Final Declaration	4
3 <b>British-French summit, St-Malo</b> , 3-4 December 1998 Joint declaration on European defence	8
4 <b>Article by Madeleine Albright</b> , US Secretary of State 'The Right Balance Will Secure NATO's Future' Financial Times, 7 December 1998	10
5 <b>European Council, Vienna</b> , 11-12 December 1998 Presidency conclusions (extracts)	13
6 <b>German Presidency paper, Bonn</b> , 24 February 1999 Informal reflection at WEU on Europe's security and defence	14
7 <b>Informal meeting of EU foreign ministers, Eltville</b> 13-14 March 1999, German proposal Strengthening the common policy on security and defence	17
8 <b>North Atlantic Council summit, Washington DC</b> 24 April 1999 Final communiqué (extracts)	20

	The Alliance's Strategic Concept	24
9	<b>Franco-German Defence and Security Council, Toulouse</b> 29 May 1999 Declaration	40
10	<b>European Council, Cologne, 3-4 June 1999</b> Declaration of the European Council on strengthening the common European policy on security and defence Presidency report on strengthening of the CESDP	41 42
11	<b>British-Italian summit, London, 19-20 July 1999</b> Joint declaration launching European Defence Capabilities Initiative	46
12	<b>French action plan:</b> letter from M. Jacques Chirac, President of the French Republic, to the Finnish presidency of the European Union, 22 July 1999	48
13	<b>Speech by Strobe Talbott,</b> US Deputy Secretary of State 'America's Stake in a Strong Europe', London, 7 October 1999	54
14	<b>Speech by Lord Robertson,</b> NATO Secretary-General Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Amsterdam, 15 November 1999	60
15	<b>General Affairs Council, Brussels, 15 November 1999</b> Extracts from communiqué: European security and defence policy	66
16	<b>WEU Ministerial Council, Luxembourg, 22-23 November 1999</b> Luxembourg Declaration Audit of assets and capabilities	67 73
17	<b>Anglo-French summit, London, 25 November 1999</b> Joint declaration on European defence	77

18	<b>Franco-German summit, Paris</b> , 30 November 1999 Paris Declaration	80
19	<b>European Council, Helsinki</b> , 10-11 December 1999 Presidency conclusions Part II: Common European policy on security and defence	82
	Annexe IV: Presidency reports on ‘Strengthening the common European policy on security and defence’ and on ‘Non-military crisis management of the European Union’	83
20	<b>Franco-Dutch summit, The Hague</b> , 10 February 2000 Joint declaration by the French and Dutch defence ministers	92
21	<b>General Affairs Council, Brussels</b> , 14-15 February 2000 Extract from communiqué: Strengthening of ESDP	93
22	<b>Meeting of European Union defence ministers, Sintra</b> 28 February 2000, Military bodies in the European Union (the ‘Toolbox Paper’) The ‘Food for Thought’ paper on headline and capability goals	94 102
23	<b>European Council, Lisbon</b> , 23-24 March 2000 Presidency Conclusions, Part II: CESDP	108
	Document submitted to the Council: Strengthening the CESDP	109
24	<b>WEU Ministerial Council, Porto</b> , 15-16 May 2000 Porto Declaration	112
25	<b>Franco-German summit, Mainz</b> , 9 June 2000 Mainz Declaration	118
26	<b>European Council, Santa Maria da Feira</b> , 19-20 June 2000 Presidency Conclusions, Part I.C: CESDP	120
	Annexe I: Presidency report on strengthening the CESDP	121

27	<b>Intervention by Dr Javier Solana</b> , High Representative for CFSP COPSi/NAC first joint meeting, Brussels, 19 September 2000	140
28	<b>Informal meeting of EU defence ministers, Ecouen</b> 22 September 2000 Presidency conclusions	143
29	<b>WEU Ministerial Council, Marseille</b> , 13 November 2000 Marseille Declaration	147
30	<b>Speech by Dr Javier Solana</b> , High Representative for CFSP ‘Where does the EU stand on CFSP?’, Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik, Berlin, 14 November 2000	151
31	<b>Capabilities Commitment Conference, Brussels</b> 20-21 November 2000 Military Capabilities Commitment Declaration Opening speech by M. Alain Richard	158 164
32	<b>European Council, Nice</b> , 7, 8 and 9 December 2000 Presidency Conclusions, Part IV: CESDP Annexe VI: Presidency report on the ESDP Treaty of Nice amending the TEU: modified Articles 17, 25 and 27	168 168 209
33	<b>Report presented to the Nice European Council</b> by the Secretary General/High Representative and the Commission ‘Improving the coherence and effectiveness of the European Union action in the field of conflict prevention’, Nice, 8 December 2000	212
34	<b>North Atlantic Council, Brussels</b> , 14-15 December 2000 Final Communiqué (extracts)	222





## *Preface*

In the two years between St-Malo and Nice, the character of the European Union changed. What was previously unthinkable 'at Fifteen' became an objective agreed by all member states: the inclusion in the Union's legitimate competencies of a common security and defence policy, in other words its acquisition of strategic responsibility in post-Cold War crisis management.

Such a revolution was not a foregone conclusion: it required all the European traumatism of the decade in which Yugoslavia broke up to turn an old rhetorical ambition into a concrete policy. Nor could realising such an ambition be a matter of just a few months: while the Treaty of Nice effectively sanctions the build-up of the ESDP, much remains to be done – concerning both operational capabilities and coherent decision-making – to complete the Union's credibility as an international actor. Nevertheless, the body of texts presented here by itself represents a historical milestone.

This *Chaillot Paper*, a project managed by Maartje Rutten, a research fellow at the Institute, is intended above all to be a working document and a reference on the core texts on European defence. But the thirty or so documents produced by the Union between December 1998 and December 2000 are also revealing in two respects. First, they show how the Union can function as an impressive machine for forging consensus: from bilateral meetings to summits of Heads of State, from non-papers to official declarations and from vague statements to operational annexes six months later, the European method can be seen at work in its entirety. The daily jumble of contacts, proposals and compromises at 2, 3, 4, 5 or up to 15, and a mass of small, sometimes minute, forward steps that are occasionally very slow, none the less in the long run produce a corpus of decisions and agreed practices. If one looks at the texts drawn up over the last two years, it is clear that the dynamic of convergence among the European countries has proved extremely powerful, and that what binds the Europeans together today far outweighs that which divides them.

But this body of basic texts also illustrates a second obvious fact: European defence policy is above all a political undertaking regarding both its *raison d'être* and its

practical arrangements, and not, as is too often perceived, simply a series of military-technical arrangements and operational capabilities that could, more or less autonomously, be grafted onto the European Union's mass of common policies. Defence capabilities are, and will remain, one instrument among others available to the European Union's foreign policy, and politics thus takes precedence over military matters: that is the key principle underlying the compromises reached by the Fifteen since St-Malo. And that is how it must remain.

**Nicole Gnesotto**  
**Paris, April 2001**

# *Introduction*

*Maartje Rutten*

The success of the EU project has made it increasingly necessary for a Europe that is integrated in so many areas, and plays an increasingly important role globally, to have a political voice as well and the capabilities to back up policy with action in foreign affairs, security, and defence. The Allied military operation in Kosovo in spring 1999, however, blatantly showed the extent to which such a voice and means were still lacking. The lesson of Kosovo merely strengthened the developments that were triggered in autumn 1998 by the British government's U-turn that led to St-Malo and – via Cologne (June 1999) and Helsinki (December 1999) – culminated in Nice (December 2000).

Put into perspective, the development of a common EU security and defence policy between December 1998 and December 2000 was almost revolutionary compared with the slow progress made during the preceding half century, at least in terms of political commitments and policy guidelines. Much as Europeans still have room for improvement, especially in terms of equipment and budgets, the progress made so far would have been unthinkable as recently as two years ago.

For these reasons the Institute, as a catalyst for the European security and defence debate, considered it crucial to recapitulate on what happened during the two years that shook the world of European defence, and identify the most relevant milestones along the road from St-Malo to Nice. The idea was to be as inclusive as practicable in order to provide as complete a reference work on the initial stages of the ESDP project as possible. Whilst all documents in this *Chaillot Paper* are readily available individually, mostly through the Internet, there is not, to our knowledge, any single source that presents them as a structured collection. It is to fill that gap that we decided to undertake this project. The texts are in chronological order, displaying the unfolding of the European defence blueprint from almost nothing to a fully-fledged policy together with institutions to implement it.

The following editorial criteria have been used for the selection of texts:

- Those EU, WEU and NATO declarations, following summits and ministerial councils, that dealt with the further elaboration of the ESDP have been included, or at least extracts from them that are of direct relevance to the goal of this *Chaillot Paper*.
- Those bilateral meetings within the period December 1998 - December 2000 that have been reproduced were selected as they were dedicated to maintaining the momentum and taking further initiatives to develop the ESDP or certain aspects of it.
- The same applies to those speeches and/or articles included in this paper, especially American, that have made an important impact on the European defence debate and process, and have received considerable attention in the press and provoked fierce reactions.
- We have deliberately omitted documents on European defence industrial cooperation.
- Only the English or French versions of official texts have been selected, as these are the two working languages of WEU. No official texts have been translated in-house, and therefore the Dutch, German and Italian versions of certain declarations are not reproduced. This also means that since some texts are available in one language only, the English version of this *Chaillot Paper* contains French texts, and vice versa.

Finally, an introductory comment has been added to some documents in order to highlight their genesis or rationale. In other cases, it provides an additional explanation of the developments in question or recapitulates on the work that lies ahead. The Institute wishes to thank those governments that have given their permission for it to publish certain 'non-papers' and documents which were not previously available to the public.

Needless to say, this *Chaillot Paper* is intended as a reference work and hopefully a

valuable tool for those involved in or doing research on European defence.

# ***1 Informal European summit Pörtlach, 24-25 October 1998***

*As explained in the Introduction, the revolutionary changes that occurred in European defence resulted from the major change in the United Kingdom's attitude towards an EU role in defence. The St-Malo Declaration (see document 3, p. 8) was the first official document laying down the new British orientation towards EU defence. However, first allusions to this change had previously been made by Prime Minister Tony Blair at an informal EU meeting of Heads of State and Government in Pörtlach, Austria, on 24 and 25 October 1998, and the press conference that followed. His speaking notes are not available to the public; the following are extracts of press conferences given by the British premier following the ministerial meeting.*

## **PRIME MINISTER:**

First of all, let me congratulate the Austrian Presidency for a very well-organised and good informal summit. There are really three main issues that we discussed and debated together :

The first was obviously the economic situation in the world and in Europe where we agree very strongly that both the European Union, G7 and others should take a concerted role and do whatever we can in order to promote greater confidence both in the financial markets and to boost the prospects of growth and employment in the world.

Secondly, in respect of common foreign and security policy, there was a strong willingness, which the UK obviously shares, for Europe to take a stronger foreign policy and security role. This will arise particularly because we are going to be appointing two people to common foreign and security positions in the European Union in the next few months so it is something that is very much on our minds but we all agreed it was important that Europe should be able to play a better, more unified part in foreign and security policy decisions and certainly obviously we discussed specifically Europe closer to the people, ideas for that and subsidiarity where there was a very strong sense that we have to push on the process that was begun at Amsterdam on subsidiarity and get that implemented.

## **QUESTION:**

Rumours were spread that your European colleagues gave you a standing ovation yesterday after your introduction to foreign policy and security affairs. What exactly made your colleagues applaud and could you elaborate on some important points in your speech?

## **PRIME MINISTER:**

I am always willing to take credit for standing ovations even when they haven't happened and they are probably like most European rumours. I think there was a warm response certainly to what I said because people want to see Britain engaged with key arguments in Europe and as Kosovo has brought home to us, it is right that Britain and other European

countries, as part of Europe, play a key and leading role and that we enhance our capability to make a difference in those situations.

We are at the very beginning of that debate, we need to get the institutional mechanism right, we need to make sure that that institutional mechanism in no way undermines NATO but rather is complementary to it, we need to recognise that that will mean changes in our own defence capability and we also need the political will to back up whatever we do.

A common and foreign security policy for the European Union is necessary, it is overdue, it is needed and it is high time we got on with trying to engage with formulating it and I think that people were pleased that Britain came to this with an open mind and was willing to participate in the debate and I think it is important that we do that.

**QUESTION:**

This weekend, you seem to be saying not a European army but you are clearly talking about the possible deployment of forces from European countries together in some way in a peacekeeping role maybe, is that a possibility?

**PRIME MINISTER:**

Europe has that capability to do that now, and I am certainly not - repeat not - talking about a European army or anything like that at all, but the very purpose of having the European Security and Defence identity within NATO, which as I say was agreed in Berlin in 1996, was the recognition that there needed to be some form of European identity within NATO. Now that is where it is at the moment. All I am saying, and I am not saying more than this, is that we need to allow fresh thinking in this and it is important for Britain to be part of that thinking and not for us simply to stand there and say we are not.

**QUESTION:**

So, it would be an important pillar?

**PRIME MINISTER:**

There are all sorts of ideas that have been put forward on this and I think most people recognise the WEU is less than ideal, that was recognised clearly at Amsterdam. But we are not committed or wedded to fourth pillar ideas at all, I am not saying that, I simply want to start the debate.

**QUESTION:**

And what is the role of countries which are not members of NATO, like Sweden or Finland?

**PRIME MINISTER:**

Again, this is what we need to discuss because obviously there are countries that are members of the European Union that are neutrals and will guard that jealously, that is one of the things that you can debate.

**QUESTION:**

Because there was a rapid response on Kosovo in the sense that you were critical in China the other day of the fact that Milosevic hadn't really got the message?

**PRIME MINISTER:**

Sure, I think it is important, and it is still important in relation to Kosovo, that the only thing that was ever going to work in Kosovo was diplomacy backed up by the credible threat of force, and that is all that has brought Milosevic to the position he is in, and we need to keep him in that position now. But I think Kosovo simply underlines the need for Europe to take a very hard-headed review of this and to make sure that it can fulfil its obligations and responsibilities properly.

**QUESTION:**

You said that Europe should speak more forcefully on the international stage, but how could you appear more forceful when only NATO has the military capability to back up diplomacy?

**PRIME MINISTER:**

That is why I think we need to discuss how we take this debate forward. The very existence of the security and defence identity within NATO for Europe is an acceptance that there will be circumstances in which it is right to have that identity for Europe, but the European security and defence identity is very much within NATO. Now as I say, let us discuss the best way forward, though I repeat to you, nothing must happen which in any way impinges on the effectiveness of NATO, anything that suggests it should be complementary to that, because NATO for us is the absolute correct forum.

## ***2 Franco-German summit Potsdam, 1 December 1998***

### **FINAL DECLARATION**

Nous, chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement de la République fédérale d'Allemagne et de France, réaffirmons tout le prix qu'attachent nos pays à leur amitié et à leur coopération. Au seuil du XXIème siècle, nous sommes décidés à les approfondir et à leur donner un nouveau souffle, afin d'œuvrer ensemble au projet européen. Le rôle moteur de la relation franco-allemande dans la construction européenne est plus important que jamais.

#### **I**

- Dans cette perspective, nous assumerons nos responsabilités pour faire en sorte que le Conseil européen de Vienne ouvre la voie à un accord sur l'ensemble de l'Agenda 2000 que nous sommes déterminés à conclure sous la présidence allemande.
- Nous nous concerterons pour définir une approche commune vis-à-vis du processus d'élargissement. A cette fin, nous favoriserons la poursuite continue des négociations dans un esprit de responsabilité et avec le souci de conduire l'ensemble des pays candidats à l'adhésion sans discrimination et en tenant compte des situations propres à chacun.
- Nous entendons également, dans la perspective de ces futurs élargissements, parvenir à des positions communes sur la réforme des institutions européennes en poursuivant une réflexion approfondie sur le processus de décision et sur le cadre institutionnel nécessaires à l'Europe de demain.
- Nous progresserons également dans la définition d'actions concrètes en vue de la mise en œuvre de la politique étrangère et de sécurité communes y compris la politique européenne de défense commune. Nous devons notamment nous mobiliser pour la prévention et la gestion des crises régionales (nous sommes en particulier déterminés à poursuivre notre bonne coopération en ce qui concerne l'ex-Yougoslavie et le Proche-Orient).

A cette fin, nous rechercherons les voies permettant à l'Union européenne de disposer des capacités opérationnelles qui lui font défaut en la dotant soit des moyens européens propres (notamment au travers de l'UEO et des forces multinationales européennes tel que le corps européen), soit des moyens de l'OTAN en application des accords conclus lors du Conseil atlantique de Berlin. Nous mènerons également une réflexion sur le processus souhaitable d'intégration de l'UEO dans l'Union européenne.

- Nous rechercherons ensemble les moyens de soutenir le développement du réseau de solidarités qui lie l'Union avec ses pays voisins et ses partenaires sur tous les continents.
- A l'heure de la globalisation, nous favoriserons les projets industriels ou technologiques communs dans la perspective de pôles européens, notamment dans le domaine des industries aéronautiques et de défense, de l'intégration des marchés financiers et du développement de la société de l'information.

- Le passage à l'euro entraîne pour nous de nouvelles responsabilités et contribuera à la stabilité monétaire et financière internationale. En ce moment décisif, nous entendons nous mobiliser pour un renforcement de la coordination des politiques économiques, notamment dans le cadre de l'euro 11, pour des progrès rapides de l'harmonisation fiscale et pour la promotion d'un véritable volet social européen.

Nous estimons qu'il est donc nécessaire de compléter le Pacte de stabilité et de croissance conclu le 11 juin 1997 à Amsterdam par un 'Pacte européen pour l'emploi' et de placer ainsi la lutte contre le chômage au centre de la politique européenne dans le prolongement du Conseil européen extraordinaire sur l'emploi de Luxembourg. Dans cet esprit, les membres de l'Union européenne devraient à l'avenir s'engager à atteindre des objectifs contraignants et vérifiables selon les lignes directrices pour l'emploi, notamment en ce qui concerne la réduction du chômage des jeunes et du chômage de longue durée, et pour l'élimination des discriminations à l'égard des femmes.

De même, nous nous efforcerons de faire progresser la dimension sociale de la construction européenne. A cet égard, nous regrettons l'insuffisance du dialogue social européen et nous appelons de nos vœux sa véritable relance qui permette aux partenaires sociaux de conclure des accords représentant des avancées significatives pour les salariés des différents Etats membres ; pour ce qui nous concerne, nous sommes prêts à rechercher et soutenir les moyens d'y parvenir. Nous favoriserons la réflexion et les initiatives sur les mesures qui peuvent renforcer le modèle social européen dans la perspective d'une harmonisation sociale permettant de réaliser des progrès, par exemple, dans les domaines de l'organisation et du temps de travail, de la formation tout au long de la vie, de la progression des salaires et de la protection du travail, dans le respect des compétences des partenaires sociaux.

- Un approfondissement de la réforme du système financier et monétaire international s'impose pour promouvoir la stabilité financière et la croissance. Dans cet esprit, nous attachons une importance particulière aux actions suivantes :
- la légitimité des institutions internationales, notamment le FMI et la Banque mondiale, doit être renforcée. A cette fin, la transformation du Comité intérimaire en un véritable « Conseil des ministres des Finances » devrait être discutée au niveau international.
- la surveillance internationale du secteur financier doit être renforcée, par exemple en imposant le respect, par les centres off shore, de règles internationales de régulation et de contrôle. Un accent tout particulier doit être mis sur le renforcement de la réglementation en matière de gestion du risque et de normes prudentielles dans les institutions financières, y compris les fonds spéculatifs (hedge funds).

## II

Le Traité signé à l'Elysée le 22 janvier 1963 et complété en 1988 a fait ses preuves. Il demeure la base de notre partenariat privilégié. Toutefois, dans un monde qui change, les instruments et les mécanismes de la coopération franco-allemande doivent être rénovés.

\*) Les échanges culturels et la coopération en matière d'éducation, domaines dans lesquels nous avons obtenu des succès significatifs et où la densité des contacts est incomparable, ont connu de nouvelles impulsions grâce aux projets actés lors du Sommet de Weimar. Ils resteront à l'avenir une priorité de notre coopération.

A cette fin, nous avons décidé que l'Université franco-allemande aura son siège à Sarrebruck. Nous accordons à ce projet un haut degré de priorité et nous avons l'intention d'achever en 1999 la mise en place de cette Université.

L'Office franco-allemand pour la Jeunesse fournit depuis 1963 une contribution particulièrement importante et porteuse d'avenir à la vitalité des échanges de jeunes entre nos deux pays. Son rôle et son fonctionnement seront adaptés pour mieux correspondre aux aspirations des jeunes de nos deux pays. Dans ce cadre nous examinerons toutes les possibilités pour améliorer l'efficacité et les moyens financiers de l'Office.

\*) Nous saluons les progrès accomplis depuis le Sommet de Weimar dans les efforts visant à promouvoir la langue du partenaire dans nos pays. Dans cet esprit, la France développera l'enseignement de l'allemand à l'ENA et étendra cet enseignement aux jeunes diplomates entrant au ministère des Affaires étrangères. Par ailleurs, nous appuierons les efforts visant à renforcer les échanges scolaires franco-allemands afin que la participation d'élèves du pays partenaire au cycle supérieur des lycées se développe de manière significative.

\*) Nous encouragerons chaque ministère à intensifier ses échanges de fonctionnaires. Nous continuerons par ailleurs à développer la coopération administrative entre les ambassades françaises et allemandes en pays tiers en favorisant des nouvelles implantations communes. Nous étudierons avec nos partenaires de l'Union européenne la possibilité de mise en place de bureaux communs pour la délivrance de visas. Enfin, nous examinerons la possibilité de désigner des ambassadeurs communs à nos deux pays.

\*) Conscients de l'importance du livre comme vecteur de la culture européenne et de sa spécificité en tant que bien culturel, nous réaffirmons notre attachement au prix unique du livre et nous nous déclarons déterminés à nous opposer à toute remise en cause dont il pourrait faire l'objet.

\*) Nous sommes désireux de donner de nouvelles impulsions à la chaîne de télévision franco-allemande : c'est pourquoi l'Allemagne s'efforcera d'améliorer l'accessibilité d'ARTE pour les téléspectateurs allemands et la France poursuivra la mise en oeuvre d'une diffusion bilingue de cette chaîne. Par ailleurs, nous chercherons à développer, à plus long terme, ARTE pour en faire une chaîne culturelle européenne qui sera également diffusée outre-mer.

\*) La société civile et le monde économique et financier doivent être pleinement impliqués dans la relance de nos relations. A cette fin, nous avons décidé la création d'un forum de discussion franco-allemand qui se tiendra à intervalles réguliers, réunissant des personnalités issues du monde de la politique, de la science, de la culture, de l'économie et des médias de France et d'Allemagne.

En outre nous désignerons des personnalités pour réfléchir aux moyens de préserver et renforcer notre mémoire collective européenne.

\*) Nous connaissons les inquiétudes soulevées dans nos deux pays par des décisions judiciaires parfois contradictoires dans des procédures relatives au droit de garde des enfants issus de couples mixtes. Nous entendons poursuivre et renforcer les décisions prises

du dernier Sommet franco-allemand d'Avignon (échanges de fonctionnaires, formation continue des juges, concentration des procédures sur des juridictions spécialisées) et élargir notre concertation entre nos deux pays à l'ensemble du droit de la famille.

Nous avons chargé nos ministres des Affaires étrangères et les ministres concernés d'assurer le suivi de ces orientations d'ici notre prochain Sommet.

Nous chargeons les ministres des Affaires étrangères de réfléchir à la simplification des dispositifs existants de la coopération franco-allemande et de considérer le remplacement de certains d'entre eux par une structure de coordination qui nous serait directement rattachée et veillerait au suivi de la coopération franco-allemande. Les ministres des Affaires étrangères nous feront rapport au prochain Sommet sur l'ensemble de cette question.

### **3 British-French summit St-Malo, 3-4 December 1998**

*For more than fifty years European countries were primarily focused on NATO for defence cooperation, despite occasional efforts to improve, or rather establish, the EEC/EC/EU's external activities and endow it with a political identity and defence responsibilities. All of this then altered with the so-called 'sea change' in the United Kingdom's attitude towards EU defence and its lifting of its decades-long objections to the EU acquiring an 'autonomous' military capacity, at the Franco-British summit in St-Malo, 3-4 December 1998. St-Malo is widely considered as the start of the European defence project. The new opportunity presented by St-Malo was very rapidly followed up by a multitude of farther-reaching declarations and proposals.*

#### **JOINT DECLARATION**

The Heads of State and Government of France and the United Kingdom are agreed that:

1. The European Union needs to be in a position to play its full role on the international stage. This means making a reality of the Treaty of Amsterdam, which will provide the essential basis for action by the Union. It will be important to achieve full and rapid implementation of the Amsterdam provisions on CFSP. This includes the responsibility of the European Council to decide on the progressive framing of a common defence policy in the framework of CFSP. The Council must be able to take decisions on an intergovernmental basis, covering the whole range of activity set out in Title V of the Treaty of European Union.

2. To this end, the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises.

In pursuing our objective, the collective defence commitments to which member states subscribe (set out in Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, Article V of the Brussels Treaty) must be maintained. In strengthening the solidarity between the member states of the European Union, in order that Europe can make its voice heard in world affairs, while acting in conformity with our respective obligations in NATO, we are contributing to the vitality of a modernised Atlantic Alliance which is the foundation of the collective defence of its members.

Europeans will operate within the institutional framework of the European Union (European Council, General Affairs Council, and meetings of Defence Ministers).

The reinforcement of European solidarity must take into account the various positions of European states.

The different situations of countries in relation to NATO must be respected.

3. In order for the European Union to take decisions and approve military action where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged, the Union must be given appropriate structures and a

capacity for analysis of situations, sources of intelligence, and a capability for relevant strategic planning, without unnecessary duplication, taking account of the existing assets of the WEU and the evolution of its relations with the EU. In this regard, the European Union will also need to have recourse to suitable military means (European capabilities pre-designated within NATO's European pillar or national or multinational European means outside the NATO framework).

4. Europe needs strengthened armed forces that can react rapidly to the new risks, and which are supported by a strong and competitive European defence industry and technology.

5. We are determined to unite in our efforts to enable the European Union to give concrete expression to these objectives.

#### ***4 Madeleine K. Albright, US Secretary of State 'The Right Balance Will Secure NATO's Future', Financial Times, 7 December 1998***

*This article subsequently became widely known as the '3Ds' US statement.*

Tomorrow my colleagues and I in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation will meet in Brussels to set the agenda for the April 1999 Nato summit in Washington. There alliance leaders will commemorate Nato's 50th anniversary and welcome, for the first time as Nato allies, the heads of state of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland.

We should be proud of what the alliance accomplished in its first half century. But we cannot be complacent. Today we face issues different from but no less challenging than those faced by our predecessors 50 years ago. With apologies to the calendar, the Washington Summit will be the first Summit of the 21st century. It will chart Nato's future, not just celebrate the past.

In Brussels we will continue our efforts to build a Nato that is a larger, more flexible alliance, committed to collective defence, capable of meeting a wide range of threats to common alliance interests, and working in partnership with other nations and organisations to advance security, prosperity and democracy in and for the entire transatlantic area.

At the Washington summit, our leaders will issue a new strategic concept, a blueprint for the alliance's future. A 21st century Nato must take account of the new strategic environment. While most of Europe is more secure than at any time in living memory, alliance territory and alliance interests can be affected by a range of risks from a variety of sources. As President Clinton said in Berlin last May: "Tomorrow's alliance must continue to defend enlarged borders and defend against threats to our security from beyond them – the spread of weapons of mass destruction, ethnic violence, regional conflict."

Bosnia and Kosovo are recent examples that demonstrate Nato must act when conflicts beyond its immediate borders affect alliance interests. Nato's new strategic concept must find the right balance between affirming the centrality of Nato's collective defence missions and responding to such crises. Together, we must improve both our flexibility and our capability to prevent, deter and if necessary respond to the full spectrum of possible threats to alliance interests.

Nato's primary mission will always remain defence against aggression. That is the heart of the original 1949 Washington Treaty establishing Nato. But the founders of the alliance also distinguished between what the treaty commits us to do and what it permits us to do. If joint military action is ever needed to protect vital alliance interests, it makes sense to use the unified military structure and the habits of co-operation we have built up over the past fifty years.

In addition to reaching agreement on a new vision for the 21st century, the task for the Washington summit will be to ensure that Nato has the means to realise that vision. We need military forces that are designed, equipped and prepared for 21<sup>st</sup>-century missions. William Cohen, US defence secretary, has been working closely with allied defence ministers on proposals to modernise Nato's military forces. Our goal is to reach agreement at the Washington summit on a long-term programme to develop the right capabilities to ensure both self-defence and the ability to respond quickly and effectively to crises.

That is why we welcome the call from Tony Blair, the UK prime minister, for Europeans to consider ways they can take more responsibility for their own security and defence. Our interest is clear: we want a Europe that can act. We want a Europe with modern, flexible military forces that are capable of putting out fires in Europe's backyard and working with us through the alliance to defend our common interests. European efforts to do more for Europe's own defence make it easier, not harder, for us to remain engaged.

We will examine all proposals on European defence and security with a simple question in mind: Does it improve our effectiveness in working together? Like Mr Blair, we believe the emphasis should be placed on enhancing the practical capabilities Europe brings to our alliance.

The Kosovo crisis shows how practical European defence capabilities can help fulfil Nato missions. Thanks to the initiative of the French and the contributions of the Germans, British, Italians and other allies, Nato is deploying an all-European "extraction force" for the monitors of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe who are being sent to the troubled province. This force is under Nato command, and is based on solid European capabilities. It shows how European forces can work within Nato to great effect in the real world. We appreciate the willingness of the government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to host this force.

Kosovo carries another lesson: political will is more important than additional institutional structures. The problem in Kosovo before we acted together was not the lack of appropriate institutions; it was the lack of agreement to use the institutions we have.

As Europeans look at the best way to organise their foreign and security policy cooperation, the key is to make sure that any institutional change is consistent with basic principles that have served the Atlantic partnership well for 50 years. This means avoiding what I would call the Three Ds: decoupling, duplication, and discrimination.

First, we want to avoid decoupling: Nato is the expression of the indispensable transatlantic link. It should remain an organisation of sovereign allies, where European decision-making is not unhooked from broader alliance decision-making.

Second, we want to avoid duplication: defence resources are too scarce for allies to conduct force planning, operate command structures, and make procurement decisions twice – once at Nato and once more at the EU. And third, we want to avoid any discrimination against Nato members who are not EU members.

The goal outlined by Mr Blair is consistent with these principles. We look forward to discussing with all of our European allies and partners how to strengthen Europe's capacity to act.

One challenge in particular the Washington summit must address is the very real threat to our people, our territory, and our military forces posed by weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We must improve overall alliance efforts both to stem proliferation and to deter, prevent and protect against such attacks. Nato's efforts should complement, not supplant, the existing regimes and efforts under way to control proliferation.

The 21<sup>st</sup>-century Nato we envisage will be a central pillar of a much wider North Atlantic community of shared risk and responsibility among increasingly secure and prosperous democracies. For nations aspiring to membership, Nato's door remains open, and the alliance should be even more active in its efforts to help them walk through it.

Nato enlargement is not a one-time event; the first new members will not be the last. But the Washington summit should improve our ability to work jointly with all partner nations, regardless of their alliance aspirations, to extend security and stability throughout this broader community. Nato's distinctive partnership with Ukraine is an important element of this broader effort.

We want Russia to be a close and active participant in this 21st century partnership. My colleagues and I will be meeting this week with Igor Ivanov, the Russian foreign minister, in the Nato-Russia Permanent Joint Council, where we continue our efforts to improve cooperation in the spirit of the Nato-Russia Founding Act, which will celebrate its second anniversary in June. Nato and Russian troops continue to work side by side in Bosnia. Together we are working on possible Russian participation in the Air Verification Regime in Kosovo. We plan to open a military liaison mission in Moscow. Together we are retraining retired Russian military officers, developing co-operative responses to civil emergencies, and developing common approaches to non-proliferation and to environmental protection – all signs that the Nato-Russia relationship continues to move forward.

The lesson of this century – the bloodiest ever – is that when Europe and the US act together, we advance our interests and our values more effectively than any of us can alone. When we fail to agree, stalemate and even crisis are the result. Fifty years from now, we want a succeeding generation to say that we learned our lesson and applied it well to the many challenges we would face in the new century. That new century is being shaped today by our joint response to instability in the western Balkans. And it will be shaped to a great extent by the decisions we take this coming week and over the coming months. I am confident that those decisions will be the right ones for the future of our great alliance.

## ***5 European Council Vienna, 11-12 December 1998***

### **PRESIDENCY CONCLUSIONS**

(...)

73. Regarding the Common Foreign and Security Policy, the European Council agrees that the Secretary-General of the Council and High Representative for the CFSP will be appointed as soon as possible and will be a personality with a strong political profile. The European Council takes note of the work undertaken by the Council concerning the establishment of a Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit within the General Secretariat.

74. The European Council invites the Council in accordance with the recommendations in its report to prepare common strategies on Russia, Ukraine, the Mediterranean region, taking specifically into account the Barcelona Process and the Middle East Peace Process, as well as on the Western Balkans, on the understanding that the first common strategy will be on Russia. When identifying further subjects for common strategies, thematic subjects should also be considered.

75. The European Council invites the Council to bring forward, in agreement with the WEU, the completion of arrangements for enhanced cooperation under the Protocol on Article 17 of the Treaty on European Union, as amended by the Amsterdam Treaty, so that these may come into effect on the Treaty's entry into force.

76. The European Council welcomes the new impetus given to the debate on a common European policy on security and defence. The European Council considers that in order for the European Union to be in a position to play its full role on the international stage, the CFSP must be backed by credible operational capabilities. It welcomes the Franco-British declaration made on 4 December 1998 in St Malo. The reinforcement of European solidarity must take into account the various positions of European States, including the obligations of some Member States within Nato.

77. It welcomes the intention of the WEU to conduct an audit of the assets available for European operations.

78. The European Council invites the incoming Presidency to further this debate in the wake of discussions in the WEU Ministerial in Rome on 16 November and in the General Affairs Council held on 7 December. The European Council will examine this issue in Cologne on 3 and 4 June 1999.

(...)

## ***6 German Presidency paper Bonn, 24 February 1999***

### **INFORMAL REFLECTION AT WEU ON EUROPE'S SECURITY AND DEFENCE**

#### **I.**

1. The Treaty of Amsterdam, which is expected to enter into force this spring, foresees the enhancement of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) including the development of a Common European Defence Policy (CEDP). The Treaty also provides for the possibility of integration of WEU into EU, should the European Council so decide.

2. The WEU Council of Ministers at Rome expressed the wish that a process of informal reflection be initiated at WEU on the question of Europe's security and defence in the perspective of the entry into force of the Amsterdam Treaty and the Washington Summit.

The European Council in Vienna welcomed the new impetus given to the debate on a common European policy on security and defence. It considered that in order for the EU to be in a position to play its full role on the international stage, CFSP must be backed by credible operational capabilities. Furthermore, it welcomed the Franco-British declaration made on 4 December 1998 in St. Malo.

The European Council invited the German Presidency to further this debate and agreed to examine the question again at the European Council in Cologne.

The WEU Ministerial Council in Bremen will also present an appropriate opportunity to discuss this question on the basis of the informal reflection which was initiated at the Rome Ministerial Council.

#### **II.**

1. The prime focus of our debate should be on how Europe can possess appropriate structures and capabilities (which obviously need to include military capabilities) to conduct crisis management in the sense of the Petersberg tasks.

The question of defence commitments (Article 5 NATO - and WEU - Treaty) should - for the time being - not be the first priority. Crisis management is the area where a European capacity to act is required most urgently.

2. For crisis management operations implying recourse to military means there are five options with potentially different participants and a different degree of European involvement.

Option 1: NATO-operations in which all NATO-members participate.

Option 2: NATO PLUS operations. Conducted by NATO including PfP partners and possibly others. Example: SFOR in Bosnia.

Option 3: NATO-operations in which not all NATO-members participate with troops.  
Ex: extraction force for Kosovo Verification Mission.

Option 4: European (EU/WEU) led operations using NATO assets and capabilities:  
Conducted by the Europeans having recourse to NATO assets in application of the Berlin decisions; further implementation decisions by the NATO summit in Washington would be required for this option to be fully operational.

Option 5: Autonomous European (EU/WEU) led operations conducted by the Europeans without recourse to NATO assets.

3. Looking at these different options we should focus our discussion in this process on options 4 and 5. We should try to define our position on the following elements:

What is our fundamental aim? Do we agree that the aim is to strengthen CFSP by enabling the EU to have the capacity for action through a common policy on European Security and Defence backed up by credible military forces and the means to decide to use them?

How far is European decision-making necessary and possible for operations both with the use of NATO assets and capabilities as well as those without recourse to NATO assets and capabilities?

What are the minimum requirements for an effective decision making capability in the field of defence and security?

What capabilities do already exist and what further developments are still required? How can duplication of means and efforts be avoided?

Should WEU be merged with EU along the lines of the phase concepts introduced during the last IGC (or at one go)?

- What institutional arrangements would be required?
- What should be the organisational link with NATO?
- How can the necessary know how be introduced in EU decision-making with the aim to provide for capabilities to conduct political control and strategic direction?
- Do we need regular meetings (or ad hoc) of the General Affairs Council together with Defence Ministers?
- Do we need independent Defence Ministers meetings?
- What would be the permanent body equivalent to the WEU Council?
- Do we need a EU military Committee?

How do we involve those European NATO Members who are not EU Member States as well as the Associate Partners?

16

How do we address the US concerns as expressed by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright on December 7 (no decoupling, no duplication, no discrimination)?

## ***7 Informal meeting of EU foreign ministers Eltville, 13-14 March 1999, German proposal***

### **STRENGTHENING THE COMMON POLICY ON SECURITY AND DEFENCE**

#### **I. Introduction**

The Treaty of Amsterdam, which is expected to enter into force this spring, foresees the enhancement of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) including the development of a Common European Defence Policy (CEDP). The Treaty also provides for the possibility of integration of WEU into EU, should the European Council so decide.

The European Council in Vienna welcomed the new impetus given to the debate on a common European policy on security and defence. It considered that in order for the EU to be in a position to play its full role on the international stage, CFSP must be backed by credible operational capabilities. Furthermore, it welcomed the Franco-British declaration made on 4 December 1998 in St. Malo.

This initiative and work in hand for the NATO Washington Summit will also strengthen the European pillar of the Alliance, enabling the European Allies to take greater responsibility for their common security and defence.

The European Council invited the German presidency to further this debate and agreed to examine the question again at the European Council in Cologne.

The WEU Ministerial Council in Bremen will also present an appropriate opportunity to discuss this question on the basis of the informal reflection which was initiated at the Rome Ministerial Council.

#### **II. Guiding principles**

1. The aim is to strengthen CFSP and complement it by the development of a Common European policy on security and defence. This requires a capacity for action backed by credible military capabilities and appropriate decision making bodies. Decisions to act would be taken within the institutional framework of the European Union. The European Union Council would thus be able to make decisions on the whole range of activities in the external relations of the Union (trade, CFSP, Defence).

The Amsterdam Treaty incorporates the Petersberg tasks ('humanitarian and rescue tasks, peace-keeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making') into the Treaty.

The focus of our efforts therefore would be to assure that Europe possesses appropriate capabilities (including military capabilities) and structures to conduct crisis management in the scope of the Petersberg tasks. This is the area where a European capacity to act is required most urgently.

2. The efforts to strengthen European defence and security contribute to the vitality and effectiveness of the Atlantic Alliance by strengthening its European pillar. This shall lead to more complementarity, co-operation and synergy.

The Alliance remains the foundation of the collective defence of its members. The commitments under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty and Article V of the Brussels Treaty will be preserved although there will be a need to review the institutional basis for the latter, in the understanding that whatever happens to the modified Brussels Treaty Article V, the collective security guarantee will continue to apply only to those who are NATO allies.

3. The requirements for the successful creation of a European defence capability will include

- the ability of all EU member states to participate fully in European operations drawing on NATO assets and capabilities;
- satisfactory arrangements for European NATO members who are not EU member states to be associated with policies in the field of defence and with Petersberg operations;
- arrangements to ensure EU/NATO transparency and consultation. In addition, the possibility for involvement of Associate Partners of WEU needs further consideration.

4. For the effective implementation of its operations, the European Union will be able to choose, according to the requirements of the case, either

- EU-led operations using NATO assets and capabilities and
- EU-led operations without recourse to NATO assets and capabilities.

This requires in particular:

- the means for effective EU decision making in the field of security and defence policy and
- the necessary capabilities including military capabilities.

As regards EU decision making in the field of security and defence policy, necessary arrangements have to be made which will also ensure political control and strategic direction of EU-led operations.

Furthermore, the EU will need a capacity for analysis of situations, sources of intelligence, and a capacity for relevant strategic planning.

This may require in particular:

- regular meetings (or ad hoc) of the General Affairs Council, including Defence Ministers;
- a permanent body consisting of representatives with pol/mil expertise;
- an EU Military Committee consisting of Military Representatives;

- a Military Staff including the Situation Centre;
- other resources such as Satellite Centre, Institute for Security Studies.

As regards military capabilities, nations need to develop further forces (including force headquarters) that are suited also for crisis management operations. The main characteristics include: deployability, sustainability, interoperability, flexibility and mobility.

Any unnecessary duplication with regard to existing capabilities within NATO has to be avoided.

5. For autonomous European led operations, the EU could use either European capabilities pre-identified within NATO's European pillar or multinational or national European means outside the NATO framework.

In the case of the EU having recourse to NATO assets and capabilities, including European command arrangements, the main focus should be on the following aspects:

- Conclusion of the arrangements based on the Berlin decisions of 1996 by the time of the Washington NATO summit in April 1999.
- Further arrangements to secure automatic access to planning capabilities in NATO and a presumption of access to NATO assets and capabilities for European led operations
- Need for transfer to the EU of the arrangements between WEU and NATO on the European side (without renegotiation).

### **III. The Way Ahead**

After discussion at ministerial level the presidency will prepare its report for the European Council in Cologne which should reflect common principles on the future of European security and defence.

The Presidency will also reflect on possible conclusions for the European Council in Cologne. In drawing up such conclusions, the Presidency will try to answer the following questions:

1. How can we create the conditions for a common European policy on security and defence providing for homogenous action in European crisis management within the EU?
2. What will be the consequences for the future of WEU taking into account Article 17 of the EU Treaty which provides for the possibility of integrating WEU into the EU?
3. How can European military capabilities be developed further with regard to Petersberg tasks and in accordance with the decisions of the NATO summit in Washington in April?
4. Does this also require harmonisation of the requirements, development and procurement as well as further enhancement of cooperation of European defence industries?

8 March 1999.

## **8 North Atlantic Council summit Washington, DC, 24 April 1999**

*NATO convened its 50<sup>th</sup> birthday/summit while Operation Allied Force was under way in Kosovo. One way of marking its birthday had been by the idea of rewriting and updating its 1991 Strategic Concept (see p. 24). By the time the summit was held, however, the whole strategic environment had altered again. One can therefore clearly see, in the light of what was happening in Kosovo, a much greater degree of acceptance of the ESDP in the Washington Communiqué than in the previously prepared 'new' new Strategic Concept.*

### **FINAL COMMUNIQUE**

An Alliance for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

1. We, the Heads of State and Government of the member countries of the North Atlantic Alliance, have gathered in Washington to celebrate the 50th anniversary of NATO and to set forth our vision of the Alliance of the 21st century. The North Atlantic Alliance, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, remains the basis of our collective defence; it embodies the transatlantic link that binds North America and Europe in a unique defence and security partnership.

2. Fifty years ago, the North Atlantic Alliance was founded in troubled and uncertain times. It has withstood the test of five decades and allowed the citizens of Allied countries to enjoy an unprecedented period of peace, freedom and prosperity. Here in Washington, we have paid tribute to the achievements of the past and we have shaped a new Alliance to meet the challenges of the future. This new Alliance will be larger, more capable and more flexible, committed to collective defence and able to undertake new missions including contributing to effective conflict prevention and engaging actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations. The Alliance will work with other nations and organisations to advance security, prosperity and democracy throughout the Euro-Atlantic region. The presence today of three new Allies - the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland - demonstrates that we have overcome the division of Europe.

3. The Alliance takes the opportunity of this 50th anniversary to recognise and express its heartfelt appreciation for the commitment, sacrifice, resolve and loyalty of the servicemen and women of all Allies to the cause of freedom. The Alliance salutes these active and reserve forces' essential contributions, which for 50 years have guaranteed freedom and safeguarded trans-Atlantic security. Our nations and our Alliance are in their debt and offer them profound thanks.

4. The NATO of the 21st century starts today - a NATO which retains the strengths of the past and has new missions, new members and new partnerships. To this end, we have:

- approved an updated Strategic Concept;
- reaffirmed our commitment to the enlargement process of the Alliance and approved a Membership Action Plan for countries wishing to join;
- completed the work on key elements of the Berlin Decisions on building the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance and decided to further enhance its effectiveness;
- launched the Defence Capabilities Initiative;
- intensified our relations with Partners through an enhanced and more operational Partnership for Peace and strengthened our consultations and co-operation within the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council;
- enhanced the Mediterranean Dialogue; and
- decided to increase Alliance efforts against weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

5. As part of the Alliance's adaptation to the new security challenges, we have updated our Strategic Concept to make it fully consistent with the Alliance's new security environment. The updated Concept reaffirms our commitment to collective defence and the transatlantic link; takes account of the challenges the Alliance now faces; presents an Alliance ready and with a full range of capabilities to enhance the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area; reaffirms our commitment to building the ESDI within the Alliance; highlights the enhanced role of partnership and dialogue; underlines the need to develop defence capabilities to their full potential to meet the spectrum of Alliance missions, including forces which are more deployable, sustainable, survivable and able to engage effectively; and provides guidance to the NATO Military Authorities to this end.

6. To achieve its essential purpose, as an Alliance of nations committed to the Washington Treaty and the United Nations Charter, the Alliance performs the following fundamental security tasks:

**Security:** To provide one of the indispensable foundations for a stable Euro-Atlantic security environment, based on the growth of democratic institutions and commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes, in which no country would be able to intimidate or coerce any other through the threat or use of force.

**Consultation:** To serve, as provided for in Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty, as an essential transatlantic forum for Allied consultations on any issues that affect their vital interests, including possible developments posing risks for members' security, and for appropriate co-ordination of their efforts in fields of common concern.

**Deterrence and Defence:** To deter and defend against any threat of aggression against any NATO member state as provided for in Articles 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty.

And in order to enhance the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area:

- **Crisis Management:** To stand ready, case-by-case and by consensus, in conformity with Article 7 of the Washington Treaty, to contribute to effective conflict prevention and to engage actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations.

- Partnership: To promote wide-ranging partnership, cooperation, and dialogue with other countries in the Euro-Atlantic area, with the aim of increasing transparency, mutual confidence and the capacity for joint action with the Alliance.

(...)

8. We reaffirm our commitment to preserve the transatlantic link, including our readiness to pursue common security objectives through the Alliance wherever possible. We are pleased with the progress achieved in implementing the Berlin decisions and reaffirm our strong commitment to pursue the process of reinforcing the European pillar of the Alliance on the basis of our Brussels Declaration of 1994 and of the principles agreed at Berlin in 1996. We note with satisfaction that the key elements of the Berlin decisions are being put in place. These include flexible options for the selection of a European NATO Commander and NATO Headquarters for WEU-led operations, as well as specific terms of reference for DSACEUR and an adapted CJTF concept. Close linkages between the two organisations have been established, including planning, exercises (in particular a joint crisis management exercise in 2000) and consultation, as well as a framework for the release and return of Alliance assets and capabilities.

9. We welcome the new impetus given to the strengthening of a common European policy in security and defence by the Amsterdam Treaty and the reflections launched since then in the WEU and – following the St. Malo Declaration – in the EU, including the Vienna European Council Conclusions. This is a process which has implications for all Allies. We confirm that a stronger European role will help contribute to the vitality of our Alliance for the 21st century, which is the foundation of the collective defence of its members. In this regard:

- a. We acknowledge the resolve of the European Union to have the capacity for autonomous action so that it can take decisions and approve military action where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged;
- b. As this process goes forward, NATO and the EU should ensure the development of effective mutual consultation, co-operation and transparency, building on the mechanisms existing between NATO and the WEU;
- c. We applaud the determination of both EU members and other European Allies to take the necessary steps to strengthen their defence capabilities, especially for new missions, avoiding unnecessary duplication;
- d. We attach the utmost importance to ensuring the fullest possible involvement of non-EU European Allies in EU-led crisis response operations, building on existing consultation arrangements within the WEU. We also note Canada's interest in participating in such operations under appropriate modalities.
- e. We are determined that the decisions taken in Berlin in 1996, including the concept of using separable but not separate NATO assets and capabilities for WEU-led operations, should be further developed.

10. On the basis of the above principles and building on the Berlin decisions, we therefore stand ready to define and adopt the necessary arrangements for ready access by the European Union to the collective assets and capabilities of the Alliance, for operations in which the Alliance as a whole is not engaged militarily as an Alliance. The Council in

Permanent Session will approve these arrangements, which will respect the requirements of NATO operations and the coherence of its command structure, and should address:

- a. Assured EU access to NATO planning capabilities able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations;
- b. The presumption of availability to the EU of pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets for use in EU-led operations;
- c. Identification of a range of European command options for EU-led operations, further developing the role of DSACEUR in order for him to assume fully and effectively his European responsibilities;
- d. The further adaptation of NATO's defence planning system to incorporate more comprehensively the availability of forces for EU-led operations.

We task the Council in Permanent Session to address these measures on an ongoing basis, taking into account the evolution of relevant arrangements in the EU. The Council will make recommendations to the next Ministerial meeting for its consideration.

11. We have launched a Defence Capabilities Initiative to improve the defence capabilities of the Alliance to ensure the effectiveness of future multinational operations across the full spectrum of Alliance missions in the present and foreseeable security environment with a special focus on improving interoperability among Alliance forces (and where applicable also between Alliance and Partner forces). Defence capabilities will be increased through improvements in the deployability and mobility of Alliance forces, their sustainability and logistics, their survivability and effective engagement capability, and command and control and information systems. In this connection, we endorse the Council decision to begin implementing the Multinational Joint Logistics Centre concept by the end of 1999, and to develop the C3 system architecture by 2002 to form a basis for an integrated Alliance core capability allowing interoperability with national systems. We have established a temporary High-Level Steering Group to oversee the implementation of the Defence Capabilities Initiative and to meet the requirement of co-ordination and harmonisation among relevant planning disciplines, including for Allies concerned force planning, with the aim of achieving lasting effects on improvements in capabilities and interoperability. Improvements in interoperability and critical capabilities should also strengthen the European pillar in NATO.

**THE ALLIANCE'S STRATEGIC CONCEPT**

**Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23rd and 24th April 1999**

**Introduction**

1. At their Summit meeting in Washington in April 1999, NATO Heads of State and Government approved the Alliance's new Strategic Concept.

2. NATO has successfully ensured the freedom of its members and prevented war in Europe during the 40 years of the Cold War. By combining defence with dialogue, it played an indispensable role in bringing East-West confrontation to a peaceful end. The dramatic changes in the Euro-Atlantic strategic landscape brought by the end of the Cold War were reflected in the Alliance's 1991 Strategic Concept. There have, however, been further profound political and security developments since then.

3. The dangers of the Cold War have given way to more promising, but also challenging prospects, to new opportunities and risks. A new Europe of greater integration is emerging, and a Euro-Atlantic security structure is evolving in which NATO plays a central part. The Alliance has been at the heart of efforts to establish new patterns of cooperation and mutual understanding across the Euro-Atlantic region and has committed itself to essential new activities in the interest of a wider stability. It has shown the depth of that commitment in its efforts to put an end to the immense human suffering created by conflict in the Balkans. The years since the end of the Cold War have also witnessed important developments in arms control, a process to which the Alliance is fully committed. The Alliance's role in these positive developments has been underpinned by the comprehensive adaptation of its approach to security and of its procedures and structures. The last ten years have also seen, however, the appearance of complex new risks to Euro-Atlantic peace and stability, including oppression, ethnic conflict, economic distress, the collapse of political order, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

4. The Alliance has an indispensable role to play in consolidating and preserving the positive changes of the recent past, and in meeting current and future security challenges. It has, therefore, a demanding agenda. It must safeguard common security interests in an environment of further, often unpredictable change. It must maintain collective defence and reinforce the transatlantic link and ensure a balance that allows the European Allies to assume greater responsibility. It must deepen its relations with its partners and prepare for the accession of new members. It must, above all, maintain the political will and the military means required by the entire range of its missions.

5. This new Strategic Concept will guide the Alliance as it pursues this agenda. It expresses NATO's enduring purpose and nature and its fundamental security tasks, identifies the central features of the new security environment, specifies the elements of the Alliance's broad approach to security, and provides guidelines for the further adaptation of its military forces.

**Part I - The Purpose and Tasks of the Alliance**

6. NATO's essential and enduring purpose, set out in the Washington Treaty, is to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members by political and military means. Based on common values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, the Alliance has striven since its inception to secure a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe. It will continue to do so. The achievement of this aim can be put at risk by crisis and conflict affecting the security of the Euro-Atlantic area. The Alliance therefore not only ensures the defence of its members but contributes to peace and stability in this region.

7. The Alliance embodies the transatlantic link by which the security of North America is permanently tied to the security of Europe. It is the practical expression of effective collective effort among its members in support of their common interests.

8. The fundamental guiding principle by which the Alliance works is that of common commitment and mutual co-operation among sovereign states in support of the indivisibility of security for all of its members. Solidarity and cohesion within the Alliance, through daily cooperation in both the political and military spheres, ensure that no single Ally is forced to rely upon its own national efforts alone in dealing with basic security challenges. Without depriving member states of their right and duty to assume their sovereign responsibilities in the field of defence, the Alliance enables them through collective effort to realise their essential national security objectives.

9. The resulting sense of equal security among the members of the Alliance, regardless of differences in their circumstances or in their national military capabilities, contributes to stability in the Euro-Atlantic area. The Alliance does not seek these benefits for its members alone, but is committed to the creation of conditions conducive to increased partnership, cooperation, and dialogue with others who share its broad political objectives.

10. To achieve its essential purpose, as an Alliance of nations committed to the Washington Treaty and the United Nations Charter, the Alliance performs the following fundamental security tasks:

**Security:** To provide one of the indispensable foundations for a stable Euro-Atlantic security environment, based on the growth of democratic institutions and commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes, in which no country would be able to intimidate or coerce any other through the threat or use of force.

**Consultation:** To serve, as provided for in Article 4 of the Washington Treaty, as an essential transatlantic forum for Allied consultations on any issues that affect their vital interests, including possible developments posing risks for members' security, and for appropriate co-ordination of their efforts in fields of common concern.

**Deterrence and Defence:** To deter and defend against any threat of aggression against any NATO member state as provided for in Articles 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty.

And in order to enhance the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area:

- Crisis Management: To stand ready, case-by-case and by consensus, in conformity with Article 7 of the Washington Treaty, to contribute to effective conflict prevention and to engage actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations.
- Partnership: To promote wide-ranging partnership, cooperation, and dialogue with other countries in the Euro-Atlantic area, with the aim of increasing transparency, mutual confidence and the capacity for joint action with the Alliance.

11. In fulfilling its purpose and fundamental security tasks, the Alliance will continue to respect the legitimate security interests of others, and seek the peaceful resolution of disputes as set out in the Charter of the United Nations. The Alliance will promote peaceful and friendly international relations and support democratic institutions. The Alliance does not consider itself to be any country's adversary.

## **Part II - Strategic Perspectives**

### **The Evolving Strategic Environment**

12. The Alliance operates in an environment of continuing change. Developments in recent years have been generally positive, but uncertainties and risks remain which can develop into acute crises. Within this evolving context, NATO has played an essential part in strengthening Euro-Atlantic security since the end of the Cold War. Its growing political role; its increased political and military partnership, cooperation and dialogue with other states, including with Russia, Ukraine and Mediterranean Dialogue countries; its continuing openness to the accession of new members; its collaboration with other international organisations; its commitment, exemplified in the Balkans, to conflict prevention and crisis management, including through peace support operations: all reflect its determination to shape its security environment and enhance the peace and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area.

13. In parallel, NATO has successfully adapted to enhance its ability to contribute to Euro-Atlantic peace and stability. Internal reform has included a new command structure, including the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept, the creation of arrangements to permit the rapid deployment of forces for the full range of the Alliance's missions, and the building of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within the Alliance.

14. The United Nations (UN), the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), and the Western European Union (WEU) have made distinctive contributions to Euro-Atlantic security and stability. Mutually reinforcing organisations have become a central feature of the security environment.

15. The United Nations Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and, as such, plays a crucial role in contributing to security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area.

16. The OSCE, as a regional arrangement, is the most inclusive security organisation in Europe, which also includes Canada and the United States, and plays an essential role in promoting peace and stability, enhancing cooperative security, and advancing democracy and human rights in Europe. The OSCE is particularly active in the fields of preventive

diplomacy, conflict prevention, crisis management, and post-conflict rehabilitation. NATO and the OSCE have developed close practical cooperation, especially with regard to the international effort to bring peace to the former Yugoslavia.

17. The European Union has taken important decisions and given a further impetus to its efforts to strengthen its security and defence dimension. This process will have implications for the entire Alliance, and all European Allies should be involved in it, building on arrangements developed by NATO and the WEU. The development of a common foreign and security policy (CFSP) includes the progressive framing of a common defence policy. Such a policy, as called for in the Amsterdam Treaty, would be compatible with the common security and defence policy established within the framework of the Washington Treaty. Important steps taken in this context include the incorporation of the WEU's Petersberg tasks into the Treaty on European Union and the development of closer institutional relations with the WEU.

18. As stated in the 1994 Summit declaration and reaffirmed in Berlin in 1996, the Alliance fully supports the development of the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance by making available its assets and capabilities for WEU-led operations. To this end, the Alliance and the WEU have developed a close relationship and put into place key elements of the ESDI as agreed in Berlin. In order to enhance peace and stability in Europe and more widely, the European Allies are strengthening their capacity for action, including by increasing their military capabilities. The increase of the responsibilities and capacities of the European Allies with respect to security and defence enhances the security environment of the Alliance.

19. The stability, transparency, predictability, lower levels of armaments, and verification which can be provided by arms control and non-proliferation agreements support NATO's political and military efforts to achieve its strategic objectives. The Allies have played a major part in the significant achievements in this field. These include the enhanced stability produced by the CFE Treaty, the deep reductions in nuclear weapons provided for in the START treaties; the signature of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the indefinite and unconditional extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the accession to it of Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine as non-nuclear weapons states, and the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention. The Ottawa Convention to ban anti-personnel landmines and similar agreements make an important contribution to alleviating human suffering. There are welcome prospects for further advances in arms control in conventional weapons and with respect to nuclear, chemical, and biological (NBC) weapons.

#### **Security challenges and risks**

20. Notwithstanding positive developments in the strategic environment and the fact that large-scale conventional aggression against the Alliance is highly unlikely, the possibility of such a threat emerging over the longer term exists. The security of the Alliance remains subject to a wide variety of military and non-military risks which are multi-directional and often difficult to predict. These risks include uncertainty and instability in and around the Euro-Atlantic area and the possibility of regional crises at the periphery of the Alliance, which could evolve rapidly. Some countries in and around the Euro-Atlantic area face serious economic, social and political difficulties. Ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the

dissolution of states can lead to local and even regional instability. The resulting tensions could lead to crises affecting Euro-Atlantic stability, to human suffering, and to armed conflicts. Such conflicts could affect the security of the Alliance by spilling over into neighbouring countries, including NATO countries, or in other ways, and could also affect the security of other states.

21. The existence of powerful nuclear forces outside the Alliance also constitutes a significant factor which the Alliance has to take into account if security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area are to be maintained.

22. The proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery remains a matter of serious concern. In spite of welcome progress in strengthening international non-proliferation regimes, major challenges with respect to proliferation remain. The Alliance recognises that proliferation can occur despite efforts to prevent it and can pose a direct military threat to the Allies' populations, territory, and forces. Some states, including on NATO's periphery and in other regions, sell or acquire or try to acquire NBC weapons and delivery means. Commodities and technology that could be used to build these weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means are becoming more common, while detection and prevention of illicit trade in these materials and know-how continues to be difficult. Non-state actors have shown the potential to create and use some of these weapons.

23. The global spread of technology that can be of use in the production of weapons may result in the greater availability of sophisticated military capabilities, permitting adversaries to acquire highly capable offensive and defensive air, land, and sea-borne systems, cruise missiles, and other advanced weaponry. In addition, state and non-state adversaries may try to exploit the Alliance's growing reliance on information systems through information operations designed to disrupt such systems. They may attempt to use strategies of this kind to counter NATO's superiority in traditional weaponry.

24. Any armed attack on the territory of the Allies, from whatever direction, would be covered by Articles 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty. However, Alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism, sabotage and organised crime, and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources. The uncontrolled movement of large numbers of people, particularly as a consequence of armed conflicts, can also pose problems for security and stability affecting the Alliance. Arrangements exist within the Alliance for consultation among the Allies under Article 4 of the Washington Treaty and, where appropriate, co-ordination of their efforts including their responses to risks of this kind.

### **Part III - The Approach to Security in the 21st Century**

25. The Alliance is committed to a broad approach to security, which recognises the importance of political, economic, social and environmental factors in addition to the indispensable defence dimension. This broad approach forms the basis for the Alliance to accomplish its fundamental security tasks effectively, and its increasing effort to develop effective cooperation with other European and Euro-Atlantic organisations as well as the United Nations. Our collective aim is to build a European security architecture in which the Alliance's contribution to the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area and the

contribution of these other international organisations are complementary and mutually reinforcing, both in deepening relations among Euro-Atlantic countries and in managing crises. NATO remains the essential forum for consultation among the Allies and the forum for agreement on policies bearing on the security and defence commitments of its members under the Washington Treaty.

26. The Alliance seeks to preserve peace and to reinforce Euro-Atlantic security and stability by: the preservation of the transatlantic link; the maintenance of effective military capabilities sufficient for deterrence and defence and to fulfil the full range of its missions; the development of the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance; an overall capability to manage crises successfully; its continued openness to new members; and the continued pursuit of partnership, cooperation, and dialogue with other nations as part of its co-operative approach to Euro-Atlantic security, including in the field of arms control and disarmament.

#### **The Transatlantic Link**

27. NATO is committed to a strong and dynamic partnership between Europe and North America in support of the values and interests they share. The security of Europe and that of North America are indivisible. Thus the Alliance's commitment to the indispensable transatlantic link and the collective defence of its members is fundamental to its credibility and to the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area.

#### **The Maintenance Of Alliance Military Capabilities**

28. The maintenance of an adequate military capability and clear preparedness to act collectively in the common defence remain central to the Alliance's security objectives. Such a capability, together with political solidarity, remains at the core of the Alliance's ability to prevent any attempt at coercion or intimidation, and to guarantee that military aggression directed against the Alliance can never be perceived as an option with any prospect of success.

29. Military capabilities effective under the full range of foreseeable circumstances are also the basis of the Alliance's ability to contribute to conflict prevention and crisis management through non-Article 5 crisis response operations. These missions can be highly demanding and can place a premium on the same political and military qualities, such as cohesion, multinational training, and extensive prior planning, that would be essential in an Article 5 situation. Accordingly, while they may pose special requirements, they will be handled through a common set of Alliance structures and procedures.

#### **The European Security And Defence Identity**

30. The Alliance, which is the foundation of the collective defence of its members and through which common security objectives will be pursued wherever possible, remains committed to a balanced and dynamic transatlantic partnership. The European Allies have taken decisions to enable them to assume greater responsibilities in the security and defence field in order to enhance the peace and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area and thus the security of all Allies. On the basis of decisions taken by the Alliance, in Berlin in 1996 and subsequently, the European Security and Defence Identity will continue to be developed within NATO. This process will require close cooperation between NATO, the WEU and, if and when appropriate, the European Union. It will enable all European Allies to make a

more coherent and effective contribution to the missions and activities of the Alliance as an expression of our shared responsibilities; it will reinforce the transatlantic partnership; and it will assist the European Allies to act by themselves as required through the readiness of the Alliance, on a case-by-case basis and by consensus, to make its assets and capabilities available for operations in which the Alliance is not engaged militarily under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or as otherwise agreed, taking into account the full participation of all European Allies if they were so to choose.

#### **Conflict Prevention And Crisis Management**

31. In pursuit of its policy of preserving peace, preventing war, and enhancing security and stability and as set out in the fundamental security tasks, NATO will seek, in cooperation with other organisations, to prevent conflict, or, should a crisis arise, to contribute to its effective management, consistent with international law, including through the possibility of conducting non-Article 5 crisis response operations. The Alliance's preparedness to carry out such operations supports the broader objective of reinforcing and extending stability and often involves the participation of NATO's Partners. NATO recalls its offer, made in Brussels in 1994, to support on a case-by-case basis in accordance with its own procedures, peacekeeping and other operations under the authority of the UN Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE, including by making available Alliance resources and expertise. In this context NATO recalls its subsequent decisions with respect to crisis response operations in the Balkans. Taking into account the necessity for Alliance solidarity and cohesion, participation in any such operation or mission will remain subject to decisions of member states in accordance with national constitutions.

32. NATO will make full use of partnership, cooperation and dialogue and its links to other organisations to contribute to preventing crises and, should they arise, defusing them at an early stage. A coherent approach to crisis management, as in any use of force by the Alliance, will require the Alliance's political authorities to choose and co-ordinate appropriate responses from a range of both political and military measures and to exercise close political control at all stages.

#### **Partnership, Cooperation, And Dialogue**

33. Through its active pursuit of partnership, cooperation, and dialogue, the Alliance is a positive force in promoting security and stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. Through outreach and openness, the Alliance seeks to preserve peace, support and promote democracy, contribute to prosperity and progress, and foster genuine partnership with and among all democratic Euro-Atlantic countries. This aims at enhancing the security of all, excludes nobody, and helps to overcome divisions and disagreements that could lead to instability and conflict.

34. The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) will remain the overarching framework for all aspects of NATO's cooperation with its Partners. It offers an expanded political dimension for both consultation and cooperation. EAPC consultations build increased transparency and confidence among its members on security issues, contribute to conflict prevention and crisis management, and develop practical cooperation activities, including in civil emergency planning, and scientific and environmental affairs.

35. The Partnership for Peace is the principal mechanism for forging practical security links between the Alliance and its Partners and for enhancing interoperability between Partners and NATO. Through detailed programmes that reflect individual Partners' capacities and interests, Allies and Partners work towards transparency in national defence planning and budgeting; democratic control of defence forces; preparedness for civil disasters and other emergencies; and the development of the ability to work together, including in NATO-led PfP operations. The Alliance is committed to increasing the role the Partners play in PfP decision-making and planning, and making PfP more operational. NATO has undertaken to consult with any active participant in the Partnership if that Partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence, or security.

36. Russia plays a unique role in Euro-Atlantic security. Within the framework of the NATO-Russia Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security, NATO and Russia have committed themselves to developing their relations on the basis of common interest, reciprocity and transparency to achieve a lasting and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area based on the principles of democracy and co-operative security. NATO and Russia have agreed to give concrete substance to their shared commitment to build a stable, peaceful and undivided Europe. A strong, stable and enduring partnership between NATO and Russia is essential to achieve lasting stability in the Euro-Atlantic area.

37. Ukraine occupies a special place in the Euro-Atlantic security environment and is an important and valuable partner in promoting stability and common democratic values. NATO is committed to further strengthening its distinctive partnership with Ukraine on the basis of the NATO-Ukraine Charter, including political consultations on issues of common concern and a broad range of practical cooperation activities. The Alliance continues to support Ukrainian sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity, democratic development, economic prosperity and its status as a non-nuclear weapons state as key factors of stability and security in central and eastern Europe and in Europe as a whole.

38. The Mediterranean is an area of special interest to the Alliance. Security in Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean. NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue process is an integral part of NATO's co-operative approach to security. It provides a framework for confidence building, promotes transparency and cooperation in the region, and reinforces and is reinforced by other international efforts. The Alliance is committed to developing progressively the political, civil, and military aspects of the Dialogue with the aim of achieving closer cooperation with, and more active involvement by, countries that are partners in this Dialogue.

#### **Enlargement**

39. The Alliance remains open to new members under Article 10 of the Washington Treaty. It expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, and as NATO determines that the inclusion of these nations would serve the overall political and strategic interests of the Alliance, strengthen its effectiveness and cohesion, and enhance overall European security and stability. To this end, NATO has established a programme of activities to assist aspiring countries in their preparations for possible future membership in the context of its wider relationship with them. No European democratic country whose admission would fulfil the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration.

**Arms Control, Disarmament, And Non-Proliferation**

40. The Alliance's policy of support for arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation will continue to play a major role in the achievement of the Alliance's security objectives. The Allies seek to enhance security and stability at the lowest possible level of forces consistent with the Alliance's ability to provide for collective defence and to fulfil the full range of its missions. The Alliance will continue to ensure that - as an important part of its broad approach to security - defence and arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation objectives remain in harmony. The Alliance will continue to actively contribute to the development of arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation agreements as well as to confidence and security building measures. The Allies take seriously their distinctive role in promoting a broader, more comprehensive and more verifiable international arms control and disarmament process. The Alliance will enhance its political efforts to reduce dangers arising from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. The principal non-proliferation goal of the Alliance and its members is to prevent proliferation from occurring or, should it occur, to reverse it through diplomatic means. The Alliance attaches great importance to the continuing validity and the full implementation by all parties of the CFE Treaty as an essential element in ensuring the stability of the Euro-Atlantic area.

**Part IV - Guidelines for the Alliance's Forces****Principles Of Alliance Strategy**

41. The Alliance will maintain the necessary military capabilities to accomplish the full range of NATO's missions. The principles of Allied solidarity and strategic unity remain paramount for all Alliance missions. Alliance forces must safeguard NATO's military effectiveness and freedom of action. The security of all Allies is indivisible: an attack on one is an attack on all. With respect to collective defence under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, the combined military forces of the Alliance must be capable of deterring any potential aggression against it, of stopping an aggressor's advance as far forward as possible should an attack nevertheless occur, and of ensuring the political independence and territorial integrity of its member states. They must also be prepared to contribute to conflict prevention and to conduct non-Article 5 crisis response operations. The Alliance's forces have essential roles in fostering cooperation and understanding with NATO's Partners and other states, particularly in helping Partners to prepare for potential participation in NATO-led PfP operations. Thus they contribute to the preservation of peace, to the safeguarding of common security interests of Alliance members, and to the maintenance of the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area. By deterring the use of NBC weapons, they contribute to Alliance efforts aimed at preventing the proliferation of these weapons and their delivery means.

42. The achievement of the Alliance's aims depends critically on the equitable sharing of the roles, risks and responsibilities, as well as the benefits, of common defence. The presence of United States conventional and nuclear forces in Europe remains vital to the security of Europe, which is inseparably linked to that of North America. The North American Allies contribute to the Alliance through military forces available for Alliance missions, through their broader contribution to international peace and security, and through the provision of unique training facilities on the North American continent. The European Allies also make wide-ranging and substantial contributions. As the process of

developing the ESDI within the Alliance progresses, the European Allies will further enhance their contribution to the common defence and to international peace and stability including through multinational formations.

43. The principle of collective effort in Alliance defence is embodied in practical arrangements that enable the Allies to enjoy the crucial political, military and resource advantages of collective defence, and prevent the renationalisation of defence policies, without depriving the Allies of their sovereignty. These arrangements also enable NATO's forces to carry out non-Article 5 crisis response operations and constitute a prerequisite for a coherent Alliance response to all possible contingencies. They are based on procedures for consultation, an integrated military structure, and on co-operation agreements. Key features include collective force planning; common funding; common operational planning; multinational formations, headquarters and command arrangements; an integrated air defence system; a balance of roles and responsibilities among the Allies; the stationing and deployment of forces outside home territory when required; arrangements, including planning, for crisis management and reinforcement; common standards and procedures for equipment, training and logistics; joint and combined doctrines and exercises when appropriate; and infrastructure, armaments and logistics cooperation. The inclusion of NATO's Partners in such arrangements or the development of similar arrangements for them, in appropriate areas, is also instrumental in enhancing cooperation and common efforts in Euro-Atlantic security matters.

44. Multinational funding, including through the Military Budget and the NATO Security Investment Programme, will continue to play an important role in acquiring and maintaining necessary assets and capabilities. The management of resources should be guided by the military requirements of the Alliance as they evolve.

45. The Alliance supports the further development of the ESDI within the Alliance, including by being prepared to make available assets and capabilities for operations under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or as otherwise agreed.

46. To protect peace and to prevent war or any kind of coercion, the Alliance will maintain for the foreseeable future an appropriate mix of nuclear and conventional forces based in Europe and kept up to date where necessary, although at a minimum sufficient level. Taking into account the diversity of risks with which the Alliance could be faced, it must maintain the forces necessary to ensure credible deterrence and to provide a wide range of conventional response options. But the Alliance's conventional forces alone cannot ensure credible deterrence. Nuclear weapons make a unique contribution in rendering the risks of aggression against the Alliance incalculable and unacceptable. Thus, they remain essential to preserve peace.

### **The Alliance's Force Posture**

#### *The Missions of Alliance Military Forces*

47. The primary role of Alliance military forces is to protect peace and to guarantee the territorial integrity, political independence and security of member states. The Alliance's forces must therefore be able to deter and defend effectively, to maintain or restore the territorial integrity of Allied nations and - in case of conflict - to terminate war rapidly by

making an aggressor reconsider his decision, cease his attack and withdraw. NATO forces must maintain the ability to provide for collective defence while conducting effective non-Article 5 crisis response operations.

48. The maintenance of the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area is of key importance. An important aim of the Alliance and its forces is to keep risks at a distance by dealing with potential crises at an early stage. In the event of crises which jeopardise Euro-Atlantic stability and could affect the security of Alliance members, the Alliance's military forces may be called upon to conduct crisis response operations. They may also be called upon to contribute to the preservation of international peace and security by conducting operations in support of other international organisations, complementing and reinforcing political actions within a broad approach to security.

49. In contributing to the management of crises through military operations, the Alliance's forces will have to deal with a complex and diverse range of actors, risks, situations and demands, including humanitarian emergencies. Some non-Article 5 crisis response operations may be as demanding as some collective defence missions. Well-trained and well-equipped forces at adequate levels of readiness and in sufficient strength to meet the full range of contingencies as well as the appropriate support structures, planning tools and command and control capabilities are essential in providing efficient military contributions. The Alliance should also be prepared to support, on the basis of separable but not separate capabilities, operations under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or as otherwise agreed. The potential participation of Partners and other non-NATO nations in NATO-led operations as well as possible operations with Russia would be further valuable elements of NATO's contribution to managing crises that affect Euro-Atlantic security.

50. Alliance military forces also contribute to promoting stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area by their participation in military-to-military contacts and in other cooperation activities and exercises under the Partnership for Peace as well as those organised to deepen NATO's relationships with Russia, Ukraine and the Mediterranean Dialogue countries. They contribute to stability and understanding by participating in confidence-building activities, including those which enhance transparency and improve communication; as well as in verification of arms control agreements and in humanitarian de-mining. Key areas of consultation and cooperation could include inter alia: training and exercises, interoperability, civil-military relations, concept and doctrine development, defence planning, crisis management, proliferation issues, armaments cooperation as well as participation in operational planning and operations.

*Guidelines for the Alliance's Force Posture*

51. To implement the Alliance's fundamental security tasks and the principles of its strategy, the forces of the Alliance must continue to be adapted to meet the requirements of the full range of Alliance missions effectively and to respond to future challenges. The posture of Allies' forces, building on the strengths of different national defence structures, will conform to the guidelines developed in the following paragraphs.

52. The size, readiness, availability and deployment of the Alliance's military forces will reflect its commitment to collective defence and to conduct crisis response operations,

sometimes at short notice, distant from their home stations, including beyond the Allies' territory. The characteristics of the Alliance's forces will also reflect the provisions of relevant arms control agreements. Alliance forces must be adequate in strength and capabilities to deter and counter aggression against any Ally. They must be interoperable and have appropriate doctrines and technologies. They must be held at the required readiness and deployability, and be capable of military success in a wide range of complex joint and combined operations, which may also include Partners and other non-NATO nations.

This means in particular:

- a. that the overall size of the Allies' forces will be kept at the lowest levels consistent with the requirements of collective defence and other Alliance missions; they will be held at appropriate and graduated readiness;
- b. that the peacetime geographical distribution of forces will ensure a sufficient military presence throughout the territory of the Alliance, including the stationing and deployment of forces outside home territory and waters and forward deployment of forces when and where necessary. Regional and, in particular, geostrategic considerations within the Alliance will have to be taken into account, as instabilities on NATO's periphery could lead to crises or conflicts requiring an Alliance military response, potentially with short warning times;
- c. that NATO's command structure will be able to undertake command and control of the full range of the Alliance's military missions including through the use of deployable combined and joint HQs, in particular CJTF headquarters, to command and control multinational and multiservice forces. It will also be able to support operations under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or as otherwise agreed, thereby contributing to the development of the ESDI within the Alliance, and to conduct NATO-led non-Article 5 crisis response operations in which Partners and other countries may participate;
- d. that overall, the Alliance will, in both the near and long term and for the full range of its missions, require essential operational capabilities such as an effective engagement capability; deployability and mobility; survivability of forces and infrastructure; and sustainability, incorporating logistics and force rotation. To develop these capabilities to their full potential for multinational operations, interoperability, including human factors, the use of appropriate advanced technology, the maintenance of information superiority in military operations, and highly qualified personnel with a broad spectrum of skills will be important. Sufficient capabilities in the areas of command, control and communications as well as intelligence and surveillance will serve as necessary force multipliers;
- e. that at any time a limited but militarily significant proportion of ground, air and sea forces will be able to react as rapidly as necessary to a wide range of eventualities, including a short-notice attack on any Ally. Greater numbers of force elements will be available at appropriate levels of readiness to sustain prolonged operations, whether within or beyond Alliance territory, including through rotation of deployed forces. Taken together, these forces must also be of sufficient quality, quantity and readiness to contribute to deterrence and to defend against limited attacks on the Alliance;
- f. that the Alliance must be able to build up larger forces, both in response to any fundamental changes in the security environment and for limited requirements, by reinforcement, by mobilising reserves, or by reconstituting forces when necessary. This ability must be in proportion to potential threats to Alliance security, including potential

long-term developments. It must take into account the possibility of substantial improvements in the readiness and capabilities of military forces on the periphery of the Alliance. Capabilities for timely reinforcement and resupply both within and from Europe and North America will remain of critical importance, with a resulting need for a high degree of deployability, mobility and flexibility;

g. that appropriate force structures and procedures, including those that would provide an ability to build up, deploy and draw down forces quickly and selectively, are necessary to permit measured, flexible and timely responses in order to reduce and defuse tensions. These arrangements must be exercised regularly in peacetime;

h. that the Alliance's defence posture must have the capability to address appropriately and effectively the risks associated with the proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery, which also pose a potential threat to the Allies' populations, territory, and forces. A balanced mix of forces, response capabilities and strengthened defences is needed;

i. that the Alliance's forces and infrastructure must be protected against terrorist attacks.

#### *Characteristics of Conventional Forces*

54. It is essential that the Allies' military forces have a credible ability to fulfil the full range of Alliance missions. This requirement has implications for force structures, force and equipment levels; readiness, availability, and sustainability; training and exercises; deployment and employment options; and force build-up and mobilisation capabilities. The aim should be to achieve an optimum balance between high readiness forces capable of beginning rapidly, and immediately as necessary, collective defence or non-Article 5 crisis response operations; forces at different levels of lower readiness to provide the bulk of those required for collective defence, for rotation of forces to sustain crisis response operations, or for further reinforcement of a particular region; and a longer-term build-up and augmentation capability for the worst case – but very remote – scenario of large scale operations for collective defence. A substantial proportion of Alliance forces will be capable of performing more than one of these roles.

55. Alliance forces will be structured to reflect the multinational and joint nature of Alliance missions. Essential tasks will include controlling, protecting, and defending territory; ensuring the unimpeded use of sea, air, and land lines of communication; sea control and protecting the deployment of the Alliance's sea-based deterrent; conducting independent and combined air operations; ensuring a secure air environment and effective extended air defence; surveillance, intelligence, reconnaissance and electronic warfare; strategic lift; and providing effective and flexible command and control facilities, including deployable combined and joint headquarters.

56. The Alliance's defence posture against the risks and potential threats of the proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery must continue to be improved, including through work on missile defences. As NATO forces may be called upon to operate beyond NATO's borders, capabilities for dealing with proliferation risks must be flexible, mobile, rapidly deployable and sustainable. Doctrines, planning, and training and exercise policies must also prepare the Alliance to deter and defend against the use of NBC weapons. The aim in doing so will be to further reduce operational vulnerabilities of NATO military forces while maintaining their flexibility and effectiveness despite the presence, threat or use of NBC weapons.

57. Alliance strategy does not include a chemical or biological warfare capability. The Allies support universal adherence to the relevant disarmament regimes. But, even if further progress with respect to banning chemical and biological weapons can be achieved, defensive precautions will remain essential.

58. Given reduced overall force levels and constrained resources, the ability to work closely together will remain vital for achieving the Alliance's missions. The Alliance's collective defence arrangements in which, for those concerned, the integrated military structure plays the key role, are essential in this regard. The various strands of NATO's defence planning need to be effectively coordinated at all levels in order to ensure the preparedness of the forces and supporting structures to carry out the full spectrum of their roles. Exchanges of information among the Allies about their force plans contribute to securing the availability of the capabilities needed for the execution of these roles. Consultations in case of important changes in national defence plans also remain of key importance. Cooperation in the development of new operational concepts will be essential for responding to evolving security challenges. The detailed practical arrangements that have been developed as part of the ESDI within the Alliance contribute to close allied co-operation without unnecessary duplication of assets and capabilities.

59. To be able to respond flexibly to possible contingencies and to permit the effective conduct of Alliance missions, the Alliance requires sufficient logistics capabilities, including transport capacities, medical support and stocks to deploy and sustain all types of forces effectively. Standardisation will foster cooperation and cost-effectiveness in providing logistic support to allied forces. Mounting and sustaining operations outside the Allies' territory, where there may be little or no host-nation support, will pose special logistical challenges. The ability to build-up larger, adequately equipped and trained forces, in a timely manner and to a level able to fulfil the full range of Alliance missions, will also make an essential contribution to crisis management and defence. This will include the ability to reinforce any area at risk and to establish a multinational presence when and where this is needed. Forces of various kinds and at various levels of readiness will be capable of flexible employment in both intra-European and transatlantic reinforcement. This will require control of lines of communication, and appropriate support and exercise arrangements.

60. The interaction between Alliance forces and the civil environment (both governmental and non-governmental) in which they operate is crucial to the success of operations. Civil-military cooperation is interdependent: military means are increasingly requested to assist civil authorities; at the same time civil support to military operations is important for logistics, communications, medical support, and public affairs. Cooperation between the Alliance's military and civil bodies will accordingly remain essential.

61. The Alliance's ability to accomplish the full range of its missions will rely increasingly on multinational forces, complementing national commitments to NATO for the Allies concerned. Such forces, which are applicable to the full range of Alliance missions, demonstrate the Alliance's resolve to maintain a credible collective defence; enhance Alliance cohesion; and reinforce the transatlantic partnership and strengthen the ESDI within the Alliance. Multinational forces, particularly those capable of deploying rapidly for collective defence or for non-Article 5 crisis response operations, reinforce solidarity.

They can also provide a way of deploying more capable formations than might be available purely nationally, thus helping to make more efficient use of scarce defence resources. This may include a highly integrated, multinational approach to specific tasks and functions, an approach which underlies the implementation of the CJTF concept. For peace support operations, effective multinational formations and other arrangements involving Partners will be valuable. In order to exploit fully the potential offered by multinational formations, improving interoperability, inter alia through sufficient training and exercises, is of the highest importance.

#### *Characteristics of Nuclear Forces*

62. The fundamental purpose of the nuclear forces of the Allies is political: to preserve peace and prevent coercion and any kind of war. They will continue to fulfil an essential role by ensuring uncertainty in the mind of any aggressor about the nature of the Allies' response to military aggression. They demonstrate that aggression of any kind is not a rational option. The supreme guarantee of the security of the Allies is provided by the strategic nuclear forces of the Alliance, particularly those of the United States; the independent nuclear forces of the United Kingdom and France, which have a deterrent role of their own, contribute to the overall deterrence and security of the Allies.

63. A credible Alliance nuclear posture and the demonstration of Alliance solidarity and common commitment to war prevention continue to require widespread participation by European Allies involved in collective defence planning in nuclear roles, in peacetime basing of nuclear forces on their territory and in command, control and consultation arrangements. Nuclear forces based in Europe and committed to NATO provide an essential political and military link between the European and the North American members of the Alliance. The Alliance will therefore maintain adequate nuclear forces in Europe. These forces need to have the necessary characteristics and appropriate flexibility and survivability, to be perceived as a credible and effective element of the Allies' strategy in preventing war. They will be maintained at the minimum level sufficient to preserve peace and stability.

64. The Allies concerned consider that, with the radical changes in the security situation, including reduced conventional force levels in Europe and increased reaction times, NATO's ability to defuse a crisis through diplomatic and other means or, should it be necessary, to mount a successful conventional defence has significantly improved. The circumstances in which any use of nuclear weapons might have to be contemplated by them are therefore extremely remote. Since 1991, therefore, the Allies have taken a series of steps which reflect the post-Cold War security environment. These include a dramatic reduction of the types and numbers of NATO's sub-strategic forces including the elimination of all nuclear artillery and ground-launched short-range nuclear missiles; a significant relaxation of the readiness criteria for nuclear-armed forces; and the termination of standing peacetime nuclear contingency plans. NATO's nuclear forces no longer target any country. Nonetheless, NATO will maintain, at the minimum level consistent with the prevailing security environment, adequate sub-strategic forces based in Europe which will provide an essential link with strategic nuclear forces, reinforcing the transatlantic link. These will consist of dual capable aircraft and a small number of United Kingdom Trident warheads. Sub-strategic nuclear weapons will, however, not be deployed in normal circumstances on surface vessels and attack submarines.

**Part V - Conclusion**

65. As the North Atlantic Alliance enters its sixth decade, it must be ready to meet the challenges and opportunities of a new century. The Strategic Concept reaffirms the enduring purpose of the Alliance and sets out its fundamental security tasks. It enables a transformed NATO to contribute to the evolving security environment, supporting security and stability with the strength of its shared commitment to democracy and the peaceful resolution of disputes. The Strategic Concept will govern the Alliance's security and defence policy, its operational concepts, its conventional and nuclear force posture and its collective defence arrangements, and will be kept under review in the light of the evolving security environment. In an uncertain world the need for effective defence remains, but in reaffirming this commitment the Alliance will also continue making full use of every opportunity to help build an undivided continent by promoting and fostering the vision of a Europe whole and free.

## ***9 Franco-German Defence and Security Council Toulouse, 29 May 1999***

### **DECLARATION**

Après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité d'Amsterdam, les travaux menés au sein de l'Union européenne sous présidence allemande vont aboutir au Conseil européen de Cologne à une avancée majeure pour le développement, auquel le Sommet de Washington a apporté son soutien, d'une Europe de la sécurité et de la défense.

Nos deux pays réaffirment leur détermination d'y contribuer de tout leur poids afin que l'Union européenne se dote des moyens autonomes nécessaires pour décider et agir face aux crises. Nous sommes déterminés à créer les conditions nécessaires afin d'atteindre cet objectif. Telles sont les ambitions que devra servir l'intégration de l'UEO dans l'Union européenne.

A cette fin, nous avons décidé de développer de façon concertée les capacités nécessaires à cette autonomie, y compris par la mise en commun de certains moyens. Dans ce contexte, nous renforcerons notre coopération pour harmoniser nos besoins opérationnels, en vue notamment d'une planification du développement en commun des matériels d'armement.

Dans le même esprit, nous sommes convaincus que le nouvel environnement stratégique doit nous conduire, avec nos trois autres partenaires du Corps européen, à adapter cette grande unité multinationale, et en priorité son état-major, pour qu'elle constitue à l'avenir un corps de réaction rapide européen.

Le Conseil de sécurité assumant la responsabilité primordiale dans le maintien de la paix et de la sécurité internationale, nous sommes déterminés à donner tout son rôle aux Nations Unies. C'est à ce titre que nous contribuons au système des forces en attente.

A Toulouse, la ville qui symbolise la coopération franco-allemande dans le domaine aéronautique, nous affirmons que la construction d'une Europe de la sécurité et de la défense exige le développement d'une base industrielle et technologique, forte, dynamique et performante. La restructuration des industries d'armement et le renforcement de notre coopération en ce domaine contribueront à la réalisation de cet objectif.

## *10 European Council Cologne, 3-4 June 1999*

### **DECLARATION OF THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL ON STRENGTHENING THE COMMON EUROPEAN POLICY ON SECURITY AND DEFENCE**

1. We, the members of the European Council, are resolved that the European Union shall play its full role on the international stage. To that end, we intend to give the European Union the necessary means and capabilities to assume its responsibilities regarding a common European policy on security and defence. The work undertaken on the initiative of the German Presidency and the entry into force of the Treaty of Amsterdam permit us today to take a decisive step forward.

In pursuit of our Common Foreign and Security Policy objectives and the progressive framing of a common defence policy, we are convinced that the Council should have the ability to take decisions on the full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks defined in the Treaty on European Union, the 'Petersberg tasks'. To this end, the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises without prejudice to actions by NATO. The EU will thereby increase its ability to contribute to international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter.

2. We are convinced that to fully assume its tasks in the field of conflict prevention and crisis management the European Union must have at its disposal the appropriate capabilities and instruments. We therefore commit ourselves to further develop more effective European military capabilities from the basis of existing national, bi-national and multinational capabilities and to strengthen our own capabilities for that purpose. This requires the maintenance of a sustained defence effort, the implementation of the necessary adaptations and notably the reinforcement of our capabilities in the field of intelligence, strategic transport, command and control. This also requires efforts to adapt, exercise and bring together national and multinational European forces.

We also recognise the need to undertake sustained efforts to strengthen the industrial and technological defence base, which we want to be competitive and dynamic. We are determined to foster the restructuring of the European defence industries amongst those States involved. With industry we will therefore work towards closer and more efficient defence industry collaboration. We will seek further progress in the harmonisation of military requirements and the planning and procurement of arms, as Member States consider appropriate.

3. We welcome the results of the NATO Washington summit as regards NATO support for the process launched by the EU and its confirmation that a more effective role for the European Union in conflict prevention and crisis management will contribute to the vitality of a renewed Alliance. In implementing this process launched by the EU, we shall ensure

the development of effective mutual consultation, cooperation and transparency between the European Union and NATO.

We want to develop an effective EU-led crisis management in which NATO members, as well as neutral and non-allied members, of the EU can participate fully and on an equal footing in the EU operations.

We will put in place arrangements that allow non-EU European allies and partners to take part to the fullest possible extent in this endeavour.

4. We therefore approve and adopt the report prepared by the German Presidency, which reflects the consensus among the Member States.

5. We are now determined to launch a new step in the construction of the European Union. To this end we task the General Affairs Council to prepare the conditions and the measures necessary to achieve these objectives, including the definition of the modalities for the inclusion of those functions of the WEU which will be necessary for the EU to fulfil its new responsibilities in the area of the Petersberg tasks. In this regard, our aim is to take the necessary decisions by the end of the year 2000. In that event, the WEU as an organisation would have completed its purpose. The different status of Member States with regard to collective defence guarantees will not be affected. The Alliance remains the foundation of the collective defence of its Member States.

We therefore invite the Finnish Presidency to take the work forward within the General Affairs Council on the basis of this declaration and the report of the Presidency to the European Council meeting in Cologne. We look forward to a progress report by the Finnish Presidency to the Helsinki European Council meeting.

## **PRESIDENCY REPORT ON STRENGTHENING OF THE COMMON EUROPEAN POLICY ON SECURITY AND DEFENCE**

### **1. Introduction**

The Treaty of Amsterdam which entered into force on 1 May provides for the enhancement of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), including the progressive framing of a common defence policy as provided in Article 17 of the TEU. The Treaty also provides for the possibility of integrating the WEU into the EU, should the European Council so decide.

The European Council in Vienna welcomed the new impetus given to the debate on a common European policy in security and defence. It considered that in order for the EU to be in a position to play its full role on the international stage, the CFSP must be backed by credible operational capabilities. Furthermore, it welcomed the Franco-British declaration made on 4 December 1998 in St. Malo. The European Council invited the German Presidency to pursue this debate and agreed to examine the question again at the European Council in Cologne. To this end Foreign Ministers discussed the subject at their informal meeting in Reinhartshausen on 13/14 March and at the General Affairs Council on 17 May.

The NATO Washington Summit welcomed the new impetus given to the strengthening of a common European policy on security and defence by the Amsterdam Treaty and confirmed that a stronger European role will help contribute to the vitality of the Alliance for the 21st century. The NATO summit furthermore stressed that the development of a CFSP, as called for in the Amsterdam Treaty, would be compatible with the common security and defence policy established within the framework of the Washington Treaty. This process will lead to more complementarity, cooperation and synergy.

At the WEU Ministerial Council on 10 and 11 May this question was also discussed on the basis of the informal reflection which was initiated at the Rome Ministerial Council. Member States will undertake efforts in line with the conclusions of the ongoing WEU Audit of European defence capabilities.

## **2. Guiding Principles**

The aim is to strengthen the CFSP by the development of a common European policy on security and defence. This requires a capacity for autonomous action backed up by credible military capabilities and appropriate decision making bodies. Decisions to act would be taken within the framework of the CFSP according to appropriate procedures in order to reflect the specific nature of decisions in this field. The Council of the European Union would thus be able to take decisions on the whole range of political, economic and military instruments at its disposal when responding to crisis situations. The European Union is committed to preserve peace and strengthen international security in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter as well as the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the objectives of the Charter of Paris, as provided for in Article 11 of the TEU.

The Amsterdam Treaty incorporates the Petersberg tasks ('humanitarian and rescue tasks, peace-keeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making') into the Treaty.

The focus of our efforts therefore would be to assure that the European Union has at its disposal the necessary capabilities (including military capabilities) and appropriate structures for effective EU decision making in crisis management within the scope of the Petersberg tasks. This is the area where a European capacity to act is required most urgently. The development of an EU military crisis management capacity is to be seen as an activity within the framework of the CFSP (Title V of the TEU) and as a part of the progressive framing of a common defence policy in accordance with Article 17 of the TEU.

The Atlantic Alliance remains the foundation of the collective defence of its Members. The commitments under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty and Article V of the Brussels Treaty will in any event be preserved for the Member States party to these Treaties. The policy of the Union shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States.

## **3. Decision Making**

As regards EU decision making in the field of security and defence policy, necessary arrangements must be made in order to ensure political control and strategic direction of

EU-led Petersberg operations so that the EU can decide and conduct such operations effectively.

Furthermore, the EU will need a capacity for analysis of situations, sources of intelligence, and a capability for relevant strategic planning.

This may require in particular:

- regular (or ad hoc) meetings of the General Affairs Council, as appropriate including Defence Ministers;
- a permanent body in Brussels (Political and Security Committee) consisting of representatives with pol/mil expertise;
- an EU Military Committee consisting of Military Representatives making recommendations to the Political and Security Committee;
- an EU Military Staff including a Situation Centre;
- other resources such as a Satellite Centre, Institute for Security Studies.

Further institutional questions may need to be addressed.

Decisions relating to crisis management tasks, in particular decisions having military or defence implications, will be taken in accordance with Article 23 of the Treaty on European Union. Member States will retain in all circumstances the right to decide if and when their national forces are deployed.

#### **4. Implementation**

As regards military capabilities, Member States need to develop further forces (including headquarters) that are suited also to crisis management operations, without any unnecessary duplication. The main characteristics include: deployability, sustainability, interoperability, flexibility and mobility.

For the effective implementation of EU-led operations the European Union will have to determine, according to the requirements of the case, whether it will conduct:

- EU-led operations using NATO assets and capabilities or
- EU-led operations without recourse to NATO assets and capabilities.

For EU-led operations without recourse to NATO assets and capabilities, the EU could use national or multinational European means pre-identified by Member States. This will require either the use of national command structures providing multinational representation in headquarters or drawing on existing command structures within multinational forces. Further arrangements to enhance the capacity of European multinational and national forces to respond to crises situations will be needed.

For EU-led operations having recourse to NATO assets and capabilities, including European command arrangements, the main focus should be on the following aspects:

- Implementation of the arrangements based on the Berlin decisions of 1996 and the Washington NATO summit decisions of April 1999.
- The further arrangements set out by NATO at its summit meeting in Washington should address in particular:
  - =assured EU access to NATO planning capabilities able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations;
  - =the presumption of availability to the EU of pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets for use in EU-led operations.

### **5. Modalities of participation and cooperation**

The successful creation of a European policy on security and defence will require in particular:

- the possibility of all EU Member States, including non-allied members, to participate fully and on an equal footing in EU operations;
- satisfactory arrangements for European NATO members who are not EU Member States to ensure their fullest possible involvement in EU-led operations, building on existing consultation arrangements within WEU;
- arrangements to ensure that all participants in an EU-led operation will have equal rights in respect of the conduct of that operation, without prejudice to the principle of the EU's decision-making autonomy, notably the right of the Council to discuss and decide matters of principle and policy;
- the need to ensure the development of effective mutual consultation, cooperation and transparency between NATO and the EU;
- the consideration of ways to ensure the possibility for WEU Associate Partners to be involved.

## ***11 British-Italian summit London, 19-20 July 1999***

### **JOINT DECLARATION LAUNCHING EUROPEAN DEFENCE CAPABILITIES INITIATIVE**

1. Among the clear lessons of Kosovo are the continued importance of a strong and effective NATO and the pressing need for improved European military capabilities, both for a more effective European role in NATO and to ensure the EU has the capacity for autonomous action in the field of the Petersberg tasks (humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping and crisis management including peacemaking) backed by credible military forces.
2. European Heads of State and Government at Cologne in June committed themselves further to develop the European defence dimension through more effective military capability; and the appropriate decision-making institutions, in support of a strong Common Foreign and Security Policy. They recognised the need to undertake sustained efforts to strengthen Europe's industrial and technological defence base. They also stressed that, avoiding unnecessary duplication, a more effective role for the European Union in conflict prevention and crisis management would contribute to the vitality of a renewed Alliance.
3. We are therefore launching a joint proposal to set criteria for improved and strengthened European defence capabilities and effective performance to be discussed and agreed at the Luxembourg WEU Ministerial meeting and the Helsinki European Council before the end of the year.
4. This approach, to be developed with our Partners/Allies, will include a timetable to achieve:
  - European-wide goals for enhanced military capabilities to undertake crisis management, including peacemaking;
  - National capability objectives to achieve this European aim.
5. These efforts will be underpinned by:
  - Peer review: at least one joint Foreign/Defence Ministers GAC per EU Presidency, to measure progress against the agreed criteria;
  - The detailed work of NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative;
  - A road map for more effective European defence procurement; this will include harmonisation of military requirements and collaborative arms procurement. We shall also promote defence industry restructuring.
6. These efforts will be complementary to, and proceed in parallel with, work in the European Union, at Italy's initiative, on developing the Union's and the Member States' capabilities concerning the non-military aspects of crisis prevention and management, and improving co-ordination between military and non-military aspects.

7. We shall pursue this bilateral initiative with our Partners and Allies in the coming weeks with a view to the earliest possible practical results in the European Union, the WEU, and NATO.

***12 French action plan:  
Letter from M. Jacques Chirac,  
President of the French Republic,  
to the Finnish presidency of the European Union,  
22 July 1999***

*Satisfied with the progress made in European defence between St-Malo and Cologne, and in particular during the European Council meeting in Cologne, France wished very much to sustain the momentum and proposed a list of further concrete measures. These are laid down in the Plan d'Action Français, which was sent to the Finnish Presidency of the EU, accompanied by a letter from President Jacques Chirac. Both are reproduced below with the permission of the Elysée. They are available in French only.*

Monsieur le Président,  
Cher ami [mention manuscrite]

A l'occasion du Conseil européen de Cologne, j'avais proposé de soumettre à la Présidence de l'Union européenne, un plan d'action susceptible de contribuer à la mise en œuvre des mesures adoptées à Cologne dans le domaine de la PESC, notamment son volet défense.

Au moment où l'Union européenne s'est fixée une haute ambition en matière de défense, il me semblait important que chaque pays membre contribue activement à ce grand projet dont la crise du Kosovo a souligné l'impérieuse nécessité.

J'ai le plaisir de vous communiquer ci-joint ce document de travail qui, en se fondant sur les dispositions que nous avons ensemble adoptées à Cologne, suggère quelques mesures concrètes pour aller de l'avant.

Le document reprend la globalité de l'approche que nous avons retenue, en mettant l'accent sur le développement des capacités militaires européennes nécessaires pour agir et la définition des instruments et organes permettant à l'Union européenne de décider et de conduire des opérations.

Afin de créer une dynamique, il est proposé, dans un premier temps, de mettre en place à Bruxelles le Comité politique et de sécurité et le Comité militaire dont nous avons retenu le principe à Cologne.

La mise en place de ces organes devrait, nous semble-t-il, aller de pair avec la prise de fonction de M. Javier Solana, qui aura besoin, pour conduire avec efficacité sa mission, d'être en contact régulier avec les représentants des nations. Afin de marquer notre engagement avec force, il est proposé de transférer au COPS le rôle actuellement dévolu au Comité politique et de le faire présider par le Haut Représentant/Secrétaire général du Conseil.

A l'instar du rôle exceptionnel que vous avez joué dans la recherche d'une solution à la crise du Kosovo, je ne doute pas que vous donnerez au projet de défense européenne les impulsions lui permettant d'accomplir des progrès significatifs et concrets. Vous pouvez être assuré de la détermination de mon pays de contribuer, avec l'ensemble des membres de l'Union, à cet objectif qui nous unit.

Je transmets à nos partenaires de l'Union européenne une copie de cette lettre.

Je vous prie de croire, Monsieur le Président, à l'assurance de ma très haute considération.

Bien amicalement vôtre [mention manuscrite]

Signé : Jacques Chirac

## **PLAN D'ACTION SUR LA DEFENSE EUROPEENNE**

### **I. CADRE GENERAL**

1/ Les textes adoptés par le Conseil européen de Cologne (Déclaration des Chefs d'Etat et de Gouvernement et rapport de la Présidence), constituent la base sur laquelle la Présidence finlandaise va poursuivre les travaux engagés et soumettre au Conseil européen d'Helsinki son « Rapport sur l'état d'avancement des travaux ».

2/ Le « Plan d'Action » doit prendre en compte trois éléments importants :

- La nécessité de donner la priorité à la substance et aux avancées concrètes, par rapport aux débats institutionnels ou théoriques qui risqueraient de ralentir la dynamique imprimée depuis Cologne.
- Les changements institutionnels dans le cadre de l'Union européenne : la nouvelle Commission devrait entrer en fonctions en septembre ; dans le courant de l'automne devrait être installée l'UPPAR (Unité de Planification, de Prévision et d'Action Rapide). M. Solana, Haut Représentant désigné, devrait prendre ses fonctions au plus tard vers la fin de l'année.
- Enfin, l'objectif fixé à Cologne, visant à l'adoption des « décisions nécessaires d'ici la fin de l'an 2000 » en ce qui concerne notamment « les modalités de l'inclusion de celles des fonctions de l'UEO qui seront nécessaires à l'Union européenne ».

### **II. LA SEQUENCE DES TRAVAUX**

Les travaux doivent être menés parallèlement autour des priorités suivantes :

- Le développement des capacités militaires européennes nécessaires pour agir ;
- La définition des instruments nécessaires dans l'Union européenne pour décider et conduire une opération et leur mise en place ;
- La résolution des questions institutionnelles.

A/Le développement des capacités militaires européennes nécessaires pour agir :  
C'est le principal défi pour l'Europe de la Défense et de la Sécurité. Aucun développement institutionnel de l'Union européenne ne remédiera aux carences constatées, notamment pendant l'intervention au Kosovo, si l'Europe ne parvient pas à combler ses déficits en matière de défense pour disposer le moment venu des moyens nécessaires pour agir.

Les objectifs sont les suivants :

1/ L'amélioration des capacités de commandement et de conduite d'opération européenne, au niveau du théâtre, qui doit se faire à deux niveaux :

- d'une part, en affermissant au sein de l'Alliance le pilier européen, par l'identification des commandements et la constitution d'une chaîne européenne (Berlin plus) ;
- d'autre part, en développant les capacités de commandement européennes, (multinationalisation des Q.G. nationaux interarmées existants, transformations des Q.G. de l'EUROCORPS, d'EUROFOR et d'EUROMARFOR en Q.G. de composante terrestre et mer).

2/ Le développement, au niveau central, des capacités de renseignement autonome, de projection de forces, de C3 (contrôle, commandement, communication) qui devra faire l'objet de décisions spécifiques. D'autres carences, identifiées lors du conflit du Kosovo, ou qui seront mises en évidence à l'occasion de l'inventaire en cours à l'UEO ou des travaux de l'OTAN sur les capacités de défense, devront faire l'objet de décisions rapides pour lancer les programmes propres à les palier.

3/ La disposition de ces capacités implique la constitution effective d'une base technologique et industrielle d'armement. Elle passe par la définition des besoins minimaux à satisfaire pour fonder l'autonomie de l'Europe en matière de sécurité et de défense. Cette démarche suppose d'évaluer ce que possèdent déjà les pays européens, ce qu'il leur faut produire en coopération et ce qu'il leur faut acquérir hors d'Europe.

4/ Parallèlement, la modernisation des forces armées européennes (forces multinationales et forces nationales) doit être poursuivie pour les amener aux normes de modularité, de flexibilité et d'adaptabilité qu'exige la gestion de crises. Elle devra s'accompagner d'une politique d'exercices européenne afin d'améliorer l'interopérabilité des forces nationales et multinationales.

Les actions à mener comprennent :

- La poursuite des exercices d'inventaires et d'identification des besoins prioritaires engagés à l'UEO, à l'OTAN, ainsi qu'au plan national.
- La transformation des forces nationales et multinationales dans les cadres correspondants (l'EUROCORPS, EUROFOR et EUROMARFOR, GAE...), tout en ménageant des possibilités d'élargissement à d'autres participants.
- Des discussions à 15 pour définir des « critères de convergence » qui permettront de dégager des objectifs communs pour l'ensemble des pays européens ou, s'il en était ainsi décidé, des objectifs plus ambitieux pour les pays désireux de les atteindre.

Il s'agit là d'actions de longue durée : les travaux doivent être lancés sans attendre et les décisions politiques nécessaires adoptées rapidement.

B/ La définition des instruments et organes qui permettront à l'Union européenne de décider et de conduire une opération doit être menée parallèlement.

Les objectifs sont les suivants :

- doter l'Union européenne, en addition aux instances de décision déjà existantes (Conseil Affaires générales), d'organes de décision permettant d'associer correctement tous les acteurs concernés par les questions de sécurité et de défense (notamment les ministres de la défense et les CEMA) ;
- garantir une capacité de décision en temps réel, indispensable pour la gestion de crises, d'où la nécessité d'instances siégeant de façon permanente ;
- assurer, par le niveau et la qualité des représentants, l'autorité et l'efficacité de ces instances.

Cela suppose de :

1/ Définir la composition, les pouvoirs, les compétences et les modes de décision des organes prévus à Cologne :

- Le Conseil Affaires générales, qui pourrait se réunir en formation élargie aux ministres de la Défense, prend les décisions nécessaires à la définition et à la mise en œuvre de la politique étrangère et de sécurité commune sur la base des orientations générales définies par le Conseil européen.  
Des réunions des ministres de la Défense pourraient contribuer à la préparation et à la mise en œuvre des décisions ayant des implications en matière de défense.
- Le Comité politique (Article 25 du TUE) serait constitué en un organe permanent, le Comité Politique et de Sécurité (COPS), composé de représentants compétents en matière politico-militaire, et chargé du suivi de l'ensemble des questions relatives à la PESC, y compris celles ayant des implications en matière de défense. Sous l'autorité du Conseil européen et du CAG, le COPS devrait pouvoir assurer le contrôle politique et la direction stratégique d'opérations conduites par l'Union. Il serait composé de représentants permanents ayant rang d'ambassadeurs, différents des représentants permanents au Conseil Atlantique (pas de « doubles casquettes » UE/OTAN) et pourrait se réunir en tant que de besoin au niveau des Directeurs politiques. La Présidence du Comité politique et de sécurité serait assurée par le Haut représentant/Secrétaire général du Conseil. Le COPS adresserait des directives au Comité militaire et en recevrait des recommandations. Il pourrait enfin créer les groupes de travail spécialisés nécessaires.
- Un comité militaire, institution permanente réunissant les CEMA, agirait en soutien du COPS et serait, à ce titre, chargé de formuler des recommandations sur des questions militaires et sur les options stratégiques provenant de l'Etat-Major européen. Il donnerait ses instructions à l'Etat-Major européen, en conformité avec les directives reçues du COPS. Il pourrait se réunir en tant que de besoin au niveau des CEMA. Ses membres auraient la « double casquette » UE/OTAN, pour les Etats de l'Union qui sont membres de l'OTAN.

- La définition des pouvoirs, compétences et composition de ces organes constitue l'objectif prioritaire à quinze. En effet, elle est nécessairement préalable à leur mise en place, qui conditionne elle-même l'acquisition par l'Union d'une capacité effective à décider dans le domaine de la sécurité et de la défense.

2/ Définir la nature des instruments collectifs d'aide à la décision (la « boîte à outils » de l'UE), tels qu'ils ont également été prévus à Cologne :

- L'Etat-Major militaire, doté d'un Centre de Situation, qui devra fournir l'évaluation du renseignement, l'analyse de la situation et, sur ces bases, élaborer et planifier, pour les soumettre aux organes de décision de l'UE, les options stratégiques pour que l'UE puisse décider d'une action éventuelle.
- Les autres instruments collectifs d'aide à la décision (le Centre Satellitaire, le Secrétariat militaire, l'Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité, l'embryon d'une structure d'armement) et leurs interaction et articulations avec le Haut Représentant, l'UPPAR et les éléments PESC du Secrétariat du Conseil. L'ensemble ainsi constitué fournira les aides à la décision assurant à l'UE la capacité de se forger une opinion autonome et une évaluation propre de la situation.

Compte tenu de la complémentarité entre ces éléments et de la nécessité pour les organes de décision de disposer de l'expertise militaire et des outils d'aide à la décision, il est nécessaire que ces travaux progressent aussi vite que possible, en commençant par ceux concernant l'Etat-Major militaire.

C/ La mise en place des nouvelles fonctions et structures.

Une fois achevé le travail prioritaire de définition des structures et des fonctions, se posera la question du rythme de leur mise en place au sein de l'Union européenne.

Le calendrier :

La logique voudrait que cette mise en place puisse intervenir de façon concomitante avec l'entrée en fonctions du Haut Représentant, ou sinon dans les délais les plus rapprochés possibles après celle-ci de manière à éviter un décalage préjudiciable aux objectifs définis à Cologne. Mais cela ne doit pas se faire au détriment de la substance et de la réflexion approfondie à mener. Il appartiendra aux présidences successives de l'UE de donner les impulsions nécessaires.

Les modalités :

S'il était isolé, le COPS ne pourrait pas remplir ses fonctions avec l'efficacité voulue. Sa mise en place devrait donc au minimum être accompagnée de la mise en place du Comité militaire et d'un Secrétariat militaire, dans l'attente d'un Etat-Major militaire. Le COPS pourrait en outre s'appuyer - de façon transitoire - sur les ressources de l'Etat-Major militaire de l'UEO.

Le COPS devrait avoir notamment pour mission d'être la cheville ouvrière de la mise en œuvre des autres dispositions du plan d'action telles qu'elles ont été décidées à Cologne et précisées ci-dessus.

#### D/ La Résolution des questions institutionnelles

- Le débat sur certains aspects institutionnels est engagé. La déclaration de Cologne a, d'ores et déjà, fixé le cadre général de l'attitude à tenir en ce qui concerne les alliés non membres de l'Union et les partenaires, pour leur permettre de participer aux opérations et d'être associés. Un examen plus approfondi des principes directeurs des relations entre l'UE et ses partenaires extérieurs dans le domaine de la sécurité et de la défense permettra de préciser les relations réciproques pour l'avenir.
- Le COPS pourrait approfondir trois groupes de questions institutionnelles : l'inclusion des fonctions de l'UEO dans l'UE ; l'association et la participation des alliés ainsi que des partenaires associés non membres de l'UE ; les relations entre l'UE et l'OTAN.
- Les modalités précises de la participation et de l'association des partenaires extérieures à l'Union, les arrangements détaillés à mettre en place entre l'OTAN et l'UE, enfin leurs formulations institutionnelles définitives (révisions éventuellement nécessaires des traités) pourront être finalisées dès lors que l'Union aura achevé la mise en place des structures et instruments nécessaires à ses missions.

*13 Speech by Strobe Talbott,  
US Deputy Secretary of State  
'America's Stake in a Strong Europe'  
London, 7 October 1999*

**REMARKS AT A ROYAL INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
CONFERENCE ON THE FUTURE OF NATO**

Thank you, Lord Carrington, for that kind introduction and for your leadership over the years on many issues and in many institutions, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Many of us here today remember the steadiness and clear-headedness with which you saw us through the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear forces in the mid-80s, and then, the energy and determination you brought to the search for peace in Bosnia. Given the topic of this conference, it's especially appropriate for an eminent British statesman to be calling us to order on the premises of a venerable British institution.

The United Kingdom, under Prime Minister Blair, is now politically at the center of Europe and intellectually at the center of European deliberations over how better to deal with threats to continental peace and transatlantic security. That trend is personified by this afternoon's keynote speaker, who is about to become the first British Secretary-General of NATO since Lord Carrington. I haven't quite gotten used to referring to George as Lord Robertson of Port Ellen, but I certainly have no trouble imagining him in his new office in Brussels, where he will bring to the helm of our Alliance the same verve and skill that have marked his stewardship of the Ministry of Defense these past two years.

George, of course, will be taking over from Javier Solana, whom I must learn to address as Señor PESC. For the last four years, he has led the Alliance in meeting a series of what can only be described as existential challenges. I say that because nothing less than the continuing existence of the Alliance, and certainly its continuing relevance and effectiveness, depended on its being able to open its doors to new members, undertake new missions, establish partnerships with former adversaries and bring peace to the Balkans. The personnel shift involving George and Javier may be one of the more auspicious in recent history.

Both in the jobs they are leaving and in the ones they are assuming, these two men stand for the complementarity of NATO and the EU. That, ladies and gentlemen, is what I'd like to talk about this morning. More specifically, I'd like to talk about the transatlantic relationship in the wake of the conflict in Kosovo, and offer an American perspective on how we might ensure the continuing vitality of that relationship.

On Sunday, it will be exactly four months since the suspension of air strikes against Yugoslavia. We've all been thinking about the lessons of that experience. The most basic question is whether the Alliance was right to take the action that it did. That issue will be discussed — and debated — in the first two sessions today. Lord Carrington will, I suspect, guarantee that it is a very real debate indeed. It will continue for many years to come. I will be among those who argue that NATO was right to enforce the principle that, in Europe on the eve of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, national leaderships must not be allowed to define national

interests or national identity in a way that threatens international peace and that leads to crimes against humanity.

But there is, of course, another question: even if NATO did the right thing, did it do it right? Did it succeed? Did we win? In one sense, of course, the answer is clearly “yes”: as a result of NATO’s political cohesion and military effectiveness, Slobodan Milosevic capitulated to the terms that the leaders of the Alliance established in Washington on April 23<sup>rd</sup> as conditions for an end of the bombing. But that’s not quite a dispositive answer to the question, is it? Asking whether the Alliance’s first major military action in half a century was a success and a victory calls to mind Zhou Enlai’s famous answer to the question of how he assessed the French Revolution: ‘It’s too early to tell,’ he replied.

Kosovo is a classic case of having to establish the strategic wisdom of an action we have taken — that is, its long-term beneficial consequence — by the way in which we implement the peace we have imposed. We’re off to a solid start, but it’s only a start, and we could all too easily transform a tentative success into a lasting failure if we were, either out of complacency or out of exasperation, to disengage too soon. That’s why we must keep KFOR in place — and keep it at its punching weight — long enough for local government and civil society to take root. And it’s why we must do everything possible to support the democratic opposition in Serbia until it brings about the democratic transformation of Serbia. That, in turn, can happen only when Yugoslavia is under new management.

The ultimate verdict on Kosovo will also depend on the effect that the war and its aftermath, have, over time, on transatlantic attitudes, relations and institutions. On this subject, I sense a basic difference of view on opposite sides of the Atlantic. Many Americans are saying: never again should the United States have to fly the lion’s share of the risky missions in a NATO operation and foot by far the biggest bill. Many in my country, notably including members of Congress — are concerned that, in some future European crisis, a similar predominance of American manpower, firepower, equipment and resources will be neither politically nor militarily sustainable, given the competing commitments our nation has in the Gulf, on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere around the world.

Now let me turn to what I think I’m hearing on this side of the Ocean. Many Europeans seem determined never again to feel quite so dominated by the U.S. as they did during Kosovo or, for that matter, during Bosnia; in the next crisis — whatever, wherever and whenever it is — our Allies want a say in the conduct of operations more nearly commensurate with the political onus that they bear in supporting the war. At least no one, on either side, is complacent about the status quo. And by the way...It did not take Kosovo for both Americans and Europeans to recognize that there is an asymmetry in the transatlantic relationship; that is unwelcome and unhealthy; and that we must find ways to rebalance our respective roles.

We started that process within the Alliance at the Berlin ministerial of the North Atlantic Council three and a half years ago. In many ways, Kosovo confirmed our foresight. But Kosovo also dramatized the extent of the imbalance, and thus it should spur us to redouble the corrective effort that we began in Berlin.

As I see it, there are three main dimensions to the problem we collectively face and to the solution we must collectively apply. The first is military. Here the two relevant sets of initials are ESDI — the European Security and Defense Identity — and DCI, the Defense Capabilities Initiative. The second dimension is economic and commercial, and the task there is to enhance cooperation among our defense industries. The third challenge is political, and it requires an intensified effort by all the structures and organizations of our

community, notably including the EU, to reach out more proactively, more comprehensively and more quickly to the post-Communist East.

Let me take these three points one at a time. On ESDI, I'll start by reiterating what I hope is a clear, unambiguous statement of American policy. It's a policy of support: the U.S. is for ESDI. It's in our interest for Europe to be able to deal effectively with challenges to European security well before they reach the threshold of triggering U.S. combat involvement. As ESDI goes from being a concept to a reality, our support will be guided by the answers to two questions: first, will it work? Will it be able to do what it's supposed to do? Second, will it help keep the Alliance together and that means the whole Alliance, European and non-European, EU and non-EU? We would not want to see an ESDI that comes into being first within NATO but then grows out of NATO and finally grows away from NATO, since that would lead to an ESDI that initially duplicates NATO but that could eventually compete with NATO. That's a long-term concern, obviously, but NATO, after all, is about the long term, and so is this conference.

In the nearer term, we and our Canadian neighbors will be watching closely to see how the EU defines its security relationship with the other six Allies who do not happen to be EU members: Iceland (where I am flying later today), Norway, Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic and, of course, Turkey. We hope that ESDI will allow non-EU Allies to help shape planning and decisions for European-led military operations, and to participate in those operations if they so desire. We would also hope that, once ESDI is a reality, all Allies would, whenever possible, continue to act together.

Our ministers committed themselves to precisely these principles first in Berlin in '96, then again in Washington this past April. However, two other meetings seem, to our ears at least, to have emitted a somewhat different set of signals. The Anglo-French Summit at St. Malo last December raised concerns among non-EU Allies that they might not be sufficiently involved in planning and decision-making structures. Then came the EU leaders' declaration at Cologne in June, which could be read to imply that Europe's default position would be to act outside the Alliance whenever possible, rather than through the Alliance.

Now, I'm aware that we're talking here about the nuances of a work-in-progress with multiple authors. It's an iterative process, going back to Berlin four years ago, extending forward to Helsinki, two months from now and beyond. As ESDI does go forward, taking on form and content, we trust it will manage both to fulfil the aspirations and commitments and to ally the apprehensions that it has generated along the way.

Let me turn to the related question of resources, which is crucial to the Alliance in general and to ESDI in particular. As George Robertson has said frequently and forcefully, even the best laid plans for ESDI will come to naught unless its European advocates and architects ensure that it has sufficient military muscle. Hence the Defense Capability Initiative — DCI — which the Alliance leadership announced in April. That was in the midst of an operation in which many of our nations had planes in the air, but in which American B-2s and F-117s undertook many of the most vital missions. That's because they were the only ones that could fly at night, in any weather, evade defenses and deliver pinpoint strikes. For similar reasons, U.S. planes also flew two-thirds of the transport, refueling and intelligence missions. Moreover, it took months for most Allies to get their KFOR contingents pre-positioned in Macedonia and deployed into Kosovo.

That's why we — all of us — need DCI: it's mostly about transport and logistics, about getting forces to the area of operation and keeping them fed and equipped. Already, a number of Allies, including our British hosts as well as France, Norway and the

Netherlands, are restructuring their forces and acquiring the necessary equipment. But there's still a long way to go. Given the constraints we all face on spending, the challenge here is not so much to spend more but to be more efficient. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I realize that much of my message so far has been hortatory: I've stressed what we hope our European partners will do better or differently.

Let me assure you that Secretary Albright, Secretary Cohen and the rest of our colleagues have spent a lot of time thinking about our end of the bargain about where there's room for improvement in the U.S.'s own contribution to the common cause. In that spirit, we've broadened European military representation in NATO's new command structure; we support European command of operations where European forces predominate on the ground KFOR being the most obvious case in point. We're also committed to supporting EU-led operations by making available NATO transport, intelligence and logistics assets. And once Javier and his colleagues are in place, we're in favor of establishing a mechanism for ensuring NATO-EU coordination so that we can hammer out the practical arrangements for sharing assets and modernizing our defenses.

Now a few words about the vexatious issue of defense industry cooperation, which is all the more nettlesome arising as it does in the larger context of U.S.-EU trade disputes. We absolutely must find a way of jointly developing, and jointly benefiting from, new technologies. Here, as with ESDI, the U.S. will look for fresh and reciprocal approaches. We'll do that because again: as with ESDI — the U.S. has a stake in a strong, integrated, self-confident and militarily capable Europe. That requires viable defense industries on both sides of the Atlantic. In pursuit of that goal, while guarding against illicit and dangerous transfers of sensitive know-how and equipment, we will explore new ways to promote technology-sharing, streamline licensing procedures and encourage appropriate joint ventures. As we do so, we hope that the EU, in refining its own policy on defense industry trade, will keep the door open for cooperation between defense firms on both sides of the Atlantic.

Finally, I'd like to address the political dimension of the challenge. Both NATO and the EU have, over the past decades, accomplished a great deal in the political sphere. NATO began life as a collective-defense alliance, and it remains one today, 50 years and six months later. But NATO has also always had a political function. For example, in the early '80s, it promoted the consolidation of civilian-led democracy in Spain, and on numerous occasions, it has helped keep the peace between Greece and Turkey. Since the end of the Cold War, NATO's has served as a catalyst for strengthening democracy, rule of law, respect for human, civil and minority rights, including among non-members. The Partnership for Peace and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council are institutional manifestations of this mission.

Similarly, politics has always been both the subtext and the context of European economic integration. That was true when the European Coal and Steel Community provided an umbrella for the reconciliation of Germany and France in the aftermath of World War Two; and it has been true in the post-Cold War era. The European Union not only gave Europe its first "stateless currency" since the days of the Roman Empire but also helped bring into being a concert of liberal democracies in some ways the first, and certainly the most advanced, in history. That development is all the more propitious for the U.S., now that the United Kingdom is, finally, front and center in carrying that great experiment forward.

A crucial aspect of what has made the EU so successful to date and so promising for the future is the way it has dealt with the related issues of communal identity, civil society,

national sovereignty and international integration. As we Americans watch what is happening under the aegis of the EU, one of the things we most admire is the way in which the old system of nation-states is giving way to a new system in which nations feel secure enough in their identities and in their neighborhoods to make a virtue out of their dependence on one another. The treaties of Westphalia and Versailles seem to be giving way to those of Maastricht and Amsterdam. On matters where borders have become an obstacle to efficiency and prosperity, such as commercial activity and monetary policy, much of Europe is investing authority in supranational bodies; on other matters, where communal identities and sensitivities are at stake, such as language and education, central governments are devolving power to local authorities.

In this fashion, Europe is managing and sublimating forces that might have ignited civil strife and conflict across borders in what has, instead, been half a century of unprecedented peace and prosperity. Our hope is that the EU as the principal force for positive change in Western Europe — will find new and imaginative ways to induce, in the post-Communist East, the protection of minorities, the empowerment of regions and the pursuit of transnational cooperation.

One way, obviously, is to keep bringing new members into the EU itself. You're doing that. We recognize that EU enlargement is a complex process, involving transfers of sovereignty and profound adjustments in national governance, economies and regulatory systems. We hope we will be able to congratulate the newest members of the EU sometime during President Prodi's tenure and see it launch the next round of accession negotiations early in his term. But enlargement is not the only tool in the EU's kit bag for enhancing the stability of the continent. Prime Minister d'Alema recently called upon the EU to be "not just wise and generous" but "open."

If the EU further opens its markets to non-members in the East, the result will be not just more prosperity for those countries but also better prospects for market reform and political stability. We in Washington are taking Mr. D'Alema's advice ourselves. We're doing so in various ways: by looking for ways to increase access to our own markets for products from Southeastern Europe, by providing unilateral trade preferences for the region for five years, and by setting up new regional investment and equity funds.

There are other programs that bear the EU's imprimatur and that comprise what we recognize and welcome as an overarching effort to define "Europe" as inclusively and extensively as possible. Let me cite three: First, the EU's Partnership and Cooperation Agreements and their complementary assistance programs provide a mechanism to help the former Soviet republics develop democracy, establish the rule of law and encourage trade and investment. This important work is now in the capable hands of Chris Patten. Second, the EU's Northern Dimension Initiative will help Nordic, Baltic and Russian citizens solve common problems, such as managing nuclear and environmental waste, as well as battling infectious disease, international crime and terrorism. Third, there is the Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe: if (and it's a big if) it gets the funding it needs from the EU and other donors — will help policemen in Bulgaria, border guards in Macedonia and bankers in Romania all to feel themselves to be participants in, and beneficiaries of, the great venture of European integration.

What all three of these undertakings have in common is that they reach out not just to aspirants for EU membership but to other emerging democracies as well. In that sense, they're comparable to NATO's PfP and EAPC programs. They dramatize what I mentioned at the outset: the essential complementarity of the European Union and the Atlantic Alliance. Just as the EU and NATO have different but overlapping memberships, so they

have different but mutually reinforcing missions. Just as the U.S. wants and needs its European Allies to be equal partners in our common defense, so all of us in NATO should want the EU to succeed in nurturing within a the broadest possible political and geographic space those values and institutions, those habits of national and international life, that have come to characterize Western Europe over the past 50 years.

If that happens, the EU will be able to go about its business of deepening and broadening in a far safer, more hospitable environment. And our Alliance will be less likely to face another test like the one that it had to pass earlier this year. In that case, we will have indeed learned, and applied, the ultimate lesson of Kosovo.

## ***14 Speech by Lord Robertson, NATO Secretary-General, Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Amsterdam, 15 November 1999***

*Almost immediately after the revolutionary St-Malo meeting, the US Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, set clear 'guidelines' for further development of European defence aspirations with her famous 'Three D's' (see document 4, p. 10). Immediately after his appointment as NATO Secretary-General, George Robertson aimed at dispelling such American fears during his visit to the United States, on 30 October and 1 November 1999, and used his 'Three I's' for the first time during this visit. As this was an unofficial meeting, no document on his presentation is available. The first reference he made to the 'Three I's' in a formal context was during the speech, reproduced below, that he gave at the annual meeting of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in Amsterdam on 15 November 1999.*

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you for that warm welcome.

Let me begin by saying how very pleased I am to have the opportunity to address this Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. I was, until weeks ago, a Minister of Government and a Parliamentarian, and I understand very well the important role played by this group in supporting and advancing the NATO agenda. That is why I think it is fortunate that I have the chance to meet with you so soon after taking up my duties as Secretary General of NATO. I am very pleased that the relationship between NATO and the NPA has recently been enhanced, and I want to ensure that it continues to remain on a strong footing.

I am told that, traditionally, the NATO Secretary General begins his address to the NPA by giving his impressions of the events of the past year. Indeed, the twelve months since the last NPA Annual Assembly have been in many ways some of the most significant in the NATO's history. One of the most important milestones, of course, was the commemoration of NATO's 50th Anniversary. This was, first and foremost, a celebration of the victory of values – the values of peace, freedom and democracy. I was very proud to be present at that historic event. And I was pleased to see representatives of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly there in Washington as well.

But the Summit was more than just a birthday party. There was real work to do.

At NATO's Summit in April, we formally welcomed the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland into the Alliance – and in so doing, underlined the fact that Europe's divisions have gone. The NATO Parliamentary Assembly played a central role in making this a reality, by successfully guiding the ratification processes in your national parliaments.

We also set NATO's eyes to the future with the new Strategic Concept. The previous version, which dated from 1991, still spoke of maintaining a 'strategic balance' in Europe. The new Strategic Concept instead talks about building security across Europe, through Partnership and, when necessary, through cooperative crisis management. This marks a historic transition. This is a historic and welcome change in emphasis.

The Summit also marked a break from the past in a hugely symbolic, and very important way – through the simple presence of so many participants. More than 40 nations, from every corner of Europe and North America - from San Francisco to Tashkent, were represented in Washington, at the highest level.

Why? Because, as I said earlier, the Summit was a true celebration of the victory of values. And today, almost every country in Europe shares the same values – a belief in peace, in democracy and in freedom. The Summit was proof that the Euro-Atlantic community is not just rhetorical flourish – it is becoming a reality.

I have mentioned three ways in which, over the past year, the Alliance has closed a door on the past. There is a fourth – the campaign to bring peace and justice to Kosovo.

While most of Europe has been growing together, and embracing the future, one small region of Europe has been consumed by its past. While everyone else has spent ten years growing together, Slobodan Milosevic and his regime have been sowing the seeds of ethnic nationalism and xenophobia, first in Bosnia, then in Kosovo. These are the darkest manifestations of Europe's past – complete with ethnic murder and mass graves.

Even as the Alliance was celebrating the victory of our values across most of Europe, we were fighting to uphold them where they were threatened – in Kosovo. And we were successful.

We compelled Milosevic to accept the will of the international community, to stop the ethnic cleansing and killing, and to allow the return of the Kosovo citizens he had driven from their own homeland.

And I must take this opportunity to congratulate, and commend, the members of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly on the important role you played during this crisis. The Kosovo campaign caused some very difficult, and sometimes divisive, domestic debates across Europe. The NPA, however, remained steadfast. It explained NATO's actions to parliaments, to governments and to your people, and in turn maintained steadfast support for this operation. I thank you warmly for your contribution - and so too do the now ex-refugees.

Through these four measures – the 50th anniversary celebrations, enlargement, the new Strategic Concept and the Kosovo operation – NATO demonstrated over the past year that Europe is firmly closing the door on a 20th century that saw too much war, too much division, too many violations of human rights.

Our task now is to build the Euro-Atlantic security environment of the future – where all states share peace and democracy, and uphold basic human rights.

NATO will play a central role in building this security environment. But to remain effective, the Alliance must continue to adapt. We must build on our successes, the better to meet the challenges of the future. And here, I am not telling the NPA anything new. Indeed, your reports and proposals on NATO's development have been among the best produced in the Alliance, and have helped pave the way for some of NATO's recent adaptations.

Looking towards the future, let me mention six aspects which will be priorities for me. First: Alliance forces must remain effective and interoperable. Kosovo demonstrated the value of diplomacy backed by force. But if we need diplomacy backed by force in future, we have to ensure the force is effective. In this respect, the Kosovo crisis was not just a success, but also a wake-up call. It made crystal clear that NATO needs to improve its defence capabilities.

During the crisis, NATO's military forces have carried out a very wide range of missions – from providing humanitarian support to refugees, to a range of air operations, to the ground operation now fully deployed in Kosovo. This illustrates the variety of unpredictable security challenges we face in the post-Cold War world – and NATO's forces must be trained and equipped to meet them, as well as their traditional tasks. We have to make changes today, to be ready for an unpredictable tomorrow.

The Defence Capabilities Initiative, which we launched at the Washington Summit, is a big step in the right direction. It will ensure that the Alliance's forces can go quickly to where they are needed, can be supplied and reinforced for an extended period away from their home bases, can engage an adversary with great effectiveness and survive his attacks, and can co-operate closely with non-NATO forces.

The Defence Capabilities Initiative will promote greater interoperability between the forces of Allies and will also play a major role in accelerating the development of interoperability between Partner forces and those of the Alliance. One of my priorities is, bluntly, to make sure the Defence Capabilities Initiative delivers.

A second priority for the future: to help build a new, more mature transatlantic security relationship. The division of labour we saw in the Kosovo air campaign was militarily necessary, but it is politically unsustainable in the longer term. The European Security and Defence Identity is no longer just an attractive idea; it has become an urgent necessity. Simply put, the burden of dealing with European security crises should not fall disproportionately on the shoulders of the US. We need to create a more balanced Alliance, with a stronger European input.

This is eminently possible. Collectively, the European members of NATO spend almost two-thirds of the United States' defence budget – but Kosovo made it clear that they have nothing like two-thirds of the real capability of the US. In other words, it is not simply a question of spending more though some of us will have to – it is about spending more wisely. The European Allies must look critically at the balance of their armed forces, and look at how they can operate together more effectively.

I see a Europe which recognises this – and is doing something about it. Europe is now building capabilities, as well as institutions, to allow it to play a stronger role in preserving

peace and security. And NATO stands ready to support that process. For my part, I will work to ensure that ESDI is based on three key principles, the three I's: improvement in European defence capabilities; inclusiveness and transparency for all Allies; and the indivisibility of Trans-Atlantic security, based on our shared values.

ESDI does not mean 'less US' – it means more Europe, and hence a stronger NATO. Strengthening Europe's role in security is about re-balancing the transatlantic relationship in line with European and American interests. I very much look forward to working on this project with Dr. Solana, in his new post as 'Monsieur PESC'. I also welcome the strong North American participation in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, because this body has its own, very valuable transatlantic link.

A third priority will be building a stronger relationship with Russia. The Kosovo operation put a considerable strain on that relationship. Russia suspended contacts with NATO during the air campaign, and even though they have returned, they do not wish, at present, to talk about anything but issues relating to the Kosovo operation.

The Kosovo operation did indeed demonstrate the potential of a strong relationship. Russia played an important role in the diplomatic process that was supported by NATO's air campaign – and that ended on terms acceptable to both NATO and Russia. And now Russian forces are working alongside NATO troops in KFOR, and are making an important contribution on the ground.

Clearly, security in the Euro-Atlantic area works best when NATO and Russia work together. Russia and NATO have many common interests – from peacekeeping to nuclear safety to arms control. There is no way around it. It is to our mutual benefit to cooperate where we agree, and to continue talking even when we disagree. I intend to work hard to build this kind of strong, practical relationship.

Kosovo not only illustrates, but is at the heart of my fourth priority – to help build lasting peace and stability in the Balkans. For too long, this region has suffered from political instability, ethnic conflict and economic weakness. And for too long – indeed, throughout this century – the international community has ignored Balkan sparks until they became fires that burned us all.

That has now changed. The international community is now fully engaged in building stability in South Eastern Europe – to ensure that the future of this region does not remain a prisoner of the past. And NATO is playing a central role in that project, in two main ways.

More than 70,000 troops, led by the Alliance, are keeping the peace in Bosnia and in Kosovo, and supporting civil reconstruction efforts. We are already seeing very positive results. In Kosovo, a secure environment is slowly being restored. Over 800,000 refugees have returned home. The UN has established its presence, and 1,800 UN police are on the streets.

The UCK has been disbanded, and a new civil emergency organisation formed. A multi-ethnic transitional council is meeting weekly, setting the stage for a multi-ethnic political future. And preparations are underway for elections sometime next year. This is real

progress, when one remembers the chaos and violence the Kosovars suffered under Milosevic just a few months ago.

There is still much work to be done. The returning Albanian majority must control its understandable anger, and refrain from attacking the minorities that remain. The former members of the now-defunct UCK must accept that their war is over, and that KFOR will provide for security in a multi-ethnic, democratic Kosovo. The immediate goal of the international community, including NATO, is to help every citizen of Kosovo enjoy what we all enjoy – peace, security and freedom.

This will require a real, determined commitment, but we will persevere. We won the war – we will not lose the peace.

Bosnia-Herzegovina gets far less attention from the media than Kosovo, but here too, there has been real progress since NATO deployed in 1995. There are more and more moderates elected to government, because Bosnians want security and stability. In fact, the security situation has improved to the point that the Alliance will, over the next six months, reduce the numbers of troops in Bosnia by another one-third, to 20,000. Our long-term goal is getting closer – a Bosnia-Herzegovina which enjoys self-sustaining peace.

But to reinforce our success in these two trouble spots, we must look beyond them, to South-Eastern Europe as a whole. Throughout the Kosovo campaign, our Partners from South-Eastern Europe have shown their solidarity with NATO's actions. Yugoslavia's neighbours supported NATO despite facing economic hardships and domestic troubles. They should be able to expect our support now.

The EU's Stability Pact is a major step forward. It is an acknowledgement of the need for a more comprehensive approach for all of South-Eastern Europe. The Stability Pact focuses on three areas:

- democratisation and human rights;
- economic reconstruction, development and cooperation; and
- security issues.

There is no doubt that NATO can - and will - play a key role in supporting the Pact, most actively in the security field. Our South-Eastern European Initiative, launched at the Washington Summit, is the key.

My goal is clear: to help build a Balkans that is firmly anchored inside the European family of democratic values.

I also want to strengthen still further the links between NATO and Ukraine as well as with our other Partners. Throughout the Kosovo crisis, NATO's Partners have demonstrated clearly that they are no longer on the sidelines of security – they are contributing. The countries neighbouring Kosovo provided invaluable assistance to the tens of thousands of refugees fleeing the brutality of Milosevic's security forces. They were staunch supporters

of NATO operations to bring the campaign of violence to a halt. And now, as in Bosnia, over 20 Partner countries are sending troops to Kosovo, to help keep the peace.

Through these major contributions, the Partnership for Peace and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council have demonstrated their value in developing a cooperative approach to security across the Euro-Atlantic area. I want these mechanisms to become even more operational and relevant to the security needs of our Partners. That is why I intend to support fully the enhancements we have recently made to PfP, to improve interoperability, and to give our Partners more say in planning and conducting NATO-led peace support operations.

Finally, one of my key responsibilities will be to prepare NATO for the next round of enlargement. NATO's Heads of State and Government have committed to consider further enlargement no later than 2002. Between now and then, we must explore the full potential of the Membership Action Plan, and give all the aspirant countries as much support as possible in meeting their targets. Partner countries want the perspective of integration into Europe. The door to NATO will remain open as an important part of that process.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Taken together, this is a broad and ambitious agenda, and it will require a lot of hard work to accomplish it. But as I look to the future of this great Alliance, I am very confident. Over the past year in particular, NATO's work plan has been so successful that the Alliance today is more relevant and more indispensable than it has ever been.

And all of us who make up this great and unique Alliance, are taking the steps necessary to face the grave and serious challenges of the future. NATO's foundations as a 21st century Alliance are rock solid. Together we can build on them to the advantage of the whole world.

## ***15 General Affairs Council Brussels, 15 November 1999***

*On 15 November 1999, EU Defence Ministers met for the first time ever with EU Foreign Ministers in the context of the General Affairs Council in Brussels. We reproduce below the extracts of the GAC document that concern defence.*

(...)

### **EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY**

The General Affairs Council, with the participation of Defence Ministers, discussed the follow-up to the Cologne conclusions on strengthening the ESDP, with a view to guiding the Presidency in the preparation of its progress report to the Helsinki European Council. Work covered both military and non-military aspects of crisis management. The Presidency will submit to the European Council two reports which are complementary and mutually reinforcing and which will underline both the ability of the Union to have recourse to the whole range of political, economic, humanitarian and military instruments and its determination to enhance the effectiveness of its instruments.

(...)

### **WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION (WEU)**

#### **Authorisation for the appointment of Mr Javier SOLANA as Secretary General of the WEU**

The Council, taking into account Opinion n° 6/99 of 8 November 1999 of the Political Committee, decided that Mr Javier SOLANA MADARIAGA, Secretary General/High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the Council of the European Union, is authorised to accept the office and perform the duties of Secretary General of the WEU, in addition to his duties as Secretary General/High Representative.

It should be noted that Mr Javier SOLANA is expected to be appointed shortly as Secretary General of the WEU and to take up his duties on 25 November 1999 after expiration of the mandate of the current Secretary General, Mr José CUTILEIRO.

(...)

## ***16 WEU Ministerial Council Luxembourg, 22-23 November 1999***

### **LUXEMBOURG DECLARATION**

1. Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Defence of the WEU nations met in Luxembourg on 22 and 23 November 1999. The WEU Council of Ministers was preceded by the meeting of the Defence Ministers of the 13 members of the Western European Armaments Group (WEAG) with the participation of their colleagues from Austria, Finland and Sweden.

2. Ministers welcomed the results of the European Council in Cologne. They welcomed the decision to give the European Union the necessary means and capabilities to assume its responsibilities regarding a common European policy on security and defence and the commitment to further develop more effective European military capabilities from the basis of existing national, bi-national and multinational capabilities and to strengthen Europe's own capabilities for that purpose. Ministers noted that the European Council has tasked the General Affairs Council to prepare the conditions and the measures necessary to achieve these objectives, including the definition of the modalities for the inclusion of those functions of WEU which will be necessary for the European Union to fulfil its new responsibilities in the area of the Petersberg tasks. They looked forward to the decisions to be taken in this regard by the European Council in Helsinki.

Pending the creation of the appropriate structures in the Union, Ministers reaffirmed their readiness, in the framework of Article 17 of the TEU, and if the Union so wishes, to continue to provide the Union with access to an operational capability and to elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the Union which have defence implications. Building upon the arrangements for enhanced cooperation between the European Union and WEU under the Protocol on Article 17 of the Treaty on European Union, implemented since the Bremen meeting, Ministers expressed their willingness to allow bodies of the Council of the European Union direct access, as required, to the expertise of the Organisation's operational structures, including the WEU Secretariat, the Military Staff, the Satellite Centre and the Institute for Security Studies.

To that end, if the European Union expressed such a need, they agreed:

- to authorise the transmission of all WEU's work and analyses, particularly those of the Military Staff, to the High Representative for the CSFP and the other appropriate bodies of the Council of the European Union taking into account the relevant security arrangements;
- to give task requests from appropriate bodies of the Council of the EU addressed to the Satellite Centre the same priority as those from the WEU Council;
- to ensure that the publications of the Institute for Security Studies are addressed to the High Representative for the CFSP and the other appropriate bodies of the Council of the EU on a systematic basis.

- to allow the continuation of cross-participation and joint meetings and meetings of the WEU-EU ad hoc group, when appropriate, according to the established modalities.

3. Ministers noted with satisfaction that the Alliance has reaffirmed its strong commitment to pursue the process of reinforcing the European pillar of the Alliance on the basis of its Brussels Declaration of 1994 and of the principles agreed at Berlin in 1996. They appreciated the progress achieved in implementing the Berlin decisions and noted that their key elements are being put in place. They underlined the importance of the Alliance's Strategic Concept.

Ministers hailed the fact that, as set out in paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of the Washington Summit Communiqué, the Alliance welcomed the new impetus given to the strengthening of a common European policy in security and defence and indicated its readiness to define and adopt the necessary arrangements for ready access by the European Union to NATO collective assets and capabilities.

4. Ministers held a detailed discussion on security and defence in Europe. In this context, they welcomed the continuation of the work on the informal reflection mandated in Rome and held at meetings of directors for security policy from Foreign and Defence Ministries which had demonstrated a common willingness:

- to strengthen the assets and capabilities available for crisis management operations;
- to prepare the WEU legacy and the inclusion of those functions of WEU, which will be deemed necessary by the European Union to fulfil its new responsibilities in the area of crisis management tasks;
- to develop satisfactory arrangements that serve the interests of all WEU nations.

Ministers decided that the informal reflection work should be pursued on this basis. In this context, WEU offers a framework for dialogue facilitating a politico-military consultation process and cooperation among Europeans on wider security and defence issues.

5. Ministers welcomed the results of the audit of assets and capabilities for European crisis management operations. They took note with satisfaction of the report prepared by the Presidency and they approved the recommendations for strengthening European capabilities for crisis management operations. They tasked the Permanent Council to take forward work within its competence on strengthening WEU's collective capabilities.

6. Ministers expressed their satisfaction with the work of the extended WEU Multinational Advisory Police Element (MAPE), undertaken at the request of the European Union, which is contributing to the ongoing process of stabilisation and democratic reform in Albania. The Operation Plan for the extended MAPE mission enables it to better respond to the needs of the Albanian authorities in building a police force according to European norms.

7. Ministers expressed their satisfaction with the implementation of the general security surveillance mission on Kosovo carried out by the WEU Satellite Centre at the request of the European Union. They welcomed the interest shown by international organisations in the Satellite Centre's Geographic Information System (GIS).

8. Ministers expressed their satisfaction with the conduct of the WEU Demining Assistance Mission (WEUDAM) in Croatia, led by Sweden and undertaken at the request of the European Union.

9. Ministers had an extended discussion on Kosovo and the region. They reaffirmed their commitment to a democratic and multiethnic Kosovo and expect all parties to comply fully with UN Security Council Resolution 1244. They reiterated the necessity for real progress towards democracy and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. They expressed their complete support for implementation of the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe aiming at lasting peace, democratisation, prosperity, security and stability in the region. They noted with satisfaction the cooperation, on the ground, of all the international organisations and particularly welcomed the efforts made by SFOR and KFOR to restore stability and implement peace in the region. They welcomed the efforts made by AFOR. They also noted with satisfaction the establishment of the Multinational Peace Force/South Eastern Europe and the official opening of its Headquarters in Plovdiv, Bulgaria, as an important contribution to the confidence building process and regional security.

10. In the field of WEU's operational development, Ministers

- highlighted the importance of the WEU/NATO Joint Crisis Management Exercise 2000 (CMX/CRISEX/2000) which will practice and validate crisis management procedures and the consultation arrangements between WEU and NATO in the event of a WEU-led operation using NATO assets and capabilities;
- stressed the importance of the measures taken regarding the new structure of the Military Staff which enhance its efficiency and cohesion. They took note of the respective documents;
- stressed the importance of civil-military cooperation in the context of crisis management missions. They took note of the WEU concept in this area;
- took note of the WEU medical support concept.

11. Ministers welcomed the recent initiatives by the member nations of Eurocorps, Eurofor and Euromarfor to reinforce the crisis management capabilities of those multinational forces. They welcomed the intention of the Eurocorps member nations to adapt the Eurocorps, and in particular its Headquarters, to the new strategic environment and to develop it in future into a European rapid reaction corps. They also welcomed the adoption of the Joint Declaration on the use of the Spanish-Italian Amphibious Force (SIAF) in the framework of WEU.

12. Ministers approved the recommendations contained in the report on the possible participation of WEU in a developing multilateral European programme in the satellite field.

13. Ministers noted with interest the report by the Presidency on the Military Committee meeting held in Luxembourg on 3 and 4 November 1999. In particular, they welcomed the fact that the work on the organisational structure and functioning of the Military Staff had been completed.

14. The WEU Council (Members of WEAG) adopted the conclusions of the WEAG Defence Ministers.

15. Ministers welcomed the results of the OSCE Summit meeting held in Istanbul on 18 and 19 November 1999. They noted with satisfaction the agreement on the adaptation of the CFE Treaty, which remains a cornerstone of European security, and the adaptation of the 1994 Vienna Document. Ministers underlined the need for the participating States to comply with all provisions in these documents. Ministers also welcomed the adoption of the Istanbul Charter for European Security which reflects the changes that have taken place in Europe in the last decade. The Charter will provide a solid basis for the OSCE to address future challenges to peace and security. In this context Ministers also welcomed the adoption of the «Platform for Cooperative Security». It reaffirms the importance of cooperation between mutually reinforcing and complementary organizations.

16. Ministers expressed their deep concern over the continuing military campaign in the Northern Caucasus. They urged the fullest restraint, so as to avoid disproportionate and indiscriminate use of force. They also urged the Russian Government to observe its commitments under international humanitarian law to avoid civilian casualties. Ministers strongly underlined the need to seek a negotiated settlement and emphasized that a dialogue between the Russian Government and the elected leaders of the North Caucasus, including Chechnya, would be an important step towards finding a political solution. Ministers underlined the role which the OSCE should play in achieving that goal. They welcomed the willingness of the OSCE to assist in the renewal of a political dialogue and the agreement of the Russian Federation to a visit by the Chairman-in-Office to the region. Ministers recalled their positions concerning the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation. They underlined their resolute condemnation of terrorism in all its forms.

17. Ministers underlined Russia's key role in Europe's security and stability and looked forward to seeing WEU's relationship with Russia further developing on the basis of enhanced political dialogue and practical cooperation.

18. Ministers reaffirmed Ukraine's significance as a European partner. They welcomed the progress made in implementation of the action plan. They expressed the wish to see further enhancement of the political dialogue and practical cooperation between WEU and Ukraine.

19. Ministers called on Belarus, Russia and Ukraine to ratify the Open Skies Treaty without further delay. They welcomed the initiatives taken in this respect by the WEU nations.

20. Ministers expressed their satisfaction regarding the development of WEU's Mediterranean dialogue. The dialogue contributes to confidence-building and cooperation in the region and reinforces other international efforts, notably the European Union's Barcelona Process and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue.

21. Ministers took note with appreciation of the ongoing dialogue between Cyprus\* and WEU that evolves in line with the development of Cyprus's\* links with the European Union, with which negotiations for accession are continuing.



- Confirmed their commitment to WEAG and agreed to retain it under their political direction.
- Confirmed their willingness to further develop its activities as well as those of its executive agency, the WEAO, and to improve the efficiency and scope of the activities conducted in common so as to better meet the agreed objectives, including the eventual establishment of the European Armaments Agency.
- Reaffirmed that all WEAG full members will continue to be entitled to participate fully in any future arrangement in the field of European armaments co-operation that might evolve from WEAG/WEAO, and with the same rights and responsibilities as currently enjoyed.
- Reaffirmed their decision to progressively open armaments co-operation activities to other European nations through the European Armaments Partnership, and agreed to offer them the possibility of full membership once the necessary conditions are met.

4. Concerning the European Armaments Partnership, Ministers, in the light of the accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to NATO and their subsequent associate membership in WEU, have decided to update the modalities agreed in Erfurt in November 1997. This will enable those nations to participate in WEAG activities. Furthermore, Ministers also approved a procedure for full membership of WEAG.

5. Ministers approved the revised version of the Coherent Policy Document issued in 1990, which gives general guidelines for WEAG policy in all matters related to the creation, development, operation and control of the European Defence Equipment Market.

6. Ministers endorsed the way ahead to continue work towards the implementation of the European Armaments Agency in accordance with the Masterplan.

7. The Western European Armaments Organisation has achieved its target for awarding research and technology contracts to European industry under the EUCLID programme. A 10% higher target has been set for launching new projects in the forthcoming period, with at least seventeen EUCLID contracts amounting to a total value of 102 million euros, including 39 million from industrial self-investment.

8. The WEU Council (members of WEAG) adopted the conclusions of the WEAG Defence Ministers.

\* Turkey dissociates itself from this reference by reserving its stated position on this issue.

## **AUDIT OF ASSETS AND CAPABILITIES FOR EUROPEAN CRISIS MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING EUROPEAN CAPABILITIES FOR CRISIS MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS**

Luxembourg, 23 November 1999

At their meeting in Rome in November 1998, WEU Ministers expressed the wish that a process of informal reflection be initiated at WEU on the question of Europe's security and defence. As part of this process, they decided to conduct a WEU audit of assets and capabilities for European crisis management operations. This audit included Member States, Associate Members and Observers.

The results of this audit show that Europeans, in principle, have the available force levels and resources needed to prepare and implement military operations over the whole range of Petersberg tasks, i.e. humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks, and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.

The general report prepared by the Luxembourg Presidency has identified a number of gaps and deficiencies, as well as areas where these European assets and capabilities should be strengthened to attain a higher level of operational effectiveness in crisis management.

Despite the measures which are already being examined by Europeans and the possibility of using Alliance assets and capabilities, considerable efforts are still needed to strengthen European capabilities.

Implementation of the recommendations presented in this document would contribute to overcoming gaps and deficiencies and to reinforcing European capabilities.

Whilst underlining the need to define priorities for the actions to be taken, the most urgent efforts should be focused:

- with regard to collective capabilities, on the following areas:
  - strategic intelligence;
  - strategic planning;
- with regard to forces and operational capabilities, on the following areas:
  - availability, deployability, strategic mobility, sustainability, survivability and interoperability and operational effectiveness;
  - multinational, joint Operation and Force HQs, with particular reference to C3 (command, control and communications) capabilities and deployability of Force HQs.

#### **Strengthening collective capabilities for crisis management operations**

With respect to the gathering and management of information and intelligence and the analysis of crisis situations, it is recommended to set up a more coherent strategic

intelligence and information pooling and management policy. In a crisis situation, this policy should allow a careful in-depth analysis at strategic level to be made. Access to classified sources should be covered by more precise agreements. Improved WEU Satellite Centre access to commercial - and, above all, military - high resolution satellite imagery should be fostered. Procedures for cooperation between the Satellite Centre and other international organisations, particularly the European Union and NATO, should be clarified.

With respect to capabilities for the preparation and planning of crisis management operations, strategic planning capabilities should be considerably strengthened. Planning architecture, procedures and terminology should be harmonised with those used in NATO. Work should continue on the procedures and criteria for identifying and selecting national or multinational HQs capable of serving as Operation or Force HQs.

With respect to political control and strategic direction of crisis management operations, WEU should produce a single, consolidated crisis management manual containing all the various texts on crisis management procedures and replacing existing documents in this field. Clear and straightforward standard operating procedures should be developed. The force activation and generation procedures should be harmonised with the mechanisms currently used by NATO. WEU's communications and information systems (CIS) should continue to be improved.

### **Reinforcement of force capabilities and operational capabilities**

With regard to availability of forces, forces and force packages should be available at shorter notice. Thus, certain of these forces should be available for immediate reaction and rapid reaction.

With regard to the deployability and strategic mobility of forces, capabilities for projecting forces to theatres of operations, even distant ones, should be improved. For operations at the higher end of the Petersberg task spectrum, military air and sea transport assets and capabilities should be considerably reinforced. A common European approach could be adopted. A number of ideas have been raised in this regard, for example a 'Eurolift' force or a structured European transport capability. Even for cases where recourse to civilian assets may be inevitable, the capability for strategic projection within short time-frames should be maintained. Coordination, designed to make optimum use of existing assets and capabilities, both military and civilian, should be stepped up. At the tactical level, mobility, particularly in-theatre helicopter transport capability, should be improved.

With regard to sustainability and survivability of forces, nations should reinforce their logistics capacity to support their forces once they have been deployed and should improve their capabilities for establishing supply lines. The capability for sustaining forces in the theatre of operations over a long period should be improved. In this respect, it may be beneficial to make greater use of task-sharing between nations in order to improve logistics and resupply capabilities.

With regard to interoperability of forces, WEU nations should continue to make efforts to improve interoperability between their forces, making use of all appropriate mechanisms.

With regard to communications and information systems (CIS), it is advisable to dispose of a consolidated, high-performance, strategic and tactical communications and information system for the rapid exchange of classified documents. The capacity to conduct electronic operations should be enhanced, particularly in the area of offensive operations and suppressive electronic countermeasures. This is particularly true for air forces. For special operations, search and rescue (SAR) capabilities should be capable of covering a hostile environment. Real combat capability should be built up in this area.

With regard to medical support to forces, efforts should be made in the field of long-haul medical evacuation and in the NBC area, particularly in the provision of aid to the civilian population. Capacities in the area of Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) should be improved. All nations should continue their efforts to develop or reinforce their capabilities, in the light of the EU's work on the enhancement of non-military tools for crisis management.

The national and multinational HQs should be capable of operating in joint and/or combined configurations and be capable of serving as Operation or Force HQs for operations across the whole range of Petersberg tasks. Efforts should be envisaged on force build-up times, interaction with politico-military structures and on deployability of Force HQs.

As far as forces are concerned, the structure of land forces should be further adapted to allow operations in a non-static environment. The organic air assets of maritime forces should reinforce their air defence and offensive capability. Air forces need to strengthen their C3 (command, control and communications) and electronic operations capabilities. The capability to conduct integrated air defence and air operations using precision-guided munitions should be developed.

It may be useful to make wider use of the framework nation concept and of task-sharing between nations in order to enhance operational capabilities. Depending on their capabilities, nations could concentrate on providing specialised units.

### **Final remarks**

In the context of the Cologne European Council, the German Presidency Report on strengthening of the common European policy on security and defence stated that the European Union Member States would 'undertake efforts in line with the conclusions of the ongoing WEU Audit of European defence capabilities'. In this connection, WEU, with its whole range of capabilities, remains at the European Union's disposal for any additional work should the EU consider that useful.

The strengthening of assets and capabilities for European crisis management operations depends on the continuation of sustained and structured defence efforts and the implementation of the necessary adaptations. Such a strengthening could be facilitated through flexible mechanisms which would identify common goals and criteria for these goals, encouraging nations to indicate how they could be fulfilled. Wherever possible, the nations concerned will also make full use of the NATO mechanisms and processes in which

they already participate (defence planning, Defence Capabilities Initiative, Planning and Review Process (PARP)).

In pursuing their efforts to develop their military capabilities in the fields identified, the nations concerned will be able to contribute to the reinforcement of the European pillar of the Alliance.

In continuing its work, WEU will maintain full transparency and the necessary consultations with the Atlantic Alliance.

### **Follow-up**

The WEU Military Staff, as part of its general responsibilities vis-à-vis national and multinational forces, is tasked with:

- taking advantage of the audit work to achieve better coverage of the issue of capabilities of forces answerable to WEU;
- using the audit work to assess the time constraints in the build-up of ad hoc Operation and Force HQs (immediate reaction and rapid reaction) based on relevant force packages;
- integrating the lessons learnt from recent military operations.

## ***17 Anglo-French summit London, 25 November 1999***

### **JOINT DECLARATION ON EUROPEAN DEFENCE**

1. A year ago in St Malo, Britain and France launched together a major initiative aimed at building European security and defence. This paved the way for the progress made at Cologne.

2. In the Kosovo crisis, our two countries played a major role in working for a political settlement and in NATO's military operations. This crisis reinforced our conviction that the European nations need to increase their defence capabilities, thus enabling them to conduct effective EU-led operations as well as playing their full role in Alliance operations.

3. We therefore call on the European Council in Helsinki to take a decisive step forward for the development of those military capabilities and for the setting up of the political and military instruments necessary to use them. This is necessary to give the EU the autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged, to launch and then to conduct EU-led military operations.

4. We are fully convinced that, by developing our military capabilities, while reinforcing the EU's capacity for action, we will also contribute directly and substantially to the vitality of a modernised Atlantic Alliance, by making a stronger and more balanced partnership. NATO remains the foundation of our collective defence and will continue to have an important role in crisis management. We expect NATO and the EU to develop a close and confident relationship.

5. Our top priorities must therefore be to strengthen European military capabilities without unnecessary duplication. We call on the European Union at the Helsinki Summit to:

- Set itself the goal of Member States, cooperating together, being able to deploy rapidly and then sustain combat forces which are militarily self-sufficient up to Corps level with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, combat support and other combat service support (up to 50,000-60,000 men) and appropriate naval and air combat elements. All these forces should have the full range of capabilities necessary to undertake the most demanding crisis management tasks.
- Urge the Member States to provide the capabilities to deploy in full at this level within 60 days and within this to provide some smaller rapid response elements at very high readiness. We need to be able to sustain such a deployment for at least a year. This will require further deployable forces (and supporting elements) at lower readiness to provide replacements for the initial force.
- Develop rapidly capability goals in the fields of command and control, intelligence and strategic lift. In this respect:
  - We are ready to make available the UK's Permanent Joint Headquarters and France's Centre Operational Interarmees and their planning capabilities as options

to command EU-led operations. As part of this, we intend to develop standing arrangements for setting up multinationalised cells within these Headquarters, including officers from other EU partners.

- We want European strategic airlift capabilities to be strengthened substantially. We intend to work urgently with our allies and partners on ways to achieve this. We note the common European need for new transport aircraft. We have today taken an important bilateral step by signing an agreement on logistics which will include arrangements by which we can draw on each other's air, sea and land transport assets to help deploy rapidly in a crisis.
- We welcome the ongoing transformation of the Eurocorps into a rapid reaction corps as decided by the five Eurocorps members in Cologne, which will contribute to giving the EU a more substantial capacity to undertake crisis management tasks, in particular by providing it with a deployable Headquarters. Our two countries intend this to be a contribution to the enhancement of key assets available both to the EU and NATO. The UK is ready, in due course and with the agreement of the Eurocorps members, to provide British forces to the Eurocorps HQ for specific operations as the Eurocorps nations have already done in the case of the British-led ACE Rapid Reaction Corps.

6. We also call on the Helsinki European Council to set a clear target date and appropriate review and consultation mechanisms to ensure that these goals are reached. Our work towards the achievement of these objectives and those arising from NATO's DCI will be mutually reinforcing. We also welcome the contributions of the non-EU European Allies and of WEU Associate Partners to this improvement of European military capabilities.

7. In addition to the decisions on military capabilities, we call on the European Union at Helsinki to:

- Set out the political and military structures to enable the Council to take decisions on EU-led military operations, to ensure the necessary political control and strategic direction of such operations and, to this end, to endorse the proposal which the UK and France have put forward on the role and composition of a Military Committee and a military staff and the planning and conduct of EU-led operations.
- Provide the basis for participation of non-EU European Allies and the involvement of WEU Associate Partners in EU-led operations.
- Underline the need to develop thereafter modalities for full co-operation, consultation and transparency between the EU and NATO.

8. We reaffirm our conviction that strengthened European defence capabilities need the support of a strong and competitive European defence industry and technology. The restructuring of the European aerospace and defence industry is a major step which will help to improve competition in the global market. We welcome this recent consolidation and restructuring of European defence companies and, in the same spirit, give our full support to the finalisation of the Letter of Intent. The strengthening of our armaments industry will foster the development of European technological capabilities and will allow transatlantic cooperation to develop in a spirit of balanced partnership. We look forward to

early progress toward the establishment of Airbus as a single commercial business with a fully united management.

9. We are committed to the efforts being made to harmonise future defence equipment requirements. The successful cooperation between the UK and France, together with Italy, on the Principal Anti-Air Missile System - which will provide world class air defence for our Navies well into the next century - is a good example of how we work together. So too are the French SCALP and the UK's Storm Shadow programme for a long range precision guide air to ground missile, which is based on the proven French Apache missile. We are partners too with Germany on the future medium range anti-armour weapon for our respective infantry.

## ***18 Franco-German summit Paris, 30 November 1999***

### **PARIS DECLARATION**

Rappelant les engagements pris ensemble à Toulouse, lors de la session du Conseil franco-allemand de défense et de sécurité, de contribuer de tout le poids de nos deux pays à ce que l'Union européenne se dote des moyens autonomes nécessaires pour décider et agir face aux crises ;

Réaffirmant également la volonté des quinze exprimée à Cologne de renforcer à cette fin les capacités militaires européennes, notamment en matière de renseignement, de mobilité stratégique, de commandement et de contrôle ;

La France et l'Allemagne attendent en conséquence du Conseil européen d'Helsinki des avancées substantielles dans l'élaboration d'une politique européenne de défense et de sécurité et se déclarent résolument en faveur à cette occasion de progrès décisifs pour le développement des capacités militaires de l'Union européenne et de décisions pour la mise en place des organes de décision comme des instruments militaires au sein de l'Union européenne. Ces éléments sont indispensables pour donner à l'Union européenne la capacité autonome de décider et, là où l'Alliance en tant que telle n'est pas engagée, de lancer puis de conduire des opérations militaires. A cet égard, la France et l'Allemagne recommandent au Conseil européen d'Helsinki d'endosser la proposition fondée sur le document intitulé « Organes militaires, planification et conduite d'opérations menées par l'Union européenne ».

Conscients de l'importance d'une base industrielle technologique forte et compétitive, nos deux pays se félicitent vivement de l'avancée majeure que constitue le rapprochement de nos industries d'armement au sein de la nouvelle EADS. La fusion Aérospatiale-Matra/DASA facilitera notre coopération autour de programmes communs.

La réalisation de nouveaux programmes nécessitera de rechercher des convergences bilatérales, notamment en relançant nos efforts d'harmonisation des besoins futurs. Dans ce cadre, nous avons décidé de comparer nos plans respectifs concernant le renforcement des capacités de renseignement, de mobilité stratégique, de commandement et de communications ainsi que de continuer à développer nos capacités militaires dans ces domaines ;

S'agissant plus spécifiquement de la capacité de renseignement, qui constitue un élément central de l'autonomie d'appréciation et de décision de l'Union européenne, nous sommes déterminés à fédérer les moyens existants ou à venir, y compris dans le domaine spatial, pour constituer des capacités communes européennes.

S'agissant de la mobilité stratégique, nous proposons à terme de créer, par étapes et dans le cadre multinational approprié, un commandement européen du transport aérien afin de

gérer en commun les moyens européens de transport aérien militaire disponibles et de coordonner l'emploi des moyens civils éventuellement utilisés. Cette coordination entraînera des effets de synergie et permettra une optimisation des coûts. Elle renforcera en même temps l'incitation à l'acquisition et à l'utilisation communes des moyens ainsi qu'à une formation commune des personnels. Le Conseil franco-allemand de défense et de sécurité a chargé les ministres de la Défense de la mise en œuvre de l'initiative visant à mettre sur pied un commandement européen du transport aérien.

Nous affirmons ainsi notre volonté de parvenir à une décision commune sur le développement et l'acquisition, de toute façon nécessaire, d'un avion de transport européen commun, au vu du rapport technique déjà soumis.

S'agissant des capacités de commandement et de contrôle, nous rappelons l'annonce faite à Toulouse et la décision de Cologne des Etats membres relative à la transformation du Corps européen, et en premier lieu de son état-major, en Corps de réaction rapide. Nous nous félicitons, avec nos trois partenaires, des progrès réalisés depuis lors, qui permettent aux Etats participants de proposer l'état-major de cette grande unité comme structure de commandement de la KFOR pour assurer dans le courant de l'année 2000 la relève de Landcent.

Nous saluons l'arrivée prochaine au Corps européen d'officiers de liaison d'autres pays membres de l'Union européenne, prélude à une participation élargie aux activités du Corps.

Nous reconnaissons de même l'intérêt d'insérer sur une base permanente, dans les QG nationaux interarmées, des officiers d'autres nations de l'Union européenne.

Nous nous félicitons de la signature aujourd'hui même d'un protocole relatif au partage des capacités sur le premier satellite de télécommunications de nouvelle génération SYRACUSE 3. Cela constitue la première étape d'un projet de coopération sur un système complet de télécommunications spatiales.

Nous sommes convaincus que ces mesures apporteront une contribution essentielle et efficace au développement de la Politique européenne de sécurité et de défense par des moyens pratiques, dans le cadre de l'Union européenne et en accord avec les décisions de Cologne, contribuant ainsi au renforcement du pilier européen de l'Alliance. Dans l'esprit des résultats du Sommet de Washington, nous contribuons également par là à l'amélioration de ses capacités de gestion de crise et à la vitalité d'une Alliance modernisée.

Le Conseil se félicite de l'intention des ministres de la Défense de créer des cours de langues française et allemande communs pour des officiers supérieurs des deux pays. Un premier cours pilote doit avoir lieu en 2000.



for civilian crisis management. The incoming Presidency is invited to draw up a first progress report to the Lisbon European Council and an overall report to be presented to the Feira European Council containing appropriate recommendations and proposals, as well as an indication of whether or not Treaty amendment is judged necessary. The General Affairs Council is invited to begin implementing these decisions by establishing as of March 2000 the agreed interim bodies and arrangements within the Council, in accordance with the current Treaty provisions.

(...)

#### **ANNEX IV**

#### **PRESIDENCY REPORTS TO THE HELSINKI EUROPEAN COUNCIL ON 'STRENGTHENING THE COMMON EUROPEAN POLICY ON SECURITY AND DEFENCE' AND ON 'NON-MILITARY CRISIS MANAGEMENT OF THE EUROPEAN UNION'**

The Presidency has responded as a matter of priority to the mandate given by the Cologne European Council to strengthen the common European policy on security and defence by taking the work forward in military and non-military aspects of crisis management. The work has been based on the provisions of the Treaty on European Union and the guiding principles agreed at Cologne, which have been reaffirmed by the Member States.

Work has yielded two separate progress reports to the European Council, which are intended to be complementary. The reports propose concrete measures and provide guidance for further work to take the necessary decisions by the end of the year 2000 towards the objectives set at Cologne. During the Portuguese Presidency, consideration will be given as to whether or not Treaty amendment is judged necessary.

To assume their responsibilities across the full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks defined in the EU Treaty, the Petersberg tasks, the Member States have decided to develop more effective military capabilities and establish new political and military structures for these tasks. In this connection, the objective is for the Union to have an autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and then to conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises.

Also in order to assume these responsibilities, the Union will improve and make more effective use of resources in civilian crisis management in which the Union and the Members States already have considerable experience. Special attention will be given to a rapid reaction capability.

All these measures will be taken in support of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and they will reinforce and extend the Union's comprehensive external role. With the enhancement and concertation of military and civilian crisis response tools, the Union will be able to resort to the whole range of instruments from diplomatic activity, humanitarian assistance and economic measures to civilian policing and military crisis management operations.

NATO remains the foundation of the collective defence of its members, and will continue to have an important role in crisis management.

The development of the common European policy on security and defence will take place without prejudice to the commitments under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty and Article V of the Brussels Treaty, which will be preserved for the Member States party to these Treaties. Nor shall the development of the common European policy on security and defence prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States.

Further steps will be taken to ensure full mutual consultation, cooperation and transparency between the EU and NATO.

The Union will contribute to international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. The Union recognises the primary responsibility of the United Nations Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security. Following up the principles and objectives of the OSCE Charter for European Security, the Union will cooperate with the UN, the OSCE, the Council of Europe and other international organisations in a mutually reinforcing manner in stability promotion, early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict reconstruction.

#### **ANNEX 1 to ANNEX IV**

### **PRESIDENCY PROGRESS REPORT TO THE HELSINKI EUROPEAN COUNCIL ON STRENGTHENING THE COMMON EUROPEAN POLICY ON SECURITY AND DEFENCE**

#### **Introduction**

Recalling the guiding principles agreed at Cologne, the European Union should be able to assume its responsibilities for the full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks defined in the EU Treaty, the Petersberg tasks.

The European Union should have the autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and then to conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises in support of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). The action by the Union will be conducted in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter and the principles and objectives of the OSCE Charter for European Security. The Union recognises the primary responsibility of the United Nations Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

For this purpose, the following has been agreed:

A common European headline goal will be adopted for readily deployable military capabilities and collective capability goals in the fields of command and control, intelligence and strategic transport will be developed rapidly, to be achieved through voluntary co-ordinated national and multinational efforts, for carrying out the full range of Petersberg tasks.

New political and military bodies will be established within the Council to enable the Union to take decisions on EU-led Petersberg operations and to ensure, under the authority of the Council, the necessary political control and strategic direction of such operations.

Principles for cooperation with non-EU European NATO members and other European partners in EU-led military crisis management will be agreed, without prejudice to the Union's decision-making autonomy.

Determination to carry out Petersberg tasks will require Member States to improve national and multinational military capabilities, which will at the same time, as appropriate, strengthen the capabilities of NATO and enhance the effectiveness of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) in promoting European security.

In presenting this report, the Presidency has taken note of the fact that Denmark has recalled Protocol no 5 to the Amsterdam Treaty on the position of Denmark.

### **Military capabilities for Petersberg tasks**

Member States recall their commitment made at Cologne and their determination to give the EU appropriate capabilities, without unnecessary duplication, to be able to undertake the full range of Petersberg tasks in support of the CFSP. Such capabilities will enable them to conduct effective EU-led operations as well as playing, for those involved, their full role in NATO and NATO-led operations. More effective European military capabilities will be developed on the basis of the existing national, bi-national and multinational capabilities, which will be assembled for EU-led crisis management operations carried out with or without recourse to NATO assets and capabilities. Particular attention will be devoted to the capabilities necessary to ensure effective performance in crisis management: deployability, sustainability, interoperability, flexibility, mobility, survivability and command and control, taking account of the results of the WEU audit of assets and capabilities and their implications for EU-led operations.

To develop European capabilities, Member States have set themselves the headline goal: by the year 2003, cooperating together voluntarily, they will be able to deploy rapidly and then sustain forces capable of the full range of Petersberg tasks as set out in the Amsterdam Treaty, including the most demanding, in operations up to corps level (up to 15 brigades or 50,000-60,000 persons). These forces should be militarily self-sustaining with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, other combat support services and additionally, as appropriate, air and naval elements. Member States should be able to deploy in full at this level within 60 days, and within this to provide smaller rapid response elements available and deployable at very high readiness. They must be able to sustain such a deployment for at least one year. This will require an additional pool of deployable units (and supporting elements) at lower readiness to provide replacements for the initial forces.

Member States have also decided to develop rapidly collective capability goals in the fields of command and control, intelligence and strategic transport, areas also identified by the WEU audit. They welcome in this respect decisions already announced by certain Member States which go in that direction:

- to develop and coordinate monitoring and early warning military means;
- to open existing joint national headquarters to officers coming from other Member States;
- to reinforce the rapid reaction capabilities of existing European multinational forces;
- to prepare the establishment of a European air transport command;
- to increase the number of readily deployable troops;
- to enhance strategic sea lift capacity.

The General Affairs Council, with the participation of Defence Ministers, will elaborate the headline and capability goals. It will develop a method of consultation through which these goals can be met and maintained, and through which national contributions reflecting Member States' political will and commitment towards these goals can be defined by each Member State, with a regular review of progress made. In addition, Member States would use existing defence planning procedures, including, as appropriate, those available in NATO and the Planning and Review Process (PARP) of the PfP. These objectives and those arising, for those countries concerned, from NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) will be mutually reinforcing.

The European NATO members who are not EU Member States, and other countries who are candidates for accession to the European Union will be invited to contribute to this improvement of European military capabilities. This will enhance the effectiveness of EU-led military operations and will, for those countries concerned, contribute directly to the effectiveness and vitality of the European pillar of NATO.

Member States welcome the recent progress made towards the restructuring of European defence industries, which constitutes an important step forward. This contributes to strengthening the European industrial and technological defence base. Such developments call for increased efforts to seek further progress in the harmonisation of military requirements and the planning and procurement of arms, as Member States consider appropriate.

### **Decision-making**

The Council decides upon policy relevant to Union involvement in all phases and aspects of crisis management, including decisions to carry out Petersberg tasks in accordance with Article 23 of the EU Treaty. Taken within the single institutional framework, decisions will respect European Community competences and ensure inter-pillar coherence in conformity with Article 3 of the EU Treaty.

All Member States are entitled to participate fully and on an equal footing in all decisions and deliberations of the Council and Council bodies on EU-led operations. The commitment of national assets by Member States to such operations will be based on their sovereign decision. Member States will participate in the ad hoc committee of contributors in accordance with the conditions provided for by paragraph 24.

Defence Ministers will be involved in the common European security and defence policy (CESDP); when the General Affairs Council discusses matters related to the CESDP, Defence Ministers as appropriate will participate to provide guidance on defence matters.

The following new permanent political and military bodies will be established within the Council:

a) - A standing Political and Security Committee (PSC) in Brussels will be composed of national representatives of senior/ambassadorial level. The PSC will deal with all aspects of the CFSP, including the CESDP, in accordance with the provisions of the EU Treaty and without prejudice to Community competence. In the case of a military crisis management operation, the PSC will exercise, under the authority of the Council, the political control and strategic direction of the operation. For that purpose, appropriate procedures will be adopted in order to allow effective and urgent decision taking. The PSC will also forward guidelines to the Military Committee.

b) - The Military Committee (MC) will be composed of the Chiefs of Defence, represented by their military delegates. The MC will meet at the level of the Chiefs of Defence as and when necessary. This committee will give military advice and make recommendations to the PSC, as well as provide military direction to the Military Staff. The Chairman of the MC will attend meetings of the Council when decisions with defence implications are to be taken.

c) - The Military Staff (MS) within the Council structures will provide military expertise and support to the CESDP, including the conduct of EU-led military crisis management operations. The Military Staff will perform early warning, situation assessment and strategic planning for Petersberg tasks including identification of European national and multinational forces.

As an interim measure, the following bodies will be set up within the Council as of March 2000:

a) - Fully respecting the Treaty provisions, the Council will establish a standing interim political and security committee at senior/ambassadorial level tasked to take forward under the guidance of the Political Committee the follow up of the Helsinki European Council by preparing recommendations on the future functioning of the CESDP and to deal with CFSP affairs on a day-to-day basis in close contacts with the SG/HR.

b) - An interim body of military representatives of Member States' Chiefs of Defence is established to give military advice as required to the interim political and security committee.

c) - The Council Secretariat will be strengthened by military experts seconded from Member States in order to assist in the work on the CESDP and to form the nucleus of the future Military Staff.

The Secretary General/High Representative (SG/HR), in assisting the Council, has a key contribution to make to the efficiency and consistency of the CFSP and the development of

the common security and defence policy. In conformity with the EU Treaty, the SG/HR will contribute to the formulation, preparation and implementation of policy decisions.

In the interim period, the SG/HR, Secretary General of the WEU, should make full use of WEU assets for the purpose of advising the Council under Article 17 of the EU Treaty.

### **Consultation and cooperation with non-EU countries and with NATO**

The Union will ensure the necessary dialogue, consultation and cooperation with NATO and its non-EU members, other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU as well as other prospective partners in EU-led crisis management, with full respect for the decision-making autonomy of the EU and the single institutional framework of the Union.

With European NATO members who are not members of the EU and other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU, appropriate structures will be established for dialogue and information on issues related to security and defence policy and crisis management. In the event of a crisis, these structures will serve for consultation in the period leading up to a decision of the Council.

Upon a decision by the Council to launch an operation, the non-EU European NATO members will participate if they so wish, in the event of an operation requiring recourse to NATO assets and capabilities. They will, on a decision by the Council, be invited to take part in operations where the EU does not use NATO assets.

Other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU may also be invited by the Council to take part in EU-led operations once the Council has decided to launch such an operation.

Russia, Ukraine and other European States engaged in political dialogue with the Union and other interested States may be invited to take part in the EU-led operations.

All the States that have confirmed their participation in an EU-led operation by deploying significant military forces will have the same rights and obligations as the EU participating Member States in the day-to-day conduct of such an operation.

In the case of an EU-led operation, an ad-hoc committee of contributors will be set up for the day-to-day conduct of the operation. All EU Member States are entitled to attend the ad-hoc committee, whether or not they are participating in the operation, while only contributing States will take part in the day-to-day conduct of the operation.

The decision to end an operation will be taken by the Council after consultation between the participating states within the committee of contributors.

Modalities for full consultation, cooperation and transparency between the EU and NATO will be developed. Initially, relations will be developed on an informal basis, through contacts between the SG/HR for CFSP and the Secretary General of NATO.

### **Follow-up for the Portuguese Presidency**

The Portuguese Presidency is invited, together with the Secretary General/High Representative, to carry forward the work within the General Affairs Council on strengthening the common European security and defence policy. The Portuguese Presidency is also invited to report to the European Council in Feira on the progress made, including:

- a) - recommendations on the institutional development of the new permanent political and military bodies related to the CESDP within the EU, taking into account the paper on 'Military bodies in the European Union and the planning and conduct of EU-led operations' and other contributions made;
- b) - proposals on appropriate arrangements to be concluded by the Council on modalities of consultation and/or participation that will allow the third States concerned to contribute to EU military crisis management;
- c) - proposals on principles for consultation with NATO on military issues and recommendations on developing modalities for EU/NATO relations, to permit co-operation on the appropriate military response to a crisis, as set out in Washington and at Cologne;
- d) - an indication of whether or not Treaty amendment is judged necessary.

### **ANNEX 2 to ANNEX IV**

#### **PRESIDENCY REPORT ON NON-MILITARY CRISIS MANAGEMENT OF THE EUROPEAN UNION**

The Presidency was mandated by the European Council in Cologne to continue the work on all aspects of security including the enhancement and better coordination of the Union's and the Member States' non-military crisis response tools. Developments *inter alia* in Kosovo have for their part underlined the importance of this task. To this end, a thorough discussion has been carried out within the Council instances.

Work listing all available resources of the Member States and the Union has been initiated and has led to inventories of the tools available to the Union and to Member States, which are contained respectively in doc. 11044/99 REV 1 for the Union and in doc. 12323/99 for the Member States.

The inventories which have been drawn up clearly show that Member States, the Union, or both have accumulated considerable experience or have considerable resources in a number of areas such as civilian police, humanitarian assistance, administrative and legal rehabilitation, search and rescue, electoral and human rights monitoring, etc. This inventory should be pursued further. Regular updating will be necessary to better identify lacunae as well as strongpoints.

In order to be able to respond more rapidly and more effectively to emerging crisis situations, the Union needs to strengthen the responsiveness and efficiency of its resources and tools, as well as their synergy.

It is therefore appropriate to draw up an Action Plan which would show the way ahead and indicate the steps the Union has to undertake to develop a rapid reaction capability in the field of crisis management using non-military instruments.

### **ACTION PLAN**

A. The Union should aim at:

- strengthening the synergy and responsiveness of national, collective and NGO resources in order to avoid duplication and improve performance, while maintaining the flexibility of each contributor to decide on the deployment of assets and capabilities in a particular crisis, or via a particular channel;
- enhancing and facilitating the EU's contributions to, and activities within, other organisations, such as the UN and the OSCE whenever one of them is the lead organisation in a particular crisis, as well as EU autonomous actions;
- ensuring inter-pillar coherence.

B. To that end:

Member States and the Union should develop a rapid reaction capability by defining a framework and modalities, as well as by pre-identifying personnel, material and financial resources that could be used in response to a request of a lead agency like the UN or the OSCE, or, where appropriate, in autonomous EU actions.

An inventory of national and collective resources should be pursued to give an overview of resources that could be marshalled within such a rapid reaction framework. In this process Member States and the EU institutions could, if they wish, highlight sectors in which they find that they have acknowledged expertise.

A database should be set up to maintain and share information on the pre-identified assets, capabilities and expertise within all areas relevant to non-military crisis management. The availability and quality of these assets would need to be clearly defined.

A study should be carried out, taking into account lessons learned, to define concrete targets for EU Member States' collective non-military response to international crises (e.g. the ability to deploy at short notice and sustain for a defined period a set number of civilian police as a contribution to civpol missions; to deploy a combined search and rescue capability of up to 200 people within twenty-four hours). This work should be taken forward by the Portuguese Presidency together with the SG/HR.

The inventory, the database project and the study should help identify areas of relative strength and weakness and could promote improved training standards, sharing of experience and best practice, as well as bilateral or multilateral projects between Member

States (e.g. 'pairing' one Member State's helicopter lift with a specialist medical team from another).

A coordinating mechanism, fully interacting with the Commission services, should be set up at the Council Secretariat. It would run the database project and the different capabilities initiatives. In particular crises, depending on the EU's role, it may set up an ad hoc centre to coordinate the effectiveness of EU Member States' contributions. This should be a lean, efficient, non-bureaucratic structure permitting close interaction with the Commission (ECHO in particular).

In establishing a rapid reaction capability urgent consideration will be given to developing civil police capabilities.

Rapid financing mechanisms such as the creation by the Commission of a Rapid Reaction Fund should be set up to allow the acceleration of the provision of finance to support EU activities, to contribute to operations run by other international organisations and to fund NGO activities, as appropriate.

### **DECISION-MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION**

The Union should develop a comprehensive approach with a view to marshalling national and collective non-military instruments within the time limits called for by the situation on the ground.

For the coordination of civilian crisis management tools, the co-ordinating mechanism for a civilian crisis management will be established. This mechanism, which will be of inter-pillar nature, will provide expert advice in support of the management of crises. Decision-making and implementation of non-military crisis management tools under the first pillar will remain subject to institutions and procedures of the EC Treaty.

As an interim practice, this work to develop the co-ordinating mechanism for civilian crisis management may draw on experts from the Member States.

If appropriate, the Union will lay down general guidelines ensuring inter-pillar coherence and setting out the means which should be made available. Arrangements for rapid financing mechanisms for a prompt response to crisis situations could be devised in this context.

## ***20 Franco-Dutch summit The Hague, 10 February 2000***

### **JOINT DECLARATION BY THE FRENCH AND DUTCH DEFENCE MINISTERS MM. ALAIN RICHARD AND FRANK DE GRAVE**

Aujourd'hui, nous avons notamment abordé les développements de la politique européenne commune en matière de sécurité et de défense. Dans ce domaine, le Conseil européen d'Helsinki a pris un certain nombre de décisions importantes.

Pour donner corps au volet naval des objectifs globaux fixés à Helsinki, nous sommes convenus de proposer à nos partenaires de l'Union européenne de réfléchir ensemble aux capacités maritimes de transport stratégiques nécessaires pour la projection des forces. Nous allons pouvoir soumettre à nos collègues notre proposition pour un 'objectif global' en matière maritime et une démarche aboutissant à une cellule de coordination lors de la réunion informelle qui se tiendra au Portugal, à la fin du mois. Nous devons également examiner avec nos partenaires les problèmes posés par l'accompagnement et la protection des moyens amphibies pour être en mesure d'entreprendre l'ensemble des 'missions de Petersberg' dans les meilleurs délais. Nos deux pays utiliseront les prochaines réunions dans le cadre de l'UE pour proposer à leurs partenaires de réfléchir ensemble aux arrangements qui pourraient contribuer au meilleur emploi et au renforcement de leurs capacités en matière de transport naval, ainsi qu'à la protection de ces moyens.

L'objectif est de donner à l'UE les moyens de pouvoir conduire efficacement une opération. Ces capacités permettraient également aux pays européens de jouer pleinement leur rôle dans le cadre d'opérations dirigées par l'OTAN. Les arrangements à prévoir seront compatibles avec les engagements pris dans le cadre de l'OTAN.

L'audit de l'UEO a mis en exergue certaines insuffisances en matière de capacités européennes. Pour y remédier, nous appelons les Etats membres de l'UE à coopérer étroitement au sein de l'UE, utilisant, le cas échéant, les orientations retenues par la 'Defence Capabilities Initiative' de l'OTAN.

Nous avons demandé à nos CEMA d'identifier les modalités d'intensification de notre coopération militaire bilatérale et de proposer un catalogue de propositions avant la fin de cette année. Cette coopération bilatérale, importante sur les plans politique et opérationnel, doit pouvoir également contribuer à la rationalisation des capacités militaires européennes.

La Haye, le 10 février 2000.

## ***21 General Affairs Council Brussels, 14-15 February 2000***

*In order to not lose the momentum gained with the ambitious plans of Helsinki, the General Affairs Council, meeting on 14-15 February in Brussels, created three interim structures in order to take the projects forward immediately. The three bodies were to become permanent by the end of 2000.*

(...)

### **STRENGTHENING OF EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY**

The Council, in the framework of the strengthening of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and in particular the common European Policy on Security and Defence (CESDP), and in line with the invitation of the Helsinki European Council of 10/11 December 1999, adopted three decisions on

- the setting up of the interim Political and Security Committee
- the setting up of the interim Military Body
- the secondment of national experts in the military field to the General Secretariat of the Council during the interim period.

The interim Political and Security Committee will be a separate formation of the Political Committee meeting in Brussels. It will be composed of national representatives at senior/ambassador level, placed within the framework of Member States' Permanent Representations.

Its task, in close cooperation with the Secretary General/High Representative, will be to prepare recommendations on the future functioning of the CESDP and to deal with CFSP affairs on a day to day basis.

The interim Military Body will be composed of representatives of Member States' Chief of Defence and will have to give military advice as required to the Political Committee, including in its formation as interim Political and Security Committee and to the Secretary General/High Representative. It is assisted by the military experts seconded from Member States to the Council Secretariat.

The national military experts on secondment will be part of the General Secretariat of the Council. They will provide military expertise to the interim Military body and the SG/HR to support CFSP. They will form the nucleus of the future military staff. They will assist the interim military body.

The three interim bodies will be put in place by the beginning of March. They shall remain in place until the establishment of the permanent bodies of the CESDP.

## ***22 Meeting of European Union defence ministers Sintra, 28 February 2000***

*The document reproduced below dates back to an exercise carried out by four countries, initiated by Richard Hatfield of the UK Ministry of Defence, in the summer of 1999 (the so-called 'Hatfield exercise'). It was then developed by the PoCo (Political Committee, EU, composed of the 15 Political Directors of the member states) in late October 1999. The official, definitive version (the 'Toolbox Paper') was presented at the meeting of EU Defence Ministers in Sintra, Portugal, on 28 February 2000, laying the groundwork for the Capabilities Commitment Conference. Another paper, on the elaboration of the Headline Goal, the so-called 'Food for Thought Paper' (see p. 102), was presented at the same meeting.*

### **MILITARY BODIES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE PLANNING AND CONDUCT OF EU-LED MILITARY OPERATIONS**

1. The Cologne Presidency Report on strengthening the common European policy on security and defence, while reaffirming that NATO remains the foundation of the collective defence of its members, said that the focus of EU efforts would be to ensure that the Union has at its disposal 'the necessary capabilities (including military capabilities) and appropriate structures for effective decision making in crisis management within the scope of the Petersberg tasks'.

2. The Helsinki European Council agreed that the objective is for the Union to have an autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and then conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises. In order to assume their responsibilities across the full range of Petersberg tasks, Member States therefore decided to develop more effective military capabilities and to establish new political and military structures for these tasks. Cologne had identified and Helsinki agreed to establish 4 pol/mil components within the Council to enable the Union to take decisions on EU-led Petersberg operations and to ensure, under the authority of the Council, the necessary political control and strategic direction of such operation:

- regular (or ad hoc) meetings of the General Affairs Council, with the participation as appropriate of Defence Ministers;
- a standing Political and Security Committee (PSC) in Brussels composed of national representatives of senior/ambassadorial level dealing with all aspects of CFSP, including the CESDP;
- an EU Military Committee composed of the Chiefs of Defence, represented by their military delegates, which will give military advice and make recommendations to the PSC, as well as provide military direction to the Military Staff;

- an EU Military Staff within the Council structures which will provide military expertise and support to the CESDP, including the conduct of EU-led military crisis management operations.

3. It is envisaged that defence ministers will be able to play their part and in particular provide guidance on specific defence matters without the need for new institutional arrangements. For example, defence ministers could meet when particular defence topics were to be discussed (e.g. links with NATO force planning or further development of European military capabilities).

4. This paper addresses the permanent military bodies and the arrangements and procedures which the EU will require for the planning and conduct of EU-led operations in such circumstances, taking into account the principles and arrangements agreed at Washington, Cologne and Helsinki to ensure that these complement the European pillar of the Alliance. It does not discuss the interim arrangements, non-military crisis management issues, nor the wider pol-mil machinery and decision-making procedures that will need to be developed but assumes that these will also reflect, where appropriate, those principles. In particular, the paper does not seek to define the circumstances which might lead to a decision to mount an EU-led operation in the absence of a NATO operation or those in which an EU-led operation would not involve the use of NATO assets and capabilities under the envisaged 'Berlin plus' arrangements. Such decisions would be reached on a case by case basis through full consultation and transparency between the EU and NATO. Nor does the paper address the arrangements which will need to be made for accommodating the non-EU European Allies with regard to the mechanisms discussed – these will need further consideration.

## **EU MILITARY BODIES**

### **The European Military Committee**

5. **Roles.** The European Military Committee (EMC) would be the highest EU military body. It would provide for consultation and co-operation between the Member States and give military advice and make recommendations to the appropriate EU political authorities and provide military direction to a European Military Staff (EMS) - described further below- on their behalf. Directives to and advice from the EMS would routinely be promulgated through the Chairman of the EMC, thus allowing the Committee the opportunity to make recommendations and highlight issues as appropriate.

6. **Composition.** The EMC would be a permanent body composed of the fifteen EU Chiefs of Defence Staff (consideration will need to be given to its relationship with the non EU European Allies). Day-to-day business would be conducted by national military delegates, who for those European nations who are also NATO members, would ideally be dual hatted with the nation's NATO representative (although this would be a matter for national decision). The EMC would convene at the level of national representatives on a routine basis and at the level of Chiefs of Defence Staff as appropriate, but twice a year as a minimum.

7. The Chairman of the EMC would be a 4-star officer, such as a former Chief of Defence, selected (from outside the EMC) by the Chiefs of Defence of the EU Member States. He would act exclusively in an international capacity and his authority would stem from the Military Committee, to which he would be responsible for the performance of his duties. He would participate as appropriate in the Political and Security Committee and in the NATO Military Committee with rights to contribute to discussions [(although he will be a member of neither)], and he would have a close working relationship with the High Representative for CFSP. He will attend meetings of the Council when decisions with defence implications are to be taken. He would direct the day-to-day business of the EMC and act on behalf of the EMC in issuing directives and guidance to the Director of the EMS.

8. Reflecting his responsibilities for NATO's European Pillar and his potential role in EU-led operations, DSACEUR would normally participate as appropriate in the EMC, although not a member. To provide transparency between the EU and the Alliance, the Chairmen of the EU and the NATO Military Committees should also be able to attend the other committee. In the case of operations, the EU operation commander would also attend or be represented at the EMC.

9. Questions of participation, composition, cross-representation with NATO or with other EU bodies have not yet been fully covered and will be dealt with at a later stage, thus indications given here on those matters are only illustrative at this stage.

#### The European Military Staff

10. The European Military Staff (EMS) would provide military expertise and capacity to support the EU's CFSP, including in the conduct of all EU-led military operations. The EMS would work under the political direction of the EU political authorities and the military direction of the EMC. The EMS will not itself act as an operational HQ but should:

- perform three main Operational functions: early warning, situation assessment and strategic planning, as described in paragraphs 10 and 11;
- provide a dedicated source of military expertise to the EU in peace time, crisis management situations, and during EU-led operations;
- act as an interface between the EU's political and military authorities and the military resources available to the EU;
- be capable, in particular, of providing effective military support to the EMC during the strategic planning phase of crisis management situations over the full range of Petersberg tasks, whether or not the EU draws on NATO assets and capabilities;
- have working procedures and operational concepts based on, and in any case compatible with, those in NATO.

11. Roles. In peace time it would:

- provide military expertise on EU defence policy issues;
- monitor potential crises, for which it will need, in addition to its own capacities in the Satellite Centre, ready access to appropriate national and multinational intelligence;
- carry out generic strategic planning for Petersberg missions;

- identify European national and multinational forces for EU-led operations;
- co-ordinate and stimulate the development of European military capabilities, developing an appropriate relationship with NATO's force planning process;
- contribute to the development (including training and exercises) of European national and multinational forces in co-ordination with NATO as appropriate;
- organise and co-ordinate operating procedures with national, multinational and NATO HQs available to the EU;
- programme, plan, conduct and evaluate the exercising of the military aspects of the EU's crisis management machinery, including the relationship with any selected Military Strategic Operation HQ (which will include exercising EU-NATO procedures);
- liaise with national HQs, European multinational force HQs and NATO.

12. In crisis management situations, the main task of the EMS would be to provide a set of prioritised military strategic options to the PSC through the EMC. To do this it would need to:

- request and handle intelligence and other relevant information from all available sources (including the Satellite Centre, European nations and NATO) and provide a military situation assessment to the PSC;
- develop and prioritise military strategic options based on this assessment by:
  - defining initial broad options;
  - drawing as appropriate on planning support from external sources (using the assured access to NATO when in place, national planning capabilities and multinational HQs available to the EU) who will analyse and elaborate these options in more detail;
  - evaluating the results of this more detailed work and commissioning any further work that might be necessary;
  - presenting an overall assessment, with an indication of priorities and recommendations as appropriate, to the Chairman of the EMC;
- identify, in co-ordination with national planning staffs and, as appropriate, NATO, European forces that might participate in possible EU-led operations;
- continue to monitor crisis situations.

13. During EU-led operations, the EMS would:

- support the PSC/EMC in the drafting of Initial Planning Directives, Planning Directives and Mission Directives;
- continuously monitor the operation and conduct strategic analysis to support both the PSC in its role of strategic direction and the EMC in its role of providing military guidance, in coordination with the designated European Operation Commander;
- provide new options in co-ordination with the Operation Commander as required, in the light of political and operational developments.

14. Organisation. The EMS would:

- work under the authority of the Director EMS, whose rank needs further consideration but who would be subordinate to the Chairman of the EMC;
- be organised to cope with the full range of Petersberg tasks, whether or not the EU has recourse to NATO assets and capabilities;
- consist of a permanent core, organised to perform five main staff functions: intelligence assessment; situation monitoring; strategic planning; force preparedness, (including training and logistics); and administration. It would have sufficient capacity and facilities for rapid augmentation in times of crisis to provide in particular 24 hour manning. This is currently estimated to require around 60-90 officers although this can only be determined as a result of a much more detailed study of composition, staffing, and structure;
- be located as close as possible to the EU CFSP Machinery/EMC (preferably co-located);
- require a command and information system which has full connectivity with capitals, national and multinational HQs, as well as NATO;
- during crisis management situations, set up a dedicated Crisis Action Team (CAT) to undertake military situation assessment, strategic planning and operations monitoring. The CAT will draw upon the EMS for manpower and expertise and, if necessary, on external temporary military augmentation.

**THE PLANNING AND CONDUCT OF EU-LED OPERATIONS**

15. The Cologne Presidency Report on strengthening of the common European policy on security and defence noted that according to the requirements of the case, the EU would need to conduct operations with or without recourse to NATO assets and capabilities. This section of the paper considers the procedures for the planning and conduct of both types of EU-led operations recognising that close coordination will be required with NATO, particularly in the early stages of a crisis, before it is clear whether or not NATO or the EU will be engaged militarily, and contingency strategic planning may be required by both the EU and NATO.

16. Strategic Planning. In the early stages of a potential or emerging crisis, the focus of the EU's activities is likely to be on diplomatic, humanitarian and economic crisis prevention measures. As a crisis emerges, the EMS would provide an initial military situation assessment to the PSC through the Chairman of the EMC, drawing on all available information sources, including NATO, national and multinational sources, to inform this assessment. The PSC, together with the Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit and other relevant elements of the European Council Secretariat, advised by the EMS assessment, would develop a pol/mil framework for addressing the crisis. Once this framework has been agreed by nations, the PSC, through the Chairman of the EMC, would task the EMS to develop and prioritise military strategic options. These could include options for operations with or without use of NATO assets and capabilities.

## Operational Planning and Command Requirements

17. The EMC and EMS would be permanent military components of the CFSP decision making structure for all types of EU-led operations. Other planning capabilities, command structures, and other military assets would be drawn from NATO or from national or multinational sources. Below the EMS level, the chain of command for EU-led operations will need to encompass three levels. The Operation Commander would need a Military Strategic Operation HQ to plan the mounting and conduct of a joint operation. In addition, a wide-ranging joint operation would require an HQ which would carry out planning at theatre level, deploy as a theatre HQ and conduct the operation in the field. Finally, supporting and component HQs would be required according to circumstances. In some cases, for less complex operations, it may be possible to simplify these arrangements.

18. For EU led operations that make use of NATO assets and capabilities:

the EU will be able to draw on the arrangements agreed at the NATO Washington Summit. These arrangements will, when fully implemented, provide the EU with extensive, capable and proven multinational military resources to plan and conduct operations in support of its Common Foreign and Security Policy, in particular: assured access to NATO planning capabilities; presumption of access to pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets. a range of European command options; and a defence planning process adapted to incorporate more comprehensively European needs. Where it is decided that Operation Plans for an EU-led military operation should be developed, the PSC, taking advice from the EMC, would select a military strategic option (or options) to be pursued further.

At this stage, the PSC/Council would also appoint an Operation Commander and Military Strategic Operation HQ, and consider designating a Force Commander and theatre HQ:

DSACEUR and SHAPE have already been identified as the primary, although not the only candidates, for Operation Commander and Military Strategic Operation HQ. NATO also has a range of deployable and proven theatre and component HQs, with well-established procedures for multinational operations and capable of augmentation (including the specially designed Combined Joint Task Force).

For all types of operation, the options for supporting and component HQs would include all the range of existing European Multinational and national forces and commands.

19. For EU-led operations without recourse to NATO assets and capabilities:

planning and command requirements would draw on existing national and multinational HQs available to the EU. The military Strategic operation HQ would be based on the multi-nationalisation of existing national HQs by participating nations, and a theatre HQ created from a national capability similarly reinforced by contributing nations. When fully implemented, systematic arrangements in peacetime for multinationalising existing national HQs to act as a multinationalised joint national HQ and the development of multinational HQs would provide access to a range of European operational planning capabilities and command options. In the long run, some less ad hoc collective capability

for operational planning and command at the strategic level could have to be developed within the EU. Where it is decided that Operation Plans for an EU-led military operation should be developed, the PSC, taking advice from the EMC, would select a military strategic option (or options) to be pursued further.

At this stage, the PSC/Council would also appoint an Operation Commander and Military Strategic Operation HQ, and consider designating a Force Commander and theatre HQ:

a Military Strategic Operation HQ would need to be based on the multinationalisation of an existing national HQ by participating nations, and a theatre HQ would need to be created from a national capability similarly reinforced.

For all types of operation, the options for supporting and component HQs would include all the range of existing European Multinational and national forces and commands.

20. The selected Operation Commander would be tasked to develop a Concept of Operations and Operation Plan for the selected military strategic option. The EMS would continue to provide, through the Chairman of the EMC, strategic planning guidance to the Operation Commander and military advice to the PSC. During this planning phase, close cooperation and transparency would continue to be necessary between the appropriate EU and NATO authorities, to ensure a shared understanding of the possible requirements for NATO assets and capabilities to support the operation.

21. The operation planning documents (Concept of Operations, Operation Plan) and associated technical documents (Communication and Information Systems, Status of Forces Agreement, Rules of Engagement etc) prepared by the Operation Commander would be submitted for political approval with the EMS and EMC making recommendations and highlighting issues as appropriate. Once these planning documents were approved, NATO assets and capabilities would, if required, be requested from and released by NATO to the EU, according to procedures to be agreed that will build upon the work already undertaken by NATO and the WEU.

22. Conduct of Operations. Once an EU-led operation was launched, the Chairman of the EMC, along with the Operation Commander would report to the EU political authorities on its conduct. The EU would also keep NATO informed of the progress of the operation, particularly where NATO assets and capabilities are involved. The EMS would continue to monitor the situation and support both the EU political authorities and the EMC. Proposals or requests for changes in the mission, Operation Plans or assets and capabilities required would be handled through the procedures described in paragraphs 19-21 above.

## ANNEX

### TERMINOLOGY

**Crisis Action Team** A team of staff officers established during a crisis from the EMS permanent structure, and if necessary external augmentation, to undertake military situation assessment, strategic planning, and monitoring of an ongoing crisis or operation.

**EU-led operation** A military operation conducted by European forces under the political control and strategic direction of the European Union. It may be an operation with or without recourse to NATO collective assets and capabilities.

**European Forces** National and multinational forces that are available to the EU for the conduct of EU-led operations. Many of these will also be declared to NATO.

**Military Situation** An assessment of possible military activities in Assessment response to an emerging or potential crisis situation, conducted by the EMS on the basis of intelligence requested from NATO, nations, and other sources. The military situation assessment is part of the strategic planning process and is an input to the development of the pol/mil framework.

**Military Strategic Option** A possible military action designed to achieve the pol/mil objectives outlined in the pol/mil framework. A military strategic option will describe the outline military solution, the required resources, constraints and chain of command. The European Military Staff will frame initial broad options, which will be analysed and elaborated by external sources, as part of the strategic planning process.

**Military Strategic Operation HQ** An HQ responsible for the planning and conduct of operations at the Military Strategic level of command. The Military Strategic Operation HQ will interact with the EU political authorities. The Operation Commander will be located at the Military Strategic Operation HQ.

**Operation Planning** Military planning activities undertaken by the Operation Commander to develop a Concept of Operations and/or an Operation Plan in accordance with selected military strategic options and/or planning directives from the EMCIEMS. While operation planning is the responsibility of the Operation Commander, planning activities will take place, under his direction, at each of the three levels of military operations: the military strategic level, the theatre level and the tactical/component level.

**Pol/Mil Framework** A conceptual framework describing the EU's overall approach to the management of a particular crisis, addressing the full range of CFSP activity (diplomatic, economic, humanitarian, military) and including the definition of politico-military objectives for any possible military activities. The definition of the pol/mil framework is part of the strategic planning process.

**Strategic Planning** Planning activities that start as soon as a crisis emerges and end when the EU political authorities approve a military strategic option or a set of military strategic options. The strategic planning process encompasses military situation assessment, definition of a pol/mil framework and development of military strategic options

**Theatre HQ** This HQ will be subordinate to the Military Strategic Operation HQ and will be responsible for the planning and conduct of operations at the theatre level of command. The Force Commander will be located at the theatre HQ. This HQ will be deployed in theatre or afloat.

**‘FOOD FOR THOUGHT’ PAPER****Process for the elaboration of the headline and capability goals**

The European Council agreed in Helsinki that ‘The General Affairs Council, with the participation of Defence Ministers, will elaborate the headline and capability goals. It will develop a method of consultation through which these goals can be met and maintained, and through which national contributions reflecting Member States’ political will and commitment towards these goals can be defined by each Member State, with a regular review of progress made. In addition, Member States would use existing defence planning procedures, including, as appropriate, those available in NATO and the Planning and Review Process (PARP) of the PfP. These objectives and those arising, for those countries concerned, from NATO’s Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) will be mutually reinforcing.’

At its meeting of 14 March 2000 in iPSC formation, the POCO agreed to recommend to the Council that it should conclude that the attached ‘food for thought’ paper on the ‘Elaboration of the headline goal’, including the timetable set out therein leading to a Capabilities Pledging Conference to be convened by the end of 2000, should constitute a basis for future work to be conducted by the competent bodies.

**ANNEX****ELABORATION OF THE HEADLINE GOAL  
‘FOOD FOR THOUGHT’****Introduction**

The European Council, meeting on 10-11 December 1999, agreed that “*by the year 2003, cooperating together voluntarily, [Member States] will be able to deploy rapidly and then sustain forces capable of the full range of Petersberg tasks as set out in the Amsterdam Treaty, including the most demanding, in operations up to corps level (up to 15 brigades or 50,000-60,000 persons). These forces should be militarily self-sustaining with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, other combat support services and additionally, as appropriate, air and naval elements. Member States should be able to deploy in full at this level within 60 days, and within this to provide smaller rapid response elements available and deployable at very high readiness. They must be able to sustain such a deployment for at least one year. This will require an additional pool of deployable units (and supporting elements) at lower readiness to provide replacements for the initial forces.*”

This headline goal is intended as a spur towards the progressive improvement of Europe’s military capabilities for crisis management operations. This process will take account of the results of the WEU audit of assets and capabilities. The resulting capabilities are intended to enable the conduct of effective EU-led operations, whether or not the EU has recourse to NATO assets and capabilities as well as being a full contribution to NATO-led operations and, for those involved, in NATO. The European Council invited the General Affairs Council to elaborate this goal, and other, collective capability goals, with the participation

of Defence Ministers. The GAC will also develop a method for meeting, maintaining and reviewing these goals and through which national contributions will be defined. In addition, Member States will use existing defence planning procedures including, as appropriate, those available in NATO and the Planning and Review Process (PARP) of the PfP. In the first instance it is necessary to identify in detail the forces and capabilities required from Member States collectively in order to achieve the headline goal. This paper focuses on this first task. A section on further work is included at the end.

### **Methodology**

The headline goal expressed at Helsinki represents a political commitment by the Member States. It includes insufficient detail for the purposes of military planning, raising questions such as where EU-led task forces might be expected to operate, with whom, and how often. Some of the key figures in the headline goal (e.g. 60 days) are also open to interpretation. The elaboration of the headline goal should follow a systematic approach. This will provide a clear link between the policy context of the CFSP, the broad statement of the headline goal and the detailed listing of capabilities and force elements necessary to deliver the goal. The key steps are set out below. In particular, agreement on the first three steps is needed before progress can be made on the later steps of the process.

**Step 1** An outline of the overall strategic context.

**Step 2** Articulation of key planning assumptions.

**Step 3** Selection of planning scenarios that describe illustrative situations for the employment of forces.

**Step 4** Identification of the force capabilities required to support the scenarios.

**Step 5** Development of illustrative force packages that have the required capabilities and confirmation of their effectiveness against the planning scenarios.

**Step 6** Using these different force packages to define the full range of requirements implicit in the headline goal.

We will, once the headline goal is elaborated in this way, need to consider the question of national contributions to it, and to identify “capability gaps” by comparing the elaborated goal against these. Consideration of how these tasks will be undertaken is beyond the scope of this paper (but see the section on further work below).

### **Step 1. Strategic Context**

In today’s strategic environment, we face new risks such as ethnic and religious conflict, inter-and intra-state competition for scarce resources, environmental damage, population shifts. Europe needs to be able to manage and respond to these, including by intervening to prevent crises escalating into conflicts. This may require operations across the full Petersberg spectrum:

- humanitarian and rescue tasks;
- peacekeeping tasks; and,
- tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking (referred to as peace enforcement by some nations).

While these operations are likely to be smaller than those envisaged during the Cold War, they will often be more demanding in other ways. Rapid deployment at short notice to crisis regions will be essential to deter or contain conflict. Armed forces may have to operate in areas where the supporting infrastructure is limited, and sustain concurrent operations for long periods. Operations will frequently be conducted under the constant gaze of the world's media. We can increasingly expect adversaries - armed with sophisticated, commercially available military technology, able to extensively adapt technologies developed for civil application and some with access to weapons of mass destruction - to employ asymmetric approaches to disrupt our capabilities. We also expect that there will be increased emphasis on minimising casualties (own forces, opposing forces and civilian) and restricting collateral and environmental damage.

Elaboration of the headline goal will need to devote particular attention to the capabilities necessary to ensure effective performance in crisis management in the context of this security environment: deployability, sustainability, interoperability, flexibility, mobility, survivability and command and control. These objectives of capability improvement and those arising, for those countries concerned, from NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative, will be mutually reinforcing.

### **Step 2. Key Planning Assumptions**

We should make the following assumptions for the purpose of further planning:

- a. **Target date.** The headline goal is to be met if possible by June 2003 (and by December 2003 at the latest).
- b. **Geographical area.** We should plan on the basis that within the agreed range of missions, the most demanding will occur in and around Europe. Forces should also be available and able to respond to crises world wide, albeit at lesser scale.
- c. **Contributions.** The headline goal is a policy and planning commitment for the EU Member States. The scale and nature of national contributions cannot be fully addressed until the overall requirement is clearer. Additional contributions to the overall improvement of European military capabilities will be invited from European NATO members who are not EU Member States and other countries who are candidates for accession to the European Union. We would expect other European nations to participate in specific EU-led operations.
- d. **Scale of Effort.** We should assume that the most demanding mission will be a complex peace enforcement task in a joint environment in or around Europe. In order to be able to undertake this task as well as the rest of the full range of Petersberg missions, the EU will require access to a ready pool of various types of combat brigades, plus the necessary combat support and combat service support elements and additionally appropriate maritime

and air elements. It is the size of this pool that will be defined by the scenario-based planning. This pool can be regarded as the source from which an appropriate force package could be constructed, depending on circumstances, of up to 50,000 - 60,000 troops. Within any overall figure the proportion of combat troops to support troops will vary according to the operational task. The assembled force should be militarily self-sustaining, with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, other combat support and appropriate maritime and air elements. We should ensure that the forces and capabilities required to meet the most demanding mission as defined above will also be able to undertake a range of smaller-scale or less combat-oriented contingencies, against agreed concurrency criteria.

e. **Concurrency.** We should plan to be able to conduct a single corps sized crisis management task, while retaining a limited capability to conduct a small-scale operation, such as a NEO. Alternatively, within the overall total of the headline goal, we should be prepared to maintain one longer term operation at less than the maximum level and at the same time be able to conduct another operation of a limited duration. It may be that this requirement will pose the most demanding challenge for the EU member states, given the competing demands for key assets. It is also assumed that the EU-led corps-size operation referred to in the headline goal is not additional to the concurrency assumptions in NATO Ministerial Guidance 98. The implications of the other concurrency assumptions listed above will need to be analysed in connection with the further development of NATO Ministerial Guidance 2000.

f. **Endurance.** We should plan to sustain a deployment of corps size, able to undertake the most demanding mission, for at least one year. Our initial assumption is that national commitments of forces and capabilities, once defined, will include a commitment to provide those elements for at least a year. This will require an additional pool of deployable forces to provide replacements for the initial ready force. (We note that in practice both the size of the force and the capabilities required might reduce as normality returned, within or beyond this initial period).

g. **Readiness.** We should plan for forces to be held at graduated readiness, sufficient to deploy in full at corps level within 60 days, from a Council decision on the forces required (equivalent to NATO ACTORD/WEU Force Creation Message) to the point when all forces are fully trained and deployed in a theatre of operations, in or around Europe, with Transfer of Authority to the Operation Commander completed. Within this limit we should plan to provide a smaller rapid response element of immediate reaction forces at very high readiness, particularly of entry and other enabling forces; the scale and nature of such forces will depend on the particular circumstances of an operation. Guidelines will be established as part of further work.

h. **Sustainability.** We should plan to deploy forces with sufficient holdings to conduct operations until their re-supply has been established (within 10 days for air supply and 28 days for sea supply). We should then be able to sustain the forces deployed, up to 60,000 troops, for a period of at least 12 months.

**Step 3. Planning Scenarios**

We have expanded the requirements implicit in the headline goal by defining the key planning assumptions listed above. We now need to select illustrative scenarios against which capabilities and force packages designed to meet these requirements may be tested. The WEU has already generated a set of illustrative Petersberg mission profiles, including scenarios for European-led operations up to corps sized level. These scenarios will also cover maritime and air elements. This work should be built on for the purposes of elaborating the headline goal. At least initially we need to identify a small number of scenarios which would be representative of the range of different mission types the EU might conduct.

**Conclusions**

The elaboration of the headline goal called for by the European Council at Helsinki is a complex task. To achieve the aim, Member States should first:

- a. agree a systematic methodology as described in this paper in order to establish a sound planning basis for ongoing work (para 3);
- b. agree a broad outline of strategic context and force characteristics (paras 5-7);
- c. agree key planning assumptions (para 8);
- d. make use of the illustrative mission profiles for Petersberg Missions and associated scenarios agreed by the WEU (Reference WEU C(96)267 of 24 September 1996) (para 9);

in order to:

- e. identify capability requirements and develop illustrative force packages;
- f. produce a comprehensive statement of the pool of forces and capabilities collectively required to conduct Petersberg Missions up to the scale of the headline goal.

**Further Work**

If the conclusions above are agreed, the following further work will need to be urgently prepared:

- a. detailed force modelling by expert military Planners to generate proposals for the overall "headline goal" pool of forces and capabilities;
- b. analysis of this pool in comparison with existing Member States' capabilities and the development of a method for the identification of key shortfalls and for definition of national contributions;
- c. a method for inviting non-EU Allies to identify additional contributions (as called for at Helsinki);
- d. definition of a system for providing regular review and incentives for Member States' progress towards the headline goal;
- e. a timetable for the conduct of this further work.

It will be essential for all of this further work to be closely co-ordinated with existing NATO and PfP planning processes, since the forces involved are also being developed and held available for NATO, or NATO-led, operations.

## ***23 European Council Lisbon, 23-24 March 2000***

### **PRESIDENCY CONCLUSIONS**

(...)

### **II. COMMON EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY**

42. The European Council has welcomed the Presidency's preliminary report on 'Strengthening the Common European Security and Defence Policy' which reflects the work carried forward by the Presidency, together with the Secretary-General/High Representative, within the General Affairs Council in accordance with the remit from Helsinki.

43. The European Council welcomes in particular the fact that the interim bodies foreseen at Helsinki have now been established and are starting to function effectively and that the Council has identified a process for elaborating the headline goal and identifying national contributions so as to meet the military capability target set at Helsinki.

44. The European Council looks forward to the further work that the Presidency, together with the Secretary-General/High Representative, will pursue in the Council and to the Presidency's overall report to the Feira European Council, as called for at Helsinki, including proposals on the involvement of third countries in EU military crisis management and the further development of the EU's relationship with NATO in conformity with the Helsinki European Council conclusions.

45. The European Council furthermore appreciates what has so far been achieved in the non-military crisis management track. It invites the Council to establish by or at Feira a Committee for Civilian Crisis Management.

(...)

**DOCUMENT SUBMITTED TO THE LISBON EUROPEAN COUNCIL****STRENGTHENING THE COMMON EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY**

1. The Helsinki European Council invited the Portuguese Presidency, together with the Secretary General/High Representative, to carry forward work within the General Affairs Council on strengthening the common European policy on security and defence, and to submit a first progress report to the Lisbon European Council.
2. The Presidency, together with the Secretary General/High Representative, have taken work forward on this subject as a matter of priority. Following this first progress report, the Presidency will present an overall report to the European Council in Feira, in line with its remit from Helsinki.
3. The Council has adopted the decisions establishing the three interim bodies identified in the Helsinki Report:
  - the interim political and security committee (iPSC),
  - the interim body of military representatives of Member States' Chiefs of Defence,
  - the detachment of military experts from Member States to the Council Secretariat to assist in the work on CESDP and to form the nucleus of the future Military Staff. The decision on detachment of military experts is accompanied by a decision setting out the rules applicable to these experts.

All these decisions apply as of 1 March 2000.

The iPSC, which is a formation of the Political Committee and works in close contacts with the Secretary General/High Representative, has had its first meetings on 1, 3, 10 and 14 March 2000. It has started to deal with CFSP affairs on a day to day basis and has begun preparing recommendations on the future functioning of the CESDP.

The interim Military Body had its first meeting on 7 March. Applications for the military experts to be seconded by Member States to the Council Secretariat have been received. The head of the military experts was appointed by the Secretary General/High Representative on 8 March. The selection process of the other military experts is underway.

4. The Council has adopted the paper 'Military bodies in the European Union and the planning and conduct of EU-led operations' as a basis for future work to be conducted by the interim military bodies and other competent bodies.
5. With a view to the overall Presidency progress report to Feira, work is progressing in the Council, the POCO and the interim PSC on the basis of a Presidency paper, to define the appropriate arrangements that, while respecting the Union's decision-making autonomy, will allow non-EU European NATO members and the other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU to contribute to EU military crisis management.

6. Consistent with their commitment to transparency, the Political Directors of the EU Member States have met with representatives from the candidate states for accession to the EU in the framework of the political dialogue. Further meetings are envisaged with non-EU European NATO members and the candidate states for accession to the EU.

7. Also with a view to the overall Presidency progress report to Feira, the Council, the POCO and the interim PSC have held discussions on the basis of a Presidency paper on 'EU-NATO relations'. The Secretary General/High Representative has intensified his informal contacts with the Secretary-General of NATO in the framework set out by Cologne and Helsinki. The Presidency looks forward to a further deepening of these contacts before the Feira European Council, in order to facilitate for Feira the preparation of proposals on principles for consultation with NATO on military issues and recommendations on development of modalities for EU/NATO relations.

8. EU Member States Defence Ministers met informally in Sintra on 28 February to consider how to progress towards the Headline Goal set at Helsinki. Ministers also welcomed the French-Netherlands proposal for the development of a maritime headline goal. The Sintra meeting contributed to the preparation of the deliberations of the General Affairs Council of 20 March in which Defence Ministers participated. At the 20 March session, the Council identified the process for further elaborating the Headline and capability Goals, with the aim of setting a more detailed collective requirement against which indications of national contributions reflecting the commitment of Member States could be considered, and the need for a review mechanism. In addition, Member States would use existing defence planning procedures, including, as appropriate, those available in NATO and the Planning and Review Process (PARP) of the PfP. The Council concluded that the 'food for thought' paper on the 'Elaboration of the headline goal', including the timetable set out therein leading to a Capabilities Pledging Conference to be convened by the end of 2000, constitutes a basis for future work to be conducted by the competent bodies.

9. Work has been carried out in parallel on the civilian track of crisis management. The Council has decided to consider the establishment of a committee for civilian crisis management and to continue to define its role and competencies along the lines described in the paper 'Establishment of a EU committee for civilian crisis management', taking into account the comments of Member States, the Commission and the Legal Services, as well as the first experiences of the co-ordinating mechanism, with a view to reaching a decision on the establishment of such a committee by or at Feira. A seminar on civilian crisis management will be held in Lisbon on 3-4 April. The results of the seminar will also be fed into the study on concrete targets for EU Member States collective non-military response to international crises.

10. The Council welcomed the steps taken by the Secretary General/High Representative to set up a co-ordinating mechanism for civilian crisis management at the Council Secretariat, which is closely interacting with the Commission, as provided for in the Helsinki conclusions. As a first priority, a preliminary database on Member State civil police capabilities has been established. The Presidency recalls in this context its intention to hold a seminar in May concerning the training of civilian police to support international peace keeping operations. The Council welcomed the setting up by the Secretary General/High

Representative of an interim Situation Centre/Crisis Cell at the Council Secretariat, which will provide support for EU crisis management. The Council noted that the Commission is preparing a proposal for the setting up of a Rapid Reaction Fund.

## ***24 WEU Ministerial Council Porto, 15-16 May 2000***

### **PORTO DECLARATION**

1. Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Defence of the WEU nations met in Porto on 15-16 May. The WEU Council of Ministers was preceded by a meeting of the Defence Ministers of the 13 members of the Western European Armaments Group with the participation of their colleagues from Austria, Finland and Sweden and also, for the first time, from the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland.

2. Ministers welcomed the progress made by the European Union in carrying forward the decisions of the Cologne and Helsinki European Councils to strengthen European security and defence. They welcomed NATO's work on the further implementation of the NATO Washington Summit decisions concerning ESDI in order to reinforce the European pillar of the Alliance. They expressed the conviction that these developments will contribute to reinforcing the Euro-Atlantic partnership.

They looked forward to the further steps to be taken at the Feira European Council which will strengthen the common European security and defence policy, inter alia, by:

- further work on the process of elaborating the headline goal. They recalled with satisfaction that the European NATO members who are not EU Member States and other countries who are candidates for accession to the European Union will be invited to contribute to this improvement of European military capabilities;
- proposals on appropriate arrangements that, while respecting the EU's decision-making autonomy, will allow these same countries to contribute to EU military crisis management;
- proposals on principles for EU-NATO consultation on military issues and recommendations on the development of modalities for EU-NATO relations, to permit cooperation on the appropriate military response to a crisis, as set out in Washington and at Cologne;
- the further development of the non-military crisis management track.

In this context, Ministers also recalled the informal reflection on security and defence in Europe which WEU had undertaken over the past eighteen months which had demonstrated a common willingness to develop satisfactory arrangements that serve the interests of all WEU nations.

3. Ministers agreed that WEU stood ready to support, as required, the development of the functions identified by the EU as being necessary to fulfil its new responsibilities in the field of the Petersberg tasks. They recognised that the fulfilment by the EU of these new responsibilities would have profound repercussions for WEU as an Organization. They acknowledged that, in the coming months, relevant decisions need to be taken on WEU's future role, and tasked the Permanent Council to examine the wide range of measures that

would need to be taken at the appropriate time within WEU, in accordance with developments in the EU.

In this context :

- They noted that, by their next meeting, a report/transition plan by the Military Committee will draw the consequences for the WEU Military Staff's activities from these developments;
- They underlined that WEU remains ready to make available to the European Union if it so wishes the WEU Satellite Centre and Institute for Security Studies. Consideration would need to be given in due time to the future of these bodies;
- They acknowledged the competence and dedication of WEU's international staff and their most valuable contribution to the work of the Organization. Ministers expressed their commitment to do their utmost to contribute to finding appropriate solutions which take into account the professional expertise and the legitimate expectations of the WEU staff and tasked the Secretary-General to make proposals to the Permanent Council to this effect.

4. Ministers welcomed the steps taken during the Portuguese Presidency of WEU to prepare the legacy of the valuable experience which WEU is able to offer in the field of crisis management. They also welcomed the arrangements put in place, in implementation of the decisions at the Luxembourg Ministerial meeting, to allow the bodies of the EU Council direct access, as required, to the expertise of the Organisation's operational structures and to WEU's work and analyses.

5. Ministers particularly welcomed the key achievements during the Portuguese Presidency:

- the first-ever WEU/NATO Joint Crisis Management Exercise CMX/CRISEX 2000 held from 17 to 23 February with the participation of 30 nations and with observation by EU staffs as well as other Organizations and nations. The Exercise provided an important test of ESDI-related concepts and arrangements developed since NATO's 1996 Berlin Ministerial for handling WEU-led operations making use of NATO assets and capabilities, such as the WEU/NATO consultation arrangements and framework document. Ministers also welcomed the report presented by the Presidency and approved by WEU nations on this Exercise, which contributes to draw useful lessons regarding the practicalities of WEU/NATO interaction for a WEU-led operation using NATO assets and capabilities;
- the transmission to the European Union, for whatever use the EU may consider appropriate, of a package of WEU politico-military concepts. This package reflects a part of the legacy of a decade of experience, which WEU is able to transmit to the EU in the field of crisis management;
- the continuation of the informal reflection on security and defence in Europe through the seminar held on 27 January involving Directors for Security Policy from Foreign and Defence Ministries, and the transmission of the Presidency's written report to the EU;

- the WEU-EU workshop held on 11 April addressing the politico-military issues associated with the various phases of a possible European-led humanitarian mission, which allowed the presentation and explanation of many relevant aspects of the experience acquired by WEU;
- the organisation by the Presidency of the Mediterranean Seminar on Conflict Prevention held on 14 and 15 February and the subsequent preparation and separate transmission to the EU of the elements for a reflection on the WEU contribution to the Barcelona Process. This document reflects the work done in the context of the WEU Mediterranean dialogue and aims at contributing to overall thinking in the EU on Mediterranean issues;
- the preparation and the separate transmission to the EU of the Document on WEU's experience on African Peacekeeping, which includes a chronology of activities, an assessment, and the appropriate lessons learned concerning the potential role of a European multinational organisation in this field.

6. Concerning WEU operations, Ministers expressed their satisfaction with:

- the work of the extended Multinational Advisory Police Element (MAPEXT) and considered it an effective contribution to the establishment of a viable police force in Albania according to European norms. They welcomed the intention by the EU to extend further the mission under its present mandate until 31 December 2000 and requested the Permanent Council to take the necessary decisions as appropriate;
- the extension of the Western European Union Demining Assistance Mission to the Republic of Croatia (WEUDAM) mandate for one year, until 9 May 2001, and expressed their appreciation for Sweden's leading role in this mission, conducted by WEU at the request of the EU. In this connection, Ministers welcomed the EU's intention to support the WEUDAM/CROMAC request for a Geographic Information System on Croatia to be executed by the WEU Satellite Centre.

7. Ministers noted the WEU Exercise Programme and, in this context, welcomed the preparation of a Joint WEU/NATO Exercise Study, to take place in the Netherlands in June 2001, which aims at enhancing interoperability and developing joint WEU-NATO procedures for establishing and operating an OHQ in the context of a WEU-led CJTF-related operation using NATO assets and capabilities.

8. Ministers noted with interest the report by the Presidency on the Military Committee meeting held in Lisbon on 13 and 14 April. They welcomed the approval of the WEU Host Nation Support Concept and the Standing Operating Procedures (SOPs) for WEU fact finding missions and civil-military co-operation.

9. Ministers welcomed the approval of the WEU framework for drafting a document on the status of forces to be used in the event of WEU operations, which does not impose a model for such arrangements but provides a useful framework to assist and guide case-by-case decisions. They noted its transmission to the EU.

10. Concerning the possible WEU participation in a developing multinational European programme in the satellite field, Ministers noted the progress report on the mid-term

concept for improving access to satellite imagery. In this context, Ministers welcomed WEU's intensified relations with the European Union in space-related work during the Portuguese Presidency. They noted the approval of the Rules of Application of the MOU on supply of Helios products to WEU.

11. Ministers welcomed the organisation by the Italian and British authorities of the visits of the WEU Permanent Council to the HQs of EUROFOR and the ARRC respectively. They provided timely opportunities to assess the co-operation and ability of forces of European countries to function at a joint level.

12. Ministers welcomed the forthcoming EOLO 2000 Exercise that will test a Peace Support Operation under the control of a combined joint HQ, deploying significant air, sea and land forces (over 12,000 troops), from the four EUROFOR/EUROMARFOR countries, plus Greece and Turkey for the naval part, aiming at improving operational readiness including interoperability of systems and procedures.

They noted the ongoing efforts of EUROFOR participating States to strengthen EUROFOR capabilities and welcomed the fact that the force is operational.

13. Ministers welcomed the measures adopted at the end of 1999 by the five Eurocorps member nations within the framework of implementation of the Cologne decision to adapt the Eurocorps, and in particular its Headquarters, to the new strategic environment and to develop it into a European rapid reaction corps available for actions by the European Union and the Atlantic Alliance. Ministers welcomed the possibility offered to their European partners by the five Eurocorps nations to take part in Eurocorps activities and possible operations, and also to place liaison officers in the Eurocorps Headquarters at Strasbourg.

They welcomed the commitment of the Headquarters of this large European multinational unit as the nucleus for the KFOR III Headquarters. This commitment demonstrates that implementation of the decisions taken by the European Union at Cologne and Helsinki, with regard to the strengthening of European defence capabilities, is contributing to the credibility of the European security and defence policy and the vitality of the Atlantic Alliance.

14. Ministers reiterated the importance they attached to the dialogue and co-operation which WEU has developed with the Russian Federation over recent years. Recalling Ukraine's significance as an important European partner, they also highlighted WEU's dialogue and co-operation with Ukraine which has notably been pursued through the Action Plan agreed last June.

15. Ministers welcomed the ratification by Ukraine of the Open Skies Treaty. They called on Russia and Belarus to ratify the Open Skies Treaty without delay. They encouraged the continuation of the initiatives taken in this respect by the WEU nations.

16. Ministers welcomed the ratification by the Russian Federation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and START II.

17. Ministers expressed their concern regarding human rights violations in the Chechen Republic of the Russian Federation and underlined the urgency of a satisfactory response to these concerns.

18. Ministers welcomed the progress made by Croatia on the road to democracy and in meeting its international obligations, particularly under the Dayton and Paris Agreements.

19. Ministers reiterated the necessity for real progress towards democracy and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

20. Ministers took note with appreciation of the ongoing dialogue between Cyprus\* and WEU that evolves in line with the development of Cyprus's\* links with the European Union, with which negotiations for accession are continuing.

21. Ministers thanked the French Chair of the Transatlantic Forum for the successful development of its programme.

22. Ministers noted the initial steps undertaken by the OSCE in order to implement the decisions taken at its Istanbul Summit last November, including its Platform for Co-operative Security. They welcomed in particular developments towards the realization of the REACT concept, 'Rapid Experts Assistance and Co-operation Teams', and the increase of students and graduates of the OSCE Kosovo Police Service School. They agreed that, based upon the outcome of a recently held OSCE seminar on small arms and light weapons in Vienna, the OSCE was well placed to continue efforts for the elaboration and adoption this autumn, of a comprehensive document on small arms and light weapons to combat the illicit trafficking and the destabilising accumulation and spread of these weapons.

23. Ministers welcomed the election of Mr. Klaus Bühler as President of the WEU Assembly and paid tribute to the work of the outgoing President Lluís Maria de Puig. Ministers acknowledged the substantial contribution of the WEU Assembly to the debate on European security and defence. In this context, they noted its recent Lisbon Initiative.

24. Ministers welcomed the statement presented by France on the programme for its forthcoming Presidency of WEU.

#### **ARMAMENTS COOPERATION**

1. WEAG Defence Ministers held a special meeting on 15 May primarily to further discuss the issue of the future of WEAG and WEAO in the evolving European security architecture, as they had decided to do at their meeting in Luxembourg in November last year.

2. As a result of the WEAG Ministers' agreement in Luxembourg to extend participation in WEAG activities to the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, their meeting on 15 May was attended by Ministers from 19 nations. In this context Ministers warmly welcomed their colleagues from the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, who were attending a WEAG Ministerial for the first time.

3. Ministers noted the statements by Austria and Finland presenting their applications for full membership of WEAG and tasked NADs to implement the related procedures which they had agreed at their meeting in Luxembourg.

4. Ministers had a fruitful exchange of views on the issue of the future of WEAG and WEAO, aiming to provide guidance for the conduct of further studies. They endorsed the NADs' proposals on the way ahead and:

- confirmed that WEAG and WEAO have a role to play in the evolution of European armaments policy;
- decided to maintain WEAG as well as WEAO in their present form, for the time being, continuing to make use of the provisions of the Modified Brussels Treaty and the associated Paris Agreements;
- tasked NADs to commence work on examining the practical issues necessary to assure the immediate future of WEAG and WEAO, consulting with other bodies as necessary, and to provide them with an initial report at their next meeting together with a phased work plan for further in-depth studies on the long term future of WEAG and WEAO including their constructive role in and contribution to European armaments policy, aimed at maximising armaments cooperation and minimising costs. The issues to be studied should include, inter alia, aims, functions and organisation taking into account the political and institutional framework for future European armaments cooperation. The work plan should be a flexible one and should describe a step-by-step approach. Following the initial report in Autumn 2000, the phased work plan would be structured towards making a final report in Autumn 2001.

5. Ministers also signed amendments to the various MoUs governing R&T cooperation under WEAG and WEAO in order to make them more workable and flexible, and to facilitate participation in R&T projects.

6. Finally, Ministers took note of the work accomplished on the establishment of the planned European Armaments Agency, which is developing in accordance with the Masterplan.

7. The WEU Council (members of WEAG) adopted the conclusions of the WEAG Defence Ministers.

## ***25 Franco-German summit Mainz, 9 June 2000***

### **MAINZ DECLARATION**

1. La France et l'Allemagne sont déterminées à faire progresser la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense.

2. La réalisation des objectifs de capacités militaires fixés au Conseil européen d'Helsinki constitue la priorité qui fonde la crédibilité de l'action de l'Union européenne. La mise en œuvre des objectifs du Conseil européen d'Helsinki s'agissant du renforcement des capacités militaires européennes sera d'une particulière importance pour la crédibilité des capacités d'action de l'UE dans les domaines de la sécurité et de la défense

La conférence d'engagement des capacités, qui se tiendra en novembre prochain, constituera à cet égard un test de la volonté des Etats membres de traduire en engagements nationaux concrets les objectifs agréés à Helsinki. Le développement de ces capacités militaires en renforçant les moyens d'action de l'UE, contribuera aussi au renforcement de l'Alliance atlantique.

A Toulouse, puis à Cologne avec leurs partenaires du Corps européen, la France et l'Allemagne avaient décidé sa transformation en corps de réaction rapide. Aujourd'hui, l'état-major du Corps européen ainsi transformé et engagé au Kosovo, constitue une première démonstration de l'amélioration des capacités européennes de gestion des crises. Avec l'actuel engagement de l'état-major du Corps européen au Kosovo, les Européens démontrent que les forces multinationales qu'ils ont créées peuvent aussi servir efficacement à des missions de l'Alliance.

3. La France et l'Allemagne entendent réaliser de nouveaux progrès en matière de politique européenne de l'armement, partie intégrante de la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense. Elles se réjouissent à ce titre de la conclusion de la négociation LoI et de la prochaine signature de l'accord cadre.

La France et l'Allemagne, dans la continuité de la décision prise à Helsinki de constituer, à terme, une flotte européenne d'avions de transport stratégique, réaffirment leur engagement d'acquérir en commun un nouvel avion de transport militaire.

La France et l'Allemagne ont l'intention commune de renforcer leur capacité dans le domaine du transport aérien militaire. C'est pourquoi elles ont fait le choix -comme le Royaume-Uni- de l'Airbus A400M comme futur avion de transport militaire. La France et l'Allemagne confirment à leur tour la décision d'acquérir l'appareil A400M, leurs besoins opérationnels étant respectivement évalués à environ 50 et 75 appareils. Nos deux pays souhaitent que les conditions du lancement effectif de ce programme puissent être finalisées en liaison avec nos autres partenaires dans le courant de l'été.

Le lancement de ce programme constitue un pas décisif pour le développement de la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense, créant les conditions de la formation d'une flotte européenne de transport commune et cohérente, susceptible d'être mise en œuvre avec une très grande efficacité.

La France et l'Allemagne souhaitent en outre que les industriels associés à ce programme recherchent, dans leurs différents métiers, des opportunités de coopération industrielle avec la Russie et l'Ukraine.

La France et l'Allemagne ont également l'intention de mettre en place un système d'observation satellitaire européen indépendant. A cet effet, l'Allemagne va acquérir un système de satellite radar tout temps. La France contribuera avec son système de satellite optique. Cette initiative bilatérale constituera la base d'un système européen d'observation, ouvert à d'autres partenaires européens.

4. S'agissant des aspects institutionnels, la France et l'Allemagne partagent l'objectif de doter l'Union européenne, dès que possible après le Conseil européen de Nice, des structures permanentes lui donnant la capacité opérationnelle nécessaire pour décider et agir face aux crises.

5. La démarche de l'Union européenne est ouverte et transparente. La France et l'Allemagne se félicitent des projets de l'UE pour le développement de relations avec l'OTAN et les pays européens non membres de l'Union.

6. La France et l'Allemagne s'accordent sur la nécessité de promouvoir au sein de l'UE une culture européenne de sécurité et de défense et une formation commune des responsables civils et militaires. A cette fin, des propositions concrètes pour la création d'un collège seront élaborées en vue d'être présentées aux partenaires de l'UE.

7. Les deux parties soulignent l'importance qu'elles attachent au renforcement dans l'UE du domaine de la gestion non militaire des crises, ce qui permettra à l'UE de disposer de la gamme complète des moyens nécessaires à la gestion des crises.

8. La convergence des efforts engagés en matière de défense dans nos deux pays, comme leur pleine adéquation au cadre européen défini à Helsinki, est un élément fondamental. La France partage pleinement les objectifs que l'Allemagne a assignés à l'adaptation de son outil de défense : une meilleure performance technologique, une plus grande capacité de réaction en temps de crise, une contribution harmonieuse à la fois aux objectifs européens et à la solidarité atlantique.

## ***26 European Council Santa Maria da Feira, 19-20 June 2000***

### **PRESIDENCY CONCLUSIONS**

(...)

#### **I. C. Common European Security and Defence Policy**

6. The European Council reaffirms its commitment to building a Common European Security and Defence Policy capable of reinforcing the Union's external action through the development of a military crisis management capability as well as a civilian one, in full respect of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

7. The European Council welcomes the Presidency report endorsed by the Council on 'Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence' and associated documents (cf. Annex I). Satisfactory progress has been made in fulfilment of the Helsinki mandate on both the military and the civilian aspects of crisis management. In this context, the European Council notes the progressive development of the interim Political and Security Committee and the interim military bodies established at Helsinki.

8. Improving European military capabilities remains central to the credibility and effectiveness of the Common European Security and Defence Policy. The European Council is determined to meet the Headline Goal targets in 2003 as agreed in Helsinki. In this context, it looks forward to the Capabilities Commitment Conference later this year, where Member States will make initial national commitments, and to the creation of a review mechanism for measuring progress towards the achievement of those targets. The necessary transparency and dialogue between the Union and NATO will be ensured and NATO expertise will be sought on capability goal requirements.

9. Principles and modalities for arrangements have been identified to allow non-EU European NATO members and other EU accession candidates to contribute to EU military crisis management. Principles for consultation with NATO on military issues and modalities for developing EU-NATO relations have also been identified in four areas covering security issues, capability goals, the modalities for EU access to NATO assets, and the definition of permanent consultation arrangements.

10. Contributions are invited from all partner third states to the improvement of European capabilities. The European Council welcomes the offers made by Turkey, Norway, Poland and the Czech Republic, which will expand the range of capabilities available for EU-led operations.

11. The European Council welcomes the setting-up and first meeting of the committee for civilian aspects of crisis management, as well as the identification of priority areas for targets in civilian aspects of crisis management and of specific targets for civilian police

capabilities. In this respect Member States, cooperating voluntarily, have undertaken that by 2003 they will be able to provide up to 5,000 police officers for international missions across the range of conflict prevention and crisis management operations. Member States have also undertaken to be able to identify and deploy up to 1,000 police officers within 30 days. The European Council also welcomes the willingness of the Commission to contribute to civilian crisis management within its spheres of action.

12. The European Council underlines the Union's determination in its approach to conflict prevention and crisis management to assume fully its Petersberg task responsibilities as referred to in Helsinki. It invites the incoming Presidency together with the Secretary General/High Representative to carry work forward within the General Affairs Council, in accordance with the mandates referred to in the Presidency report, and to submit an overall Presidency report to the European Council in Nice. The permanent political and military structures should be put in place as soon as possible after Nice.

(...)

## **ANNEX I**

### **PRESIDENCY REPORT ON STRENGTHENING THE COMMON EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. In Cologne, the European Council expressed its resolve that the EU should play its full role on the international stage and that to that end the EU should be provided with all the necessary means and capabilities to assume its responsibilities regarding a common European policy on security and defence. Since Cologne, the European Union has been engaged in a process aiming at building the necessary means and capabilities which will allow it to take decisions on, and to carry out, the full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks defined in the Treaty on European Union ('Petersberg tasks'). These developments are an integral part of the enhancement of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and are based on the principles set out in Helsinki. The Union will contribute to international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

2. Having approved the two Finnish Presidency progress reports on military and non-military aspects of crisis management, including the common European headline goal and the collective capabilities goals, the European Council in Helsinki asked the Portuguese Presidency, together with the Secretary-General/High Representative, to carry work forward in the General Affairs Council on all aspects, as a matter of priority. The Portuguese Presidency was invited to draw up a first progress report to the Lisbon European Council and an overall report to be presented to the Feira European Council containing appropriate recommendations and proposals, as well as an indication of whether or not Treaty amendment is judged necessary.

3. A first progress report, reflecting the work carried forward by the Presidency, together with the Secretary-General/High Representative, within the General Affairs Council was

presented to the Lisbon European Council. The European Council of Lisbon welcomed the progress already achieved and in particular the fact that the interim bodies had been established and had started to function effectively and that the Council had identified a process for elaborating the headline goal and identifying national contributions so as to meet the military capability target.

4. The European Council in Lisbon looked forward to the further work that the Presidency, together with the Secretary-General/High Representative, would pursue in the Council and to the Presidency's overall report to the Feira European Council, including proposals on the involvement of third countries in EU military crisis management and the further development of the EU's relationship with NATO.

5. The Lisbon European Council furthermore appreciated what had been achieved in the non-military crisis management track and invited the Council to establish by, or at, Feira a Committee for Civilian Crisis Management.

6. Since then, work has been carried forward on all aspects of military and non-military crisis management and substantive progress has been made, in particular with the identification of appropriate arrangements for the participation of third countries to EU military crisis management, as well as of principles and modalities for developing EU-NATO relations. The headline goal has been further elaborated; a committee for civilian aspects of crisis management has been set up; a coordinating mechanism, fully interacting with the Commission services, has been established at the Council Secretariat; the study to define concrete targets in the area of civilian aspects of crisis management has been concluded; concrete targets for civilian police have been identified.

7. The Presidency submits herewith its overall report to the Feira European Council covering, in Chapter II, the military aspects and, in Chapter III, the non-military aspects of crisis management. Work has also been carried out on conflict prevention. The usefulness of finding ways of improving the coherence and effectiveness of the EU action in the field of conflict prevention has been recognised.

8. In the course of the work during the Presidency on the strengthening of military and non-military crisis management and conflict prevention, the importance has been underlined of ensuring an extensive relationship in crisis management by the Union between the military and civilian fields, as well as cooperation between the EU rapidly-evolving crisis management capacity and the UN, OSCE and the Council of Europe.

9. In presenting this report, the Presidency has taken note of the fact that Denmark has recalled Protocol No 5 to the Amsterdam Treaty on the position of Denmark.

## **II. MILITARY ASPECTS OF CRISIS MANAGEMENT**

### **A. Elaboration of the Headline and the collective capabilities goals**

1. Concerning the development of the Headline and the collective capabilities goals, the General Affairs Council, reinforced with Ministers of Defence, concluded at its meeting of 20 March that the 'Food for thought' paper on the 'Elaboration of the Headline Goal',

including the timetable set out therein leading to a Capabilities Commitment Conference to be convened by the end of 2000, constitutes a basis for future work to be conducted by the competent bodies.

2. The General Affairs Council, at its session of 13 June, with the participation of Ministers of Defence, approved the work carried out by the Interim Military Body and forwarded through the IPSC, up to the 'First Seminar of National Experts in Defence Planning' held in Brussels on 22-24 May 2000. The Council, inviting the competent bodies to continue on that basis, adopted the following guidelines for further work:

- The development of the Headline and collective capabilities goals, which have been agreed at the European Council in Helsinki, should be conducted by the B, in accordance with the decision-making autonomy of the EU as well as the requirements regarding military efficiency.
- The Interim Military Body, with the political guidance of the IPSC, will propose the elements which will encompass the Headline Goal.
- In order to do this, the Interim Military Body will identify the capabilities necessary for the EU to respond to the full range of the Petersberg Tasks.
- In elaborating the Headline and collective capabilities goals by drawing on Member States contributions, the IMB, including representatives from capitals, will also call meetings with DSACEUR and NATO experts in order to draw on NATO's military expertise on the requirements of the Headline and collective capabilities goals.
- In this connection, transparency and dialogue between the EU and NATO will in addition be provided by the Ad Hoc Working Group on the capabilities goals provided for in Appendix 2.
- The Headline Goal requirements agreed by the IMB at CHODs level will, after endorsement by the Council, be the basis for the Member States in considering their initial offers of national contributions to the Headline Goal. These contributions will be examined by the Interim Military Body. This process must be concluded before the convening of the Capabilities Commitment Conference.
- It will be important to ensure coherence, for those Member States concerned, with NATO's defence planning process and the Planning and Review Process.
- In accordance with the determination expressed at Helsinki and Lisbon, once the needs and resources available have been identified, Member States will announce, at the Capabilities Commitment Conference, their commitments with a view to enabling the EU to fulfil the Headline Goal and the collective capabilities goals. It will be also important to create a review mechanism for measuring progress towards the achievement of those goals.
- The European Union will encourage third countries to contribute through supplementary commitments. In order to enable those countries to contribute to improving European military capabilities, appropriate arrangements will be made by the incoming presidency regarding the Capabilities Commitment Conference. These arrangements will take into account the capabilities of the six non-EU European NATO members. The offers of capabilities already made by Turkey, Poland, the Czech Republic and Norway are welcomed.

**B. Recommendations on the institutional development of the new permanent political and military bodies related to the CESDP within the EU**

The interim political and military bodies were established on 1 March 2000. In the light of the experience gained since their establishment, work has been carried out on the institutional development of the new permanent political and military bodies, in accordance with the Helsinki conclusions. Further work is under way, in order to ensure as soon as possible the start of the permanent phase and of the EU operational capacity for crisis management.

**C. Proposals on appropriate arrangements to be concluded by the Council on modalities of consultation and/or participation that will allow the third States concerned to contribute to EU military crisis management**

Work has been carried forward on the modalities of consultation and/or participation concerning the non-EU European NATO members and other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU.

In this context, the aim has been to identify, in accordance with the Helsinki conclusions, arrangements for dialogue, consultation and cooperation on issues related to crisis management ensuring the decision-making autonomy of the EU. These arrangements will provide for the interim period meetings with the above-mentioned countries, which will take place within a single inclusive structure and will supplement the meetings held as part of the reinforced political dialogue on CFSP matters. Within this structure there will be exchanges with the non-EU NATO European members when the subject matter requires it. For the permanent phase, arrangements will take into account the different needs arising in the routine phase and in the operational phase. The outcome of the Council deliberations is contained in Appendix 1 to this report.

Exchanges took place on 11 May 2000 between the EU Member States' Political Directors and their counterparts of the non-EU NATO European members and other candidate countries as well as between the EU Member States' Political Directors and their counterparts of the non-EU NATO European members.

Russia, Ukraine, other European States engaged in political dialogue with the Union and other interested States, may be invited to take part in EU-led operations. In this context, the EU welcomes the interest shown by Canada.

The French Presidency is invited, together with the Secretary General/High Representative, to carry forward further work within the General Affairs Council in order to make initial proposals to the Nice European Council on appropriate arrangements for consultation and/or participation to allow these other prospective partners to contribute to EU-led military crisis management.

**D. Proposals on principles for consultation with NATO on military issues and recommendations on developing modalities for EU/NATO relations, to permit cooperation on the appropriate military response to a crisis**

The Council has identified the principles on the basis of which consultation and cooperation with NATO should be developed. As to modalities, the Council has recommended that the EU should propose to NATO the creation of four 'ad hoc working groups' between the EU and NATO on the issues which have been identified in that context: security issues, capabilities goals, modalities enabling EU access to NATO assets and capabilities and the definition of permanent arrangements for EU-NATO consultation.

The outcome of the Council deliberations is contained in Appendix 2 to this report.

**E. Indication of whether or not Treaty amendment is judged necessary**

The existing provisions of the TEU define the questions relating to the security of the Union, including the progressive fanning of a common defence policy as part of the Common Foreign and Security Policy governed by Title V of the Treaty. On this basis, the Council has decided to establish the Interim Political and Security Committee and the Interim Military Body, and to reinforce the Council Secretariat with military experts seconded from Member States. Article 17 TEU expressly includes the Petersberg tasks in the CFSP. The Presidency took note of the opinion of the Council Legal Service the conclusion of which reads as follows:

'The Council's Legal Service is of the opinion that the conclusions of the Cologne and Helsinki European Councils regarding European security and defence policy can be implemented without it being legally necessary to amend the Treaty on European Union. However, such amendments would be necessary if the intention is to transfer the Council's decision-making powers to a body made up of officials, or to amend the Treaty's provisions regarding the WEU. Furthermore, it is for Member States to determine whether amendments to the Treaty would be politically desirable or operationally appropriate.'

The Presidency suggests that the issue of Treaty revision should continue to be examined between the Feira and Nice European Councils.

**III. CIVILIAN ASPECTS OF CRISIS MANAGEMENT**

1. The Presidency has, together with the Secretary General/High Representative, responded as a matter of priority to the Helsinki European Council's invitation to carry work forward on all aspects of civilian crisis management, as defined in Annex 2 to Annex IV to the Helsinki conclusions.

2. The aim of this work has been to enhance and better coordinate the Union's and the Members States' non-military crisis management response tools, with special emphasis on a rapid reaction capability. This will also improve the EU's contribution to crisis management operations led by international and regional organisations.

3. As a concrete result of this intensive work, the following measures have been taken:

(a) A Committee for civilian aspects of crisis management has been set up by a Council decision adopted on 22 May 2000. The Committee held its first meeting on 16 June 2000.

(b) A coordinating mechanism, fully interacting with the Commission services, has been set up at the Council Secretariat. Further developing the inventory of Member States and Union resources relevant for non-military crisis management, it has, as a first priority, established a database on civilian police capabilities in order to maintain and share information, to propose capabilities initiatives and to facilitate the definition of concrete targets for EU Member States collective non-military response. The coordinating mechanism has further developed its close cooperation with the interim Situation Centre/Crisis Cell established by the Secretary General/High Representative.

(c) A study (Appendix 3), drawing on experience from recent and current crises, on the expertise of the Member States and on the results of the seminar on civilian crisis management in Lisbon on 3 April 2000, has been carried out to define concrete targets in the area of civilian aspects of crisis management. This study identifies priorities on which the EU will focus its coordinated efforts in a first phase, without excluding the use of all the other tools available to the Union and to Member States.

(d) Concrete targets for civilian police capabilities have been identified and are set out in Appendix 4. In particular, Member States should, cooperating voluntarily, as a final objective by 2003 be able to provide up to 5 000 police officers for international missions across the range of conflict prevention and crisis management operations and in response to the specific needs at the different stages of these operations. Within the target for overall EU capabilities, Member States undertake to be able to identify and deploy, within 30 days, up to 1 000 police officers. Furthermore, work will be pursued to develop EU guidelines and references for international policing.

4. In addition to these measures, the Council has received and is examining the Commission's proposal for a Council Regulation creating a Rapid Reaction Facility to support EU activities as outlined in the Helsinki Report.

#### **IV. FOLLOW-UP**

1. The French Presidency is invited, together with the Secretary General/High Representative, to carry work forward within the General Affairs Council on strengthening the Common European Security and Defence Policy. The French Presidency is invited to report to the European Council in Nice, in particular on:

(a) the elaboration of the headline goal and the collective capabilities goal agreed at Helsinki, including results reached at the Capabilities Commitment Conference to be convened before Nice;

(b) the establishment of the permanent political and military structures to be put in place as soon as possible after the Nice European Council;

(c) the inclusion in the EU of the appropriate functions of the WEU in the field of the Petersberg tasks;

(d) the implementation of the Feira decisions on :

- the arrangements that will allow consultations with and participation of third countries in EU-led military crisis management;
- the development of the arrangements ensuring consultation and cooperation with NATO in military crisis management on the basis of the work undertaken in the relevant EU-NATO 'ad hoc working groups';

(e) the development and the implementation of EU capabilities in civilian aspects of crisis management, including the definition of concrete targets.

2. The issue of Treaty revision should continue to be examined between the Feira and Nice European Councils.

3. The Secretary General/High Representative and the Commission are invited to submit to the Nice European Council, as a basis for further work, concrete recommendations on how to improve the coherence and the effectiveness of the European Union action in the field of conflict prevention, fully taking into account and building upon existing instruments, capabilities and policy guidelines.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **ARRANGEMENTS TO BE CONCLUDED BY THE COUNCIL ON MODALITIES OF CONSULTATION AND/OR PARTICIPATION THAT WILL ALLOW THE NON-EU EUROPEAN NATO MEMBERS AND OTHER COUNTRIES WHICH ARE CANDIDATES FOR ACCESSION TO THE EU TO CONTRIBUTE TO EU MILITARY CRISIS MANAGEMENT**

#### **MANDATE**

1. In the Helsinki European Council Conclusions the Portuguese Presidency is '...invited to report to the European Council in Feira on the progress made, including (...) proposals on appropriate arrangements to be concluded by the Council on modalities of consultation and/or participation that will allow the third States concerned to contribute to EU military crisis management'.

#### **GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

2. The Union will ensure the necessary dialogue, consultation and cooperation with non-EU European NATO members and other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU on EU-led crisis management.

3. Appropriate arrangements will be established for dialogue and information on issues related to security and defence policy and crisis management.

4. There will be full respect for the decision-making autonomy of the EU and its single institutional framework.

5. There will be a single, inclusive structure in which all the 15 countries concerned (the non-EU European NATO members and the candidates for accession to the EU) can enjoy the necessary dialogue, consultation and cooperation with the EU.

6. There will, within this structure, be exchanges with the non-EU European NATO members where the subject matter requires it, such as on questions concerning the nature and functioning of EU-led operations using NATO assets and capabilities.

### **MODALITIES**

7. Modalities for the participation of non-EU European NATO members and candidate countries, to be established for the permanent phase, will need to take into account the different needs arising in different situations:

- routine non-crisis phase: mechanism for a regular dialogue;
- operational phase, including two stages:
  - (a) pre-operational phase when options for action are considered, in which dialogue and consultations will be intensified;
  - (b) operational phase ‘*stricto sensu*’, which starts when the Council takes the decision to launch an operation, and an ad hoc Committee of Contributors is set up.

Full account should be taken of the role of the Secretary General/High Representative in the EU’s CFSP and CESDP.

#### **A. For the interim period**

8. Until the implementation of the modalities established for the permanent phase, meetings with the 15 countries concerned (non-EU European NATO members and other candidates for accession to the EU) will take place within the single inclusive structure referred to in paragraph 5. The choice of the appropriate form and modalities will be based on considerations of pragmatism and efficiency, depending on the circumstances, subject-matter and needs.

9. A minimum of two meetings in EU+15 format will be organised in each Presidency on ESDP matters. These will supplement the meetings held as part of the reinforced political dialogue on CFSP matters.

10. Within this framework, a minimum of two meetings will be organised with the six non-EU European NATO members (in EU+6 format) in each Presidency. Additional exchanges will be organised if the need arises upon decision by the Council or the IPSC.

11. A meeting at Ministerial level within the framework referred to in paragraph 8, will be organised in each Presidency with the 15 and with the 6.

12. The exchanges provided for in paragraphs 9 and 10 will cover the elaboration of the headline and capability goals as well, so as fully to inform non-EU members of ongoing work on the list of necessary means. In order to enable those countries to contribute to improving European military capabilities, appropriate arrangements will be made by the

incoming Presidency regarding the capabilities pledging conference. These arrangements will take into account the capabilities of the 6 non-EU European NATO members.

## **B. For the permanent phase**

### ***- Routine Phase***

13. Exchanges on issues related to security and defence policy and, in particular, on progress within the EU in establishing its crisis-management capabilities, will take place during the routine phase.

14. During the routine phase there should be, in the course of each semester,

- regular meetings in EU+15 format, at the appropriate level;
- at least two meetings with the participation of the non-EU European NATO members in EU+6 format;
- additional meetings will be organised if the need arises upon decision by the Council or the PSC.

PSC will play a leading role in the implementation of these arrangements, which should also include exchanges at military level.

15. Arrangements for Ministerial meetings during the permanent phase will be based upon the experience gained during the interim phase.

16. The exchanges will facilitate participation of the concerned countries to EU-led operations.

### ***- Operational Phase***

#### **(a) Pre-operational phase**

17. In the event of a crisis, dialogue and consultation will be intensified.

18. When the possibility of an EU-led military crisis management operation is under consideration, these consultations will provide a framework for exchanges of views and discussion on any related security concerns raised by the countries concerned. Where the EU recourse to NATO assets is under active consideration, particular attention will be given to consultation with the six non-EU European NATO members.

#### **(b) Operational phase 'stricto sensu'**

19. When deciding on the military option, the EU will address participation of non-EU NATO members and other countries which are candidates to accession to the EU according to the provisions agreed in Helsinki:

'Upon a decision by the Council to launch an operation, the non-EU European NATO members will participate if they so wish, in the event of an operation requiring recourse to

NATO assets and capabilities. They will, on a decision by the Council, be invited to take part in operations where the EU does not use NATO assets. Other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU may also be invited by the Council to take part in EU-led operations once the Council has decided to launch such an operation.'

20. The operational phase will start when the Council decides to launch a military crisis management operation. Those non-EU European NATO members and countries candidates for accession which have confirmed their participation in an EU-led operation by deploying significant military forces, will have the same rights and obligations as the EU participating Member States in the day to day conduct of that operation.

21. An ad hoc committee of contributors will be set up comprising all EU Member States and the other participating countries for the day to day conduct of the operation. The Council/PSC will be responsible for the political control and strategic direction of the operation. For the military day to day conduct of the operation, functions and roles of the MC and of the operation commander will be set out in the relevant arrangements.

22. The decision to end an operation shall be taken by the Council after consultation between participating states within the ad hoc committee of contributors.

23. The Council will formalise the necessary arrangements in due time and will examine the options for doing so.

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **PRINCIPLES FOR CONSULTATION WITH NATO ON MILITARY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEVELOPING MODALITIES FOR EU/NATO RELATIONS**

#### **THE MANDATE**

The European Council in Helsinki invited the Portuguese Presidency to report to the European Council in Feira on the progress made, including 'proposals on principles for consultation with NATO on military issues and recommendations on developing modalities for EU/NATO relations, to permit cooperation on the appropriate military response to a crisis, as set out in Washington and at Cologne'.

#### **THE PRINCIPLES**

1. Development of consultation and cooperation between the EU and NATO must take place in full respect of the autonomy of EU decision-making.

2. The EU and NATO have undertaken further to strengthen and develop their cooperation in military crisis-management on the basis of shared values, equality and in a spirit of partnership. The aim is to achieve full and effective consultation, cooperation and transparency in order to identify and take rapid decisions on the most appropriate military response to a crisis and to ensure efficient crisis-management. In this context, EU-

objectives in the field of military capabilities and those arising, for those countries concerned, from NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative, will be mutually reinforcing.

3. While being mutually reinforcing in crisis management, the EU and NATO are organisations of a different nature. This will be taken into account in the arrangements concerning their relations and in the assessment to be made by the EU of existing procedures governing WEU-NATO relations with a view to their possible adaptation to an EU-NATO framework.

4. Arrangements and modalities for relations between the EU and NATO will reflect the fact that each Organisation will be dealing with the other on an equal footing.

5. In the relations between the EU and NATO as institutions, there will be no discrimination against any of the Member States.

#### **ISSUES AND MODALITIES FOR THE INTERIM PERIOD**

Contacts with NATO (informal contacts by SGs, briefings by the Portuguese Presidency at the NAC) have taken place in accordance with the Helsinki definition for the initial phase in which the EU-interim bodies have concentrated on establishing themselves. There is now a need for a further evolution in EU-NATO relations.

##### **A. Issues**

1. **Security:** EU efforts towards finalising its own security arrangements (physical and personal security, and work towards an EU security agreement) are an absolute priority. On this basis, the Union will have to establish a dialogue with NATO to define security arrangements between the two organisations. These discussions should lead to an agreement, which will govern inter alia information exchange and access by designated officials from the EU and its Member States to NATO planning structures.

2. **Defining capability goals:** to ensure that "these objectives and those arising, for those countries concerned, from NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) will be mutually reinforcing", modalities for consultation on these issues will need to be established. These modalities should permit the EU to draw, as needed, on NATO military expertise, as the EU elaborates its headline goal by drawing on Member State contributions. Having elaborated the headline and capability goals, the EU, as agreed in Helsinki, will develop a method of consultation through which these goals can be met and maintained, and through which national contributions reflecting Member States' political will and commitment towards these goals can be defined by each Member State, with a regular review of progress made. In addition, Member States would use existing defence planning procedures including, as appropriate, those available in NATO and the Planning and Review Process of the PfP.

### **3. Arrangements enabling the EU access to NATO assets and capabilities (Berlin and Washington agreements):**

Helsinki and Cologne defined two approaches to implementing EU operations: with or without NATO assets. To use NATO assets, it is important to make progress on defining together how this will work in practice in order to draw up an agreement. This agreement should be ready by the time the EU becomes operational. To make this possible, the EU looks forward to substantial progress within NATO.

### **4. Defining permanent arrangements:**

Following the Feira European Council, discussion will be needed to determine the nature of the permanent arrangements, which will govern relations between the EU and NATO. These arrangements should be based upon the principles defined above.

The groundwork undertaken on these four issues will pave the way for establishing permanent arrangements between NATO and the EU. Our aim is that these should be ready at the same time as the EU permanent structures are put in place after the Nice European Council.

### **B. Modalities**

1. The Feira European Council should decide to propose to NATO the creation of “ad hoc working groups” between the EU and NATO for each of the issues mentioned above.

2. The “ad hoc working groups” would have the following tasks:

- (a) for security issues: preparation of an EU-NATO security agreement;
- (b) for capability goals: the implementation of information exchange and discussion with NATO on elaborating capability goals. It is understood that DSACEUR could participate, as appropriate;
- (c) for modalities enabling EU access to NATO assets (Berlin and Washington agreements): preparation of an agreement on the modalities for EU access to NATO assets and capabilities as agreed at Washington (draft framework agreement on Berlin Plus implementation). It is understood that DSACEUR should participate;
- (d) for the definition of permanent arrangements: defining the main parameters of an EU/NATO agreement which would formalise structures and procedures for consultation between the two organisations in times of crisis and non-crisis.

3. If, having regard to the principles set above, new issues were to arise which were recognised as requiring consultation between the EU and NATO, further “ad hoc working groups” could be considered.

4. On the EU side, the IPSC will have a coordinating role for the work of the ‘ad hoc working groups’, and will be a focal point for dialogue.

## APPENDIX 3

### STUDY ON CONCRETE TARGETS ON CIVILIAN ASPECTS OF CRISIS MANAGEMENT

#### A. Introduction

The European Council expressed its determination to increase and improve the effectiveness of the Union's capacity to respond to crises, including by actions in civilian areas. This increased effectiveness could be used both in response to request of a lead agency like the UN or the OSCE, or, where appropriate, in autonomous EU actions.

The Union should seek to enhance its capability in civilian aspects of crisis management in all relevant areas, with the objective of improving its potential for saving human lives in crisis situations, for maintaining basic public order, preventing further escalation, facilitating the return to a peaceful, stable and self-sustainable situation, for managing adverse effects on EU countries and for addressing relevant problems of coordination. Particular attention could be paid to those areas where the international community so far has demonstrated weaknesses. It would provide "added value" as it would improve the Union's capacity to react as well as the Union's capability to meet the requests of the other lead organisations: they would be able to count – on a more systematic basis – on a sizeable quantitative and qualitative contribution which could represent the nucleus of some of their missions. This would, in turn, increase the Union's visibility.

The reinforcement of the Union's capabilities in civilian aspects of crisis management should, above all, provide it with adequate means to face complex political crises by:

- acting to prevent the eruption or escalation of conflicts;
- consolidating peace and internal stability in periods of transition;
- ensuring complementarity between the military and civilian aspects of crisis management covering the full range of Petersberg tasks.

It has been agreed that the identification of concrete targets should be premised on a pragmatic, bottom-up approach, focusing on operational requirements, and reflecting the political concerns of the European Council.

The inventories which have been drawn up clearly show that Member States, the Union, or both have accumulated considerable experience or have considerable resources in a large number of areas, a number of which are resources already being used in development cooperation. Fully taking into account, and building upon, existing experiences, instruments and resources, the Union should as a matter of priority concentrate its efforts on the areas where a rapid reaction is most needed, and where the added value of an increased and coordinated effort by the Union and Member States is most evident. This process could be built outwards step-by-step to cover a wide range of limited as well as complex civil crisis management operations. However, the identification of priorities on which the EU will focus its coordinated efforts in a first phase does by no means exclude the use of all other tools available to the Union and to Member States.

**B. Priorities**

The first priority area, identified in the light of the crises Europe has had to face in recent times and is still facing now, is police.

**I. POLICE**

Concrete targets on police capabilities, to be reached by 2003, have been established by Member States, cooperating voluntarily within the framework of Article 12, fifth indent, of the TEU. These concrete targets are elaborated in detail in Appendix 4 to the Presidency report.

**II. STRENGTHENING OF THE RULE OF LAW**

Intensified work on police must necessarily be accompanied by work in other areas that are felt as necessary if a positive outcome of a police mission is to be ensured. The area most specifically concerned is assistance for the re-establishment of a judicial and penal system. The following measures could be considered:

- (i) Member States could establish national arrangements for selection of judges, prosecutors, penal experts and other relevant categories within the judicial and penal system, to deploy at short notice to peace support operations, and consider ways to train them appropriately;
- (ii) the EU could aim at promoting guidelines for the selection and training of international judges and penal experts in liaison with the United Nations and regional organisations (particularly the Council of Europe and the OSCE);
- (iii) the EU could consider ways of supporting the establishment/renovation of infrastructures of local courts and prisons as well as recruitment of local court personnel and prison officers in the context of peace support operations.

**III. STRENGTHENING CIVILIAN ADMINISTRATION**

Yet another area which it is necessary to enhance, in order to succeed in supporting societies in transition, is the area of civil administration.

- (i) Member States could consider improving the selection, training and deployment of civil administration experts for duties in the re-establishment of collapsed administrative systems;
- (ii) Member States could also consider taking on the training of local civil administration officials in societies in transition.

**IV. CIVIL PROTECTION**

In addition to the priority areas mentioned before, Member States have identified civil protection, including search and rescue in disaster relief operations. It is necessary to draw a distinction between operations of civil protection within the framework of crisis management operations, and other types of disaster relief operations. The latter kind of operations have specific characteristics.

This being said, in crisis management operations within CFSP, it should also be possible to resort to EU Member States' tools and capabilities for civil protection.

Even though specific coordination mechanisms already exist in the field of civil protection, it is felt that, in the light of experience gleaned in recent major natural disasters, improvement is needed and is possible.

Ideas aimed at ensuring a better organisation of the Union's reaction, such as a lead-nation concept as well as specialisation, have been put forward. Work currently under way within the Council and involving experts in the field will permit the definition of concrete targets also in this area.

Such concrete targets could be defined in terms of human and material resources that each Member State could make available, type of mandate and status of the operation for participating countries as well as promotion of compatibility of equipment between Member States.

### **C. Resources**

Improved coordination at EU level can lead to an increased effectiveness and synergy in the Union's reaction. Together with the definition of concrete targets by the European Council, this will ensure tangible improvements in the Union's contribution to crisis management operations.

### **D. Further Work on Concrete Targets after Feira**

The Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management could work on the development and further elaboration of the concrete targets set out by Feira European Council as well as on areas going beyond the priority areas already identified. To this end, the Committee should be integrated with experts from the relevant national administrations, i.a. providing specialist advice on police, judicial and penal aspects, civilian administration, humanitarian assistance as well as the interface between crisis management and development cooperation.

Further work could also address the identification of national capabilities with a view to reaching collective targets, taking into account national areas of expertise/specialisation.

It is noted that the Commission will submit shortly an operational inventory of actions already led by the Union as well as proposals in the civil protection area.

**APPENDIX 4****CONCRETE TARGETS FOR POLICE****A. CONCRETE TARGETS**

To develop police capabilities, Member States, cooperating voluntarily within the framework of Article 12, fifth indent, of the Treaty on European Union, have set themselves the following concrete targets, to be reached by 2003.

The targets are related but highlight different aspects of EU police capabilities. In this regard, the target for rapid deployment capability (2) is defined as lying within the target for overall EU capabilities (1).

**1. OVERALL EU CAPABILITIES**

Recognising the central role of police in international crisis management operations, and the increasing need for police officers for such operations, EU Member States undertake to strengthen their capability to provide police officers for international police operations to which they voluntarily decide to contribute. Member States' contributions will take account of their own particular arrangements for national policing and the type of police expertise which they can provide.

Strengthening their capabilities in phases, EU Member States should, as a final objective, be able to provide up to 5 000 police officers to international missions across the range of crisis prevention and crisis management operations and in response to the specific needs at the different stages of these operations. The current total deployment of EU Member States is approximately 3 300 persons.

This will require the pre-identification and training of a sufficiently large pool of police staff, covering all fields of police work required internationally and taking into account the comparative advantages as well as the specific constraints of Member States' police. It may also necessitate the reinforcement of mechanisms for rotation and sufficient financial and logistical resources.

Member States will share national experience with a view to producing specific recommendations on increasing the number of police officers available for international missions (looking inter alia at a greater use of retiring or recently retired officers and the freeing-up of police capability through greater involvement of experts from adjacent fields).

In this respect, due consideration will be given to the possibility of putting a greater emphasis on the training of local police, as this can contribute to reduce the size and period of international police deployments.

The target on overall EU police capabilities may be extended to cover also international support to local justice and penal systems, the deficiency of which in some crises can have a significant impact on the credibility and effectiveness of an international police presence.

## 2. RAPID DEPLOYMENT CAPABILITY

The EU police deployment can either be in response to a request from an international lead organisation, in particular the United Nations or the OSCE, or can constitute an EU autonomous police operation, possibly as part of a larger EU-led crisis management operation, once the necessary EU planning and logistical framework has been defined.

Within the target for overall EU capabilities, Member States undertake to be able to identify and deploy, within 30 days, police able to implement operations and missions of police advice, training, monitoring as well as executive policing:

- in order to prevent or mitigate internal crises and conflicts (such as e.g. MINUGUA in Guatemala);
- in non-stabilised situations, such as e.g. immediate post-conflict situations, requiring robust forces able to restore law and order; (such as e.g. UNMIK/KFOR in Kosovo and UNTAET in East Timor);
- in support of local police, ensuring respect for basic human rights standards (such as e.g. WEU/MAPE in Albania, WEUPOL in Mostar and ONUSAL in El Salvador), and, where international police performs an executive role, allowing the rapid return of responsibility for law enforcement to local police (such as e.g. OSCE/KPSS in Kosovo).

Experience has shown that the most demanding of crisis management tasks may require the deployment of up to 1 000 EU Member State police within 30 days. For each of these generic target missions, further elaboration by proper Council instances will be needed.

Given the specific requirements on international police performing executive tasks in non-stabilised situations, and in particular during the transition from initial military command to subsequent civil command, special attention will be given to the proposal for the development of robust, rapidly deployable, flexible and interoperable European Union integrated police units, as well as to the possibility of a smaller number of Member States cooperating to build capabilities in this specific field.

In order to reach the deployment time target, Member States and the EU will further strengthen, as appropriate, the capacity to contribute with the required expertise to an advance team headed by the international lead organisation – as well as, in due course, deploy EU advance teams of experienced police experts in charge of assessing the risks of, defining, planning and establishing an EU-led police mission. In this context, the EU should be able to contribute with, and deploy, legal experts in order to prepare for support to local judicial and penal systems, as well as experts in engineering, logistical and administrative support.

Member States will exchange information and experience on methods of creating rapidly deployable police forces, inter alia through the use of pre-identified police forces which, while actively taking part in national police work, would be available at short notice for police missions.

### 3. RAISING STANDARDS FOR INTERNATIONAL POLICE MISSIONS

Member States and the EU can play a catalysing role in raising standards for international police operations, including within and through the United Nations and the OSCE. Therefore the EU and its Member States will initiate work in view of the definition of an EU concept for international police operations. This work will be carried out in close cooperation with UN/DPKO, on the basis of existing UN guidelines and without duplicating work being carried out in the UN, and will draw on Member State and EU police expertise. First discussions on this subject have identified the need, inter alia, to:

- (1) define the categories of police officers and experts most appropriate for the different policing tasks, including priorities for deployment, on the basis of scenarios or illustrative profiles covering the role of police across the range of, and at the different phases of, crisis prevention and crisis management operations, and taking into account the need for flexibility of intervention;
- (2) contribute to the development of a general concept of executive policing, notably as regards the interaction between military forces and police forces in post-conflict situations where both are deployed in parallel;
- (3) contribute to the clarification of the legislative framework in which international police missions operate;
- (4) contribute to the definition of clear international mandates for police missions.

The development of an EU concept would facilitate the drawing up of EU guidelines and references for international policing, including on rules of engagement, as well as contribute to the further refinement of the categories of police and experts in Member State and EU databases.

Member States and the EU will also, in the framework of the cooperation in the field of justice and home affairs, and taking into account requirements of different types of police missions, continue efforts to define standard selection criteria and basic training programmes, based on, and compatible with, existing UN, OSCE and Council of Europe standards, in order to ensure that police sent by EU Member States on international missions meet high standards and that the pool of pre-identified and trained police officers is sufficiently large to meet the capability and deployment targets defined above. These efforts will take into account the Lisbon seminar organised in this context on 29-31 May 2000 and earlier work on police training for peacekeeping missions carried out within the framework of the European Union and will reflect the central role of the EU and its Member States in contributing to improved international policing standards.

#### **B. IMPLEMENTATION**

The specific concrete targets are the expression of the political will and commitment of Member States. The targets will be further elaborated by the appropriate Council instances. A method will be developed through which these phased targets can be met and maintained through voluntary contributions. The comparative advantages of national police taking into account e.g. national rotational requirements and the possible use of retirees, can be defined by each Member State, with a regular review of progress made. This work will be carried out in close cooperation with police experts.

General information on pre-identified police capabilities, their readiness, as well as on specific national expertise, in particular for advance teams, will be fed into the police database established at the Council Secretariat as part of the Coordinating Mechanism set up following the conclusions of the European Council in Helsinki. Further work will be undertaken concerning national arrangements, including on specific information on pre-identified police capabilities and single national contact points.

The European Council in Helsinki set the objective of developing the EU's contributions to international organisations, in particular the UN and OSCE, as well as its capabilities for EU autonomous actions. To that end the EU will coordinate closely with the United Nations Department of Peace Keeping Operations (UN/DPKO), the OSCE, notably the REACT Task Force, and with the Council of Europe and Member States contact points, in order to ensure that EU efforts and those of these organisations are compatible and mutually reinforcing, to avoid duplication as well as to facilitate the exchange of information relating to new police missions.

In addition, a detailed study on the feasibility and implications of planning, launching and leading autonomous EU missions will be carried out.

***27 Intervention by Dr Javier Solana  
High Representative for CFSP  
COPSi/NAC first joint meeting,  
Brussels, 19 September 2000***

*On 19 September 2000, the first-ever joint meeting between the EU's interim Political and Security Committee and the North Atlantic Council was held at the EU Council Headquarters. There is no official document available on this revolutionary first joint meeting. We reproduce below the intervention by the High Representative of the EU for CFSP, as he outlines progress thus far and further aims and projects of the EU in the defence field.*

- It is a pleasure to see so many old colleagues again. As I said to Lord Robertson when I greeted him downstairs, it is very satisfying for me to welcome members of the NAC to the Council for what will be, I am sure, the first of many productive meetings.
- I would like to thank the Presidency for the introduction and for the work on EU/NATO contacts undertaken so far. I do not want to recap Michel's summary of where the work stands but want to focus on one or two aspects.

Cooperation and Transparency

- Key commitments at Helsinki concerned cooperation and transparency with NATO. With this meeting, with growing contacts between Secretariats and with several ad hoc working group meetings, we are delivering on transparency.
- We are delivering too on cooperation. The Union's work on capabilities has benefited from NATO's input. We shall continue to wish to draw upon the expertise of the Alliance as we work to deliver our Helsinki commitments. I am in no doubt that enhancing our capabilities is the core issue before us. All our efforts on structures and procedures mean nothing if we do not put rapidly in place deployable and sustainable crisis management forces. We simply cannot achieve this task alone.

Capabilities

- We are advancing well with our work on the Helsinki Headline Goal. Our Chiefs of Defence Staff meet on Thursday to review the work so far and I shall then meet with Defence Ministers the following day to consider the way forward, particularly in view of our Capabilities Commitment Conference in November.
- One aspect of our work on capabilities that has yet to be explored in great depth is the question of strategic capabilities. At Helsinki, the European Council recognised the need to make improvements in a number of areas, particularly on command and control, intelligence and strategic transport. This will be a long-term project.
- Some Member States have already announced major procurements in the field of strategic transport. But much work remains to be done in other areas and we shall want to work together closely to ensure coherence with the Alliance's own Defence

Capabilities Initiative. My hope is that we should begin the Union's work in this field in the next few weeks.

- As well as wanting a close relationship with the Alliance, the Union's leaders also want a close relationship with those individual members of the Alliance who are not members of the European Union. At Feira we agreed arrangements to involve them closely in our work on crisis management. As was announced last week we shall involve the 6 European Allies not members of the Union in a special session on capabilities immediately after our own capabilities commitment conference.
- This will offer us an opportunity to provide an immediate briefing of the work towards meeting the headline goal and an opportunity to formally recognise the generous offers of forces made by many of you here.
- We of course recognise the commitment of Allies here to Europe's past security and their declared commitment to future crisis management operations. Many of you have key capabilities which would make important contributions to future EU crisis-management operations and I should like to welcome here your declared intention to contribute forces.

#### Crisis management procedures

- I should say that over lunch today I briefed the COPS on the work that I have been directing here on crisis management procedures. Once the member States have had a chance to digest the material we shall of course also want to give you all a full briefing. It should come as no surprise that we have tried to benefit from existing best practices and lessons learnt, including in NATO and the WEU.
- It is important to register that the EU aims to take a global approach to crisis management: our greatest asset is the range of crisis management instruments that we have at our disposal. Our challenge is to combine them in an effective way. So while we have looked to NATO and the WEU for ideas, they do not provide all the answers. We cannot simply replicate the arrangements of the WEU, we have to craft something much more sophisticated that combines military and non-military approaches to a crisis.
- But I want to emphasise that one of the key points that I have insisted upon is that the consultation arrangements foreseen at Feira should be truly extensive, in particular as they relate to those contributing to EU-led operations.
- We know that these offers are not simply a matter of numbers on paper. When it comes to an operation the commitments made by Allies here to join in an EU-operation are serious commitments of men, women and materiel. We owe it to those Allies to make the consultations over the deployment of those forces truly meaningful. I hope this will become clearer as we work on the details of the arrangements.

#### Permanent Arrangements

- It will not be long before the European Union is ready to declare itself operational in the field of military crisis management. Before then we shall have to settle the details of our permanent arrangements: our own internal organisation, our relations with NATO and with third countries.
- I am sure that as we finalise these arrangements we shall draw upon the experience we have gathered in this interim phase. I urge all around this table to make maximum use of these interim arrangements: to cooperate to the maximum, to share knowledge as

openly as possible and to recognise that we are joined by common interests and have common goals.

## ***28 Informal meeting of EU defence ministers Ecouen, 22 September 2000***

### **PRESIDENCY CONCLUSIONS**

It falls to me, as representative of the French Presidency of the European Union, to summarize for you the informal meeting that we have just held with my 14 European colleagues in the presence of Javier Solana, whom I thank for his presence here.

I am very satisfied with this meeting, which I had proposed to my colleagues to devote essentially to the work in progress on defining and setting up European military capacities, as instructed by the European Council at Feira.

We noted that the definition work in progress was taking place in excellent conditions, and that the determination to reach our objectives was shared by all.

We had three items on the agenda: summary of work in progress on defining the catalogue of forces and the European capacities necessary for the achievement of the goals set down in Helsinki; organization of the capacity commitment conference that will be held in Brussels on 20 November; structure of the capacity commitment document that we will adopt.

#### **1/ Summary of work**

On the first point, we noted that the military experts of the fifteen member States had done excellent work in Brussels. Their task was to transform the political objective decided on in Helsinki into a catalogue of forces and precise capacities – the constitution of a force of 60,000 men capable of being deployed in less than 60 days, self-sufficient, with the necessary aerial and maritime support, and capable of remaining on the ground one year.

The EU's interim military organization (created on 1 March) drafted on 28 July a preliminary version of the catalogue, in accordance with the mandate it had been given a month before. The European Union chiefs of staff, meeting yesterday, took stock prior to drafting a second, more detailed and more complete version of this catalogue, to be finished in the weeks to come.

We paid tribute to the experts of the fifteen member States who carried out this work.

It is presented as an extremely precise document, summarized in a table of about fifty pages.

This table includes columns for the four basic hypotheses, or scenarios, which allow us to cover all the Petersberg missions we had set ourselves: separation by force of the belligerent parties; prevention of conflicts; humanitarian aid; evacuation of nationals.

The rows of the table – of which there are more than 500 – correspond to the needs identified in the areas of ground, air and sea forces and of the key or strategic capacities that we identified in Helsinki.

To give you an idea of the precision of these rows, I will quote an example: amphibious vehicles, strategic reconnaissance planes; mechanized infantry battalions, drones; surgical units...

These are 5 examples taken from 500 lines. Of course, each of these 500 lines includes the quantity of necessary units.

You will understand that I cannot detail our objectives line by line, but I can indicate to you the larger tendencies on which our experts agree.

I should first make clear that the objectives, like the States' contributions, take the form of units and capacities able to 'sustain deployment for at least a year', to quote the terms used at Helsinki. It is therefore clear that we are talking about capacities that the States commit to providing for at least one year.

In terms of ground forces, our experts are of the opinion that to be able to deploy 60,000 men in all possible configurations of use, our objective should be greater, probably nearer 80,000 men. This will enable us to cover all possible hypotheses of use, while remaining of course within the framework of our objective of 60,000 men.

For aerial forces, the range of objectives is currently between 300 and 350 fighter planes.

For naval forces, our hypothesis is 80 ships.

This gives us the necessary basis for the work that now awaits us, that is to say the definition of each member State's involvement, in the form of a contribution of forces or a commitment to acquire the necessary capacities through the framework of national, bi-national or multi-national programmes.

Each country will be invited to supply its response to each of these lines, specifying the type of unit that it commits itself to provide, the number or size, the time limit for deployment, expressed in days, and the year from which we will be able to count on this commitment.

We expressed our appreciation of the quality of the cooperation with the NATO experts who contributed, in the planned conditions, to the development of this catalogue. During the eight weeks of work by the EU experts, six meetings with their NATO colleagues gave rise to this fruitful exchange.

## 2/ Organization of the conference on capacity commitment

The second item on the agenda concerned the organization of the conference. It will be held according to the following programme:

On the morning of Monday 20 November, in the Council building in Brussels, another informal meeting of the fifteen defence ministers will enable us to declare officially the level of commitment of our States during the capacity commitment conference.

The same day, in the afternoon, a meeting of the general affairs council plus the ministers of defence will have the opportunity to comment on these results and on their communication to the European Council in Nice.

The following day, at the same venue, I will invite our fifteen colleagues from the European States who are not members of the EU to participate in a meeting with the EU defence ministers. The purpose of this meeting will be to take note of their possible additional contributions. A specific meeting will be organized the same day between the fifteen EU defence ministers and the European countries who are members of the alliance but not members of the EU.

These additional contributions will be welcome, but I would remind you that it is the natural responsibility of members of the EU alone to fulfil the capacity objectives they have set themselves.

3/ The third item on the agenda concerned the structure of the capacity commitment document that we shall adopt during the conference of 20 November.

The first part of the document will be concerned with the global objective that we set ourselves in Helsinki in terms of ground, air and sea forces, to constitute a European rapid reaction force.

We shall look at the needs of the catalogue and the 'slots filled' by the member States, probably making a distinction between what we will be able to do by 2003, consistent with the deadline set in Helsinki, and what we could do earlier, in 2001.

A second part, which will be very important for the credibility of the project, should be dedicated to observed needs.

These needs will probably appear under the three key areas that we identified in Helsinki as requiring the collective commitment of capacities: C3 (command, communication and control), strategic transport, information. They may also appear under other areas.

In terms of these observed needs in the catalogue, we won't produce capacities available immediately, but a set of initiatives, projects and national commitments or commitments arising from joint European programmes. They should come with timetables that will be spread out beyond 2003 as planned in Helsinki.

As an illustration, we already have elements in each of the three domains defined in Helsinki:

Command and control: the staff of the European Corps has acquired a command capacity for the terrestrial component, as is being shown under the command of General Ortuno in Kosovo.

In the area of information, I would like to mention the Western European Union's satellite imaging interpretation capacity at Torrejon, which should be transferred to the EU, the Italian radar satellite projects, the Franco-German initiative to endow the European Union with an independent satellite observation capacity, and, I hope, other contributions.

In the area of strategic transport, six members declared officially this summer at Farnborough their commitment to the Airbus programme for a future transport plane, in association with our Turkish partners. This progress goes alongside other initiatives, such as the one that we are running with our Dutch partners on maritime strategic transport. Work is also being done in other directions, notably with our colleagues in Belgium and Luxembourg.

This is just a series of illustrations. We hope that our catalogue of initiatives and commitments will grow in size and that every member State will make its contribution.

The third part of the commitment document should include, as the Council of Feira asked, "an evaluation mechanism enabling the progress made towards the realization of these objectives to be measured". Within the framework of this mechanism we will re-evaluate and update our objectives every year, ensure that commitments made are followed up, and that we will verify the operational degree and the quality of the forces and capacities we have offered.

That is what I wished to tell you about capacities, which have constituted the main element of our work today, which has taken place in an excellent atmosphere. We also had discussions on the institutional questions that are also on the agenda of the French presidency: definition of permanent bodies, permanent relations with NATO and the European countries which are not members of the EU. These exchanges showed much agreement, even though work remains to be done to arrive at a document representing a consensus in Nice.

Finally, I indicated to my colleagues that I had accepted the invitation of Mr Elmar Brok, Chairman of the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs and Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy, to a meeting of the committee in Strasbourg on 24 October. At the meeting I will inform the parliamentarians of the progress of our work.

## ***29 WEU Ministerial Council Marseille, 13 November 2000***

### **MARSEILLE DECLARATION**

The WEU Council of Ministers met in Marseille on 13 November 2000. The WEU Council was preceded by a meeting of the Defence Ministers of WEAG at which Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Poland and Sweden became full members.

Ministers welcomed the crucial role played by WEU, particularly since its reactivation and installation in Brussels, and appreciated its important contribution to the development of European security and defence architecture.

Ministers welcomed the progress made by the EU in the field of European security and defence policy, and the Atlantic Alliance's support for this process. They recalled their attachment to this policy which will serve the interests of all WEU nations, through the development of satisfactory arrangements.

Following on from the Porto Ministerial Council, and with a view to the decisions that will be taken by the Nice European Council, Ministers agreed on a number of measures designed to address the consequences for WEU of the changes under way.

In this regard,

1. Ministers approved the WEU residual functions and structures which will be in place by 1 July 2001 at the latest and will enable the Member States to fulfil the commitments of the modified Brussels Treaty, particularly those arising from Articles V and IX, to which the Member States reaffirm their attachment. Ministers requested that the necessary administrative and accommodation measures now be taken, to ensure that the residual WEU structures are in place when the EU becomes operational.
2. Ministers again acknowledged the competence and dedication of the staff of the WEU Secretariat-General and their most valuable contribution to the work of the Organisation. They reiterated the commitment they made at Porto in this area. In this regard, they encouraged the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to find appropriate solutions which take into account the professional expertise and legitimate expectations of the WEU staff. They also endorsed the social plan which will benefit the WEU staff members concerned.
3. Ministers acknowledged the work of the WEU Military Staff and noted that it is preparing to cease its activities in accordance with the transition plan approved on 17 October by the Chiefs of Defence Staffs. Ministers also acknowledged that due consideration was being given in the EU to the question of appropriate contacts between military officers of the non-EU WEU nations and the new EU military structures.

4. Ministers acknowledged the importance of the dialogue and cooperation which WEU at 28 and 21 has developed with third countries over recent years. WEU will cease to carry out these responsibilities, which it is intended will be taken up within the existing framework of political dialogue between the EU and the countries concerned.
5. They also agreed to suspend application of the routine consultation mechanisms in force between WEU and the EU, without prejudice to the cooperation required within the framework of the transition process. Similarly, WEU/NATO routine consultation mechanisms will be suspended, except for those that still need to be applied during the transition period, in particular for exercise JES 2001.
6. Ministers noted with satisfaction the European Union's agreement in principle to the setting-up, in the form of agencies within the EU, of a Satellite Centre and an Institute for Security Studies which would incorporate the relevant features of the corresponding WEU subsidiary bodies. They tasked the Permanent Council to draw all the administrative and financial consequences of these decisions. Ministers also acknowledged that due consideration was being given in the EU to the question of the appropriate involvement of non-EU WEU nations in the activities of the Institute for Security Studies and the Satellite Centre.
7. Ministers expressed their resolve to bring the Transatlantic Forum to an end. They welcomed the European Union's intention to enrich the transatlantic dialogue, by entrusting the ISS with undertaking activities similar to those being currently conducted within the Transatlantic Forum, in accordance with modalities to be agreed, enabling all the nations concerned to participate in these activities.
8. Ministers noted the European Union's agreement in principle to take over in due course the direct management of the MAPE mission on police cooperation with Albania. WEU is ready to extend the mission under its present terms for an interim period beyond the end of the current mandate on 31 December 2000.
9. The Demining Assistance Mission to the Republic of Croatia will be continued under the responsibility of Sweden in the WEU framework until 9 May 2001 when its present mandate expires.
10. Ministers noted the importance of continuing cooperation between the members of the WEU Group of States parties to the Open Skies Treaty, that for the foreseeable future would be coordinated directly between its members, as appropriate, from capitals and from their missions in Vienna.
11. Recalling the relevant provisions of the modified Brussels Treaty, Ministers noted with interest the WEU Parliamentary Assembly's work of strategic reflection on European security and defence.
12. Ministers noted that WEAG will continue to carry out its function of reflection and cooperation in the armaments field.

13. Ministers welcomed the presentation by the Netherlands with regard to its incoming Presidency.

## **ARMAMENTS COOPERATION**

1. The Defence Ministers of the thirteen member nations of the Western European Armaments Group (WEAG), the European forum for armaments cooperation, met together with their colleagues from Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Poland and Sweden in Marseille on 13 November 2000.
2. They reviewed the evolving situation in the field of armaments and the specific armaments cooperation activities carried out under WEAG. Their discussion focused in particular on the European Armaments Partnership issue, the participation of Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland in WEAG Research and Technology cooperation, and the future of WEAG and WEAO.
3. Concerning the European Armaments Partnership issue, Defence Ministers had agreed at their meeting in Luxembourg in November 1999 on a procedure, so as to allow the possibility to Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Poland and Sweden to become full members of WEAG. Since then, those nations have formally applied for full membership and, based on the recommendation of National Armaments Directors (NADs), Defence Ministers agreed to their accession to WEAG full membership. From now on, WEAG numbers 19 full members, each enjoying equal rights and responsibilities.
4. Defence Ministers also noted the wish expressed by Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to participate in WEAG R&T cooperation through the SOCRATE MOU. To this end, Defence Ministers mandated their Chairman-in-Office to request the WEU Council to authorise the extension of the central contracting by the WEAO Executive Body under SOCRATE to the benefit of those four nations, and on this basis agreed to sign the necessary Amendments to the SOCRATE MOU.
5. Concerning the future of WEAG and WEAO, Defence Ministers had tasked NADs, at their special meeting in Porto, to commence work on examining the practical issues necessary to assure the immediate future of WEAG and WEAO and to establish a phased work plan for further in-depth studies on the long-term future. Defence Ministers noted with satisfaction that NADs have agreed on the way forward on the immediate future of WEAG and WEAO and that work has commenced based on the agreed phased work plan. Defence Ministers had a fruitful exchange of views on the initial report presented by NADs and provided guidance for the continuation of work towards a final report to be presented at their Autumn 2001 meeting.
6. Defence Ministers further took note of the work accomplished by the WEAG Panels and Groups. They expressed, in particular, their satisfaction with the finalisation and recent endorsement by NADs of a Manual on 'Principles, Procedures and Methods for the Harmonisation of Military Requirements and the Facilitation of Armaments Cooperation in Europe', and on the way forward agreed by NADs on the Masterplan for a European Armaments Agency.

7. Finally, Defence Ministers expressed their satisfaction to the Western European Armaments Organisation (WEAO) which has achieved its targets for launching EUCLID and THALES Research and Technology projects, including notifying research and technology contracts to European industry under the EUCLID programme. A 10% higher target has been set for launching new projects in the forthcoming period, with at least seventeen EUCLID contracts, amounting to a total value of 119 million euros, including 34 million from industrial self-investment.
8. The Chairmanship of WEAG, which rotates among its members, will be handed over from Greece to Italy for the years 2001 and 2002, while the WEAO Board of Directors will be chaired by Italy for one year starting from 1 January 2001.
9. The WEU Council (members of WEAG) adopted the conclusions of the WEAG Defence Ministers.

**30 Speech by Dr Javier Solana  
High Representative for CFSP,  
Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft  
für Auswärtige Politik,  
Berlin, 14 November 2000**

**‘WHERE DOES THE EU STAND ON COMMON  
FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY?’**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very grateful to the Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Auswaertige Politik (German Foreign Policy Association) and to Professor Karl Kaiser in particular for giving me the opportunity to speak to you about my work as the High Representative for the Common Foreign Policy of the European Union. My remarks this evening concern Europe’s down-to-earth political realities, and our ambition to create a safer world. So whilst I am conscious of the fact that this building used to house an eminent poet, the Nobel prize winner Ivo Andric, I shall nevertheless address you in plain prose.

The past year has been a time of major innovation in the area of the Union’s Common Foreign and Security Policy. Every European Council has proved to be a new high-water mark in extending the range of instruments available under the Common Foreign and Security Policy and moving towards a more effective, more coherent and more visible Foreign Policy.

At the same time, political events have not come to a halt. The world is not waiting while we get our own house in order. Our global partners expect us to have an effective and clear policy on issues of international importance. Over the last few weeks we have been able to welcome the election of President Kostunica in the FRY. At almost the same time we have seen the Middle East Peace Process undermined and severely weakened. The European Union is expected to respond in both these and other cases. Are we willing to deliver? Are we capable of delivering? And have we delivered in the course of the last year?

I shall answer each of these questions in turn. Afterwards, I will be very happy to answer any questions you might have.

Are we willing to deliver?

CFSP is about Europe making a difference in international politics. It is about the European Union being able to project its values and its interests – the core of its political identity – effectively beyond its own borders. At the same time, the construction of CFSP is a political project itself. It is the product of continuing debate between the Member States, the European institutions, and the people of Europe. Convergence has always been the goal,

divergence was too often the reality. But this is changing. There is now a serious commitment to presenting a single political will to the rest of the world, a commitment to match Europe's economic power with political influence. This is the enormous change which we have witnessed in Europe over the last year.

The creation of the post of High Representative itself was an indication of this new willingness by the Member States of the Union to make CFSP work. This willingness has continued throughout my first twelve months in the job. It has been evident in the constructive approach shown by the three presidencies with whom I have worked so far. What we want to achieve in common is to be relevant and influential in the foreign policy arena. To do that, we need the political will of all Member States; close interaction among EU organs and institutions; and the support of European citizens.

There is no doubt that the political will of the Member States is a pre requisite for engaging in the foreign policy arena. But, even that crucial political will needs to translate into sustainable policies. And the very first test of concrete progress in this direction is the ability to spell out clearly why we want to act together on the world scene; i.e. what are our priorities are. This is not a literary exercise; and needs not to be a catalogue of overlapping national priorities: we need to focus our joint efforts where they are most needed. In not so many words, where joint action really brings added value.

I believe our priorities are clear enough in that respect:

- Firstly, relations with our neighbours. I need not to recall here, in the city that has been for decades the very symbol of a tragic fracture in European history, how dramatically important the enlargement process will be for the 'fifteen' and for the accession candidates alike. Within the same fold, the countries of the Balkans and the Southern Mediterranean shore deserve our outmost attention, because their political and economic evolution can have serious implications for our prosperity and even for our security. This is a lesson from our recent past, and I will revert to this point in a minute. Russia, a partner of massive importance for the Geo-economic and strategic stability of the continent also deserves our continuing collective attention, in addition to the strong bilateral links established with many of the 'Fifteen'.
- Secondly, relations with a wide array of international organisations and institutions: in primis the UN system and its 'sister' organisations such as the IMF, the World Bank, the WTO (World Trade Organisation), without losing sight of the relevance of regional organisations such as the OSCE and of course NATO. Our ambition there should be to increase our collective influence, inter alia by co-ordinating our national positions better than what we have done so far. It can be done. We only need to go that extra mile vis-à-vis national suspicion and prerogatives which are rooted in many capitals, although essentially a reflex the past.
- Thirdly we need to relate more coherently with a number of major players and actors on the world scene. That is certainly true of the US, the partner with whom we have developed the most strategic relation in all fields. But also China, Japan and India deserve growing attention. And this is likewise true for major regional grouping which will no doubt develop overtime into coherent and cohesive entities: Mercosur, ASEAN, possibly the OAU (Organisation of African Unity).

Last but not least, the defense and promotion of the values which are at the heart of European history and civilisation. We believe in the value of tolerance, democracy and respect for human rights. This must be an integral part of our policy-making process. Because values are our crucial link with the people of the street, who want to understand why we take this or that decision, and whose support we need at all times.

Beyond the political will of the countries, lies the need to make our work more effective, through better interaction between the responsible institutions. Here comes the crucial link with the European Commission – which is and will remain an essential player in our foreign policy process – and with the European Parliament.

Equally crucial, will be the conscious support of the people of Europe – our citizens – for the strengthening of a common foreign policy. A foreign policy which even at national level is no longer confined to the restricted circle of diplomats or foreign policy experts. A policy that calls instead for the increased attention of the business community, which has much at a stake in a globalised market place; and of the people at large, who have become influential spectators in real time of world wide crises, thanks to the ‘global village’.

#### Are we capable of delivering?

A foreign policy requires instruments. The European Union needs to dispose of the means to make its policies heard, to present them cohesively, and to implement them efficiently. Do we have access to the right instruments to deliver?

In the field of security policy we have achieved enormous progress. We are in the process of putting together a range of instruments – from a rapid reaction force to a conflict prevention system – which will greatly enhance our ability to implement a true European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). Simultaneously, we are improving the performance of more traditional European foreign policy instruments: diplomacy and economic assistance.

Less than one year ago, at the Helsinki European Council, Europe’s leaders decided to develop by 2003 a collective European capability to deploy rapidly 60,000 troops for crisis management operations (the headline goal). The purpose of this capability is clearly set out in the Treaty. Our aim is to provide the Union with sufficient military and non-military capabilities to enable us to intervene when appropriate in humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking (Petersberg Tasks).

We have followed-up on Helsinki by creating new structures. As of March 2000 the Interim Political and Security Committee has met weekly to develop the permanent structures which will be necessary for crisis management; an interim Military Committee has been set up and a military staff has been established to provide the Council with military expertise. A catalogue of capabilities necessary to fulfil the Petersberg tasks was approved recently by the Council, and at a meeting to take place next week in Brussels each Member State will specify the assets it will be able to contribute. This ‘Capabilities Commitment Conference’ marks a milestone in the development of the ESDP.

The development of the ESDP inevitably has evoked questions about the EU's relationship with NATO. We have responded to these questions from the very beginning: The EU is not in the business of collective defence. Nor is it in the business of creating a European army. The creation of a European Security and Defence Policy is aimed at strengthening, not weakening transatlantic ties. We have followed up on these principles in practice.

Much has been achieved already. The Feira European Council in June provided for the establishment of four ad-hoc EU/NATO working groups. These committees have already begun to discuss issues of security, capabilities, the modalities for EU access to NATO, and the definition of permanent agreements. On 9 November a meeting took place in Brussels between the interim Political and Security Committee and NATO's Permanent Council. This was the second of regular meetings planned at senior level between the two organisations. These contacts will continue and develop further as more detailed discussions begin. These include my own regular and well-established meetings with NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson.

ESDP is not only about the creation of a rapid reaction force. Military means will always be the last resort for solving a crisis. ESDP is also about the Union having access to other tools which most of the time might be better suited to maintaining or providing security than military force. This is why the Union is devoting attention to the development of other instruments for use in crisis management situations. Of particular importance is the area of civilian police, for which the Feira European Council established a concrete target of 5000 officers ready for deployment by 2003. It also includes instruments for the strengthening of the rule of law and conflict prevention. Following the mandate which was given at Feira, I am working with the Commission to draw up concrete recommendations on how to improve the coherence and effectiveness of our work in the important area of conflict prevention. We shall be presenting this report to the European Council in Nice.

Military capabilities, civilian capabilities, diplomacy, and our extensive programme of development assistance and humanitarian aid - the European Union is and will be in a unique situation to draw on a comprehensive range of instruments to support its interests world-wide. But let me re-state an important point: We are not in the business of devising a European security policy for the sake of merely having some sort of security policy. CFSP is the means to an end, namely to promote the values and principles for which the European Union is respected world-wide. We should increasingly be able to ensure that the rule of law and human rights are respected, and that people throughout the world can, like ourselves, enjoy the benefit of freedom, democracy and prosperity.

Ladies and Gentlemen, in the last year we have witnessed a continuing political will to create a different, more visible, more cohesive, and more efficient CFSP. We have spent a lot of time developing new instruments and making the existing instruments more effective. Does it pay? Have we succeeded in delivering concrete policies? Please allow me to address the development in two regions which are of special importance to me: the Balkans and the Middle East.

## Have we delivered?

### The Balkans

A disproportionate amount of my work continues to be devoted to the Balkans. I expect that to continue to be the case for some time. It is clear why. The Balkans have for over a decade been a top priority for our foreign policy efforts. Nowhere is the EU expected to deliver more. What does our balance-sheet in the region look like?

Following the mandate which I was given in March this year from the European Council, I have worked closely with the Commission to ensure a more coherent approach to our policy towards the region, and to strengthen the impact of our contribution. Much still remains to be done, but we have since the Spring pursued a policy based on a long-term commitment to the full integration of all the countries in the region into the political and economic mainstream of Europe. We have at the same time gone a long way in persuading others (in particular the US) of the depth of our engagement in the Balkans.

Recent events in Serbia have to some extent vindicated that policy. About a month ago, the people of Serbia voted for change. They were clearly tired of economic decline and international isolation. Their decision is a clear step for Serbia on the road to a democratic Europe. This important development was the result of a free choice by the people themselves. But during the last year the European Union has devoted considerable efforts to helping give a voice to those in Serbia who are genuinely committed to democracy. I myself have been engaged in very concrete terms in strengthening civil society in Serbia: the independent media, opposition municipalities and those politicians committed to change. We were clear also in the support which Serbia would receive under a new and democratic leadership. On this we are already beginning to deliver.

The Summit which is due to take place in Zagreb next week, bringing together Heads of Government from the EU and most Balkan countries, will somehow seal the transition between the tragic fall out of the implosion of Yugoslavia, and more orderly and promising future for the region. A positive European perspective will be on the table for all the participants. And, most important, all the Governments around the table will have been issued by true democratic elections. Only a year ago, this would have been a dream.

Let me now turn to another critical area for the European Union: The Middle East.

### The Middle East

The last few weeks have brought a major set-back for the Peace Process in the Middle East. The United States, the United Nations, and the European Union now have to combine their efforts to stop any further damage and pave the way for reconciliation.

The European Union has been engaged in the Middle East for a long time, both politically and economically. In 1995 it established a framework for relations with its 12 Mediterranean partner countries. I personally chaired the first meeting which established the Barcelona Process. This consists of a framework for co-operation across a wide range of sectors: political, economic and social.

Only two days from now, in Marseilles, ministers from all these countries are due to meet again in order to assess the process. The meeting in Marseille - to be clear - is not part of the Middle East peace process. It represents a possible - indirect - contribution to it. It is important that the European Union and its Mediterranean partners maintain a platform for dialogue and communication for the future.

Our commitment to the Peace Process itself has been most visible through the high level of financial support for the region. But recently we have also been able to play a more active role politically.

A few weeks ago I was asked by EU foreign ministers to travel to the region to meet all the parties concerned and to try to offer support in the search for an end to the violence. The rounds of talks I held in the region paved the way for participation by the European Union in the Sharm el-Sheikh summit, which allowed us for the first time to be actively involved in the search for a solution to the crisis. We worked closely at the summit with Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary-General, in an effort to contribute to a process which was on the brink of collapse. Violence and suffering continue. Nevertheless we are determined to work patiently behind the scenes to try to create a further breathing space. And over time, I hope we shall be able to help deliver a permanent solution. I have been nominated by President Clinton and UN Secretary General Kofi Annan to become a member of the fact-finding Commission set up in Sharm-el-Sheikh. I will continue to work in support of the search for peace in the Middle East; the European Union will continue to be fully engaged.

In all these areas, and in particular in those areas close to the European Union, we are seeing the beginnings of a Common Foreign and Security Policy which is more visible, more coherent, and more efficient. There is plenty more to do. The road will be long. But we are heading in the right direction.

#### Conclusion

Ladies and Gentlemen. Is the European Union willing to deliver a visible, coherent, and efficient foreign and security policy? Are we capable of doing so? And have we delivered in the course of the last year?

I am confident that, given the progress we have made throughout the last year, each of these questions can be answered positively, carried forward by the political will and determination of the Member States and the European institutions to deliver.

I will continue to devote my efforts to developing that role, and in ensuring that we can make a difference. The post of High Representative is not about creating a new power centre. Nor need it complicate relations between the institutions. The post fills an institutional vacuum, and sets in motion policies and activities in areas where the EU was previously either inactive, or irrelevant as an actor.

My aim is to give added value to what exists already, and to give greater focus to the EU's external policy. I assist the Presidency and the Council in working for greater coherence and in ensuring that increasingly we speak with one voice. That includes making sure that ESDP becomes a reality. I will also be working on the very many foreign policy challenges

which the Union is likely to face over the next few years, some of which I have outlined above.

The European Union was founded by those who sought peace and reconciliation. We must continue to promote these values and principles in our relations with the rest of the world. This can only be a joint undertaking. It requires both commitment and the means to act. I am confident that we can have both. In doing so, we can play our part in living up to the original vision of Europe's founding fathers.

## **31 Capabilities Commitment Conference Brussels, 20-21 November 2000**

*As foreseen in Sntra, in order to meet the Headline Goal, a Capabilities Pledging Conference, for EU member states to make forces, assets and capabilities available to the EU, was planned for the end of 2000. 'Preparatory work' was entrusted to a 'Headline Goal Task Force (HTF), created at Feira. Where EU-NATO relations and cooperation were addressed, the HTF was reinforced by NATO experts, the so-called 'HTF+'. A first overview of available, expected and required forces and assets was made in July 2000, by means of a (confidential) Helsinki Headline Catalogue. The Catalogue was updated in mid-September 2000 and the final version was discussed at the Capabilities Commitment Conference (CCC) on 20-21 November 2000. We reproduce below the Declaration that followed the CCC and the opening statement by M. Alain Richard, on behalf of the EU Presidency.*

### **DECLARATION**

1. Since the Cologne European Council in June 1999, and in particular thanks to the work carried out by the Finnish and Portuguese Presidencies, it has been a priority of the Union to develop and introduce the civil and military resources and capabilities required to enable the Union to take and implement decisions on the full range of conflict-prevention and crisis-management missions defined in the Treaty on European Union ('Petersberg tasks'<sup>1</sup>). The Union has in this respect highlighted its determination to develop an autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises. For that purpose, Member States have decided to develop more effective military capabilities. This process, without unnecessary duplication, does not involve the establishment of a European army. These developments are an integral part of strengthening the Common Foreign and Security Policy. The Union will thus be able to make a greater contribution to international security in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter, the OSCE Charter and the Helsinki Final Act. The Union recognises the primary responsibility of the United Nations Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

2. In the field of military capabilities, which will complement the other instruments available to the Union, at the Helsinki European Council in December 1999 the Member States set themselves the headline goal of being able, by 2003, to deploy within 60 days and sustain for at least one year forces up to corps level (60,000 persons). These forces should be militarily self-sustaining with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, other combat support services and additionally, as appropriate, air and naval elements.

In Helsinki the Member States also decided rapidly to develop collective capability goals, particularly in the field of command and control, intelligence and strategic transport. At the Feira European Council in June 2000 the Union also encouraged the countries which have

applied for membership of the EU and the non-EU European members of NATO to contribute to improving Europe's capabilities. The work conducted since the Feira European Council has enabled the Union to define the variety of measures needed successfully to carry out the full range of Petersberg tasks, including the most demanding among these. It has made it possible to specify the Union's needs in terms of the military capability and forces required to attain the headline goal. The needs identified are outlined in a capability catalogue. As agreed at the Feira European Council, NATO's military expertise has helped in drawing up this catalogue.

3. On 20 November 2000 in Brussels the Member States took part in a Capabilities Commitment Conference, making it possible to draw together the specific national commitments corresponding to the military capability goals set by the Helsinki European Council.<sup>2</sup> The conference also made it possible to identify a number of areas in which efforts will be made in upgrading existing assets, investment, development and coordination so as gradually to acquire or enhance the capabilities required for autonomous EU action. The Member States announced their initial commitments in this respect.

This conference constitutes the first stage of a demanding process of reinforcing military capabilities for crisis management by the Union with the purpose being to achieve the headline goal set by 2003 but continuing beyond that date in order to achieve the collective capability goals. At the Helsinki European Council the Member States had also decided rapidly to identify the collective capability goals in the field of command and control, intelligence and strategic transport, and had welcomed decisions of that nature already announced by certain Member States: – to develop and coordinate monitoring and early warning military means; – to open existing joint national headquarters to officers coming from other Member States; – to reinforce the rapid reaction capabilities of existing European multinational forces; – to prepare the establishment of a European air transport command; – to increase the number of readily deployable troops; – and to enhance strategic sea lift capacity. This effort will continue. It remains essential to the credibility and effectiveness of the European security and defence policy that the Union's military capabilities for crisis management be reinforced so that the Union is in a position to intervene with or without recourse to NATO assets.

4. At the Capabilities Commitment Conference, in accordance with the decisions taken at the Helsinki and Feira European Councils, the Member States committed themselves, on a voluntary basis, to making national contributions corresponding to the rapid reaction capabilities identified to attain the headline goal. These commitments have been set out in a catalogue known as the 'Force Catalogue'. Analysis of this catalogue confirms that by 2003, in keeping with the headline goal established in Helsinki, the Union will be able to carry out the full range of Petersberg tasks, but that certain capabilities need to be improved both in quantitative and qualitative terms in order to maximise the capabilities available to the Union. In this respect, Ministers reaffirmed their commitment fully to achieve the goals identified at the Helsinki European Council. To that end, they will aim to identify as soon as possible the complementary initiatives which they may implement, either on a national basis or in cooperation with partners, to respond to the needs identified. These efforts will be in addition to the contributions already identified. For the countries concerned, their efforts here and those they devote to the NATO Defence Capabilities Initiative will be mutually reinforcing.

A) Concerning forces

In quantitative terms, the voluntary contributions announced by Member States make it possible to achieve in full the headline goal established in Helsinki (60 000 persons available for deployment within 60 days for a mission of at least a year). These contributions, set out in the 'Force Catalogue', constitute a pool of more than 100 000 persons and approximately 400 combat aircraft and 100 vessels, making it possible fully to satisfy the needs identified to carry out the different types of crisis management missions within the headline goal.

By 2003, once the appropriate European Union political and military bodies are in a position to exercise political control and strategic management of EU-led operations, under the authority of the Council, the Union will gradually be able to undertake Petersberg tasks in line with its increasing military capabilities. The need to further improve the availability, deployability, sustainability and interoperability of forces has, however, been identified if the requirements of the most demanding Petersberg tasks are to be fully satisfied. Efforts also need to be made in specific areas such as military equipment, including weapons and munitions, support services, including medical services, prevention of operational risks and protection of forces.

B) Concerning strategic capabilities

As regards command, control and communications, the Member States offered a satisfactory number of national or multinational headquarters at strategic, operational, force and component levels. These offers will have to be evaluated further in qualitative terms so that the Union can, in addition to possible recourse to NATO capabilities, have the best possible command and control resources at its disposal. The Union pointed out the importance it attaches to the speedy conclusion of ongoing talks on access to NATO capabilities and assets. The European Union Military Staff, which will acquire an initial operating capability in the course of 2001, will bolster the European Union's collective early warning capability and will provide it with a predecisional situation assessment and strategic planning capability.

In regard to intelligence, apart from the image interpretation capabilities of the Torrejon Satellite Centre, Member States offered a number of resources which can contribute to the analysis and situation monitoring capability of the Union. Nevertheless, they noted that serious efforts would be necessary in this area in order for the Union to have more strategic intelligence at its disposal in the future.

As regards the strategic air and naval transport capabilities at the Union's disposal, improvements are necessary to guarantee that the Union is able to respond, in any scenario, to the requirements of a demanding operation at the top of the Petersberg range, as defined in Helsinki.

5. In accordance with the decisions of the Helsinki and Feira European Councils on collective capability goals, the Member States also committed themselves to medium and long-term efforts in order to improve both their operational and their strategic capabilities still further. The Member States committed themselves, particularly in the framework of the

reforms being implemented in their armed forces, to continue taking steps to strengthen their own capabilities and carrying out existing or planned projects implementing multinational solutions, including in the field of pooling resources.

These projects as a whole relate to:

- improving the performance of European forces in respect of the availability, deployability, sustainability and interoperability of those forces;
- developing ‘strategic’ capabilities: strategic mobility to deliver the forces rapidly to the field of operations; headquarters to command and control the forces and the associated information and communication system; means of providing the forces with intelligence information;
- strengthening essential operational capabilities in the framework of a crisis-management operation; areas which were identified in this context were: resources for search and rescue in operational conditions, means of defence against ground-to-ground missiles, precision weapons, logistic support, simulation tools.

The restructuring of the European defence industries taking place in certain Member States was a positive factor in this. It encouraged the development of European capabilities. By way of example, the Member States concerned cited the work they are engaged in on a number of vital projects which would contribute to bolstering the capabilities at the Union’s disposal: Future Large Aircraft (Airbus A 400M), maritime transport vessels, Troop Transport Helicopters (NH 90). Some Member States also announced their intention to continue their efforts to acquire equipment to improve the safety and efficiency of military action. Some undertook to improve the Union’s guaranteed access to satellite imaging, thanks in particular to the development of new optical and radar satellite equipment (Helios II, SAR Lupe and Cosmos Skymed).

6. In order to ensure continuing European action to strengthen capabilities, the Member States agreed on the importance of defining an evaluation mechanism enabling follow-up and progress towards the realisation of the commitments made with a view to achieving the headline goal, in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

The mechanism, the broad outline of which will be approved at the Nice European Council, will provide the Union with an assessment and follow-up mechanism for its goals (based on the HTF - Headline Goal Task Force) on the basis of a consultation method between the Member States. In order to avoid unnecessary duplication, it will, for the Member States concerned, rely on technical data emanating from existing NATO mechanisms such as the Defence Planning Process and the Planning and Review Process (PARP). Recourse to these sources would be had, with the support of the EU Military Staff (EUMS), via consultations between experts in a working group set up on the same model as that which operated for the drawing up of the capabilities catalogue (HTF Plus). In addition, exchange of information and transparency would be appropriately ensured between the Union and NATO by the Working Group on Capabilities set up between the two organisations, which would take steps to ensure the coherent development of EU and NATO capabilities where they overlap (in particular those arising from the goals set out at the Helsinki European Council and from the NATO Defence Capabilities Initiative).

This mechanism would be based on the following principles:

- (a) preservation of the Union's autonomy in decision making, in particular in the definition, evaluation, monitoring and follow-up of capability goals;
- (b) recognition of the political and voluntary nature of the commitments made, which implies that the Member States are responsible for any adjustment of the commitments in the light of the evaluation made;
- (c) transparency, simplicity and clarity, in order among other things to enable comparisons to be made between the commitments of the various Member States;
- (d) a continuous and regular evaluation of progress made, on the basis of reports enabling ministers to take the appropriate decisions;
- (e) the flexibility necessary to adapt the commitments to newly identified needs.

Regarding relations with NATO:

The arrangements concerning transparency, cooperation and dialogue between the Union and NATO should be set out in the document on permanent arrangements between the Union and NATO. The evaluation mechanism will take account of the following additional principles:

- (f) the need, for the countries concerned, to ensure the compatibility of the commitments taken on in the EU framework with the force goals accepted in the framework of the NATO Defence Planning Process or the PARP;
- (g) the need for mutual reinforcement of the Union's capability goals and those arising, for the countries concerned, from the Defence Capabilities Initiative;
- (h) the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of procedures and of information requested.

Concerning relations with third countries:

- (i) the mechanism will ensure that the contributions of European States which are members of NATO but not part of the EU, and of the applicant countries, are taken into account, in order to enable an evaluation to be made of their complementary commitments which contribute to the improvement of European capabilities, and to facilitate their possible participation in EU-led operations in accordance with the Helsinki and Feira decisions.

The examination of the work carried out within the Union will benefit from the support of EUMS, in the framework of its mandate, and will be the subject of reports to the Council.

The Member States welcomed the intentions expressed with a view to the ministerial meetings on 21 November 2000 by the countries applying for membership of the EU and the non-EU European NATO Members in reply to the invitation made to them at the Feira European Council to make their contribution, in the form of complementary commitments, to improving European capabilities.

Contributions received at the ministerial meetings on 21 November 2000 will extend the range of capabilities available for EU-led operations, thus enabling the Union's intervention

capability to be strengthened in the manner most appropriate to the circumstances. They would be welcomed as significant additional contributions to those capabilities offered by the Member States. In this context, the Member States signalled their agreement for those contributions to be evaluated, in liaison with the States concerned, according to the same criteria as those applied to the Member States.

<sup>1</sup> The Petersberg tasks include humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking. (Article 17(2) TEU).

<sup>2</sup> Denmark drew attention to Protocol No 5 annexed to the Treaty of Amsterdam.

**CAPABILITIES COMMITMENT CONFERENCE  
BRUSSELS, 20-21 NOVEMBER 2000  
OPENING SPEECH BY M. ALAIN RICHARD,  
FRENCH MINISTER OF DEFENCE**

Mes chers collègues, mon cher Javier,

Je voudrais vous dire ma satisfaction d'ouvrir notre réunion et de nous voir réunis aujourd'hui en conférence d'engagement des capacités.

Nous avons formé le projet il y a près de neuf mois à Sintra de tenir une telle conférence avant la fin de l'année, afin de mettre l'Union en mesure de conduire des missions de gestion de crise. Nous y sommes aujourd'hui. Nous pouvons d'ores et déjà nous réjouir d'avoir tenu le rythme de travail et les échéances que nous nous étions fixés. Cela a représenté une somme d'efforts considérables : il faut en remercier tous ceux qui y ont participé.

La journée et demie et les multiples échanges que nous allons consacrer aux engagements de capacités montrent l'importance de l'étape que nous marquons aujourd'hui. Les résultats de notre conférence, consignés dans la déclaration que nous allons préparer, seront discutés cet après-midi avec nos collègues des Affaires étrangères. Demain, nous prendrons note des offres de contributions complémentaires qui seront présentées par nos homologues des '15' et des '6'. Enfin, nous préparons aujourd'hui, par l'étape décisive de notre conférence d'engagement, la prochaine échéance sur notre 'tableau de marche': le sommet de Nice, dans à peine trois semaines. Notre déclaration sera annexée au rapport du Conseil européen.

Il s'agira pour nos chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement de constater, sur la base des engagements que nous allons souscrire, que l'UE sera en mesure en 2003, et progressivement d'ici là, d'agir dans le cadre institutionnel qu'ils devraient agréer par ailleurs. Ils s'engageront aussi à mettre en œuvre les projets que nous avons préparés. Ne nous leurrions pas en effet. Cette étape que je souligne n'est que la première d'un processus d'adaptation de nos capacités militaires qui durera. Nous ne nous engageons pas seulement aujourd'hui à tenir à la disposition de l'Union européenne des moyens que nos capitales décideront d'engager, au titre d'une éventuelle opération de gestion de crise, mais nous nous engageons à poursuivre les efforts nécessaires au renforcement de nos capacités dans différents domaines, d'ici 2003 et même après 2003.

Je voudrais d'abord rappeler que cette conférence d'engagement de capacités est rendue possible par la qualité et l'intensité des travaux qui ont débuté sous la Présidence portugaise, et se sont poursuivis depuis.

La Présidence française avait été invitée par le Conseil européen de Feira à présenter un rapport sur, je cite, 'l'élaboration de l'objectif global et des objectifs collectifs en termes de capacités arrêté à Helsinki, y compris en ce qui concerne les résultats de la conférence d'offres d'engagement en matière de capacités, conférence qui doit être organisée avant le Conseil de Nice'.

Nous avons fait de cet objectif l'axe principal de notre Présidence. Les efforts déployés par chacun des Etats membres pour y parvenir montrent que vous en avez également fait une priorité. Je vous en remercie.

Je crois que cette priorité reflète bien l'importance fondamentale accordée dans notre démarche, depuis Cologne, à la dimension capacitaire. Nous avons su, aux côtés de nos collègues des Affaires étrangères, travailler à la dimension institutionnelle de la construction de l'Europe de la Défense pour garantir son autonomie d'évaluation et de décision. L'efficacité et la crédibilité de ces structures seront aussi, pour nous qui portons une part importante de la responsabilité d'engagement de militaires dans des situations à risques, la condition de la confiance des contributeurs de troupes. Mais c'est l'aspect capacitaire qui donne à l'ensemble de notre démarche son dynamisme et son caractère pragmatique.

Nous avons pris les moyens de traduire en termes concrets, techniques et militaires les objectifs de capacités fixés au niveau politique à Helsinki. Nous avons su également, chacun d'entre nous, déterminer la contribution précise que nous apportons à la force européenne de réaction rapide. De même, nous avons identifié les efforts qui demeurent nécessaires pour atteindre tous les objectifs fixés pour 2003, et au-delà pour mettre l'Union en mesure d'intervenir dans la gestion des crises sur l'ensemble du spectre de Petersberg.

Les représentants de nos ministères respectifs, sous l'impulsion des chefs d'état-major de nos 15 pays ont consacré tous leurs efforts à ces travaux. C'est la première fois, comme cela avait été relevé à Ecouen, que les représentants militaires de nos quinze nations faisaient ensemble un travail de planification de forces. Ils ont ainsi établi et testé entre eux des procédures et des habitudes de travail nouvelles.

La formation ad hoc, issue de l'organe militaire intérimaire et complétée par des experts du noyau d'état-major : la 'Headline Goal Task Force'; ou HTF, s'est réunie de façon quasi permanente depuis le début du mois de juillet. Les experts de l'UE ont été rejoints, chaque fois que nécessaire (douze réunions ont eu lieu à ce jour), par des experts de l'OTAN, en format dit 'HTF+', afin que ces derniers présentent des analyses techniques spécifiques complémentaires. La coopération avec l'OTAN s'est avérée exemplaire. Les Européens ont su mener à bout le travail technique qui leur incombait pour la mise en œuvre de leurs objectifs. Ils ont su faire 'bon usage', comme le disait Javier à Ecouen, des contributions complémentaires de très grande qualité fournies par l'OTAN.

Nous disposons donc de notre catalogue de capacités. Il a été établi sans préjuger des solutions qui pourraient être requises pour combler les insuffisances et les lacunes qui apparaîtraient à la confrontation de nos demandes et de nos offres. Il était en effet primordial pour la crédibilité et l'efficacité de la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense que l'Union européenne se fixe comme objectif d'être en mesure d'intervenir avec ou sans recours aux moyens de l'OTAN. Le catalogue de capacités a défini des critères qualitatifs, notamment en terme de disponibilité. Celle-ci est indispensable pour assurer des missions humanitaires ou d'évacuation de ressortissants que nous nous sommes fixées. Il est de même de la capacité des troupes à durer, par exemple dans le cadre d'opérations de maintien de la paix, comme nous le démontrent nos engagements dans les Balkans. Nous avons déjà pris note des grandes lignes de ce catalogue à Ecouen et avons demandé que

soit approfondi le travail réalisé dans le domaine des capacités de commandement, de contrôle, de renseignement et de transport stratégique. Ce travail complémentaire a été réalisé et validé le 10 novembre par les chefs d'état-major des armées. Nous devons certes continuer à le faire vivre au gré des évolutions techniques et tactiques et de nos choix politiques. A ce jour, il reflète une expression globale, cohérente et détaillée de nos besoins.

C'est en référence à ce catalogue que les Etats membres ont déterminé et affiné leur contribution. En matière de forces, le travail de recensement des contributions des Etats membres aboutit à la constitution de ce qu'il est convenu d'appeler un 'réservoir' pour les opérations menées par l'UE, qui regroupe de l'ordre de 100 000 hommes, 400 avions et 100 bâtiments.

La Présidence a tenu à ce que ces chiffres figurent dans la déclaration. Soyons bien clairs : il n'y a aucune remise en cause, explicite ou implicite, de l'objectif fixé à Helsinki. L'objectif global reste d'être en mesure de déployer, pour la composante terrestre d'une force de réaction rapide, un corps d'armée d'un effectif maximum de 60 000 hommes. Simplement, les experts militaires de l'UE ont estimé, comme c'est logique, que pour disposer de la palette de moyens apte à couvrir chacun des scénarios envisagés, y compris dans les hypothèses de simultanéité, le besoin en militaires s'élevait à plus de 60 000 hommes. Il nous faut donc être transparents sur ce point. L'objectif de 60 000 hommes fixé par nos chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement est ambitieux, sa mise en œuvre l'est aussi.

Dans le même souci de crédibilité et de transparence, il nous faut reconnaître que des améliorations, notamment en matière de disponibilité, de déployabilité, de capacité à durer et d'interopérabilité des forces devront être apportées pour être en mesure de réaliser pleinement l'objectif fixé pour 2003, notamment dans le cas des missions de Petersberg les plus exigeantes.

Nous devons aussi penser au renforcement des domaines où nous avons collectivement des déficiences significatives. Pour opérer avec l'efficacité et la sécurité voulues, les Européens chercheront à améliorer leurs moyens dans des domaines essentiels tels que les moyens de recherche et de sauvetage, les moyens de défense contre les missiles sol-sol, les munitions de précision, le soutien logistique et les outils de simulation. Il va nous falloir penser aussi à agir loin de nos territoires, souvent en environnement très dégradé, si la défense de nos intérêts de sécurité ou le soutien aux décisions des Nations Unies l'exigent.

Des efforts sérieux sont aussi nécessaires en matière de capacités stratégiques, pour nous rendre réellement capables d'intervenir sur l'ensemble du spectre de Petersberg, avec ou sans les moyens de l'OTAN. En matière de capacités de commandement, il conviendra, en particulier, de vérifier l'interopérabilité de nos systèmes nationaux et d'assurer que nous disposerons, dans toutes les hypothèses, des états-majors nécessaires aux différents niveaux de commandement et des moyens de communication idoines. Pour le renseignement, certains pays de l'Union européenne sont, dès à présent, en mesure de réaliser seuls de complexes opérations de paix, le Royaume-Uni en Sierra Leone nous en a donné le plus récent exemple, il convient de capitaliser sur ces moyens et de chercher, comme nous y appelons les objectifs collectifs de capacités d'Helsinki, à disposer des outils de recueil, d'analyse et de diffusion voulus. Enfin, en matière de capacités de transport stratégique, des efforts d'investissement s'imposent pour que nous soyons en mesure, dans toutes les

circonstances, de satisfaire l'objectif de délai fixé à Helsinki et donc de pouvoir disposer rapidement, lorsque cela s'impose, d'un volume de forces significatif sur un théâtre de crise pour y influencer la situation conformément à nos vues.

Des efforts restent à effectuer pour réaliser pleinement en 2003 et au-delà l'objectif global et mettre en œuvre les objectifs collectifs de capacités fixés à Helsinki. Plusieurs Etats membres ont communiqué à la Présidence un répertoire des projets et des pistes de réflexion qu'ils s'engagent à étudier. Il nous appartient aujourd'hui d'étoffer la liste des initiatives nationales ou multinationales qui garantiront que nous atteindrons les objectifs fixés. A ce sujet, je tiens à préciser que pour ceux d'entre nous qui sont, en parallèle, engagés dans l'exercice de l'OTAN d'amélioration des capacités de défense, il y a, certes, cohérence et compatibilité entre les objectifs fixés sans que ces deux processus puissent être confondus ou que les efforts à mener pour l'un puisse suffire à satisfaire l'autre. Soyons clairs : nous nous sommes donné pour ambition d'agir au sein de l'Union européenne en ayant ou non recours aux moyens de l'Alliance, le champ d'application de nos projets est donc forcément plus large que celui de la DCI (Defence Capabilities Initiative).

Voilà, mes chers collègues ce que je souhaitais vous dire en introduction de nos discussions. Je laisse la parole à Javier, puis, nous engagerons le tour de table.

## ***32 European Council Nice, 7, 8 and 9 December 2000***

### **PRESIDENCY CONCLUSIONS**

(...)

#### **IV. COMMON EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY**

13. The European Council approves the Presidency report, plus annexes, on the European security and defence policy.

14. The European Council calls on the next Presidency, together with the Secretary-General/High Representative, to take forward work within the General Affairs Council, in accordance with the tasks assigned in the Presidency report. The objective is that the European Union should quickly be made operational in this area. A decision to that end will be taken by the European Council as soon as possible in 2001 and no later than at its meeting in Laeken. The incoming Swedish Presidency is requested to report to the European Council in Göteborg on all of these matters.

(...)

### **ANNEX VI**

#### **PRESIDENCY REPORT ON THE EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY**

##### **Introduction**

The aim of the efforts made since the Cologne, Helsinki and Feira European Councils is to give the European Union the means of playing its role fully on the international stage and of assuming its responsibilities in the face of crises by adding to the range of instruments already at its disposal an autonomous capacity to take decisions and action in the security and defence field. In response to crises, the Union's particular characteristic is its capacity to mobilise a vast range of both civilian and military means and instruments, thus giving it an overall crisis-management and conflict-prevention capability in support of the objectives of the Common Foreign and Security Policy.

In developing this autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises, the European Union will be able to carry out the full range of Petersberg tasks as defined in the Treaty on European Union: humanitarian and rescue tasks, peace-keeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking. This does not involve the establishment of a European army. The commitment of national resources

by Member States to such operations will be based on their sovereign decisions. As regards the Member States concerned, NATO remains the basis of the collective defence of its members and will continue to play an important role in crisis management. The development of the ESDP will contribute to the vitality of a renewed Transatlantic link. This development will also lead to a genuine strategic partnership between the EU and NATO in the management of crises with due regard for the two organisations' decision-making autonomy.

The development of the European Security and Defence Policy strengthens the Union's contribution to international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter. The European Union recognises the primary responsibility of the United Nations Security Council for maintaining peace and international security.

The value of cooperation between the Union and the United Nations, as well as with the OSCE and the Council of Europe, as the Union develops its crisis-management and conflict-prevention capabilities has been emphasised in the context of the work carried out during the Presidency. In this context, the Secretary-General of the United Nations has also submitted a proposal for closer cooperation between the EU and the UN. In this respect the European Union welcomes the recent contacts between the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Secretary-General/High Representative, the Presidency and the EU Troika.

The development of European crisis-management capabilities increases the range of instruments for responding to crises available to the international community. The efforts made will enable Europeans in particular to respond more effectively and more coherently to requests from leading organisations such as the UN or the OSCE. This development is an integral part of strengthening the Common Foreign and Security Policy.

In connection with the submission of this report, the Presidency noted that Denmark drew attention to Protocol No 5 annexed to the Treaty of Amsterdam on the position of Denmark.

## **I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF MILITARY CAPABILITIES AND THE STRENGTHENING OF CIVIL CRISIS MANAGEMENT CAPABILITIES**

### **(1) Elaboration of the headline goal and of the military capability goals established in Helsinki**

The main challenge for Member States is to develop military capabilities which can be put at the disposal of the EU for crisis management purposes. The aim is to mobilise Member States' efforts in this sphere.

The Commitment Conference, which was held in Brussels on 20 November, demonstrated the Europeans' capability to satisfy fully, by their contributions in numerical terms, the needs identified to carry out the different types of crisis-management missions within the headline goal agreed in Helsinki.

At this Conference the Member States also signalled their determination to make the necessary efforts to improve their operational capabilities further in order to carry out in full the most demanding of the Petersberg tasks, in particular as regards availability,

deployability, sustainability and interoperability. As for their collective goals, the Member States agreed to pursue their efforts in the area of command and control, intelligence and strategic air and naval transport capabilities.

The Council approved the military capabilities commitment declaration published at the close of its meeting on 20 November and the definition of a 'mechanism for evaluating military capabilities'.

Its aim is to enable the EU to ensure follow up and to facilitate progress towards the realisation of the commitments made with a view to achieving the headline goal, to review its aims in the light of changed circumstances and to contribute as well to ensuring compatibility of the commitments undertaken in the EU framework and, for the countries concerned, the goals accepted in the framework of NATO planning or the Planning and Review Process of the Partnership for Peace. These documents are annexed hereto.

The ministerial meetings with the non-EU European NATO members and other countries which are candidates for accession in the follow-up to the Capabilities Commitment Conference made it possible to draw together pledges of additional contributions from these States with a view to their participation in EU-led operations. The Member States welcome these contributions, which increase and bolster the capabilities available for EU-led crisis-management operations.

## **(2) Definition and implementation of EU capabilities in the civilian aspects of crisis management**

The European Union has continued developing civilian capabilities in the four priority areas established by the Feira European Council: police, strengthening of the rule of law, strengthening civilian administration and civil protection. Discussions have focused on the implementation of the specific goal regarding police capabilities, whereby Member States should be able to provide 5 000 officers by 2003 for international missions, 1 000 of whom could be deployed within less than 30 days, and on the definition of specific goals in connection with strengthening the rule of law. The proceedings of the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management enabled considerable progress to be made in elaborating the police objective. Methods were devised and ideas for deployment were developed. It is now necessary to flesh out Member States' commitments by calling for voluntary contributions. Moreover, the need to equip the General Secretariat of the Council with expertise in police matters on a permanent basis has been identified.

Discussions on strengthening the rule of law, the second priority identified in Feira, will make it possible to establish specific objectives in this area compatible with the development of European Union police capabilities. At the seminar organised in Brussels on 25 October it was possible to determine initial views and guidelines for further work within the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management. In connection with these discussions, a database to record Member States' capabilities regarding the re-establishment of a judicial and penal system was set up within the General Secretariat of the Council.

Discussions have been initiated on cooperation with the UN, the OSCE and the Council of Europe. They will need to be followed up.

The contribution of non-EU Member States to the EU's civilian crisis management operations, in particular in EU police missions, will be studied in a positive spirit, in accordance with procedures to be determined.

A document setting out the main aspects of the work on the civilian aspects of crisis management is annexed hereto.

## **II. ESTABLISHMENT OF PERMANENT POLITICAL AND MILITARY STRUCTURES**

The process initiated since the Cologne European Council is intended to enable the European Union to assume its responsibilities for crisis management as a whole. If it is to play fully its role on the international stage, the EU must be in a position to have at its disposal the whole range of instruments required for a global approach to crisis management, and in particular:

- develop a coherent European approach to crisis management and conflict prevention;
- ensure synergy between the civilian and military aspects of crisis management;
- cover the full range of Petersberg tasks.

To enable the European Union fully to assume its responsibilities, the European Council has decided to establish the following permanent political and military bodies, which should be made ready to start their work:

- the Political and Security Committee;
- the Military Committee of the European Union;
- the Military Staff of the European Union.

The documents detailing the composition, competences and operation of these bodies are annexed hereto.

The build-up of the resources needed for the operation of such bodies, in particular the Military Staff, will have to take place without delay.

The development of a mechanism to ensure synergy between civilian and military instruments is essential if the civilian and military aspects of crisis management are to be efficient and consistent.

To this end, a document (13957/1/00 REV 1 + COR 1) constituting a reference framework has been submitted by the Secretary-General/High Representative and has been noted with interest. Another document, concerning crisis management procedures, including an Annex on the European Union Situation Centre, has also been circulated by the General Secretariat of the Council. This document will be the subject of a detailed study, followed by tests and exercises so that it can be adapted in the light of experience, and subsequently approved.

In this crisis management mechanism the PSC has a central role to play in the definition of and follow-up to the EU response to a crisis. The Secretary General/High Representative,

who may chair the PSC, plays an important role in providing impetus. He also contributes to the effectiveness and visibility of the Union's action and policy.

### **III. ARRANGEMENTS WHICH WILL PERMIT IN THE EU'S MILITARY CRISIS MANAGEMENT THE CONSULTATION AND PARTICIPATION OF NON-EU EUROPEAN NATO MEMBERS AND OTHER COUNTRIES WHICH ARE CANDIDATES FOR ACCESSION TO THE EU**

The EU project is open. If there is to be efficient crisis management, the European Union wishes to receive contributions from the non-EU European NATO members and other countries which are candidates for accession to the EU, in particular those which have the determination and capability to commit considerable resources to participate in the Petersberg tasks. This openness must, of course, respect the principle of the European Union's decision-making autonomy.

In implementing the arrangements agreed in Feira, the Presidency has initiated and developed a regular and substantive dialogue on the ESDP with the countries concerned. Ministerial meetings were thus held on 21 November as a follow-up to the Capacities Commitment Conference. This dialogue has also been developed at the level of the IPSC, which held meetings in the inclusive structure on 27 July, 2 October and 17 November, and through meetings comprising military experts to prepare non-member states' contributions to the capability goals. These consultations were in addition to the meetings held in connection with the Union's political dialogue with its partners.

The document on 'arrangements for non-EU European NATO members and other countries which are candidates for accession to the EU' is annexed hereto. In accordance with the undertakings given, these arrangements will make it possible to consult such countries on a regular basis when there is no crisis and to associate them to the greatest possible extent in EU-led military operations in times of crisis.

### **IV. PERMANENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR EU-NATO CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION**

On the basis of the decisions taken by the Feira European Council and in close consultation with NATO, the European Union has, during the French Presidency, continued preparations for establishing a permanent and effective relationship between the two organisations. The attached documents on the principles for consultation, cooperation and transparency with NATO and the modalities for EU access to NATO assets and capabilities (Berlin plus) constitute the EU's contribution to work on future arrangements between the two organisations. The EU hopes for a favourable reaction from NATO so that these arrangements can be implemented on a mutually satisfactory basis.

Consultations and cooperation between the two organisations will be developed in matters of security, defence and crisis management of common interest in order to make possible the most appropriate military response to a given crisis and ensure effective crisis management, while fully respecting the decision-making autonomy of NATO and the EU.

The EU reiterates the importance which it attaches to being able, when necessary, to make use of the assured access to NATO's planning capabilities and to the presumption of availability of NATO's assets and capabilities as envisaged in the Communiqué of the Washington Summit. The European Union will call on NATO for operational planning of any operation using NATO assets and capabilities. When the Union examines options with a view to an operation, the establishing of its strategic military options can involve a contribution by NATO's planning capabilities.

The EU would stress the importance of appropriate provisions giving those who so wish access to Alliance structures in order, when necessary, to facilitate effective participation by all Member States in EU-led operations which make use of NATO assets and capabilities.

The meetings between the Interim Political and Security Committee and the North Atlantic Council on 19 September and 9 November marked a decisive stage in the development of a relationship of confidence between the EU and NATO. The discussions by the ad hoc working parties set up at Feira and the working party of experts on military capabilities (HTF plus) have led to progress in transparency and cooperation between the two organisations. The Interim Security Agreement concluded by the two Secretaries-General has encouraged the development of these relations by authorising initial exchanges of documents and opened the way to a definitive arrangement between the European Union and NATO.

#### **V. INCLUSION IN THE EU OF THE APPROPRIATE FUNCTIONS OF THE WEU**

The European Union has confirmed its intention of itself assuming the crisis-management function of the WEU. It took note in this context of the measures adopted by the WEU Council of Ministers in Marseilles to enable the latter to take account of developments which have occurred in the EU.

The Council adopted the following decisions of principle on the inclusion of the appropriate functions of the WEU in the field of the Petersberg tasks:

- the setting up in the form of agencies of a Satellite Centre and an Institute for Security Studies which would incorporate the relevant features of the existing parallel WEU structures;
- the direct management by the EU of a police technical cooperation mission in Albania to take over from the Multinational Advisory Police Element in Albania, implementation of which had been entrusted to the WEU by the Council on the basis of Article 17 of the TEU. The Council took note of the assessment that the mine-clearance operation in Croatia will have achieved its objectives, in its current form in the WEU, upon expiry of its mandate.

The Council also agreed to enrich the Transatlantic dialogue by asking the ISS to undertake activities similar to those currently being conducted by the Transatlantic Forum, in accordance with modalities to be agreed which would enable all the States concerned to participate in these activities.

## **VI. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONSULTATION AND PARTICIPATION OF OTHER POTENTIAL PARTNERS**

In Feira, it was recalled that Russia, Ukraine, other European States with which the Union maintains political dialogue and other interested States such as Canada could be invited to participate in EU-led operations.

To that end, the Union proposes stepping up dialogue, cooperation and consultation on security and defence issues with the countries concerned within the framework of existing agreements on the basis of the following principles:

In the routine phase, the Union will conduct exchanges of information on questions relating to the ESDP and military crisis-management through meetings on this topic, which will normally be held once every six months by the PSC Troika. Additional meetings will be organised if the Council deems it necessary. In a crisis situation, when the possibility of a military crisis-management operation is being considered, such consultations conducted in Troika format or by the Secretary-General/High Representative will constitute the framework making it possible for exchanges of views and discussions on possible participation by potential partners to be held.

The European Union has already welcomed the interest shown by Canada. Consultations with Canada will be stepped up in times of crisis. Participation by Canada will be of particular importance in the case of EU operations drawing on NATO assets and capabilities. In this context, when the Union embarks on detailed examination of an option making use of NATO assets and capabilities, particular attention will be paid to consultation with Canada.

The countries participating in an operation may appoint liaison officers to Planning Staff and, together with all the EU members, attend the Committee of Contributors with the same rights and obligations as the other participating States as far as day-to-day management of the operation is concerned.

These initial principles are without prejudice to any specific consultation and/or participation mechanisms which may be concluded with some of the countries concerned. The EU has, for example, adopted with Russia a joint declaration on strengthening dialogue on political and security questions in Europe, providing in particular for specific consultations on security and defence issues.

## **VII. CONFLICT PREVENTION**

The European Councils in Cologne, Helsinki and Feira decided that the Union should fully assume its responsibilities in the sphere of conflict prevention. To that end, the Feira European Council invited the Secretary-General/High Representative and the Commission to submit to the Nice European Council concrete recommendations for improving the cohesion and effectiveness of action by the European Union in the field of conflict prevention.

The report was submitted to the European Council, which welcomed the concrete recommendations made by the Secretary-General/High Representative and the Commission and highlighted the need to continue these discussions.

#### **VIII. MANDATE FOR THE NEXT PRESIDENCY**

1. On the basis of the present report, the Swedish Presidency is invited, in association with the Secretary-General/High Representative, to continue work within the General Affairs Council on developing the Common Security and Defence Policy and to implement the measures necessary for the following:

(a) to achieve the objective of making the EU quickly operational. A decision to that end will be taken by the European Council as soon as possible in 2001 and no later than the European Council in Laeken.

To that end, the Swedish Presidency is invited to:

- take the measures necessary for implementation and validation of the crisis-management mechanisms, including structures and procedures;
- continue discussions with NATO with a view to establishing arrangements between the EU and NATO;
- report back to the European Council in Gothenburg.

(b) the follow-up of the military capabilities objectives and the commitments in the Declaration of Military Capabilities Commitment, in particular by defining the details of the follow-up and evaluation mechanism, which have been outlined in the document annexed to Annex I hereto;

(c) the continuation of the work begun on civilian aspects of crisis management, including the development of a capability for planning and conducting police operations and the request for voluntary contributions with respect to police, as well as the definition of specific objectives;

(d) the implementation of the decisions taken at the present European Council on permanent arrangements with non-EU European NATO members and other countries which are candidates for accession to the EU and the submission of proposals for the modalities of participation by third countries in the civilian aspects of crisis management;

(e) the implementation of the arrangements for the consultation and participation of other potential partners, the principles of which are laid down by this European Council;

(f) the setting up in the form of agencies within the EU of a ‘Satellite Centre’ (responsible for producing satellite and aerial images) and an ‘Institute for Security Studies’ which would incorporate the relevant features of the similar existing WEU structures;

(g) the identification of possible areas as well as modalities of cooperation between the European Union and the United Nations in crisis management;

(h) the definition of proposals for improving the cohesion and effectiveness of Union action in the sphere of conflict prevention.

2. The Swedish Presidency is invited to submit a report on these matters to the European Council in Gothenburg.

## **ANNEX I to ANNEX VI**

### **MILITARY CAPABILITIES COMMITMENT DECLARATION**

1. Since the Cologne European Council in June 1999, and in particular thanks to the work carried out by the Finnish and Portuguese Presidencies, it has been a priority of the Union to develop and introduce the civil and military resources and capabilities required to enable the Union to take and implement decisions on the full range of conflict-prevention and crisis-management missions defined in the Treaty on European Union ('Petersberg tasks'<sup>2</sup>). The Union has in this respect highlighted its determination to develop an autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises. For that purpose, Member States have decided to develop more effective military capabilities. This process, without unnecessary duplication, does not involve the establishment of a European army. These developments are an integral part of strengthening the Common Foreign and Security Policy. The Union will thus be able to make a greater contribution to international security in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter, the OSCE Charter and the Helsinki Final Act. The Union recognises the primary responsibility of the United Nations Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

2. In the field of military capabilities, which will complement the other instruments available to the Union, at the Helsinki European Council in December 1999 the Member States set themselves the headline goal of being able, by 2003, to deploy within 60 days and sustain for at least one year forces up to corps level (60,000 persons). These forces should be militarily self-sustaining with the necessary command, control and intelligence capabilities, logistics, other combat support services and additionally, as appropriate, air and naval elements.

In Helsinki the Member States also decided rapidly to develop collective capability goals, particularly in the field of command and control, intelligence and strategic transport. At the Feira European Council in June 2000 the Union also encouraged the countries which have applied for membership of the EU and the non-EU European members of NATO to contribute to improving Europe's capabilities. The work conducted since the Feira European Council has enabled the Union to define the variety of measures needed successfully to carry out the full range of Petersberg tasks, including the most demanding among these. It has made it possible to specify the Union's needs in terms of the military capability and forces required to attain the headline goal. The needs identified are outlined in a capability catalogue. As agreed at the Feira European Council, NATO's military expertise has helped in drawing up this catalogue.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Petersberg tasks include humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking. (Article 17(2) TEU).

3. On 20 November 2000 in Brussels the Member States took part in a Capabilities Commitment Conference, making it possible to draw together the specific national commitments corresponding to the military capability goals set by the Helsinki European Council.<sup>3</sup> The conference also made it possible to identify a number of areas in which efforts will be made in upgrading existing assets, investment, development and coordination so as gradually to acquire or enhance the capabilities required for autonomous EU action. The Member States announced their initial commitments in this respect.

This conference constitutes the first stage of a demanding process of reinforcing military capabilities for crisis management by the Union with the purpose being to achieve the headline goal set by 2003 but continuing beyond that date in order to achieve the collective capability goals. At the Helsinki European Council the Member States had also decided rapidly to identify the collective capability goals in the field of command and control, intelligence and strategic transport, and had welcomed decisions of that nature already announced by certain Member States: – to develop and coordinate monitoring and early warning military means; – to open existing joint national headquarters to officers coming from other Member States; – to reinforce the rapid reaction capabilities of existing European multinational forces; – to prepare the establishment of a European air transport command; – to increase the number of readily deployable troops; – and to enhance strategic sea lift capacity. This effort will continue. It remains essential to the credibility and effectiveness of the European security and defence policy that the Union's military capabilities for crisis management be reinforced so that the Union is in a position to intervene with or without recourse to NATO assets.

4. At the Capabilities Commitment Conference, in accordance with the decisions taken at the Helsinki and Feira European Councils, the Member States committed themselves, on a voluntary basis, to making national contributions corresponding to the rapid reaction capabilities identified to attain the headline goal. These commitments have been set out in a catalogue known as the 'Force Catalogue'. Analysis of this catalogue confirms that by 2003, in keeping with the headline goal established in Helsinki, the Union will be able to carry out the full range of Petersberg tasks, but that certain capabilities need to be improved both in quantitative and qualitative terms in order to maximise the capabilities available to the Union. In this respect, Ministers reaffirmed their commitment fully to achieve the goals identified at the Helsinki European Council. To that end, they will aim to identify as soon as possible the complementary initiatives which they may implement, either on a national basis or in cooperation with partners, to respond to the needs identified. These efforts will be in addition to the contributions already identified. For the countries concerned, their efforts here and those they devote to the NATO Defence Capabilities Initiative will be mutually reinforcing.

#### A) Concerning forces

In quantitative terms, the voluntary contributions announced by Member States make it possible to achieve in full the headline goal established in Helsinki (60 000 persons available for deployment within 60 days for a mission of at least a year). These contributions, set out in the 'Force Catalogue', constitute a pool of more than 100 000 persons and approximately 400 combat aircraft and 100 vessels, making it possible fully to

---

<sup>3</sup> Denmark recalled Protocol No 5 annexed to the Treaty of Amsterdam.

satisfy the needs identified to carry out the different types of crisis management missions within the headline goal.

By 2003, once the appropriate European Union political and military bodies are in a position to exercise political control and strategic management of EU-led operations, under the authority of the Council, the Union will gradually be able to undertake Petersberg tasks in line with its increasing military capabilities. The need to further improve the availability, deployability, sustainability and interoperability of forces has, however, been identified if the requirements of the most demanding Petersberg tasks are to be fully satisfied. Efforts also need to be made in specific areas such as military equipment, including weapons and munitions, support services, including medical services, prevention of operational risks and protection of forces.

#### B) Concerning strategic capabilities

As regards command, control and communications, the Member States offered a satisfactory number of national or multinational headquarters at strategic, operational, force and component levels. These offers will have to be evaluated further in qualitative terms so that the Union can, in addition to possible recourse to NATO capabilities, have the best possible command and control resources at its disposal. The Union pointed out the importance it attaches to the speedy conclusion of ongoing talks on access to NATO capabilities and assets. The European Union Military Staff, which will acquire an initial operating capability in the course of 2001, will bolster the European Union's collective early warning capability and will provide it with a predecisional situation assessment and strategic planning capability.

In regard to intelligence, apart from the image interpretation capabilities of the Torrejon Satellite Centre, Member States offered a number of resources which can contribute to the analysis and situation monitoring capability of the Union. Nevertheless, they noted that serious efforts would be necessary in this area in order for the Union to have more strategic intelligence at its disposal in the future.

As regards the strategic air and naval transport capabilities at the Union's disposal, improvements are necessary to guarantee that the Union is able to respond, in any scenario, to the requirements of a demanding operation at the top of the Petersberg range, as defined in Helsinki.

5. In accordance with the decisions of the Helsinki and Feira European Councils on collective capability goals, the Member States also committed themselves to medium and long-term efforts in order to improve both their operational and their strategic capabilities still further. The Member States committed themselves, particularly in the framework of the reforms being implemented in their armed forces, to continue taking steps to strengthen their own capabilities and carrying out existing or planned projects implementing multinational solutions, including in the field of pooling resources.

These projects as a whole relate to:

- improving the performance of European forces in respect of the availability, deployability, sustainability and interoperability of those forces;

- developing ‘strategic’ capabilities: strategic mobility to deliver the forces rapidly to the field of operations; headquarters to command and control the forces and the associated information and communication system; means of providing the forces with intelligence information;
- strengthening essential operational capabilities in the framework of a crisis-management operation; areas which were identified in this context were: resources for search and rescue in operational conditions, means of defence against ground-to-ground missiles, precision weapons, logistic support, simulation tools.

The restructuring of the European defence industries taking place in certain Member States was a positive factor in this. It encouraged the development of European capabilities. By way of example, the Member States concerned cited the work they are engaged in on a number of vital projects which would contribute to bolstering the capabilities at the Union’s disposal: Future Large Aircraft (Airbus A 400M), maritime transport vessels, Troop Transport Helicopters (NH 90). Some Member States also announced their intention to continue their efforts to acquire equipment to improve the safety and efficiency of military action. Some undertook to improve the Union’s guaranteed access to satellite imaging, thanks in particular to the development of new optical and radar satellite equipment (Helios II, SAR Lupe and Cosmos Skymed).

6. In order to ensure continuing European action to strengthen capabilities, the Member States agreed on the importance of defining an evaluation mechanism enabling follow-up and progress towards the realisation of the commitments made with a view to achieving the headline goal, in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

The mechanism, the broad outline of which will be approved at the Nice European Council, will provide the Union with an assessment and follow-up mechanism for its goals (based on the HTF - Headline Goal Task Force) on the basis of a consultation method between the Member States. In order to avoid unnecessary duplication, it will, for the Member States concerned, rely on technical data emanating from existing NATO mechanisms such as the Defence Planning Process and the Planning and Review Process (PARP). Recourse to these sources would be had, with the support of the EU Military Staff (EUMS), via consultations between experts in a working group set up on the same model as that which operated for the drawing up of the capabilities catalogue (HTF Plus). In addition, exchange of information and transparency would be appropriately ensured between the Union and NATO by the Working Group on Capabilities set up between the two organisations, which would take steps to ensure the coherent development of EU and NATO capabilities where they overlap (in particular those arising from the goals set out at the Helsinki European Council and from the NATO Defence Capabilities Initiative).

This mechanism would be based on the following principles:

- (a) preservation of the Union’s autonomy in decision making, in particular in the definition, evaluation, monitoring and follow-up of capability goals;
- (b) recognition of the political and voluntary nature of the commitments made, which implies that the Member States are responsible for any adjustment of the commitments in the light of the evaluation made;

- (c) transparency, simplicity and clarity, in order among other things to enable comparisons to be made between the commitments of the various Member States;
- (d) a continuous and regular evaluation of progress made, on the basis of reports enabling ministers to take the appropriate decisions;
- (e) the flexibility necessary to adapt the commitments to newly identified needs.

Regarding relations with NATO:

The arrangements concerning transparency, cooperation and dialogue between the Union and NATO should be set out in the document on permanent arrangements between the Union and NATO. The evaluation mechanism will take account of the following additional principles:

- (f) the need, for the countries concerned, to ensure the compatibility of the commitments taken on in the EU framework with the force goals accepted in the framework of the NATO Defence Planning Process or the PARP;
- (g) the need for mutual reinforcement of the Union's capability goals and those arising, for the countries concerned, from the Defence Capabilities Initiative;
- (h) the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of procedures and of information requested.

Concerning relations with third countries:

- (i) the mechanism will ensure that the contributions of European States which are members of NATO but not part of the EU, and of the applicant countries, are taken into account, in order to enable an evaluation to be made of their complementary commitments which contribute to the improvement of European capabilities, and to facilitate their possible participation in EU-led operations in accordance with the Helsinki and Feira decisions.

The examination of the work carried out within the Union will benefit from the support of EUMS, in the framework of its mandate, and will be the subject of reports to the Council.

The Member States welcomed the intentions expressed with a view to the ministerial meetings on 21 November 2000 by the countries applying for membership of the EU and the non-EU European NATO Members in reply to the invitation made to them at the Feira European Council to make their contribution, in the form of complementary commitments, to improving European capabilities.

Contributions received at the ministerial meetings on 21 November 2000 will extend the range of capabilities available for EU-led operations, thus enabling the Union's intervention capability to be strengthened in the manner most appropriate to the circumstances. They would be welcomed as significant additional contributions to those capabilities offered by the Member States. In this context, the Member States signalled their agreement for those contributions to be evaluated, in liaison with the States concerned, according to the same criteria as those applied to the Member States.

**Appendix to ANNEX I to ANNEX VI****ACHIEVEMENT OF THE HEADLINE GOAL  
REVIEW MECHANISM FOR MILITARY CAPABILITIES****INTRODUCTION**

1. The Helsinki European Council on 10 and 11 December 1999 decided to press ahead with the achievement of capability goals (a headline goal and collective capability goals in the fields of command and control, intelligence and strategic transport) in order to be able to carry out the full range of Petersberg tasks defined in the Amsterdam Treaty, including the most demanding among them.
2. The European Council also instructed the General Affairs Council (GAC) to elaborate the headline and capability goals, together with 'a method of consultation through which these goals can be met and maintained and through which national contributions reflecting Member States' political will and commitment towards these goals can be defined by each Member State, with a regular review of progress made.'
3. The Feira European Council noted the progress made and reaffirmed how important it would be to 'create a review mechanism for measuring progress towards the achievement of those goals'.

**PROGRESS MADE SINCE HELSINKI**

## 4. Since Helsinki

- (a) the headline goal has been elaborated by Member States' military experts who, assisted where necessary by NATO experts, have detailed in quantitative and qualitative terms a reservoir or 'catalogue of forces' essential to the achievement of the full range of proposed Petersberg tasks. The Member States have announced their national contributions and have identified areas in which progress still needs to be made if the requirements of the most demanding of the Petersberg tasks are to be met in full;
- (b) at the capability-pledging Conference on 20 November 2000, the Member States pledged both existing means and measures aimed at making up the remaining requirements;
- (c) contributions in terms of capability and forces by European NATO Member States not part of the EU and by countries which are candidates for accession to the EU have been taken into account and welcomed as a further valuable contribution towards improving the European military capability.

**EU REVIEW MECHANISM GOALS**

5. Following the elaboration of the headline goal set forth in a detailed catalogue of the necessary capability and the announcement of national pledges to make the latter available, the review mechanism proposed at Helsinki should now be defined in detail. The mechanism has three specific aims:

- (a) to enable the EU to monitor and facilitate progress towards the honouring of undertakings to achieve the overall goal, in both quantitative and qualitative terms;
- (b) to enable the EU to evaluate and, if necessary, to review its defined capability goals in order to meet the requirements of the full range of Petersberg tasks in the light of changing circumstances;
- (c) to help to achieve consistency between the pledges undertaken in the EU framework and, for the countries concerned, the headline goal force agreed to in the context of NATO planning or the Partnership for Peace (PfP).

As agreed at Helsinki, the Member States concerned will also deploy existing defence planning procedures, including, if appropriate, those of NATO and of the Planning and Review Process (PARP) of the Partnership for Peace.

### **PRINCIPLES**

6. The method of consultation and the process of evaluation pursued at Helsinki must observe the following principles:

- (a) preservation of the EU's autonomy in decision making, in particular in the definition, evaluation, monitoring and follow-up of capability goals;
- (b) recognition of the political and voluntary nature of the commitments made, which implies that the Member States are responsible for any adjustment of the commitments in the light of the evaluation made;
- (c) transparency, simplicity and clarity, in order among other things to enable comparisons to be made between the commitments of the various Member States;
- (d) a continuous and regular evaluation of progress made, on the basis of reports enabling ministers to take the appropriate decisions;
- (e) the flexibility necessary to adapt the commitments to newly identified needs.

Regarding relations with NATO:

The arrangements concerning transparency, cooperation and dialogue between the EU and NATO should be set out in the document on permanent arrangements between the EU and NATO. The evaluation mechanism will take account of the following additional principles:

- (f) the need, for the countries concerned, to ensure the compatibility of the commitments taken on in the EU framework with the force goals accepted in the framework of NATO planning or the PARP;
- (g) the need for mutual reinforcement of the EU's capability goals and those arising, for the countries concerned, from the Defence Capabilities Initiative;
- (h) the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of procedures and of information requested.

Concerning relations with third countries:

- (i) the mechanism will ensure that the contributions of European States which are members of NATO but not part of the EU, and of the applicant countries, are taken into account, in order to enable an evaluation to be made of their complementary

commitments which contribute to the improvement of European capabilities, and to facilitate their possible participation in EU-led operations in accordance with the Helsinki and Feira decisions.

### **EU EVALUATION PROCESS: TASKS**

7. Progress since Helsinki constitutes the initial stages of a planning and evaluation exercise which will be maintained on a regular basis.

The process will continue to be based on the method used with success initially in the elaboration of the headline goal, in particular the involvement of Member State and NATO experts through expert groups based on the Headline Task Force/Headline Task Force Plus (HTF/HTF Plus) formats, with the EUMS assisting in the process of elaborating, evaluating and reviewing capability goals in accordance with its remit.

All work carried out will be the subject of reports to the EU's Military Committee, which will draft any necessary recommendations for the PSC.

The EU mechanism encompasses the following main tasks:

(a) identification of EU capability goals for military crisis management. The original goals set by the Helsinki European Council will be evaluated and, if necessary, revised. New capability goals and an appropriate timetable will be determined by the European Council when the latter considers it necessary for EU political decisions to be reflected in the development of the CESDP.

(b) monitoring, under the direction of the EU Military Committee, of a 'catalogue' of the necessary forces and capabilities resulting from these goals. Monitoring will involve the preparation and analysis of possible planning scenarios by a group of national experts, assisted by the EU military staff (HTF) which will call on NATO expertise in the form of an experts group based on the HTF Plus format.

(c) identification and harmonisation of national contributions in the light of the required capability. This task was originally performed at the ministerial capacity-pledging Conference in November 2000, which was preceded by a feedback process under the direction of the EUMC which recorded Member States' original offers, their quantitative and qualitative scrutiny, the identification of requirements not entirely met and additional offers. National contributions will need to be re-evaluated and re-harmonised in the light of the revision of approved needs. For the countries concerned, this will need to be done in such a way as to ensure consistency with Defence Planning Process (DPP) and the Planning and Review Process (PARP).

(d) the quantitative and qualitative review of progress towards honouring previously approved national pledges, including requirements in terms of the interoperability of forces (C3, exercises, training, equipment)<sup>4</sup> and forces availability standards. This evaluation will be made by the EU Military Committee on the basis of the detailed work of the experts group (HTF), assisted where necessary by NATO in the form of the experts group based on the HTF Plus format. The EU Military Committee will be required to spot any shortcomings and to make recommendations to the PSC regarding

---

<sup>4</sup> C3 = command, control and communications.

measures guaranteeing that Member States' undertakings are consistent with requirements.

(e) the modification of national pledges, if necessary.

### **EU EVALUATION PROCESS: MECHANISMS**

8. In the light of the positive experience gained in the context of post-Helsinki discussions on the elaboration of capability goals, teams of military experts, particularly those from the various capitals, assisted by EU, NATO/SHAPE and international military staff (based on the HTF and HTF Plus formats) must be able to continue their activities on a regular basis in order, among other things, to:

- permit the exchange of necessary information (in particular, from the DPP and the PARP for the Member States concerned and to prevent futile duplication);
- provide a technical assessment of progress with pledges, including pledges in respect of such qualitative issues as availability, standards and interoperability.

The EU Military Committee will draw conclusions from experts' exchanges with a view to referring the appropriate recommendations to the PSC.

9. A group on EU/NATO capability, based on the ad hoc group set up by the Feira European Council, will act to ensure the consistent development of EU and NATO capabilities where they overlap (in particular, those arising under the overall EU goal and NATO's DCI<sup>5</sup>). This group will participate in the transparent exchange of information and in the dialogue between the two organisations.

It will act to promote:

- the exchange of information on capability issues;
- a mutual understanding of the state of their respective capabilities;
- a consistent overview of EU goals and, for the countries concerned, the goals arising from the NATO planning process, including defence planning and the PARP;
- discussion among experts on such qualitative issues as availability, standards and interoperability.

It will be for the Member States concerned and for both the EU and NATO to draw the appropriate conclusions from the work of the group.

### **RELATIONS WITH THIRD COUNTRIES**

10. Additional contributions from European non-EU members of NATO and other countries which are candidates for accession to the EU will be taken into consideration and welcomed as further valuable contributions towards the improvement of European military capabilities. These contributions will be examined, in conjunction with the nations concerned, on the basis of the same criteria as those applying to Member States' contributions.

---

<sup>5</sup> Defence Capabilities Initiative.

Reports may also be made within the single consultations structure, including non-EU countries.

11. The setting of a detailed timetable will be examined further in the light of the need for the nations concerned to ensure consistency with NATO planning disciplines. In principle, the mechanism described above will trigger reports to the Council at least every six months on progress achieved towards accomplishing capability goals. At the initial stage at least, the EU mechanism is likely to require relatively frequent monitoring by Defence Ministers of the progress of collective national undertakings in guaranteeing that the headline goal is achieved by 2003. However, this should not require a complete evaluation of every feature of the headline goal process. The details of this military capability assessment mechanism should be made clear under the incoming Presidency and may also be subject to review in the light of experience gained.

## **ANNEX II to ANNEX VI**

### **STRENGTHENING OF EUROPEAN UNION CAPABILITIES FOR CIVILIAN ASPECTS OF CRISIS MANAGEMENT**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

In order to be able to give an effective response to the challenges of crisis management under the European security and defence policy the European Union has committed itself to increasing and improving its capabilities, including those for civilian aspects of crisis management. In Santa Maria da Feira, the European Council accordingly identified policing, strengthening the rule of law, strengthening civilian administration and civil protection as the four priority areas of work in which the Union intends to establish specific capabilities for use in operations conducted by lead agencies, such as the United Nations or the OSCE, or in EU-led autonomous missions.

Action by the Union in these areas will enable it to make a greater contribution to conflict prevention and crisis management in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

On the basis of the recommendations made by the European Council in Santa Maria da Feira, the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management set up by Council Decision of 22 May 2000 has given priority in its work to implementing the specific target for policing. It has dealt with strengthening the rule of law, with a view to setting specific targets in that area. A meeting has been organised with representatives of the United Nations, the OSCE and the Council of Europe with a view to identifying areas and principles for cooperation with those organisations.

This paper presents the essential elements of the work carried out by the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management.

## II. POLICING CAPABILITIES

In Feira, Member States committed themselves to providing by 2003, by way of voluntary cooperation, up to 5000 police officers, 1000 of them to be deployable within 30 days, for international missions across the full range of conflict-prevention and crisis-management operations.

In order to achieve that specific target, the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management has established a 'method through which phased targets can be met and maintained through voluntary contributions'. It has been agreed that this will be a basis for work under successive Presidencies.

The method singles out four steps:

- preparation of generic planning scenarios and identification of the resultant missions;
- definition of the capabilities needed for the performance of the missions identified;
- call for contributions from Member States and identification of the capabilities on offer;
- possible measures to ensure follow-up for concrete targets.

Based on a pragmatic approach, the Committee's work has thus made it possible to establish more clearly the underlying principles of the Union's approach to the policing aspects of crisis management, consider ways of using European police forces and make substantial progress towards identifying the kinds of capabilities required.

### 1. Guiding principles

The following guiding principles have been identified.

**1) A full range of assignments:** the European Union must be capable of carrying out police missions ranging from advice, assistance or training assignments to substituting for local police. Member States have available all of the various policing capabilities required for the purpose, which should be deployable so as to complement one another, while not losing sight of their specific features.

Particular arrangements of Member States for national policing and the type of police expertise they can provide will be taken into account. This variety of police forces in the Member States is a valuable asset since it enables the Union to carry out a wide range of police missions.

**2) A clear remit and appropriate mandate:** The deployment of EU police forces requires clearly defined guidelines regarding their tasks and powers as well as an appropriate mandate.

**3) An integrated approach:** European Union action on Petersberg-type assignments requires a strong synergy between the military component and the civilian component (police, rule of law, civilian administration, civil protection). The military and police

components must therefore, where necessary, be part of an integrated planning process and should be used on the ground in a closely coordinated manner, making allowance for the constraints on deployment of Member States' police forces.

**4) Close coordination with international organisations:** The European Union should ensure that its own efforts and those of the United Nations, the OSCE and the Council of Europe are consistent and mutually reinforcing, without any unnecessary duplication. The European Union should notably take into account the recommendations set forth in the Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations ('Brahimi report').

## **2. Concepts of police forces**

In order to identify the capabilities required, two generic concepts, based on recent experience in Guatemala, Croatia, Albania, Mostar and El Salvador, as well as in Bosnia and Herzegovina, East n should

in 17025 in (keep Dredn photej (0940861) Tc 1.6926 6)

legislation, such police forces may be placed temporarily under the responsibility of the military authority entrusted with the protection of the population.

With a view to re-establishing a functioning local police force as quickly as possible, the European Union will in parallel, wherever necessary, also provide support for police instruction, advice, assistance and training.

### **3. Capabilities required**

The two functions (strengthening of and substituting for local police forces) draw on all specialist policing techniques available in the Member States (NB: 'police forces' here covers both police forces with civilian status and police forces with military status of the gendarmerie type). It has been found that European police forces have developed within their ranks a variety of skills, based on similar professional criteria, available for use at various stages of crisis management.

More specifically, in assignments to strengthen local police, the spectrum of required capabilities covers, inter alia:

- monitoring of and advice for local police in their day-to-day work, including criminal investigation work. This may include recommendations for police reorganisation;
- training of police officers as regards international standards, both for senior officers and for ordinary law enforcement officers. Special emphasis should, where necessary, be placed on training in police professional ethics and human rights;
- training of instructors, particularly through cooperation programmes.

In substitution assignments, the spectrum of required capabilities covers, inter alia:

- public surveillance, traffic regulations, border policing and general intelligence;
- criminal investigation work, covering detection of offences, tracing of offenders and transfer to the appropriate judicial authorities;
- protection of people and property and keeping order in the event of public disturbances. The risk of situations getting out of control with a resulting need for supporting military forces should be borne in mind here.

In order to develop capabilities required to carry out both kinds of missions, the following needs have been identified as priorities:

- maintaining and developing the policing capabilities database produced by the coordinating mechanism established by the European Council in Helsinki;
- information-sharing between Member States by way of a network of contact points;
- quantitative and qualitative identification of policing capabilities to be used in accordance with the scenarios envisaged;
- preparation of generic documents, drawing on United Nations work, as a frame of reference for police missions (rules of engagement, standard operating procedures, legal framework, etc.);

- planning of logistical requirements for rapid implementation of international policing operations, their incorporation into the general planning process and logistical support throughout a mission (equipment, staffing, etc.);
- furthering cooperation between Member States in the field of training for police missions;
- identification of precursor elements (advance teams, stand-by leadership and logistic capabilities) for EU police operations;
- interaction with military structures.

The Union's policing activities should be integrated, as from the planning stage, into a coherent overall crisis management operation. This requirement means that the General Secretariat of the Council should be provided with a permanent police expertise as soon as possible. Preliminary work has been carried out on the development of a policing operations planning and conduct capability as part of a 'detailed study on the feasibility and implications of EU autonomous police missions'.

### **III. STRENGTHENING OF THE RULE OF LAW**

In accordance with the Feira recommendations, particular attention has been paid to enhancing the effectiveness of police missions by parallel efforts to strengthen and restore local judicial and penal systems.

In this framework, a database designed to record Member States' ability to make available specialist judicial and penal staff has been compiled. Regularly updated by the coordinating mechanism, it constitutes a first step in setting specific targets in this area.

A seminar entitled 'Strengthening the rule of law in the context of crisis management – What are the specific targets of the European Union?' was held on 25 October 2000. Initial exchanges between the EU and representatives of the United Nations, the OSCE and the Council of Europe covered four themes – concrete experiences, lessons and perspectives, legal framework considerations, methodology and issues of added value. The attendance of representatives from the United Nations, the OSCE and the Council of Europe served to broaden the horizons of the European Union's discussions, on the basis of those international organisations' practical experience.

The following lines of approach emerged from proceedings:

- The need to rely, in certain crisis situations, when facing an institutional and normative vacuum, on a legal framework, which could be applicable straight away on a provisional basis to all components of an international police mission and to local actors. On this point, the European Union should notably take into account the recommendations of the Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations ('Brahimi report').
- With that in mind, on the basis of specific objectives identified by the European Union, a strong synergy needs to be developed between the actions undertaken in support of the rule of law and those of the police mission. This means that a suitable criminal justice infrastructure must be available as soon as possible in dealing with a crisis so as to avoid any legal vacuum liable to leave further difficulties to be resolved.

- While some unstable situations require immediate substitution measures, focusing primarily on law and order and on criminal justice, it is necessary to ensure a lasting settlement by restoring as early as possible the local judicial and penal system. Experience in a number of recent crisis situations has shown the need for continuity between short-term emergency interventions and more long-term initiatives.
- The reconstruction, restoring and improvement of judiciary and penitentiary systems could take the form, among others, of training local magistrates and personnel, of advising and providing expertise to local authorities and governmental institutions to drafting of laws and regulation in compliance with international standards. Account should be taken of social, ethnic, cultural, economic and political complexities which may require coordinated action on several fronts (police, judiciary, local administration).
- International personnel should be selected according to common standards. The European Union's work should here take full account of the body of experience built up by the United Nations, the OSCE and the Council of Europe.

#### **IV. FOLLOW-UP**

Work undertaken on strengthening civilian aspects of crisis management should be resolutely continued, so that the European Union can make more effective use of its civilian instruments for the objectives of conflict prevention and crisis management.

The progress of work on policing capabilities now makes it possible to consider the third stage of the method decided on for achieving the specific target. This involves going on to put Member States' commitment into practice with a call for voluntary contributions, to be issued in the near future in accordance with procedures to be determined. Work should therefore continue identifying the capabilities required, particularly in qualitative terms, and specify requirements for the planning and conduct of European policing operations. The next Presidency, in liaison with the Secretary-General/High Representative, is called upon to put forward proposals for the purpose.

For the rule of law, it has been agreed that it is now possible for the European Union to set specific targets in conjunction with the development of policing capabilities. Scenarios based on recent experience could therefore be considered in order to spell out the capabilities required, both in terms of Member States' resources and expertise within the European Union. Future work of the Committee for civilian aspects of crisis management should be informed by, inter alia, themes raised at the Seminar held on 25 October 2000.

In both areas, the Commission and the coordinating mechanism established within the General Secretariat of the Council will continue to provide their input to work in hand.

In the upcoming work of the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management, coherence and coordination with ongoing work in other bodies on related areas have to be ensured.

For strengthening civilian administration and civil protection, the European Union will have to continue its discussions, on the basis of the recommendations made by the

European Council in Feira, with the aim of defining concrete targets and equipping the EU with suitable resources for it to cope effectively with complex political crises.

Contributions of non-EU States to EU civilian crisis management operations, especially EU police missions, will be given favourable consideration, in accordance with modalities to be determined.

Lastly, the European Union will further develop its cooperation with the United Nations, the OSCE and the Council of Europe, particularly in the light of the meeting arranged with those organisations within the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management and the seminar on strengthening the rule of law.

### **ANNEX III to ANNEX VI**

#### **POLITICAL AND SECURITY COMMITTEE**

The approach adopted at Helsinki makes the PSC the linchpin of the European security and defence policy (ESDP) and of the common foreign and security policy (CFSP): ‘The PSC will deal with all aspects of the CFSP, including the CESDP ...’. Without prejudice to Article 207 of the Treaty establishing the European Community, the PSC has a central role to play in the definition of and follow-up to the EU’s response to a crisis.

The PSC will deal with all the tasks defined in Article 25 of the TEU. It may convene in Political Director formation.

After consulting the Presidency and without prejudice to Article 18 of the TEU, the Secretary-General/High Representative for the CFSP may chair the PSC, especially in the event of a crisis.

1. In particular the PSC will:

- keep track of the international situation in the areas falling within the common foreign and security policy, help define policies by drawing up ‘opinions’ for the Council, either at the request of the Council or on its own initiative, and monitor implementation of agreed policies, all of this without prejudice to Article 207 of the Treaty establishing the European Community and to the powers of the Presidency and of the Commission;
- examine the areas of GAC draft conclusions in which it is involved;
- provide guidelines for other Committees on matters falling within the CFSP;
- maintain a privileged link with the Secretary-General/High Representative (SG/HR) and the special representatives;
- send guidelines to the Military Committee; receive the opinions and recommendations of the Military Committee. The Chairman of the Military Committee (EUMC), who liaises with the European Union Military Staff (EUMS), takes part, where necessary, in PSC meetings;
- receive information, recommendations and opinions from the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management and send it guidelines on matters falling within the CFSP;

- coordinate, supervise and monitor discussions on CFSP issues in various Working Parties, to which it may send guidelines and whose reports it must examine;
- lead the political dialogue in its own capacity and in the forms laid down in the Treaty;
- provide a privileged forum for dialogue on the ESDP with the fifteen and the six as well as with NATO in accordance with arrangements set out in the relevant documents;
- under the auspices of the Council, take responsibility for the political direction of the development of military capabilities, taking into account the type of crisis to which the Union wishes to respond. As part of the development of military capabilities, the PSC will receive the opinion of the Military Committee assisted by the European Military Staff.

2. Furthermore, in the event of a crisis the PSC is the Council body which deals with crisis situations and examines all the options that might be considered as the Union's response within the single institutional framework and without prejudice to the decision-making and implementation procedures of each pillar. Thus the Council, whose preparatory work is carried out by Coreper, and the Commission alone have powers, each within their own areas of competence and in accordance with procedures laid down by the Treaties, to take legally-binding decisions. The Commission exercises its responsibility, including its power of initiative under the Treaties. Coreper exercises the role conferred on it by Article 207 of the Treaty establishing the European Community and by Article 19 of the Council's Rules of Procedure. To that end, it will be informed in good time by the PSC.

In a crisis situation, close coordination between these bodies is especially necessary and will be ensured in particular by:

- the participation, where necessary, of the Chairman of the PSC in Coreper meetings;
- the role of the Foreign Relations Counsellors whose task it is to maintain effective permanent coordination between CFSP discussions and those conducted in other pillars (Annex to the Council conclusions of 11 May 1992).

To prepare the EU's response to a crisis, it is for the PSC to propose to the Council the political objectives to be pursued by the Union and to recommend a cohesive set of options aimed at contributing to the settlement of the crisis. In particular it may draw up an opinion recommending to the Council that it adopt a joint action. Without prejudice to the role of the Commission, it supervises the implementation of the measures adopted and assesses their effects. The Commission informs the PSC of the measures it has adopted or is envisaging. The Member States inform the PSC of the measures they have adopted or are envisaging at the national level.

The PSC exercises 'political control and strategic direction' of the EU's military response to the crisis. To that end, on the basis of the opinions and recommendations of the Military Committee, it evaluates in particular the essential elements (strategic military options including the chain of command, operation concept, operation plan) to be submitted to the Council.

The PSC plays a major role in enhancing consultations, in particular with NATO and the third States involved.

On the basis of the proceedings of the PSC, the Secretary-General/High Representative directs the activities of the Situation Centre. The latter supports the PSC and provides it with intelligence in conditions appropriate to crisis management.

The following arrangements will be put in place to enable the PSC to ensure full 'political control and strategic direction' of a military crisis-management operation:

- With a view to launching an operation the PSC sends the Council a recommendation based on the opinions of the Military Committee in accordance with the usual Council preparation procedures. On that basis the Council decides to launch the operation within the framework of a joint action.
- In accordance with Articles 18 and 26 of the TEU, the joint action will determine, in particular, the role of the Secretary-General/High Representative in the implementation of the measures falling within the 'political control and strategic direction' exercised by the PSC. For such measures the Secretary-General/High Representative acts with the PSC's assent. Should a new Council decision be deemed appropriate, the simplified written procedure could be used (Article 12(4) of the Council's Rules of Procedure).
- During the operation, the Council will be kept informed through PSC reports presented by the Secretary-General/High Representative in his capacity as Chairman of the PSC.

#### **ANNEX IV to ANNEX VI**

#### **EUROPEAN UNION MILITARY COMMITTEE (EUMC)**

##### **1. Introduction**

At Helsinki, the European Council decided to establish within the Council, new permanent political and military bodies enabling the EU to assume its responsibilities for the full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks defined in the EU Treaty, the Petersberg tasks.

As provided in the Helsinki report, the European Union Military Committee (EUMC), established within the Council, is composed of the Chiefs of Defence (CHODs) represented by their military representatives (MILREPs). The EUMC meets at the level of CHODs as and when necessary. This Committee gives military advice and makes recommendations to the Political and Security Committee (PSC), as well as provides military direction to the European Union Military Staff (EUMS). The Chairman of the EUMC (CEUMC) attends meetings of the Council when decisions with defence implications are to be taken.

The EUMC is the highest military body established within the Council.

For this purpose, the Terms of Reference of the EUMC are outlined as follows:

## 2. Mission

The EUMC is responsible for providing the PSC with military advice and recommendations on all military matters within the EU. It exercises military direction of all military activities within the EU framework.

## 3. Functions

It is the source of military advice based on consensus.

It is the forum for military consultation and co-operation between the EU Member States in the field of conflict prevention and crisis management.

It provides military advice and makes recommendations to the PSC, at the latter's request or on its own initiative, acting within guidelines forwarded by the PSC, particularly with regard to:

- the development of the overall concept of crisis management in its military aspects;
- the military aspects relating to the political control and strategic direction of crisis management operations and situations;
- the risk assessment of potential crises;
- the military dimension of a crisis situation and its implications, in particular during its subsequent management; for this purpose, it receives the output from the Situation Centre;
- the elaboration, the assessment and the review of capability objectives according to agreed procedures;
- the EU's military relationship with non-EU European NATO Members, the other candidates for accession to the EU, other states and other organisations, including NATO;
- the financial estimation for operations and exercises.

(a) In crisis management situations

Upon the PSC's request, it issues an Initiating Directive to the Director General of the EUMS (DGEUMS) to draw up and present strategic military options.

It evaluates the strategic military options developed by the EUMS and forwards them to the PSC together with its evaluation and military advice.

On the basis of the military option selected by the Council, it authorises an Initial Planning Directive for the Operation Commander.

Based upon the EUMS evaluation, it provides advice and recommendation to the PSC:

- on the Concept of Operations (CONOPS) developed by the Operation Commander;
- on the draft Operation Plan (OPLAN) drawn up by the Operation Commander.

It gives advice to the PSC on the termination option for an operation.

(b) During an operation

The EUMC monitors the proper execution of military operations conducted under the responsibility of the Operation Commander.

The EUMC members sit or are represented in the Committee of Contributors.

#### **4. Chairman of the EUMC (CEUMC)**

The EUMC has a permanent Chairman whose responsibilities are described hereafter.

The CEUMC is a 4-star flag officer on appointment, preferably a former Chief of Defence of an EU Member State.

He is selected by the CHODs of the Member States according to approved procedures and is appointed by the Council on the recommendation of the EUMC meeting at CHODs level.

His term of office is in principle three years, except in exceptional circumstances.

His authority is derived from the EUMC to which he is responsible. Acting in an international capacity, the CEUMC represents the EUMC at the PSC and the Council, as appropriate.

As the Chairman of the EUMC, he:

- chairs the EUMC meetings at MILREPs and CHODs levels,
- is the spokesman of the EUMC and, as such:
  - participates as appropriate in the PSC with the right to contribute to discussions and attends the Council meetings when decisions with defence implications are to be taken and
  - performs the function of military adviser to the SG/HR on all military matters, in particular, to ensure consistency within the EU Crisis Management Structure;
- conducts the work of the EUMC impartially and in order to reflect consensus;
- acts on behalf of the EUMC in issuing directives and guidance to the DGEUMS;
- acts as the primary Point of Contact (POC) with the Operation Commander during the EU's military operations;
- liaises with the Presidency in the development and implementation of its work programme.

The CEUMC is supported by his personal staff and assisted by the EUMS, especially regarding the administrative support within the General Secretariat of the Council.

When absent the CEUMC is replaced by one of the following:

- the permanent DCEUMC, if it is so decided to create and fill the post,
- the Presidency representative or
- the Dean.

## **5. Miscellaneous**

The relations to be established between the EUMC and NATO military authorities are defined in the document on the EU/NATO permanent arrangements. The relations between the EUMC and the non-EU European NATO members and other countries which are candidates for accession to the EU are defined in the document on the relations of the EU with third countries.

The EUMC is supported by a military working group (EUMCWG), by the EUMS and by other departments and services, as appropriate.

### **ANNEX V to ANNEX VI**

## **EUROPEAN UNION MILITARY STAFF ORGANISATION (EUMS)**

### **1. Introduction**

At Helsinki, the EU Member States decided to establish within the Council, new permanent political and military bodies enabling the EU to assume its responsibilities for the full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks defined in the EU Treaty, the Petersberg tasks. As provided in the Helsinki report, the EUMS, 'within the Council structures provides military expertise and support to the CESDP, including the conduct of EU-led military crisis management operations'.

For this purpose, the Terms of Reference of the European Union Military Staff (EUMS) are defined as follows:

### **2. Mission**

The Military Staff is to perform 'early warning, situation assessment and strategic planning for Petersberg tasks including identification of European national and multinational forces' and to implement policies and decisions as directed by the European Union Military Committee (EUMC).

### **3. Role and Tasks**

- It is the source of the EU's military expertise;
- It assures the link between the EUMC on the one hand and the military resources available to the EU on the other, and it provides military expertise to EU bodies as directed by the EUMC;
- It provides an early warning capability. It plans, assesses and makes recommendations regarding the concept of crisis management and the general military strategy and implements the decisions and guidance of the EUMC;

- It supports the EUMC regarding situation assessment and military aspects of strategic planning,<sup>6</sup> over the full range of Petersberg tasks, for all cases of EU-led operations, whether or not the EU draws on NATO assets and capabilities;
- It contributes to the process of elaboration, assessment and review of the capability goals taking into account the need, for those Member States concerned, to ensure coherence with NATO's Defence Planning Process (DPP) and the Planning and Review Process (PARP) of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) in accordance with agreed procedures;
- It has the responsibility to monitor, assess and make recommendations regarding the forces and capabilities made available to the EU by the Member States, on training, exercises and interoperability;

#### 4. Functions

- It performs three main operational functions: early warning, situation assessment and strategic planning;
- Under the direction of the EUMC it provides military expertise to EU bodies and, in particular, to the Secretary-General/High Representative;
- It monitors potential crises by relying on appropriate national and multinational intelligence capabilities;
- It supplies the Situation Centre with military information and receives its output;
- It carries out the military aspects of strategic advance planning for Petersberg missions;
- It identifies and lists European national and multinational forces for EU-led operations co-ordinating with NATO;
- It contributes to the development and preparation (including training and exercises) of national and multinational forces made available by the Member States to the EU. The modalities of the relation with NATO are defined in the relevant documents;
- It organises and co-ordinates the procedures with national and multinational HQs including those NATO HQs available to the EU, ensuring, as far as possible, compatibility with NATO procedures;
- It programmes, plans, conducts and evaluates the military aspect of the EU's crisis management procedures, including the exercising of EU/NATO procedures;
- It participates in the financial estimation of operations and exercises;
- It liaises with the national HQs and the multinational HQs of the multinational forces;
- It establishes permanent relations with NATO according to 'EU/NATO Permanent arrangements' and appropriate relations with identified correspondents within the UN and OSCE, subject to an agreement from these organisations.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Preliminary definitions:*

*Strategic planning:* *planning activities that start as soon as a crisis emerges and end when the EU political authorities approve a military strategic option or a set of military strategic options. The strategic process encompasses military situation assessment, definitions of a POL/MIL framework and development of military strategic options.*

*Military strategic option:* *a possible military action designed to achieve the POL/MIL objectives outlined in the POL/MIL framework. A military strategic option will describe the outline military solution, the required resource and constraints and recommendations on the choice of the operations commander and OHQ.*

## (a) Additional functions in crisis management situations

- It requests and processes specific information from the intelligence organisations and other relevant information from all available sources;
- It supports the EUMC in its contributions to Initial Planning Guidance and Planning Directives of the Political and Security Committee (PSC);
- It develops and prioritises military strategic options as the basis for the military advice of the EUMC to the PSC by:
  - defining initial broad options;
  - drawing as appropriate on planning support from external sources which will analyse and further develop these options in more detail;
  - evaluating the results of this more detailed work and commissioning any further work that might be necessary;
  - presenting an overall assessment, with an indication of priorities and recommendations as appropriate, to the EUMC;
- It can also contribute to the non-military aspects of the military options;
- It identifies in co-ordination with national planning staffs and, as appropriate, NATO, the forces that might participate in possible EU-led operations;
- It assists the operation commander in technical exchanges with third countries offering military contributions to an EU-led operation, and in the preparation of the force generation conference;
- It continues to monitor crisis situations.

## (b) Additional functions during operations

- The EUMS, acting under the direction of the EUMC, continuously monitors all the military aspects of operations. It conducts strategic analysis in liaison with the designated operation commander to support the EUMC in its advisory role to the PSC in charge of the strategic direction;
- In the light of political and operational developments, it provides new options to the EUMC as a basis for EUMC's military advice to the PSC.

**5. Organisation**

- It works under the military direction of the EUMC to which it reports;
- The EUMS is a Council Secretariat department directly attached to the SG/HR; it is composed of personnel seconded from the Member States acting in an international capacity under the statute to be established by the Council;
- EUMS is headed by the DGEUMS, a 3-star flag officer, and works under the direction of the EUMC;
- In order to cope with the full spectrum of Petersberg tasks, whether or not the EU has recourse to NATO resources, the EUMS is organised as in Annex 'A';
- In crisis management situations or exercises, the EUMS could set up Crisis Action Teams (CAT), drawing upon its own expertise, manpower and infrastructure. In addition, it could, if necessary, draw upon outside manpower for temporary augmentation to be requested from the EU Member States by the EUMC.

## 6. Relations with third countries

- The relations between the EUMS and the non-EU European NATO members and other countries, which are candidates for accession to the EU will be defined in the document on the relations of the EU with third countries.

### ANNEX VI to ANNEX VI

#### **ARRANGEMENTS CONCERNING NON-EU EUROPEAN NATO MEMBERS AND OTHER COUNTRIES WHICH ARE CANDIDATES FOR ACCESSION TO THE EU**

##### **I. Guiding principles:**

At Helsinki it was agreed that:

*The Union will ensure the necessary dialogue, consultation and cooperation with NATO and its non-EU members, other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU as well as other prospective partners in EU-led crisis management, with full respect for the decision-making autonomy of the EU and the single institutional framework of the Union.*

*With European NATO members who are not members of the EU and other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU, appropriate structures will be established for dialogue and information on issues related to security and defence policy and crisis management. In the event of a crisis, these structures will serve for consultation in the period leading up to a decision of the Council.*

*Upon a decision by the Council to launch an operation, the non-EU European NATO members will participate if they so wish, in the event of an operation requiring recourse to NATO assets and capabilities. They will, on a decision by the Council, be invited to take part in operations where the EU does not use NATO assets.*

*Other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU may also be invited by the Council to take part in EU-led operations once the Council has decided to launch such an operation.*

*All the States that have confirmed their participation in an EU-led operation by deploying significant military forces will have the same rights and obligations as the EU participating Member States in the day-to-day conduct of such an operation.*

*The decision to end an operation will be taken by the Council after consultation between the participating states within the committee of contributors.*

At Feira the following guiding principles were agreed:

*The Union will ensure the necessary dialogue, consultation and cooperation with non-EU European NATO members and other countries who are candidates for accession to the EU on EU-led crisis management.*

*Appropriate arrangements will be established for dialogue and information on issues related to security and defence policy and crisis management.*

*There will be full respect for the decision-making autonomy of the EU and its single institutional framework.*

*There will be a single, inclusive structure in which all the 15 countries concerned (the non-EU European NATO members and the candidates for accession to the EU) can enjoy the necessary dialogue, consultation and cooperation with the EU.*

*There will, within this structure, be exchanges with the non-EU European NATO members where the subject matter requires it, such as on questions concerning the nature and functioning of EU-led operations using NATO assets and capabilities.*

## **II. Permanent consultation arrangements during non-crisis periods**

On the basis of what was agreed at Helsinki and Feira, consultation procedures will, during normal periods, be based on the following elements:

The frequency of and procedures for consultation will depend on requirements and should be guided by considerations of pragmatism and efficiency, with a minimum of two meetings in EU+15 format being held during each Presidency on ESDP matters and their possible implications for the countries concerned. Within this context, a minimum of two meetings will be held during each Presidency with the six non-EU European NATO members (EU+6 format).

One ministerial meeting bringing together the 15 and the 6 countries will be held during each Presidency.

The PSC will play a leading role in the implementation of these arrangements, which will also include a minimum of two meetings at Military Committee representative level, as well as exchanges at military experts level (in particular those concerning the establishment of capability objectives) which will continue in order to enable the non-EU European NATO members and other candidate countries to contribute to the process of enhancing European military capabilities; meetings of experts may be called on matters other than capabilities, such as, for example, in times of crisis, for information on the strategic options envisaged.

These meetings will supplement those held as part of the CFSP enhanced political dialogue.

This meeting schedule is indicative. Extra meetings may be organised if circumstances require. Each Presidency will submit the planned timetable of meetings for its term and the agendas. The States concerned may also submit proposals.

Each third country may, if it so wishes, appoint a representative from its mission to the EU to follow the ESDP and act as an interlocutor with regard to the PSC.

To facilitate the association of third countries wishing to be involved in EU military activities, they may appoint an officer accredited to the EU Military Staff who will serve as a contact. A minimum of two information meetings will be held during each Presidency for these officers from the 15 and the 6 countries, which could for example address the question of how the follow-up of crisis situations should be handled. In addition, specific liaison arrangements may be organised, particularly for the duration of NATO/EU exercises. These arrangements will be particularly important for the involvement of the 15 and the 6 in the development of the military capabilities available to the EU for EU-led operations.

### **III. Arrangements during crisis periods:**

#### **(A) Pre-operational phase**

As agreed at Helsinki and Feira, in the event of a crisis, dialogue and consultation will be intensified at all levels, including ministerial level, in the period leading up to the Council decision. When a crisis develops, these intensified consultations will provide an opportunity for exchanges of views on situation assessment and discussion of the concerns raised by the countries affected, particularly when they consider their security interests to be involved.

When the possibility of an EU-led military crisis management operation is under consideration, the aim of these consultations, which could be held at politico-military experts level, will be to ensure that the countries potentially contributing to such an operation are informed of the EU's intentions, particularly with regard to the military options being envisaged. In this respect, once the EU begins to examine in depth an option requiring the use of NATO assets and capabilities, particular attention will be paid to consultation of the six non-EU European NATO members.

#### **(B) Operational phase**

Once the Council has chosen the strategic military option(s), the operational planning work will be presented to the non-EU European NATO members and the other candidate countries which have expressed their intention in principle of taking part in the operation, to enable them to determine the nature and volume of the contribution they could make to an EU-led operation.

Once the Council has approved the operation concept, having taken into consideration the outcome of the consultation with third countries likely to take part in the operation, these countries will be formally invited to take part in the operation according to the arrangements agreed in Helsinki, i.e.:

- the non-EU European NATO members will participate if they so wish, in the event of an operation requiring recourse to NATO assets and capabilities. They will, on a decision by the Council, be invited to take part in operations where the EU does not use NATO assets.
- other countries which are candidates for accession to the EU may also be invited by the Council to take part in EU-led operations once the Council has decided to launch such an operation.

For operations requiring recourse to NATO assets and capabilities, operational planning will be carried out by the Alliance's planning bodies, and for an autonomous EU operation it will be carried out within one of the European strategic level headquarters. For operations requiring recourse to NATO assets, the non-EU European allies will be involved in planning according to the procedures laid down within NATO. For autonomous operations in which they are invited to take part, the candidate countries and non-EU European allies may send liaison officers to the European Military Staff bodies at strategic level for exchanges of information on operational planning and the contributions envisaged. The States concerned will provide the EU with an initial indication of their contribution, which will then be further specified during exchanges with the Operation Commander assisted by the EUMS.

These exchanges will make it possible to establish the significant nature of the national contributions proposed and their suitability as regards the requirements of the EU-led operation. The countries concerned will confirm the level and quality of their national contribution at the Force Generation Conference, following which the operation will be formally launched and the Committee of Contributors established.

### **(C) Committee of Contributors**

The Committee of Contributors will play a key role in the day-to-day management of the operation. It will be the main forum for discussing all problems relating to day-to-day management having regard to the measures taken by the PSC in this field. The deliberations of the Committee of Contributors will constitute a positive contribution to those of the PSC.

In this connection:

- it will be supplied with detailed information regarding the operation on the ground via the EU bodies responsible for follow-up. It will receive regular information from the Operation Commander who may be heard by the Committee.
- it will deal with the various problems concerning the implementation of the military operation, the use of forces, and all day-to-day management matters which are not exclusively, under the instructions he will have received, the responsibility of the Operation Commander.
- it will provide opinions and recommendations on possible adjustments to operational planning, including possible adjustments to objectives which may affect the situation of forces. It will adopt a position on planning the end of the operation and the withdrawal of forces.

In these areas, the Political and Security Committee, which exercises the political control and strategic direction of the operation, will take account of the views expressed by the Committee of Contributors.

All EU Member States are entitled to be present at the Committee's discussions irrespective of whether or not they are taking part in the operation, but only contributing States will take part in the day-to-day management of the operation. Non-EU European allies and candidate countries deploying significant military forces under an EU-led operation will have the same rights and obligations in terms of day-to-day management of the operation as EU Member States taking part in the operation.

The work of the Committee of Contributors will be conducted without prejudice to consultations in the framework of the single structure including non-EU European NATO members and EU candidate countries.

Depending on the nature of its tasks, the Committee may meet in the appropriate format. For Member States, it may be comprised of representatives on the PSC and on the Military Committee. It will usually be chaired by a representative of the Secretary-General/High Representative or the Presidency, assisted by the Chairman of the Military Committee or his Deputy. The Director of the Military Staff and the Operation Commander may also attend or be represented in the Committee.

The Chairman will be responsible for conveying the outcome of the Committee's discussions to the PSC and to the Military Committee.

The Committee will be consulted by the Military Committee and the PSC on matters relating to planning the end of the operation and the withdrawal of forces. Once the operation is ended, the Committee of Contributors may be requested to provide its assessment of the lessons drawn from the operation.

## **ANNEX VII to ANNEX VI**

### **STANDING ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE EU AND NATO**

#### **I. Guiding principles:**

As stated in the conclusions of the Helsinki European Council, the aim in relations between the EU and NATO is to ensure effective consultation, cooperation and transparency in determining the appropriate military response to crises, and to guarantee effective crisis management. At the Feira European Council it was decided to base consultations with NATO on the following principles:

- Development of consultation and cooperation between the EU and NATO must take place in full respect of the autonomy of EU decision-making.
- The EU and NATO have undertaken further to strengthen and develop their cooperation in military crisis-management on the basis of shared values, equality and

in a spirit of partnership. The aim is to achieve full and effective consultation, cooperation and transparency in order to identify and take rapid decisions on the most appropriate military response to a crisis and to ensure efficient crisis-management. In this context, EU-objectives in the field of military capabilities and those arising, for those countries concerned, from NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative, will be mutually reinforcing.

- While being mutually reinforcing in crisis management, the EU and NATO are organisations of a different nature. This will be taken into account in the arrangements concerning their relations and in the assessment to be made by the EU of existing procedures governing WEU-NATO relations with a view to their possible adaptation to an EU-NATO framework.
- Arrangements and modalities for relations between the EU and NATO will reflect the fact that each Organisation will be dealing with the other on an equal footing.
- In the relations between the EU and NATO as institutions, there will be no discrimination against any of the Member States.

In that spirit, and to place this consultation and cooperation within a true strategic partnership on crisis management, the autonomy of NATO and EU decision-making will be fully respected.

Consultations and cooperation will be developed between the two organisations on questions of common interest relating to security, defence and crisis management, so that crises can be met with the most appropriate military response and effective crisis management ensured.

## **II. Arrangements for consultation outside times of crisis**

1. Regular dialogue will be established between the two organisations to ensure consultation, cooperation and transparency, in particular by holding meetings between the PSC and the North Atlantic Council (NAC) and ministerial meetings, at least once during each Presidency; either organisation may request additional meetings, for which it will propose a draft agenda.

Meetings between the NATO and EU Military Committees may be held as required, at the request of either organisation, with at least one such meeting during each Presidency. These meetings will be held on the basis of specific agendas.

There may also be meetings between subsidiary groups (such as the PCG<sup>7</sup> and the PMG,<sup>8</sup> or Military Committee working parties), in the form of ad hoc EU/NATO groups (for example on capabilities) or expert groups along HTF Plus lines, when there is a need for NATO expertise on specific subjects.

The organisational arrangements for these meetings will have to be agreed between the two organisations.

---

<sup>7</sup> NATO Policy Coordination Group.

<sup>8</sup> Politico-Military Group.

2. When necessary, and in particular where the capabilities and expertise of the Alliance are concerned, the dialogue will be supplemented by inviting NATO representatives to meetings, in accordance with the provisions of the TEU and on a basis of reciprocity. This will apply to the Secretary-General of NATO for ministerial meetings, in particular those attended by Defence Ministers; the Chairman of the NATO Military Committee for meetings of the Military Committee, and, in view of his responsibilities for the European pillar of NATO and his potential role in EU-led operations, DSACEUR<sup>9</sup> for meetings of the Military Committee.

3. Regular contacts between the Secretaries-General, Secretariats and Military Staffs of the EU and NATO will also be a useful contribution to transparency and exchanges of information and documents.

Under this heading there will be:

- contacts between the Secretaries-General or between the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs and the European Union's official responsible for ESDP;
- contacts between NATO's International Staff and the Council Secretariat departments dealing with the ESDP (PPEWU,<sup>10</sup> DGE,<sup>11</sup> Situation Centre, etc), in particular for preparing for meetings and forwarding documents for such meetings.
- contacts, based on directives from the Military Committee, between experts from the EU Military Staff (EUMS) and their opposite numbers on NATO's Military Staff, in particular for preparing for meetings and forwarding documents for meetings (including planning documents).

All these contacts and exchanges will be the subject of regular reports to the PSC and the EUMC.

### **III. NATO/EU relations in times of crisis**

(A) In the emergency phase of a crisis, contacts and meetings will be stepped up, including those at ministerial level if appropriate, so that, in the interests of transparency, consultation and cooperation, the two organisations can discuss their assessments of the crisis and how it may develop, together with any related security problems.

At the request of the PSC, the EUMC will instruct the European Military Staff to determine and prioritise the strategic military options. Having determined the initial general options, the Staff may call on external planning sources, in particular the guaranteed access to NATO planning capabilities, to analyse and refine these options. This contribution will be evaluated by the EUMS, which may commission any additional work that may be necessary.

Should the Union intend to look more closely at an option calling for predetermined NATO assets and capabilities, the PSC will so inform the NAC.

---

<sup>9</sup> Deputy Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

<sup>10</sup> Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit.

<sup>11</sup> Directorate-General for External Relations.

**(B) In the event of an operation calling on NATO assets and capabilities (see Appendix to this Annex)**

- on the basis of opinions and recommendations from the Military Committee assisted by the EUMS, the PSC will send the designated operation commander, via the Military Committee, strategic directives enabling him to draw up the necessary planning documents for the operation (CONOPS, OPLAN), making use of the guaranteed access to NATO planning capabilities; these planning documents will be submitted to the PSC for approval;
- experts from the two organisations, in liaison with DSACEUR as strategic coordinator, will meet to specify the predetermined NATO assets and capabilities concerned by this option;
- once the predetermined assets and capabilities to be used in the operation have been specified, the EU will forward a request to NATO;
- the hand-over of the predetermined assets and capabilities used in the EU operation, together with the arrangements for making them available and any recall conditions, will be identified at a PSC/NAC meeting;
- throughout the operation the Alliance will be kept informed of the use of NATO assets and capabilities, if necessary by convening a meeting of the PSC and the NAC;
- the commander of the operation will be invited to EUMC meetings to report on the progress of the operation. The Presidency may invite him to attend meetings of the PSC and the GAC;
- having first informed the NAC, the PSC will propose to the Council that the operation be terminated. The EU will terminate the use of NATO assets and capabilities.

**(C) In the event of a European Union operation conducted without NATO assets**

Throughout the period in which the European Union conducts an operation without NATO assets, or if NATO conducts a crisis management operation, each organisation will keep the other informed of the general progress of the operation.

**Appendix to ANNEX VII to ANNEX VI****ANNEX TO THE PERMANENT ARRANGEMENTS ON EU/NATO  
CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
PARAGRAPH 10 OF THE WASHINGTON COMMUNIQUE**

On the basis of decisions adopted by the Alliance at the Washington Summit on 24 April 1999, the European Union suggests that the arrangements between the two organisations for the implementation of Berlin Plus should be as follows:

### **(1) Guaranteed access to NATO's planning capabilities**

The European Union will have guaranteed permanent access<sup>12</sup> to NATO's planning capabilities:

- when the EU examines options with a view to an operation, drawing up its strategic military options can involve a contribution from NATO's planning capabilities;
- in order to provide operational planning for an operation which has recourse to NATO assets and capabilities.

That access will be guaranteed under the following arrangements:

- under the control of the EUMC, the Director-General of the EUMS will send DSACEUR, as part of his responsibilities within NATO's European pillar, technical planning requests to contribute to the drafting of strategic options;
- in the field of operational planning, the Military Staff of the Alliance with responsibility for handling EU requests will be accessible to experts from the Member States who so wish without discrimination;
- in the event of DSACEUR's informing the EU that he cannot at the same time satisfy both the EU request and NATO work on a non-Article V operation, close consultation will take place between the organisations at the appropriate level in order that an acceptable solution for the two organisations in terms of managing priorities and allocating assets may be reached, the final decision lying with NATO;
- should NATO undertake an Article V operation and should it have had to refuse or recall planning capabilities in that context, the EU will have access to those NATO planning capabilities which remain available.

### **(2) Presumption of availability of pre-identified assets and capabilities**

Regarding the pre-identification of assets, work on pre-identifying the collective assets and capabilities of the Alliance which may be used for EU-led operations will be carried out by EU and Alliance experts and will be validated by a meeting of the Military Committees of the two organisations with a view to their approval under each organisation's specific procedures.

If the EU should consider an in-depth study of a strategic option which calls for NATO assets and capabilities, the PSC will inform the NAC.

In the event of an EU operation calling for NATO assets and capabilities, the following procedure for placing those pre-identified assets and capabilities at the disposal of the European Union will be established:

- once the EU has chosen a strategic option, experts from both organisations will meet to determine the pre-identified assets and capabilities which are likely to be used within that operation;

---

<sup>12</sup> Without case-by-case NATO authorisation.

- on a proposal from the EUMC based on a report from the EUMS which takes account of talks with experts, the PSC will forward a request for pre-identified assets and capabilities to the NAC;
- the NAC will reply to the PSC request. A meeting of experts from the two organisations will examine from the technical viewpoint the extent to which the assets and capabilities proposed by the Alliance match the EU request;
- availability will be formally confirmed at a PSC/NAC meeting in the form of an overall package defining the practical arrangements, including the administrative, legal and financial aspects, for making them available throughout the operation;
- the assets and capabilities will be available to the EU throughout the operation, except in cases where the Alliance has to carry out an Article V operation or a non-Article V operation which has been given priority after consultation between the two organisations;
- new requests which might be made during the operation will go through the same procedure as described for the initial package;
- throughout the operation the EU will inform NATO of the use of the assets and capabilities placed at the EU's disposal, in particular at meetings between the PSC and the NAC and through the intermediary of the Chairman of the EU Military Committee, come to address the Military Committee of the Alliance.

### **(3) Identification of a series of command options made available to the EU**

Discussions will take place between experts from the EU and the Alliance with a view to identifying a series of possible options for the choice of all or part of a chain of command (operation commanders, force commanders, unit commanders and associated Military Staff elements). These discussions will include developing the role of the DSACEUR to enable him to meet his European responsibilities fully and effectively. These discussions will be validated by a meeting of the Military Committees of the two organisations with a view to their approval under each organisation's specific procedures.

- should the EU consider an in-depth study of a strategic option which calls for NATO command options, in particular for the command of the operation, the PSC will inform the NAC;
- after the EU Council has adopted a strategic option and chosen to call upon an operation commander, the PSC will forward to the NAC a request for the command options relating to the operation;
- after the NAC has replied, the Council will appoint the operation commander and, through the intermediary of the PSC, instruct him to activate the chain of command;

the entire chain of command must remain under the political control and strategic direction of the EU throughout the operation, after consultation between the two organisations. In that framework the operation commander will report on the conduct of the operation to EU bodies only. NATO will be informed of developments in the situation by the appropriate bodies, in particular the PSC and the Chairman of the Military Committee.

**TREATY OF NICE AMENDING THE TREATY ON EUROPEAN UNION, THE TREATIES ESTABLISHING THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES AND CERTAIN RELATED ACTS**

(...)

**Article 17 shall be replaced by the following:**

‘Article 17

1. The common foreign and security policy shall include all questions relating to the security of the Union, including the progressive framing of a common defence policy, which might lead to a common defence, should the European Council so decide. It shall in that case recommend to the Member States the adoption of such a decision in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements.

The policy of the Union in accordance with this Article shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States and shall respect the obligations of certain Member States, which see their common defence realised in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), under the North Atlantic Treaty and be compatible with the common security and defence policy established within that framework.

The progressive framing of a common defence policy will be supported, as Member States consider appropriate, by cooperation between them in the field of armaments.

2. Questions referred to in this Article shall include humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.

3. Decisions having defence implications dealt with under this Article shall be taken without prejudice to the policies and obligations referred to in paragraph 1, second subparagraph.

4. The provisions of this Article shall not prevent the development of closer cooperation between two or more Member States on a bilateral level, in the framework of the Western European Union (WEU) and NATO, provided such cooperation does not run counter to or impede that provided for in this Title.

5. With a view to furthering the objectives of this Article, the provisions of this Article will be reviewed in accordance with Article 48.’

(...)

**Article 25 shall be replaced by the following:**

‘Article 25

Without prejudice to Article 207 of the Treaty establishing the European Community, a Political and Security Committee shall monitor the international situation in the areas

covered by the common foreign and security policy and contribute to the definition of policies by delivering opinions to the Council at the request of the Council or on its own initiative. It shall also monitor the implementation of agreed policies, without prejudice to the responsibility of the Presidency and the Commission.

Within the scope of this Title, this Committee shall exercise, under the responsibility of the Council, political control and strategic direction of crisis management operations.

The Council may authorise the Committee, for the purpose and for the duration of a crisis management operation, as determined by the Council, to take the relevant decisions concerning the political control and strategic direction of the operation, without prejudice to Article 47.'

**The following Articles shall be inserted:**

'Article 27a

1. Enhanced cooperation in any of the areas referred to in this Title shall be aimed at safeguarding the values and serving the interests of the Union as a whole by asserting its identity as a coherent force on the international scene. It shall respect:

- the principles, objectives, general guidelines and consistency of the common foreign and security policy and the decisions taken within the framework of that policy;
- the powers of the European Community, and
- consistency between all the Union's policies and its external activities.

2. Articles 11 to 27 and Articles 27b to 28 shall apply to the enhanced cooperation provided for in this Article, save as otherwise provided in Article 27c and Articles 43 to 45.

Article 27b

Enhanced cooperation pursuant to this Title shall relate to implementation of a joint action or a common position. It shall not relate to matters having military or defence implications.

Article 27c

Member States which intend to establish enhanced cooperation between themselves under Article 27b shall address a request to the Council to that effect.

The request shall be forwarded to the Commission and to the European Parliament for information. The Commission shall give its opinion particularly on whether the enhanced cooperation proposed is consistent with Union policies. Authorisation shall be granted by the Council, acting in accordance with the second and third subparagraphs of Article 23(2) and in compliance with Articles 43 to 45.

Article 27d

Without prejudice to the powers of the Presidency or of the Commission, the Secretary-General of the Council, High Representative for the common foreign and security policy, shall in particular ensure that the European Parliament and all members of the Council are

kept fully informed of the implementation of enhanced cooperation in the field of the common foreign and security policy.

**Article 27e**

Any Member State which wishes to participate in enhanced cooperation established in accordance with Article 27c shall notify its intention to the Council and inform the Commission. The Commission shall give an opinion to the Council within three months of the date of receipt of that notification. Within four months of the date of receipt of that notification, the Council shall take a decision on the request and on such specific arrangements as it may deem necessary. The decision shall be deemed to be taken unless the Council, acting by a qualified majority within the same period, decides to hold it in abeyance; in that case, the Council shall state the reasons for its decision and set a deadline for re-examining it.

For the purposes of this Article, the Council shall act by a qualified majority. The qualified majority shall be defined as the same proportion of the weighted votes and the same proportion of the number of the members of the Council concerned as those laid down in the third subparagraph of Article 23(2).'

(...)

# ***33 Report Presented to the Nice European Council by the Secretary General/High Representative and the Commission***

***Nice, 8 December 2000***

## **IMPROVING THE COHERENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION ACTION IN THE FIELD OF CONFLICT PREVENTION**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **Main challenges facing the European Union in effective conflict prevention**

- *to reaffirm and maintain conflict prevention as a fixed priority of EU external action;*
- *to establish and sustain priorities for action in the field of conflict prevention;*
- *to move the timescale for EU action forward, becoming progressively more pro-active and less reactive;*
- *to ensure the coherent use of what is now a very broad range of resources in pursuit of priorities, better integrating development, trade, economic and humanitarian instruments with CFSP instruments and civilian and military capabilities for crisis management;*
- *to deploy those resources in a timely, comprehensive and integrated way;*
- *to build and sustain effective partnerships with those who share our values and priorities at global, regional, national and local level;*
- *to develop targeted common approaches to countries and regions at risk of conflict taking account of CFSP, development, trade, economic and justice and home affairs issues.*

#### **Key recommendations in the short term**

- *early consideration of conflict prevention by the GAC, possibly during annual orientation debate, and periodic identification of priority areas for EU action;*
- *SG/HR and Commission to assist in overseeing implementation of policies;*
- *the Political and Security Committee invited to develop role as a focal point in developing conflict prevention policies in CFSP and CSDP;*
- *Commission to bring forward Communications on Conflict Prevention and on Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development;*
- *Council and Commission to pursue review of relevant budgetary regulations and procedures and to examine issues of co-ordination between Community instruments and those of Member States;*
- *intensify coordination with the UN, building on the UNSG proposals, and supporting drive for greater UN effectiveness generated by the Millennium and Brahimi Reports;*
- *deepen dialogue with and support for key partners including OSCE, Council of Europe and ICRC, as well as academic and NGO communities;*

- *draw on experience of partners in preparing EU action plans and approaches to specific countries and regions;*
- *systematically support the rights of access to potential conflict zones by ICRC, OSCE and UN Human Rights Rapporteurs;*
- *prioritise support for effective action on small arms including in UN and G8 frameworks;*
- *ratify and implement new international instruments including the Rome Statute on the International Criminal Court and the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stock Piling, Production and Transfer of Anti Personnel Mines and On their Destruction;*
- *review use of diplomatic instruments for conflict prevention including the role of Special Representatives and heads of mission;*
- *Council Working Groups invited to develop the practice of scheduling informal discussion with relevant partner organisations;*
- *better coordination of information sources available to Union and regular preparation by the Policy Unit and by the Commission of papers on conflict prevention issues for consideration by policy makers.*

## **I Introduction**

1. Conflict prevention is at the heart of the European Union which is in itself a strikingly successful example of how reconciliation, stability and prosperity can be promoted through closer cooperation and understanding. The process of enlargement aims to extend these benefits to a wider circle of European states. Preserving peace, promoting stability and strengthening international security worldwide is a fundamental objective for the Union, and preventing violent conflict constitutes one of its most important external policy challenges.

2. Conflict bears a human cost in suffering and undermines economic development. It also affects EU interests by creating instability, by reducing trade and putting investments at risk, by imposing a heavy financial burden in reconstruction and ultimately by threatening the security of its citizens. The financial costs of preventing conflict are small compared to the cost of addressing its consequences. Millions of civilians in Africa have died from violent conflict in recent years, and our efforts in support of lasting economic and social development are repeatedly set back by recurring conflict. Conflict has moved much closer in recent years to the EU's own borders: an estimated 200,000 people have been killed and some 1.8 million remain displaced following a decade of conflict in the Western Balkans. Democratic change in the FRY has opened new prospects for lasting peace and stability in the region but the process of recovery will be a long one and the financial cost high. Already the Union has invested some Euro 18 billion in reconstruction for the region as a whole. Recent developments in the Middle East are a reminder of how rapidly conflict can escalate, with potential consequences not only for regional stability but also for the global economy.

3. Against the background of its work on strengthening the Common European Security and Defence Policy, the European Council at Feira underlined its determination to prevent

conflict and invited the Secretary General/High Representative and the Commission to *'submit to the Nice European Council, as a basis for further work, concrete recommendations on how to improve the coherence and effectiveness of the European Union action in the field of conflict prevention, fully taking into account and building upon existing instruments, capabilities and policy guidelines.'*

4. The purpose of this report is to build on the existing work undertaken by the Union, to indicate some of the broader challenges facing the Union as it prepares to undertake further work on conflict prevention, to put forward some concrete recommendations aimed at improving our effectiveness in the short term, and to set out a more coherent framework for possible future action.

## **II Coherent action: the central challenge of conflict prevention**

5. Conflict prevention is not a new issue on the EU's agenda. For some years now, the Union has made sustained efforts to adapt its external action to a changing international security environment characterised by a growth in conflict within borders where civilians are increasingly both the victims and the intended targets of violent conflict. The Council has repeatedly emphasised the importance of effective early action to prevent violent conflict. Our experience of the consequences of conflict has been instrumental in the development of civilian and military crisis management capabilities, and is a driving factor in the development of a more effective and responsive common foreign and security policy. A key challenge now facing the Union is to ensure the most effective use of the full range of tools which have become available in order to prevent conflict from occurring in the first place.

6. The European Union is well placed to engage in conflict prevention. Its capabilities include trade policy instruments, cooperation agreements, development assistance and other forms of economic cooperation, social and environmental policies, humanitarian assistance from both ECHO and member states, civilian and military crisis management capabilities, diplomatic instruments and cooperation in the area of Justice and Home Affairs. In many of these areas the Union has very considerable influence. It is the world's largest provider of development and humanitarian assistance and the biggest trading partner.

7. Specific situations of potential conflict present unique challenges. Policies aimed at defusing tensions in the Middle East will be quite different from those deployed to prevent a recurrence of conflict in the Western Balkans or in the Horn of Africa. The central issue for the Union is one of coherence in deploying the right combination and sequence of instruments in a timely and integrated manner. This demands greater coherence and complementarity at several levels: between the instruments and capabilities available within each pillar, between the pillars themselves, between Member State and Community activities, and between the Union and its international partners in conflict prevention.

8. Moreover, the coherence of conflict prevention policies cannot be separated from the broader issue of how the EU sets priorities in the area of external relations. While some regions, including those close to the EU's own borders, will remain a high priority, the Union must be ready to engage elsewhere when confronted with a clear risk of violent

conflict. The work under way since Brian on improving coordination of EU external assistance will also serve to improve our ability to address situations of emerging conflict.

9. Policies can only be effective if the Union adopts a proactive approach, identifying problems before they become acute, and translating early warning into early action. Measuring the success of conflict prevention policies is particularly difficult, and the absence of easily identifiable results can be a stumbling block in securing support at a political level. Political will is essential if the Union is to develop and sustain a new emphasis at all levels of our external action: a shift from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention.

### **Recommendations**

- *Conflict prevention should be addressed by the GAC, possibly during its annual orientation debate on external relations, integrating the issue into its work and addressing the broader issue of coherence at Council level, including with the Development Council.*
- *The GAC should regularly identify priority areas for EU action in the field of conflict prevention, taking account of recommendations from the SG/HR and the Commission. Where priorities are identified, the Council should invite the SG/HR and the Commission to oversee the implementation of policies and to report accordingly.*
- *The Union should set the explicit aim of developing targeted, common approaches to countries and regions at risk of conflict taking account of CFSP, development, trade, economic and justice and home affairs issues.*

### **III Building more effective partnerships**

10. The causes of conflict are usually complex and therefore require complex policy responses which can only be delivered by a broad range of actors, some of whom have specific mandates under international law. Recent experience clearly demonstrates the need for the European Union to cooperate closely in this area with other regional and international organisations as well as with the non-governmental sector.

11. The United Nations, with its Charter responsibilities, global presence and broad institutional framework, is uniquely placed both to contribute to tackling the root causes of conflict and to take shorter term preventive measures. The UNSG has recently made specific proposals for strengthening dialogue with the Union. Agencies such as UNHCR, UNDP and UNICEF, as well as the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Coordinator for Humanitarian Affairs, have access to extensive information networks and can play an important role in addressing specific problems associated with conflict. The UN is currently taking steps towards greater effectiveness in conflict prevention. The European Union can play a key role in helping to maintain the momentum to this work.

12. Regional cooperation and the growth of regional and sub-regional organisations is a development which in itself plays a valuable role in conflict prevention. Organisations such as the OAS, OAU, SADC, ECOWAS, the ARF and ASEAN are adopting an operational

role in this area. Key partners for the EU are the OSCE and the Council of Europe. Each plays a distinct role: the OSCE through its field missions, the High Commissioner on National Minorities and its emerging mechanisms for preventing and managing conflict, and the Council of Europe through its Parliamentary Assembly and its role in standard setting and human rights. Partnership for Peace, through its work on Petersberg Tasks, and the EAPC can also play a valuable contributory role in conflict prevention.

13. The G8, IMF and World Bank have taken an active role in developing an approach to conflict prevention which focuses on the broader economic factors underlying conflict, including issues such as the trade in small arms and diamonds.

14. Non-governmental organisations have an increasingly influential role to play in conflict prevention. Many are well-placed to work with the victims of conflict and to identify and address root causes at an early stage. Others have done valuable work on policy elaboration and conflict mediation. Experience in Serbia demonstrates that a strong and active civil society and independent media are themselves important factors for democratic change and long-term stability. The growth in the number of civilian victims of conflict underlines the increasingly important role of the International Committee of the Red Cross in promoting and upholding humanitarian law.

15. The EU's extensive political dialogue offers regular opportunities to address the issue of conflict prevention with our partners in a more flexible and timely way, both with those who are directly at risk of conflict and those with the potential to assist those at risk.

16. Building effective partnerships with such a broad range of actors sets specific challenges for the European Union: first, to establish a focussed dialogue with agreed contact points based on mutual priorities; second, to incorporate their input into our own policy formulation; third, to establish practical cooperation on operational issues and fourth, to support mandate based organisations in playing their role for conflict prevention to the full. The principles guiding our approach to partnership should include those of added value, comparative advantage and mutually reinforcing institutions.

### ***Recommendations***

- *Further development of mechanisms for coordination with the UN system, building on the proposals already put forward by the UN SG.*
- *Support the drive for greater UN effectiveness in conflict prevention, maintaining the momentum generated by the Millennium Report and the Brahimi Report on peacekeeping.*
- *Deepen dialogue with other key international and regional partners such as the OSCE, the Council of Europe and the ICRC, with a view to identifying common priorities, strengthening support for their mandates and cooperating in the implementation of EU policies.*
- *Draw on the experience of other actors in preparing EU action plans and approaches to specific countries and regions.*

- *Intensify dialogue with the academic and NGO communities in order to improve effectiveness in identifying potential conflict and to ensure close convergence of effort on priority issues.*
- *Systematically support the rights of access to potential conflict zones by other mandated organisations including the ICRC, OSCE and UN Human Rights Rapporteurs.*
- *Consistently integrate conflict prevention priorities into our political dialogue with international partners (as is already the case with Canada and Japan) as well as with those directly at risk of conflict.*
- *Support conflict prevention initiatives in the G8 framework, in particular in areas where the G8 can bring particular value such as small arms and the illicit trade in high-value commodities.*

#### **IV Long-term measures**

17. There is a wide range of measures which can be deployed over the long-term in support of an overall strategy of conflict prevention. Many of these already constitute a major part of the Union's action in the area of external relations. In general, long-term action is not focussed on the avoidance of a specific and imminent outbreak of conflict, but is designed to address the underlying causes of conflict and thereby to contribute to the overall objective of peace and stability. The role of the Union as a global trading partner and as the largest donor of development cooperation give it the possibility of contributing to conflict prevention even in those areas which are not the subject of specific policy priorities. The recently agreed standard framework for Country Strategy Papers should become an important basis for ensuring coherence between the long term cooperation programs and other complementary actions aimed at preventing conflict. Long term action may be divided into horizontal instruments which are explicit in their overall objective of preventing conflict, and broader policies which address wider economic and developmental issues, but in doing so have an important role to play in creating the conditions for longer-term stability.

18. Many of the horizontal issues are relatively new on the international agenda. The establishment of the International Criminal Court and the creation of new international instruments governing landmines and the issue of child soldiers will enable us to address new and emerging concerns but must be followed up by sustained and concerted efforts aimed at full ratification of the instruments and implementation of their standards. This calls for closer convergence between Community and Member State programmes aimed at addressing such issues. Our emphasis on human rights values and on upholding international legal standards provides a framework for much of this effort. Human rights and humanitarian violations lie at the heart of many conflicts. Addressing the gap between international commitments and practical implementation must be a priority in our conflict prevention policies.

19. Other concerns have yet to be addressed, not least the issue of the trade in small arms and the trade in diamonds. The Union should continue to support such initiatives which

have a clear role in preventing conflict and should remain open to suggestions (both from inside and outside) for further imaginative proposals which would deserve its support.

20. Increasingly important also are the wide range of instruments falling under the heading of 'Justice and Home Affairs'. Measures designed to tackle organised crime, drug trafficking and money laundering all have the long-term effect of creating greater stability and therefore contributing to the prevention of conflict. Initiatives undertaken in recent years in the UN, G8 and other contexts have helped to create frameworks in which concerted action on these issues can be taken at international level. The Union has been involved in all of these initiatives and has sought to adapt its own instruments in support of them. The challenge for the Union now is to develop policy-making mechanisms which allow it to integrate these initiatives into its overall political approach to specific countries and regions, to assess their respective benefits, and to set priorities for the future.

21. Alongside these horizontal measures, there is a wide range of instruments which can contribute to the prevention of conflict. These should be used in a more targeted manner to address the root-causes of violent conflicts, such as inequality of opportunity, lack of legitimacy and effectiveness of government, lack of frameworks for peaceful conciliation of interests and absence of an active and organised civil society. In many countries, conflict prevention can also be considered a development objective because without peace and democratic stability there can be no poverty alleviation and no sustainable development.

22. The most effective way for the Union to use its cooperation instruments in conflict prevention is by integrating long-term peace-building measures into its country cooperation strategies. In countries in unstable situations, specific projects and programs within the cooperation sectors included in the Country Strategy Papers should be dedicated to supporting a peaceful resolution of conflict and strengthening the democratic state. These should support political dialogue and mediation efforts, democratic institutions, the rule of law and the administration of justice, an effective and impartial police force, and, for countries emerging from armed conflict, the demobilisation and reintegration of ex-combatants, including child soldiers. Furthermore, in traditional sectors of development cooperation (infrastructure, health, education etc.), the reduction of existing imbalances in a society, whether ethnic, regional, or economic, must be taken into account in allocating funds to specific sectors.

23. The Union should also strengthen its support for non-state actors which play a role in developing a culture of democracy, tolerance and peaceful resolution of conflict, through support for projects and programmes which assist independent media, civil society, local NGOs, women's groups etc.

24. Effective deployment of both horizontal measures and measures designed to tackle the root causes of conflict requires much greater coordination between Community instruments and those relevant instruments of the Member States. This should involve cooperation both in-country and between capitals at an early stage.

## **Recommendations**

- *Closer consideration should be given to coherence and coordination between measures envisaged or taken in the different phases of a conflict or crisis situation. The Commission will present in January 2001 a Communication on Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development which will i.a. include proposals to enable a quicker and more coherent transition from one phase of assistance to another in countries going through a crisis, whether political or other in nature.*
- *An inventory should be made of EU instruments and policies which could be brought to bear on conflict situations. A Commission Communication on conflict prevention in Spring 2001 will focus specifically on the use and possible adaptation of Community instruments in this respect. The Commission will also pursue work on the 'Conflict Prevention Handbook' detailing instruments and procedures.*
- *In the context of 'post-Evian' discussions on ways to improve co-ordination between Community instruments for external cooperation and those of Member States, greater exchange of information on economic and political issues, both at the level of capitals and in country, is recommended. This should include a revitalisation of the Electronic Bulletin Board (EBB), established by the Commission in 1999 to link country desk officers in the Commission, Council and Member States.*
- *An early decision by the Council on the proposed recasting of the Financial Regulation would facilitate the successful completion of the reform of EC external cooperation programmes. In this context, the Commission will also pursue internally the objective of more rapid mobilisation of funds under its various cooperation programmes.*
- *The Union should give priority to effective preparation for the UN Conference on Small Arms and to the ratification and implementation of new international instruments including the Rome Statute on the International Criminal Court and the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stock Piling, Production and Transfer of Anti Personnel Mines and On their Destruction.*

## **V Short term measures**

25. Situations which have the potential to lead to conflict in the short term are often characterised by complexity and rapid change. If it is to use its instruments and capabilities to best effect, the Union must address specific challenges to the way in which policy is formulated and implemented.

26. First, efforts at conflict prevention must be underpinned by vigorous and continuous diplomatic engagement, involving the transmission of clear messages to countries and regions in a situation of political deterioration as well as to its other international partners. Progress has been made. The EU's traditional diplomatic instruments such as structured political dialogue, démarches, and high-level visits are increasingly effective. The use of special representatives has allowed sustained engagement in both the Middle East, Africa and the Western Balkans. The appointment of the High Representative with new resources in the Council Secretariat has raised the level of our diplomatic engagement and broadened its scope. This must be underpinned however by a more focused, flexible and robust approach to dialogue than is often the case at present. There is a need for more informal

contact with a broad range of actors, clear mandates and for a more effective use of the privileged relationships of individual Member States in support of a common political objective. Such an approach has been successful in assisting a peaceful transition to democracy in Serbia. The effectiveness of dialogue will be further enhanced by the development of ESDP and the development of a comprehensive range of civilian and military instruments, broadening the toolbox for conflict prevention and enabling the EU to deploy civilian and military crisis management instruments for conflict prevention purposes.

27. Second, moving the focus of policy-making away from a responsive to a more proactive approach represents a particular challenge for the Union. The earlier the Union is able to anticipate and address problems, the lower the ultimate human and financial cost. Conflict prevention has to begin in situations of 'unstable peace', where structural problems are apparent but have not yet resulted in open violence. The Union has access to information from many sources and a range of capabilities, many of them new, for assessing situations and formulating policy options. Their potential has still to be fully developed. Translating early warning into early action will require the application of political will by the Council and its bodies at all levels in order to encourage the early assessment of potential problems and the formulation of possible policy options.

28. Third, as is the case with our longer term measures, there is a clear need for comprehensive and integrated policies which address the full range of factors which can produce or exacerbate violence. These include discrimination against minorities, forced population displacement, the abuse of human rights, and weak institutions, the availability of small arms, abuse of humanitarian law, exclusion of international organisations and curtailment of media freedoms.

29. Fourth, a recurring challenge is the need for responsiveness in the deployment of appropriate instruments. Deployment can involve a range of authorities and different procedures for decision making and accountability: humanitarian aid and trade policy fall within Community competence while responsibility for third pillar instruments and new civilian and military capabilities lies primarily with Member States. Achieving coherence and responsiveness is not solely a matter of instruments but of political will.

### ***Recommendations***

- *Evaluate use of diplomatic instruments for conflict prevention (including use of Special Representatives) with objective of more focussed, flexible and robust diplomatic engagement.*
- *The Political and Security Committee should continue to develop its potential as a focal point within the framework of CFSP and CSDP for the development, implementation and monitoring of conflict prevention policies.*
- *Council Working Groups should support PSC in this task and develop the practice of joint meetings and informal discussion with relevant partner organisations*
- *More proactive use of heads of mission for conflict prevention, including through visits to potential conflict zones, and the preparation of regular systematic reports.*

- *Better coordination of the wide range of information sources now available for identifying and monitoring potential conflicts including Member States commitment to sharing all relevant information.*
- *Regular preparation by the Policy Unit and by the Commission of conflict prevention papers for consideration by policy makers.*

## **VI Conclusion**

30. Effective action by the EU in the area of conflict prevention will require sustained political will and should become a priority. Future work should acknowledge our failures but also build on our successes. The Union has, for example, made a very substantial contribution to the establishment of permanent stability in Central and Eastern Europe. The rapid delivery of political and financial support to Montenegro was important in stabilising a potential conflict situation while our support for democratic forces in Serbia and the recent Zagreb Summit with its emphasis on the Stability and Association Process have opened up new prospects for lasting peace in the region. It can build also on successes further afield. After a decade which has seen many failures, the wider international community has, for example, acted to address the spiral of conflict in East Timor and has stepped in to provide the support and security necessary for the re-establishment of public authority and civil society.

31. The challenges which face the Union as it sets about improving its coherence and effectiveness for conflict prevention are similar to those which it faces throughout its external action: to establish and sustain priorities for action; to ensure the coherent use of what is now a very broad range of resources in pursuit of those priorities; to deploy those resources in a pro-active, flexible and integrated way; and to build and sustain effective partnerships with those who share our values and priorities at global, regional, national and local level. Addressing these issues in the context of conflict prevention can give impetus to our efforts towards greater coherence in all external action. It is an ambitious political undertaking and will be achieved only with the exercise of political will. Nonetheless, it demands a high place in the Council's priorities. The benefits of effective conflict prevention – to human life, political stability, national and community budgets, and trade and investment – will far outweigh the effort invested.

## **34 North Atlantic Council Brussels, 14-15 December 2000**

*At the Nice European Council, ministers reiterated the wish and need for permanent arrangements and links between the EU and NATO. No agreement on this point was reached at the NAC meeting in Brussels on 14-15 December 2000 because of Turkish dissatisfaction with the so-called 'participation issue'. The outcome of an informal dinner on 15 December, arranged at the last moment, for NATO and EU Foreign Ministers, was no more successful.*

*The extracts of the Final Communiqué of the NAC meeting reproduced below elaborate on NATO-EU relations following the Nice European Council.*

### **FINAL COMMUNIQUE**

(...)

28. We took stock of the progress made to date on the development of the European Security and Defence Identity in accordance with the decisions taken at the Washington Summit and subsequent Ministerial meetings. We reaffirmed our determination to reinforce NATO's European pillar and remain committed to a balanced and dynamic transatlantic partnership. We share the goal endorsed by EU Member States at the Nice European Council for a genuine strategic partnership in crisis management between NATO and the EU. The Alliance will remain the foundation for the collective defence of its members and continue actively to play its important role in crisis management as set out in the Strategic Concept. The partnership between NATO and the EU and the development of a capable and effective ESDI, in accordance with the principles set out at the Washington Summit and subsequent Ministerial meetings, will strengthen the Alliance through which we remain ready to pursue common security objectives wherever possible.

29. We welcome the intensification of the dialogue between the Alliance and the European Union since our last meeting in Florence. In this context, we look forward to the working dinner between Foreign Ministers of NATO and the European Union later today, which is an important step towards establishing a close, confident and mutually beneficial relationship between the two organisations. We have made progress in the NATO-EU ad hoc working groups which have met to discuss security issues, permanent arrangements for consultation and co-operation, modalities for EU access to NATO assets and capabilities, and capability goals – taking into account all relevant matters, including those related to participation. Together with the two meetings of the North Atlantic Council and the EU interim Political and Security Committee in September and November, they have enhanced the understanding of the two organisations and their members on how they might most effectively cooperate in the future. We look forward to their future work as well as to future meetings of the North Atlantic Council and the Political and Security Committee with a view to developing all the elements of the envisaged NATO-EU relations. We also

welcome the establishment of an interim security agreement between the two organisations and note NATO's readiness to conclude a permanent security agreement with the European Union as a matter of priority.

30. The European Allies are committed to further strengthening their military capabilities and to reinforcing the Alliance's European pillar. This will enhance their ability to contribute both to the Alliance's missions and to EU-led operations for Petersberg tasks where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged. We note that this process does not imply the creation of a European army and that the commitment of national resources for EU-led operations will be based on sovereign decisions. We welcome the efforts made in the EU towards meeting its Headline Goal by 2003 as set out at the Helsinki European Council, thus contributing to the improvement and strengthening of European military capabilities. Alliance experts, on the basis of a Council decision, have contributed military and technical advice to the work of EU experts on a catalogue of forces and capabilities for the EU Headline Goal. We note the EU's acknowledgement of the value of this input. NATO stands ready to provide, subject to the necessary decisions, further expert advice upon request by the EU. We welcome the pledges made at the recent EU Capabilities Commitment Conference, noting the EU's appreciation of the significant additional contributions offered by non-EU European Allies to the pool of forces available for EU-led operations. Such contributions, as expressed on 21 November 2000 at the meeting between the EU and the non-EU European Allies, are important and will enhance the range of capabilities potentially available to the EU. We note the EU's recognition of the need for further capability improvements. The Alliance's Defence Capabilities Initiative is also supporting the enhancement of European capabilities. The objectives arising from NATO's DCI and the EU's Headline Goal are mutually reinforcing.

31. We note and welcome the proposals made by the European Council at Nice for permanent arrangements to ensure full transparency, consultation and co-operation between NATO and the EU. We agree that consultations and co-operation will be developed between the two organisations on questions of common interest relating to security, defence and crisis management, so that crises can be met with the most appropriate military response and effective crisis management ensured.

We look forward to the early establishment of such mutually satisfactory arrangements based on the principles enunciated in Washington and at subsequent Ministerial meetings, which will be taken into account in the framework agreement establishing these arrangements. These arrangements are key to a close, confident and transparent relationship between the two organisations as foreseen at the Washington Summit.

We welcome the intention of the European Union that this dialogue should be pursued through a regular pattern of meetings at Ministerial, North Atlantic Council/Political and Security Committee, Military Committee and expert level as well as through contacts with Secretariats to ensure consultation, co-operation and transparency. We endorse the view of the EU that in the emergency phase of a crisis contacts and meetings will be stepped up. In the view of the Alliance, meetings between the North Atlantic Council and the Political and Security Committee outside times of crisis should be held not less than three times, and Ministerial meetings once, per EU Presidency; either organisation may request additional meetings as necessary.

We welcome the Nice provisions on invitations for the NATO Secretary General, Chairman of the Military Committee and DSACEUR, in accordance with his terms of reference, to EU meetings. For our part, on the basis of reciprocity, we will invite the EU Presidency and Secretary General/High Representative to NATO meetings. The Chairman of the EU Military Committee or his representative will similarly be invited to meetings of the NATO Military Committee.

The Alliance agrees that these proposals constitute the basis for the permanent NATO/EU agreement. We stand ready to work to finalise this agreement without delay.

32. We underline, as we did at the Washington Summit and subsequent Ministerial meetings, the importance of finding solutions satisfactory to all Allies to the issue of participation. We note the provisions agreed by the European Council at Nice for dialogue, consultation and co-operation with non-EU European Allies on issues related to security and defence policy and crisis management and as well as the modalities for participation in EU-led military operations. We welcome the commitment to intensify consultation in times of crisis, which will also enable non-EU European Allies to raise their concerns when they consider their security interests might be involved. It is particularly important in this context that non-EU European Allies can request meetings with the European Union and submit proposals for agenda items.

Allies look forward to the broad and effective practical implementation of these arrangements, in particular for consultation and co-operation with the EU Political and Security Committee and EU Military Committee and, as appropriate, with the EU military staff, so as to ensure that the Allies concerned derive maximum benefit from them and to enable the Allies concerned to contribute effectively. In this context, in accordance with the Washington Treaty, we stress the importance we attach to respecting the security interests of all Allies and the obligations which they have to each other as Allies.

We also welcome the EU's decision at Nice on initial proposals to develop dialogue, co-operation and consultation with Canada, including a commitment to intensify consultation in times of crisis, particularly when the EU is considering an operation using NATO assets and capabilities.

33. Taking into account the evolution of relevant arrangements in the EU, work on ESDI is continuing within the Alliance as directed at the Washington Summit and agreed at subsequent Ministerial meetings. It has proceeded on the principle that nothing will be agreed until everything is agreed – the participation issue is also relevant in this context. On this basis, and consistent with the decisions taken at Washington and subsequent Ministerial meetings, work has progressed on the various aspects of the Washington agenda. Subject to this, we intend to put in place arrangements for: assured EU access to NATO planning capabilities able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations; the presumption of availability to the EU of pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets for use in EU-led operations; the identification of a range of European command options for EU-led operations, further developing the role of DSACEUR in order for him to assume fully and effectively his European responsibilities; and the further adaptation of the Alliance's defence planning system, taking account of relevant activities in and proposals from the European Union. Allies will be consulted on the EU's proposed use of assets and

capabilities, prior to the decision to release these assets and capabilities, and kept informed during the operation.

34. Important work remains to be done which we will pursue intensively. We direct the Council in Permanent Session to continue work on the implementation of the ESDI decisions on the basis of the agenda above, and to report to us at our next meeting.

35. We note the decisions taken at the Ministerial meeting of the WEU held in Marseille in November, particular that WEU/NATO routine consultations mechanisms will be suspended, except for those that still need to be applied during the transition period, in particular for the joint exercise study next year, JES 2001, to which we look forward. We appreciate the WEU's important contribution to the development of the European security and defence architecture. We have valued the close co-operation between NATO and the WEU and pay tribute to the work of the WEU and NATO staffs in support of it.