

A stylized world map composed of a grid of dots in various shades of gray, with several dots highlighted in red. The map is centered behind the title and subtitle.

# EU Civilian Crisis Management in Early 2010

The Beginning of a New Chapter Fraught  
with Complex Tasks

**RADEK KHOL**  
September 2010

- The EU has, over the past decade, established itself as an important and complex security actor able successfully to plan and conduct civilian crisis management missions on a scale that few other international actors are capable of and that no single Member State can achieve on its own. It is now time to move ahead to confront the challenging tasks remaining in places such as Afghanistan and Kosovo and to achieve even better results, reflecting the vision and principles outlined in the European Security Strategy.
- This task of improving how, where and under what conditions the EU's crisis management instruments are used needs a clearly defined strategic vision. New European External Action Service structures brought into being by the Lisbon Treaty can assist in this task, but first and foremost a consensus must be reached among EU Member States on these matters.
- As the EU's crisis management activities depend largely on the resources of the EU Member States, it is imperative that the latter adopt and effectively implement national strategies to facilitate deployment of civilian personnel to international crisis management operations, drawing upon best practices across EU Member States.
- As EU crisis management structures mature further it is also vital to apply a robust system to integrate »lessons identified«, at both the Member State and the EU level, identifying best practices as well as gaps and challenges faced by civilian CSDP Missions. Only by means of such a system can the EU become more effective and deliver on the ground, where demands for EU action are growing all the time.





## Content

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>Introduction</b> .....  | <b>3</b> |
| <b>Achievements of Civilian ESDP in the Course of Ten Years –<br/>An Institutional Perspective</b> ..... | <b>3</b> |
| <b>Overview of the Breadth of Civilian ESDP Missions</b> .....   | <b>5</b> |
| <b>The Way Forward – Member States, Brussels and Field-level</b> .....                                   | <b>5</b> |
| <b>Lisbon Treaty and Possible Impact of the EEAS</b> .....   | <b>7</b> |
| <b>Conclusions</b> .....   | <b>7</b> |
| <b>Policy Recommendations</b> .....  | <b>8</b> |



## Introduction

Ten years after its launch, EU civilian crisis management is a qualified success. The EU has successfully established the necessary new structures of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP)<sup>1</sup> and, above all, has been carrying out under the EU flag a growing number of crisis management operations.

The past decade has seen the construction of new structures inside the EU institutions – primarily within the General Secretariat of the European Council, GSC – to deal with crisis management, in both its civilian and military dimensions, including new operations never before conducted under the EU flag, while every effort is made to ensure coherence and interlinkage with traditional Community instruments and EU external relations. Some of the GSC structures tasked with planning and running EU civilian crisis management activities are fairly unique in many respects and for all practical purposes, unlike in the military sphere, do not have any counterparts at the national level.

While ESDP was built to serve the EU and to reflect its collective ambitions, it must rely on the political will and, above all, the capacity of the individual Member States to provide the necessary resources and capabilities, as well as their perseverance to see political actions and operations through. The consensus principle guiding all ESDP decisions and actions has its strengths and limitations. It might be painstakingly slow to reach consensus among 27 Member States with different traditions of foreign and security policy, and interpretations of their national and EU interests in a particular region or crisis area, not to mention national sensitivities. But once consensus is achieved, the EU's power, the wide spectrum of tools available to it and support across the 27 Member States is usually much more potent than anything a single Member State could hope to achieve in dealing with complex crises, such as Kosovo, Afghanistan, Georgia or piracy off the Horn of Africa.

In pursuit of overall coherence and better identification of a common strategic vision of the EU in dealing with security policy issues Member States can rely on the basic principles laid down in the European Security Strategy

(ESS), adopted in December 2003. Rather than a full-scale review, fine-tuning was deemed sufficient in the run-up to its fifth anniversary, eventually producing the Implementation Report in December 2008.

In line with the global outlook defined in the ESS and the expectation that the EU will play an important security role in most major security hotspots there is no shortage of demands on EU action. The EU is indeed a security actor with a unique combination of tools at its disposal, including both civilian and military crisis management tools, but also a solid presence (through EC Delegations) in more than 130 countries throughout the world. A more copious toolbox of coherent strategies and policies should now also be available to the EU as a result of the Lisbon Treaty.

Civilian crisis management missions represent one of the tools used by the EU on a regular basis. We can identify a clear recent trend towards EU deployment of more demanding civilian ESDP missions – operating in a high-risk environment, performing executive tasks, advising on the complex restructuring of the security sector in third countries and engaging in long-term commitments.

The political ambitions of the EU and demands from crisis areas have so far always been greater than its ability to generate the required capabilities – in the case of civilian crisis management these are primarily seconded civilian experts, but also the provision of the financial resources needed for their secondment; providing the necessary equipment; establishing effective legal frameworks for their deployment; setting up and running complex selection, recruitment and training systems; identifying lessons and best practices; and implementing overall knowledge management. These things present a crucial challenge for the EU and its Member States if they want to deliver effective ESDP missions on the ground and to make a difference in terms of the local population, regional stability and international security writ large.

## Achievements of Civilian ESDP in the Course of Ten Years – An Institutional Perspective

To become a full-fledged security actor, able to make important decisions on crisis management policies and operations the EU needed to establish permanent crisis management support structures and new Council

1. Throughout this text the term »ESDP« will be used to refer to the period prior to 1 December 2009, when the Lisbon Treaty entered into force, while »CSDP« will be used for the period thereafter.

working bodies. Thus, the Political and Security Committee since the Treaty of Nice (2000) has exercised political control and strategic direction over operational crisis management activities, assisted on the civilian side by the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM). While CIVCOM is the key body for the discussion and preparation of policy-making on the part of the PSC and the Council in their respective roles, with regard to both capabilities and civilian ESDP missions it is involved in regular interaction with other relevant Council working bodies, such as the Political-Military Group (PMG), RELEX and geographical working groups (such as COWEB, COEST, COASI, COAFR and so on). This multifaceted dimension of its work is mirrored at the national level by the much more daunting task of intra-ministerial coordination within individual Member States, where civilian crisis management usually involves a number of ministries (foreign affairs, interior, justice and so on) and often also the prime minister's office or national security council equivalents.

The operational dimension of EU structures presented a similar challenge and over the past decade has gone through an institutional evolution of its own, especially on the civilian side, where nearly 20 civilian ESDP missions have been launched since January 2003. Directorate DGE IX (Civilian crisis management) came into being in 2001 and was given a fairly demanding list of tasks: from developing basic conceptual documents for civilian crisis management areas under EU auspices, through strategic planning for civilian ESDP missions, to the launching and running of multiple missions in several crisis regions. In order to respond to the huge demands imposed by operational planning, mission support and effective conduct of civilian ESDP missions – since 2006 nearly 10 civilian ESDP missions have been running simultaneously, at several key security hotspots – the EU decided in August 2007 to set up a new Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC), headed by the Civilian Operations Commander (CivOpsCdr). It also adopted a new civilian command and control document. The organisational evolution of the GSC structures dealing with crisis management was completed for the time being with a Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD), created on 1 February 2010, bringing together the civilian and military dimensions of strategic planning and supervising current missions and operations.

The EU now has at its disposal fairly unique permanent multinational structures capable of strategic and operational planning for international civilian crisis management missions. This is crucial as, unlike military operations, there is no single Member State capable of performing these tasks on its own; not to mention the much greater legitimacy it bestows on the EU as a collective entity in using crisis management tools abroad. On the international scene, only the UN is capable of planning and launching such complex civilian crisis management missions. Also in contrast to the military sphere there are no permanent OHQs and it is impossible to find even one standing multinational nucleus of OHQs or FHQs. The EU therefore has to rely on its own structures and set up new mission HQs in an ad hoc manner. An additional challenge for the EU in civilian crisis management is its need to provide for key mission personnel, select individual mission members and proceed with mission planning in parallel. No pool of potential Heads of Mission exists for civilian ESDP missions; the same applies with regard to senior mission personnel and for EU Special Representatives.

Another area being pursued at the EU level is related to concepts. Basic civilian ESDP concepts were initially established in 2001–2004 but, understandably, without much reference to actual ESDP operational activity. Consequently, with the massing of a solid body of ESDP operational experience they are now being revised and new concepts are under preparation. The recently completed revised concepts reflect both ESDP operational feedback and deepened cooperation among the EU Member States in the areas of police and justice. A good example is the Comprehensive Concept for Police Strengthening Missions agreed at the end of 2009. The revised concept builds on the need for strong links between the police and justice sectors within the broader rule of law framework. It also further stresses the importance of the interface with the host country's justice system, as well as focusing on the fight against corruption and organised crime. This area is particularly topical as organised crime originating in the target countries where ESDP missions operate may ultimately directly affect the security of EU Member States and their citizens.

## Overview of the Breadth of Civilian ESDP Missions

Civilian ESDP missions have become one of the most frequently used tools of the CFSP over the past seven years. Over 4,000 civilian experts – both seconded by Member States or participating Third States and contracted internationally or nationally – are currently serving in nine civilian crisis management missions run under ESDP auspices (with another one deploying civilian experts seconded by Member States but financed through Community instruments being conducted under the EU flag along the Moldova/Ukraine border). The track record is therefore growing and experience accumulating as a result of the deployment of almost twenty civilian ESDP missions over the period 2003–2009. They have been deployed in key regions for EU security interests: Western Balkans, Eastern Europe, South Caucasus, the Middle East, Africa and Central and Southeast Asia.

The civilian ESDP missions deployed so far can be differentiated as follows:

*Size:* big (EULEX Kosovo), medium-sized (EUPM Bosnia and Herzegovina, EUMM Georgia, EUPOL Afghanistan, AMM) and smaller-sized (all other civilian ESDP missions deployed in FYROM, Palestine, Democratic Republic of Congo, Sudan, Guinea Bissau and Iraq).

*Nature of the mandate:* Executive or non-executive, main area of the mandate (Police, Justice, broader Rule of Law, Monitoring, Security Sector Reform and so on).

The measuring of overall progress in achieving ESDP mission mandates within the framework of the overall situation in the host country has been difficult so far. The programmatic approach gradually being adopted by civilian ESDP missions (now as a pilot project within EULEX Kosovo) may help in this regard, although ultimately these activities must also be viewed and assessed in their political context, as most Member States tend to do in any case. As ESDP operational activities move into more high-security risk theatres and concentrate on more complex mandates this brings with it difficult challenges in the operational and political dimensions that EU institutions and Member States must be aware of and address effectively. Only in this way can the EU as a security actor involved in crisis management activities remain relevant and deal with the manifold security crises that affect the Union's interests.

## The Way Forward – Member States, Brussels and Field-level

### Addressing Structural Challenges

If the EU is to become truly effective in the use of the civilian crisis management tools at its disposal within the CSDP framework it needs to address three main challenges:

1. The elaboration of an overall EU strategy vis-à-vis a given country or a crisis region, as the deployment of a civilian CSDP mission cannot be an end in itself. The EU needs to focus on what crisis management missions can actually achieve over the short and medium terms, followed by further activities utilising various Community instruments in order to achieve a truly sustainable effect.
2. A measure of progress must be established as part of the initial mandate and afterwards as a tool for regular mission reviews (usually conducted through Six-Monthly Review reports). Importantly, a clear commitment from the host country in this regard must be secured prior to the deployment of a civilian CSDP mission.
3. The growing deployment gap. Over recent years the growing gap between authorised and actual levels of staffing of civilian CSDP missions marks the continuation of a worrying trend of understaffing. It seems that the political ambitions of the EU Member States may be much greater than the current capacity to provide qualified, well-trained, well-prepared and well-equipped civilian personnel for EU civilian crisis management operations on a sustainable basis.

In 2009, several documents were adopted and subsequent processes put in motion to improve EU civilian crisis management. Specifically, a document entitled »Civilian Capability Planning and Development – Guidelines for the second semester of 2009« was issued by the PSC on 7 July 2009, building upon the ideas of the Hluboká non-paper presented at the Gymnich meeting of foreign ministers on 27–28 March 2009. In addition, two previous processes were under way, namely Civilian Headline Goal 2010, Civilian Capability Improvement Plan 2009 and the so-called Traffic Lights paper (jointly developed by the Council Secretariat and European Commission services). The following actions and results materialised within these processes:

**Goalkeeper project** – a purpose-built software environment has been developed by the Council Secretariat to support capability planning and development for civilian aspects of ESDP. Four interlinked applications are envisaged, addressing the following areas and tasks: (i) generation of job descriptions for mission personnel (Headhunter), (ii) Member States' potentially available personnel (Registrar), (iii) training (Schoolmaster) and (iv) overview of concepts/doctrines and national strategies to facilitate the deployment of civilian personnel to missions (Governor).<sup>2</sup>

**National strategies** facilitating the deployment of civilian personnel in ESDP missions. A general objective was agreed by the Council in December 2008, then further developed at the informal meeting of foreign ministers (Gymnich) at Hluboká in April 2009, where the issues of civilian crisis management capabilities and ways forward were discussed intensively. A high-level seminar in June 2009 identified four areas of action:

1. national regulatory frameworks;
2. dedicated budget lines;
3. national rosters of civilian personnel for deployment in international crisis management operations;
4. training activities.

Follow-up seminars at expert level were conducted during the second semester of 2009 in those areas, identifying best practices and possible ways forward.

**Enhancing civilian rapid deployment capability** – this area included discussions on fine-tuning preparatory measures (including discussions on possible revision of the Financial Regulation in 2010, so that specific rules applicable to CFSP/CSDP could be established); rapid availability of vital equipment for the start-up of civilian CSDP missions was discussed in 2009, focusing on a temporary solution as well as a feasibility study on the permanent warehousing of strategic materials for deploying in new missions – the example of the UN Logistical Base in Brindisi could be helpful in this respect; Civilian Re-

sponse Teams – the CRT Concept was revised and a doubling of the CRT pool of experts agreed in late 2009.

**Capabilities/civil-military synergies** – in the area of the development of civilian capabilities conducted under the Civilian Headline Goal 2010, attention is now being paid to seeking possible synergies with the development process concerning military capabilities and the development of concrete dual use capabilities for both civilian CSDP missions and military CSDP operations in areas such as transport, communication and information systems (CIS), security and protection of personnel, medical support and so on. The EU must, however, look beyond the 2010 horizon of current capability development processes with a view to establishing a future comprehensive capability development process encompassing both the civilian and the military dimensions, while respecting the specific features of both domains.

**Training** – specific challenges exist in the civilian crisis management field: no pre-formed, pre-equipped and pre-trained units exist at national level (with the exception of Integrated Police Units/Formed Police Units (IPUs/FPU) in some Member States, such as various gendarmerie-type units). Also, civilian training infrastructure varies significantly across the EU (the situation is significantly different from the military field, where practically all Member States have at their disposal military educational institutions and systems for the preparation of military personnel, including for deployment to international crisis management operations generally). Personnel for civilian ESDP missions can come both from within the civil service and beyond; as a consequence, civilian personnel deployed on ESDP missions have different levels of training (and sometimes none at all). As the absolute majority of civilian personnel are seconded national experts there has so far been no agreement on the testing of key skills (language, driving and so on) prior to deployment (unlike in the case of the UN).

**Best practices** – identifying lessons from both civilian and military ESDP missions and operations is one way of improving their performance and carrying out better planning for future CSDP operations. A much better overall framework now exists in the area of civilian CSDP, with the adoption of the »Guidelines on the Identification and Implementation of Lessons and Best Practices« in November 2008, followed by the first Annual Report in 2009, as foreseen in the Guidelines. All civilian ESDP

2. Public sections of Goalkeeper applications are available online at <https://esdp.consilium.europa.eu>



missions have appointed best practice officers and now include a section on best practices and lessons identified in the regular Six Monthly Review reports.

## Lisbon Treaty and Possible Impact of the EEAS

The Lisbon Treaty, which entered into force on 1 December 2009, brought with it not only newly created posts (High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy/Vice-President of the European Commission) and institutional entities (European External Action Service), but also a high level of expectation in the area of EU crisis management. First of all, new structures reporting to HR/VP Ashton could finally provide – or at least improve – coherence with regard to all broadly defined external relations and crisis management instruments available to the EU. HR/VP Ashton will be backed by the newly created EEAS, including all EU civilian and military crisis management structures (primarily CMPD, CPCC and EUMS), while her overall responsibility as Vice-President of the European Commission should also encompass strategic planning with regard to utilisation of the vast array of Community instruments. Furthermore, HR/VP Ashton should be able to draw upon a dense network of EU Delegations (previously Commission Delegations), present in more than 130 countries around the globe to receive and utilise information made available through their activities on the ground, in a better and more efficient manner. However, in the area of crisis management, the EU Delegations will have to undergo something of a transformation themselves in order to fully integrate conflict/security policy reporting and analysis into their regular tasks.

Through this structural integration it should be much easier to plan for the complementarity of actions, within the overall framework of an overarching EU strategy vis-à-vis a given country, region or thematic issue. This co-operation and coordination will, however, not be easy, while in the crisis management area there exists the further challenge of deepening cooperation between CSDP and JHA actors. Coherence and an overall EU approach is still fairly difficult to achieve across pillar boundaries.


## Conclusions

The track record of the civilian ESDP institutions and missions is certainly not a bad one, given the relatively short time they have been operating. The ability to establish, from scratch, decision-making, planning and implementation structures within the EU, as well as to use them quickly to deploy almost 20 civilian crisis management operations over the past seven years speaks for itself. It is even more remarkable because in the civilian domain there are very few counterparts or readily available resources at national level and almost no other international entities (bar the UN) able to perform crisis management with, potentially, such a broad array of tools. The achievements of the EU's civilian crisis management so far are, however, only one of the main building blocks with regard to moving forward and achieving even better results, reflecting the vision and principles outlined in the European Security Strategy.

For this, the EU's post-Lisbon Treaty crisis management activities need a clearly defined strategic vision, reflecting the EU's ambitions in the field of crisis management and security policy writ large, but including also a clear recognition of the resources that must be committed to support such ambitions. The EU can still make good use of the comparative advantages provided by its structures and instruments in the crisis management field, bearing in mind that true effectiveness cannot be achieved on the cheap. Clear political guidance should then translate into more effective use of civilian crisis management missions, supporting an overall EU strategy in a given country or region.

However, the EU institutions are not alone in their need to undertake some remedial work. A coherent approach is also urgently needed on the part of the EU Member States, ideally across various ministries via clear tasking exercised by the Prime Minister or President. National strategies for the development and deployment of civilian crisis management capabilities are an important instrument in this regard, together with other measures agreed and implemented at the EU or mission level, not least when they have been flagged within the framework of lessons identified.

The EU and its Member States should also use the opportunities arising from the Lisbon Treaty changes and, above all, from the creation of the EEAS and, in HR/VP



Ashton, now having a single linchpin responsible for various strands of EU activities in external relations, as well as conflict prevention and crisis management. Civil-military synergies, more robust strategic planning and oversight through the newly created Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD) should now be easier to achieve.

## Policy Recommendations

- The Member States should clearly identify EU ambitions in security policy and link them to the required crisis management capabilities and resources, as well as processes enabling their acquisition or improvement (at the level of both individual Member States and the EU).
- The EU should use civilian CSDP missions as a well-thought-out and well-planned instrument of overall EU strategy vis-à-vis a given country or region, while also applying tools for measuring the progress of the mission and the host state.
- National strategies should be adopted and implemented effectively to facilitate the deployment of civilian personnel to international crisis management operations, based on an inter-ministerial document, drawing upon best practices across EU Member States.
- A robust »lessons identified« system should be put in place, both at the Member State and the EU levels, identifying best practices as well as gaps and challenges faced by civilian CSDP missions.





### About the author

**Radek Khol** is a security analyst. He joined the Institute of International Relations, Prague in 1996 and became the Head of its Centre for Security Analysis in 2001. Since 2006 he has been working at the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union.

This policy paper represents strictly his personal views and should in no way be interpreted as expressing the views of his employer.

### Imprint

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung  
International Policy Analysis  
Hiroshimastraße 28 | 10785 Berlin | Germany

Responsible:  
Dr. Gero Maaß, Head, International Policy Analysis

Tel.: ++49-30-269-35-7745 | Fax: ++49-30-269-35-9248  
[www.fes.de/ipa](http://www.fes.de/ipa)

To order publications:  
[info.ipa@fes.de](mailto:info.ipa@fes.de)

The views expressed in this publication are not necessarily those of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung or of the organization for which the author works.

This publication is printed on paper from sustainable forestry.

**ISBN 978-3-86872-442-4**