



The ESS Scorecard

Number 42, December 2008

The long awaited report on the implementation on the European Security Strategy (ESS)¹ finally emerged at the December Council Ministerial under the French EU Presidency. Rather than a “replacement”, it is a “reinforcement” of the 2003 ESS and attempts to examine the five threats outlined in the ESS - five years on. ISIS Europe gives a brief overview of the report.

Threat 1 – terrorism; Threat 2 - nuclear and proliferation of WMD; Threat 5 – organised crime:

The report includes a four page “Statement on strengthening international security”, giving further details of principles and objectives to address these three (of the five) threats as outlined in the ESS. The statement reiterates an “unremitting determination” to combat all manifestations of terrorism, and calls for an upgrading of tools for early detection of radicalisation and closer cooperation on financing of terrorism. In particular, it emphasises pursuing terrorism “with due regard for human rights, international humanitarian law and the right of asylum” - an element that was missing in the ESS. It acknowledges the growing power of the internet and seeks to develop a “European alert platform” to make recruitment and incitement to terrorism via the internet a criminal offence - something that will prove hard to police and for some be arguably in conflict with civil liberties. It also highlights Afghanistan and Pakistan as a partners to work against terrorism – the latter not being mentioned the ESS.

On proliferation, the report - perhaps dangerously – singles out Iran as a threat, something it had avoided in the ESS (which singled out North Korea as a nuclear threat instead). Further, the report goes beyond dialogue, stating that “additional measures to increase pressure on Iran will have to be considered should it fail to comply with the urgent requests of the UN Security Council”. On a more positive note, the statement outlines the various mechanisms that we need to strengthen to combat nuclear proliferation (which were not in the ESS) – including the CTBT, post-START, NPT, fissile material cut-off treaty and the Hague Code of Conduct. The report also calls for full implementation of the CWC and BWC and outlines efforts towards control of small arms.

What else is new – Finally a reference to a gender dimension in security, with acknowledgment that “Effective implementation of UNSCR 1820 on sexual violence on situations of armed conflict is essential”. It also recognises the “role of women in building peace” and notes that “Effective implementation of UNSCR 1325 on women peace and security and UNSCR 1612 on Children in Armed Conflict is essential”. This is a major step for EU security policy, as the ESS has no mention of UN SCR 1325 nor acknowledges the role of women as agents rather than as victims.

The report also welcomes the Convention on Cluster Munitions and encourages an adoption of a protocol within a UN framework, involving “all major military powers”.

There is an elaboration of the challenges that the EU now faces in relations with Russia, after they “deteriorated” since the August conflict with Georgia.

The EU claims improved institutional links with the UN (on security) based on the 2007 EU-UN Declaration. Relations with the OSCE have also “deepened”.

¹ “Report by the EU High Representative Javier Solana, in association with the European Commission on the implementation of the European Security Strategy: Providing Security in a Changing World” – Statement on strengthening international security. Declaration on strengthening capabilities” S407/08 11 December 2008.

What's missing – formal relations between the EU and NATO “have not advanced” and better operational cooperation is needed.

The joint Africa-EU strategy (2007) aims to support the AU’s abilities for crisis management, but little assessment was elaborated in the report - pointing to the challenges that still remain in this new foray into multilateralism with Africa’s lack of financial resources for capabilities. Similarly for the Asian region, engagement has been “developed” – but little analysis.

What's interesting – the report notes that Battlegroups “have enhanced our capacity to react rapidly”. However, as Battlegroups have not been used – especially critiqued as not deployed in Darfur or the DRC - it begs the question of why this is a positive assertion.

The most revealing aspect of this report is the separate section “Declaration on Strengthening Capabilities”. This six page segment outlines a vastly increased quantity of capabilities towards which the EU should strive.

- Ability to deploy 60 000 troops within 60 days
- Ability to conduct two simultaneous operations of up to 10 000 troops for 2 years
- Two rapid response operations using *inter alia* Battlegroups
- Civilian-military humanitarian assistance mission up to 90 days.
- A dozen ESDP civilian missions of varying formats with a major mission (up to 3000 experts) lasting several years.

This is particularly remarkable in the light of recent research from *Peacekeeping Operations* (see ESR 42 for our review of the book launch), which notes that globally only some 3 to 5 percent of military ground force capabilities are used for crisis management (peacekeeping) operations². Hence there does exist capacity to deploy more troops.

The declaration also encourages the SG/HR to set up a single civilian-military strategic planning structure for ESDP operations and missions.

On capabilities, the declaration calls for the establishment of a European air transport fleet, an airlift command and an airbase for a European force. Also for observation satellites (the MUSIS programme) and taking account of military requirements in space surveillance. Mumbai also probably further influenced calls for establishing mobilisation of military assets for evacuating European nationals.

A welcome aspect for harmonisation, is the clear statement of developing a military Erasmus and improving the functioning of the European Security and Defence College (for training). Pooling of efforts are to be explored further,³ by looking at new methods for joint capabilities, collective capabilities (through pooling) and voluntary specialisation provision through mutual interdependence.

By Giji Gya, Executive Director, ISIS Europe



international security information service, europe

Rue Archimède 50, 1000 Brussels Tel: +32 (0)2 230 7446 Fax: +32 (0)2 230 6113
E-mail: info@isis-europe.org Internet: www.isis-europe.org

² Donald C.F Daniel (2008), “Why So Few Troops from Among So Many?” in *Peace Operations: Trends, Progress and Prospects*. Georgetown University Press: Washington D.C. p.47.

³ See the Study under ISIS Europe’s lead for the European Parliament by Jean-Pierre Mulny and Fabio Liberti of IRIS on “Pooling of EU Member States Assets in the Implementation of ESDP” http://www.isis-europe.org/pdf/2008_artrel_142_08-02epstudy-pooling.pdf