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Table 1-1: Overview of Research Areas
The Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) operations and missions take place in a dynamic and changing security environment that has seen major shifts over the past two decades. Those evolutions are connected to the changing nature of security threats as much as to the concomitant adaptation of policy responses. Thus, also for the EU and its member states, a comprehensive understanding of the threats as well as the capabilities and instruments to be deployed is essential.

The new environment has also made it obvious that - as the European Security Strategy of 2003 stated - no single country is able to tackle today’s complex problems on its own. Furthermore, the financial and economic crisis starting in 2008 has added to a decreasingly defence spending among EU member states. Therefore, new forms of cooperation between EU member states needed to be developed, such as pooling and sharing, plus existing forms of cooperation, such as civil-military cooperation and interoperability were also considered in order to make CSDP more efficient and better adjusted to the current need of the EU as a genuine security political actor.

Based on the WP6 tasks and earlier deliverables, D6.5 will provide the description of the potential for pooling and sharing the capabilities in future in terms of the future threats and challenges. It summons the findings of the analysis carried out in the framework of IECEU as well as includes the outcome of the policy dialogue on interoperability and civ-mil interface held on 27 March 2017 in Brussels.

In general, there is a common understanding that in practice there are already concrete steps to improve the civil-military relations as well as to achieve a higher degree of interoperability. With regard to pooling and sharing, several initiatives are also under way which however are mainly focusing on the military equipment and capability sector. The analysis has nonetheless shown, that especially the area of training poses a huge potential for pooling and sharing which could be exploited in order to develop a European strategic culture that fosters early, rapid and where necessary robust crisis management.

---

1 European Security Strategy (2003), 1.
1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this report is to describe the potential for pooling and sharing of EU CSDP capabilities, based on the research done within the framework of the IECEU-project. This research looked at the state of the art of pooling and sharing, the overlap between civilian and military resources, the interoperability of resources. In addition, a policy dialogue was held in Brussels in March 2017, with key stakeholders from the EU institutions and member states.

The report starts with an introductory paragraph about the project and its methodology as well as the aim and goal of the policy dialogue. Chapter two lists the research and policy dialogue findings for pooling and sharing, civ-mil interface and interoperability. The final chapter presents conclusions of the research and identifies areas that can be further explored in new research.

1.1 The IECEU-Project

Researching the effectiveness of military and civilian crisis management operations implemented within the framework of the European Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) has been the core focus of the Horizon 2020 funded IECEU-project.

This research has been carried out using a conceptual framework, that defined for CSDP crisis management operations six core capabilities, common data collection methods, unified questionnaires as well as criteria to measure effectiveness.

1.1.1. CSDP-CAPABILITIES

The following six core capabilities have been identified and used to research the crisis management operations:

- Planning
- Organizational
- Interoperability
- Competences
- Comprehensiveness
- Technologies

---

2 More details can be found in Deliverable 1.5, IECEU Conceptual Framework, accessible http://www.ieceu-project.com/?page_id=197
The capabilities ‘Interoperability’ and ‘Technology’ are relevant for this report that looks into potential for pooling and sharing of EU CSDP capabilities. These two capabilities have been defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>focus</th>
<th>perspective</th>
<th>EU: policy making, military, civilian</th>
<th>non-EU: local, international community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td>Cooperation/Collaboration, Coordination, Clv-Mil/Clv-Mil-Mil synergies</td>
<td>EUUPS/IEUFO*: The processes of cooperation and collaboration in the mission / operation, Coordination processes, National caveats or deficiencies, Prior mission co-training and exercises, Different aspects of interoperability (technical, skills-related, resources-related), Clv-Mil / Clv-Civ / Mil-Mil dimensions of cooperation and synergies</td>
<td>INEUUPS/INEUFO*: The processes of cooperation and coordination (also with the local stakeholders), Different aspects of interoperability (technical, skills and training related, resources related - also in the local context or with local stakeholders and within the wider international community), Clv-Mil / Clv-Civ / Mil-Mil dimensions of cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologies</td>
<td>Technological resources at disposal, Pooling &amp; Sharing, EDA priorities</td>
<td>TEUPS/TEUFO*: Technological resources at disposal, Technical Interoperability and integration, Processes of pooling and sharing, Integration and evaluation of the results of EDA’s R&amp;D, Technical deficiencies or lacking resources, Incorporation of service providers</td>
<td>TNEUPS/TNEUFO*: Technological resources at disposal, Technical interoperability (also with the local stakeholders and the International community), Technical deficiencies or lacking resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.1.2. DATA COLLECTION METHODS

The main data collection methods have been desk study research, active observation and interviews of personnel representing the EU CSDP operation, local authorities, other international organizations, local population and various EU institutions (HQ level).

The effectiveness or success has been defined as when a mission/operation achieves its purpose in an appropriate manner, seen from the perspective of the EU and the specific conflict in which it intervenes (at least in part) to prevent (further) violent conflict. According to this definition, corresponding criteria should consider and combine perspectives both internal and external to the European Union to evaluate its effectiveness.\(^3\)

Over a time span of 33 months, 8 case studies in Europe, Africa, Middle East and Asia have been reviewed, covering 12 CSDP crisis management operations. Additionally, research has been implemented within the EU’s institutions to review the effectiveness of the concepts pooling and sharing, civilian-military synergies and interoperability.

A list of the crisis management operations that have been reviewed is shown in the table below:

---

\(^3\) More details can be found in Deliverable 1.4, Identifying the success factors, accessible http://www.ieceu-project.com/?page_id=197
Table 1-1. Overview of Research Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Region</th>
<th>Crisis Management Operation(s)</th>
<th>Research completed by</th>
<th>Year of the field study</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>EULEX Kosovo</td>
<td>University of Ljubljana, Slovenia</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>EUFOR Althea</td>
<td>National Defence University, Finland</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>EUFOR RD Congo, EUPOL Congo, Operation Artemis</td>
<td>Royal Danish Defence College (RDDC), Denmark</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>EUAVSEC, South Sudan</td>
<td>Austrian Institute for European and Security Policy, Austria</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>EUFOR Tchad/RCA, EUFOR CAR</td>
<td>National Defence University, Finland</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>EUBAM Libya</td>
<td>Crisis Management Centre, Finland</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>EUPOL Afghanistan</td>
<td>National University of Ireland, Maynooth—Kennedy Institute, Ireland</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian Territories</td>
<td>EUPOL COPPS EUBAM Rafah</td>
<td>Crisis Management Centre, Finland</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 8 case study areas  Total: 12 crisis management operations  Total: 265 interviews

In addition, within the research on pooling and sharing and interoperability a number of targeted interviews were held with key stakeholders to better understand the dynamics at play within the EU institutions and at member state level.
1.1.3. RESEARCH REPORTS AND POLICY DIALOGUE

The case studies findings have been analysed in terms of pooling and sharing, civ-mil interface and interoperability. Three separate research reports have been finalised, of which the first two are public and one the last one confidential.

The findings have been discussed in a policy dialogue, held on 27 March 2017 in Brussels under Chatham House Rules. The policy dialogue managed to engage 24 representatives from academia, NGO’s, related H2020 projects (WOSCAP), Member States (Permanent Representations) and EU institutions (EEAS) discussed the IECEU project research results. The aim of the policy dialogue was to analyse with key stakeholders the potential in practice for pooling and sharing the EU capabilities.

1.1.4. CAVEATS

A quick glance at the list of crisis management operations that have been used to inform the research leads to two caveats. Firstly, concerning the eight case studies of the project, most of these CSDP missions and operations already ended or are in the process of ending, which will affect the possibility to reach valid conclusions. Secondly, during the timeframe of the project (2015-2017) significant policy developments at strategic level have taken place, that also do affect the CSDP, such as the Brexit and the publication of the new EU Global Strategy (A Global Strategy for the European Union’s Foreign And Security Policy)⁴.

2 RESEARCH FINDINGS

As indicated in chapter 1, the IECEU-project research looked at three different topics related to pooling and sharing:

- The state of play of pooling and sharing;
- The overlap between civilian-military efforts;
- Identifying the interoperability of resources.

The paragraphs below summarise the outcomes of the research.

2.1 State of Play Pooling and Sharing

The IECEU-project research provides an overall picture of the state of play of pooling and sharing within the European Union CSDP crisis management and conflict prevention policies, dated April 2016. The used definition for pooling and sharing is broad in order to include both civilian and military examples. Therefore, pooling and sharing practices are considered to be examples of institutionalised cooperation between states or other institutions, where capabilities/assets are shared, either in a bilateral, multinational and supranational context.

Starting point for the research is the methodological framework of the project, that is complemented with a political risk analysis when engaging in pooling and sharing. As such, the report researches pooling and sharing starting from basic activities with increasing risk levels, i.e. training and maintenance, procurement and research and development, operations and strategy and common capabilities.

In terms of the lowest political risk - training and maintenance – training is reviewed. The CSDP-missions and operations related EU training initiatives are detailed and analysed. These activities are carried out by a number of different institutions and provide common standards, based on common curricula. The training initiatives also create a common organisational culture for EU member states representatives to work in missions and operations. However, there is also potential for development in terms of joint-standard setting, joint-curricula and certification.

The review of the next step of the political risk pyramid, i.e. common procurement and R&D, points to its importance in the development of common capabilities for crisis management and CSDP-missions and operations. The work of the EDA is paramount in building common capabilities, based on agreed standards, as this ensures interoperability and support pooling and sharing. Standard-setting between member states is also necessary for joint-procurement, as differences in standards can lead to large discrepancies in estimations of what level of procurement is necessary and what resources are factually needed. By taking one specific example, medical support, an analysis is made of how the process of common capability building works in practice and what the dynamics of the process are.
The review of operations is based on the analysis of the research findings on pooling and sharing practices collected by the twelve case study reports on CSDP-missions and operations in the Balkans, Africa, Middle East and Asia. It found examples such as transfer of staff, mission support, standard operational procedures and common warehousing, and sharing knowledge. However, in contrast to the cost effectiveness that pooling and sharing provides as well as other potential benefits in terms of creating better cooperation, strengthening joint operating cultures, forging stronger links between individuals and organisations, this deliverable found surprisingly few examples of pooling and sharing at CSDP-mission level.

Finally, the strategic dimension of pooling and sharing analysed strategy and shared capabilities and concludes that currently within the CSDP-missions, the pooling and sharing of common capabilities is not frequent. It examined possibilities of creating a more conducive environment for pooling and sharing as well as some relatively easily applicable mechanisms that would strengthen current pooling and sharing, including development of a system or roster of pre-committed capabilities from the member states, which include personnel, equipment and functions such as medical support.

The state of play of pooling and sharing was also discussed in the Policy Dialogue, held on 27\textsuperscript{th} March 2017. The discussion highlighted that within the EU there are currently many bilateral and multilateral initiatives in the field of pooling and sharing, especially in the military domain. However, the participants felt that instead of having many little islands of P&S, it would be more efficient to have a continent of P&S. As for strategic shortfalls, it was also noted that it is not possible to pool these and that the sharing in such cases consists of sharing frustrations.

### 2.2 Civ-Mil Interface

The IECEU-project research provides an assessment of the current state of play of CSDP civilian and military instruments, their overlap and the potential for more effective streamlining of the two instruments with a view of creating synergies and efficiencies.

An in-depth analysis is given of the current comprehensive approach within the scope of the CSDP and the interaction between civilian and military actors (the civil-military interface). It details how the current approach to comprehensive action has developed, the key topics related to it, ways in which the policy frameworks on comprehensive approach have been implemented within the EU and looks at new challenges and upcoming developments.

This state-of-play is complemented by a detailed analysis at both politico-strategic level and field-operational level of how the civil-military interface works and what potentials can be identified for further development. At politico-strategic level the civil and military capability to plan and conduct operations is reviewed, where the main finding is that both are separate stovepipes, where requirements are identified separately and support platforms differ.
At field operational level, one case study with both a civilian mission and a military operation is further analysed, i.e. the Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) case study with the European Union Police Mission (EUPM) and the European Union Force Althea (EUFOR Althea). The case study does also confirm that the differences at politico-strategic level are continued at field-operational level, with differences in funding, equipment and reporting lines. Staff is left to deal with the differences at operational level.

These results have furthermore been tested by an online poll among experts and practitioners that was underlining the main assumptions of the deliverable.

Finally, the analysis is completed with a list of pragmatic recommendations to strengthen the civilian-military interface, which are grouped in two categories, i.e. temporal (short-medium-long term) and political feasibility (low-medium-high). They thus rank from possible short term measures with a high political feasibility, such as the development of a well-resourced and capable Military planning and conduct capability (MPCC) for non-executive military missions and for developing the CivMil interface to long-term measures with high political feasibility, such as ensuring that the political will is coupled with realistic levels of ambition for all aspects of CSDP capacities.

The state of play of CSDP civilian and military instruments and their overlap was also discussed in the Policy Dialogue, held on 27th March 2017. Since 2003, when the first civilian and military operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (EUPM) was implemented, the Civ-mil interface has developed positively within the EU although strategic shortcomings cannot be ignored.

Furthermore, it was stated that the CivMil Interface should be addressed within the Comprehensive Approach (CA), with a concrete level of ambition to accompany it. Regarding the level of ambition of the EU, it was stated that nowadays it is the Global Strategy, only that the Global Strategy is actually not the Strategy of the EU member states since it was drafted by the High Representative and her team. Other experts, however, mentioned that member states did have a say in formulating the document, although it was considered as a pity that only the presentation of the strategy has been welcomed by the European Council instead of a proper adoption. This deficit can however be overcome by a proper implementation of the accompanying and follow-up documents, such as the Implementation Plan on Security and Defence as well as the European Defence Action Plan and the European Semester on Defence. It was also mentioned that the term itself is not so important, what counts more is the actual meaning behind it and the fact that all the elements need to be present in order for us to be able to achieve our goals.

Also, it was pointed out that one of the main problems in the field of CivMil cooperation is the ‘language barrier’: the fact that the EU overtook the meaning from NATO but used a different word for it or even used the same word but changing its meaning. Therefore, the need to work towards a common language is pressing.
2.3 Interoperability

The IECEU-project research analysed interoperability in the context of CSDP crisis management by using the definition of the Council (8009/03)\(^5\), stating:

"The ability of systems, units or forces to provide services to and accept services from other systems, units or forces and to use the services so exchanged to enable them to operate effectively together."

In terms of research, interoperability has been reviewed from three angles, i.e. civilian-civilian, military-military and civilian-military. For the civilian-civilian research, 8 CSDP missions were reviewed, with 173 interviews leading to the key finding that there is a large variety among the missions, which leads to a varied interoperability needs and challenges.

For the military-military research, 4 CSDP operations were reviewed, with 42 interviews, leading to the main finding that for interoperability the role of NATO is key, with the lack of consensus in EU defence integration.

As for the research on civilian-military interoperability; an additional online survey was held (24 respondents) as well as interviews (24), generating a list of 19 potentials for interoperability, of which 3 were highlighted, relating to information sharing and review systems. These can be summarised as follows: (i) reinforcing the jointly initiated crisis management concept with more integrated, structured civilian/military operationalization; (ii) creating a centralised system of mandatory pre-mission training, linked to job descriptions and selection procedures; (iii) discouraging national (re)interpretation of the ‘Statement of recruitment’ used in CSDP military operations to enhance interoperability of military staff; (iv) support joint civilian-military in-mission trainings where both types of personnel are present; (v) harmonize “working” versions of capacity building concepts such as ‘Integrated Border Management’.

Beyond these mechanisms to enhance interoperability, three main challenges for interoperability are identified: i) divergent, non-standardised and sometimes contradictory national practices, which remain evident in CSDP operations and missions. ii) lack of a mind-set for increasing interoperability in practice especially in civilian missions, but also between civilian and military actors, even where increasing interoperability has no foreseen costs; iii) the current intergovernmental set-up of the CSDP crisis management operations, some of which, is based on the very foundations of the EU (including the Lisbon treaty), which affects the development of interoperability.

The interoperability was also discussed in the Policy Dialogue, held on 27\(^{th}\) March 2017. It was noted that the debate about interoperability is based on bias, as for most Brussels respondents this usually means tanks and capabilities. However, in reality it is much broader than that, as there is a changing nature of the concept of interoperability with: (i) a widening web of activities/tasks; (ii) proliferation of actors; (iii) proliferation of concepts. Also, what changes is what is defined as

These different actors come with different mind-sets, which are difficult to reconcile. In addition, the number of third states and partners are also proliferating, adding to the complexity in terms of achieving interoperability. All these partners have different views on planning and operations and setting standards is challenging as the CMO’s have different nature and needs.

In addition, there is proliferation of concepts, e.g. comprehensive approach versus integrated approach and new hot trending topics such as ‘resilience’, where it is not clear what does that mean and what are its consequences for interoperability. Military tasks are updated, on top of peacekeeping, new tasks are added such as policing of high seas. These new needs affect interoperability and standards.
3 CONCLUSIONS

Since 2010 when Germany and Sweden launched the so-called Ghent initiative, pooling and sharing have become buzzwords in CSDP and European defence cooperation. Although, the cooperation aspect as well as harmonization and standardisation in terms of interoperability should be at the forefront of the considerations, it appears that pooling and sharing is mostly related to financial implications, i.e. saving money in defence spending. According to various studies, Europe could save almost a third of what it spends on military equipment if governments agreed to work together to coordinate investment and use fewer arms suppliers.\(^6\)

This logic could also be found with regard to the research carried out in the framework of IECEU. When talking about the potential for pooling and sharing, lots of emphasis has been given to military equipment and capability development, however it has become obvious that the idea of pooling and sharing has not entirely reached the mission/operational level. A similar situation can be witnessed regarding interoperability. Interoperability needs to be understood more comprehensively regarding its tasks, actors and concepts.

As regards the civ-mil interface, the comprehensive approach needs to be better translated within the EU’s comprehensive/integrated approach including a stated level of ambition what to achieve. It is not that much about the wording, but of how to practically work together in a more coordinated and efficient manner in the field.

The analysis of the overall project has nonetheless shown that especially in the area of training, there is still huge potential for pooling and sharing. Taking the trainings of the European Security and Defence College as an example, this approach of collaboratively developing also a common European strategic culture should be further developed and fostered in order to fosters early, rapid and when necessary, robust intervention.\(^7\)

To conclude, the list of tasks for crisis management operations and peace-keeping is constantly developing thus requiring new approaches of how to best tackle the challenges. The new security political threats are more complex, dynamic, interrelated and each conflict/region calls for a combined and tailor-made response as also described by the integrated approach of the EU. Such an approach requires even more focus and attention for interoperability, more efficient civ-mil cooperation and harmonisation and standards. The current developments are very first paths in the right direction, however, the new needs will require even more efforts, on both the EU as well as the member states level. Altogether this can then lead – as it was stated as a goal in the EU Global Strategy – to strategic autonomy of the European Union.\(^8\)


\(^7\) European Security Strategy (2003), 11.

\(^8\) EU Global Strategy (2016), 9.
4 ANNEXES

4.1 Presentations in Policy Dialogue on 27th March 2017

---

IECEU Opening

- **Topic**
  - Conflict prevention and peace building topic
  - Enhancing the conflict prevention and peace building capabilities of the EU
- **Type of action**
  - Coordination and Support
- **Call identifier**
  - BES12H2020, Acronym IECEU
- **Proposal title**
  - Improving the Effectiveness of Capabilities (IEC) in EU conflict prevention
- **Duration in Months**
  - 33
- **Budget**
  - 2,081,112.00 (project cost and requested EU contribution)
---
1. IECEU main goals

IECEU aims to provide a creation of new conceptual approaches through methods which integrate civil, military, operational and academic perspectives.

IECEU aims to provide recommendations in order to improve the EU external security capabilities. The recommendations are based on the analyses of the effectiveness of CSDP missions and operations.

2. IECEU overall status

This project has received funding from the European Commission's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 653371. The content of this document reflects the authors' view and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.
3. IECEU overall status

Desk Studies: Current EU capabilities (civilian and military efforts)

Methodology Framework to analyse missions and operations and their effectiveness

Case Studies: in Kosovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, DR Congo, South Sudan, Central African Republic, Libya, occupied Palestinian Territories and Afghanistan

Comparative Studies: The Effectiveness of EU capabilities
(a set of efficiency factors to evaluate CSDP missions)

Learning Application Creation: Design and development

Assessing the potential for pooling and sharing of EU capabilities by identifying the potentials of the interoperability and civil-military synergies

Identify and produce conclusions and recommendations for preventive support activities in existing EU structures

New concepts and methodologies of effectiveness

Policy Dialogues and Workshops: dissemination of the findings

4. Impact

- The creation of conceptual framework with six different capabilities and effectiveness analysis supported the IECEU case study researchers to implement their assessments and analysis
- IECEU has examined the current EU conflict prevention and crisis management capabilities with the key focus on 12 Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) missions and operations.
- 8 Case studies have gathered key local and international stakeholders together to discuss the crisis management operations, their impact and possible venues to enhance their effectiveness and find opportunities to strengthen pooling and sharing of resources.
- The work aims to support the policy level actors by providing the preliminary findings and policy recommendations.
- IECEU elaborates the policy priorities by finalizing the comparative analysis and facilitate policy dialogues during year 2017.
Interoperability

Improving the Effectiveness of Capabilities (IEC) in EU conflict prevention

Maria Mekri, Executive Director, SaferGlobe

This project has received funding from the European Commission's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 653371. The content of this document reflects the authors' view and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.
IECEU Research

- IECEU research is mainly from the view point of the “field” and is based on interviews in missions and operations.
  - Hence the implementation of EU crisis management.
  - The research is also external and limited by available material.

- IECEU aim is to find potentials for improving effectiveness, which we have done through using a conceptual framework for comparison.

- Interesting observations, e.g. variation in missions and operations is great on all levels.

- Here in the policy dialogues, we would like to refine and challenge our own findings.

This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 653371. The content of this document reflects the authors’ view and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Interoperability in IECEU

- “The ability of systems, units or forces to provide services to and accept services from other systems, units or forces and to use the services so exchanged to enable them to operate effectively together.”


This project has received funding from the European Commission EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation Horizon 2020 under grant agreement no 653371. The content of this document reflects the authors’ view and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.
D6.5 The potential for P&S EU capabilities

IECEU
CSA project: 653371
Start date: 01/05/2015
Duration: 33 months

Dissemination level: Public

Interoperability

- Interoperability is vital for improving effectiveness and creates a basis for pooling and sharing.
  - Often only referenced with regards to interoperability of technology, but the definition also extends to:
    - Planning
    - Staffing (selection, recruitment, pre-deployment training, staff capabilities)
    - Shared Services
    - Equipment
    - Command Systems and Information Sharing
    - Third Party Contributions
    - Review Systems

Focus of discussion: civ-mil interoperability

- Interoperability
  - Civ-civ
  - Mil-mil
  - Civ-mil

- The focus of the discussion mostly on civ-mil interoperability as:
  - it is the least developed of the three
  - Likely to be of most interest because of:
    - Integrated missions
    - New Security threats/ EU’s Global strategy (internal&external security concerns)
    - Improving effectiveness of crisis management
IECEU Discussion

- Elisa Norvanto, Finchent, presents IECEU findings
- Daniel FIOTT, EUISS & VUB, discusses the findings
- Discussion
Analysis Process

- Based on the analysis of 8 civilian CSDP missions (173 interviews).
- Civilian interoperability has received less emphasis than the military interoperability.
- Key issues affecting the development: due to the variety of the civilian missions, the interoperability needs and challenges may differ greatly from one another.

- Based on the analysis of 4 Military CSDP operations (82 interviews).
- Key issues affecting the development: The role of NATO and lack of consensus on the European defence integration among the Member States.

- Based on the comparative analysis of civilian and military sides.
- 24 interviews & Survey on interoperability (44 respondents).
- 7 elements: (1) planning; (2) staff; (3) shared services; (4) equipment; (5) command systems & information sharing; (6) Third states participation in crisis management operations; (7) review systems.

This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 653371. The content of this document reflects the authors’ view and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.
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Potentials for further discussion

(1) Possibility of an enhanced information sharing framework between missions and their support elements to compile, analyze and discuss reports, intelligence and other relevant information.

(2) Continued development of a CSDP civil-military intelligence analysis tools.

(3) Continued development of a shared platform for lessons identified as it can build synergies and enhance the learning process of crisis management operations.
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CivMil Interface

Q1. What are the major obstacles for joint civilian-military crisis management operations?

- Financing (76.5%)
- Command of joint civilian-military CMO’s (72.3%)
- Differences in culture (50.6%)
- Planning process (56.7%)
- Lack of interoperability (55.6%)
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4.2 Presentation “Technology in CSDP missions and operations” in Policy Dialogue on 27th April 2017
1 The technological solutions
technology – driven

- The technological solutions have been much technology – driven. We must consider to strengthen the planning phase of the crisis management operation by implementing a technological needs assessment before the start of the mission/operation. Doctrining?

Case Study examples:
- DR Congo: “The lack of logistical and communication networks, and lack of skilled local human resources made the establishment and running of the operation challenging. Challenges related to poor road network, lack of internet connection and electricity, also created difficulties for the day to day running of the operation.”
- Afghanistan: “Unfortunately, some international actions are based on IT and land mobile systems, which are not compatible. It creates friction and dependency in funding. I am hesitant in promoting technology in building capability.”

3 Relevance of Local Ownership

- Local representatives in the crisis area can be trained by EU/operation with equipment/technologies which (they locals) normally do not have in use. As a result no real capability has been established.

Case Study examples:
- Kosovo: “There is a lack of appropriate ICT technology within Kosovo police and customs.
- DR Congo: “When Irish Troops first deployed to Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo the UN command was unable to provide the necessary training to make the local operation capable of operating the system.”
- Afghanistan: “I saw projects where we gave Afghan 100 computers. After that no one received them or how they worked.”

Dialogue: Discussion Points

- Discussion Point 1: Crisis Management Operations should have
  - User Centric Technologies
  - Relevance? Needs Assessment? Challenges?
- Discussion Point 2: Technology related training needed
  - Current state? How to ensure?
- Discussion Point 3: Relevance of local ownership
  - Could this be linked to MNC concept of learning outcome?
- Discussion Point 4: Need for CSF/Technology Infrastructure Management
  - Entry state for common understanding?
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