

## Chapter 2

# Waiting for Soft Power: Why the EU Struggles with Civilian Crisis Management

Claudia Major and Martina Bail

“The journey from war to sustainable peace is not possible in the absence of stronger civilian capacity (...) Without this capacity, there may be breaks in the fighting, but resilient institutions will not take root and the risk of renewed violence will remain.”

-- *Jean-Marie Guéhenno, former UN Under-Secretary General for Peacekeeping Operations.*

States and international organizations increasingly insist upon the crucial importance of civilian instruments for sustainable crisis solution. The lessons from recent operational experiences with fragile or failed states, whether in Afghanistan, Somalia or the Balkans, have brought home to the international community that no conflict can be resolved by military means alone. For a sustainable and comprehensive crisis solution, civilian instruments that address the political, social and economic dimensions of a conflict are crucial. The European Union (EU) prides itself on having developed a useful tool for exactly these tasks with the inception, in 1999, of the civilian component of the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP).<sup>1</sup> CSDP was meant to enable the EU to achieve the aims that were codified later on in the European Security Strategy (ESS), namely warding off security threats to the EU, stabilizing

the neighborhood, and strengthening effective multilateralism.<sup>2</sup>

However, the 17 civilian missions deployed since 2003 have only partly allowed the Union to reach these goals. While some of these missions have yielded success, most have been too small in size, ill-prepared, and under-resourced to bring about enduring change and sustainably stabilize crisis regions. The key players of the CSDP, the member states, manifestly fail to take the necessary political decisions for effective missions and to materialize them. A sign of the decreasing capacity to act might be the fact that no single new civilian mission has been deployed since 2008, although several opportunities came up. At the same time, member states hold on to their 2008 Level of Ambition, whereby the EU wants to be able to conduct 12 civilian missions in parallel plus various civil-military operations.<sup>3</sup> The apparent slow-down

---

1 With the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009, the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) was renamed Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). For better readability, the authors exclusively use the term CSDP.

---

2 European Union, *A Secure Europe in a Better World – The European Security Strategy* (Brussels: EU, December 12, 2003).

3 Council of the European Union, *Declaration on Strengthening Capabilities* (Brussels: EU, December 11, 2008).

of the civilian CSDP is even more surprising given that since the first civilian mission in 2003 the EU had been starting one or even several new missions each year. In addition, the Lisbon Treaty that entered into force in 2009 was supposed to strengthen the capacity of the Union to act in the realm of foreign and security policy.

The limited capacity to act under the civilian CSDP clashes not only with the Union's own level of ambition. It is also challenged by the growing demand for civilian crisis management capacities worldwide. EU instruments could indeed offer useful support, for example to the developments in North Africa or Sudan. However, the Union can only pretend to be a strategic actor in international security policy when it is able to improve its capacity to act.

This chapter seeks to identify and analyze the factors that determine the Union's capacity to act with regard to civilian CSDP. It aims to explain the mechanisms, structures and processes at both the national and European levels to grasp the dynamics that explain why the EU's soft power hasn't yet lived up to the expectations the EU outlined for itself in the ESS and the 2008 Level of Ambitions.

## Civilian Crisis Management in the EU's Common Security and Defense Policy

In June 1999, in the wake of the Kosovo War, EU member states launched the CSDP with the goal to enable the Union to conduct autonomous crisis management. Still acting under the shadow of the Balkan Wars, states initially concentrated their efforts on the development of military capabilities for EU missions. But already in December 1999 they agreed on complementing the military

conception with civilian instruments.<sup>4</sup> The civilian CSDP deploys missions composed of civilian experts to crisis regions to carry out a wide range of tasks, from police training and security sector reform (SSR) to rule of law missions. Such missions can be deployed in both situations related to conflict prevention and resolution, but first and foremost in post-conflict consolidation, when weak state structures need to be strengthened or rebuilt after armed conflicts.

## Changing Parameters for Civilian CSDP

Various European and international developments demand reflection on how the EU and its member states use civilian CSDP:

***Increasing Demand: Cooperation and Competition.*** Both the demand for civilian experts and their presence in international operations have been increasing in recent years.<sup>5</sup> States and international organizations increasingly view civilian instruments as a key element for sustainable conflict regulation and expand their capacities. The Pentagon established its Civilian Expeditionary Workforce in 2009. France started to establish inter-ministerial structures to improve the recruitment of

---

4 For comprehensive chronological and historical surveys on civilian CSDP, see Reinhardt Rummel, *Deutscher Einfluss auf den Ausbau ziviler Krisenintervention der EU* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, July 2006 (SWP-Diskussionspapier 03/2006)); Agnieszka Nowak, "Civilian Crisis Management within ESDP," in Agnieszka Nowak (ed.), *Civilian Crisis Management: The EU Way*, Chaillot Paper 90 (Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies, June 2006), pp. 15-37.

5 Jens Behrendt, "Zivilpersonal in Friedenseinsätzen: von der Improvisation zur Systematik?," Zentrum für Internationale Friedenseinsätze, Berlin, January 2011 (Policy Briefing).

civilian experts in 2010.<sup>6</sup> NATO announced the set up of a modest civilian planning and conduct capability in its 2010 Strategic Concept. If the EU wants to play a role in civilian crisis management, it must decide what line to take with the other organizations with which it is both cooperating and competing for specialized personnel.

***Repercussions of the Financial Crisis Require Common Action.*** As a result of the austerity programs that were implemented by virtually all EU governments as a response to the financial crisis, contributions to crisis management are decreasing, at least temporarily. The member states must reflect on how to keep EU structures efficient in times of restricted budgets. Reportedly, demand for civilian missions is stable and may be increasing. Crisis management tasks cannot be fulfilled by one state alone: it is only through the pooling of contributions from different states that any deployment (in regards to both equipment and personnel) is possible. The EU plays an important role here, as it bundles the various contributions of the member states into one EU package.

***Civilian Crisis Management—Which Role Should It Play for the EU?*** Despite the fact that CSDP has been in existence for ten years, EU member states still struggle to agree on military action: the divergent strategic cultures are still strong. The Libyan crisis in the spring of 2011 affirmed this. A pragmatic perspective, taking into account what EU states and EU partners can really rely on, begs two questions: if not in the military realm, is the Union at least capable of acting in the civilian sector?; and will the Union —out of feasibility rather

than out of conviction—in future concentrate on this civilian dimension, because it is more consensual and thus more likely to lead to action, i.e. EU missions?

***Mixed Results: CSDP Between Aspirations and Reality.*** Since 2003 EU member states have launched 17 civilian missions, ten of which are ongoing.<sup>7</sup> Their principal tasks were threefold: develop police forces, build rule of law structures, and perform monitoring missions, (at border control stations, for instance). The EU initially undertook many missions at a rapid pace, most of which being civilian rather than military. However, the contribution of civilian missions to sustainable stabilization, peace, and security of the crisis regions is controversial.<sup>8</sup>

***Increasing Expectations for the EU as a Security Actor.*** At the same time, international expectations are increasing for the EU to assume greater international responsibilities. First of all, the United States is reducing its commitment to international security. During the 2011 mission in Libya, the U.S. government exercised restraint, stemming both from political intent and financial considerations. Statements made by President Obama and outgoing defense secretary Gates in the spring of 2011 confirmed this approach. Second, some EU member states are less and less

---

6 Claudia Major and Elisabeth Schöndorf, *Comprehensive Approaches to Crisis Management Complex Crises Require Effective Coordination and Political Leadership* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, September 2011 (SWP Comments 2011/C 23).

---

7 See [www.consilium.europa.eu/eeas/security-defence/eu-operations.aspx?lang=en](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/eeas/security-defence/eu-operations.aspx?lang=en), accessed August 29, 2011.

8 Giovanni Grevi/Damien Helly/Daniel Keohane (eds.), *European Security and Defense Policy. The First Ten Years* (Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies, 2009); Muriel Asseburg and Ronja Kempin (eds.), *The EU as a Strategic Actor in the Realm of Security and Defence? A Systematic Assessment of ESDP Missions and Operations* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, December 2009 (SWP-Studie 32/2009), pp. 164-177; Christopher S. Chivvis, *EU Civilian Crisis Management: The Record So Far* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2010); Daniel Korski and Richard Gowan, *Can Europe Rebuild Failing States?* (London: European Council on Foreign Relations, October 2009).

capable—due to financial and political issues—of shaping security policy unilaterally. The EU offers the necessary structures to bundle capacities and act jointly. Finally, some ask the question whether the loss of U.S. military force can be compensated—even partially—by European “soft” power.

***New Framework through Lisbon.*** The Lisbon Treaty altered the framework of the civilian CSDP as of 2009. Especially the European External Action Service (EEAS) was supposed to make the EU foreign and security policy both more coherent and efficient, and thus improve the EU’s capacity to act. As post-Lisbon structures did not become operational until 2010-11, EU member states have scope for action in three dimensions: first, they can shape and interpret the structures and tasks of the embryonic institutions and processes by every day routines; second, they may make recommendations for the scheduled evaluation in 2013-14; and third, they can take advantage of the general dynamics of change for new initiatives.

## Defining “Actorness” in Civilian CSDP

If European countries define civilian crisis management as a major political objective, they should develop ideas on how to efficiently use civilian CSDP and to optimize its results. Strategic actorness is a highly fashionable term, and its sloppy and inflationary use easily obscures its meaning. The debates in the European and strategic studies community have yielded numerous attempts to define the term from which three central criteria emerge.<sup>9</sup> They guide the present analysis:

9 Concerning the academic debate on European or national strategic actorness, see Charlotte Bretherton and John Vogler, *The European Union as a Global*

### ***1. Existence of a shared strategic culture:***

the convergence between conceptions and preferences, i.e., to what extent do actors present a common vision of the aims and means of civilian crisis management and consider the EU to be an appropriate forum for common action? The strategic culture of a country is a distinctive body of beliefs, attitudes and practices regarding the means (civilian vs. military), partners, frameworks of action, etc. of a country in foreign, security and defense policies, which has developed gradually over time through a unique protracted historical process.<sup>10</sup> A strategic culture is “persistent over time, tending to outlast the era of its inception (...) It is shaped and influenced by formative periods and can alter (...) at critical junctures in a collective’s experience.”<sup>11</sup> Large differences between the strategic cultures of EU member states complicate the emergence of a European strategic culture.<sup>12</sup>

### ***2. Political and administrative decision-***

***making ability:*** the ability to assign political

---

*Actor* (London: Routledge, 1999); Fritz Scharpf, *Interaktionsformen. Akteurszentrierter Institutionalismus in der Politikforschung* (Opladen: Leske + Buderich, 2000); Paul Cornish and Geoffrey Edwards, “The strategic culture of the European Union: a progress report,” *International Affairs*, No. 4 (2005), pp. 801-820; Claudia Major, “It’s a long way to...regional strategic actorness. Assessing the EU’s ongoing (r)evolution in strategic and regional affairs,” in Kathrin Brockmann and Bastian Hauck (eds.), *Security in a Globalized World: Towards Regional Cooperation and Strategic Partnerships* (Berlin, German Council on Foreign Relations, 2007), pp.19-32.

10 Kerry Longhurst, *Germany and the Use of Force: the Evolution of German Security Policy 1990-2003* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 17.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 17.

12 On the debate on strategic culture and the possibility of a European strategic culture, see Christoph O. Meyer, *The Quest for a European Strategic Culture:*

and strategic priorities, overcome conflicts, develop a conceptual framework, gather requisite information and analyze it jointly, formulate and make decisions.

**3. Provision of resources:** to develop capacities in conformity with decisions taken and supply financial and material resources.

This chapter seeks to identify the factors that affect the capacity to act, that is, the actorness of civilian CSDP. The analysis focuses on the decision-making level in Brussels and in European capitals.

### Civilian Crisis Management in European Security Policy

Even though the term “civilian crisis management” has been included in official EU documents and discourse since 1999, for a long time EU member states could not agree on a definition. Civilian crisis management was often simply described as “non-military crisis management” as opposed to military (crisis management) in EU documents. In the meantime, a genuine understanding has established itself.

Civilian CSDP is a dimension of EU security policy which primarily targets acute crisis situations. The goal is to make civilian personnel contribute to stabilization, conflict prevention

and resolution in crisis areas. Civilian crisis management can be used when states are not able or willing to fulfill their functions, such as the protection of their territory, population, state institutions and services. In many cases the states in question are weak or failed and cannot settle an acute crisis, prevent the escalation of a situation, elaborate and comply with peace agreements, or reconstruct statehood without external help. Whereas military operations can freeze a conflict by use or threat of military force, civilian crisis management aims at sustainable conflict transformation that stabilizes the region in a long-term perspective and prevents it from suffering a relapse into conflict. Tasks such as security sector reform and the strengthening of civilian administration and of the rule of law fall within this ambit. Stabilization accomplished by such commitments also contributes to keep security risks to the Union at bay.

Hence, civilian CSDP complements established financial, diplomatic and economic means of both CFSP and the European Commission, such as sanctions or trade agreements. It flanks the Commission’s long-term development and cooperation policy, which is predominantly meant to support long-term structural change.

The coming into effect of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009 transferred the structures of civilian CSDP into the EEAS.<sup>13</sup> They directly report to High Representative (HR) Catherine Ashton, who coordinates EU foreign and security

---

*Changing Norms on Security and Defence in the European Union* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Frédéric Mérand, “Social Representations in the European Security and Defence Policy,” *Cooperation and Conflict*, 41 (2) 2006, pp. 131-152; Longhurst, op. cit.; Bastian Giegerich, *European Security and Strategic Culture. National Responses to the EU’s Security and Defence Policy* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2006); Emil J. Kirchner/James Sperling (eds.), *National Security Cultures: Patterns of Global Governance* (London: Routledge 2010).

---

13 On the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty, see Claudia Major, *Außen-, Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik der EU nach Lissabon* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, January 2010 (SWP-Aktuell 7/2010); Nicolai von Ondarza, *Koordinatoren an der Spitze. Politische Führung in den reformierten Strukturen der Europäischen Union* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, April 2011 (SWP-Studie 8/2011); SWP-Dossier *Die EU nach Lissabon* [www.swp-berlin.org/de/swp-themendossiers/die-eu-nach-lissabon.html](http://www.swp-berlin.org/de/swp-themendossiers/die-eu-nach-lissabon.html), accessed August 29, 2011.

policy. Nevertheless, civilian CSDP remains intergovernmental in nature. Here, member states did not transfer decisive power to the EU as they did in other areas such as development policy within the Commission framework: relevant decisions, for instance whether or not a mission is deployed, are made by EU member states.

### **National, European and International Obstacles to an Efficient Civilian CSDP**

The commitment of member states, the efficiency and coherence of the interplay of the Brussels institutions, as well as EU interaction with international partners all enable or limit the actorness of civilian CSDP.

#### **EU Member States: Big Influence, Big Differences**

Decisions in CSDP are taken unanimously and thus require agreement among EU member states. Such agreements indeed occur quite frequently, but are due less to a convergence of the strategic cultures of member states than rather to the limited interest in civilian CSDP. The successful deployment of a mission particularly depends on the commitment of personnel and thus (once more) on the backing of states. However, in most states there is little support because of a lack of interest, but also because states have not created the necessary administrative settings. Member states are therefore part of the weak actorness problem, but also prerequisites for its solution, as they can initiate improvements at a national level.

#### **Intergovernmentalism and Strategic Culture**

The intergovernmental CSDP decision-making process illustrates that EU states are not willing to abandon their sovereignty in the realm of security and defense: EU institutions might prepare decisions, but states enact them. Also, the commitments states undertake at EU level, for instance for the capability development in the framework of the Headline Goals, are merely political self-commitments. Non-compliance can only be sanctioned through rhetorical and moral pressure.

The institutional and political influence of member states manifests itself in various ways. They decide whether a mission is launched, define its mandate, decide whether they take part in it or not and whether they allocate personnel to it. The Foreign Affairs Council, where EU foreign ministers meet under HR chairmanship, is the highest decision-making level and decides on the planning and deployment of missions by a unanimous legal resolution.<sup>14</sup>

As decisions about deployments have to be taken unanimously, a common understanding of the issue at hand is vital for CSDP actorness. A minimum level of coherence in how member states perceive civilian crisis management is hence needed to make CSDP work.

The conceptions and the priority states attribute to civilian means are defined by their strategic cultures. If they contrast so strongly that they cannot be brought down to a common denominator, states cannot take a decision at EU level. As a matter of fact, big

---

<sup>14</sup> Until the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, these resolutions were called Joint Actions. Through resolutions, the EU gets operational: they contain objectives, scope, funding, conditions and, where applicable, the timeframe of the mission.

differences exist with regard to security policy and civilian means. But this is rarely problematic, as civilian missions seldom cause the controversies military operations have the potential to. Many states do not explicitly reject civilian CSDP, but just attribute little priority to it. Disagreement usually leads to the adjustment of mission mandates, with the result that missions are guided less by the specific needs of the crisis region than by member states' political and material willingness to contribute. Yet, states usually do not oppose missions, but rather express their limited interest with restricted contributions of personnel. As a consequence, missions frequently are too small, ill-prepared, and badly equipped. Moreover, they then enjoy little political support and therefore have only limited impact on conflict resolution on the ground. One example is the not very successful security sector reform mission in Guinea-Bissau (EU SSR Guinea-Bissau, 2008-2010).

Another example, EULEX Kosovo, illustrates on the one hand that EU member states are capable of initiating missions despite differences of opinion. Although five EU member states (Spain, Cyprus, Romania, Slovakia, Greece) did not recognize the independence of Kosovo, they accepted in 2008 the deployment of a EU rule of law mission to support state building. This succeeded because EU member states defined the mission as a technical solution and tried to circumvent the political question about the status of Kosovo. As all EU member states agreed on the necessity of stabilizing Kosovo, that an independent and efficient judicial system was indispensable to that aim, and that the future of Kosovo and the Western Balkans could only be found in Europe, the EU was able to get involved in this area. Ultimately, no state voted against the mission and, with the exception of Cyprus, all states contributed personnel. On the other hand, however, the ambivalent basis of the mission undermines its daily work, because in

reality it is hard to "promote rule of law without state building."<sup>15</sup>

The various and often conflicting goals and priorities of states not only impact on the EU's political decision-making ability, they also shape the administrative decision-making ability of member states, which is essential for preparing and supporting civilian crisis management. These structures underline the credibility of an engagement. Three broad groups of countries can be distinguished: states that significantly campaign for civilian crisis management and have created support structures and concepts on the national level, like the Nordic states, Germany, and the United Kingdom; those countries that recently stepped up efforts, like France, or are in the process of doing so, such as Slovakia; and finally those states that barely support civilian crisis management, like Greece or Estonia.

A few states systematically supported the civilian dimension from the start, for instance by submitting conceptual guidelines for the building of EU institutions and by setting up exemplary structures that embed and support civilian crisis management at the national level.<sup>16</sup> The German government realized such measures in the aftermath of the passage of the "Civilian Crisis Prevention" action plan

---

15 Solveig Richter, "Promoting Rule of Law without State-building: Can EULEX Square the Circle in Kosovo?" in Muriel Asseburg and Ronja Kempin (eds.), *The EU as a Strategic Actor in the Realm of Security and Defence?*, op. cit., pp. 32-49; David Cadier, *EU Mission in Kosovo (EULEX): Constructing Ambiguity or Constructive Disunity?*, Transatlantic Security Paper, 3 (2011), Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique, Paris; Emily Haber, "Primat der Stabilität. Der Pragmatismus aller Beteiligten ebnete den Weg für den Aufbau rechtsstaatlicher Strukturen im Kosovo," *Internationale Politik*, 64 (2009) 7-8, pp. 83-89.

16 Rummel, op. cit.; Folke Bernadotte Academy, *Sweden's Contribution to Civilian ESDP Operations – Structures, Routines and Experiences*, Seminario L'Italie nelle Missioni civili dell'UE. Criticità e prospettive, Rome, November 4-5, 2009 (Background Paper).

in 2004: the Interministerial Steering Group on Civilian Crisis Prevention in the German Foreign Office coordinates the government's actions in this field. The Advisory Board for Civilian Crisis Prevention (established in 2005) seeks to assure the involvement of non-state actors and advises the Interministerial Steering Group. The German Bundestag's Subcommittee on Civilian Crisis Prevention and the Comprehensive Approach (established in 2010) provides an opportunity for parliamentary initiatives. The Center of International Peace Operations (ZIF) organizes the recruitment and training of personnel. Also conceptually, Germany has become engaged on the EU level and in its 2007 "Traffic Lights" Paper submitted precise suggestions how to increase the effectiveness of civilian crisis management.<sup>17</sup>

The UK established in 2004 an innovative coordinating body, the interministerial "Stabilization Unit." Its main task is to recruit, train and deploy civilian personnel. The Nordic states are equipped with similar structures and have equally positioned themselves with conceptual initiatives, like Sweden did when it submitted its "Guiding Lines" in 2009.<sup>18</sup>

By contrast, France exhibited a more reluctant commitment in the early days of civilian CSDP. As its strategic culture is more military-oriented, it had no clear vision how and to what end civilian CSDP was to be employed. This had repercussions for the provision of resources, as France indeed provides many police personnel, but is underrepresented in other areas. But at the same time, France is the biggest provider for military CSDP missions.<sup>19</sup>

---

17 Non-paper, *Further Improving the Effectiveness of Civilian Crisis Management*, Brussels 2007.

18 Non-Paper, *Civilian Capability Planning and Development – Guiding Lines for the Second Semester of 2009*, Brussels, July 2009.

19 Grevi/Helly/Keohane, op.cit., pp. 414-415.

Meanwhile, France has started emphasizing the relevance of the civilian dimension in strategic documents (2008 French white book), has set up a civil-military coordination unit in its Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and is currently developing a training system for civilian experts and an adjacent personnel pool.<sup>20</sup>

In other countries such as Greece, no comparable approaches can be discerned at present.

### Provision of Resources

Resources for a mission include the general mission budget, equipment and personnel. The CFSP budget covers the mission budget, which finances a part of the equipment and infrastructure. Personnel are provided for almost exclusively by member states. To a lesser extent, the states also supply equipment, such as vehicles.

Qualified personnel are the key resource in civilian CSDP. When a mission is to be deployed, it is a question of timely provision of appropriately trained civilian experts, such as police forces or legal experts, in adequate numbers. Civilian operations differ from military operations in that their deployability relies on different aspects: personnel/soldiers, their equipment and a specific organizational structure.

The EU almost exclusively draws on seconded experts and hires only few experts on a direct contractual basis (contracting). Secondment means that member states recruit national experts, make them available for deployment and pay them. In 2009 for example, of a total of 2334 civilian experts, 1976 were seconded and only 358 contracted.<sup>21</sup>

---

20 Major and Schöndorf, op cit.

21 Grevi/Helly/Keohane, op. cit., p. 415.

Areas of Expertise	Numbers and Tasks (as agreed on in CHG 2010)
Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5761 policemen</li> <li>• substitution tasks (substitution of local police forces) and reinforcement tasks (support to local forces)</li> </ul>
Rule of Law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 631 experts</li> <li>• judges, prosecutors, penitentiary personnel, administrative clerks</li> </ul>
Civil Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 565 experts, available on short notice</li> <li>• general administrative tasks (i.e. civil registration, local administration)</li> <li>• social tasks (i.e. education, public health)</li> <li>• infrastructure (i.e. water and energy supply)</li> </ul>
Civil Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 579 experts and 4445 aid workers</li> <li>• assistance in civil protection, pandemic preparedness, migratory flows</li> </ul>
Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 505 experts for monitoring, situation analysis and evaluation</li> </ul>
Support to EU Special Representatives (EU SR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 444 experts to support EUSRs in areas such as human rights, politics, gender, Security Sector Reform (SSR)</li> </ul>

EU member states possess great resources of civilian expertise, a fact illustrated by an inventory of existing civilian experts in both member states and the Commission that the Council published in December 1999, shortly after the inception of CSDP.<sup>22</sup> However, this list provided little information about the availability of personnel and did not build upon standardized criteria for recruitment and training.

In order to guarantee flexibility, professionalism and specialization of the civilian personnel as well as the rapid deployment of specific groups of experts, EU member states decided to concentrate their efforts first and foremost

<sup>22</sup> European Council, *Conclusions of the Presidency*, Helsinki, November 24, 1999 (doc. 12323/99 for member states, doc. 11044/99 for the EU).

on six priority areas.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, states agreed upon two Civilian Headline Goals (CHG) in 2000 and 2004 to fix how many experts the EU would like to have at its disposal in the concerned areas (see Table 1).

According to national pledges, states have already fulfilled these numeric CHG targets.<sup>25</sup> In case of deployment, however, states routinely experience difficulties in satisfying the demand for personnel, ensuring the re-

<sup>23</sup> European Council, *Conclusions of the Presidency*, Santa Maria de Feira, June 19-20, 2000; Council of the European Union, *Civilian Headline Goal 2008*, Brussels, December 7, 2004 (doc. 15863/04).

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.; table updated and adapted from Rummel, op. cit., p. 8-9.

<sup>25</sup> General Affairs Council, *Final Report on the Civilian Headline Goal 2008*, Brussels, EU, November 19, 2007 (doc. 14807/07).

quired speed, and supplying personnel that can cope with complex mission tasks. Almost all missions have experienced difficulties in obtaining the required manpower. This problem is especially felt when several large missions need to be staffed simultaneously, as was the case in 2008, when EUMM Georgia, EUPOL Afghanistan, and EULEX Kosovo were all seeking staff. EUPOL Afghanistan and EULEX Kosovo, the biggest missions in numbers so far, did not reach their planned strength, even if pledged numbers of the CHG suggest they would have been able to. When EULEX Kosovo advertised positions in 2010/11, it only received applications for 60% of advertised posts.<sup>26</sup> Specialized profiles such as logisticians and legal experts as well as sensitive posts, such as in the management, are especially hard to staff. Things prove to be less difficult for posts that require less specific expertise, such as general monitoring, mentoring and advising tasks.

These problems with provision of personnel stem from five challenges:

**First, civilian experts do not form a homogeneous professional group.** The term “civilian personnel” comprises a multiplicity of profiles: from judges to engineers to customs or gender experts. This results in a range of problems, especially because different parameters and institutional contacts for deployment exist, which rarely cooperate. Whereas in the military national defense ministries act as coordinating hubs, in the civilian realm there is a multiplicity of institutional contacts. In the case of Germany, they are to be found both in the state and private domain: on the one hand, there are several ministries (MFA, Interior, Justice, Economic Cooperation and Development). The ministries in turn do not

all possess the same structures: whereas the Federal Ministry of the Interior has a working group for international police missions, one is lacking in the Federal Ministry of Justice. In addition, competencies are split between the federal and the regional state level, for instance in the police forces.

On top of that, the different systems and professional backgrounds complicate cooperation in the field. Here, too, differences with the military realm are evident: NATO membership has meant that most EU member state military forces have been trained in cooperation and been socialized in common standards and conceptions. This facilitates international military cooperation and increases mutual understanding. But there is no comparable structure in the civilian realm.

EU-wide training standards have now been developed, however. Between 2001 and 2009 representatives of numerous EU member states developed training programs for civilian EU missions in the European Group on Training (EGT) for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management.<sup>27</sup> The results of the Commission-funded EGT considerably contributed to the creation of Europe’s New Training Initiative for Civilian Crisis Management (ENTRi), chaired by ZIF, within the framework of which 13 European partner institutions have since January 2011 been jointly conducting a training program for civilian crisis management.<sup>28</sup> The Commission bears 80% of the costs (€2.5 million), and the 13 partner institutions share the rest. With regard to police forces, the European Police College (CEPOL) attempts to harmonize education. But these trainings have restricted utility, because they are not obligatory and not all countries participate.

26 Interview in the EEAS in May 2011; see Giovanni Grevi: “EULEX Kosovo,” in Grevi/Helly/Keohane, op. cit., pp. 353-368.

27 [www.europeangroupontraining.eu](http://www.europeangroupontraining.eu), accessed June 29, 2011.

28 [www.entriforccm.eu/](http://www.entriforccm.eu/), accessed June 29, 2011.

**Second, there is no European recruitment system.** This means that the quality of personnel cannot be guaranteed. As EU provisions only apply to quantitative (CHG objectives) and not qualitative standards, considerable differences persist with regard to recruitment in terms of institutions, procedures and criteria. A few states have developed institutions and programs that deal with recruiting, selecting, advising, preparing, supervising, de-briefing and evaluating personnel. Frontrunners include Germany (ZIF, established in 2002), Sweden (Folke Bernadotte Academy, established in 2002), and Finland (Crisis Management Center, established in 2007). They are in charge of civilian personnel contributions to EU, UN, and OSCE and probably eventually NATO (if it decides to turn civilian). At the same time, they ensure the quality of candidates. In case of doubts about a candidate's aptitude, the agencies can decide not to support his or her application for a position in an EU mission. Some states also established a legal basis for deployment, dealing with practical issues such as medical insurance. The German and the Finnish models are here seen as exemplary. The 2009 German Secondment Act guarantees the legal and social protection of civilian personnel in international missions.<sup>29</sup>

The majority of EU member states, however, are just in the process of systematically organizing their recruiting and training, as well as establishing some legal groundwork for it. Whereas the recruitment of police forces is already frequently centralized and backed by training programs, things look rather bleak for other civilian experts. Recruitment centers are very rare. Poland, for example, has no central database; decisions on deployments are taken on an ad hoc basis in the individual agencies

or ministries. However, Poland started to change legal requirements in order to harmonize deployment conditions among civilian experts. Slovakia developed a corresponding draft bill that is likely to be adopted by parliament by the end of 2011. The bill creates a coordinating committee for deployment of civilian personnel and defines deployment conditions. In general, a trend towards a more systematic organization of recruitment can be discerned.

**Third, civilian experts cannot be “enlisted.”**

The principle of voluntary participation holds both for the expert and the seconding agency or company. In principle, experts can volunteer to participate in missions, yet in case of deployment decide on short notice whether they want to take part in this very mission or not. Private reasons, security concerns or career considerations can play a role here. The voluntary character explains the gap between pledged numbers and actually available experts in civilian CSDP. In order to close that gap, member states and the EU set up preselected pools of experts. They can improve availability and actual willingness for deployment by means of better preparation and information, and by greatly clarifying administrative questions in generic contracts in advance. These pools can thus help by creating a sense of commitment, but ultimately cannot guarantee the experts' willingness to deploy. The Civilian Response Teams (CRT), that are supposed to ensure rapid reaction to crisis situations are an example of such EU-level pools.<sup>30</sup> However, results have been meager so far: CRT have been deployed, but in other staff compositions than those pledged.

---

29 Gesetz zur Regelung von Sekundierungen im Rahmen von Einsätzen der zivilen Krisenprävention (Sekundierungsgesetz – SekG), 17. Juli 2009 (BGBl. I S. 1974).

---

30 Council of the European Union, Multifunctional Civilian Crisis Management Resources in an Integrated Format – Civilian Response Teams, Brussels, EU, June 23, 2005 (doc. 10462/05).

**Fourth, civilian experts frequently are scarce resources in their own country.**

Agencies thus often are reluctant to support deployment and accept absences in their own staff. The same applies for the private sector.

**Fifth, individual incentives are low to participate in deployment abroad.**

For the majority of experts, deployment abroad is neither a career move nor financially attractive. On top of that, returning to work after a mission often proves difficult. Consequently, many civilians are reluctant to undergo (more or less, depending on country) time-consuming training or deploy to a faraway and potentially dangerous crisis region without the prospect of garnering some professional or financial profit from it.

Increased contracting of experts could probably resolve current problems with deployment of seconded experts. While seconding generally allows for swift recruitment and deployment (often less than three months), the number of applicants is low. This is mainly due to the fact that some countries limit secondments to the civil service. The EU has received no more than 3,500 applications for a total of about 1,800 posts in 2010.<sup>31</sup> Contracting frequently and significantly increases the number of applicants. Also, expenditure and costs for the states would drop substantially if applicants could apply to and be paid by the EU.

On the other hand, states would lose their quality assurance mechanism, because the recruiting agencies that are now active, such as Folke Bernadotte Academy or ZIF, would not necessarily be involved in selection and training. Moreover, states would be left with a potentially reduced ability to exercise influence over missions: bypassing their personnel recruitment programs also undermines the

ability of state attempts to influence a mission or to emphasize its commitment to a region symbolically. Under specified conditions, it seems reasonable to uphold secondment, while increasing incentives and improving procedures.

As long as states hold on to secondment, problems with the provision of personnel can only be resolved on the national level. Given the differences concerning legal systems and institutional practices, no universal model for recruitment, training, deployment and administration of civilian personnel can be developed. However, the EU level can provide support for change by generating a general framework.

In July 2009 the Political and Security Committee (PSC), a permanent Brussels-based body of EU member states representatives, defined four priority areas for improvement of the provision of civilian personnel: development of national frameworks; budget lines; national databases (rosters); and training. In order to make progress in these areas, the PSC recommended developing national coordinating institutions, national concepts and instruments, such as the Goalkeeper database. Goalkeeper is a software program that is supposed to give an (interconnected) overview over available posts in missions with standardized job descriptions, training courses and resources of EU states. It is still under construction.<sup>32</sup>

Furthermore, the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD), the EEAS' agency for the coordination of civilian and military planning, conduct and capability development, organizes periodical workshops

---

31 Behrendt, op. cit., p. 3.

---

32 Council of the European Union, *Civilian Headline Goal 2010: Outline of Goalkeeper Software Environment*, Brussels, EU, April 2, 2009 (doc. 8096/09); interview in the CMPD in May 2011. As of this writing Goalkeeper is not fully operational.

that serve as forums where states can exchange experiences and best practices.<sup>33</sup> Ideas and assistance concerning the improvement of staff supply stem from both the EU level and advanced member states. But as these are recommendations rather than obligations, and because states lack interest, they are frequently not or only in a very modest way implemented.

### **The EU Level: Fragmentation and the Challenge of Coordination**

The interaction between states and the EU level is characterized by disparate assumptions about their respective responsibilities and priorities in the realm of crisis management, and often proves to be inefficient. The same holds true not only for cooperation within EEAS, but also between EEAS and the Commission. This confusion has negative effects on civilian CSDP's political and administrative actorness, because initiatives are hampered, decisions delayed or insufficiently equipped in material terms. Because of opaque internal distribution of competences and the resulting disputes, the "Brussels Machine" cannot pool expertise and provide coordination as effectively as it should.

#### **Inefficient Interaction between States and the EU Level**

CSDP's administrative decision-making capacity depends on the efficient and goal-oriented cooperation of EU-level CSDP structures with the EU member states. The Lisbon Treaty provided a new framework for this interaction. So far, however, this has not contributed to

the strengthening of civilian CSDP: the HR shows little interest in civilian CSDP and has not yet launched noteworthy initiatives since assuming office in November 2009. States have less access to EU structures and fewer opportunities for visible actions. Hence, civilian CSDP finds itself with progressively less leadership to guide it.

Two provisions of the Lisbon Treaty in particular had the potential to improve the greatly criticized lack of coherence, continuity and efficiency of EU security policy: first, the abolition of the rotating 6-month-presidency of the Council; and second, and linked to that, the introduction of a High Representative (HR) for EU foreign and security policy.

The HR was intended to be a leadership figure with numerous competences: coordinating internal EU decision-making processes; bundling resources of the states; creating a coherent security policy profile for the Union; and supporting member states in their role as driving forces in CSDP. For that reason, the post merges CFSP domains that were formerly split between the Commission (supranationally organized) and the Council (intergovernmentally organized). This bridging function is supported by the HR's role as Vice President of the Commission: the HR leads CFSP/CSDP, but is also responsible for the EU's external action in the Commission. This merger was supposed to overcome problems that previously resulted from the fragmentation between the EC and CFSP pillars, such as competence-based squabbles in the civilian area (in which both Commission and CSDP are active).

The High Representative's potential influence on CSDP results from the fact that he/she can lead the whole decision-making process, from the initiative to deliberation in the working groups through to the decision in the new formation of the Foreign Affairs Council (FAC). The HR chairs this council

---

33 Hungary consequently organized a study trip to Finland in the framework of the creation of its national crisis management strategy; Polish experts have visited ZIF.

formation, which has put an end to the rotating Council presidency. A representative of the HR also leads the PSC and the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM). In the PSC, representatives of member states discuss international security policy developments and prepare the meetings of the FAC. CIVCOM is the expert committee that advises the PSC on civilian matters. It formulates recommendations, accompanies capacity-building, develops strategies for single domains and supports both intra-EU and EU-member states' cooperation. The principle of unanimity in PSC and CIVCOM still applies, but the HR sets the agenda and chairs the meetings. Most importantly, she/he now possesses a formal power of initiative and her own apparatus, the EEAS.

Two years into the Lisbon Treaty, however, civilian CSDP appears weakened and leaderless. This is due both to the current High Representative's lack of leadership and the limited commitment of member states.

The HR has so far failed to distinguish herself as a driving force.<sup>34</sup> Whether or not the Lisbon provisions are effective depends to a great extent on the commitment of the High Representative. To date, her capacities in generating momentum, exerting leadership and representing have proven to be far from convincing in the realm of civilian CSDP. That is in part because she enjoys little support from member states. But she also has not yet shown an ambition to put her stamp on civilian CSDP. This is all the more striking, as there was no shortage of opportunities for profile-making, such as the chance to define the EU's response to the Arab Spring in early 2011. But the HR acted with reserve, whereas some member states, such as France and Great Britain,

promoted themselves and explicitly refrained from acting within the EU framework.

The reasons for Ashton's lack of commitment are manifold. First, the beginning of her tenure was complicated by the fact that she had to set up the service (EEAS) that was essentially supposed to support her work. This undertaking was hindered by the power struggle among member states, the European Parliament and the Commission, which were contending for authority, influence and financial means.<sup>35</sup> During the start-up phase, the working capacity of the EEAS was limited and missing posts were not staffed. Additionally, the Lisbon Treaty has vested competences in the HR, but not always the corresponding support structures: one of Ashton's representatives may now head CIVCOM, but does not dispose of proper working groups, as does his military counterpart, the EU Military Staff. Thus, the HR is expected to lead and initiate, but is equipped with few of her own resources and remains dependent upon member states for support. This principle applies, for instance, in the provision of personnel for missions. This contradiction between supranational leadership tasks for the HR on one hand, and unvaryingly intergovernmental control by member states over resources on the other, affects the actorness of civilian CSDP.

Furthermore, the HR seems to conceive of CSDP as states' turf, where her own agenda setting power is limited. According to observers, she has little interest in mediating conflicts between member states and producing compromise. Her reserved role in the debates about the set up of an EU civil-military headquarters in the spring and summer of 2011 illustrate this shortcoming.<sup>36</sup> She seems to

---

34 Interviews in the EEAS in May 2011, in the French, German and Polish Foreign Ministries in May, June and August 2011

---

35 See von Ondarza, *op. cit.*

36 Claudia Major, *A Civil-Military Headquarters for the EU. The Weimar Triangle Initiative Fuels the Current*

prefer other domains, like the setup of EU delegations, where she sees more scope for action.

In addition to the HR's role, the lack of political actorness, or even the leadership vacuum in civilian CSDP, can also be explained by the reluctant attitude of member states since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. The Treaty established conditions that hamper member state initiatives, because they now have less access to Brussels structures and decision-making mechanisms. The abolition of the rotating presidency in the FAC, the PSC and CIVCOM leaves the member states with fewer opportunities for agenda-setting and lobbying for their issues. The HR's right of initiative leaves member states with the impression that they have less a say. As opportunities of influence diminish, states are less interested in committing to the EU. The fact that CIVCOM is not always able to fulfill its tasks of developing ideas and pushing dossiers is due not only to the weak presidency, but also to a lack of member state commitment.

This outcome is disastrous, because during past Council presidencies, many member states put a lot of effort into their projects. Sweden, for example, pushed for further development of civilian capabilities and submitted detailed proposals in the 2009 "Guiding Lines."<sup>37</sup> In 2008, France campaigned for the monitoring mission EUMM Georgia, which was rapidly deployed after the 2008 Georgia-Russia war. However, some decisions seem indeed to have been taken solely for the sake of prestige and good publicity. The very same French EU presidency initiated a pool of experts on Security Sector Reform (SSR pool), which was basically a duplication of existing

pools, such the Crisis Reaction Teams. However, taking the Arab Spring as an example, recent experiences show that without the support and the interest of influential member states, strong EU actorness and the further development of civilian means are impossible to achieve.

Who will fill the leadership vacuum that emerged because of lack of commitment from both the HR and member states? Initial signs of willingness by member states to become a driving force emerged again in the 2011 Polish EU presidency, which presented an ambitious program and tried to promote it, if necessary, independently from the HR.<sup>38</sup> But Ashton also appears to have become more ambitious. She initiated a screening of EEAS crisis management structures, which should be completed by the end of 2011. Its results are supposed to inform the restructuring and rationalization of these structures in order to improve their capacity to act.

### **Insufficient Cooperation Inside the EEAS**

The EEAS develops policy input for concepts, capabilities or training and thus lays the basis for administrative decision-making at the EU level. However, disputes over competences and insufficient coordination of certain entities inside the EEAS impair its capacity to act.

Many EU diplomats, as well as national representatives, criticize the difficult start-up phase of the EEAS as a "standstill."<sup>39</sup> Lasting uncer-

---

*Debate* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, December 2010 (SWP Comments 2010/C 31).

37 Non-Paper, *Civilian Capability Planning and Development – Guiding Lines for the Second Semester of 2009*, Brussels, July 2009.

38 Claudia Major and Florian Wassenberg, *Warsaw's Ambitious CSDP Agenda* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, September 2011 (SWP Comments 2011/C 25).

39 Interviews in the EEAS in May and July 2011, in the German, French, Belgian and Polish MFAs in June 2011.

tainty about the placement of CSDP institutions inside the EEAS, opaque distribution of competences between the Commission and the EEAS, and practical questions—EEAS employees being dispersed among different buildings and thus exchanging little in day-to-day work—not only affected the ability to work of the EEAS, but also curbed the enthusiasm of its staff.

The staffing situation remains problematic. Until the outline of the EEAS had been defined in December of 2010, personnel decisions and recruiting were postponed. Even senior positions were staffed late. The directors of the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC), which conducts civilian missions, and the CMPD were appointed as late as April and May, 2011. This delay, however, caused the strategic orientation to be defined quite late. The staffing situation remains difficult, as the HR cannot fill all vacant posts due to saving targets. Out of 56 authorized positions in CPCC, only 40 were filled by May 2011.

Inside the EEAS, disputes about competence affect the coordination between the departments. Cooperation between the geographic and thematic desks within the EEAS on the one hand, and the CSDP crisis management structures (CMPD, CPCC) on the other, is often impaired by insufficient communication. Meetings of the CMPD, some EEAS departments and the Commission took place, however, during the Libyan crisis in spring 2011.

Inside the crisis management structures, the CPCC/Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability and the CMPD/Crisis Management and Planning Department compete with each other. CPCC is responsible for civilian operational questions: the conduct of ongoing missions, mission support (legal, logistic and financial), and planning. It is a kind of civilian headquarters and is headed by a civilian operations commander. The CMPD deals with

integrated, politico-strategic planning, concept development, operation reporting and lessons learned. It is supposed to improve coordination of civilian and military planning, conduct and capability development. Therefore, CMPD is often likened to a planning staff, whereas implementation takes place within CPCC. The line between the two is difficult to draw, however, and strongly depends on senior staff. The unresolved rivalry between the two obstructs decision-making within the civilian CSDP. For example, the Civilian Reaction Teams are a dossier of both CMPD and CPCC without clear distribution of tasks and competences. Disagreements between CPCC and CMPD over responsibilities on that issue in the spring of 2011 delayed scheduled training programs. Since the restaffing of senior positions in spring 2011, weekly meetings between directors from both agencies take place to improve coordination. But it is too early to assess the results.

The marginal integration of the field level of CSDP and its expertise in the work of Brussels-based CSDP structures also has a negative impact on the EU's administrative capacity to act. Situations are appraised very differently in the field and in Brussels. If local expertise is not integrated or only partially integrated in Brussels' work, this disconnect might lead to inappropriate decisions or allocation of resources. A fact-finding mission in 2007 sent out an alert about hostile developments on the Georgian border and recommended that the PSC send police and border monitoring personnel to South Ossetia and Abkhazia. But the PSC could not manage to reach a decision.<sup>40</sup> When the Georgian-Russian war erupted in 2008, the EU had no personnel on the ground to provide information about the conflict.

---

40 See Korski and Gowan, *op. cit.*, p. 56; Interviews in the German Foreign Office, May 2011.

The administrative capacity to act is equally affected by vague and inadequate planning. The EU lacks numerous preconditions for ensuring the deployment of civilian experts and creating good working conditions: from equipment to contracts with external suppliers (e.g., for fuel) or rapid funding at the beginning of a mission. Meanwhile, member states and the Commission have provided for the latter. Funds can now be unblocked prior to the resolution on a mission deployment has passed in order to pay per diem or local interpreters in fact-finding missions, which provide information for the elaboration of the mandate.<sup>41</sup> The Commission determined corresponding procedures in 2008. Funds were first used for the preparation of EUMM Georgia in 2008.

Procurement remains problematic, as Brussels' standards are widely used for the field level, even if conditions differ considerably. Hence missions are subject to the same procurement standards—for their headquarters, for example—as if they were in Brussels. But lengthy delivery times can render a mission ineffective: the first experts for EUMM Georgia quickly arrived on the ground in 2008, but were not immediately able to act because the infrastructure was lacking. Similar problems occurred in EUPOL Afghanistan and EULEX Kosovo. This problem especially concerns equipment that is expensive and takes time to deliver, such as armored vehicles. Since the EU does not maintain a stand-by “starter kit” for missions, it always needs to procure new equipment, take over equipment from other missions or hope for member state support. EUMM Georgia lacked the armored vehicles it needed to do its work in a dangerous environment. Only the commitment of France

and Italy, which supplied the required vehicles, helped overcome the problem quickly.

Furthermore, the EU has trouble integrating mission evaluations to form a systematic learning process. CPCC is responsible for the monitoring and evaluation of civilian missions. But these procedures are not always systematic, and lessons learned are slowly implemented. As a result, it is difficult for the EU to respond to changing conditions, such as the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan. In addition, learning from past experiences for future missions is restricted. Problems like procurement procedures that are not adapted to operating conditions in the field are thus upheld.<sup>42</sup> EU member states, however, do not always implement EEAS best practice recommendations that are relevant to them, like issuing diplomatic passports to CRT personnel in order to facilitate rapid deployment and their stay in crisis regions.

Finally, the EU only partially exploits synergies that can result from the interplay of civilian and military components of CSDP. Planning is coordinated, but opportunities for cooperation are rarely seized. The concept of Civil-Military Coordination (CMCO) is supposed to enable the coordination of civilian and military instruments in planning processes.<sup>43</sup> The Crisis Management Procedures complement CMCO and describe at which points in planning and decision-making the civilian and military dimensions are to be taken into consideration. In reality, civilian and military missions are coordinated at best, like in the Democratic Republic of Congo. From 2005 to 2006, up to two civilian missions and one

---

41 Council of the European Union, *Procedure for Having Recourse to the 'Preparatory Measures' Budget Line within the CFSP Budget*, Brussels, EU, May 31, 2007 (doc. 10238/07).

---

42 Chivvis, op. cit.; interviews in the EEAS in May 2011, in the MFA in July 2011.

43 Council of the European Union, *Civil Military Coordination (CMCO)*, Brussels, EU, November 7, 2003 (doc. 14457/03).

military mission coexisted there.<sup>44</sup> But synergies were rarely exploited. Cooperation in EUMM Georgia, however, was successful: the civilian mission could not have started as quickly as it did without military support with transport. One important initiative was started by the 2009 Swedish Council presidency, when it identified 13 areas (including transport, logistics and communication) of possible civil-military synergies and consequently drafted a working program.<sup>45</sup> It seems that implementation is progressing rather slowly.<sup>46</sup>

An efficient arrangement of civil-military cooperation is complicated by criticism from numerous observers, including some from civil society, who fear that the label “civil-military cooperation” stands for creeping militarization of crisis management.<sup>47</sup> They list staff numbers, existing structures and processes and the role of concepts as criteria for militarization. Civilian CSDP indeed compares unfavorably to military CSDP in these categories and military influences are apparent. Hence more CMPD staff has a military background than a civilian one. Military structures and processes guided the construction of CPCC and this leads to large similarities between military and civilian crisis management concepts, for example. This suggests that the military mindset

shapes planning and that military patterns are borrowed for civilian missions.

Civilian institutions also have fewer supporting structures at their disposal. Inside CMPD, the numbers of employees responsible for military and civilian capability development are roughly the same.<sup>48</sup> The military side, however, gets additional support in terms of technical expertise from EUMS and the European Defense Agency (EDA). On the civilian side, there is only CPCC, which has a much smaller staff (40) than its military counterpart EUMS (150).<sup>49</sup> But CPCC has more competencies and tasks than EUMS and needs to conduct numerous missions in different geographic areas (10 missions as of summer of 2011).

There is debate about how this military dominance manifests itself in practice. Potential militarization of planning so far seems to concern mainly functional issues, such as redundancy planning, that is to say the military rather plans for double the resources in order to have reserves that could be needed in case of emergency. The military’s considerable planning expertise should be acknowledged at some point. This level of expertise is not yet available in the civilian sphere, because there is a dearth of proficient civilian planners who are able to assume long-term and intensive planning for civilian CSDP. Whether military dominance is problematic to the degree that it obstructs the genuine civilian character of CSDP has not yet been systematically investigated.

---

44 See *Annex 1*, p. 41; EUPOL Kinshasa (April 2005-June 2007), EUSEC RD Congo (since May 2005), EUFOR DR Congo (July-November 2006).

45 cf. Council of the European Union, Political and Security Committee Note to the Permanent Representatives’ Committee and the Council. Promoting Synergies between the EU Civil and Military Capability Development, Brussels, EU, November 9, 2009 (doc. 15475/09).

46 cf. Council of the European Union, *Promoting Synergies between the EU Civil and Military Capability Development -Final report on the outcomes of Phase 2 of the Workplan*, Brussels, EU, May 17, 2011 (doc. 9850/11).

47 Alain Déléroz, “Kapazität der EU zur Friedenssicherung schwindet,” in *Der Tagesspiegel*, February 22, 2010.

---

48 As competences overlap and change, some observers speak of 1,5 posts, others of 3. But most importantly, military and civilian staffs are equal in numbers (as of July 2011).

49 As of May 2011, numbers are constantly changing, but the disequilibrium persists. There still is no military EU HQ that would mirror CPCC structures. Military HQ tasks currently fulfilled by EUMS, the Operations (Ops) Center, and in case of deployment by national HQs. Thus, by adding the national HQ staff, the civil-military ratio sways even more to the military side.

## Obstructive Competition between Commission and the EEAS

Both the EEAS and the European Commission have civilian instruments. They are dependent on each other, but their interaction is characterized by differing preconceptions and competence-based squabbles, which affect practical work.

The Commission has a deep-seated tradition in humanitarian aid and development cooperation, which is predominantly geared towards long-term institution-building. CSDP was created for quick intervention in acute crisis situations. The gap between security—quick reaction by CSDP—and development—long-term commitment by the Commission—suggests a complementary division of labor. In the complex crises the EU faces today it is hard to draw a clear line between security and development, as both demand concerted action within a comprehensive approach. But practice in the field often looks somewhat different.

The most famous example is the 2008 ECOWAS judgment, which ruled in favor of the Commission on a dispute it had with the Council regarding competences concerning the handling of small arms and light weapons.<sup>50</sup> In July 2002, the Council had adopted a CFSP Joint Action aiming at curbing the spread of small arms and light weapons in West Africa. The Commission, however, regarded this as a part of development cooperation and thus as under its own authority. In 2008, the European Court of Justice found in favor of the Commission.

---

50 Europäischer Gerichtshof, *Pressemitteilung Nr. 31/08. Urteil des Gerichtshofs in der Rechtssache C-91/05*, Luxemburg, EU, 20. Mai 2008; *Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union, V. Bekanntmachungen*, Brussels, June 5, 2008 (C 171/2).

The Lisbon Treaty was not able to completely resolve such squabbles. First, not all the competences in foreign policy are organized under one umbrella. Many observers note that the power struggle between the Commission and the member states concerning the structuring of EEAS was decided at the expense of the EEAS.<sup>51</sup> Thus, Commission President Barroso curtailed Ashton's portfolio shortly after her assumption of office by cutting the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) from her future assignment and allocating it to the Commissioner for Enlargement. Areas like enlargement, trade, and development cooperation, which are fundamentally important for civilian crisis management, remain with the Commission and hence are subject to its authority and funding lines. The Commission, by means of its Foreign Policy Instruments Service, also administers the CFSP budget, which funds civilian CSDP missions.<sup>52</sup> In these ways the Commission has influence on CSDP by deciding, for example, when to release funds. The HR may be able to link CSDP initiatives with Commission initiatives, but as she has no power to direct the actions of the Commissioners, cooperation has thus far been inadequate.

Second, disputes about competences persist despite the fact that subject areas have been formally assigned to the EEAS or to the Commission. This especially concerns the domain of humanitarian aid and disaster relief. When taking office in February 2010, the new European Commission decided to aggregate these two areas under a new EU Commissioner for International Cooperation, Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Response. But the HR, too, sees a role for CSDP in crisis response and disaster

---

51 See von Ondarza, *op. cit.*

52 The Commission administers the budget and controls the finances. Member states decide on the size of the budget per mission (in the framework of the CSDP budget).

relief. Both the Commissioner and the HR insist on their competence, which leads, for example, to insufficient sharing of information.

Finally, coordination processes between the EEAS and the Commission often turn out to be lengthy, even though the Commission is in many respects associated with CSDP decision-making processes. Civilian CSDP missions are indeed more likely to make a contribution to crisis management when their action is part of a comprehensive, coordinated EU involvement in the crisis region.<sup>53</sup> Coordination both between the CSDP budget and Commission funds and between their respective planning processes is a precondition for success. As processes differ in their structure and functioning, however, they are difficult to coordinate. This does not necessarily result in contradictory decisions and serious problems, but more likely in missed synergy effects, because of unnecessary duplications, for example. The common use of resources such as transport, logistics or common fact-finding can create synergies, whereas duplications boost costs.

Coordination between Commission and the EEAS in the case of rapid crisis reaction has been deemed to be successful. The Commission can provide funds for actions on short notice via its Instrument for Stability (IfS).<sup>54</sup> IfS projects are often complementary to CSDP missions, for instance in the field of crisis response or capacity building. But real coordination has rarely happened. In Afghanistan, where a rule of law mission (Commission) works in parallel with the EUPOL police mission (CSDP), progress in terms of

coordination was finally achieved after tedious efforts: the IfS now provides funds for projects which EUPOL identified. In Kosovo, EULEX Kosovo and the European Commission Liaison Office have improved cooperation after start-up difficulties: they now jointly identify priorities for assistance in the rule of law sector and monitoring the implementation of EC-funded programs.<sup>55</sup> Especially in crisis areas where both actors have different representatives on the ground and run parallel projects, coordination is necessary in order to exploit synergy effects, prevent mutual obstructions, and implement an overarching strategy for the region.

### The International Level: Competition and Cooperation

The EU is one actor among many in international crisis management. It has to share tasks and resources with international partners such as the UN or the OSCE. Under the paradigm of the comprehensive approach, all actors are supposed to strive for cooperation. But the increasing number of missions and the extension of their tasks have led to growing competition for resources and competences. Between 1988 and 2008, the number of UN missions quadrupled.<sup>56</sup> Between 2004 and 2010 alone, the number of civilian personnel in UN missions increased from 12,500 to 22,500.<sup>57</sup> Competition particularly concerns personnel, because increasing demand from all organizations needs to be satisfied by drawing upon the

53 See Claudia Major and Christian Mölling, *Towards an EU Peacebuilding Strategy?*, European Parliament, Brussels, April 2010 (Standard Briefing).

54 See Marco Overhaus, *Aufbauhilfe der EU in Konfliktländern. Die außenpolitischen Instrumente im Spannungsfeld von Sicherheit und Entwicklung* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Oktober 2011 (SWP-Studien 2011), p. 28.

55 Grevi, in Grevi/Helly/Keohane, op. cit., pp. 353-36.

56 United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations, *United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations Fact Sheet*, United Nations, New York 2008, [www.un.org/Depts/dpko/factsheet.pdf](http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/factsheet.pdf), accessed July 8, 2011.

57 Civilian personnel here comprises international staff, local staff and United Nations volunteers. See Zentrum für Internationale Friedenseinsätze 2011.

same pool of personnel: a German legal expert is basically available for all missions; he can choose the UN or the EU, but he cannot do both at the same time.

Unlike the EU, the UN and NATO are currently developing their own initiatives to tackle the staffing question. The report on civilian capacity of March 2011 gives the UN concrete recommendations for more flexible and globally interconnected recruiting and deployment.<sup>58</sup> NATO is also considering building its own civilian structures. By this it means – for the moment – primarily the establishment of interfaces to ensure interaction with civilian actors. But setting up its own civilian capacities is not excluded. Such capacities would have to be recruited from the same pool from which the EU, UN and OSCE draw personnel.

In addition, the basis for cooperation with other international organizations and third countries in planning and deployment is partially lacking. This basis would allow for complementarity and interaction in crisis management and is strongly needed in light of growing demand and the aspiration to put the comprehensive approach into practice. The conceptual basis for cooperation has already partly been established: the EU has committed itself several times—in the ESS, and again in joint declarations in 2003 and 2007—to cooperation with the UN.<sup>59</sup> In reality, however, this cooperation falls short of expectations, especially because of different institutional cultures, objectives and insufficient framework

conditions. By way of illustration, the EU and the UN lack a security agreement when it comes to information exchange. Existing cooperative bodies, such as liaison structures, are frequently underused. The administrative and political decision-making capacity of CSDP is thereby limited, if, for example, not all necessary information for the elaboration of a mandate is available.

### Conclusion: Waiting for...the Member States

This analysis underscores that the capacity of civilian CSDP to act—namely, whether it has an impact or not—largely depends on the commitment of EU member states. Current developments, however, do not suggest that this commitment is to increase any time soon.

Member states drive and shape civilian CSDP at all three levels—national, European, and international—, although with differing intensity. At the national level, they decide whether to make civilian crisis management a political priority. They create the administrative prerequisites and provide resources. At the EU level, they fix directions, and can contribute, encourage, or stop initiatives. At the international level, they lay the foundations for cooperation with partners and alleviate competition by providing more personnel and by building incentive structures for deployments in the EU framework.

If the states that consider civilian crisis management a priority on the national level lose interest in CSDP instruments or question their usefulness, CSDP might lose some of its political significance and see its actorness permanently constrained. EU actors, notably the HR, can only partially avert this. Developments in recent years revealed exactly these negative dynamics: ever since the Lisbon Treaty entered into effect, civilian CSDP has

---

58 Jean-Marie Guéhenno et al., *Civilian Capacity in the Aftermath of Conflict. Independent Report of the Senior Advisory Group* (New York: United Nations, February 2011 (A/65/747-S/2011/85)).

59 Council of the European Union, *Joint Declaration on UN-EU Cooperation in Crisis Management*, Brussels, September 19, 2003; Council of the European Union, *Joint Statement on UN-EU Cooperation in Crisis Management*, Brussels, June 7, 2007.

remained relatively weak due to a combination of reduced leverage and interest among member states; insufficient commitment by the High Representative; and increasing international competition.

In a long-term perspective, EU states have to decide whether they want to keep civilian CSDP, whether they prefer to act in other multilateral frameworks or organizations, or even whether they want to withdraw from civilian crisis management as such. If they were to abandon civilian CSDP and turn to other fora, be they the UN, OSCE, NATO or a coalition of the willing, and yet do so with stronger political and material commitments, it would certainly be beneficial from the perspective of the crisis regions. The experiences of the UN and other organizations, however, show that all international organizations suffer

from insufficient commitment by member states. Lack of interest and commitment is thus not characteristic of the EU framework in particular but of the field of civilian crisis management itself.

The crucial problem of civilian CSDP is hence the limited political will and interests of EU member states. Some states or the HR might still seek to improve the technical and administrative conditions of civilian CSDP, such as a better assignment of competences between CPCC and CMPD. Some states may develop national support structures. However, all of these technical efforts can only alleviate the political problem, they will not resolve it. Without real political commitment by EU member states, civilian CSDP will remain as it is now: for limited use and of only limited effectiveness.