

Working Group VIII

Working document 11

WORKING GROUP VIII « DEFENCE »

Subject : Note by Mr Liviu MAIOR

Members of the Working Group will find attached a note by Mr Liviu Maior, member of the Convention.

**CONTRIBUTION BY SENATOR LIVIU MAIOR,
MEMBER OF THE CONVENTION**

PROPOSALS FOR THE WORKING GROUP VIII – DEFENSE

1. ESDP IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS: GENERAL ASPECTS

- The development of European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) within the European Union will contribute to the reinforcement of European security climate, and last but not least, will provide a higher level of visibility to the efforts of European allies in this area.
- Meanwhile, ESDP should be implemented in a transparent way and in co-operation with other security organizations, NATO in particular, in order to avoid any duplication of current efforts.
- The reinforcement of European co-operation in the field of defense industry represents a key element for finalizing the implementation process of the Helsinki European Council goals and for addressing the deficiencies already identified at operational level. In this framework, the experience of candidate states and their industrial production capabilities may contribute to increasing this process' efficiency.

2. DEFENCE CAPABILITIES' IMPROVEMENT MECHANISM

- The European Union's commitments on creating a defense dimension clearly represent a major challenge. Launching this initiative will fundamentally contribute to concluding the process of developing European defense capabilities.
- The European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP) is the first force planning/building process of this dimension started within the EU. In such a wide-ranging process, there certainly is the advantage of using the experience of NATO member states that are simultaneously EU members. This ought to include, in the future, not only negotiations among member states, but also a clearly defined inter-agency co-operation framework. Following this proposal, connecting

ECAP in an institutionalized manner to the DCI Plus process may require joint meetings or the participation of international experts from both organizations at common debates on military capabilities.

- Hence, **duplication of efforts** will be avoided, as for now, they practically converge towards the same goal- meaning the reduction or elimination of present deficiencies and subsequent development of rapid reaction capabilities, which will enable the European states, in the case of the EU, and the US and European members, in the case of NATO, to increase the efficiency of their response to current crisis and challenges.
- In this context, it may be useful to develop a EU political-strategic concept, which should define the relevant areas and topics for future operations of the EU Rapid Reaction Force (RRF). Coordination of EU interests and priorities with those included in the NATO Strategic Concept will be unavoidable, either because some of its elements could be taken over by the EU, or because certain distinctions would be made at the conceptual level.
- For developing the mechanism of improving EU defense capabilities, one should analyze its supplementation with measures regarding the improvement of the financing mechanisms, both by increasing the national expenditures in the field of defense, as well as by providing common EU funds. Developing a EU defense budget could be an option worth to be debated.
- Currently, two concepts are undergoing a reflection process, related to the creation of two rapid reaction forces, one belonging to the EU, much larger and supported by a process which comprises civil capabilities and crisis prevention procedures, and one belonging to NATO, that will probably be based on a revision process of present military structures and on the lessons learned in the process of capabilities planning and evaluation.
- In this respect, I believe that somehow, and maybe this Convention is the one to provide the appropriate forum, one could think about a formula of inter-relating the two concepts, with regard to goals, missions, operations or fields of concern. This especially since we are practically speaking about the same armies, capabilities and budgets in the case of states participating in both EU and NATO processes. Such coordination could allow the proceeding of the discussions on defining the framework of the agreement concerning EU access to the Allied capabilities.
- There is another essential element in this field. It is obvious that we have witnessed some difficulties and discrepancies in defining the relation between the two organizations. In our view, the need for a coherent solution should also include the incorporation of an institutionalized dimension by involving candidate states for EU membership and non-EU Allied states.

- This issue will have to be settled especially since both EU and NATO are envisaging two robust enlargements in 2002, respectively in 2004. New NATO members will probably participate in DCI Plus without being for the moment involved in ECAP, which could induce additional difficulties in the endeavors of coordinating the two processes, as they were presented by both Javier Solana and Lord Robertson at the meeting in Crete.
- Last but not least, we should remember that one of the top priorities of NATO Washington Summit was the development of a relevant European identity in the field of security within the Alliance. What happened to this project? The European scheme is much broader: we discuss now about a common foreign policy, a constitutional treaty etc. It is obvious that a substantial and coherent European political identity will emerge and will exercise a critical influence over other organizations and processes.
- **In defining and developing EU military capabilities, we should learn from the achievements and difficulties that other organizations had to cope with: an analysis of the NATO Washington-launched processes, from ESDI to DCI will allow us to avoid previous miscalculations and to design a more realistic framework for the accomplishment of our goals.**

PROSPECTS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CONVERGENCE CRITERIA IN THE AREA OF MILITARY CAPABILITY

- In accordance with the commitments undertaken at the European Council summit in December 1999, the Helsinki Headline Goal generates the necessary premises for re-evaluating the parameters of cooperation between EU member states.
- We should note that the endeavors related to developing convergence criteria in the defense area would be better achieved in the context of making use of the existing NATO experience in this field. Thus, increasing interoperability among EU members' forces incorporate, let's say, a part of the criteria and procedures applied within the Alliance, taking into consideration also that we are practically talking about the same national capabilities of European states, earmarked for both EU and NATO.
- We welcome the exercise carried out during the Belgian presidency as it was developed in the form of a questionnaire on defense capabilities and we appreciate similar modus operandi could be employed further on.
- The convergence criteria should be institutionalized to acquire a higher relevance within the overall ESDP implementation process. Furthermore, the future EU wide institutional architecture should also become more coherent to allow for an improved process of harmonization of national policies with regard to military capabilities.
- Such a system would be an inner guarantee for a rapid decision making process to be used in crisis management operations, while it would also offer the required inter-pillar coherence for this type of missions.
- Undoubtedly, defense convergence criteria will additionally produce a positive impact on the development of defense industries. In this sector, EU could establish common guidelines supporting the current projects of reducing existing deficiencies in the defense capabilities' area.

3. CO-OPERATION IN THE FIELD OF DEFENCE INDUSTRY

- Setting up a European Agency with responsibilities in the field of armaments would complement the current EU tools in the area of security and defense.
- Within the process of creating a EU agency, it may be helpful to use, under common auspices, present structures and especially WEU residual ones (Western European Armaments Group).

Such an option has the advantage of incorporating an important acquis of research and defense industry programs that involves both EU/NATO member and candidate states.

- I would like to reiterate that the implementation of the ongoing projects within WEAG and OCCAR would have a notable relevance for the activity of the ECAP working groups.
- Co-operation in the field of armaments could also incorporate the EU candidates' contribution, in accordance with their status and experience as acquired within the WEU. Last but not least, this option will encompass the opportunities offered by the existing industrial production capacities of these states.
- A future European Armaments Agency would have to respond to the needs of coherence at the level of national policies in this area, by adapting the R&D programs to the production capacities' characteristics in the case of both EU current and future members.
- Possible responsibilities:
 - Monitoring European defense production to ensure harmonization with Community' defense capabilities requirements;
 - Controlling defense industry exports – according to the EU acquis;
 - Ensuring a co-operation forum with candidate states to EU membership;
 - Developing a co-operation tool with foreign partners, US in particular.

CONCLUSIONS

- ESDP will contribute to the development of a European component both in EU and NATO in the field of defense and military intervention.
- The substance of NATO – EU complementarity is to comprise the distinction between the roles of the two organizations. Coordination means assuming from the very beginning conceptual differentiations.
- Therefore, it represents a major step forward, encompassing capabilities, budgets and industries with a possible medium term impact on the currently used formulas and systems for crisis management in Europe and in the world.
- We could imagine, beyond the current debates, sometime probably too much politicized, the emergence of a new model of crisis and conflicts management based on “role sharing” or “burden sharing” among various organizations – EU, NATO, OSCE, UN. Such a model would provide the basis for a new type of inter- national and inter- organizational relationships.
