Band 12 / 2019

The European Security and Defence Architecture – Challenges and Austrian Security Policy Priorities

Gunther Hauser

Schriftenreihe der
Landesverteidigungsakademie

UNSER HEER

Schriftenreihe der
Landesverteidigungsakademie

Gunther Hauser

The European Security and Defence Architecture - Challenges and Austrian Security Policy Priorities

12/2019
Vienna, September 2019

Imprint:

Copyright, Production, Publisher:
Republic of Austria / Federal Ministry of Defence
Rossauer Lände 1
1090 Vienna, Austria

Edited by:
National Defence Academy
Institute for Strategy and Security Policy
Stiftgasse 2a
1070 Vienna, Austria

Schriftenreihe der Landesverteidigungsakademie

September 2019
ISBN 978-3-903121-54-6

Printing:
ReproZ W 19-3428
Stiftgasse 2a
1070 Vienna

Content

List of Abbreviations

ACO	Allied Command Operations
ACT	Allied Command Transformation
AFDRU	Austrian [Armed] Forces Disaster Relief Unit
APSA	African Union (AU) Peace and Security Architecture
ARRC	Allied Rapid Reaction Corps
AU	African Union
BMD	Ballistic Missile Defence
CARD	Coordinated Annual Review on Defence
CDP	Capability Development Plan
CEDC	Central European Defence Cooperation
CFE	Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
CFI	Connected Forces Initiative
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy (EU)
CIVCOM	Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (EU)
CMC	Crisis Management Concept
CMPD	Crisis Management and Planning Directorate
COE	Centre of Excellence
CONOPS	Concept of [Military] Operations
CPCC	Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability
CRRT	Cyber Rapid Response Team
CSBM	Confidence-and-Security-Building Measures
CSCE	Conference for Security and Co-operation in Europe
CSDP	Common Foreign and Defence Policy (EU)
CTBT	Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty
DCFTA	Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area
DPKO	Department for Peacekeeping Operations
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
EEAS	European External Action Service
EAPC	Euro-Atlantic-Partnership Council

EASO	European Asylum Support Office
EADRCC	Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre
ECAP	European Capabilities Action Plan
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
EDA	European Defence Agency
EDF	European Defence Funds
EDIDP	European Defence Industrial Development Programme
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
EPAA	European Phased Adaptive Approach
ERCC	Emergency Response Coordination Centre (European Commission)
ESDC	European Security and Defence College
EU	European Union
EUMC	European Union Military Committee
EUMS	European Union Military Staff
EUROSUR	European Border Surveillance System
EU RRF	European Rapid Reaction Forces
EU TMCC	European Union Training Mission Competence Centre
FAC	Foreign Affairs Council (EU)
Frontex	Frontières exterieures, European Border and Coast Guard Agency
FSC	Forum on Security Cooperation (OSCE)
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
HCNM	High Commissioner on National Minorities (OSCE)
HoM	Head of Mission
HQ	Headquarters
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IFOR	Implementation Force
INTCEN	EU Intelligence and Situation Centre
IOC	Initial Operational Capability
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPAP	Individual Partnership Action Plan

IPCP	Individual Partnership and Cooperation Programme
IPP	Individual Partnership Program
JCC	Joint Force Commands
JSEC	Joint Support and Enabling Command
KFOR	Kosovo Force
LCC	Lisbon Capabilities Commitment (NATO)
MAP	Membership Action Plan (NATO)
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MND	Multinational Division
MPCC	Military Planning and Conduct Capability (EU)
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NCC	National Coordination Centre
NDPP	NATO Defence Planning Process
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRC	NATO-Russia Council
NRF	NATO Response Force
ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (OSCE)
OHQ	Operational Headquarters
OPCW	Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons
OPLAN	Operation Plan
OPSCEN	EU Operations Centre
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PARP	Partnership for Peace Planning and Review Process
PESCO	Permanent Structured Cooperation
PKO	Peacekeeping Operations
PSC	Political and Security Committee (EU)

R2P	Responsibility to Protect
REACT	Rapid Expert Assistance and Cooperation Teams (OSCE)
RSM	Resolute Support Mission
SACEUR	Supreme Allied Commander, Europe
SACT	Supreme Allied Commander Transformation
SDD	Security and Defence Doctrine (Austria)
SECPOL	Security and Conflict Prevention Directorate (EU)
SFOR	Stabilization Force
SHADE MED	Shared Awareness and de-Confliction in the Mediterranean
SHAPE	Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe
SHIRBRIG	UN Multinational Standby High Readiness Brigade of United Nations
SMM	OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
UK	United Kingdom (of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
UN	United Nations
UNDOF	United Nations Disengagement Observer Force
UNGA	UN General Assembly
UNHCR	UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
UNO	United Nations Organization
UNODA	UN Office on Disarmament Affairs
UNSC	UN Security Council
US / U.S.	United States of America
USA	United States of America
VJTF	Very High Readiness Joint Task Force
WEU	Western European Union
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Foreword

The security architecture in Europe has rapidly changed since the end of the Cold War. Since 2015, the fear of immigration is poisoning Western politics. US President Donald Trump owes his job to it. One cause of Brexit was opposition to immigrants and to some EU member states like Germany, Sweden and Austria that have allowed them entry (Endo 2016: 2). Strident nationalists wield power in Germany, Italy, Hungary, Poland, and in Sweden, while in the meantime they are gaining influence elsewhere.

'Citizens will only accept the EU if it makes it possible for them to prosper,' said German Chancellor Angela Merkel (The Economist 2016d: 22). People expect from the EU to be stronger when it comes to big questions, especially by coordinating foreign, security, and defence policy and by tackling illegal migration together with member states: 'A key element of a sustainable migration policy is to ensure effective control of our external border and stem illegal flows into the EU' (European Council The President 2017: point 2).

On the other hand, EU member states like Austria demand from the EU 'to retreat in cases where it may be better to handle issues on a more local level' (Himmelfreundpointner 2018b: 77). Thus in the second half of 2018, the third Austrian EU Presidency of the Council (after 1998 and 2006) took place 'during a rather challenging period – Brexit, the Multiannual Financial Framework of the EU and the debate about the future of the EU in general' (ibid). Therefore, the Austrian government was heading the EU Council under the motto 'A Europe that protects' focusing on security and 'the fight against illegal migration, prosperity and competitiveness, as well as stability in the region. All of this falls under protection' (ibid). Austria is also considered a supporter of the Western Balkans countries in regard to their EU membership accession. The countries of the Western Balkans 'are offered a realistic chance for membership. EU Commissioner Hahn sees 2025 as a realistic and optimistic goal. Austria is going to continue to support these countries in their rapprochement' (ibid 2018: 78). Austria sees itself as 'a builder of bridges' (ibid) striving for dialogue. This 'bridge building concept' is part of Austria's neutral policy, a country which is in addition embedded in today's European security architecture composed of

the European Union (EU), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the United Nations (UN) Organisation.

This book aims at analysing today´s challenges of the EU and of those international organisations which are formative for (Western and Central) European security and at defining Austria's role within the European security architecture. The status of EU neutral and non-aligned member states is also comprehensively debated. The book is based on official documents as well as on academic studies and contributions to public debates and shall aid better understanding of inter(b)locking processes within the institution-building of European security.

Introduction

Europe's geostrategic position 'is marked by increasing global volatility, emerging security challenges', which

> are numerous, complex, interrelated and difficult to foresee: regional crises can occur and turn violent, new technologies can emerge and bring new vulnerabilities and threats, environmental changes and scarcity of natural resources can provoke political and military conflicts. At the same time, many threats and risks spread easily across national borders, blurring the traditional dividing line between internal and external security. These security challenges can only be tackled in a comprehensive approach combining different policies and instruments, short and long-term measures. This approach must be underpinned by a large range of civil and military capabilities. It is increasingly unlikely that Member States can bear this burden in isolation. (European Commission 2013: 2).

Peace and security at home can no longer be taken for granted in a world in which global and regional powers re-arm, terrorist strike at the heart of cities in Europe and around the world and cyber attacks escalate. (European Commission 2017: 4)

On a global stage, a multipolar and interconnected international system is changing the nature of power:

> The distinction between internal and external security is breaking down. Complex layers of governance and new patterns of interdependence empower new players and give rise to new challenges. As a result, state power is becoming more fragile. Among the drivers for this are: changing demographics and population growth, embedded inequalities, and new technologies. (Mogherini 2013: 1).

In addition to long-standing security threats like

> weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, failed states, regional conflict and organized crime – there are also new security threats, such as cyber attacks, as well as new risks such as the consequence of climate change and increased competition for resources both at a national and international level. (Mogherini 2013: 1)

In the era of globalisation, it is more apparent than ever that these challenges and insecurities 'are threats without borders' (El Baradei 2011: 315). Also such threats like cyber attacks, financial meltdowns, pandemics or thefts of nuclear material 'cannot be countered effectively by any one country or organization; by their nature, they demand cooperative multinational, multidimensional responses.' (ibid)

Cyber-attacks and hybrid tactics pose a severe threat to European infrastructure. The cyber-attacks against Estonia in 2007, amid the Estonian-Russian row about the relocation of the Bronze soldier of Tallinn, showed both a willingness and an aptitude to use hybrid tactics to bully (Aitoro 2018b: 28). The banks in Estonia were paralyzed. In 2007, financial institutions across Estonia had difficulty carrying out the simplest of tasks: 'Email inboxes of Estonian journalists were flooded with spam. The Ministry of Defence's website went down. The Estonian government blamed Russia for the digital blitz. The crippling cyberattack lasted for three weeks and at the time was known as perhaps the most brazen act of cyber aggression by one state on another.' This large-scale cyberattack on Estonia is still seen 'as a rallying cry for NATO to bolster its cyber prowess' (Lynch 2018: 12).According to Western estimates, there is also 'no denying' that Russia 'is often trying to manipulate elections and widen social division in the West.' (Galeotti 2019: 14) Russia also seems to test continually NATO´s defences. Sometimes, 'it does this by buzzing warplanes briefly into Estonian airspace to see how quickly the defenders respond. More often it does it digitally' (ibid: 16)

Targeted information can try to manipulate opinion on countries. The example of a Chinese information campaign in Sweden shows how manipulation could work. Thus, the Chinese government has embarked on an unprecedented campaign to shape Sweden´s public debate on China. Since early 2018, the Chinese embassy in Stockholm has released a steady stream of statements denouncing media coverage of China as 'one-sided', 'untruthful' and 'totally groundless': 'The criticism has targeted reporting and commentaries on various China-related issues, ranging from the fate of Gui Minhai', a Swedish citizen being held in China since 2015, to the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) which is – from the Chinese standpoint – a 'global development strategy' (Jerdén/Bohman 2019: 2). This kind or a

similar propaganda push 'could be an attempt to not only silence Swedish criticism but also set an example to other EU countries' (ibid: 8).
As a means in global power competition, states try to manipulate public opinion – striving for global political and economic influence and natural resources. Furthermore, access to and control over natural resources will play an increasing role in power politics. Thus, for example, the melting Arctic

> will have geostrategic consequences beyond helping a bunch of resource-fattened countries to get fatter. An obvious one is the potentially disruptive effect of new trade routes. Sailing along the coast of Siberia by the north-east passage, or Northern Sea Route (NSR), as Russians and mariners call it, cuts the distance between Western Europe and East Asia by roughly one third. The passage is now open for four or five months a year and is getting more traffic. (The Economist 2012: 5)

The geopolitics of the new Arctic entered 'the mainstream on August 2nd 2007. Descending by Mir submersible to a depth of over four kilometres, a Russian-led expedition planted a titanium Russian flag beneath the North Pole. The news shocked the world.' (The Economist 2012: 10). The Lomonosov ridge under the pole, which is probably rich in materials, is claimed by Russia, Canada and Denmark. The Lomonosov ridge could contain several billion barrels of oil equivalent, a substantial prize. For Greenland, currently semi-autonomous from Denmark, Arctic development contains an even richer promise: full independence. That would have strategic implications not only for Denmark but also for the United States, which has an airbase in northern Greenland (The Economist 2012: 10). 95 percent of Arctic mineral resources are within agreed national boundaries (ibid). The 2007 furore over the Russian flag led to an important statement of Arctic solidarity, the Ilulissat Declaration, issued by the foreign ministers of the five countries adjoining the arctic Ocean (to the chagrin of the Arctic Council's other members, Sweden, Iceland, Finland). This expresses their commitment to developing the Arctic peacefully and without outside interference. Possible defence co-operation between Arctic countries points in the same direction. Their defence chiefs met for the first time in Canada in April 2012 in what is to become an annual event (The Economist 2012: 10). Russia has at least half of the Arctic in terms of area, coastline, population and probably mineral wealth (ibid: 11).

In the southern and eastern neighbourhood of the EU, intra-state conflict, with the potential to transcend national boundaries, has become common place. Key drivers for these conflicts are

- troubled legacy of foreign intervention;
- state failure;
- regional rivalries between Saudi-Arabia, Iran and others;
- ruling strategies of authoritarian regimes as well as the spread of identity and sect-based political movements (European Parliament 2017: 6).

Key areas of sectarian conflict in the contemporary Middle East are Syria, Iraq, Yemen and Libya (state collapse). In the Middle East and North Africa, authoritarianism has largely survived, 'and counter-revolutionary tactics, such as the use of sectarian differences, have helped to keep old regimes in power, with disastrous consequences for much of the regions' (ibid). However, '[s]ectarianism is thus a political tool, a way of ruling the population, of preventing broad-based opposition and ensuring loyalty amongst a core segment of the population' (ibid: 7).

In Europe for the first time since World War II, liberal democracy no longer seems the only option for Western societies, the alternatives are growing – from Viktor Orbán's 'illiberal democracy' in Hungary to Germany's nationalist populists, who have claimed the word 'alternative' for their party's name to suggest a new way out of the current political and economic order to which German Chancellor Angela Merkel famously said there is 'no alternative' (Blom 2018: 54). Orbán announced that an 'illiberal democracy' is his goal for Hungary. Through a media law, the state controls the press, especially television, the primary source of news. This has had enormous political impact and helped Orbán win re-election in spring 2014. Hungary: 'climate of fear and self-censorship among Hungarian journalists' (Marton 2014: 6).

More and more within European societies,

> economic growth is uncoupled from wage rises, with rising unemployment for many and precarious employment for many more,

> while a new billionaire class has come into existence, whose interests are powerful enough to determine the direction of national governments, international institutions, and of democracy itself. (Blom 2018: 54)

'There is a new trend that is developing in Europe – a rebellion against the elite. […] This hype of anti-elite sentiment is becoming stronger and stronger while there is no clear positive agenda of what those who rebel really want' (Krastev 2015: 7). Disintegration 'was always the result of an internal cause' (ibid). It is therefore not surprising that many people have come to suspect, that their elected politicians are increasingly serving a global wealth elite. Democracy no longer appears to deliver for the so-called 'little people', the ordinary citizens and families of Europe, and indeed elsewhere. It is then perfectly reasonable for people to search for alternatives which they believe will serve them better (Blom 2018: 54). This new political landscape is no longer adequately understood in terms of 'right' and 'left'. The new populist nationalists are combining identity politics and social conservatism with strong social and economic protectionism (ibid).

Additionally, the EU faces a shift in transatlantic relations: Then-US President Barack Obama supported the idea of a strong EU: 'The world needs a strong, democratic, united Europe', Barack Obama said in April 2016, 'to guard against rising intolerance and authoritarianism within the EU and across the globe' (Wintour 2016: 10). In an ambitious speech urging Europe to remember its emergence from division, war and hatred, Obama said: 'We cannot allow fears about security and inequality to undermine our commitment to universal values. That is a false comfort.' (Wintour 2016: 10). Speaking in Hannover/Germany on the final day of his Middle East and Europe tour, Obama had a blunt message for the continent: 'Perhaps you need an outsider to remind you of the magnitude of what you have achieved from the ruins of the Second World War.' (ibid). Obama's chief message was a call for Europe to show confidence in its achievements, and not be attracted to the populist right or left. 'These are unsettling times, and when the future is uncertain there seems to be an instinct in human nature to withdraw to the perceived comfort of our own tribe, our own sect, our own nationality: people who look like us, sound like us,' he said. 'But in today's world more than in any time in our human history that is a false comfort. It pits people against one another because of

what they look like, or how they pray or who they love.' Obama said that 'twisted thinking can lead to oppression, segregation, internment camps and to Srebrenica' (ibid). Obama admitted the politics of immigration is hard in every country. There is a danger, he said, that the loudest voices win out, creating a them-and-us culture (ibid).

The Trump campaign in 2016 emphasised the aim of 'making America great again', which meant the revision of US investment and burden in its international political, economic and security affairs. Trump 'challenged the pillars of the international order that had been established and maintained by the United States' (Csizmazia 2017: 109). The novelty of Trump's position was 'that he openly questioned the US obligation to follow NATO's article 5, making it dependent on the defence spending performance of the attacked ally in question' (ibid: 117).

Every American president has put America first – but all have considered the preservation of the multilateral system that their predecessors have created to be necessary to that end (Biscop 2018b: 41). In his speech at the UN General Assembly, Trump called for a 'great reawakening of nations' instead: 'We can no longer be taken advantage of, or enter into a one-sided deal where the United States gets nothing in return' (Trump, ibid).

From a US point of view,

> we are emerging from a period of strategic atrophy, aware that our competitive military advantage has been eroding. We are facing increased global disorder, characterized by decline in the long-standing rules-based international order – creating a security environment more complex and volatile than any we have experienced in recent memory. Inter-state strategic competition, not terrorism, is now the primary concern in US national security. (Department of Defense 2018: 1)

For the US, China remains the main

> strategic competitor using predatory economics to intimidate its neighbors while militarizing features in the South China Sea. Russia has violated the borders of nearby nations and pursues veto power over the economic, diplomatic, and security decisions of its neighbors. … Iran

> continues to sow violence and remains the most significant challenge to Middle East stability. (ibid)

The politics of 'globalised consensus' that have dominated world and international and security affairs since the Cold War effectively came to an end as the 'little green men' (Russian soldiers wearing no insignia) quietly seized key strategic buildings and border crossings in the Crimean peninsula at the start of March 2014 (Aron 2015: 40). Russian election meddling in the US and Europe, continued military intervention in Eastern Ukraine, illegal and dangerous flyovers of US and British naval vessels in international waters, and the deployment in 2017 of the first Russian spy ship off New England's coast since the end of the Cold War. The British Royal Navy's public disclosure in December 2017 that Russian submarines are prowling near undersea cables in the North Atlantic is now the latest string of concerns. These communications conduits are a vital link between North America and Europe, the two largest economic zones in the world (Courtney 2018: 29). Despite the proliferation of satellite communications, over 90 percent of internet traffic, telephone communication and even telegraph signals pass along the undersea cables (ibid).

Since the end of World War II, there has been a remarkable consensus within the US establishment about foreign policy. Republicans and Democrats alike have supported a global network of American-led alliances and security guarantees. Leading figures in both parties – from John F. Kennedy to Ronald Reagan 'through the Bushes and Clintons' – agreed 'that it was in US interests to promote free-trade and democracy around the world.' (Rachman 2018: 9). Donald Trump has taken an axe to this Washington consensus. He departed from the 'established principles of American foreign policy'. Trump has defined 'making America great again' in economic terms. To this end, he has focused on countries that he believes have excessive trade surpluses with the US. This emphasis on trade and economics blurs the distinction between allies and adversaries – many of the nations that have a large trade surplus with America are also important security partners including Japan and Germany. That is why Trump described the EU as a foe in July 2018. Trump has shown very little interest in democracy and the promotion of human rights. His conception of 'the West' is based not on shared values, but on culture or, even, race. This leads to his preoccupation with controlling immigration, which he

believes is the real threat to 'the West'. He reiterated this view, arguing that immigration is 'very bad for Europe, it's changing the culture' (ibid).

On July 25th, 2018, the US (Donald Trump) and the EU (Jean-Claude Juncker) agreed to work together towards 'zero tariffs, zero non-tariff barriers and zero subsidies on non-auto industrial goods'. Trade barriers in services, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, medical products and soya beans were on the chopping block, too. The meeting's other outcomes have more immediate consequences. Trump agreed to 'hold off further tariffs', halting the threat of punitive measures on European cars and avoiding escalation in a nastier tit-for-tat dispute. Remarkably for a man said to be itching to withdraw from the World Trade Organization (WTO), Trump announced that he would work with the EU to reform it (The Economist 2018n: 31). 'The United States and the European Union together count more than 830 million citizens and more than 50 percent of global GDP. If we team up, we can make our planet a better, more secure, and more prosperous place':

> Already today, the United States and the European Union have a $1 trillion bilateral trade relationship – the largest economic relationship in the world. We want to further strengthen this trade relationship to the benefit of all American and European citizens. This is why we agreed today, first of all, to work together toward zero tariffs, zero non-tariff barriers, and zero subsidies on non-auto industrial goods. We will also work to reduce barriers and increase trade in services, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, medical products, as well as soya beans. This will open markets for farmers and workers, increase investment, and lead to greater prosperity in both the United States and the European Union. It will also make trade fairer and more reciprocal. Secondly, we agreed today to strengthen our strategic cooperation with respect to energy. The European Union wants to import more liquefied natural gas (LNG) from the United States to diversify its energy supply (EU Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker 2018: 1).

On June 23rd, 2016, the United Kingdom voted to leave the EU. That decision of the majority of the British people (the majority of the people in England and Wales) marked a watershed moment in the history of Europe. The Treaty of Lisbon sets out the procedures for the orderly departure of a Member State (article 50). Since Britain's vote to quit the EU, its government 'has promised repeatedly to make a success of withdrawal,

known as Brexit' (Castle 2016: 1). Four decades of EU integration have left Britain so deeply embedded in the EU 'that there is no easy escape route' (ibid). The outgoing leader of the right-wing populist UK Independence Party (UKIP) Nigel Farage stated: 'We made June 23rd our independence day when we smashed the establishment'. Farage, 'without whom Britain's vote for Brexit probably would not have happened, could not have been happier' (The Economist 2016c: 29). 'Brexit campaigners now acknowledge that a key driver of their successful campaign was not to argue via fact and evidence, but rather to stir raw emotions' (Hutton 2016: 21). Then-British Prime Minister Theresa May decided in 2016 to trigger article 50 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) and called a general election. According to Article 50 (TEU)

> 1. Any Member State may decide to withdraw from the Union in accordance with its own constitutional requirements.
> 2. A Member State which decides to withdraw shall notify the European Council of its intention.

The Brexit vote 'was a grievous blow to a club that has only ever known expansion' (The Economist 2016d: 22). According to a British view, the EU 'was a commercial convenience for London, whose partner of choice in global politics was always been Washington' (Pecastaing 2017: 7). Thus, the UK saw the EU 'as a glorified free-trade area' (ibid). In 2016, the UK represented 'no less than 25 percent of the total defence expenditure of 265 billion of the EU-28', and 10 per cent of the total of 1.5 million troops. Moreover, the quite experienced British forces represented a major part of the EU forces employable for expeditionary operations: 'If the British contribution is withdrawn from the EU's Force Catalogue, it will create gaps that cannot be easily filled by the existing capabilities of the remaining Member States', says Belgian security policy analyst Sven Biscop (Biscop 2016: 8-9). But the UK 'never showed much inclination to pool and share its capabilities with other countries anyway. Quite the contrary, London will now no longer be able to block the remaining Member States from using EU institutions and Treaty provisions to the full' (ibid: 2). Thus, the British contribution to operations under the EU Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) has always been limited, 'and the UK could still take part in operations if it wanted to, as many non-Member States do today' (ibid).

As a result of European integration, 'we see regional identities emerge and put pressure on the nation state, such as Scotland and Catalonia. We can expect an even stronger rebellion if the EU ceases to be a project about Europe and becomes a project for its elites' (Krastev 2015: 11). On October 1st, 2017, Catalonia voted overwhelmingly to secede from Spain. But the turnout for what the Spanish government called an illegal referendum was only around 43 per cent (2.3m people according to the Generalitat, Catalonia's government), 90 per cent of them in favour, since those opposed to the poll mostly stayed away. Hundreds of people were injured by riot police attempting to disrupt voting, causing outrage and further protests. Madrid decided to impose direct rule on the region. On March 25th, 2018, the German police arrested the former leader of Catalonia, Carles Puigdemont, after he drove across the border from Denmark. Puigdemont's arrest ended five months of self-imposed exile, mostly in Belgium, after he organised a post-referendum declaration of independence on October 27th, 2017. It came two days after a judge of the Supreme Court in Madrid charged Puigdemont and 24 other separatist leaders with crimes ranging from rebellion to disobedience. He sent five to prison (four more were already there) and ordered European arrest warrants against six, including Mr Puigdemont. Tens of thousands demonstrated in Barcelona to denounce what they saw as repression of a peaceful, democratic cause. Many other Spaniards see Mr Puigdemont and his fellow separatists as people who use intimidation to try to break up their country and oppress the majority of Catalans who don't want independence. The conflict has deprived Catalonia of a regional government since then-Spanish Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy imposed emergency rule by Madrid in the wake of the independence declaration (The Economist 2018d: 30). Carles Puigdemont declared that Catalans who had voted in a referendum were 90 percent in favour of a break with Spain. For the European Commission, Catalonia is a concern of Spain. The Catalan vote was declared unconstitutional by Spain's own courts, and in times of rising nationalism and populism, the last thing that the EU wants to do is to encourage regional separatism. As with the 2014 referendum in Scotland, which unlike Catalonia's vote was held with the blessing of the central government and where independence was rejected for now, member countries fear encouraging separatists at home: the Flemish in

Belgium, the Lombards in Italy, the Corsicans in France, the Transylvanians in Romania (Erlanger 2017: 1).

As a consequence of the sensitivity toward regional separatism, five of the member states of the EU – including Spain – do not recognise the independence of Kosovo, declared in 2008, although NATO fought the Serbian effort to retain the territory. So the European Commission's official position towards the events in Catalonia was hardly surprising: Spain is sovereign, the referendum was illegal, but the violence was terrible and the parties should talk (Erlanger 2017: 5).

The European Commission has followed the so-called Prodi doctrine, named after a former European Commission president from Italy, Romano Prodi. The doctrine says that a breakaway state would have to leave the bloc and could then be let back in only if it had gained independence in accordance with constitutional law in the member state it left. Any new member state must enter with the unanimous agreement of all the others, so Spain would have a veto, but it would hardly be alone. The Commission president, Jean-Claude Juncker, backed 'the rule of law' and has said that Brussels must respect the decisions of the Spanish government and its constitutional court (ibid). The Commission has said that a vote in favour of Catalan independence would only be recognised if the referendum complied with the Spanish Constitution and was ruled to be legal. The European Parliament has been solidly on the side of Spain. Antonio Tajani, the then-parliament's conservative president, said that to ignore Spain's Constitution was to undermine the legal basis for the whole EU (Erlanger 2017: 5).

The rise of nationalism and regionalism and the lack of decision making on relevant EU foreign and security policies cause severe challenges to the European integration process – does this mean that the EU itself is already in a state of decline? Now, this is too early to say. It depends on the EU and mainly its member states to define which direction to go. Nevertheless, a strong EU means having a coherent and united foreign, security and defence policy. Member states cannot agree on what these policies should mean in practice: 'Europe's weakness is the blindness, or rather the persistence, of the states in putting their national interests before integration' (Dempsey 2015: 23f).

The EU Global Strategy

The EU first published its own security strategy – the European Security Strategy (ESS) in December 2003. This strategy was soon overtaken by events and it needed an update following the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon and the adoption of several strategic documents. Moreover, the 2003 European Security Strategy 'codified *how* to do things – but did not really tell Europe *what* to do first' (Biscop 2017b: 30). In addition to the ESS, in 2010 the EU adopted the European Internal Security Strategy (ISS) referring to the thin line existing between external and internal security risks. In addition, the EU set out risk-based strategies, like the Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (2003), the EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy (2005) or the Cyber Security Strategy (2012) as well as specific regional strategies like the EU strategic framework for the Horn of Africa (2011) or the EU Strategy for Security and development in the Sahel (2011) (EPP Group in the European Parliament 2013: 6). What is really missing, however, is any real prioritisation which would allow effective civilian and military forces planning and the appropriate coordination processes (ibid).

In mid-2012 the Foreign Ministers of Italy, Poland, Spain and Sweden took the initiative to launch the debate on a 'European Global Strategy' and invited think tanks to set up a dialogue leading to the delivery of a report by May 2013. It is labelled 'global' to indicate that this strategy 'is not only dealing with the EU's Foreign, Security, and Defence Policies, CFSP and CSDP sensu stricto, but is to encapsulate all security aspects related to EU external action.' (Coelmont 2013: 1).

On June 28th, 2016, the new EU Global Strategy entitled 'Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe' was presented to the European Council by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Vice-President of the European Commission Federica Mogherini, in order to replace the 2003 and pretty outdated European Security Strategy (ESS). Since 2003 the overall situation of the EU has changed dramatically, today we 'live in times of existential crisis': 'The purpose, even existence, of our Union is being questioned. Yet, our citizens and the world need a strong European Union as never before' (Mogherini

2016: 3). As Federica Mogherini stated, the 'wider region has become more unstable and more insecure. The crises within and beyond our borders are affecting directly our citizens' lives' (Mogherini 2016: 3). She emphasised that in 'challenging times, a strong Union is one that thinks strategically, shares a vision and acts together. This is even more true since the British referendum. Mogherini stressed that

> [n]o one of our countries has the strength nor the resources to address these threats and seize the opportunities of our time alone. […] Our diplomatic network runs wide and deep in all corners of the globe. Economically we are in the world's G3. We are the first trading partner and the first foreign investor for almost every country in the globe. Together we invest more in development cooperation than the rest of the world combined. It is also clear, though, that we are not making full use of this potential yet. A vast majority of our citizens understands that we need to collectively take responsibility for our role in the world. And wherever I travel, our partners expect the European Union to play a major role, including as a global security provider. We will deliver on our citizens' needs and make our partnerships work only if we act together, united. This is exactly the aim of the Global Strategy for European Foreign and Security Policy. (ibid)

The EU Global Strategy underlines the following facts:

- "Global' is not just intended in a geographical sense: it also refers to the wide array of policies and instruments the Strategy promotes. It focuses on military capabilities and anti-terrorism as much as on job opportunities, inclusive societies and human rights. It deals with peace-building and the resilience of States and societies in and around Europe. The European Union has always prided itself on its soft power – and will keep doing so, because we are the best in this field. […] For instance, the European Union currently deploys seventeen military and civilian operations …For Europe, soft and hard power go hand in hand.' (European Global Strategy 2016: 4)
- 'The Strategy nurtures the ambition of strategic autonomy for the European Union. This is necessary to promote the common interests of our citizens, as well as our principles and values. Yet we know that such priorities are best served when we are not alone. And they are best served in an international system based on rules

and on multilateralism. This is no time for global policemen and lone warriors. Our foreign and security policy has to handle global pressures and local dynamics, it has to cope with super-powers as well as with increasingly fractured identities.' (ibid: 4)

- 'Our Union will work to strengthen our partners: We will keep deepening the transatlantic bond and our partnership with NATO, while we will also connect to new players and explore new formats. We will invest in regional orders, and in cooperation among and within regions. And we will promote reformed global governance, one that can meet the challenges of this 21st century.' (ibid: 4) 'We have learnt the lesson: my neighbour's and my partner's weakness are my own weaknesses. So we will invest in win-win solutions […]' (ibid: 4)
- 'Joining all our cultures together to achieve our shared goals and serve our common interests is a daily challenge, but it is also our greatest strength: diversity is what makes us strong.' (ibid: 4)
- A fragile world calls for a more confident and responsible European Union, it calls for an outward-and-forward-looking European foreign and security policy. This Global Strategy will guide us in our daily work towards a Union that truly meets its citizens' needs, hopes and aspirations; a Union that builds on the success of 70 years of peace; a Union with the strength to contribute to peace and security in our region and in the whole world.' (ibid : 5)
- 'We have an interest in promoting our values in the world. […] Peace and security, prosperity, democracy and a rules-based global order are the vital interests underpinning our external action' (ibid: 13).
- A 'prosperous Union hinges on a strong internal market and an open international economic system. We have an interest in fair and open markets, in shaping global economic and environmental rules, and in sustainable access to the global commons through open sea, land, air, and space routes. In view of the digital revolution, our prosperity also depends on the free flow of information and global value chains facilitated by a free and secure Internet.' (ibid: 15)
- 'Rules-based global order with multilateralism as its key principle and the United Nations at its core. As a Union of medium-to-small

sized countries, we have a shared European interest in facing the world together. Through our combined weight, we can promote agreed rules to contain power politics and contribute to a peaceful, fair and prosperous world' (ibid: 15). 'The Iranian nuclear agreement is a clear illustration of this fact. A multilateral order grounded in international law, including the principles of the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is the only guarantee for peace and security at home and abroad' (ibid: 15-16). 'Principled pragmatism will guide our external action in the years ahead' (ibid: 16).

- Principles: Unity: 'In a more complex world of global power shifts and power definition, the EU must stand united. Forging unity as Europeans – across institutions, states and peoples – has never been so vital nor so urgent. Never has our unity been so challenged' (ibid: 16).
- 'Together we will be able to achieve more than Member States acting alone or in an uncoordinated manner. There is no clash between national and European interests. Our shared interests can only be secured by standing and acting together' (ibid: 16).
- Responsibility: 'We will take responsibility foremost in Europe and its surrounding regions, while pursuing targeted engagement further afield. We will act globally to address the root causes of conflict and poverty, and to champion the indivisibility and universality of human rights' (ibid: 17). 'However, responsible engagement can bring about positive change. We will therefore act promptly to prevent violent conflict, be able and ready to respond responsibility yet decisively to crises, facilitate locally owned agreements, and commit long-term' (ibid: 17-18).
- Partnership: 'In pursuing our goals, we will reach out to states, regional bodies and international organisations. We will work with core partners, like-minded countries and regional groupings. We will partner selectively with players whose cooperation is necessary to deliver global public goods and address common challenges. We will deepen our partnerships with civil society and the private sector as key actors in a networked world. We will do so through dialogue and support, but also through more innovative forms of engagement' (ibid: 18).

- 'The EU Global Strategy starts at home' (ibid: 18).
- Security and Defence: 'As Europeans we must take greater responsibility for our security. We must be ready and able to deter, respond to, and protect ourselves against external threats. While NATO exists to defend its members – most of which are European – from external attack, Europeans must be better equipped, trained and organised to contribute decisively to such collective efforts, as well as to act autonomously if and when necessary. An appropriate level of ambition and strategic autonomy is important for Europe's ability to foster peace and safeguard security within and beyond its borders' (ibid: 19).
- 'Europeans must be able to protect Europe, respond to external crises, and assist in developing our partners' security and defence capacities, carrying out these tasks in cooperation with others' (ibid: 19).
- 'Alongside external crisis management and capacity-building, the EU should be able to assist in protecting its Members upon their request, and its institutions' (ibid: 19). 'This means living up to our commitments to mutual assistance and solidarity and includes addressing challenges with both an internal and external dimension, such as terrorism, hybrid threats, cyber and energy security, organised crime and external border management. For instance, Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions and operations can work alongside the European Border and Coast Guard and EU specialised agencies to enhance border protection and maritime security in order to save more lives, fight cross-border crime and disrupt smuggling networks' (ibid: 20).
- 'When it comes to collective defence, NATO remains the primary framework for most Member States. At the same time, EU-NATO relations shall not prejudice the security and defence policy of those Members which are not in NATO. The EU will therefore deepen cooperation with the North Atlantic Alliance in complementarity, synergy, and full respect for the international framework, inclusiveness and decision-making autonomy of the two. In this context, the EU needs to be strengthened as a security community: European security and defence efforts should enable the EU to act autonomously while also contributing to and undertaking actions in

cooperation with NATO. A more credible European defence is essential also for the sake of a healthy transatlantic partnership with the United States' (ibid: 20). 'Deeper defence cooperation engenders interoperability, effectiveness, efficiency and trust: it increases the output of defence spending. Developing and maintaining defence capabilities requires both investments and optimising the use of national resources through deeper cooperation' (ibid: 20).

- Cyber Security: 'This entails strengthening the technological capabilities aimed at mitigating threats and the resilience of critical infrastructure, networks and services and reducing cybercrime. It means fostering innovative information and communication technology (ICT) systems which guarantee the availability and integrity of data, while ensuring security within the European digital space through appropriate policies on the location of data storage and the certification of digital products and services. It requires weaving cyber issues across all policy areas, reinforcing the cyber elements in CSDP missions and operations, and further developing platforms of cooperation' (ibid: 21-22). 'It will enhance its cyber security cooperation with core partners such as the US and NATO' (ibid: 22).
- Energy Security: 'In line with the goals of the Energy Union, the EU will seek to diversify its energy sources, routes and suppliers, particularly in the gas domain, as well as to promote the highest nuclear safety standards in third countries' (ibid: 22).
- 'It is in the interests of our citizens to invest in the resilience of states and societies to the east stretching into Central Asia, and south down to Central Africa. Fragility beyond our borders threatens all our vital interests' (ibid: 23). 'The EU will therefore promote resilience in its surrounding regions. A resilient state is a secure state, and security is key for prosperity and democracy' (ibid: 23).
- The EU is continuing to strengthen cooperation with the Western Balkans region, with a clear commitment and concrete measures, focussing on the three key areas of cooperation: economy, security and reconciliation – to further advance the European integration process.

- 'The ENP has recommitted to Eastern Partnership and South Mediterranean countries wishing to develop stronger relations with us. We will support these countries in implementing association agreements, including Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas (DCFTAs). We will also think creatively about deepening tailor-made partnerships further. Possibility includes the creation of an economic area with countries implementing DCFTAs, the extension of Trans-European Networks and the Energy Community, as well as building physical and digital connections' (ibid: 25).
- Resilience in or surrounding regions: 'The EU will pursue a multifaceted approach to resilience in its surrounding regions. While repressive states are inherently fragile in the long term, there are many ways to build inclusive, prosperous and secure societies. We will therefore pursue tailor-made policies to support inclusive and accountable governance, critical for the fight against terrorism, corruption and organised crime, and for the protection of human rights' (ibid: 25-26). 'We will pursue locally owned rights-based approaches to the reform of the justice, security and defence sectors, and support fragile states in building capacities, including cyber. We will work through development diplomacy, and CSDP, ensuring that our security sector reform efforts enable and enhance our partner's capacities to deliver security within the rule of law. We will cooperate with other international players, coordinating our work on capacity-building with the UN and NATO in particular' (ibid: 26).
- 'Finally, the EU will seek to enhance energy and environmental resilience. Energy transition is one of the major challenges in our surrounding regions, but must be properly managed to avoid fuelling social tensions' (ibid: 27). 'Climate change and environmental degradation exacerbate potential conflicts in light of their impact on desertification, land degradation, and water and food scarcity. Mirroring security sector reform efforts, energy and environmental sector reform policies can assist partner countries along a path of energy transition and climate action. Through such efforts, we will encourage energy liberalisation, the development of renewables, better regulation and technological transfers, alongside

climate change mitigation and adaption. We will also support governments to devise sustainable responses to food protection and the use of water and energy through development, diplomacy and scientific cooperation' (ibid: 27).

- 'Implementing a *multi-dimensional* approach through the use of all available policies and instruments aimed at conflict prevention, management and resolution is essential. But the scope of the 'comprehensive approach' will be expanded further. There are no quick fixes to any of these conflicts. Experience in Somalia, Mali, Afghanistan and elsewhere highlights their protracted nature. The EU will therefore pursue a multi-phased approach, acting at all stages of the conflict cycle. We will invest in prevention, resolution and stabilisation, and avoid premature disengagement when a new crisis erupts elsewhere' (ibid: 28-29). 'The EU will therefore pursue a *multi-level* approach to conflicts acting at the local, national, regional and global levels. Finally, none of these conflicts can be solved by the EU alone. We will pursue a *multi-lateral* approach engaging all those players present in a conflict and necessary for its resolution' (ibid: 29).
- 'Early warning is of little use unless it is followed by early action. This implies regular reporting and proposals to the Council, engaging in preventive diplomacy and mediation by mobilising EU Delegations and Special Representatives, and deepening partnerships with civil society. We must develop a political culture of acting sooner in response to the risk of violent conflict' (ibid: 30). (EEAS 2017: 31).
- 'The EU will follow five lines of action. First, in the Maghreb and the Middle East, the EU will support functional multilateral cooperation. We will back practical cooperation, including through the Union for the Mediterranean, on issues such as border security, trafficking, counter-terrorism, non-proliferation, water and food security, energy and climate, infrastructure and disaster management. We will foster dialogue and negotiation over regional conflicts such as those in Syria and Libya' (ibid: 34).
- The Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) is an intergovernmental organisation bringing together 43 countries: 28 EU member states and 15 Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries. It provides

a platform for political dialogue, coordination, and regional cooperation. The Secretariat of the UfM, established in Barcelona in 2010, focuses on implementing regional cooperation projects and initiatives in areas such as energy, environment, education, transport, business development and social affairs. The Secretariat works in close collaboration with governments and with an active network of Euro-Mediterranean partners to assist project promoters throughout the entire project cycle: from technical assistance to project implementation, including financial planning and fundraising (Union for the Mediterranean 2012: 1). Horizon 2020 – research funding opportunities for MENA countries: a € 80 billion EU research and innovation funding program (2014-20). A response to economic crisis by investing in future jobs and growth. Flagship initiative of the EU ten-year strategy Europe 2020 for delivering smart, sustainable and inclusive growth of the European Union. EU-MENA R+I Cooperation – countering with some challenges e.g. water scarcity, food security, weak social protection, health problems, energy concerns, brain-drain, migration, lack of job creation / job security, human development.

- 'On the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, the EU will work closely with the Quartet, the Arab League and all key stakeholders to preserve the prospect of a viable two-state solution based on 1967 lines with equivalent land swaps, and to recreate the conditions for meaningful negotiations. The EU will also promote full compliance with European and international law in deepening cooperation with Israel and the Palestinian Authority' (ibid: 34-35).
- 'Second, the EU will deepen sectoral cooperation with Turkey, while striving to anchor Turkish democracy in line with its accession criteria, including the normalisation of relations with Cyprus. The EU will therefore pursue the accession process – sticking to strict and fair accession conditionality – while coherently engaging in dialogue on counter-terrorism, regional security and refugees. We will also work on a modernised customs union and visa liberalisation, and cooperate further with Turkey in the fields of education, energy and transport' (ibid: 35).
- 'Third, the EU will pursue balanced engagement in the Gulf. It will continue to cooperate with the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)

and individual Gulf countries. Building on the Iran nuclear deal and its implementation, it will also gradually engage Iran on areas such as trade, research, environment, energy, anti-trafficking, migration and societal exchanges. It will deepen dialogue with Iran and GCC countries on regional conflicts, human rights and counter-terrorism, seeking to prevent contagion of existing crises and foster the space for cooperation and diplomacy' (ibid: 35).

- 'Fourth, in light of the growing interconnections between North and sub-Saharan Africa, as well as between the Horn of Africa and the Middle East, the EU will support cooperation across these sub-regions. This includes fostering triangular relationships between Europe, the Horn and the Gulf to face shared security challenges and economic opportunities. In means systematically addressing cross-border dynamics in North and West Africa, the Sahel and Lake Chad regions through closer links within the African Union, the Economic Community of Western African States (ECOWAS) and the G5 Sahel' (ibid: 35).
- 'Finally, we will invest in African peace and development as an investment in our own security and prosperity. We will intensify cooperation with and support for the African Union, as well as ECOWAS, the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development in Eastern Africa, and the East African Community, among others. We must enhance our efforts to stimulate growth and jobs in Africa. The Economic Partnership Agreements can spur African integration and mobility, and encourage Africa's full and equitable partnership in global value chains. A quantum leap in European investments in Africa is also needed to support sustainable development. We will build stronger links between our trade, development and security policies in Africa, and blend development efforts with work on migration, health, education, energy and climate, science and technology, notably improve food security. We will continue to support peace and security efforts in Africa, and assist African organisations' work on conflict prevention, counter-terrorism and organised crime, migration and border management. We will do so through diplomacy, CSDP and developments, as well as trust funds to back up regional strategies' (ibid: 36).

- NATO 'remains the strongest and most effective military alliance in the world. The EU will deepen its partnership with NATO through coordinated defence capability development, parallel and synchronised exercises, and mutually reinforcing actions to build the capacities of our partners, counter hybrid and cyber threats, and promote maritime security' (ibid: 37).
- 'With the US, the EU will strive for a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). Like the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) with Canada, TTIP demonstrates the transatlantic commitment to shared values and signals our willingness to pursue an ambitious rules-based trade agenda. On the broader security agenda, the US will continue to be our core partner. The EU will deepen cooperation with the US and Canada on crisis management, counter-terrorism, cyber, migration, energy and climate action' (ibid: 37).
- A connected Asia: 'There is a direct connection between European prosperity and Asian security. In light of the economic weight that Asia represents for the EU – and vice versa – peace and stability in Asia are a prerequisite for our prosperity. We will deepen economic diplomacy and scale up our security role in Asia' (ibid: 37).
- A cooperative Arctic: 'With three Member States and two European Economic Area members being Arctic states, the EU has a strategic interest in the Arctic remaining a low-tension area, with ongoing cooperation ensured by the Arctic Council, a well-functioning legal framework, and solid political and security cooperation. The EU will contribute to this through enhanced work on climate action and environmental research, sustainable development, telecommunications, and search & rescue, as well as concrete cooperation with Arctic states, institutions, indigenous people and local communities' (ibid 38-39).
- The EU Global Strategy Strategy 'is underpinned by the vision of and ambition for a stronger Union, willing and able to make a positive difference to its citizens and in the world. We must now swiftly translate this into action. First we will revise existing sectoral strategies, as well as devise and implement new thematic or geographic strategies in line with the political priorities of this Strategy. Such work must begin with clear procedures and time

> frames agreed promptly by all relevant players. Second, the EU Global Strategy itself will require periodic reviewing in consultation with the Council, the Commission and the European Parliament. On a yearly basis we will reflect on the state of play of the Strategy, pointing out where further implementation must be sought. Finally, a new process of strategic reflection will be launched whenever the EU and its Member States deem it necessary to enable the Union to navigate effectively our times. Our citizens deserve a true Union, which promotes our shared interests by engaging responsibility and in partnership with others' (ibid: 51).

The primary aim of the EU should be to stabilise politically and economically the African continent. Today's 54 African countries are home to over one billion inhabitants. Compared to the other continents, Africa has the most rapid population growth rate as it may reach the 2.5 billion mark by 2050, which also makes it the youngest population worldwide. 'Besides the fact that the combination of demographic growth and harsh environmental circumstances will pose a challenge to peace and security on the African continent, the state-building process is still ongoing' (Zinkanell and Hainzl 2016: 9).

One EU key issue aims at fully integrating the Western Balkan states into a European political, economic and security architecture.

EU relations to the Western Balkans

With the Thessaloniki Agenda in 2003, the EU promised the perspective of integration and membership to the Western Balkan countries (Himmelfreundpointner 2018: 46). The Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) is the framework for the European integration of the Western Balkans. In the Balkans, and in spite of remarkable progress over the last decades, unfinished business remains (Mogherini 2013: 1). The unfinished Western strategy for the Western Balkans (six partners) is to bring the fractious Balkan countries into the stabilization and modernization process of joining the EU and NATO. Thus far, the picture is mixed: Slovenia and Croatia are both EU and NATO members, while Albania and Montenegro are NATO members but only EU aspirants. North Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Serbia are not members of either institution (Binnendijk / Joseph 2018: 29). 'We believe that the EU is the only way forward for us. And for the EU, the Western Balkan membership perspective is the only way of providing stability in the region,' said Roland Bimo, Ambassador of Albania to Austria (Himmelfreundpointner 2018: 48).

One main challenge in the Balkans is the state of Kosovo where NATO has based a KFOR mission since 1999. Kosovo became independent in February 2008, but the Kosovo´s independence has not been recognised by the five EU member states Spain, Greece, Cyprus, Slovakia and Romania. Then-Macedonia / FYROM (now North Macedonia) solved its name dispute with Greece in 2018 and achieved EU candidate status in 2005. The new EU strategy is to integrate Western Balkan states by 2025, which states still remain open. EU Commissioner Johannes Hahn and French President Emmanuel Macron have mentioned that Serbia and Montenegro can be in the EU by 2025 (Himmelfreundpointner 2018: 48). 'We would like to see that every country should be evaluated by its own achievements,' said Ambassador Ivan Milić, Ambassador of Montenegro to Austria (ibid). 'For Albania, the enlargement policy, based on individual merit of each country, is very much welcomed, meaning that each country has to been judged by its own progress,' emphasised Ambassador Roland Bimo, Ambassador of Albania to Austria (ibid).

From an EU perspective, the Western Balkans are still regarded as a group. The decision whether Western Balkan countries can join the EU is a political one, so the status of the six countries reads as follows:

- Albania: Since June 2014, Albania has been a candidate country for EU membership. Since April 2009, a Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA) has been in force. Since 15th December 2010 Albanians with biometric passports have been able to travel visa-free to the Schengen zone (BBC 2014: 1).
- Bosnia and Herzegovina: EU integration is one of the country's main political objectives. It initiated the SAA process back in 2007, but has not yet been granted candidate status due to a delay of submitting answers to an extensive questionnaire. Visa-free travel to the Schengen zone began in mid-December 2014 for Bosnians with biometric passports. The EU maintains a peacekeeping force mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
- Montenegro has the most advanced EU perspective among the Western Balkans. Montenegro applied for full membership in December 2008 and was confirmed as candidate in December 2010. The negotiations started in June 2012. The EU opened the country's accession talks on June 29th, 2012. The SAA was signed in October 2007 (BBC 2014: 5). Since December 19th, 2009, citizens of Montenegro have not needed visas to visit most EU countries – those in the Schengen zone (BBC 2014: 5). As of December 2017, 30 negotiating chapters, including the rule of law chapters, have been opened, while three chapters (science and research, education and culture, external relations) have been provisionally closed.
- Macedonia / FYROM (now North Macedonia) was the first Balkan nation to sign a SAA with the EU in 2004. It has enjoyed candidate country status since December 2005, and an Accession Partnership was adopted by the EU in 2008. As of 2018 formal accession negotiations have still not been opened due to the resistance of Greece because of the country's name dispute. The deal between Athens and Skopje of July 2018 settled a 27-year dispute between Greece and now North Macedonia that had prevented North Macedonia from joining NATO and starting accession negotiations with the EU (Hope 2018: 6). Under the deal, Macedonia's Prime

Minister agreed to a new name, North Macedonia. In return, Greece would recognize a Macedonian identity and language (ibid).

- Kosovo: In April 2016, Kosovo reached a Stabilisation and Association Agreement with the EU and though it is a potential candidate has not yet delivered a formal membership application. The independence of Kosovo is not yet officially recognised by 23 of the 28 EU member states (Himmelfreundpointner 2018: 53).
- Serbia: In December 2009, Serbian citizens were granted the right to travel without a visa to the Schengen Area. Serbia applied for EU membership in the same month. The EU facilitates dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina about promoting cooperation, achieving progress on the path to the European Union and improving people's lives. Since October 2012, the High Representative Catherine Ashton has been personally involved in facilitating a High-Level Dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina which resulted in the historic 'First agreement of principles governing the normalisation of relations' reached on 19th April 2013. This agreement and its implementation are a breakthrough in relations between both sides. In June 2013, the European Council decided to start negotiations with Serbia. In September 2013 the Stabilisation and Association Agreement – a comprehensive contractual framework between Serbia and the EU – entered into force. In January 2014 the EU and Serbia held their 1st Intergovernmental Conference, thereby formally starting accession negotiations (European Union External Action 2016).

At the end of February 2018, the EU presented its new western Balkans strategy to encourage reform in Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia and Albania, by renewing the prospect of membership (Krastev 2018: 20). The migrant crisis rattled the region. In 2003, when the EU first promised membership, there seemed little doubt that the region's future would be European. Russia was looking to the Balkans primarily as a transit area for its energy exports to western European markets (Krastev 2018: 20). Geopolitical competition between Turkey, China and Russia in the Balkans is rife. China is set to become the No. 1 foreign investor in Serbia in 2018. Plans to build a high-speed railway between the Greek port of Piraeus and Budapest, via Belgrade, are of

immense value to China as it deploys its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) and trade route between Eastern Asia and Europe. Additionally, Turkey is trying to build its influence among Muslim communities in the Balkans, Moscow is using its own leverage over Orthodox Christians. Turkey applied for full membership in 1987 and was confirmed as candidate in December 1999. Negotiations started in October 2005 (BBC 2014: 6). Turkey's relations with the EU stand at a historical low. If the EU is slow to wake up to these new geopolitical realities, its strategy for the Balkans will end in defeat (Krastev 2018:20).

On the way toward a Common Security and Defence Policy

The story of European integration began with defence. The Treaties of Dunkirk (1947) and of Brussels (1948) were primarily geared to forging a security community which would banish any further prospect of war. But the demands of sovereignty and the sheer complexity of European security challenges, including early German rearmament and the need for a transatlantic alliance (NATO), ruined the first attempt at defence integration, the European Defence Community, in the early 1950s (Howorth 2000: 2). When the European Union Treaty entered into force on November 1st, 1993, the creation of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) became one of the main objectives of the European Union (E.U.). Upon achieving this goal, Europe should finally be able to speak with one voice. Achieving this goal shall also include the creation of a common defence policy, if the European Council so decides. EU member states face challenges and threats which cannot be overcome by a single state alone. Closer cooperation is a precondition! According to Article 42, the CSDP is an integral part of the CSFP. But CSDP can be divided into 'S' and 'D': 'While there is broad convergence inside the EU on what a common external security policy ('S') should and could be like, there is much less convergence on the possible scope of a common defence policy (the 'D')' (Missiroli 2016: 5). **'**D' within CSDP is ill defined: we are still not clear what defence matters. However, CSDP is not yet a military alliance, thus, CSDP includes neutral, non-aligned, and NATO member states.

The main decisions taken at the Anglo-French Saint-Malo Summit in December 1998 were the following:

- The European Council was to be given responsibility for framing a common security and defence policy under the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP).
- The EU was to be given the capacity for autonomous action, whilst at the same time enhancing the robustness of the NATO (Howorth 2000: 2).

While Paris considered that the emergence of a common European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) 'with teeth would consolidate and enhance a more balanced – and therefore stronger – Atlantic Alliance, London feared that the opposite would be the case: that if Europe demonstrated a serious capacity to manage its own security affairs, Washington would retreat into isolationism and NATO would eventually collapse' (Howorth 2000: 2). In 2000, then-Secretary-General of the Western European Union Javier Solana emphasised: 'The creation of a European Security and Defence Policy is aimed at strengthening, not weakening transatlantic ties' (Solana 2000: 1).

In accordance with article 5 of protocol No 22 on the position of Denmark annexed to the Treaty on European Union and to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Denmark does not participate in the elaboration and implementation of decisions and actions of the Union which have defence implications (Council Decision 2015: 51).

The first informal EU defence ministers' meeting took place under the Austrian EU presidency in October 1998 in Vienna. The Franco-British meeting in Saint-Malo (December 4th, 1998), and subsequently the Cologne European Council summit (June 3rd-4th, 1999), set out the guidelines required for the strengthening of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). In Cologne, European governments declared that

> the Union must have the capability for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crisis without prejudice to actions by NATO. (European Council 1999, Annex III, point 1)

> was clearly demonstrated during the War on Kosovo in 1999. Operation *Allied Force* underlined the conclusion that Europe had no capability for autonomous action and should develop a force projection capability for operations in an out-of-area environment. (de Wijk 2004: 11)

This war showed that EU nations are largely dependent on the United States of America for carrying out large-scale military operations. The United States carried out 65 percent of all flights and, within that figure, 80 percent of all combat missions (ibid). EU leaders saw the need to strengthen European capabilities in the fields of intelligence, strategic transport, and command and control (C2), which implies efforts to adapt, exercise, and bring together national and multinational European forces.

In 1997, the so-called Petersberg tasks that were adopted by the Western European Union (WEU)[1] on June 19th, 1992 have been incorporated into Title V of the Treaty on European Union (the Amsterdam Treaty). This was a crucial step forward at a time when there had been a resurgence of local conflicts posing a real threat to European security, even though the risk of large-scale conflicts had fallen significantly compared to those of the Cold War period. The Petersberg tasks represent a very fitting response by the Union, and embodying the member states' shared determination to safeguard security through operations such as humanitarian and rescue tasks; peacekeeping tasks; tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking; and peace enforcement. In 1998, US State Secretary

[1] The WEU was created by the Treaty on Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence signed in Brussels on March 17th, 1948 (the Brussels Treaty), as amended by the Protocol signed in Paris on October 13th, 1954, which modified and completed it. The Brussels Treaty was signed by Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the UK. Its main feature was the commitment to mutual defence should any of the signatories be the victim of an armed attack in Europe (Western European Union 2011). Citing the mutual assistance clause enshrined in the Treaty of Lisbon (article 42.7), the ten member states of the WEU agreed on March 31st, 2010, to initiate procedures to terminate the modified Treaty of Brussels till June 30th, 2011. The 'WEU has therefore accomplished its historical role.' (Europe Diplomacy & Defence. 2010: 2)

Madeleine Albright's 'three Ds' summed up the US conditions for the possibility of the EU building its own functions:

- no duplication of existing NATO structure;
- no discrimination against non-EU-NATO members; and
- no decoupling from Alliance structures (Reichard 2006: 354).

A fourth condition was added by the US Congress: that NATO should have a 'right of first refusal' versus the EU on any peacekeeping activity. These four conditions duly reflected US interests in Europe in 1998 (ibid).

After a lack of action and coordination during the conflicts and secession wars in former Yugoslavia in the 1990s which were a challenge to European security structures (Institute 'Clingendael' 2010: 8), the Cologne European Council placed crisis management at the core of the process of strengthening the CFSP in June 1999. This action led to priority being given to conflict prevention two years later at the Gothenburg Summit. Conflict prevention does not only mean preventing the initial outbreak of violence, but also its escalation and later recurrence (International Crisis Group 2001: 2). Conflict prevention covers preventive engagement, preventive deployment and embargo, counter-proliferation and joint disarmament operations (Giegerich 2008: 20).

On the basis of the declaration at the NATO summit held in Washington on April 23rd-25th, 1999 the Union should be able to conduct operations, also with recourse to NATO resources and capabilities (planning and command and control capabilities). To implement this category of operations, specific arrangements were agreed upon with the Alliance. At the Helsinki European Council meeting of December 10th-11th, 1999 the heads of state or government confirmed that they intended to give the European Union autonomous capacity to make decisions and made clear their intention, where NATO as a whole was not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises worldwide (Hauser 2006a: 44). In Helsinki, the EU nations also decided rapidly to develop collective capability goals, particularly in the field of command and control (C2), intelligence and strategic transport. NATO obligations of EU member states are not in contradiction with engagement

in EU security and defence issues according to article 42.2 TEU (the Lisbon Treaty):

> The policy of the Union [. . .] shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States and shall respect the obligations of certain Member States, which see their common defence realised in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), under the North Atlantic Treaty and be compatible with the common security and defence policy established within that framework.

At the Cologne and Helsinki European Council Summits in 1999, heads of state decided that the European Rapid Reaction Forces (EU RRF)—60,000 troops—should have the capacity to undertake autonomous actions by 2003 so the European Union 'can take decisions and approve military action where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged' (North Atlantic Council 1999: para. 9a). The EU RRF of 60,000 servicemen intended first to constitute a pool of more than 100,000 persons and 400 combat aircraft and 100 warships (de Wijk 2004: 12). To fulfil the whole spectrum of the EU Petersberg tasks—from peacekeeping to peace enforcement actions—the European Union will need advanced military capabilities to close capability gaps between the United States and the European allies.

The military component was introduced by the Helsinki (December 10th-11th, 1999) and Nice (December 7th-10th, 2000) European Councils. First, Helsinki established the *headline goal* for the EU Rapid Reaction Force to be deployable within sixty days and to be sustained for at least one year (Perruche 2006: 8). This headline goal was the logical outcome of lessons learned during the conflicts in former Yugoslavia of the 1990s. The EU RRF does not intend to establish a European army. The commitment and deployment of national troops are based on sovereign decisions taken by member states. The primary task for the European Union is now to increase and coordinate capabilities both for its own security and for the stabilization of the European area.

The headline goal was accompanied by a European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP) launched on December 15th, 2001. This plan

> was designed to meet the capability requirements identified under the four military scenarios developed by the EU Military Staff (EUMS) and approved by the then fifteen Member States: the prevention of conflicts, the evacuation of nationals, the forced separation of belligerents and humanitarian aid. (Perruche 2006: 8)

ECAP was launched

> to address known shortfalls in military capabilities across the spectrum of capabilities from procurement issues such as air to air refuelling, and to qualitative issues such as headquarters, where with five OHQs [Operation Headquarters], four FHQs [Force Headquarters] and sixteen Component Commands, the shortfall was clearly not quantitative. (Dunn 2006: 130)

Much of the work of ECAP has already been migrated to the European Defence Agency that was founded in 2004 (ibid). The initial Helsinki Headline Goal 2003 prepared the way for the Headline Goal 2010 (HHG 2010) adding qualitative criteria for achieving capability improvements. However, the member states should be able

> *to deploy smaller rapid response elements with very high readiness*. These forces must be self-sustaining, with the necessary command, control, and intelligence capabilities, logistics, other combat support services and, additionally as appropriate, air and naval elements. (Assembly of Western European Union 2003: 7)

At the 1999 Helsinki European Council, Rapid reaction was identified as an 'important aspect of EU crisis management. As a result, the Helsinki Headline Goal 2003 assigned to Member States the objective of being able to provide rapid response elements available and deployable at very high levels of readiness. Subsequently an EU military rapid reaction was developed' (Council of the European Union: 2007: I). In order to increase high readiness capabilities, the development of rapid reaction battle groups was launched in 2004 at the Noordwijk Defence Ministers summit. Battle groups 'are rapid-reaction-force packages of between 1,500 and 3,000 personnel (including all enabling capabilities) deployable for up to 120 days if resupplied' (Giegerich 2008: 17). During this informal meeting, defence ministers agreed to create battlegroups based on a French/British/German initiative of February 18th, 2004, beginning with the Initial Operational

Capability (IOC) (at least one battlegroup on standby) and the initial commitments on the Full Operational Capability (FOC) from January 1st, 2007 onwards (Dutch EU Presidency 2004a). The EU Military Staff (EUMS) developed the Battlegroup Concept, and in June 2004, the EU Military Committee (EUMC) approved this concept. Since 2007, the EU has not always been fulfilling its ambition of having the capacity to undertake two concurrent single battlegroup-sized rapid response operations, including the ability to launch both such operations nearly simultaneously (General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union 2007: 1):

> The battlegroup is the minimum militarily effective, credible, rapidly deployable, coherent force package capable of stand-alone operations, or of being used for the initial force phase of larger operations. It is based on a combined armed, battalion-sized force and reinforced with combat support and combat service support elements. In its generic composition, but depending on the mission, the battlegroups are about 1,500 personnel strong. A battlegroup is associated with a deployable force headquarters and pre-identified operational and strategic enablers, such as strategic lift and logistics. […] The battlegroups are sustainable for 30 days in initial operations, extendable to 120 days, if re-supplied appropriately. (ibid)

Defence ministers also agreed to consider the possibility of third countries participating in EU battlegroups and to harmonise the EU battlegroups and the NATO Response Force (NRF) that became operable in late 2006. As a part of the Headline Goal 2010, the objective was to have integrated forces based on a reinforced infantry battalion (about 1,500 troops) by January 2007, that are able to start an operation on the ground within ten days after an EU decision to launch an operation (Perruche 2006: 8 and 9).

The civilian component, developed at the Feira European Council (June 19th-20th, 2000) and Gothenburg European Council (June 15th-16th, 2001) with extensive contributions by the Commission, aimed to improve actions in a field where the international community has shown itself to be lacking. In order to provide added value, the European Union intended to establish, before 2003, four main instruments that are mutually dependent:

- police cooperation which would provide up to 5,000 police officers, including 1,000 within thirty days, for tasks ranging from restoring

order in cooperation with a military force to the training of local police; (candidate countries and NATO members Iceland and Norway participate in this cooperation by providing police capacities);

- strengthening the rule of law by providing up to 200 judges, prosecutors, and other experts in the field;
- civilian administration which would provide a team to establish or guarantee elections, taxation, education, water provision, and perform similar functions; and
- civil protection which would assist humanitarian efforts in emergency and other operations and would require the European Union to be capable, within three to seven hours, of providing two to three assessment teams consisting of ten experts as well as intervention teams consisting of 2,000 people (Hauser 2006a).

The ministers of defence of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal and the Netherlands signed a Declaration of Intent on September 17th, 2004, concerning the establishment of a European Gendarmerie Force (EGF) during the informal meeting of ministers of defence of the EU in Noordwijk. The EGF is a police force with military status and might be excellently suited to deployment during or immediately after a military operation for maintaining public order and safety and in situations where local police forces are not (sufficiently) deployable. For the rapidly-deployable EGF it should be possible to conduct operations in support of the fight against organised crime and the protection of participants in civil missions. The EGF is a multinational unit that is not only allocated to the EU, but also to the UN, the OSCE and NATO. The initiative for establishing the EGF was taken in 2003 by the Minister of Defence of France, Michèle Alliot-Marie. The force headquarters in Vicenza / Italy was established in early 2005, while the EGF became operational at the end of 2005 (Dutch EU Presidency 2004c). Romania joined the EGF in 2007.

In the Lisbon Treaty, article 21.1 TEU sets out its main principles of the common foreign and security policy (CFSP):

> The Union's action on the international scene shall be guided by the principles which have inspired its own creation, development and

> enlargement, and which it seeks to advance in the wider world: democracy, the rule of law, the universality and indivisibility of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality and solidarity, and respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law.

Furthermore, the EU

> shall seek to develop relations and build partnerships with third countries, and international, regional or global organisations which share the principles referred to in the first paragraph. It shall promote multilateral solutions to common problems, in particular in the framework of the United Nations.
> The Union shall seek to develop relations and build partnerships with third countries, and international, regional or global organisations which share the principles referred to in the first subparagraph. It shall promote multilateral solutions to common problems, in particular in the framework of the United Nations.

According to article 21.2 TEU,

'The Union shall define and pursue common policies and actions, and shall work for a high degree of cooperation in all fields of international relations, in order to:

(a) safeguard its values, fundamental interests, security, independence and integrity;
(b) consolidate and support democracy, the rule of law, human rights and the principles of international law;
(c) preserves peace, prevent conflict and strengthen international security, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, with the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and with the aims of the Charter of Paris, including those relating to external borders;
(d) foster the sustainable economic, social and environmental development of developing countries, with the primary aim of eradicating poverty;
(e) encourage the integration of all countries into the world economy, including through the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade;

(f) help develop international measures to preserve and improve the quality of the environment and the sustainable management of global natural resources, in order to ensure sustainable development;
(g) assist populations, countries and regions confronting natural or man-made disasters; and
(h) promote an international system based on stronger multilateral cooperation and good global governance.'

On the basis of these principles and objectives, 'the European Council shall identify the strategic interests and objectives of the Union' (article 22.1) TEU, first sentence). However, decisions of the European Council relating to EU strategic interests and objectives

> may concern the relations of the Union with a specific country or region or may be thematic in approach. They shall define their duration, and the means to be made available by the Union and the Member States (article 22.1 TEU, second sentence).

According to article 42.1 TEU, the Common Security and Defence policy (CSDP)

> shall be an integral part of the common foreign and security policy. It shall provide the Union with an operational capacity drawing on civilian and military assets. The Union may use them on missions outside the Union for peacekeeping, conflict prevention and strengthening international security…

When the European Council decides unanimously, the CSDP will lead to a 'common defence' (article 42.2 TEU). 'We have already foreclosed the optimal use of the mutual defence clause by activating it after the November 13th, 2015, terrorist attacks in Paris) (Biscop 2017a: 13). CSDP 'shall include the progressive framing of a common Union defence policy which might lead to a common defence' (stipulated by article 42 TEU) (Weisserth 2013: 8). The mutual assistance clause is based on the UN principle of collective self-defence and shall underline the EU guiding principle of solidarity. The application of this clause is based on 'armed aggression' (to fight it inside and preventively outside the EU) which is

more extensive than an armed attack. Nevertheless the various types of EU member states are respected: those which are neutral, non-allied and members of NATO. Terrorism can be found within the CSDP task catalogue of article 43 (1) TEU, in the mutual assistance clause of article 42.7 TEU (implicitly) and explicitly in the solidarity clause of article 222 TFEU. Article 42.7 TEU has been activated the first time at the request of France following the Paris terrorist attacks of November 13th, 2015, 'but this was mostly a symbolic move' (Biscop 2019: 193).

Both – CFSP and CSDP – serve to fulfil the EU's foreign policy objectives. CSDP is subsumed under the wider umbrella of CFSP. CFSP and CSDP serve to complement each other. CFSP is concentrating on foreign policy objectives at the strategic level, while CSDP enables the EU to execute crisis management operations on the ground. CSDP also covers civilian missions.

The European Defence Agency

In the context of capabilities, the EU Military Staff (EUMS) also works in close coordination with the European Defence Agency (EDA). The EDA is based in Brussels with around 140 staff, it was already established under a Joint Action of the Council of Ministers on July 12th, 2004, its steering board of the EDA met for the first time on September 17th, 2004 in Noordwijk, the Netherlands, under the chairmanship of the first High Representative of the EU, Javier Solana (Dutch EU Presidency 2004b). The EDA's main 'shareholders' include the Council and the Commission as well as third parties such as OCCAR (Organisation Conjointe de Coopération en matière d'Armement), LoI (Letter of Intent) and NATO. EDA has a special relationship with Norway (through an Administrative Arrangement). The first major achievement was the approval by ministers of a voluntary Code of Conduct on defence procurement in November 2005. On July 1st, 2006 the Code of Conduct became operational (Starlinger and Fuchshuber 2008: 5).
As the EU Lisbon Treaty states, member states shall improve their military capabilities. The establishment of an agency in the field of defence capabilities development, research, acquisition and armaments (EDA) was foreseen to identify operational requirements, to promote measures to

satisfy those requirements, to contribute to identifying and, where appropriate, implementing any measure needed to strengthen the industrial and technological base of the defence sector, to participate in defining a European capabilities and armaments policy, and to assist the Council in evaluating the improvement of military capabilities (article 42.3 TEU). In detail, the EDA has as its task to

- contribute to identifying the member states' military capability objectives and evaluating observance of the capability commitments given by the member states;
- promote harmonisation of operational needs and adoption of effective, compatible procurement methods;
- propose multilateral projects to fulfil the objectives in terms of military capabilities, ensure coordination of the programmes implemented by the member states and management of specific cooperation programmes;
- support defence technology research, and coordinate and plan joint research activities and the study of technical solutions meeting future operational needs;
- contribute to identifying and, if necessary, implementing any useful measure for strengthening the industrial and technological base of the defence sector and for improving the effectiveness of military expenditure (article 45.1 TEU).

The EDA's Steering Board provides guidance and endorsed the first Capabilities Development Plan (CDP) in July 2008. The CDP is not a supranational plan. It is also a tool to bring out opportunities to pool and collaborate. It is a key tool and catalyst for a capability-based approach to force and capability planning. It is a living document which will be updated as appropriate. The CDP is not a plan in the traditional sense, describing the number of units or the amount of equipment member states should have at their disposal. Rather it provides a review of future capability needs, taking into account the impact of future security challenges, technological development and other trends. It assists the member states in their national defence planning and progresses, it is developed collectively with EDA's member states, the Council Secretariat and the EU Military Committee (EUMC) which is supported by the EU Military Staff.

The EDA shall be open to all member states wishing to be part of it. Military and civilian capabilities should be made available to the CFSP. Those member states which together establish multinational forces may also make those forces available to the CSDP (article 42.3 TEU). EDA is allocated four tasks covering:

- development of defence capabilities;
- promotion of defence research and technology
- promotion of armaments cooperation;
- creation of a competitive European Defence Equipment Market and the strengthening of the European Defence, Technological and Industrial Base. The EDA Steering Board consists of the defence ministers of 27 participating states (all EU member states except Denmark) chaired by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the European Commission. The EDA has three operational directorates: Cooperation Planning & Support; Capability, Armament and Technology; European Synergies and Innovation.

Meanwhile, a coordinated annual review of national defence budgets is taking shape. Therefore the Council initiated a Coordinated Annual Review on Defence (CARD). This mechanism will facilitate regular and systematic sharing of information between EU member states on their defence planning and the implementation of the Capability Development Plan. It shall promote enhanced defence cooperation among member states (EEAS 2017: 23). The CARD's ambition is to foster a gradual synchronization and mutual adaption of member states' national defence planning cycles and capability development practices 'in the hope this will lead to more systematic defence cooperation in Europe' (Domecq 2017: 26). The responsibility for the information gathering lies in the EDA as the CARD secretariat, with operational inputs from the EU Military Staff (EUMS). Once collected, the information will be assessed by the EDA in a comprehensive CARD analysis report to be discussed with member states, followed by a final report to ministers. Directly linked to CARD is Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) enshrined in article 46 TEU. As of December 7th, 2017, 25 EU member states have notified their intention to participate, and more may join, which is an unprecedented and

historic step toward European defence (Domecq 2017: 26). The EDA is indispensable to carrying forward all three initiatives (CARD, PESCO and European Defence Fund – EDF). This was recognised by EU defence ministers at their meeting on November 13th, 2017 when they explicitly encouraged the EDA to further support the coherent development of the European capability landscape (Domecq 2017: 26).

'Solidarity Clause' and 'Mutual Assistance Clause'

A 'solidarity clause' enables member states to mobilise all the necessary military and civilian instruments at its disposal, including the military resources made available, within the Union to prevent terrorist threats and to provide assistance to another EU country in the event of a terrorist attack or disaster. Article 222.1 TFEU (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union) reads,

> The Union and its Member States shall act jointly in a spirit of solidarity if a Member State is the object of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or man-made disaster. The Union shall mobilise all the instruments at its disposal, including the military resources made available by the Member States, to:
>
> - prevent the terrorist threat in the territory of the Member States;
> - protect democratic institutions and the civilian population from any terrorist attack;
> - assist a Member State in its territory at the request of its political authorities, in the event of a terrorist attack;
> - assist a Member State in its territory, at the request of its political authorities, in the event of a natural or man-made disaster.

However, the Union shall mobilise all the instruments at its disposal, including the military resources made available by the EU member states. Article 222 TFEU follows directly from the EU Convention Working Group VIII on Defence Issues' recommendations for the inclusion of a solidarity clause in the Constitution. As regards assistance to a member state following a terrorist attack, states need to take action immediately after the event. Accordingly, the second paragraph provides that assistance should be triggered automatically at the request of the member state in

question. The affected member state will need to specify its requirements, and the other states, meeting in Council, will co-ordinate the action and resources needed to remedy the situation. The Solidarity Clause allows 'for the use of CSDP within the territory of the Union, at the request of a Member State, in case of natural or man-made disasters or terrorist attack, including in the latter case preventive deployment' (Biscop and Coelmont 2012: 50).

In the Union framework, limited mutual assistance is given in case of armed aggression:

> If a Member State is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other Member States shall have toward it an obligation of aid and assistance by all the means in their power, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. This shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States. (article 42.7 TEU)

In article 42.7 TEU, on comparison with article V of the Western European Union (WEU) Treaty, military means are no longer explicitly mentioned as an element of that aid and assistance. There is again uncertainty about the manner in which the security of the six EU member states which are not NATO members – Austria, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Malta, and Sweden – is to be guaranteed (Hauser 2005: 210-215).

In spring 2011, ten of the EU's member states were members of the WEU and were, therefore, bound by a robust mutual defence commitment under article V of the Brussels Treaty. On June 30th, 2011 the WEU was closed 'following the termination of the Modified Brussels Treaty of 1954' (Council of the European Union 2011), as was stated by the WEU presidency on March 31st, 2010. A mutual assistance clause was already incorporated in the EU Lisbon Treaty in article 42.7, the Lisbon Treaty entered into force on December 1st, 2009: 'The WEU has therefore accomplished its historical role.' (WEU 2010). Since the 'cessation of WEU activities' (Council of the Western European Union 2011), mutual assistance in defence matters in Europe can only be guaranteed effectively by NATO (Article 5 of the NATO Treaty). Similar defence assistance could be invoked within the EU framework, but only, if neutral and non-

aligned EU member states agree. But neutrals and non-aligned states would lose their neutral and non-aligned status when joining a defence alliance.

The institutions coordinating CSDP

When the Lisbon treaty entered into force on 1st December 2009, the Treaty on European Union (TEU) kept the same name and the Treaty establishing the European Community became the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The Union's institutions in general according to article 13 TEU are the European Parliament; the European Council; the Council of the European Union; the European Commission; the Court of Justice of the European Union; the European Central Bank; and the Court of Auditors. The following institutions are involved within the policy shaping in the framework of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP): the European Council; the Council; the European Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy; and the European Parliament.

Relating to article 15.1 TEU the 'European Council shall provide the Union with the necessary impetus for its development and shall define the general political directions and priorities thereof. It shall not exercise legislative functions'. As article 15.2 TEU states, the 'European Council shall consist of the Heads of State or Government of the Member States, together with its President and the President of the Commission. The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy shall take part in its work.' According to article 15.3 TEU

> The European Council shall meet twice every six months, convened by its President. When the agenda so requires, the members of the European Council may decide each to be assisted by a minister and, in the case of the President of the Commission, by a member of the Commission. When the situation so requires, the President shall convene a special meeting of the European Council.

Under the Lisbon Treaty, the European Council became an institution which is assisted by the General Secretariat of the Council. The staff of the

General Secretariat is therefore at the President's disposal, including the Directorate for general political questions, the Legal Service, policy Directorate-Generals (Ecofin, Environment, Justice and Home Affairs, etc.), translation services, protocol, press office, etc.

In the Lisbon Treaty, the General Affairs Council (GAC) and the Foreign Affairs Council (FAC) are the only Council formations which are laid down. The Foreign Affairs Council elaborates 'the Union's external action on the basis of strategic guidelines laid down by the European Council and ensure that the Union's action is consistent' (article 16.6 TEU, third sentence). There is only one Council of the EU, it can meet in ten different formations. The Council formations can be extended or limited in numbers by the heads of state or government. The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy who is also one of the Vice-Presidents of the European Commission chairs the Foreign Affairs Council, contributes through proposals towards the preparation of the CFSP and ensures implementation of the decisions adopted by the European Council and the Council.
Article 16.7 TEU states: 'A Committee of Permanent Representatives of the Governments of the Member States shall be responsible for preparing the work of the Council.'

A new political figure has come on the scene since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty: the fixed full-time President of the European Council. At their informal meeting in Brussels on November 19th, 2009, ahead of the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, EU heads of state or government agreed on the election of Mr Herman van Rompuy as the elect President. According to article 15.6 of the Treaty on the European Union, the President of the European Council:

- chairs it and drives forward its work;
- ensures the preparation and continuity of the work of the European Council in cooperation with the President of the Commission, and on the basis of the work of the General Affairs Council;
- endeavours to facilitate cohesion and consensus within the European Council;
- presents a report to the European Parliament after each of the meetings of the European Council.

He also shall, 'at his level and in that capacity, ensure the external representation of the Union on issues concerning its common foreign and security policy, without prejudice to the powers of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.' According to article 15.5 TEU

> The European Council shall elect its President, by a qualified majority, for a term of two and a half years, renewable once. In the event of an impediment or serious misconduct, the European Council can end the President's term of office in accordance with the same procedure.

As article 42.1 TEU states, the CSDP is an integral part of CSFP. It shall provide the Union with an operational capacity drawing on civilian and military assets. The Union may use them on missions outside the Union for truce, conflict prevention and strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter. Relating to CSDP operations and missions, a 'constructive abstention' could be used by the member states as follows in article 31.1 TEU:

> Decisions under this Chapter shall be taken by the European Council and the Council acting unanimously, except where this Chapter provides otherwise. The adoption of legislative acts shall be excluded.
> When abstaining in a vote, any member of the Council may qualify its abstention by making a formal declaration under the present subparagraph. In that case, it shall not be obliged to apply the decision, but shall accept that the decision commits the Union. In a spirit of mutual solidarity, the Member State concerned shall refrain from any action likely to conflict with or impede Union action based on that decision and the other Member States shall respect its position. If the members of the Council qualifying their abstention in this way represent at least one third of the member states comprising at least one third of the population of the Union, the decision shall not be adopted.

The formal role of the European Parliament in relation to the CFSP stems from its two main roles as stipulated in the Treaties i.e. that of political scrutiny and budgetary authority. The High Representative has a central role in ensuring the consistent and effective formulation of CSFP/CSDP.

In this respect, the Lisbon Treaty tasks the High Representative to work with the European Parliament (article 36 TEU).

The High Representative and the European External Action Service (EEAS)

The office of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (origninally for Common Foreign and Security Policy – CFSP) was introduced on October 18th, 1999, by the EU Amsterdam Treaty. The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy is appointed by the European Council with the agreement of the President of the Commission. His term of office (five years) coincides with the Commission's term of office. He exercises, in foreign affairs, the functions which, so far, were exercised by the six-monthly rotating Presidency, the High Representative for CFSP and the Commissioner for External Relations. According to Articles 18 and 27 of the Treaty on the European Union, the High Representative:

- conducts the Union's common foreign and security policy (article 18.2 TEU);
- contributes by his proposals to the development of that policy, which she will carry out as mandated by the Council, and ensures implementation of the decisions adopted in this field (article 18.2 TEU);
- presides over the Foreign Affairs Council (article 18.3 TEU and article 27.1 TEU);
- is one of the Vice-Presidents of the Commission. She ensures the consistency of the Union's external action. She is responsible within the Commission for responsibilities incumbent on it in external relations and for coordinating other aspects of the Union's external action (article 18.4 TEU);
- represents the Union for matters relating to the CFSP, conduct political dialogue with third parties on the Union's behalf and expresses the Union's position in international organisations and at international conferences (article 27.2 TEU);
- exercises authority over the European External Action Service and over the Union delegations in third countries and at international organisations (General Secretariat of the Council of the EU 2009).

Article 18.1 TEU states as follows:

> The European Council, acting by a qualified majority, with the agreement of the President of the Commission, shall appoint the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. The European Council may end his term of office by the same procedure.

The High Representative is subject, together with the President of the Commission and the other members of the Commission, to a vote of consent by the European Parliament. In fulfilling his mandate, the High Representative is assisted by a European External Action Service (EEAS) and has authority over 139 delegations and offices of the Union in third countries and to international organisations. Article 27.3 TEU constitutes the legal basis for the Council decision on the organisation and functioning of the EEAS.

The EEAS helps the High Representative ensure the consistency and coordination of the Union's external action as well as prepare policy proposals and implement them after their approval by Council. It also assists the President of the European Council and the President as well as the Members of the Commission in their respective functions in the area of external relations and shall ensure close cooperation with the member states. Its key policy goals are a secure, stable and prosperous European neighbourhood, a close relationship with strategic partners, universal respect for human rights, to spread democracy and the rule of law, sustainable development policy and crisis management and conflict prevention.

The EEAS is a service of a *sui generis* nature, separate from the Commission and the Council Secretariat (Council of the European Union 2009: 6). The EEAS has its own section in the EU budget, to which the usual budgetary and control rules will apply. Most of the EEAS personnel originate from the European Commission and the Council Secretariat.

The Commission's delegations became Union delegations under the authority of the High Representative and as part of the EEAS structure. Delegations contain both regular EEAS staff (including Heads of Delegation) and staff from relevant Commission services. EU delegations

work in close cooperation with diplomatic services of the member states. They shall play a supporting role as regards diplomatic and consular protection of Union citizens in third countries. In order to enable the High Representative to conduct the CSDP, the EEAS includes the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD), the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC) and the EU Military Staff (EUMS) and the Situation Centre (SitCen) (Council of the European Union 2009: 3, Hynek 2010: 4). The CPCC was established in August 2007 and has a mandate to plan and conduct civilian CSDP operations under the political control and strategic direction of the Political and Security Committee (PSC); to provide assistance and advice to the High Representative, the presidency and the relevant EU Council bodies 'and to direct, coordinate, advise, support, supervise and review civilian CSDP operations'. The CPCC Director, as EU Civilian Operations Commander, exercises command and control at strategic level for the planning and conduct of all civilian crisis management operations (European Council 2013: 1).

The CMPD was created in 2009 and is part of the EEAS. It works under political control and strategic direction of the member states in the PSC, acting under the responsibility of the Council of the EU and the High Representative. Its core activities and products include:

- Strategic planning of CSDP missions and operations;
- Strategic reviews of existing CSDP mission and operations;
- Develop CSDP partnerships;
- Coordinate the development of civilian and military capabilities;
- Develop CSDP policy and concepts;
- Conduct exercises and develop CSDP training;
- Develop possible options for EU action and prepare a decision by EU Ministers on 'what to do, why, where and with whom' with regard to an international security crisis situation.

These options are put together in a Crisis Management Concept (CMC) which is proposed to EU Ministers for approval. This strategic planning is conducted in an integrated way, involving both civilian and military planners and in consultation with other services within the EEAS. It forms the basis for the further operational planning and the conduct of a mission or an operation. CMCs developed by the CMPD and approved by the

Foreign Affairs Council include e.g. those for the mission for the Regional Maritime Capacity Building in the Horn of Africa and in Somalia, the Sahel mission and the mission for the security of the airport in Juba (South Sudan).

Consultation procedures have been established between the EEAS and the services of the European Commission with external responsibilities, including those in charge of internal policies with significant external dimensions. The EU Special Representatives (EUSR) or their tasks also became part of the EEAS (ibid: 5).

According to article 33 TEU,

> The Council may, on a proposal from the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, appoint a special representative with a mandate in relation to particular policy issues. The special representative shall carry out his mandate under the authority of the High Representative.

With regard to CFSP/CSDP, the High Representative's core responsibility is to oversee the implementation of decisions taken by the ministerial Council of the European Union and the European Council (article 43.2 TEU) – the Heads of State or Government. Tasks and functions of the High Representative are:

- International representation of the EU;
- Appointment of EU Special Representatives;
- Head of the European Defence Agency chairing its Ministerial Steering Board Meetings;
- Head of the European Union Satellite Centre;
- Chair of the board of the European Union Institute for Security Studies (EU ISS) and of the European Security and Defence College (ESDC).

The EU Satellite Centre (EUSC) was originally founded within the Western European Union in 1992 and incorporated as an agency into the EU on 1st January 2002. It is located in Torrejón de Ardoz, Spain. The EU ISS was established by the Council Joint Action on July 20th, 2001 (revised by

Council Joint Action on December 21st, 2006) as a replacement for the WEU Institute for Security Studies which was established in 1990. It was inaugurated on January 1st, 2002 and provides research and recommendations that can contribute to the formulation of CSDP. The EU ISS enriches Europe's strategic debate and provides analysis and forecasting to the High Representative.

Council role in CSDP

The Council is assisted in military CSDP operations by the Political and Security Committee (PSC); the European Union Military Committee (EUMC); and the European Union Military Staff (EUMS), composed of military experts seconded to the Council Secretariat by the member states. These three political and military bodies within the Council were established by the Helsinki European Council in December 1999. The European Council (Nice, December 7th-10th, 2000) decided to establish these permanent political and military structures within the Council of the European Union 'in order to provide political control and strategic direction in a crisis' (Perruche 2006: 6).

The PSC meets at the ambassadorial level as a preparatory body for the Council of the EU. Its main functions are keeping track of the international situation and helping to define policies within the CSDP. The PSC 'prepares a coherent EU response to a crisis and exercises political control and strategic direction', however, the PSC is the linchpin of the CSDP (ibid).
As the highest military body set up in the Council, the EUMC is composed of the Chiefs of Defence of the member states, who are regularly represented by their permanent military representatives. The EUMC provides the PSC with advice and recommendations on all military matters within the EU. In parallel with the EUMC, the PSC is advised by a Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM). This committee provides information, drafts and recommendations, and also expresses its opinion on civilian aspects of crisis management to the PSC (ibid).
The EUMS is to perform early warning, situational awareness and strategic planning within the framework of crisis management outside of the EU member states territories. It is responsible e.g. for peacekeeping tasks, tasks

of combat forces in crisis management (including peacemaking), and also for joint disarmament operations, support for third countries in combating terrorism and security sector reform (SSR). Furthermore, '[t]he mission of EUMS also includes identifying European and multinational forces as well as implementing policies and decisions as directed by the European Union Military Committee.' (ibid). The role and tasks of the EUMS have some unique characteristics. On the one hand the EUMS is an integral part of the General Secretariat of the Council and directly attached to the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. On the other hand the EUMS operates under the military direction of the EUMC, by which it is assisted and to which it reports. The EUMS ensures all the necessary military expertise for the internal work within the EU, providing an early warning capability to that end. It also supports the EUMC with regard to situation assessment and military aspects of strategic planning over the full range of EU-led military operations (Perruche 2006: 6 and 7). The EUMS has established relations with the Department for Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) of the United Nations (UN). Twice a year, a joint steering committee (EU/UN) meets in either Brussels or New York to discuss points of common interests and decide on future cooperation (ibid: 9). An EU Military Staff's liaison officer was established at the UN Headquarters in December 2008 which had already been 'an interesting step in coordination of communication' for the EUFOR Tchad/RCA and EU NAVFOR Somalia missions (Hynek 2010: 2). Additionally, a permanent EU liaison cell has been created at NATO's Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE), and a SHAPE liaison team was situated within the EUMS (Perruche 2006: 9, Hynek 2010: 6). The EUMS, along with member states, also helped for some months in supporting their African Union (AU) counterparts by working on the AU's military mission in the Sudanese province of Darfur (Perruche 2006: 9).

According to article 42.3 TEU, member states shall make civilian and military capabilities available to the Union for the implementation of CSDP, to contribute to the objectives defined by the Council. Those member states which together establish multinational forces may also make them available to the CSDP. As article 42.4 TEU states, decisions relating to CSDP

> shall be adopted by the Council acting unanimously on a proposal from the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy or an initiative from a Member State. The High Representative may propose the use of both national resources and Union instruments, together with the Commission where appropriate.

In order to operate, the Council 'may entrust the execution of a task, within the Union framework, to a group of Member States in order to protect the Unions values and serve its interests' (article 42.5 TEU). Those member states

> whose military capabilities fulfil higher criteria and which have made more binding commitments to one another in this area with a view to the most demanding missions shall establish permanent structured cooperation within the Union framework. Such cooperation shall be governed by Article 46. ..

The tasks

> in the course of which the Union may use civilian and military means, shall include joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilisation. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting third countries in combating terrorism in their countries. (Article 43.1 TEU)

Relating to these task, the

> Council shall adopt decisions …, defining their objectives and scope and the general conditions for their implementation. The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, acting under the authority of the Council and in close and constant contact with the Political and Security Committee, shall ensure coordination of the civilian and military aspects of such tasks. (Article 43.2 TEU)

The Council also

> 'may entrust the implementation of a task to a group of Member States which are willing and have the necessary capability for such a task. Those

> Member States, in association with the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, shall agree among themselves on the management of the task.' (Article 44.1 TEU)

This article opens up the possibility for the Council to entrust a task to a group of member states. This article could be used in the context of rapid reaction, when consensus exists, and a group of member states is willing to provide capabilities and take action on behalf of the EU (The High Representative 2013: 7).

Those member states which are participating in the task are obliged to keep the Council regularly informed of its progress on their own initiative or at the request of another member state. Those states shall inform the Council immediately should the completion of the task entail major consequences or require amendment of the objective, scope and conditions determined for the task in the decisions referred to in paragraph 1. In such cases, the Council shall adopt the necessary decisions.

European Commission coordinated external activities

The Commission is responsible for the CFSP budget financing the common administrative costs of each CSDP mission not related to defence. Article 21.3 TEU emphasises the role of the Council and the Commission in order to ensure consistency in the field of external actions as follows:

> The Union shall ensure consistency between the different areas of its external action and between these and its other policies. The Council and the Commission, assisted by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, shall ensure that consistency and shall cooperate to that effect.

The 'consistency' principle was developed in the December 2013 Joint Communication on the EU Comprehensive Approach, and the ensuing May 2014 Council conclusions. Thus, 'CSDP is not to act in isolation from other EU external actions and instruments. On the contrary, it must act in sync with non-CFSP instruments for which Commission participation is required as a result of its responsibility to implement the EU budget as determined in articles 317 and 318 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the

EU' (de Ojeda 2017: 55). Non-CFSP EU external instruments include the geographic Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA), the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) and the Development Co-operation Instrument (DCI), as well as the extra-budgetary European Development Fund (EDF). The thematic Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP), the Partnership Instrument (PI), the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), the Instrument for Nuclear Safety Co-operation (INSC) and the DCI thematic programmes 'also belong to this category' (ibid). In addition, under the authority of the High Representative acting in her capacity as Vice-President, the Commission also implements the CFSP budget, which finances civilian missions, EU Special Representatives and non-proliferation and disarmaments projects (de Ojeda 2017: 55). Furthermore, the Commission manages other related external action policies such as international trade and humanitarian assistance, as well as internal policies with substantial and growing external dimensions – security, migration, climate, energy, transport, space, defence internal market, etc. – which are relevant to the EU's foreign, security and defence policy (de Ojeda 2017: 55). Thus, the Commission participates in the PSC and all Council bodies – including the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CivCom), the Politico-Military Group (PMG) and the EU Military Committee (EUMC) – discussing and preparing the decisions of the Foreign Affairs Council (FAC) in its different configurations: FAC, FAC Defence, FAC Development and FAC Trade (de Ojeda 2017: 55). Officials of the Commission are participating at the European External Action Service (EEAS). On October 30th, 2009 the European Council agreed on guidelines for the new European External Action Service – EEAS (doc. 14930/09). According to the guidelines, the EEAS will be a single service under the authority of the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy who is one of the Vice-Presidents of the European Commission (General Secretariat of the Council of the EU 2009). The High Representative conducts the Union's CFSP and contributes to the development of that policy and ensures implementation of the decisions adopted in this field.

The Commission itself is completely independent of national governments, so the members of the Commission are committed to acting in the interests

of the Union and not taking instructions from national governments. A new Commission is appointed every five years.
The European Commission has four main roles:

- to propose new laws to Parliament and the Council;
- to manage the EU's budget and allocate funding;
- to enforce EU law (jointly with the Court of Justice);
- to represent the EU on the international stage, 'for example by negotiating agreements between the EU and other countries' (European Commission 2011a).

In the context of citizen participation in third countries, the Commission run the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). EIDHR was launched in 2006 and building upon the European Initiative (2000-2006), its 'aim is to provide support for the promotion of democracy and human rights in non-EU countries' (European Commission 2011e). The key objectives of the EIDHR are: strengthening the role of civil society in promoting human rights and democratic reform, in supporting the peaceful conciliation of group interests and in consolidating political participation and representation; supporting and strengthening the international and regional framework for the protection of human rights, justice, the rule of law and the promotion of democracy (ibid). The EIDHR 'can grant aid where no established development cooperation exists, and can intervene without the agreement of the governments of third countries. It can support groups or individuals within civil society defending democracy as well as intergovernmental organisations that implement the international mechanisms for the protection of human rights' (ibid).

The European Parliament´s role in CFSP/CSDP

The number of Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) including the President of the European Parliament cannot exceed 751 and the breakdown of parliamentary seats between member states will be degressively proportional. The Lisbon Treaty also stipulates that no member state can have fewer than six or more than 96 seats:

> The European Parliament shall be composed of representatives of the Union's citizens. They shall not exceed seven hundred and fifty in number, plus the President. Representation of citizens shall be

> degressively proportional, with a minimum threshold of six members per Member State. No Member State shall be allocated more than ninety-six seats.
> The European Council shall adopt by unanimity, on the initiative of the European Parliament and with its consent, a decision establishing the composition of the European Parliament, respecting the principles referred to in the first subparagraph. (Article 14.2 TEU)

According to article 14.1 TEU, 'The European Parliament shall, jointly with the Council, exercise legislative and budgetary functions. It shall exercise functions of political control and consultation as laid down in the Treaties. It shall elect the President of the Commission.' As article 14.3 TEU states, 'The members of the European Parliament shall be elected for a term of five years by direct universal suffrage in a free and secret ballot'. According to article 14.4 TEU: 'The European Parliament shall elect its President and its officers from among its members.'

In particular the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union are involved in the decision-making process at EU level. New legislation is generally proposed by the European Commission, but it is the Council and the European Parliament that pass the laws. Directives and regulations are the main forms of EU law. The co-decision procedure which was introduced by the EU Maastricht Treaty increased the influence of the European Parliament significantly. In this procedure, the Parliament shares legislative power equally with the Council. In the meantime the co-decision procedure has been used for most EU law-making. This procedure gives the European Parliament the opportunity to negotiate directly with the Council in a conciliation committee, composed of equal numbers of Council and Parliament representatives. This only happens in the event of a lack of agreement on a proposal. Once this committee has reached an agreement (time limit six weeks), the text is sent once again to Parliament and the Council so that they can finally adopt it as law. The Council and the European Parliament have six weeks to adopt the bill (Folketinget 2011). The Council of Ministers (e.g. agriculture, economy, transportation, justice and home affairs) generally takes a decision by qualified majority, while the European Parliament has to approve the bill by a majority of the votes cast (ibid). However, if neither the Council nor the European Parliament can approve the bill within the

time limit of six weeks, the proposal is automatically rejected (ibid). Conciliation is becoming increasingly rare. Most laws passed in co-decision are, in fact, adopted either at the first or second reading. The co-decision procedure is divided into three phases. Whether final adoption takes place during the first or second reading, or whether the proposal must go through a third reading depends on the parties' willingness to negotiate (ibid).

Foreign policy, security and defence are matters over which the national governments retain independent control. However, they did not pool their national sovereignty in these areas, therefore the European Parliament and the Commission play only a limited role here. The CFSP 'shall be put into effect by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and by Member States, … The specific role of the European Parliament and of the Commission in this area is defined by the Treaties. …' (Article 24.1 TEU)

According to article 36 TEU

> The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy shall regularly consult the European Parliament on the main aspects and the basic choices of the common foreign and security policy and the common security and defence policy and inform it of how those policies evolve. He shall ensure that the views of the European Parliament are duly taken into consideration. Special representatives may be involved in briefing the European Parliament.
> The European Parliament may ask questions of the Council or make recommendations to it and to the High Representative. Twice a year it shall hold a debate on progress in implementing the common foreign and security policy, including the common security and defence policy.

Relating to the European External Action Service (EEAS), the European Parliament may exercise budgetary control in all questions not related to the responsibilities of the member states. European 'diplomats' could be invited to contribute hearings by the Members of the European Parliament (MEPs).

Financing CSDP

The Union's annual budget is decided jointly by the Council and the European Parliament. According to article 41.2 TEU:

> Operating expenditure to which the implementation of this Chapter gives rise shall … be charged to the Union budget, except for such expenditure arising from operations having military or defence implications and cases where the Council acting unanimously decides otherwise.
> In cases where expenditure is not charged to the Union budget, it shall be charged to the Member States in accordance with the gross national product scale, unless the Council acting unanimously decides otherwise. As for expenditure arising from operations having military or defence implications, Member States whose representatives in the Council have made a formal declaration under Article 31(1), second subparagraph, shall not be obliged to contribute to the financing thereof.

Relating to article 41.3 TEU:

> The Council shall adopt a decision establishing the specific procedures for guaranteeing rapid access to appropriations in the Union budget for urgent financing of initiatives in the framework of the common foreign and security policy, and in particular for preparatory activities for the tasks referred to in Article 42(1) and Article 43. It shall act after consulting the European Parliament.

Civilian crisis-management operations are funded from the CFSP budget which is established following the budgetary procedure laid down for the Community budget.

Operations with military implications or defence operations cannot be financed from Community funds. For the common costs of such operations, the Council of the EU has set up a special mechanism (Athena) that was established on March 1st, 2004 (EU Council Secretariat 2006: 1). Athena administers 'the financing of common costs of EU operations having military or defence implications' (ibid). A review is foreseen after every operation and at least every 18 months respectively. Athena is managed by a Special Committee (SC) composed of representatives of EU States (contributors). The European Commission attends the SC meetings

(ibid: 3). The Operations Commander 'is the authorising officer for the operation he commands. Where there is no Operations Commander, Athena's administrator becomes the authority officer' (ibid: 2). Member states have the choice either to pay contributions in anticipation of a possible rapid reaction operation or to pay within five days.

The Council decision establishing Athena includes a list of common costs which are financed by all contributing states. The Operation Commander is the authorising officer for the operation he commands. Where there is no Operation Commander, Athena's administrator is the authorizing officer. During the preparatory phase of an operation (i.e. before the Operation Commander is appointed), Athena finances inter alia the costs for transport and accommodation necessary for exploratory missions and preparations (in particular fact-finding missions) by military and civilian personnel (Council of the European Union 2014: 1). As of the date when the Operation Commander is appointed, Athena finances most incremental costs for Operation-, Force- and Component Headquarters, as well as for example incremental costs for infrastructure, essential additional equipment and evacuation for persons in need of urgent medical evacuation (Medevac) (ibid). Finally, the Special Committee may decide that certain expenditures that do not figure on the list of common costs can be financed in common for a given operation. For instance barracks / lodging for the forces, certain types of medical services and facilities in theatre, or even demining and chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear protection, insofar as necessary for the operation. Transport of the forces and multinational task-forces headquarters however remain under the Council's competence. Athena administers the financing of the common costs of the following operations/actions: Operation EUFOR Althea, Operation EUNAVFOR Atalanta, EU Training Mission Somalia, EU Training Mission Mali (Council of the European Union 2014: 2). In addition, Athena is managing the 'Nation borne costs', i.e. items such as fuel, water and food which are being paid by the member states and third states which contribute forces to operations, on the basis of their consumption (Council of the European Union 2014: 2). In order to improve the rapid reaction capability for the EU, an early financing fund was set up in 2005 (ibid). It is designed for rapid response operations for which contributions are rapidly needed. Member states have the choice either to pay contributions to the fund in anticipation or to pay their contribution to a rapid response

operation within five days (Council of the European Union 2014: 2). Participating states are member states of the EU except Denmark (as it has opted out of actions with defence implications under the EU Treaty). Third states participating in a military operation may contribute to its financing (Council of the European Union 2014: 2). As third states, the EEAS and the Commission are also invited to attend the Special Committee's meetings, but without taking a vote (ibid).

The Council shall adopt by a qualified majority, on proposal from the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, decisions establishing:

- the procedures for setting up and financing the start-up fund, in particular the amounts allocated to the fund;
- the procedures for administering the start-up fund;
- the financial control procedures.

The High Representative shall report to the Council on the implementation of this remit (ibid). If expenditure is not charged to the Union budget, it will be generally charged to the member states in accordance with their gross national product (unless the Council unanimously decides otherwise). The rather new aspect, which was introduced by the TEU (Lisbon) is the creation of a so-called start-up fund. Preparatory activities for the tasks referred to articles 42.1 and 43 TEU which are not charged to the Union budget will be financed by a start-up fund made up of member states' contributions. The Council will then authorise the High Representative to use the fund (ibid). The EU Treaty (article 42.2 TEU) does not allow for the Union's budget to finance expenditure with military and defence implications. Up until now EU military CSDP missions and operations have been financed exclusively through the Athena mechanism, and support to partners' military peace support operations has been limited to African-led operations through the African Peace Facility.

EU crisis management

In order to provide political control and strategic direction in a crisis, the European Union Council (Nice, December 2000) decided to establish new permanent political and military structures within the Council of the European Union. These new structures are:

- The Political and Security Committee (PSC);
- The European Union Military Committee (EUMC);
- The European Union Military Staff (EUMS), composed of military and civilian experts and seconded to the Council Secretariat by the member states (Perruche 2006: 6).
- The PSC meets at the ambassadorial level as a preparatory body for the Council of the EU. Its main functions are keeping track of the international situation and helping to define policies within the CFSP. Including the ESDP. It prepares a coherent response to a crisis and exercises political control and strategic direction.

The PSC is assisted by a politico-military group, a committee for civilian aspects of crisis management, as well as the European Union Military Committee (EUMC) and the European Union Military Staff (EUMS). The work of PSC is prepared by the 'Nicolaidis group', so called after its first chairman (Amorim 2017: 53). The politico-military group carries out preparatory work in the field of CSDP for the PSC. It covers the political aspects of EU military-civ/mil issues, including concepts, capabilities and operations and missions; the PMG prepares Council conclusions and provides recommendations for the PSC, monitors their effective implementation and facilitates exchanges of information (Amorim 2017: 53). It has a particular responsibility regarding partnerships with non-EU countries and international organisations, including EU-NATO relations, as well as exercises. It is chaired by a representative of the High Representative and is composed of member states delegates (Amorim 2017: 54) The EUMC provides military advice to the PSC and the High Representative and exercises military command over all military activities. On January 22nd, 2001, the EUMC, a body of military representatives comprised of member states' Chiefs of Defence, was established as a Council group to give military advice to the PSC and to direct the work of the EUMS. The EUMC is the forum for military consultation and co-

operation between EU member states in the field of conflict prevention and crisis management. It is not legally subordinate to the PSC, but advises it on the Concept of [Military] Operations (CONOPS) developed by the Operation Commander and the associated Operation Plan (OPLAN). It is the Operation Commander, especially appointed for a new crisis management operation, who supervises the actual military planning. The planning for the actual military operations will be a decision of the 'Committee of Contributors', an ad hoc group to be formed from countries contributing military units to an EU force. The EUMS is responsible for early warning (via the Single Intelligence Analysis Capability – SIAC), situation assessment, strategic planning, communications and information systems, cyber capabilities, logistics, concept development, training and education, and support of partnerships through military-military relationships (Amorim 2017: 70). It supplies military expertise. The EUMS is responsible for running the EU Operations Centre (OPSCEN) and providing the Centre's core staff when it is brought into play. This OPSCEN was activated in 2012 for CSDP missions and operations in the Horn of Africa. Its duty is to support planning and conduct of the missions, and to facilitate coordination and interaction among the EU funded activities for the region. The Centre would be able to lead military operations and missions as an Operational Headquarters (OHQ). In addition, a Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC) was established within EUMS. The MPCC is the new command centre for EU military training and advisory missions and a permanent planning and conduct capability for non-executive EU military missions. The Director of MPCC has assumed the functions of mission's commander for the EU`s non-executive military CSDP missions – at present three EUTMs in the Central African Republic, Mali and in Somalia (EEAS 2017: 21). The EUMS is responsible for the planning and conduct of all military non-executive missions at the military strategic level. The EUMS is composed of five directorates: Concept and capability, Intelligence, Operations, Logistics, Communications and Information Systems (Amorim 2017: 70).

The European Union Military Committee Working Group (EUMCWG) supports and assists the EUMC in its work on military matters within the EU framework. It carries out tasks assigned to it by the EUMC, such as the drafting of military advice and military concepts, and reports to the EUMC (ibid: 53).

The Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CivCom) advises the PSC on civilian aspects of crisis management. It prepares planning documents for new missions, provides advice to the PSC, and deals with the development of strategies for civilian crisis management and for civilian capabilities. It is chaired by a representative of the High Representative and is composed of member states' delegates (ibid: 54).

The Working Party of Foreign Relations Counsellors (RELEX) deals with the legal, financial and institutional issues of the CSDP. Its priorities include sanctions, EU crisis management missions and operations, EU special representatives, financing of external activities, non-proliferation matters, and other crosscutting issues in the CFSP/CSDP domain (ibid). In 2004, a new formation called 'sanctions' was created within the working party. Its main task is to share best practice, and to revise and implement common guidelines and to ensure effective and uniform implementation of EU sanctions regime. RELEX is chaired by a representative of the rotating Presidency of the Council (ibid).

The Deputy Secretary-General of the EEAS, is responsible for the CSDP and crisis management structures. These structures comprise, in particular

- The Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD);
- The Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC);
- The EU Military Staff (EUMS);
- The Security and Conflict Prevention Directorate (SECPOL);
- The EU Intelligence and Situation Centre (INTCEN).

In December 2016, a new division complemented the crisis management structures, which deals with prevention of conflicts, rule of law / security sector reform, integrated approach, stabilization and mediation (PRISM) as a focal point within the EEAS. It is located in the organisation chart immediately below Deputy Secretary-General, Pedro Serrano and linked with a dotted line to the Deputy Secretary-General for Political Affairs. PRISM coordinates EU responses to the conflict cycle, including conflict analysis, early warning, conflict prevention and peacebuilding, mediation, security sector reform and the rule of law, crisis response and stabilisation. Integrated approach to conflicts and crises outlines how to ensure rapid

and effective crisis response, from building greater synergies between the EEAS Crisis Response Mechanism, the European Commission's Emergency Response Coordination Centre (ERCC) and other emergency response systems in different EU institutions, to the deployment of CSDP crises management and capacity building missions and operations (EEAS 2017: 18). The European Commission's Emergency Response Coordination Centre monitors natural disasters 24/7. On July 16th, 2018, Sweden requested EU assistance to battle the unprecedented forest fires as hundreds of hectares burned in the regions of Jamtland, Gavleborg, Dalarna, Norrbotten and Västerbotten (European Commission 2018a: 1). Therefore, the Commission mobilised firefighting aircrafts from Italy and France through the EU's Civil Protection Mechanism, which have since been operating in the affected areas. Further EU support has been offered by Germany, Lithuania, Poland and Denmark. The following has been channelled through the EU Civil Protection Mechanism:

- 5 planes: 2 from Italy and 3 from France. These were highly specialised Canadair water bombing planes as well as one reconnaissance plane.
- 6 firefighting helicopters: 5 from Germany and 1 from Lithuania.
- Firefighters and vehicles: 44 vehicles from Poland and 139 firefighters, as well as 12 vehicles and 55 personnel from Denmark.

The EU's emergency Copernicus satellite was also helping Sweden provide damage assessment maps of the affected areas (ibid).

The division acts as a centre of expertise on policy, programming, training, technical support and operational issues across the phases of the conflict cycle. PRISM is composed of four thematic teams:

- Early Warning System and Conflict Prevention;
- Mediation Support Team;
- Stabilization and Crisis Response Team;
- Rule of law, security sector reform, Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) team (Amorim 2017: 69 and 72).

CMPD works in close cooperation with the EUMS, CPCC and other relevant crisis management bodies, including the European Commission. CMPD comprises of four divisions:

- Coordination;
- Capabilities, concepts, training and exercises;
- Integrated strategic planning;
- CSDP partnerships and agreements (ibid: 70).

The CMPD has been tasked, strategically and politically with planning and following up civilian and military CSDP missions and operations. CMPD, as the primary service for political strategic planning on CSDP, prepares the Crisis Management Concept (CMC) in consultation with, and supported by, the relevant EEAS services. CMC analyses and proposes strategic policy options. Military and Civilian Strategic Options (MSO/CSO) are optional – if requested by EUMC/CIVCOM. The MSOs are developed by the EUMS, the CSOs by the CPCC. Both have to be approved by the PSC and the Council.

The EU Intelligence Analysis Centre (EUIntcen) is the exclusive civilian intelligence service of the EU, providing intelligence analysis, early warning and situational awareness to the High Representative. It monitors and assesses international events 24 hours a day, seven days a week, focusing in particular on sensitive geographical regions, terrorism and the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and other global threats. The EU Intcen has no formal mandate to collect intelligence as traditionally understood (Amorim 2017: 70-71). Its analytical products are based on intelligence from EU member states' intelligence and security services and on open-source intelligence (OSINT). In cooperation with the EUMS Intelligence Directorate, EU IntCen produces intelligence reports under the heading of Single Intelligence Analysis Capacity (SIAC), which combines civilian and military intelligence (Amorim 2017: 71). EU IntCen has its roots in the Joint Situation Centre set up in 1999 as an open-source intelligence unit under the supervision of the High Representative, Javier Solana. In the wake of 9/11, Solana decided to use the Joint Situation Centre to start producing intelligence-based classified assessments. In 2002 it was renamed the EU Joint Situation Centre (SITCEN) and was made a directorate of the General Secretariat of the Council of the EU. This centre started to be a forum for exchange of sensitive information between the external intelligence services of France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the UK. At the request of the then-High

Representative, Javier Solana, the Council on the European Union agreed in June 2004 to establish within SITCEN a Counter Terrorist Cell. This cell was tasked with producing counter terrorist intelligence analysis with the support of member states' security services. When the European External Action Service (EEAS) was founded in 2010 it became one of its directorates. In 2012, it was renamed the EU Intelligence Analysis Centre (EU Intcen). IntCen is composed of four divisions: intelligence analysis, open-source intelligence, situation room, consular crisis management (ibid: 71).

The Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC) was established in August 2007 as a permanent structure to conduct autonomous, operational civilian CSDP crisis management missions at strategic level. The Civilian Operation Commander is the Director of the CPCC. He exercises command and control at strategic level for the planning and conduct of all civilian CSDP missions under the political control and strategic direction of the Political and Security Committee and the overall authority of the High Representative. CPCC thus acts as the permanent operational headquarters for civilian CSDP missions. It is responsible for the operational planning and conduct of civilian CSDP crisis management missions and oversees the implementation of all mission-related tasks. CPCC provides support for missions, is involved in developing doctrine and concepts and provides missions with guidance on cross-cutting issues (Amorim 2017: 71). CPCC is composed of three divisions: conduct of operations, chief of staff / horizontal coordination, mission support (ibid).

The Directorate for Security Policy and Conflict Prevention (SECPOL) supports the High Representative's task of framing policies to fulfil the EU's objective to preserve peace, prevent conflicts and strengthen international security in accordance with article 21.2 of the Treaty on EU. It provides the various crisis management bodies with conflict risk assessments. It uses conflict analysis to assess the impact on actual and potential conflicts of a planned CSDP mission, supports the development of conflict mitigation strategies and conflict prevention missions, and contributes to the overall expertise on conflict, peace and security inside the crisis management bodies. In addition, SECPOL's responsibilities cover disarmament, non-proliferation, arms export control, the sanctions regime, and the fight against terrorism and organised crime, as well as addressing

external security threats, including those relating to outer space, and the maritime and cyber domains. SECPOL is composed of four divisions:

- Disarmament – non-proliferation and arms export control;
- Counter-terrorism;
- Security policy and space policy;
- Sanctions policy (ibid).

The Emergency Response Coordination Centre (ERCC), operating within the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid & Civil Protection Department (ECHO), was set up to support a coordinated and quicker response to disasters both inside and outside Europe using resources from 31 countries participating in the Union Civil Protection Mechanism.

The EUMS is to perform early warning, situational awareness and strategic planning within the framework of crisis management outside of EU member states' territories. It is thus be responsible for peacekeeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management (including peacemaking) and further tasks identified in the ESS, such as joint disarmament operations, support for third countries in combating terrorism and security sector reform. The mission of the EUMS also includes identifying European and multinational forces as well as implementing policies and decisions as directed by the EUMC (Perruche 2006: 6). The EUMS ensures the necessary military expertise for the internal work within the EU. It plans, assesses and makes recommendations regarding the concept of crisis management and general military strategy, and implements the decisions of, and guidance by, the EUMC. It also supports the EUMC with regard to situation assessment and military aspects of strategic planning over the full range of EU-led military operations, either with or without access to common NATO assets and capabilities (ibid: 7). The EUMS staff provided military advice on the Crisis Management Concept of the military operations, developed and prioritised the necessary Military Strategic Options, prepared the Initiating Military Directives, and elaborated military advice on the Operational Planning Process Documents that were prepared by the respective operation commanders. The military and civilian operation commanders present the Concept of Operations (CONOPS) and the PSC submits it to the Council for approval. The Force Generation Process is conducted by the operation commanders and the mission

commander (Head of Mission). The civilian and military operation commander prepares their respective draft Operation Plan (OPLAN). The Council adopts the OPLAN and adapts a decision launching the mission or operation. The EUMS helps the member states to elaborate, assess and review capability goals, thereby striving for consistency with NATO's Defence Planning Process (NDPP), and also taking into account the Planning and Review Process (PARP) of Partnership for Peace (PfP) in accordance with procedures agreed. A further task of the EUMS is to establish appropriate relations with the UN and other international organisations (e.g. the African Union). Through its Civilian/Military Cell, it undertakes strategic contingency planning at the initiative of the Secretary-General/High Representative or the PSC. The Civilian/Military Cell helps to develop doctrines concerning civilian/military operations, and prepares concepts and procedures for the EU Operations Centre. The Civilian/Military Cell has already assisted successfully in the planning of the civilian ESDP missions in Aceh, thereby illustrating the possibilities of close Civil-Military Cooperation (ibid).

Military training in the EU

Strategic theory teaches us that we should set ourselves objectives. 'Military Erasmus is not a goal in itself. It is a tool to improve training and as a consequence operational effectiveness in the long run. It is also a tool to find ways of providing military education and training to our young officers in the most efficient and effective way possible. Finally, it's a tool to ensure the quality of our military education on a European level by sharing best practices.' (Paile and Gell 2013: 10). The exchange of young officers inspired by Erasmus was launched by the Ministers of Defence during the French Presidency of the EU on November 11th, 2008. EU defence ministers adopted the European initiative which 'is intended to strengthen the interoperability of the armed forces of the EU member states and to promote a European security and defence culture through an enhancement of the exchange of young officers during the initial phase of their officer training' (Weisserth 2013: 8). The Presidency of the Council of the EU tasked the European Security and Defence College (ESDC) to implement the recommendations for the creation of a European Initiative for the Exchange of Young Officers, inspired by Erasmus. Europeanization means 'to increase the intercultural competence and interoperability of our future officers' (Paile and Gell 2013: 13). Thus, it is a necessity by all means. The flagship course offered by the ESDC (strategic and partly operational training under ESDC), the High-Level Course, is run each year and targets decision makers in the EU institutions, agencies and the EU member states. The Senior Mission Leaders Course trains future Heads of Mission and Force Commanders. An Advanced Political Advisor Course, a Legal Advisor Course and a Gender Advisor Course aim to provide human resources for future specialised headquarters staff. A number of courses deal with horizontal issues such as Strategic Mission Planning, Capability Development and Security Sector Reform (SSR) (Weisserth 2014: 11).

The ESDC provides training and education in the field of the Union's Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) in the context of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) at EU level 'in order to develop and promote a common understanding of CSDP among civilian and military personnel, and to identify and disseminate, through its training activities, good practice in relation to various CSDP issues (European Security and Defence College 2018: 8).

ESDC was founded in 2005. Before, there was 'no single entity in the EU devoted to training and education at European level or the development of a common European security culture' (ibid: 9). It was only in 2002 that the Greek Presidency introduced what it called 'common training' as one of the presidency priorities. The task of common training 'involved developing a European security culture by providing knowledgeable personnel both in the EU member states and within the EU institutions' (ibid). The EU member states are the political masters of the college. They convene in a Steering Committee, which is chaired by a representative of the High Representative (ibid: 10). The Committee gives political guidance and strategic direction on issues relating to the academic training programme. The programme encompasses all the training activities offered in the course of the academic year, which runs from September to July. A small but efficient international Secretariat located in Brussels facilitates the conduct of training activities and the organization of meetings in various formats (ibid: 10). The ESDC was created as a network college and therefore relies on certified national institutions. They provide training on a 'costs lie where they fall' basis. The college is currently composed of around 140 national training institutes, including military academies within the military Erasmus programme. Network members range from national defence academies to peace universities, from police colleges to diplomatic training institutes. ESDC is embedded in the European External Actions Service (EEAS), but has its own legal capacity. The ESDC is organised in a four tier structure

- The Steering Committee is responsible for the overall coordination and direction of the ESDC training activities.
- The Executive Academic Board ensures the quality and coherence of the ESDC training activities.
- The Head of the ESDC is responsible for the financial and administrative management of the ESDC, as well as assisting the Committee and the Board in organizing and managing ESDC activities.
- The ESDC Secretariat assists the head of the ESDC in fulfilling his tasks (ibid: 16).

The Executive Academic Board is supported by specific configurations that ensure the involvement of experts:

- Security Sector Reform: This board configuration benefits from the expertise of member states and EU institutions in the field of SSR, cooperating closely with the EU Task Force on SSR;
- Military Erasmus: introduced under the French EU presidency in 2008, this initiative aims to standardise and harmonise basic training for officers within the EU member states.
- E-learing, cyber security, internet performance;
- Working group on CSDP missions and operations training: it contributes to the coordination, coherence and quality of training of personnel for CSDP missions and operations.
- Doctoral school: aims to pool training offered by European higher education institutions and non-academic institutions (ibid: 17).

Strong ties have been established between the ESDC and the Directorate General for Neighbourhood Policy and Enlargement negotiations (DG NEAR). TAIEX, a European Commission Technical Assistance and Information Exchange instrument managed by DG NEAR, finances ESDC training activities directed at the implementation and facilitation of accession efforts. The Eastern Partnership Platform, also within DG NEAR, provides similar support to ESDC activities for the Eastern Partnership countries. Other Commission directorates also provide support to meet specific training needs. They include DG HOME (counter terrorism), DG MOVE (maritime security) and DG DEVCO (security, development) (ibid: 25).

'Defence matters'

We have to 'prioritise European capability cooperation over national procurement and enter into concrete pooling and sharing agreements among willing partners'. With the EU defence package of 2009, member states and the European Parliament took the first supranational legislative step towards an internal EU defence market. However, the Commission still has to provide evidence of the strict interpretation of article 346 (TFEU) limiting member states 'to make extensive use of the exemptions from internal market rules for national security reasons' (EPP Group in the European Parliament 2013: 8). As the European Commission states:

- 'Since 2010, less than €200 million has been spent each year on collaborative European Research and Development in the field of defence. From 2021, we will more than triple this figure to over €600 million.'
- 'Around 80 percent of defence procurement and more than 90 percent of R&T are run on a purely national basis, leading to a costly duplication of military capabilities.' (European Commission 2017b: 15)
- 'More Europe in defence will have a positive spill-over effect on the European economy.' The European defence industry generates a total turnover of €100 billion per year, a sector that employs 500,000 people and 1.2 million people indirectly (Banks 2018b: 18).
- 'Less than 3 percent of European troops (40,000) are deployable due to lack of interoperability and shortages in equipment. This compares to 190,000 deployable troops in the US' (European Commission 2017b: 15).

The European Council made important decisions on defence at its summit on December 19th-20th, 2013. This summit was dedicated to security and defence issues:

> The need for a fresh start derives from outside and within the EU:
> - the changing strategic environment with old threats and new risks to Europe's security;
> - the clear message from the US that Europeans should assume their responsibility and care for their own security in their neighbourhood;

- the uncoordinated cuts in national defence budgets as a consequence of the sovereign debts and financial crisis;
- member states' ignorance to implement the new provisions of the Lisbon Treaty in the field of security and defence. (EPP Group in the European Parliament 2013: 1)

However, according to the European People´s Party (EPP) proposals,

> in the short term, the heads of state and government have to politically guarantee to …
> - review national defence capabilities and identify the capabilities needed for the protection of EU's interests;
> - better link civilian and military capabilities and personnel for CSDP missions;
> - better implement the comprehensive approach;
> - activate the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) as well as the other instruments which the EU has at its disposal and which have not been used yet.' (ibid: 1-2)

In the mid-term, the heads of state and government have to commit themselves to …

- 'set up an EU strategic civilian and military headquarters with separate chains of command;
- launch the preparation of an EU White Book on Security and Defence in defining EU's security interests, prioritizing its strategic objectives and linking these with the operational deployments;
- deliver more and better fitted civilian and military personnel and capabilities in service of CSDP missions.' (ibid: 2)

In the long run, the heads of state or government have to give political guidance on how to

- 'exercise permanently their strategic oversight, with a view to taking the necessary decisions on establishing a common Union defence policy and establishing regular formal Council meetings on defence;
- build a solid European Defence Technological and Industrial Basis (EDTIB) as the basis for a well-functioning European Defence Equipment Market (EDEM);
- further develop the EU as a regional security provider and also as a strong European pillar of NATO;

- go beyond the Lisbon Treaty and establish European stand-by forces under Union command.' (ibid 2) (EPP proposals)

During the European Council meeting of December 2013 heads of state or government supported a more systematic and long-term approach to cooperation through increased transparency and information-sharing in defence planning. At this European Council, heads of states and government endorsed four major capability programmes proposed and prepared by the EDA, three of these four were on the 'Ghent list':

- Air-to-air refuelling, with the objective of establishing a multinational fleet by 2019;
- Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems, with the objective of laying the foundations for a European solution in the 2020-25 timeframe;
- Governmental Satellite Communication, with the objective of preparing the next generation in the 2025 timeframe;
- Cyber defence with a focus on technology, training and protection of EU assets.

Then-European Commission president Jean-Claude Juncker declared on July 15th, 2014: 'I also believe that we need to work on a stronger Europe when it comes to security and defence matters. Yes, Europe is chiefly a soft power. But even the strongest soft powers cannot make do in the long run without at least some integrated defence capacities.' (European Commission 2017b: 4) In the Rome declaration of March 25th, 2017, EU heads of state or government adopted their following political goal:

> a Union ready to take more responsibilities, to assist in creating a more competitive and integrated defence industry, a Union committed to strengthening its common security and defence also in cooperation and complementarity with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization taking into account national circumstances and legal commitments […]. (European Commission 2017: 4)

The Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO)

Coordinated force planning in the EU and trans-Atlantic contexts are based on the Headline Goal Catalogue 2010, the EU Framework Nation Concept, and the criteria of force planning within the NATO Partnership for Peace. Particularly in times of heavy defence expenditure cuts, European nations tend to pool and share resources to plug looming gaps. European countries have become richer, they have spent less on defence:

> Since the end of the Cold War, defence spending by the European NATO countries has fallen by almost 20 percent. Over the same period, their combined GDP grew by around 55 percent. … By the end of the Cold War, in 1991, defence expenditures in European countries represented almost 34 percent of NATO's total, with the United States and Canada covering the remaining 66 percent. Since then, the share of NATO's security burden shouldered by European countries has fallen to 21 percent. (Rasmussen 2011: 3)

While defence spending of European NATO allies has gone down by roughly 20 per cent over the past decade, Chinese defence spending has risen by almost 200 per cent. In 2012, 'for the first time in centuries, Asian nations spent more on military force than European countries' (Rachman 2013: 1). Britain's Royal Air Force in 2012 had just a quarter of the number of combat aircraft it had in the 1970s. The Royal Navy has 19 destroyers and frigates, compared with 69 in 1977. The British army was scheduled to shrink to 82,000 soldiers, its smallest size since the Napoleonic wars. In 1990 Britain had 27 submarines (excluding those that carry ballistic missiles) and France had 17. In 2012 the two countries had seven and six respectively (Rachman 2013: 1).

The lack of cooperation between member states in the field of defence and security is estimated 'to cost annually between €25 billion and €100 billion. This is 'because of inefficiencies, lack of competition and lack of economies of scale for industry and production' (European Security and Defence College 2017: 25). Around 80 percent of defence procurement is run on a purely national basis, leading to a costly duplication of military capabilities (ibid). 'More Europe in defence will have a positive spill-over effect on the European economy. The European defence industry

generates a total turnover of €100 billion per year and 1.4 million highly skilled people directly or indirectly employed in Europe. Each euro invested in defence generates a return of €1.6 in particular in skilled employment, research and technology and exports' (European Security and Defence College 2017: 25). Furthermore, 'Europe can no longer afford to rely on the military might of others. We have to take responsibility for protecting our interests and the European way of life. It is only by working together that Europe will be able to defend itself at home and abroad.' (Jean-Claude Juncker, State of the European Union, European Parliament, Strasbourg, 14 September 2016) (European Security and Defence College 2017: 25). In the run-up to the initial air strikes by US, British and French aircraft and naval vessels in Libya in 2011, it became obvious that the EU lacked the planning and command and control capacity to run such a relatively limited campaign. Even though Northwood and Mont Valérian Headquarters are permanently staffed, national and multinational commands have not been used for a complex operation. Thus, participants in the Libyan war used the US facility at Ramstein Air Base, and then NATO centres. The Libyan experience has shown the need for a permanent European planning and command and control function (Tran and Chuter 2011: 14).

Since the Brexit referendum in the UK and the publication of the EU Global Strategy in June 2016, there has been a flurry of proposals by member states to deepen defence cooperation in the context of the EU (Biscop 2017a: 2). Most notable among these were two Franco-German papers, first by the two foreign and then by the two defence ministers, and a proposal by the French, German, Italian and Spanish defence ministers. Most notable, because without both France and Germany involved, no initiative can reach the scale to make it worthwhile. However, if France, Germany, Italy and Spain were to go ahead and do it, that would create the kind of momentum necessary to make it work. 'It would be Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) (Biscop 2017a: 2). The Franco-German-Italian-Spanish paper sees this unused provision of the Lisbon Treaty as 'a fundamental instrument'. It allows for the creation of a smaller group (which can mean any number below twenty-seven), of member states 'whose military capabilities fulfil higher criteria and which have made more binding commitments to one another in this area with a view to the most demanding missions', and who would cooperate 'within the Union

framework' (article 42.6 TEU). The Protocol on PESCO annexed to the Treaty lists five broad commitments participating member states have to make:

- To agree on the level of investment in defence equipment;
- to 'bring their defence apparatus into line with each other as far as possible', by harmonizing military needs, pooling, and specialization;
- to enhance their forces' availability, interoperability, flexibility and deployability, notably by setting 'common objectives regarding the commitment of forces';
- to address the commonly identified capability shortfalls, including through multinational approaches;
- to take part in equipment projects in the context of the European Defence Agency (EDA) (Biscop 2017a: 2).

Relating to Article 42.6 TEU, those

> Member States whose military capabilities fulfil higher criteria and which have made more binding commitments to one another in this area with a view to the most demanding missions shall establish permanent structured cooperation within the Union framework.

These states should notify their intention to the Council and to the High Representative of the Union Minister for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (article 46.1 TEU). The Council acts by a qualified majority after consulting the High Representative of the Union Minister for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (article 46.2 TEU), but only members of the Council representing the participating member states take part in the vote. By 2014, this qualified majority is defined as at least 55 percent of the members of the Council representing the participating member states, comprising at least 65 percent of the population of these states. A blocking minority must include at least the minimum number of Council members representing more than 35 percent of the population of the participating member states, plus one member, failing which the qualified majority shall be deemed attained (article 238.3 TFEU). Participating member states could also make use of Union structures such as the Political and Security Committee (PSC) and the EU Military Committee (EUMC). However,

operations undertaken by that group of member states would not be Union operations.

Article 2 of the Protocol on PESCO attached to the Lisbon Treaty states how PESCO objectives are to be achieved. The member states to take part in PESCO should commit to agree on objectives for the level of investment in defence equipment, to 'bring their defence apparatus into line with each other as far as possible', by harmonizing military needs, pooling, and, 'where appropriate', specialization, to enhance their forces' availability, interoperability, flexibility and deployability, notably by setting 'common objectives regarding the commitment of forces'; to address the shortfalls identified by the Capability Development Mechanism (CDM), including through multinational approaches; to take part, 'where appropriate', in equipment programmes in the context of the European Defence Agency (EDA). The final Article 3 states that EDA 'shall contribute to' a regular assessment of participating member states' contributions (Biscop 2008: 2).

EU defence expenditure has been low, inefficient and uncoordinated for decades. EU governments should 'tackle the decline of European military capabilities by raising defence budgets, by integrating and coordinating their spending and by reducing waste and duplication' (Gilli 2011: 52). The good news is that in the coming years, based on their procurement plans, EU nations should have a number of new strategic capabilities such as: A400M and more C-17 transport planes; A330 air tankers; Eurofighter, Rafale and Joint-Strike-Fighter jets; and French-British aircraft carriers. EU defence ministers will also be able to use Galileo – a satellite navigation system – to guide their equipment and define their positions. All this equipment will greatly add to the military prowess of Europe's armies in the future. Britain has warned the EU it will build its own navigational satellite system if it is locked out of access to key defence-grade data from the Galileo network now being built by Brussels. Then Defence Secretary Gevin Williamson said the country will respond to threats to deny it access to the military data needed to accurately target missiles by developing its own, rival system. Britain could go it alone or team with other countries such as Japan, Australia and South Korea to build its own navigational satellite capabilities. Britain has supplied much of the encryption and know-how for Galileo. A support facility capable of receiving military data from

Galileo has already been moved from England to Madrid, Spain, and British companies have recently been locked out of further Galileo contracts. The full network of some 30 Galileo satellites is expected to be operational around 2021 (Chuter 2018: 22). For years Britain has relied on US GPS for its military data. Russia and China also have navigational systems in orbit (Chuter 2018: 22).

The long-awaited European medium-altitude long-endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) will rely on the new Galileo satellite system for navigation, but also use GPS as a backup. The 'Eurodrone' is being developed by Airbus, Dassault and Italy's Leonardo in a bid to end Europe's reliance on US and Israeli UAVs. UAVs are only as autonomous as the satellite navigation links they use, and the launch of the Eurodrone has coincided with the introduction of Galileo, the satellite network that may wean Europe off US GPS dependence. The drone will use Galileo from the start, and 'will probably be dual mode, with GPS as a redundancy measure' initially, said Giovanni Soccodato, Leonardo's head of strategy, markets and business development (ibid). The EU refuses to give the British access to military-grade data from the Galileo navigational satellite system once Brexit kicks in. The British have invested more than 1 billion pounds ($1.3billion) in the new Galileo and supplied much of the ultrasensitive encryption technology, but have been excluded from other contracts on the system. That has gone down poorly in London, where the government has threatened to build its own satellite system and sue the EU for a reimbursement on the Galileo project (Defense News 2018b: 33).

The EU wants to quicken the pace of moving military equipment across countries on the continent to prepare for future crises, according to a planning document. The project is billed as a key prerequisite for an ambitious project to build European defence capabilities outside of NATO, though still in support of alliance objectives and comes after years of deteriorating relations with Russia. There are still bureaucratic hurdles toward the free flow of military equipment from Portugal to the Baltics and anywhere in between. A pilot exercise initiated by Estonia in 2017 demonstrated the viability of beginning larger-scale planning for a Europe-wide transportation network capable of handling heavy equipment like tanks. That drill examined the ability for countries along a North Sea-Baltic corridor to pass equipment from one end to the other. The exercise

uncovered height and weight restrictions on some bridges and put a spotlight on the lack of heavy-loading equipment used for oversized military materiel travelling by rail. The directive builds heavily on the idea of advancing dual-use scenarios, or tweaking transportation infrastructure meant for civilian purposes to also work for shipping military gear. By 2019, European Commission officials will study what logistics projects are needed for greater mobility (Sprenger 2018c: 8).

Then-European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker has called for closer military cooperation at the EU level (Banks 2016: 22). The European Defence Action Plan which was adopted by the European Commission on November 30th, 2016, comprises a European Defence Fund and other actions 'to help Member States boost research and spend more efficiently on joint defence capabilities, thus fostering a competitive and innovative defence industrial base and contributing to enhance European citizens' security' (European Security and Defence College 2017: 24). The European Defence Fund, launched in June 2017 to build the union's military capabilities, foresees a pooled € 13 billion procurement budget (Kington 2018: 10). In the framework of EDIDP (European Defence Industrial Development Programme) – one of the two pillars of the European Defence Fund – the EU will co-finance projects which will be joined by three companies from at least three member states.

The first research project to be carried out by the EU defence fund will cover unmanned naval systems and be led by Italy's Leonardo (Kington 2018: 10). The team set to work on the so-called OCEAN2020 project comprises 42 firms from 15 countries: 'OCEAN2020 will see unmanned platforms of different types (fixed wing, rotary wing, surface and underwater) integrated with naval units' command and control centres, allowing for data exchange via satellite, with command and control centres on land', Leonardo said in a statement (Kington 2018: 10). The team will be supported by the defence ministries of Italy, Greece, Spain, Portugal and Lithuania, with additional support from the defence ministries of Sweden, France, the United Kingdom, Estonia and the Netherlands (Kington 2018: 10). European partner firms include Indra, Safran, Saab, MBDA, PGZ/CTM, Hensoldt, Intracom Defense Electronics, Fincantieri and QinetiQ, as well as research centres including Fraunhofer, TNO, CMRE (of NATO) and IAI (Kington 2018: 10).

Those member states which wish to participate in the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) and which fulfil the criteria and have made the commitments on military capabilities set out in the protocol on Permanent Structured Cooperation, 'shall notify their intention to the Council and to the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy' (article 46.1 TEU). Within three months 'the Council shall adopt a decision establishing permanent structured cooperation and determining the list of participating Member States. The Council shall act by qualified majority after consulting the High Representative' (article 46.2 TEU). Any participating state 'which wishes to withdraw from permanent structured cooperation shall notify its intention to the Council, which shall take note that the Member State in question has ceased to participate' (article 46.5 TEU).

The first 17 collaborative PESCO projects were adopted as follows:

- European Medical Command (Germany): the EMC will provide the EU with an enduring medical capability to support missions and operations on the ground. The EMC will provide critical medical resources, including a multinational medical task force with a rapidly deployable capability for basic primary care.
- European Secure Software defined Radio (ESSOR) (France): it aims to develop common technologies for European military radios. The ESSOR project will provide a secure military communications system, improving voice and data communication between EU forces on a variety of platforms.
- Network of logistic hubs in Europe and support of operations (Germany): it will improve strategic logistic support and force projection in EU Missions and Operations. It aims at establishing cross-border solutions for more efficient, seamless military transport/logistics and connection of existing European initiatives under one logistic umbrella. It is expected to enhance logistic planning and movement as well as to deliver common standards and procedures that will greatly improve the EU's and NATO's capability to conduct even the most demanding missions.
- Military Mobility (The Netherlands): This project will support member states' commitment to simplify and standardise cross-

border military transport procedures. It aims to enhance the speed of movement of military forces across Europe. It aims to guarantee the unhindered movement of military personnel and assets within the borders of the EU. This entails avoiding long bureaucratic procedures to move through or over EU member states, be it via rail, road, air or sea. The project should help to reduce barriers such as legal hurdles to cross-border movement, lingering bureaucratic requirements (such as passport checks at some border crossings) and infrastructure problems, like roads and bridges that cannot accommodate large military vehicles.

- European Union Training Mission Competence Centre (EU TMCC) (Germany): it will improve the availability, interoperability, specific skills and professionalism of personnel (trainers) for EU training missions across participating member states.
- European Training Certification Centre for European Armies (Italy): it aims to promote the standardisation of procedures among European Armies and enable the staff, up to Division level, to practice the entire spectrum of the command and control (C2) functions at land, joint and interagency levels in a simulated training environment. The Centre will ensure that soldiers and civilian employees will work together in a simulated training environment with scenarios such as 'Humanitarian Assistance' and 'Support to Stabilization and Capacity Building' and eventually contribute to ensure that corporate experience and knowledge is consolidated, shared and made available to plan and conduct CSDP missions and operations.
- Energy Operational Function (EOF) (France): it aims at developing together new systems of energy supply for camps deployed in the framework of joint operations and for soldier connected devices and equipment. Also, it aims at ensuring that the energy issue is taken into account from the conception of combat systems to the implementation of the support in operations and included in the framework of operational planning.
- Deployable Military Disaster Relief Capability Package (Italy): it will deliver a multi-national specialist military package for the assistance to EU and other states, which can be deployed within both EU-led and non EU-led operations. The new EU capability will manage a

range of emergencies including natural disasters, civil emergencies, and pandemics. The project aims to include the establishment of a new EU Disaster Relief Training Centre of Excellence, and ultimately a Disaster Relief Deployable Headquarters.

- Maritime (semi-) Autonomous Systems for Mine Countermeasures (MAS MCM) (Belgium): it will deliver a world-class mix of (semi-) autonomous underwater, surface and aerial technologies for maritime mine countermeasures. The project will enable member states to protect maritime vessels, harbours and off shore installations, and to safeguard freedom of navigation on maritime trading routes. The development of underwater autonomous vehicles, using cutting-edge technology and an open architecture, adopting a modular set up, will contribute significantly to the EU's maritime security by helping to counter the threat of sea mines.
- Harbour & Maritime Surveillance and Protection (HARMSPRO) (Italy): it will deliver new maritime capability which will provide member states with the ability to conduct surveillance and protection of specified maritime areas, from harbours up to littoral waters, including sea line of communications and choke points, in order to obtain security and safety of maritime traffic and structures. It will deliver an integrated system of maritime sensors, software and platforms (surface, underwater and aerial vehicles), which fuse and process data, to aid the detection and identification of a range of potential maritime threats. The project will also deliver a command and control function for the deployable system, which could operate in harbours, coastal areas and the littoral environment.
- Upgrade of Maritime Surveillance (Greece): it will integrate land-based surveillance systems, maritime and air platforms in order to distribute real-time information to member states, so as to provide timely and effective response to the international waters. The main objective of the program is to enhance the Maritime Surveillance, Situational Awareness and potential Response Effectiveness of the EU, by using the existing infrastructure, deploying assets and developing related capabilities in the future. It aims to address timely and effectively new and old threats and challenges (such as energy security, environmental challenges, security and defence

aspects); thus ensuring accurate Awareness and Rapid Response, so as to contribute to the protection of the EU and its citizens.

- Cyber Threats and Incident Response Information Sharing Platform (Greece): it will develop more active defence measures, potentially moving from firewalls to more active measures. This project aims to help mitigate these risks by focusing on the sharing of cyber threat intelligence through a networked member state platform, with the aim of strengthening nations' cyber defence capabilities.
- Cyber Rapid Response Teams (CRRTs) and Mutual Assistance in Cyber Security (Lithuania): CRRTs will allow member states to help each other to ensure higher level of cyber resilience and to collectively respond to cyber incidents. Cyber RRTs could be used to assist other member states and EU institutions, CSDP operations as well as partner countries. CRRTs will be equipped with unified Deployable Cyber Toolkits designed to detect, recognise and mitigate cyber threats. The response teams would be able to assist with training, diagnostics and attribution forensics, and assistance in operations. The aim of this project is to integrate member states expertise in the field of cyber defence. For European NATO allies, cyber defence is part of NATO's core task of collective defence: 'A decision as to when a cyber attack would lead to the invocation of Article 5 would be taken by the North Atlantic Council on a case-by-case basis.' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014b: point 72).
- Strategic Command and Control (C2) System for CSDP Missions and Operations (Spain): it aims to improve the command and control systems of EU missions and operations at the strategic level. The project will enhance the military decision-making process, improve the planning and conduct of missions, and the coordination of EU forces. The Strategic C2 System for CSDP missions will connect users by delivering information systems and decision-making support tools that will assist strategic commanders carry out their missions. Integration of information systems would include intelligence, surveillance, command and control, and logistics systems.

- Armoured Infantry Fighting Vehicle / Amphibious Assault Vehicle / Light Armoured Vehicle (Italy): The project will develop and build a prototype European Armoured Infantry Fighting Vehicle / Amphibious Assault Vehicle / Light Armoured Vehicle. The vehicles would be based on a common platform and would support fast deployment manoeuvre, reconnaissance, combat support, logistics support, command and control, and medical support.
- Indirect Fire Support (EuroArtillery) (Slovakia): it will develop a mobile precision artillery platform, which would contribute to the EU's combat capability requirement in military operations. This platform is expected to include land battle decisive ammunition, non-lethal ammunition, and a common fire control system for improving coordination and interoperability in multi-national operations. This project aims at procuring a new capability / platform of a key mission component for land forces in the short to mid-term.
- EUFOR Crisis Response Operation Core (EUFOR CROC) (Germany): it will decisively contribute to the creation of a coherent full spectrum force package, which could accelerate the provision of forces. It will improve the crisis management capabilities of the EU (European Council 2017: 1-6).

The members of PESCO, now a collection of 34 EU defence projects, agreed 'to do things together, spend together, invest together, buy together, act together', as Federica Mogherini put it. The plan 'will be lubricated with cash' from the European Commission (The Economist 2019: 21).

NATO General Secretary, Jens Stoltenberg welcomed the launch of PESCO: 'This has the potential to help drive increased defence spending, provide new capabilities and improve burden-sharing within the alliance. But we need to keep in mind three points to ensure that NATO and EU defence efforts are complementary.

- First, we need coherence when it comes to development of capabilities. We must avoid the same nations having two sets of requirements for the kind of capacities they should develop.
- Second, we need to be sure that European forces and capabilities are also available to NATO to avoid competition.

- Third, we need the fullest possible involvement of non-EU NATO allies in the consultations and in the process.' (Stoltenberg 2017: 10)

European NATO allies which are members of the EU have to urgently coordinate military cooperation and therefore also to increase expenditures according to the 2014 NATO Wales Summit conclusions: 'This is critical because, after Brexit, 80 percent of NATO defence spending will come from non-EU allies; and three of the NATO battlegroups deployed to Eastern Europe will be led by non-EU allies' (Stoltenberg 2017: 10). US Defence Secretary Jim Mattis emphasized that a strong Europe is a 'better security partner' for the US, but European initiatives should 'complement, not compete with NATO' (Sprenger 2018b: 8).

EU relations to the United Nations

The United Nations (UN) is an international organisation whose aims are strengthening and maintaining international peace by facilitating cooperation in international law, international security, economic development, social progress, human rights and by achieving world peace in the future. It contains multiple subsidiary organisations to carry out its missions. The UN's most visible public figure is the Secretary-General, currently António Guterres of Portugal who attained the post in 2017. The UN is financed from assessed and voluntary contributions from its member states, and has six official languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

The earliest concrete plan for a then 'new world organisation' was begun under the aegis of the US Department of State in 1939. US President Franklin D. Roosevelt first coined the term 'United Nations' as a term to describe the allied countries during World War II fighting against those countries allied with National Socialist Germany – such as Bulgaria, Italy and Japan. The term was first officially used on January 1st, 1942 named after the military alliance of the 26 governments that joined the US and the UK in their efforts to face 'the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked' (The Atlantic Charter, August 14th, 1941; NATO 2018e: 1). On April 25th, 1945, the UN Conference on International Organisation began in San Francisco attended by 50 governments and a number of non-governmental organisations involved in drafting the UN Charter. According to chapter VII of the UN Charter, the UN Security Council can approve enforcement measures (political, economic, military) to maintain or restore international peace and security:

> The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. (Article 41 UN Charter)

According to article 42 UN Charter, should the UN Security Council

> consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

It is up to the UN Security Council to 'determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security' (article 39 UN Charter).

According to article 49 UN Charter, all UN member states 'shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.' Moreover,

> [n]othing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security. (Article 51 UN Charter)

The 'Friendly Relations Declaration' of 1970 recalled 'the established principle that outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation' (United Nations General Assembly 1970: 1). Furthermore, this declaration also recalls 'the duty of States to refrain in their international relations from military, political, economic or any other form of coercion aimed against the political independence or territorial integrity of any State' (ibid). Thus, a 'war of aggression constitutes a crime against the peace, for which there is responsibility under international law' (ibid).

The main UN bodies are:

- The UN General Assembly (UNGA): When the UNGA votes on important questions, a two-thirds majority of those present and voting is required. These questions include recommendations on peace and security; election of members to organs; admission; suspension; and expulsion of members; and budgetary matters. All other questions are decided by majority vote. Each of the 193 member states has one vote. Apart from approval of budgetary matters, resolutions are not binding for the members. On May 3rd, 2011, with 180 votes to two, the UN General Assembly backed a resolution giving the EU almost all the rights in the global chamber that usually only fully-fledged states enjoy, and which until then had only maintained observer status at the UN. The EU now has the right to speak, the right to make proposals and submit amendments, the right of reply, the right to raise points of order and the right to circulate documents. There are also additional seats put in the chamber for the EU's foreign policy chief, High Representative Federica Mogherini and her officials (Phillips 2011: 1). The UNGA includes subsidiary bodies: Main and other sessional committees; Disarmament Commission; Human Rights Council; International Law Commission; Standing Committees and ad hoc bodies. The Main Committees consider agenda items referred to them by the UNGA and prepare recommendations and draft resolutions for submission to the UNGA plenary.[2] Related organisations are the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organisation (CTBTO), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the OPCW (Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons) and the WTO (World Trade Organisation) (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2013). In 1978, the UNGA declared general and complete

[2] The six Main Committees are: First Committee (Disarmament and International Security Committee); Second Committee (Economic and Financial Committee); Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee); Fourth Committee (Special Political and Decolonisation Committee); Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary Committee); Sixth Committee (Legal Committee). These Committees correspond tot he UNGA´s major fields of responsibility.

disarmament to be the ultimate objective of the UN in the field disarmament.

- The UN Security Council (UNSC) is charged with maintaining peace and security among countries and has the power to make binding decisions that member governments have agreed to carry out. The UNSC is made up of 15 member states, consisting of five permanent members ('The P5'): China, France, Russian Federation, the UK and the US) and ten non-permanent members elected for two-year terms by the UN General Assembly (UNGA) (with end of term date): Bolivia (2018), Côte d'Ivoire (2019), Equatorial Guinea (2019), Ethiopia (2018), Kazakhstan (2018), Kuwait (2019), the Netherlands (2018), Peru (2019), Poland (2019), and Sweden (2018). The ten non-permanent members shall be elected according to the following pattern: Five from African and Asia-Pacific states; one from Eastern European states; two from Latin American and Caribbean states; two from Western European and other states. The five permanent members hold veto power over substantive but not procedural resolutions allowing a permanent member to block adoption but not to block the debate of a resolution unacceptable to it. The ten temporary seats are held for a two-year term with member states voted in by the UNGA on a regional basis. The presidency of the UNSC is rotated alphabetically each month. The UNSC includes subsidiary bodies: counter-terrorism committees; International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR); International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY); Military Staff Committee; Peacekeeping Operations and Missions; Sanctions Committee (ad hoc); and Standing Committees and ad hoc bodies (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2013).
- The UN Secretary-General (UNSG) is the 'chief administrative officer'. This position has evolved into a dual role of an administrator of the UN, and a diplomat and mediator addressing disputes between member states and finding consensus to global issues. The UNSG is appointed by the UNGA, after being recommended by the UNSC, any member of which can veto. The post of UNSG shall be held for one or two terms of five years, the post shall be appointed on the basis of geographical rotation, and the UNSG shall not originate from one of the five permanent

UNSC member states. In total nine Secretary-Generals have been nominated since the UN was founded as an organisation: Trygve Lie of Norway (February 2nd, 1946 – November 10th, 1952, he resigned); Dag Hammarskjöld of Sweden (April 10th, 1953 – September 18th, 1961, he died while in office); U Thant of Burma / Myanmar (November 30th, 1961 – January 1st, 1972); Kurt Waldheim of Austria (January 1st, 1972 – January 1st, 1982); Javier Pérez de Cuéllar of Peru (January 1st, 1982 – January 1st, 1992); Boutros Boutros-Ghali of Egypt (January 1st, 1992 – January 1st, 1997); Kofi Annan of Ghana (January 1st, 1997 – January 1st, 2007); Ban Ki-moon of the Republic of Korea (January 1st, 2007 – January 1st, 2017); António Guterres of Portugal (January 1st, 2017 – incumbent)

A Military Staff Committee was established under article 47 of the UN Charter. It consists of representatives of the Chiefs of Staff of the 'Permanent 5' ('P5'), its function is to advise and assist the UNSC on all questions relating to the

- Military requirements to maintain international peace and security;
- Employment and command of forces placed at its disposal;
- Regulation of armaments and possible disarmament.

This Committee's advice and assistance is expected to be sought for

- Actions requiring the use of military forces under article 42 UN Charter;
- Agreements to provide military forces to the UNSC under articles 43 and 44 UN Charter;
- The readiness of immediately available air force contingents for combined international enforcement action under article 45 UN Charter;
- Planning for the application of armed forces under article 46 UN Charter;
- The Committee's task in assisting the UNSC in formulating plans for the regulation of armaments is addressed under article 26 UN Charter. The General Assembly Resolution 1235 (XII) (1957)

authorised the integration of the Committee civilian staff with the UN Secretariat.

In April 2012, the Committee published a Working Methods Handbook of the Military Staff Committee. In accordance with this handbook, the Committee meets every fortnight. Committee meetings include informal participation by the Office of Military Affairs, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and military representatives from the elected members of the UNSC (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2013: 90).

The ECOSOC (Economic and Social Council) assists the UN General Assembly (UNGA) in promoting international economic and social cooperation and development. It has 54 members, all of which are elected by the UNGA for a three-year term. The president is elected for a one-year term and chosen amongst the small or medium powers represented on ECOSOC.

In September 2015, the UN convened a World Summit with the following results:

- A Peacebuilding Commission was created to help countries emerging from conflict.
- A Human Rights Council was established to replace the Commission on Human Rights as well as a Democracy Fund.
- A clear and unambiguous condemnation of terrorism 'in all its forms and manifestations'.
- Agreements to spend billions more on achieving the Millennium Development Goals;
- The dissolution of the Trusteeship Council which completed its missions when former US protectorate Palau gained independence in 1994.
- Agreement that individual states, with the assistance of the international community, have the 'responsibility to protect' (R2P) populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansings and crimes against humanity – with the understanding that the international community is prepared to act 'collectively' in a 'time

and decisive manner' to protect vulnerable civilians should a state be unable or unwilling to do so.

Every member state is legally obliged to pay their respective share toward peacekeeping – in accordance with the provisions of article 17 UN Charter (United Nations Organization 2014: 1). The UN General Assembly (UNGA) apportions peacekeeping expenses based on a special scale of assessment under a complex formula that member states themselves have established. This formula takes into account the relative economic wealth of member states, with the 'P5' required to pay a larger share because of their special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security (ibid). The peacekeeping budget cycle runs from July 1st to June 30th. The UN has no military forces of its own. Police and other civilian personnel are paid from the peacekeeping budgets established for each operation. The UN also reimburses member states for providing equipment, personnel and support services to military and police contingents. Peacekeeping operations are all led by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO). The UN Secretary-General (UNSG) appoints a Head of Mission (HoM) (usually a Special Representative) to direct the peacekeeping operation. The HoM reports to the Under-Secretary-General for peacekeeping Operations at the UN Headquarters in New York. The UNSG also appoints peacekeeping operations Force Commanders and Police Commissioners, and senior civilian staff (United Nations Organization 2010b: 1). The DPKO and the Department of Field Support (DFS) are then responsible for staffing the civilian components of a peace-support operation. DPKO / DFS lead the planning for the political, military, operational and support (i.e. logistics and administration) aspects of the peace-support operations. The DPKO also provides guidance and support on military, police and mine action. The official DPKO was formally created in 1992 when Boutros Boutros-Ghali took office as UNSG. Up to the late 1980s, peacekeeping missions were operated through the UN Office of Special Political Affairs. The DPKO has four main offices:

- The Office of Operations to provide political and strategic policy and operational guidance and support to the missions.

- The Office of the Rule of Law and Security Institutions (OROLSI) which was established in 2007 to strengthen the links and coordinate the DPKO's activities in the areas of police, justice, mine actions, the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of ex-combatants and security sector reform (SSR).
- The Office of Military Affairs (OMA) works to deploy the most appropriate military capability in support of UN objectives; and to enhance performance and improve the efficiency and the effectiveness of military components in UN peacekeeping missions.
- The Policy Evolution and Training (PET) Division which provides an integrated capacity to develop and disseminate policy and doctrine; to develop coordinate and deliver standardised training; to evaluate mission progress toward mandate implementation; and to develop policies and operational frameworks for strategic cooperation with various UN and external partners (United Nations Organization 2010b: 1).

Since 1948, when the UN established its first peacekeeping operation in the Middle East (the UN Truce Supervision Organisation) to monitor the Armistice Agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbours, there have been a further 70 UN peacekeeping operations (PKOs) around the world. The term 'peacekeeping' is not found in the United Nations Charter and defies simple definition (United Nations Organization 2010a: 1). Dag Hammarskjöld, the second UN Secretary-General, referred to it as belonging to 'Chapter Six and a Half' of The Charter, placing it between traditional methods of resolving disputes peacefully, such as negotiation and mediation under Chapter VI, and more forceful action as authorised under Chapter VII (United Nations Organization 2010a: 1). Since the end of the Cold War, the strategic context for UN peacekeeping changed, prompting the UN to shift and expand its field operations from 'traditional' missions involving strictly military tasks, to complex 'multidimensional' enterprises designed to ensure the implementation of comprehensive peace agreements and assist in laying the foundations for sustainable peace. Peacekeepers currently undertake a wide variety of complex tasks, from helping to build sustainable institutions of governance, to human rights monitoring, to security sector reform, to the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of former combatants (United Nations Organization

2010a: 1). Originally developed as a means of dealing with inter-state conflict, UN peacekeeping has been increasingly applied to intra-state conflicts and civil wars. Although the military remain the backbone of most peacekeeping operations, the many faces of peacekeeping now include administrators and economists, police officers and legal experts, de-miners and electoral observers, human rights monitors and specialists in civil affairs and governance, humanitarian workers and experts in communications and public information (United Nations Organization 2010a: 1).

Currently, the UN has in place 14 PKOs, engaging more than 100,000 personnel. Most are deployed in Africa (over 88% of uniformed UN peacekeepers). Since the 1990s, the number of missions has increased, while mission mandates have become more robust and multifaceted. The annual budget for UN peacekeeping for the fiscal year July 1st, 2018 – June 30th, 2019 was $6.7 billion, or less than half of one per cent of global military spending. The top 10 providers of assessed contributions to United Nations Peacekeeping operations are

- The United States of America (28.47%)
- China (10.25%)
- Japan (9.68%)
- Germany (6.39%)
- France (6.28%)
- United Kingdom (5.77%)
- Russian Federation (3.99%)
- Italy (3.75%)
- Canada (2.92%)
- Spain (2.44%) (United Nations Organization 2018: 1)

UN peacekeeping faces a series of challenges, including new ones such as the changing nature of conflicts (e.g. transnational and unconventional threats) and coping with a wider range of mandated tasks for PKOs. Its peacekeepers are also confronted with ever more complex crises and are called upon to intervene in situations where there is 'little peace to keep'. Furthermore, there is no UN standing force and, since the fiascos of UN peacekeeping in Somalia, Rwanda and Bosnia and Herzegovina in the

1990s, the organisation has generally avoided peace enforcement (European Parliament 2015: 2). Therefore, to respond to the complexity of contemporary conflicts, the UN is dependent on troops from its members and on modern, high-tech capabilities, including new technologies, all underpinned by strong engagement from UN members. Chapter VIII on Regional Arrangements (Articles 52-54) provides the basis for cooperation between the EU and regional organisations in the maintenance of international peace and security. Regional 'arrangements' or 'agencies' can take action for the peaceful settlement of local disputes (European Parliament 2015: 3).

The 1992 'Agenda for Peace' marked the emergence of the concept of regional partnerships. The UN Secretary-General underlined then the potential for cooperation between the UN and regional organisations/arrangements in the areas of preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping, peace-making and post-conflict peacebuilding. The 1995 Supplement to the Agenda for Peace pointed furthermore to five options for such cooperation: consultation (formal and informal); mutual diplomatic support in peacemaking efforts; operational support from regional organisations to UN peacekeeping missions, and vice-versa; co-deployment (missions deployed in parallel in the same area); and joint operations whereby the UN and the regional organisation share staffing, financing and direction.

In 2005, the Secretary-General's report 'In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all' advocates the 'establishment of an interlocking system of peacekeeping capacities' which would allow the UN to cooperate with regional organisations in predictable and reliable partnerships. The 2010 New Horizons process mentions partnerships with regional organisations among issues needing improvement, in light of interoperability difficulties experienced in several parallel, hybrid or bridging operations conducted by the UN, AU and EU. (European Parliament 2015: 3). Since 2006, the UN Secretary-General has regularly reported on the issue of global-regional partnerships, and cooperation with regional organisations. The UN Security Council started in 2003 to regularly hold thematic debates on regional organisations. A focus on Africa became evident and, since 2007, the UNSC and its AU counterpart – the Peace and Security Council – have held annual meetings.

Later, the UNSC and the EU's Political and Security Committee (PSC) also started to meet informally (European Parliament 2015: 4).

The UN Department for Peacekeeping Operations (UN DPKO) is dedicated to plan, prepare, manage and direct UN peacekeeping operations. Depending on their mandate, peacekeeping missions may be required to:

- Deploy to prevent the outbreak of conflict or the spillover of conflict across borders;
- Stabilise conflict situations, offer a cease fire, to create an environment for the parties to reach a lasting peace agreement;
- Assist in implementing comprehensive peace agreements;
- Lead states or territories through a transition to stable governments, based on democratic principles, good governance and economic development (United Nations Organization 2010b: 1).

However, the EU and UN are cooperating systematically at strategic and operational levels, with consultation and coordination mechanisms established (European Parliament 2015: 1). The EU-UN partnership in the field of crisis management and peacekeeping was established in September 2003, when the EU and the UN issued their first Joint Declaration on EU-UN cooperation in Crisis Management. The Joint Declaration came in the context of the first instances of cooperation on the ground in 2003, namely in Bosnia and Herzegovina where the EU Police Mission (the EU 's first CSDP mission) took over the policing mandate from the UN International Police Task Force, and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) where the EU deployed its first autonomous military operation (Artemis). The EU was the first organisation to sign a cooperation agreement with the UN (European Parliament 2015: 6).

The so-called Brahimi Report (2000) introduced a new term 'Peace Operations' which were meant to reflect the new multidimensional post-Cold War UN operations that were tasked with supporting the implementation of comprehensive peace agreements. The AU, many European countries and the NATO adopted the 'Peace Support Operations Concept' (de Coning et al 2008: 1) In early 2008, the UN DPKO released a hundred page document entitled: 'United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines'. For the first time in

history, the UN had produced a doctrine that presides over a large number of directives, guidelines, standard operating procedures, manuals and training materials issued by the DPKO and the Department of Field Support. The 2008 UN doctrine reclaims 'Peacekeeping Operations' as the distinctive UN concept for all its consent-based missions. Consent has three basic principles: consent, impartiality and non-use of force (except self- defence and defence of the mandate (ibid: 2). The mandate must be applied without favour and prejudice to the parties to the peace agreement, it should not be confused with 'neutrality'. The capstone doctrine highlights three success factors: legitimacy, credibility and local ownership (ibid).

The UN and EU work closely together to increase participation of women in peace and security decision-making processes and to incorporate a gender perspective when addressing international peace and security challenges according to the UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 (2000). This resolution recognises that women and men have different experiences of conflict and war and that both need to be taken into account in order to reach sustainable peace and security. UNSCR 1325 calls for the inclusion of women in four areas: participation of women in peace processes, protection of women in war and peace, prevention of conflicts and prosecution of perpetrators of sexual and gender-based violence and the inclusion of women in post-conflict reconstruction efforts.

The EU and the UN refer to each other as key partners, and their cooperation covers a wide range of policies and issues: humanitarian aid, development, promotion of human rights, democracy and rule of law, climate action, as well as conflict resolution and peace-building (European Parliament 2015: 4). The first European Security Strategy (ESS) – adopted in December 2003 – and the 2008 Report on the Implementation of the ESS underline the principle of 'effective multilateralism' (a rule-based international order with effective international institutions) as a key objective of EU external action (European Parliament 2015: 5). 'Multilateralism is seen as being in the DNA of the EU as it sees itself as a rules-based entity based on shared sovereignty and common actions to achieve peace and prosperity.' (Hwee 2018: 51)

The UN recognises the EU as one of its most important regional partners in peacekeeping, together with the African Union. The EU completed 21 CSDP missions and operations and has in place another 16 CSDP civilian missions and military operations on three continents, with a wide range of mandates (e.g. military training, capacity-building, counter-piracy, rule of law and security sector reform, border assistance, etc.) and deploying over 5,000 civilian and military personnel. Like UN PKOs, the majority of these missions have been in Africa and, in many cases, they have operated in parallel to UN PKOs or the AU missions. Both organisations have complementary interests: the UN can offer legitimacy for the EU's crisis management activities and its global security ambitions, while EU member states can provide capabilities the UN needs for peacekeeping (European Parliament 2015: 5). The EU and UN have already cooperated on the ground in Mali, Central African Republic, Somalia, RD Congo and Afghanistan. The EU also proved its potential in acting as a bridging mechanism until the UN took over. The EU and UN also cooperate on strengthening conflict prevention tools and mediation, and in 2013, they collaborated in supporting the OPCW-UN Joint Mission for removing and destroying chemical weapon stockpiles in Syria according to the UN Security Council Resolution 2118 (European Parliament 2015: 6).

In June 2007, a new Joint Statement on UN-EU Cooperation in Crisis Management was adopted. It recognised the progress achieved and tried to expand the cooperative arrangements, particularly in areas such as support of African peacekeeping and cooperation on police, rule of law and security sector reform; regular high-level political dialogue and exchanges of views between UN and EU officials; systematic UN-EU joint lessons learnt exercises, etc. Moreover practical cooperation in the field developed with parallel deployments and sequential missions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Chad. Nevertheless, the actions defined in the Joint Statement were not fully realised. One example is the ongoing discussion on the EU Battlegroups as an option for rapid intervention, at the request of the UNSC, the EU decided not to grant the UN's request for an EU intervention in Congo in 2008. In fact, the EU has to date not used the Battlegroups (European Parliament 2015: 6).

Following the 2003 Joint UN-EU Declaration, a permanent joint consultative mechanism was established: the EU-UN Steering Committee,

tasked with assessing options for cooperation on planning, training, communication and exchanging best practices. As part of the General Secretariat, the EUMS (EU Military Staff) has established relations with the UN DPKO. Twice a year, a joint steering committee (EU/UN) meets in either New York or Brussels to discuss points of common interest and decide on future cooperation (Perruche 2006: 9). An EUMS military liaison officer to the United Nations was established in New York in order to further enhance cooperation between military elements of the two organisations (ibid). The UN-EU High-Level Political Dialogue was established in 2013 to enhance structural political dialogue. The UNSC meets annually with the EU's Political and Security Committee, and holds regular meetings on UN-EU cooperation with the UN Secretary-General and the High Representative. Liaison offices were also set up: currently the EU delegation to the UN ensures this function, and in 2011 a UN Liaison Office for Peace and Security (UNLOPS), representing the three UN departments responsible for peace operations and political missions (Department for Peacekeeping Operations, DPKO; for Political Affairs, DPA; and for Field Support, DFS), was set up in Brussels. Finally, the UN-EU desk-to-desk dialogue on conflict prevention (in the DPA remit) includes UN and EU staff (European Parliament 2015: 6). The UN and EU support the African Peace and Security Architecture, including to the support to the African Standby Force and African Capacity for Immediate Response (ibid: 8) and support to training and capacity-building to AU.

Cooperation on the ground has evolved notably since the first EU missions and operations in 2003 – the EU Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (EUPM) taking over from the UN police mission, and the military operation Artemis in RD Congo (June-August 2003), requested by the UN to support its mission there (MONUC). Yet, at the end of operation Artemis, the European contributors refused to 're-hat' some of their forces as UN 'blue helmets' and no European state participated in the UN force that took over Artemis. The subsequent military operations, EUFOR RD Congo (July-November 2006), which, like Artemis, complemented MONUC, and EUFOR Tchad/RCA (January 2008-March 2009), which was a military bridging operation to the UN Mission to CAR and Chad (MINURCAT), were generally assessed as successful in terms of EU-UN cooperation on the ground and at the highest political level. However, a series of political and operational problems were also evident:

due to divergent national interests, reluctance of EU member states to get involved and to contribute troops to the operations (France was the main promotor of and contributor to the operations), shortage of EU operational capabilities and interoperability problems, and slow EU decision-making, but also problems resulting from persistent differences between the organisational cultures, practices and procedures of the EU and UN. On the other hand, these experiences provided valuable lessons for future collaboration (ibid: 9).

Significant progress has ensued on the ground after the EU Action Plan and the mutually agreed modalities on planning. Mali, CAR and Somalia have been cited as 'excellent examples of the comprehensive and complementary nature of the UN-EU partnership' (ibid). In Mali, the UN mission MINUSMA saw increased participation of uniformed personnel from eleven EU states, as well as the provision of helicopters, transport aircraft, intelligence experts and special forces (ibid: 9-10).

Experts consider that the EU-UN coordination with regard to EUCAP Sahel Mali was very good: coordinated planning, reciprocal liaison officers, consultations on the division of labour between the EU mission and UN police (ibid: 10). The EU had also provided support through the African Peace Facility to the AU mission in CAR (MISCA), which handed over to MINUSCA in September 2014. In Somalia, both the UN and EU have supported logistically and financially the AU mission in the country (AMISOM, established in 2006), and all three organisations cooperated in designing a security strategy for Somalia. Currently, the EU has three missions in Somalia and the Horn of Africa: EUTM Somalia (military training), EUCAP Nestor (capacity-building) and EUNAVFOR Atalanta (counter-piracy operation) (ibid: 10).

The threats faced by the European democracies are increasing and wide-ranging. Piracy became a big issue during the 2000s. Therefore, the EU launched its first military maritime operation in 2008 (Atalanta) to face piracy threats. EUNAVFOR Atalanta is one part of the EU's 'Comprehensive Approach', tackling both current symptoms and root causes of the problem. Together, EU NAVFOR, EUCAP Nestor and the EU Training Mission Somalia (EUTM Somalia) form a coherent, integrated CSDP package supporting the EU's 'Strategic Framework for the Horn of

Africa', which the EU member states adopted on November 14th, 2011, 'which guides the EU's multi-facetted engagement in the Horn of Africa' (European Union External Action 2014: 1). This 'strategic Framework for the Horn of Africa' defines five priorities for EU action:

- Building robust and accountable political structures;
- Contributing to conflict resolution and prevention;
- Mitigating security threats emanating from the region;
- Promoting economic growth;
- And supporting regional economic cooperation (EUNAVFOR 2016: 1).

To coordinate these efforts, the EU appointed a Special Representative to the Horn of Africa on January 1st, 2012. He was tasked to focus on Somalia and the regional dimensions of instability in the country, as well as on piracy, which has its root causes in the instability of Somalia. In 2012, the EU set up three new civilian CSDP missions: EUCAP (EU capacity-building), NESTOR (Horn of Africa), EUCAP SAHEL Niger and EU AVSEC (aviation security) in South Sudan. In February 2013, the EUTM Mali was launched to help rebuild the military capacity of the Malian army. In 2013, also a mission in Libya was launched 'to support the Libyan authorities to develop capacity for enhancing the security of Libya's land, sea and air borders in the short term and to develop a broader Integrated Border Management strategy in the long term.' (Wallace 2013: 14) The EU has a comprehensive approach to the crises in the Sahel region. These strategies are based on the assumptions that development and security are interconnected and can be mutually supportive and that the complex crisis in the Sahel requires a regional answer. The EU's actions themselves are just part 'of an international, multilateral, multiagency effect designed to bring aid, stability and development programmes to the region. A proper Comprehensive Approach' (ibid). Three CSDP missions are playing their part in Somalia: firstly, Atalanta which worked in conjunction with NATO Operation Ocean Shield and other US-led and bilateral naval operations; secondly, EUTM which already trained several thousand soldiers till 2013 'improving the capacity of the government to defend itself' (ibid); and finally the civilian mission EUCAP Nestor helping to train and equip maritime security agencies in Somalia, but also throughout the region (ibid).

The EU sustains AU peacekeeping and the AU Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) through its civilian and training missions, and through the African Peace Facility. For 2014-2016, the EU increased African Peace Facility funds from the initially allocated €750 million to €900 million. The EU and UN also provide coordinated support for the AU multi-annual security sector reform (SSR) capacity-building programme (European Parliament 2015: 10). Although the EU and UN have significantly strengthened their cooperation in crisis management, a series of limitations and challenges to the partnership persist. Some experts consider the partnership as asymmetric and reflecting the gap between 'what the UN wants and what the EU is willing to offer' (ibid); (e.g. lack of capabilities, collective action problems, conflicting procedures of both organisations – differences in organisational cultures and planning rules: more decentralisation and autonomy on the UN side, more political control in the EU case; disagreement over mandates, obstacles to the exchange of information) (ibid).

EU states provide low numbers of troops to UN operations. The uniformed personnel contribution of EU member states is around 5 percent of total UN military and police personnel. There are several reasons for this: European mistrust toward UN command and control structures, lack of experience with UN peacekeeping practices, increased focus on the EU's own CSDP missions and the wish to preserve autonomy of decision-making and conduct over operations, as well as visibility concerns. Some limits in this area relate to the UN, which in 2014/15 established a strategic force generation capacity (the Strategic Force Generation Planning Cell). However, UN peace operations could acquire greater importance for the EU's security, as its external borders are in turmoil (ibid: 11). A key focus of the UN has been to end or contain armed conflicts in Africa. Two notable developments can be identified in this regard: firstly, the establishment of the African Peace Facility (APF) and Security Architecture, under the slogan 'African solutions to African problems'. Secondly, since the beginning of the 21st century, a stronger and more direct EU security policy engagement in Africa has emerged (Hainzl and Feichtinger 2017: 5). The African Peace Facility is a specific financial cooperation with the EU with regard to scrutiny, stability and peace. Besides long-term capacity-building approaches, the APF consists of immediate crisis response mechanisms, which seem to be more important

than long-term engagement (ibid: 7). Three pillars are central to the APF: first, the provision of financial support for African-led peace support operations, ensuring self-management and independent decision-making, second the provision of solely non-lethal support, the salaries for African soldiers, and third the early warning mechanism, enabling the approval of funding within two weeks only' (Zinkanell and Hainzl 2017: 13). All of the APF funding comes from the European Development Fund (EDF) (ibid).

The African Union consists of all 55 African states, accounts for a GDP of some two trillion US dollars and has set out ambitious goals in its 'Agenda 2063' – a common market without trade barriers and the creation of an infrastructure all over the continent (Himmelfreundpointner 2017a: 50). Apart from millions of displaced persons inside the African continent – most of them are in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Sudan, Somalia or the Central African Republic (CAR) – an increasing number of people are fleeing the continent to Europe. In the so called 'Khartoum process', which started in 2014, Europe is trying to contain migration out of Africa via 'tailored deals' with a commitment of some 8 billion euros for countries of origins of migrants (ibid). Since the mid-1990s Africa has delivered an impressive economic performance with an average growth rate of some 6 percent. Two thirds of the African people have to live with less than two USD a day, 20 percent are not sufficiently nourished (ibid: 47). Thus, high priority shall be given to accelerate development in Africa, promote economic integration of the continent, as spelled out in the policies of the African Union (AU). The idea is to create larger markets, especially for intra-African trade 'because national markets on their own have proved to be too small for meaningful trade expansion' (ibid). So this is the way to go: develop our infrastructure and remove obstacles to free trade in the continent,' said Ambassador Michael A.O. Oyugi of Kenya to Austria (ibid: 48). Many African countries are basically more or less still producers of basic commodities like oil, coffee and tea. Some countries are heavily dependent. The African continent with a population of some 1.2 billion people represents a huge market in which there is still massive scope for development (ibid). Many African countries need and indeed are transforming their economies from that of raw material and primary commodity procedures – a heritage from colonial times – to modern manufacturers of finished goods. In the meantime, China has been involved in financing the development of roads, railways and energy

infrastructure which is beneficial to 'our value-addition efforts', said Ambassador Oyugi (ibid: 49).

Furthermore, EU and the UN are playing a crucial role in helping states get the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1540 relating to legislation and strict domestic control. According to UNSCR 1540 on weapons of mass destruction, states are obliged to take steps that contains some 300 obligations, and each is crucial to ensuring that nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and their means of delivery do not get into the wrong hands. To support states in their implementation, the UN Security Council established the 1540 Committee, which is supported by the UN Office on Disarmament Affairs (UNODA). The UNODA at Vienna was established in 2011 with the aim of responding to the need for cooperation in all areas of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. EU and OSCE have been motivating states to sign the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban-Treaty (CTBT) in order to ban nuclear explosions in all environments (underwater, underground, in the atmosphere and on the Earth's surface). 184 countries have signed the treaty and by July 2019 it was ratified by 168 countries including France, Russia and the UK. However, there are 44 countries that hold nuclear technology, which must sign and ratify the treaty in order to put the CTBT into effect. During the CTBT negotiations, these 44 countries appeared to possess nuclear power and research reactors, and their commitment not to pursue nuclear testing is crucial for the success in implementing the CTBT (Alvear et al. 2016: 1). Currently, the pending ratification of China, Egypt, Iran, Israel and the US, as well as the signature and ratification of India, North Korea and Pakistan prevent the treaty from entering into force.

The CTBT verification system detects nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, underground or under water all around the world. This International Monitoring System (IMS) is a crucial part of the work of the CTBT Organisation. The IMS proved to be especially helpful in the case of North Korea's nuclear tests in 2006, 2009, 2013 and 2016 when the monitoring stations were able to detect the explosions and send the information to the member states about their time, location and magnitude even before the nuclear tests were officially announced by North Korea (ibid: 11).

EU relations to the OSCE

The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is the world's largest regional security organisation with 57 participating states (1.2 billion people), including all of Europe as well as Turkey and Russia, Mongolia, the successor states of the former Soviet Union, the United States of America and Canada. Decisions are taken by consensus on a politically, but not legally binding basis. This organisation is spanning the northern hemisphere from Vancouver to Vladivostok and defines itself as a regional security arrangement under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter. It traces its origins to the détente phase of the early 1970s, when the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) was created to serve as a multilateral forum for dialogue and negotiation between East and West. Meeting over two years in Helsinki and Geneva, the CSCE reached agreement on the Helsinki Final Act, which was signed on August 1st, 1975, by the heads of 35 states. This document contains a number of key commitments on politico-military, economic and environmental and human rights issues that became central to the so-called 'Helsinki Process'. It also established the following ten fundamental principles (The 'Decalogue') governing the behaviour of states towards their citizens, as well as towards each other:

- Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty;
- Refraining from the threat or use of force;
- Inviolability of frontiers;
- Territorial integrity of states;
- Peaceful settlement of disputes;
- Non-intervention in internal affairs;
- Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief;
- Equal rights and self-determination of peoples;
- Co-operation among states;
- Fulfilment in good faith of obligations under international law (OSCE 2013: 2).

The OSCE deals with three dimensions of security – the politico-military (questions relating to security in Europe), the economic and environmental

(co-operation in the fields of economics, of science and technology, and of the environment), and the human dimension (co-operation in humanitarian and other fields) (OSCE 2013: 2). It therefore addresses a wide range of security-related concerns, including arms control, confidence and security-building measures, human rights, national minorities, democratisation, policing strategies, counter-terrorism and economic and environmental activities (Zannier 2016: 3). The OSCE is a primary instrument for early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation in its area. In 2018, the participating states supported the OSCE with a budget of about 137 million euros. This budget financed 14 missions or field operations in East and Southeast Europe, the southern Caucasus and Central Asia.

The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) (signed on November 19th, 1990) is a complex instrument which established a military balance between the former two groups of states NATO and the Warsaw Pact by providing equal ceilings for major weapons and equipment systems, namely for each group in the whole area from the Atlantic to the Urals. Thus, Article IV (paragraph 1) of the treaty established equal limitations on major armaments, including 20,000 battle tanks (no more than 16,500 in active units); 30,000 armoured combat vehicles (no more than 27,300 in active units), of which no more than 18,000 shall be armoured infantry fighting vehicles and heavy armament combat vehicles, of which no more than 1,500 shall be heavy armament combat vehicles; 20,000 artillery pieces (17,000 in active units); 6,800 combat aircrafts; and 2,000 attack helicopters (NTI 2014: 1). The group ceilings were subsequently translated into national limits for each individual state-party. This treaty came into force on July 17th, 1992, the limits were legally reached by November 16th, 1995. It was widely considered to be the cornerstone of European security. On December 12th, 2007, the Russian Federation announced that it would suspend its participation of the treaty. The NATO member states link their ratification of the Adapted CFE Treaty with the fulfilment by Russia of the political commitments it undertook at the 1999 OSCE Istanbul Summit to withdraw its forces from Moldova and Georgia. Russia has strongly criticized this linkage: 'While there is no hard evidence of a direct relationship between Russia's suspension of the CFE Treaty and the events that led to the 2008 Georgian-Russian conflict, the concurrence of these two developments is striking.' (Lachowski 2009: 6). The August 2008

conflict between Georgia and Russia saw the violation of the principles contained in both the OSCE documents and the preamble of the CFE Treaty, which call on the states' parties to refrain from 'the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state', as well as the commitments to peaceful cooperation and prevention of any military conflict in Europe (ibid: 5). Furthermore, the prospects for resolving the ongoing CFE crisis 'have become even more difficult in the wake of Russia's recognition of Abkhazia and South Ossetia as independent states and the renewed stationing of Russian troops and armaments in these regions' (ibid). The main difference with the earlier CFE treaty was that troop ceilings on a block-to-block basis, NATO vs. Warsaw Pact, would be replaced with a system of national and territorial ceilings. The new treaty would have provided for more inspections and new mechanisms designed to reinforce the states parties' ability to grant or withhold consent for the stationing of foreign forces on their territory.

On March 24th, 1992, the Treaty on Open Skies was signed in Helsinki within the framework of CSCE by 26 member states of NATO and the former Warsaw Pact. Following a very long period of negotiations, the treaty entered into force on January 1st, 2002. The treaty authorises the conduct of unarmed areal observation flights over the entire territory of its 34 signatories using aircraft equipped with agreed imaging devices, 'sensors' according to the terminology of the treaty. At first, Open Skies aimed at contributing to building confidence between former adversaries. But its future, however, 'could well be clouded by the evolution of the security situation in Europe and the priorities of individual states parties (Simonet 2012: 18).

On December 3rd, 1994, the OSCE Forum on Security Cooperation (FSC) adopted the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, which regulates the role of armed forces in democratic societies. This document is only politically binding, it obliges participating states to provide for democratic oversight of their armed, internal, para-military and intelligence forces as well as the police. They are also obliged to ensure that their armed forces remain politically neutral and to guarantee that the human rights of security personnel are respected.

On January 1st, 1995, the OSCE developed from a conference to a fully-fledged organisation according to the Budapest conclusions of 1994. During the 1990s, the OSCE began deploying long-term field operations to accompany the transitions in the countries of former Yugoslavia and Soviet Union (Stenner 2016: 14). The OSCE employs some 450 people in its various institutions and around 2,330 in its field operations (called 'missions', 'offices' or 'project offices') which serve as instruments of conflict prevention and crisis management in a number of participating states (United States Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe – The Helsinki Commission 2003: 3). Mandates for field operations are agreed in the OSCE Permanent Council by consensus, i.e. including the vote of the host country. The mandates of individual missions can take various forms, depending on the situation and needs of the host country. They comprise, inter alia, support and advisory services in the promotion of democracy and the rule of law, human rights and the rights of minorities as well as civil society development and police reform. The OSCE helped the Tajik government to develop a National Border Management Strategy, adopted by Presidential Decree in 2010. Other elements of OSCE assistance for Tajikistan are the Border Patrol and Leadership Programme (launched in December 2008), the Murghab customs project and the Border Management Staff College (BMSC) in Dushanbe which is the first international centre for specialist training of senior border officials, also from Afghanistan (OSCE 2011: 4). The Border Patrol and Leadership Programme has helped to strengthen the operational patrol and surveillance capacities of the Tajik Department of Border Troops and enabled them to increase the number of cross border movement detections and seizures of illegal commodities (ibid: 5). The OSCE has designed and constructed a modern customs terminal at the junction of the roads coming from Kyrgyzstan to the north and China to the east, in response to a request by Tajikistan government for help in controlling the contraband coming into the country. At the outskirts of the town of Murghab in the Pamir Mountains, where yaks use to gaze, an area of three hectares has been fenced in and three office and technical containers and a water tower have been built. The building of the customs terminal was supported by the government of Japan (ibid: 12). In Kyrgyzstan, the OSCE customs training project (2009-2011) team in Bishkek has been working side by side with Kyrgyz officials and trainers. An important part of the project is the training of Afghan customs officers in Bishkek (ibid: 6). In Bishkek, the

OSCE Academy, which was created in 2002, offers a one-year Master of Arts programme in political science (ibid: 8).

The successful implementation of the Sub-Regional Arms Control Agreement required by Annex 1-B of Article IV of the Dayton Peace Accords ended the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the breakup of Yugoslavia. The OSCE handed full control of the agreement to its parties Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia (Periotto 2011: 27). The Dayton Accords mandated the OSCE to help elaborate and implement the Agreement, and the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office (CiO) decided to designate a Personal Representative to assist the parties in negotiating and implementing it, a decision that the OSCE participating states welcomed at their 1995 Ministerial Council in Budapest (OSCE 2011: 27). On June 14th, 1996, the Agreement was signed in Florence, Italy (Periotto 2011: 27). Members of the Dayton Contact Group Countries are the US, the UK, Germany, France, Italy and Russia. International military arms-control experts – particularly the NATO School in Oberammergau, Germany and the RACVIAC Centre for Security Cooperation in Zagreb, Croatia contributed to the education of the international assistants and the parties' military experts (Periotto 2011: 28).

On November 20th, 2011, the latest version of the Vienna Document was adopted by the Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC) and entered into force on December 1st, 2011. It requires participating states to share information on their military forces, equipment and defence planning. The 2011 adoption put an end to an eleven-year deadlock in the work of the FSC to modernise military confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs) and constituted 'a positive example of the ability to the participating States to negotiate and adapt important politically binding commitments without linking them to other contested political issues, such as protracted conflicts or the stalemate of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE)' (von Arx 2012: 9). Among other improvements, the Vienna Document 2011 facilitates and ameliorates certain procedures for inspections, evaluation visits and contacts. A variety of information exchanges, on-site inspections, evaluation visits, observation visits, and other military-to-military contacts take place according to the Vienna Document provisions.

Additionally, the Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW), adopted in 2000, contains a wide range of norms, principles and measures relating to the production, transfer, storage, collection or seizure and destruction of weapons. This document also obliges the participating states to provide information on their annual imports and exports of SALW as well as the number of small arms seized and destroyed. The document is supplemented by FSC decisions that regulate related matters, such as SALW export controls. The OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition, adopted in 2003, outlines criteria for identifying surplus stockpiles of conventional ammunition, explosive material or detonating devices. It also recognises the states' responsibility over stockpile safety and security (Conflict Prevention Centre 2015: 2).

The OSCE has been an essential mediation tool in conflicts that have become protracted in its regions and therefore has created mediation spaces of diverse formats to seek solutions. Thus, the OSCE also mediates talks in the so-called 5+2 format for the settlement of the protracted conflict over Moldova's breakaway Transdniestrian region. The 5+2 format includes Moldova, Transdniestria, the OSCE, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, the United States of America and the European Union. The OSCE functions together with the UN and the EU as co-chair in the Geneva International Discussions addressing the consequences of the 2008 conflict in Georgia, and it also holds the auspices of the Minsk Group dealing with the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, co-chaired by Russia, the US and France (Stenner 2016: 14). The permanent members of the Minsk Group include the following participating states: Belarus, Finland, Germany, Italy, Sweden and Turkey as well as Armenia and Azerbaijan, and, on a rotating basis, the OSCE troika. Furthermore, the OSCE is engaged in mediating in on-going crises, it is striving to open the way for a resolution of the conflict in eastern Ukraine as a member of the Trilateral Contact Group (TCG) (Stenner 2016: 14). This TCG comprises representatives of Ukraine, the Russian Federation and the OSCE (Chairperson-in-Office's Special Representative Martin Sajdik) and its four Working Groups (Working Group on Security Issues; Political Working Group; Humanitarian Working Group; Economic Working Group) (OSCE 2016: 4). Additionally, since 2014 the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (SMM) has been monitoring the security situation in Ukraine and engages with the population to reduce tensions. Furthermore,

the OSCE observer mission at the Russian checkpoints Gukovo and Donetsk continue to monitor and report on the situation at the two checkpoints, as well as on cross-border movements (OSCE 2016: 5). The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights continues to strengthen dialogue among civil society and government stakeholders in Ukraine. Its projects are focused on human rights monitoring, promoting dialogue and cooperation between Russian and Ukrainian civil societies. The High Commissioner on National Minorities aims at strengthening the institutional framework for inter-ethnic relations in Ukraine in the context of decentralisation. The OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media continues to closely monitor the situation regarding media freedom and safety of journalists in Ukraine (OSCE 2016: 5). The OSCE Project Coordinator in Ukraine continues to assist with Ukraine's crisis-related challenges, providing expert support to constitutional, judicial and law enforcement reforms and promoting dialogue to rebuild trust between the central government and conflict-affected communities in eastern Ukraine. Projects include providing support to the government with mine action and elaborating strategies for the social adaption of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and ex-combatants. Another area of focus is promoting conflict-sensitive journalism and journalist's safety (OSCE 2016: 5).

In all of these processes, the Mediation Support Team of the Conflict Prevention Centre's Operations Service offers OSCE Special Representatives, heads of field operations and other mediators targeted assistance, as mandated by the 2011 Ministerial Council Decision on elements of the conflict cycle, which calls for strengthening the OSCE's mediation capacity. The support is request-based and strives for a holistic approach (Stenner 2016: 14).

The main OSCE institutions and bodies are:

1. The negotiating and decision-making bodies:

- Summits: Heads of state or government of the OSCE participating states set priorities and provide orientation at the highest political level. During periods between summits, decision-making and governing power lies with the Ministerial Council.

- The Ministerial Council, which meets annually. Foreign ministers of the OSCE states act as the central decision-making and governing body of the OSCE activities.
- The Permanent Council, which is responsible for the day-to-day operation of the OSCE. It is the regular body for political consultation and decision-making based in Vienna and it convenes weekly to discuss developments in the OSCE area and to make appropriate decisions. Participating states are represented by the members of their delegations. The committees focusing on the three dimensions of the OSCE also work under the Permanent Council: the Security Committee dealing with non-military affairs, the Economic and Environmental Committee and the Human Dimension Committee. The committee meetings enable the representatives to exchange views and prepare decisions in advance to the Permanent Council.
- The Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC), which was established at the 1992 Helsinki Summit of the CSCE and meets weekly in Vienna. It negotiates and consults on concrete measures aimed at strengthening security and stability throughout Europe. The OSCE-57 meet in the FSC to discuss military aspects of security, in particular confidence and security-building measures (Permanent Mission of Finland to the OSCE 2013: 1).

2. The operational structures and institutions:

- The Chairman-in-Office (CiO), which is vested with overall responsibility for executive action and coordination of current OSCE activities. This includes coordination of the work of the OSCE institutions, representing the OSCE and supervising its activities related to conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. The chairmanship rotates annually, and the post of CiO is held by the foreign minister of the participating state that currently holds the chairmanship. The CiO is assisted by the previous and succeeding chairman; the three of them together constitute the Chairmanship Troika.
- Personal Representatives of the CiO to promote tolerance and combat racism, xenophobia and discrimination. The CiO of 2004, Bulgaria, appointed three personal representatives to promote

greater tolerance and combat racism, xenophobia and discrimination across the OSCE region.

- The Secretary-General and the Secretariat, which acts as the representative of the CiO and supports him in all activities aimed at attaining the goals of the OSCE. The Secretariat includes several units that focus on achieving the goals of OSCE: Action against Terrorism Unit, Conflict Prevention Centre, Strategic Police Matters Unit, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities and Office of the Special representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings (ibid: 2).
- The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), which is responsible for furthering human rights, democracy and the rule of law. It is the specialised institution of the OSCE dealing with elections, human rights, and democratisation. Its headquarters is located in Warsaw. The ODIHR's tasks include election observation and advice in democratic elections related issues as well as supporting participating states in implementing their human dimension commitments (ibid).
- The High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) (his/her office is located in The Hague), which responds at the earliest possible stage to ethnic tensions that have the potential to develop into a conflict within the OSCE region. This post was created through the Helsinki Declarations of July 1992 as a reaction to outbreaks of inter-ethnic violence in the former Yugoslavia and concerns about tensions in some former Soviet republics (OSCE 2011: 29).
- The Representative on Freedom of the Media (his/her office is based in Vienna), who assists governments in the furthering of free, independent and pluralistic media and who observes relevant media developments in OSCE participating states with a view of providing early warning on violations of freedom of expression.
- The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly (OSCE PA): The primary task of the more than 300 member Assembly is to facilitate inter-parliamentary dialogue. The parliamentarians of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly are appointed by their national parliaments, and they come together several times each year to

debate questions that are significant for the OSCE (Permanent Mission of Finland to the OSCE 2013: 2).

- The Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, which was established in 1995 to settle disputes submitted to it by OSCE states. The Court can be called upon with regard to any international dispute (United States Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe – The Helsinki Commission 2003: 3).

With the adoption of the 1999 Platform for Cooperative Security, the OSCE declared its firm intention to cooperate with other security institutions, including the EU and NATO. Rather than seeing the OSCE as a rival, the EU strongly supports the strengthening of the OSCE. For example, at the OSCE Istanbul Summit (1999), the EU supported the establishment of Rapid Expert Assistance and Cooperation Teams (REACT), 'which includes a database of experts who can be contacted and actively serve during crisis situations' (van Ham 2006: 161). The EU funds the bulk of the OSCE's funding in all three dimensions of security – the OSCE's three baskets: politico-military security, the economy, and human rights (ibid).

The first formal working group level exchange between EU and OSCE took place in 2003, which indicates that the EU-OSCE dialogue was not very intensive before. EU and OSCE also worked closely together in implementing UN sanctions imposed on former Yugoslavia and Republika Srpska. For Albania, both organizations initiated a so-called Friends of Albania group in September 1998 which coordinated the international efforts to support Albania in its development efforts. In Moldova, the OSCE Mission collaborated with the EU Tacis Programme to encourage the Government of Moldova and the Trans-Dniestrian authorities to begin reconstruction projects. In North Macedonia, both organisations supported the implementation of the 2001 Ohrid Agreement in order to end the armed conflict and stabilise the ethnic tensions in the country (ibid).

The potential for EU-OSCE cooperation is most obvious in the area of conflict prevention and crisis management. Like the EU-NATO Dialogue, the EU and OSCE have institutionalised political contacts at the ministerial and ambassadorial level (van Ham 2006: 162). The European Commission

has its own delegation to most international organisations based in Vienna, the OSCE included. Some OSCE programmes are jointly funded and run with the European Community. For instance, the European Community provides assistance to the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) in monitoring free elections and developing national electoral and human rights institutions in new democracies (European Commission 2009: 1). The President of the European Commission participates at OSCE summits and the Commissioner responsible for external relations participates at the annual Ministerial Council of the OSCE. A meeting is held at ministerial level for each EU presidency, bringing thus the EU Troika (European Commission, previous residency and incoming presidency) and the OSCE Troika (Chairman-in-Office (CiO) foreign minister, previous CiO, incoming CiO, and the OSCE Secretary-General) together to discuss issues of shared interest (European Commission 2009: 1). EU-OSCE relations are complex and at times a conflict-ridden process of institutional collaboration. Perhaps the most vexing problem is that member states use or abuse Europe's key security institutions to further their own national foreign policy and security agenda.

In addition, the OSCE maintains special relations with six Mediterranean Partners for Cooperation: Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia. Mediterranean Partners for Cooperation participate as observers in the OSCE Ministerial Council meetings, and on the margins at high-level with the OSCE Ministerial Troika and the Secretary-General (OSCE 2015: 1).

In the OSCE region, Russia has either directly supported or contributed to the emergence of four breakaway ethnic regions in Eurasia: Transnistria, a self-declared state in Moldova on a strip of land between the Dniester River and Ukraine; Abkhazia, on Georgia's Black Sea coast; South Ossetia, in northern Georgia; and to a lesser degree, Nagorno-Karabakh, a land-locked mountainous region in southwestern Azerbaijan that declared its independence under Armenian protection following a brutal civil war. Moscow's meddling has created so-called frozen conflicts in these states, 'in which the splinter territories remain beyond the control of the central governments and the local de facto authorities enjoy Russian protection and influence.' (Mankoff 2014: 60). Russia 'has felt free to intervene politically and militarily in all these cases, until Crimea, it had never

formally annexed the territory its forces occupied, nor had it deposed the local government' (ibid: 65).

Ukraine – an inter-institutional challenge

The Ukraine conflict cannot be solved without Russia. The EU cannot integrate a country which is not stable and which is unable to exercise jurisdiction. Russian President Vladimir Putin came with an agenda of his own when he sent troops to annex Crimea and stirred political and military upheaval in eastern Ukraine. The EU calls on all sides to agree and honour a ceasefire immediately in order to stabilise the security situation. The EU called on Russia to support the peace plan and to adopt effective measures to stop the continued flow of illegal fighters, arms and equipment over the border into Ukraine, to use its influence on the separatists to stop the violence and lay down their arms, to continue withdrawing and refrain from gathering troops again near the Ukrainian border and to cancel the mandate of the Federation Council to use force on Ukrainian soil. The EU strongly condemns the illegal annexation of Crimea and Sevastopol and will not recognise it. The EU established a CSDP mission to assist Ukraine in the field of civilian SSR, including police and rule of law.

In the 1991 Minsk Agreement, signed by the then heads of state of Belarus (Stanislav Shushkyevitch), the Russian Federation (Boris Jelzin) and Ukraine (Leonid Kravtchuk) on December 8th, 1991, '[t]he high contracting parties recognise and respect one another's territorial integrity and the inviolability of existing borders within the Commonwealth. …' (Article 5). Furthermore in article 6

> [t]hey seek the elimination of all nuclear weapons and universal disarmament under strict international control. The parties will respect one another's aspiration to obtain the status of a non-nuclear zone and a neutral state. The member states of the community will preserve and maintain under united command a common military strategic space, including unified control over nuclear weapons, the procedure for implementing which is regulated by a special agreement.

On September 5th, 2014, the OSCE released the 12-point protocol agreements reached between Russia and Ukraine and separatists in Minsk.

This protocol was signed by Ambassador Heidi Tagliavini (OSCE), Leonid Kutchma (the second president of Ukraine) and the ambassador of the Russian Federation to Ukraine, M. Yu. Zurabov (members of the trilateral contact group). The 12-point protocol was also signed by A.V. Zakharchenko and I.V. Plotnitskij. It calls to

1. provide for immediate and two-sided ceasefire;
2. provide monitoring and verification from the side of OSCE of the ceasefire;
3. conduct decentralisation of power, including through approval of the Law of Ukraine 'On temporary order of local self-government in certain districts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions' (law on special status);
4. provide permanent monitoring at the Ukrainian-Russian state border, verification by OSCE, with creation of a safety zone in the areas adjacent to the border in Ukraine and Russia;
5. immediately free all hostages and illegally held persons;
6. approve a law to prevent persecution and punishment of persons in relation to events that took place in certain districts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions of Ukraine;
7. continue an inclusive national dialogue;
8. take measures to improve the humanitarian situation in Donbas;
9. conduct early local elections in accordance with the Law of Ukraine 'on temporary order of local self-government in certain districts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions' (Law on special status);
10. remove illegal military formations, military equipment and militants and mercenaries from the territory of Ukraine;
11. approve a program for economic development of Donbass and renew the vital functions of the region;
12. give guarantees of personal security for participants of consultations. (Kyivpost 2014: 1)

The OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (SMM) was deployed on March 21st, 2014, following a request to the OSCE by Ukraine's government and a consensus decision by all 57 OSCE participating states. The SMM is an unarmed, civilian mission, present on the ground in all regions of Ukraine. Its main tasks are to observe and report in an impartial and objective way on the situation in Ukraine, and to facilitate dialogue

among all parties to the crisis. The conflict in Ukraine has led to at least 10,000 casualties and displaced over 1.5 million since early 2014 (NATO 2018b: 1). The Minsk peace process which since mid-2014 has sought to broker and to end the conflict, has been at a standstill, and violence has been escalating.

Ukraine has long been considered a possible candidate for NATO, signing a partnership agreement in 1997 and launching talks on full membership in 2005. In June 2017, the Ukrainian parliament voted to restore NATO membership as the country's strategic foreign policy objective. The Verkhovna Rada passed a bill 'to amend the Ukrainian laws on national security and internal and foreign policies. The new laws hereby enact Ukraine's commitment to achieve NATO membership strategically by having made it legally binding' (Adamowski 2017: 30), the Parliament said in a statement on June 8th, 2017. Passed by a majority of 276 members of parliament out of the 450 elected lawmakers, the bill represents a shift from Ukraine's previous nonaligned policy (ibid). This move is expected to stimulate increased military cooperation between Ukraine and NATO allies. NATO opposes 'Russia's continuing destabilisation of Eastern Ukraine'. 'We highly evaluate our cooperation with […] NATO in all spheres,' Ukrainian Prime Minister Volodymyr Groysman said on February 9th, 2017 (ibid).

Thus, NATO called upon

> the Russian Federation to honour its international commitments, including those set out in the Budapest Memorandum of 1994, the Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation between Russia and Ukraine of 1997, and the legal framework regulating the presence of the Russian Black Sea Fleet, to withdraw its forces to its bases, and to refrain from any interference elsewhere in Ukraine. We urge both parties to immediately seek a peaceful resolution through bilateral dialogue, with international facilitation, as appropriate, and through the dispatch of international observers under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

NATO continues to see Ukraine as

> a valued partner for NATO and a founding member of the Partnership for Peace. NATO Allies will continue to support Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and the right of the Ukrainian people to determine their own future, without inside interference (North Atlantic Council 2014: 1).

However, Russia 'must use its influence with the separatists to deescalate the situation and take concrete steps to allow for a political and a diplomatic solution which respects Ukraine's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and internationally recognised borders' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014b: point 16).

The EU strongly condemned the holding of an illegal 'referendum' in Crimea on joining the Russian Federation, in clear breach of the Ukrainian Constitution. The European Council of March 20th, 2014, strongly condemned the illegal annexation of Crimea and Sevastopol of the Russian Federation (European Union External Action 2015b: 3). The EU considered the holding of 'presidential and parliamentary elections' in Donetsk and Luhansk 'People's Republics' on November 2nd, 2014, as illegal and illegitimate, calling on all sides to work towards early local elections in these parts of the Donetsk and Luhansk regions in accordance with Ukrainian law (ibid: 6). The EU fully supports all the initiatives aimed at bringing political solution to the ongoing conflict in Eastern Ukraine, using all the means available to push for a political solution, by applying pressure as well as continuing dialogue. On March 19th, 2015, the European Council agreed that the duration of the restrictive measures against the Russian Federation, adopted on July 31st, 2014, and enhanced on September 8th, 2014, should be clearly linked to the complete implementation of the Minsk agreements (ibid. 7-8). The EU has also increased its support for the work of the OSCE in Ukraine. The EU and its member states have been the biggest contributors to the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission (SMM), contributing about two thirds of both the mission's budget and monitors. The EU has furthermore donated unarmoured and armoured vehicles to the SMM (ibid: 9).
In October 2017, the outgoing EU ambassador to Moscow, Vygaudas Ušackas, said that relations between Russia and the EU are stuck in a 'deep and acute' crisis and are unlikely to improve until President Putin leaves office and the conflict in Ukraine is resolved – events that could be many

years away. He said the EU must offer Ukraine a path to membership of the bloc if it wants to resist Russian attempts to bring Ukraine more firmly back under Moscow's control: 'The differences between us are vast and hinge on principles of European security.' (The Guardian Weekly 2017b: 2) The EU 'is committed to a policy of sequenced engagement with Ukraine and to a close relationship that encompasses gradual progress towards political association and economic integration. Ukraine is a priority partner country with the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and the Eastern Partnership (EaP). The Partnership and Cooperation Agreement between the EU and Ukraine, which entered into force in 1998, provides a comprehensive framework for cooperation between the EU and Ukraine in key areas of reform.' (European Union External Action 2015b: 1). An Association Agreement, including a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area, was negotiated between 2007 and 2011 and initialled in 2012. The EU and Ukraine signed the political provisions of the Association Agreement on March 21st, 2014, underlining commitment to proceed with the signature and conclusion of the remaining parts of the Agreement. Following the completion of technical preparations, the EU and Ukraine signed the remaining provisions of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement in Brussels on June 27th, 2014. Provisional application of important parts of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement began on November 1st, 2014: on the respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and rule of law; political dialogue and reform; justice, freedom and security; economic and financial cooperation (ibid: 2). The EU has also acted as moderator in discussions on energy security between Ukraine and Russia in trilateral gas talks, leading to an agreement on October 30th, 2014, on outstanding energy debt issues and an interim solution that enables gas supplies to continue throughout the winter (ibid). Germany has urged Russia to continue sending gas through Ukraine even after the planned North Stream 2 pipeline comes into operation, saying it was determined to avoid 'damage' to Kiev (Chazan/Olearchyk/Peel 2018: 2). Germany is facing accusations that North Stream 2 could increase Europe's reliance on Russian energy at a time of mounting tension with Moscow. The pipeline will allow Germany to import more gas directly from Russia, bypassing Ukraine, which fears the loss of billions of dollars of transit fees (ibid). Germany's position on the €9.5bn project has hardened. Berlin warned in April 2018 that it could not go ahead unless Ukraine's role as a transit route for Russian gas was protected (ibid).

NATO

NATO´s goals and the command structure

On 4th April 1949, NATO was founded as a political alliance to protect economic reconstruction in Western Europe. This was the first time the United States had formed a security alliance based on democratic principles with European countries. NATO finally was the security umbrella under which Western Europe became an economic and political partner to North America. Now NATO member states represent the richest group of countries in the world; they are each other's greatest trading partners and biggest direct investors. In Western Europe, strong economic and security relations became the key instruments to unify former foes and to increase living standards rapidly.

At its core, this is NATO's historical mission: 'ensuring peace, freedom, stability and prosperity for our people' (Bakke-Jensen 2017: 18). Article 5 provides for a unified response by NATO states should a member nation come under attack. The United States of America 'has on numerous occasions made it clear that it stands by its commitments to its NATO allies: 'This is also demonstrated through action. US investments in European security through the European Deterrence Initiative is a clear example' (ibid).

NATO will not rule out invoking Article 5 should one or more member nations find themselves under a serious cyber-attack that threatens critical military and civilian infrastructure. According to NATO officials, the Alliance would deliver 'a robust response in the event of a serious and prolonged attack on a member state in cyberspace' (O'Dwyer 2017: 9). NATO member Estonia came under a series of coordinated denial-of-service attacks in 2007 that caused serious disruption to state IT infrastructure, including military networks. The cyber attacks also targeted online platforms run by the country's leading banks, denying customers access to their accounts and basic services. 'NATO would take a very different and offensive posture if a cyber attack event on the scale of that launched against Estonia in 2007 were to happen now,' said Brig. Gen Christos Athanasiadis, then-assistant chief of staff cyber at NATO's

Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (ibid). Therefore, Article 5 could be activated in certain situations if deliberately hostile attacks against a NATO member state happened within a cyberwar scenario.

NATO's Command Structure is under the authority of the Military Committee, NATO's highest military authority composed of the Chiefs of Defence of all 29 member states. They meet at least three times a year. The Chairman of the Military Committee presides over the Military Committee where each member country has a military representative (or Milrep) for his/her Chief of Defence. This committee – NATO's most senior military authority – provides the North Atlantic Council and the Nuclear Planning Group with consensus-based military advice – that is, advice agreed to by all of NATO's Chiefs of Defence (NATO 2018d: 1). Permanent military representatives of the 29 nations, mainly of three-star rank, meet one to four times a week in formal and informal sessions. The Military Committee is supported by the International Military Staff of about 500 military and civilian personnel from NATO member countries. The International Military Staff provides strategic and military advice and staff support for the Military Committee, which advises the North Atlantic Council on military aspects of policy, operations and transformation within NATO (NATO 2017: 1). It also ensures that NATO decisions and policies on military matters are implemented by the appropriate NATO military bodies (ibid).

The NATO's Command Structure consists of two strategic commands: Allied Command Operations (ACO) and Allied Command Transformation (ACT). ACO, under the command of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) in Belgium (at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe – SHAPE), is responsible for the planning and execution of all NATO military operations, as directed by the North Atlantic Council. ACO consists of a strategic-level Joint Force Commands (JFC) in Naples / Italy, and Brunssum / the Netherlands, each of which is capable of deploying up to a major joint operation-capable headquarters out of area. ACO is further organised into three major tactical-level commands for air (Allied Air Command – AIRCOM, Germany), land (Allied Land Command – LANDCOM, Turkey), and sea operations (Allied Maritime Command – MARCOM, UK), each with a dedicated headquarters (NATO 2018c: 1). ACT is the forefront of NATO's military transformation. It is under the

command of the Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT), who exercises his responsibilities from headquarters in Norfolk / Virginia (USA). ACT's main responsibilities include education, training and exercises, and promoting interoperability throughout NATO. ACT operates the Joint Analysis and Lessons Learnt Centre in Lisbon / Portugal, the Joint Force Training Centre in Bydgoszcz / Poland, and the Joint Warfare Centre in Stavanger / Norway (ibid).

NATO's Command Structure is composed of permanent multinational headquarters at the strategic, operational and component levels of command. At the end of the Cold War, NATO had 22,000 staff across 33 commands. In 2018, NATO maintained personnel in 6,800 posts across seven commands. In November 2017, the NATO defence ministers decided to establish two new multi-corps capable Land Component Commands: a Joint Force Command (JFC) for the Atlantic, based at Norfolk / Virginia, to ensure that sea lines of communication between Europe and North America remain free and secure; a new Joint Support and Enabling Command (JSEC), based at Ulm / Germany, to improve the movement of troops and equipment within Europe; it is responsible 'for organising and protecting movements of troops and equipment within Europe' (Permanent Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: 1). Aditionally, a Cyberspace Operations Centre in Belgium was established 'to provide situational awareness and cooperation of NATO operational activity within cyberspace' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 29).

Thus, in June 2018, the NATO defence ministers approved the finalised plan. NATO was revamping its structures 'partly to better counter the perceived threat posed by Russia' (Banks 2018a: 10).

NATO can quickly dispatch Rapid Deployable Corps which are High Readiness Headquarters to lead NATO troops on missions within or beyond the territory of NATO member states. Those corps can be deployed for a wide range of missions: from disaster management, humanitarian assistance and peace support to counter-terrorism and high-intensity war fighting (NATO 2015: 1). Rapid Deployable Corps can command and control forces from the size of a brigade up to a corps of tens of thousands. There are currently nine NATO Rapid Deployable

Corps, which are each capable of commanding up to 60,000 soldiers (ibid: 2). Now the general requirement for High Readiness Forces Headquarters is to be ready to deploy its first elements within ten days and the entire force within two months. The corps participates in the NATO Response Force (NRF) (ibid). Under the NRF's rotation system, a designated Rapid Deployable Corps assumes command of the land component of the NRF for a fixed 12-month period, during which it is on standby (ibid). The corps are multinational, but are sponsored and paid by one or more 'framework nations' who provide the bulk of the headquarters' personnel, equipment and financial resources; i.e. Germany and Poland are framework nations of the Multinational Corps Northeast and Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg and Spain are the Eurocorps framework nations. All Rapid Deployable Corps Headquarters, except Eurocorps, belong to NATO's integrated military structure, which means that they operate under the direct operational command of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) (ibid: 4). The political authorisation of the North Atlantic Council (NAC), NATO's principal political decision-making body, is required to deploy the corps. In addition, any commitment of the Eurocorps requires an exclusive decision of the member states Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg and Spain (ibid).

The Allied Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC), originally based in Rheindalen / Germany, but now in Innsworth / UK, was the first such corps, created in 1992. Following a review of NATO forces structures, four more High Readiness Force Headquarters were established in 2002 and three other were established in 2005 and 2006 reaching the total of nine High Readiness Force Headquarters (ibid). These are:

- the Allied Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC) in Innsworth, Gloucester (UK);
- the NATO Rapid Deployable Corps Italy (NRDC-IT) in Solbiate Olana near Milan;
- the NATO Rapid Deployable Corps Spain (NRDC-Spain) in Valencia;
- the NATO Rapid Deployable Corps Turkey (NRDC-T) based near Istanbul;
- the 1 German-Netherlands Corps based in Münster, Germany;
- the Rapid Reaction Corps France (RRC-FR) based in Lille;

- the NATO Deployable Corps Greece (NRDC-GR) based in Thessaloniki;
- the Multinational Corps Northeast (MNC-NE) based in Szczecin, Poland;
- Eurocorps, based in Strasbourg, France, has a technical agreement with NATO since 2002 and can be used for NATO missions.

The Spanish corps commanded the land elements of the NRF that were deployed to Pakistan as part of NATO's disaster assistance to the country following the devastating October 2005 earthquake. In 2006, the Allied Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC) commanded the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. The NATO Rapid Deployable Corps Italy, the NATO Rapid Deployable Corps Turkey, Eurocorps and 1 German-Netherlands Corps have also commanded ISAF. In addition, ARRC and Eurocorps played an important role in NATO's operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia and Kosovo (ibid).

Nuclear weapons 'are a core component of NATO's overall capabilities for deterrence and defence alongside conventional and missile defence forces' (NATO 2012a: point 8). The 'fundamental purpose of NATO's nuclear capability is to preserve peace, prevent coercion, and deter aggression' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 36):

> 'As long as nuclear weapons exist, NATO will remain a nuclear alliance. The strategic forces of the Alliance, particularly those of the United States, are the supreme guarantee of the Allies. The independent strategic nuclear forces of the United Kingdom and France have a deterrent role of their own and contribute significantly to the overall security of the Alliance' (ibid: point 35).

In 2017, the global nuclear warhead inventory reads as follows:

- Russia: 7,000 including 2,510 warheads no longer in the stockpile but intact as they await dismantlement (retired), 4,500 warheads assigned for potential use on military delivery vehicles; includes active and inactive warheads (stockpiled) and 1,561 warheads on ballistic missiles and at aircraft bases (deployed) (Defense News 2018a: 22).

- USA: 6,800 including 2,800 warheads no longer in the stockpile but intact as they await dismantlement (retired), 4,018 warheads assigned for potential use on military delivery vehicles; includes active and inactive warheads (stockpiled) and 1,393 warheads on ballistic missiles and at aircraft bases (deployed). In 1966/1967 the warheads numbered 31,255 in the US nuclear weapons stockpile (ibid).
- France: 300
- China 270
- UK: 215
- Pakistan: 140
- India: 130
- Israel: 80
- North Korea: 15 (ibid).

At the Lisbon Summit in November 2010, NATO leaders decided to develop a territorial ballistic missile defence (BMD) capability. In May 2012 at the Chicago Summit, NATO leaders declared the Interim NATO BMD capability as a first operationally meaningful step. It offered the maximum coverage within available means to defend NATO's populations, territory and forces across southern Europe against a limited ballistic missile attack. However, the final aim remains to provide full coverage and protection for all NATO European populations, territory and forces against the increasing threats posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles. This coverage is based on the principles of indivisibility of allied security and NATO solidarity, equitable sharing of risks and burdens, as well as reasonable challenge.

> NATO ballistic missile defence is purely defensive and not directed against Russia. As explained by NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg, geography and physics make it impossible for the NATO system to shoot down Russian intercontinental missiles by the interceptors available for NATO BMD. They are too few, and located too far south or too close to Russia, to be able to do so. They are designed to tackle threats from outside the Euro-Atlantic area. (NATO 2016a: 1)

The US BMD system consists of 36 ICBM interceptors – 32 in Alaska at Fort Greely and four in California at Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency expanded that number to 44 (Klimas and O'Brien 2017: 3). As part of the US European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA)

- Turkey hosts a US BMD radar at Kürecik;
- Romania hosts an Aegis Ashore site at Deveselu Air Base;
- Germany hosts the command centre at Ramstein Air Base;
- Poland hosts another Aegis Ashore site at the Redzikowo military base;
- Additionally, Spain hosts four multi-mission BMD-capable Aegis ships at its naval base in Rota. These assets are national contributions, and are integral parts of the NATO BMD capability.

However, 'NATO BMD is based on voluntary national contributions, mainly US European Phased Adaptive Approach assets in Romania, Turkey, Spain, and Poland' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 38).

In the 2010 Lisbon Capabilities Commitment (LCC), NATO leaders agreed to prioritise resources to deliver '[t]he Alliance's most pressing capability needs'. The LCC identified eleven common funded and multinational programmes. Some of these address operational shortfalls in NATO and national capabilities. Others support emerging and future missions, such as missile and cyber defence and the civil-military Comprehensive Approach (Flory 2010: 29). Allies also committed to deliver long-delayed but critically needed programs like Alliance Ground Surveillance (AGS) and the Air Command and Control System (ACCS) (Flory 2010: 29).

NATO ties with partner nations

The alliance also has been deepening and strengthening cooperation with partner nations. Since 2002, NATO launched different forms of cooperation with partners:

- Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP): Launched at the November 2002 Prague Summit, IPAPs are open to countries that have the political will and ability to deepen their relationship with

NATO. IPAPs are developed on a two-year basis, an IPAP should clearly set out the cooperation objectives and priorities of the individual partner country, and ensure that the various mechanisms in use correspond directly to these priorities. NATO provides focused, country-specific advice on reform objectives. Intensified political dialogue on relevant issues may be an integral part of an IPAP process. Objectives covered fall into the general categories of political and security issues; defence, security and military issues; public information; science and environment; civil emergency planning; and administrative, protective security and resource issues. On October 29th, 2004, Georgia became the first country to agree an IPAP with NATO. Azerbaijan agreed on May 27th, 2005, Armenia on December 16th, 2005, Kazakhstan on January 31st, 2006, Moldova on May 19th, 2006 (NATO 2006: 1).

- The Wales Summit in September 2014 has created a new Partnership Interoperability Initiative plus a related Interoperability Platform with 24 partners, including Austria and Switzerland. Within that initiative, so-called 'enhanced opportunities' were offered to an inner circle of five nations: Australia, Finland, Georgia, Jordan, and Sweden. There are no written criteria for these enhanced opportunities, but there are hints that they have to do not only with participation in crisis management operations (a criterion which Austria fulfils), but also in the NATO Response Force and other advanced trainings, with defence budgets. The concrete advantages of the enhanced opportunities lie in intensified political consultations, closer involvement in the planning of activities of interest to partners and in guaranteed participation in desired training activities.
- Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI): launched at NATO's Summit in Istanbul on June 28th, 2004, aims to contribute to long-term global and regional security by offering countries of the broader Middle East region practical bilateral security cooperation with NATO. The ICI offers a 'menu' of bilateral activities that countries can choose from in six areas: tailored advice on defence reform, defence budgeting, defence planning and civil-military relations; military-to-military cooperation to contribute to interoperability through participation in selected military exercises and related

> education and training activities that could improve the ability of participating countries' forces to operate with those of NATO; and through participation in selected NATO and Partnership for Peace (PfP) exercises and in NATO-led operation on a case-by-case basis; cooperation in the fight against terrorism, including through intelligence-sharing; cooperation in NATO's work on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery; cooperation regarding border security in connection with terrorism, small arms and light weapons and the fight against illegal trafficking; civil emergency planning, including participating in training courses and exercises on disaster assistance. Participating nations are Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, United Arab Emirates (NATO 2005a: 1).

At the NATO Summit in Brussels in July 2018, NATO expressed its committment 'to building a stronger and more dynamic relationship with our Mediterranean Dialogue and Istanbul Cooperation Initiative partners, including to help them modernise their defence and security institutions' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 55). On July 11th, 2018, NATO declared full capability of its Regional Hub for the South in Naples. This Hub aims at contributing to the situational awareness and understanding of regional challenges, threats, and opportunities; supporting the collection management, and sharing of information; coordinating NATO's activities in the South aimed at focusing a more strategic and coherent approach to the Middle East and North Africa (MENA); and reaching out to partners:

> We are determined to complete, including through the full capability of the Regional Hub for the South, the additional work required to implement all elements of our Framework of the South, namely the ability to anticipate and respond to crises emanating from the South, improved capabilities for expeditionary operations, and enhancing NATO's ability to project stability through regional partnerships and capacity building efforts. These efforts include advance planning and conducting more exercises with scenarios reflecting the strategic environment in the South. (ibid: point 27)

Within that overall strategic aim, NATO is pursuing three main objectives:

- To strengthen NATO's deterrence and defence against threats emanating from the south;
- to contribute to international crisis management efforts in the region; and
- to help our regional partners build resilience against security threats, including in the fight against terrorism (ibid: point 55).

Enhanced planning and exercises shall help improve NATO's ability to anticipate and respond to crises in the region. The NATO-ICI Regional Centre in Kuwait allows NATO to work more closely with partners in the Gulf region to enhance regional security and counter shared threats. NATO also aims at further developing its relations with the League of Arab States and the Gulf Cooperation Council, and at strengthening its cooperation with the African Union (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 55). Furthermore, NATO builds on the implementation of the Defence and related Security Capacity Building (DCB) assistance to Jordan 'in such priority areas as cyber defence; counter-improvised explosive devices; and civil preparedness and crisis management' (ibid: point 56). Similarly in Tunisia, the DCB package was implemented mainly through education and training activities and the exchange of expertise and best practices (ibid: point 57).

NATO is also engaged in disaster relief and plans and conducts exercises in this field. In 2000, NATO established the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) for disaster relief purpose. From September 25th to 29th,2017, EADRCC conducted the consequence management fields exercise 'Bosna i Herzegovina 2017', in and around the city of Tuzla. The exercise had been jointly organised by EADRCC and the Ministry of Security of Bosnia and Herzegovina. More than 1,200 participants from 34 NATO allied and partner countries took part in this event. NATO and partner countries practiced disaster response mechanisms, exercised capabilities and improved their ability to work together effectively in emergency situations. The exercise also contributed to strengthening the host nation's capacity to effectively coordinate international disaster response operations. The exercise was based on a combined flood and earthquake scenario, linked to the type of geological and environmental challenges faced by Bosnia and Herzegovina. Floods

and landslides devastated large parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2014. More than 40 countries and several international organizations provided support. At the request of the Ministry of Security, a NATO civilian team was deployed to Bosnia and Herzegovina in July 2014. One of the team's recommendations was that training activities and civil military international exercises should be organised in the future. It provided an opportunity for NATO and partner countries to improve interoperability across a wide range of operations, including water rescue, urban search and rescue and chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) protection. This was the seventieth field exercise conducted by the EADRCC since 2000, and first hosted by Bosnia and Herzegovina. The exercise Base of Operation was located at the Campus of the University of Tuzla (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2017b: 1 and 2).

NATO operations

One main challenge of European NATO allies focuses to the deployability of troops: NATO needed 30 nations to field 50,000 troops in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1995 and stretched to field 66,000 troops in both IFOR/SFOR (Implementation Force/Stabilization Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina) and KFOR (Kosovo Force) in 2000 (Simon 2005: 33). The Balkans 'demonstrated unequivocally the necessity of being able rapidly to deploy well-equipped military forces to theatre, but also that it is a fallacy to believe that every conflict has a purely military solution' (Wallace 2013: 15).

In Afghanistan, US-led Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and the subsequent and deployment of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) have benefited greatly from a shared risk perception and were legitimised in the first NATO invocation of article 5 in the wake of the '9/11' attacks on September 11th, 2001 (Simon 2005: 1): 'It would be wrong to describe Operation Enduring Freedom as traditional war fighting. It has not been that. Al-Qaida and the Taliban were unlike any adversary the US military had encountered before. And soldiers and airmen have learned plenty.' (Aitoro 2017: 28). NATO's aim is to 'help establish the conditions in which Afghanistan can enjoy – after decades of conflict, destruction and poverty – a representative government and self-sustaining peace and security' (NATO 2008: 1). NATO's engagement during the ISAF mission in Afghanistan was three-fold:

- Through leadership of a UN-mandated ISAF, an international force of some 41,700 troops (including National Support Elements) that assisted the Afghan authorities in extending and exercising its authority and influence across Afghanistan, creating the conditions for stabilisation and reconstruction.
- A Senior Civilian Representative, responsible for advancing the political-military aspects of the Alliance's commitment to the country, who worked closely with ISAF, liaised with the Afghan government and other international organisations, and maintained contacts with neighbouring countries.
- A substantial programme of cooperation with Afghanistan, concentrating on defence reform, defence institution-building and the military aspects of security sector reform (NATO 2008: 1).

ISAF's main security tasks included the conduct of stability and security operations; support to the Afghan National Army; support to the Afghan government programmes to Disarm Illegally Armed Groups (DIAG); support to the Afghan National Police (ANP), within means and capabilities (ibid). The mission of ISAF was concluded at the end of 2014, a new, follow-on, NATO-led mission called Resolute Support was launched on January 1st, 2015, to provide further training, advice and assistance for the Afghan security forces and institutions. At the NATO Summit in Warsaw, allied leaders decided to extend the presence of RSM beyond 2016. In June 2018, some 16,000 personnel from 39 contributing countries were deployed in support of the RSM. The biggest troop-contributing nations during this time were the United States of America (8,475 servicemen), Germany (1,300 servicemen), Italy (895 servicemen), Georgia (870 servicemen), Romania (679 servicemen), the United Kingdom (650 servicemen) and Turkey (563 servicemen) (NATO 2018a: 2). The mission operates with one central hub (in Kabul/Bagram) and four spokes in Mazar-e-Sharif, Herat, Kandahar and Laghman (ibid: 1). Key functions include:

- Supporting planning, programming and budgeting; assuring transparency, accountability and oversight;
- Supporting the adherence to the principles of rule of law and good governance;

- Supporting the establishment and sustainment of such processes as force generation, recruiting, training, managing and development of personnel.

The detailed operation plan for RSM was approved by NATO foreign ministers at the end of June 2014. The legal framework for RSM is provided by a Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), which was signed in Kabul on September 30th, 2014 by the Afghan President and NATO's Senior Civilian Representative to Afghanistan, and later ratified by the Afghan Parliament on November 27th, 2014. The SOFA defines the terms and conditions under which NATO forces will be deployed in Afghanistan as part of RSM, as well as the activities that they are set to carry out under this agreement. The UN Security Council welcomed the RSM with the unanimous adoption on December 12th, 2014, of Resolution 2189, which underscores the importance of continued international support for the stability of Afghanistan. Beyond the training, advice and assistance mission, allies and partner countries are committed to the broader international community's support for the long-term financial sustainment of the Afghan security forces until the end of 2020 (ibid: 1). NATO places 'special emphasis on continuing the development of Afghan Special Forces, Air Forces and improving command and control' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2017c: 1).

The security situation in Afghanistan has changed significantly over the last years. The reasons for this are the persistent resistance of the Taliban and the emergence of the 'Islamic State' in different parts of the country. The failure of the Afghan government and the international community to bring peace and the rise of the 'Islamic State' have significantly increased the concerns of the regional players (Russia, Iran and Pakistan) regarding their own security. Suddenly they find themselves on the same side, countering the 'Islamic State' and exerting pressure on the Taliban as well as on the Afghan government towards a peaceful settlement of the Afghan conflict. And it seems that they are ready to play an assertive role (Aakhunzzada 2018: 1): 'Operations in Afghanistan created a lot of challenges for the military. It ate up funds. It exhausted military personnel. It divided factions of the country, as wars so often do. But it also sucked the oxygen out the room.' (Aitoro 2017: 28) Furthermore 'the situation is worse than it's ever

been. […] It's not because the American military failed, but the American military can't fix the problems in Afghanistan. Poppy production, corruption, tribal decisions, topography. All the uncontrollable are there. You don't fix that with the military. We tried that, had over 100,000 troops in there for a number of years,' said Chuck Hagel, former US secretary of defence (Metha 2018: 27).

NATO also has been focusing on sea operations: In today's globalised economy, 90 percent of the total volume of goods is moved by sea, and communication cables that carry 95 percent of the world's cyberspace traffic lie on the sea-bed. The Mediterranean Sea is no exception. In terms of energy alone, some 65 percent of the oil and natural gas consumed in Western Europe pass through the Mediterranean each year (NATO 2016b: 2). In the Mediterranean, Operation Active Endeavour was one of the measures resulting from NATO's decision to implement article 5 of the Washington Treaty on September 12th, 2001, expanding the options available in the 9/11 campaign against terrorism. For the first time in NATO's history, NATO assets have been deployed in support of article 5 operations. Following US requests, NATO subsequently agreed to implement eight specific measures to expand the options available in the campaign against terrorism. These measures included the deployment of elements of NATO's Standing Naval Forces that was dispatched to conduct maritime presence, monitoring and boarding operations in support of the international campaign against terrorism. On March 16th, 2004, this Operation Active Endeavour had been expanded to the whole Mediterranean. NATO invited Russia and Ukraine as well as Mediterranean Dialogue states like Israel or Jordan to join this operation. Launched in October 2001, it continued to conduct surveillance and monitoring operations of the major shipping lanes of the Mediterranean. NATO decided in 2004 to enlist the support of partner countries, Mediterranean Dialogue countries and other selected nations. Russia became the first partner to support the operation with a ship in September 2006. Ukraine was the second partner to contribute, deploying a frigate in June 2007 (NATO 2007: 1).

As part of the 2011 NATO Maritime Strategy, NATO has created a flexible maritime operation called Sea Guardian which replaced Operation Active Endeavour. Sea Guardian was launched at the Warsaw Summit in July 2016

and comes under the command of Headquarters Allied Maritime Command (HQ MARCOM), Northwood / UK. The contributing forces are generated from national assets (NATO 2016b: 2). Sea Guardian is not be driven by NATO's collective defence clause (article 5). However, it could have an article 5 component, if the North Atlantic Council (NAC) so decides. It shall be able to undertake the following seven tasks:

- support maritime situational awareness: the focus is on information-sharing between allies and with civilian agencies to enhance the NATO Recognised Maritime Picture (RMP);
- uphold freedom of navigation: NATO must be ready and able to act in compliance with and support the principle of freedom of navigation in times of peace and war. This includes surveillance, patrol, maritime interdiction, special operations, deployment of law enforcement detachments and, when authorised, the use of force;
- conduct maritime interdiction: assets will be assigned for quick-response actions and may use special operations forces and experts in chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) weapons to board suspect vessels;
- fight the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction: the aim is to prevent the transport and deployment of weapons of mass destruction, and involves the ability to locate, identify and secure illicit CBRN material transiting at sea;
- protect critical infrastructure: at the request of a NATO or non-NATO country and in accordance with directions from the North Atlantic Council, NATO will help protect critical infrastructure in the maritime environment, including the control of choke points;
- support maritime counter-terrorism: this involves the planning and conduct of a range of operations to deter, disrupt, and defend and protect against maritime-based terrorist activities; essentially, these operations will aim to deny terrorist access to designated areas and contain threats through the use of force;
- contribute to maritime security capacity-building: NATO could contribute to the international community's efforts in developing maritime security with both military and non-military authorities (ibid: 3-4).

So far, the major maritime operations already conducted by NATO had been Operation Active Endeavour in the Mediterranean and Operation Ocean Shield off the Horn of Africa. Operation Ocean Shield was NATO's counter-piracy operation off the Horn of Africa. In 2016, NATO has been assisting Frontex, the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, and Greek and Turkish national authorities in their efforts to tackle the migrant and refugee crisis in the Aegean. Drawing from the extensive experience accrued from these operations, NATO has acquired unparalleled expertise in the deterrence of maritime terrorist activity in the Mediterranean Sea, detecting and deterring piracy activity, capacity-building and maritime situational awareness. Moreover, this experience has strengthened the Alliance's capacity to cooperate with non-NATO countries, civilian agencies and other international organisations (NATO 2016b: 3).

In 2011, The NATO Operation Unified Protector in Libya revealed 'that NATO allies do not lack military capabilities. Any shortfalls have been primarily due to political, rather than military, constraints' (Rasmussen 2011: 2). The NATO air campaign Unified Protector triggered chaos in Libya. Originally, this mission based on UN Security Council Resolutions 1970 and 1973 (2011) consisted of three elements: an arms embargo, a no-fly zone and actions to protect civilians from attack or the threat of attack. In October 2011 the Muammar al-Gaddafi regime was toppled, and the state of Libya has since then become a split country. In early 2015, 'Islamic State' fighters made a murderous debut in Libya alongside warring militias, rendering the return of stability ever more remote. The release of an 'Islamic State' video of the beheading of 21 Christian Egyptians in Libya in February 2015 showed this group was serious about expansion in the lawless country (Kington 2015: 6). The arrival of the 'Islamic State' followed a slow, four-year collapse of the central government in the wake of NATO's campaign backing rebels who unseated Gaddafi (Kington 2015: 6). Two hostile governments have originally efficiently split the country: moderate Islamicists (Libyan Dawn Coalition) rule of militias in Tripoli backed by Qatar, and a government set up in Tobruk – which was internationally recognised – was backed by Egypt (ibid: 1). In 2019, fightings erupted between a military force led by General Khalifa Haftar, a former Gaddafi officer who joined the opposition against him, and the internationally recognised Libyan government in Tripoli when General

Haftar tried to conquer the Libyan capital. According to Libya, NATO still remains 'committed to providing advice to Libya in the area of defence and security institution'. Thus, any assistance to Libya would be provided in full complementarity and in close coordination with other international efforts, including those of the UN and the EU (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 58).

The NATO Training Mission in Iraq (NTM-I) started in 2004 at the request of the Iraqi authorities. The aim was to help to develop a more sustainable, multi-ethnic security force. From 2004 and 2011, NTM-I has trained over 5,000 military personnel and over 10,000 police personnel in Iraq, provided courses for nearly 2,000 more in NATO countries, as well as over €115 million worth of military equipment and a total of €17.7 million in trust fund donations from all NATO allies for training and education at NATO facilities. The permanent withdrawal of the NATO Training Mission personnel from Iraq was undertaken by December 31st, 2011. In early 2018, NATO agreed to organise a formal military training mission in Iraq again to stabilize the country and fight terrorism 'in all its forms and manifestations' (North Atlantic Treaty Organizations 2018: point 54; and Mehta 2018: 12). Australia, Finland and Sweden are operational partners in this training mission which is not a combat mission. NATO sends mobile training team groups who visit for a limited period of time for specific training. And some countries also invite Iraqi officers to their nations for training (Mehta 2018: 12). NATO advises relevant Iraqi officials, 'primarily in the Ministry of Defence and the Office of the National Security Advisor, and train(s) and advise(s) instructors at professional military education institutions to help Iraq develop its capacity to build more effective national security structures and professional military education institutions' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 54).

NATO´s force packages and initiatives

The 2014 Wales Summit focused on assurance and began to improve the readiness of allied forces. The NATO Readiness Action Plan provides a coherent and comprehensive package of necessary measures to respond to the changes in the security environment on NATO's borders. The Plan aims at strengthening collective defence and crisis management capability. The elements of the Plan include measures that addresses both the

continuing need for assurance of allies and the adaption of the Alliance's military strategic posture (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014b: points 5-7). The assurance measures

> include continuous air, land, and maritime presence and meaningful military activity in the eastern part of the alliance, both on a rotational basis. They will provide the fundamental baseline requirement for assurance and deterrence, and are flexible and scalable in response to the evolving security situation. (ibid: point 7).

Adaption measures include the components required to ensure that the Alliance can fully address the security challenges it might face. NATO will significantly enhance the responsiveness of the NATO Response Force (NRF) by developing force packages that are able to move rapidly and respond to potential challenges and threats. As part of it, a Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (VJTF), a spearhead force, was established, a new allied joint force that is able to deploy within a few days to respond to challenges that arise, particularly at the periphery of NATO's territory. This force consists of a land component with appropriate air, maritime, and special operations forces available. The readiness of elements of the VJTF have been tested through short-notice exercises. NATO also established a command and control presence and 'some in-place force enablers on the territories of eastern allies at all times, with contributions from allies on a rotational basis, focusing on planning and exercising collective defence scenarios' (ibid: point 8). Seven VJTF framework nations (France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Spain, Turkey and the UK) and a VJTF rotation plan were established through 2022. Furthermore, NATO established eight multinational NATO Force Integration Units on the territory of allies in the eastern part of NATO to assist in training of alliance forces and in the reception of reinforcements when needed. As part of the NATO Force Structure, the Headquarters of a Multinational Corps Northeast in Poland were made fully operational, and NATO established the headquarters of a Multinational Division Southeast in Romania to take command of the NATO Force Integration Units.

At the NATO Summit in Chicago in May 2012, 'we set ourselves the ambitious goal of NATO Forces 2020; modern, tightly connected forces equipped, trained, exercised, and commanded so as to be able to meet

NATO's level of ambition' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014b: point 63). Therefore, NATO launched the Connected Forces Initiative (CFI) as a key component in delivering NATO Forces 2020, addresses the full range of missions, including the most demanding:

> It provides the structure for Allies to train and exercise coherently: reinforces full-spectrum joint and combined training; promotes interoperability, including with partners and leverages advances in technology, such as the federated Mission Networking framework, which will enhance information sharing in the Alliance and with partners in support of training, exercises and operations. (Ibid: point 70).

The Framework Nations Concept was originally proposed by Germany and was under discussion in NATO before the 2014 Wales Summit (Biscop 2014: 3). It focuses on groups of allies coming together 'to work multinationally for the joint development of forces and capabilities required by the alliance, facilitated by a framework nation' (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation 2014b: point 67): It was endorsed at the Wales Summit as follows:

> To implement this concept, today, a group of ten Allies, facilitated by Germany as a framework nation and focusing on capability development, have, through a joint letter, committed to working systematically together, deepening and intensifying their cooperation in the long term, to create, in various configurations, a number of multinational projects to address Alliance priority areas across a broad spectrum of capabilities. They will initially concentrate on creating coherent sets of capabilities in the areas of logistic support; chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear protection; delivering fire-power from land, air, and sea; and deployable headquarters. Another group of seven Allies, facilitated by the UK as a framework nation, have also agreed today to establish the Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF), a rapidly deployable force capable of conducting the full spectrum of operations, including high intensity operations. The JEF will facilitate the efficient deployment of existing and emerging military capabilities and units. Additionally, a group of six Allies, facilitated by Italy as a framework nation and based on regional ties, will focus on improving a number of Alliance capability areas, such as stabilization and reconstruction, provision of enablers, usability of land formations, and command and control. Other groupings are being developed in line with the Framework Nations Concept. (Ibid: point 67)

At the 2016 Warsaw Summit, allies marked the full implementation of NATO's Readiness Action Plan – including the tripling in size of the NATO Response Force (NRF) with a brigade-sized high-readiness spearhead force at its core able to move within in a matter of days (The White House 2016: 2). NATO already increased the strength of the NRF, and the Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (VJTF) remains ready to deploy on short notice (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 23).

NATO also launched an additional Readiness Initiative. It shall ensure that more high-quality, combat-capable national forces as high readiness can be made available to NATO. From within the overall forces, allies shall offer an additional 30 major naval combatants, 30 heavy or medium manoeuvre battalions, and 30 kinetic air squadrons, with enabling forces, at 30 day's readiness or less. They shall be organised and trained as elements of larger combat formations, in support of NATO's overall deterrence and defence posture (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 14):

> The NATO Readiness Initiative will further enhance the Alliance's rapid response capability, either for reinforcement of allies in support of deterrence or collective defence, including for high-intensity warfighting, or for rapid military crisis intervention, if required. It will also promote the importance of effective combined arms and joint operations. (Ibid).

At the Brussels Summit on July 11th, 2018, NATO declared the initial operational capability of Rapid Air Mobility 'aimed at allowing short notice, cross-border air movement in Europe' (ibid: point 16). As a priority, NATO aims to:

- shorten border crossing times and, to that end, provide diplomatic clearances for land, sea, and air movement within five days by the end of 2019, and will consider bringing this period further down for rapid reinforcement;
- identify main and alternative supply routes capable of handling military transport by the end of 2018;
- use suitable existing exercises to practise more regularly military mobility;

- set up a network between NATO, national entities, civil and military, including the single National Points of Contact by the end of 2019, to facilitate and speed up communications and cooperation with regard to border crossing. (ibid: point 17)

In 2019, the Joint Support and Enabling Command (JSEC) in Ulm / Germany achieved its initial operational capability to ensure rapid movement of troops and equipment into and across Europe.

NATO 'will continue to pursue a 360-degree approach to security' (ibid: point 1) supporting the Alliance's three core tasks: collective defence, crisis management and cooperative security (NATO 2018b: point 1). Cyber defence remains 'part of NATO's core task of collective defence' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 20). NATO 'is determined to deliver strong national cyber defences through full implementation of the Cyber Defence Pledge, which is central to enhancing cyber resilience and raising the costs of a cyber attack' (ibid). Thus in cases of hybrid warfare, the North Atlantic Council can decide to invoke Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, as in the case of armed attack. Furthermore, NATO established Counter Hybrid Support Teams, 'which provide tailored, targeted assistance to Allies, upon their request, in preparing for and responding to hybrid activities' (ibid: point 21).

European defence spending – a challenge for transatlantic ties

On June 10th, 2011, US Secretary of Defence Robert Gates harshly criticised NATO (read: Europe) for the decline of its military capabilities during his farewell speech in Brussels: 'EU defence expenditure has been low, inefficient and uncoordinated for decades' (Gilli 2011: 52). Until 2014, things just worsened. However, Gates' conclusions represent somehow a break with the past as already in 2011 he suggested the possibility of a US disengagement from NATO. The NATO Unified Protector mission in Libya perhaps convinced Gates to use a 'more blunt language':

> In fact, despite the fact that the US had limited interest at stake in Libya, Washington had to play a major role to ensure the success of the operation. Importantly, this was also due to the European military

> performance that – so far – has been far from encouraging (contested leadership, lack of political will, shortage of equipment, etc.). (ibid)

In general, the crisis in public spending in Europe induced cuts in defence budgets which exacerbated the situation, 'because they are neither coordinated nor implemented with regard to common strategic objectives. From 2001 to 2010 EU defence spending declined from €251 billion to €194 billion' (1.6 million soldiers) (European Commission 2013: 3). In 2015, Washington accounted for three-quarters of total defence expenditures among NATO members (Baroudos 2016: 29). Even though NATO membership has doubled since 1990, European defence spending had decreased by about 28 percent – almost all European NATO allies cut their defence budgets while Russia enlarged its defence budget more than 100 percent from 2004 to 2013 (ibid).

At the NATO Summit in Wales in September 2014, NATO and the EU agreed that 'NATO and EU efforts to strengthen defence capabilities are complementary'. Allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defence is below this level will:

- halt any decline in defence expenditure;
- aim to increase defence expenditure in real terms as GDP grows;
- aim to move towards the two percent guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO capability targets and filling NATO's capability shortfalls (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014b: point 14).

Allies who spend less than 20 per cent of their annual defence spending on major new equipment, including related research and development, 'will aim, within a decade, to increase their annual investments to 20% or more of total defence expenditures' (ibid).

On most measures, NATO appears comfortably ahead of Russia. Between them, the US and its European NATO allies spent $871 billion on defence in 2015, compared with Russia's $52 billion (The Economist 2018e: 26). But as a report by the American RAND Corporation argues, the reality on the ground is rather different. It finds that Russia would now enjoy significant local superiority in any confrontation with NATO close to its

own border. NATO's latent strengths, once they were brought to bear, would be too much for Russia to cope with. But in the early stages of a conflict, for at least the first month and possibly for a good deal longer, NATO would find itself 'outnumbered, outranged and outgunned' (The Economist 2018e: 26).

Many politicians in the US think European governments should tackle the decline of European military capabilities 'by raising defence budgets, by integrating and coordinating their spending, and by reducing waste and duplication' (Gilli 2011: 52). In 2014, NATO allies agreed at the Wales Summit 'to stop the cuts, gradually increase defence spending and move toward spending two per cent of that gross domestic product on defence by 2024' (Stoltenberg 2017: 10). But according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the following countries were meeting this goal in 2015: the US with its defence budget of 3.3 per cent of GDP, Greece (2.8 per cent), Poland (2.2 per cent), France and Turkey (each 2.1 per cent) and the UK and Estonia (with two percent each). Top German leaders managed to put a damper on the expectation that Germany would radically ramp up its defence spending. In early 2018, Germany spent about €37 billion annually on its armed forces, or 1.2 percent of GDP. Boosting that to two percent would translate the defence expenditures into a sum of €72 billion (Sprenger 2018a: 8). Then-German defence minister Ursula von der Leyen said at the 2018 Munich Security Conference that NATO spending commitment – two percent of GDP by 2024 – remains a goal (ibid). In Germany, a parliamentary report disclosed that much of the country's military equipment is defective. At the end of 2017, it said, not one of the navy's six submarines was operational (The Economist 2018c: 5). US President Donald Trump wrote in a tweet: 'We have a massive trade deficit with Germany, plus they pay far less than they should on NATO and military. Very bad for US. This will change' (Bennett 2017: 1). Furthermore, Trump unsettled NATO allies when he did not mention the central commitment members of the alliance make to defend each other (article 5). During a speech in May 2017, German Chancellor Angela Merkel said Germany must rethink how much it can rely on its allies: 'The era in which we could rely completely on others is gone, at least partially'. (ibid). Portugal's Defence Minister, José Alberto de Azeredo Lopes, stated:

> If every state was at two per cent defence budget – now there will be no further problems? We would be secure? Because if it does that, I can convince my prime minister to pay the two per cent. But can anyone seriously say that our defence and security issues are a money issue? I have some doubts on that. (Defense News 2018c: 26)

On May 17th, 2018, US President Trump threatened alliance members who failed to meet the organization's defence spending target, saying they would be 'dealt with'. Trump had demanded that his allies adopt a target of four percent (which even America itself does not satisfy (The Economist 2018h: 27). At the NATO Brussels Summit in 2018, the alliance 'reaffirmed our unwavering commitment to all aspects of the Defence Investment Pledge agreed at the 2014 Wales Summit, and to submit credible national plans on its implementation, including the spending guidelines for 2014, planned capabilities, and contributions' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 3).

> All Allies have started to increase the amount they spend on defence in real terms and some two-thirds of Allies have national plans in place to spend 2% of their Gross Domestic Product on defence by 2024. More than half of Allies are spending more than 20% of their defence expenditures on major equipment, including related research and development, and, according to their national plans, 24 Allies will meet the 20% guidelines by 2024. Allies are delivering more of the heavier, high-end capabilities we require and are improving the readiness, deployability, sustainability, and interoperability of their forces. (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 3)

EU-NATO military cooperation

A joint EU-NATO Declaration on European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) adopted by the EU and NATO on December 16th, 2002, has opened the way for closer political and military cooperation between these two organisations. This landmark declaration provides a formal basis for cooperation between the EU and NATO in the areas of crisis management and conflict resolution by allowing the EU to have access to NATO's collective assets and capabilities for EU-led operations, including command arrangements and assistance in operational planning. In effect, NATO can support EU-led operations in which NATO as a whole is not engaged

(NATO 2011: 2). These so-called Berlin Plus arrangements outline the political principles for EU-NATO cooperation. The Agreement on the Security of Information between the EU and NATO was signed in Athens on March 14th, 2003. In this arrangement with NATO, the EU agreed to ensure 'the fullest possible involvement of non-EU European members of NATO within the EU Security and Defence Policy.' Furthermore, NATO is giving the EU 'assured access to NATO's planning capabilities, as set out in the North Atlantic Council decisions on December 13th, 2002' (EU-NATO Declaration on ESDP, NATO Press Release (2002)142, Dec. 16th, 2002).

EU and NATO cooperate mainly in the fields of operations and capabilities. Eventually, the EU took over from NATO on two occasions: first in 2003, when Operation Concordia succeeded NATO's Operation Allied Harmony in Macedonia / FYROM, and then in early December 2004, when the EU launched Operation Althea in Bosnia and Herzegovina, replacing NATO's Stabilization Force (SFOR). For Operation Althea, the EU continues to rely on NATO assets and capabilities, particularly for the chain of operational command (Perruche 2006: 9) On a provisional basis, an EU Cell has been established at the SHAPE Headquarters (SHAPE: Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe) for Operations Althea, and a SHAPE Liaison Team was situated in 2006 within the EU Military Staff (EUMS). For some months, EUMS planners, along with member states, have been supporting their African Union (AU) counterparts by working on the AU's military mission in the Sudanese province of Darfur.

NATO and EU, in particular the European Defence Agency, are working together to avoid needless duplication within the pooling and sharing initiative. Concrete opportunities for cooperation have already been identified, in particular combating improvised explosive devices, chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and medical support. NATO's Smart Defence initiative also presupposes innovative multinational cooperation by industry. NATO then-Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen had introduced Smart Defence as a concept at the 2011 Munich Security Conference (February 6th, 2011) (Thiele 2012: 84). At the Chicago Summit in May 2012, NATO leaders began to implement Smart Defence 'aimed at getting more out of available defence dollars through multilateral cooperation' (Brennan 2012: 14). Rasmussen argued that allies need to

cooperate more, and be more flexible, to 'prevent a deterioration in NATO's collective capability in the force of the three-pronged challenge of budget austerity, ongoing operational challenges, and a security environment characterised by deep strategic uncertainty' (Giegerich 2012: 69). As he put it, the political initiative would amount to 'a new way for NATO and Allies to do business […] this is about doing more by doing it together' (ibid). NATO presented some two-dozen multinational projects to mark the start of the initiative (ibid). The crisis in Libya in 2011 showed the need for modern systems and facilities, and for less reliance on the United States for costly advanced capabilities. However, rebalancing defence spending between European allies and the US is more than ever a necessity. Smart defence is based on capability areas that are critical for NATO, in particular as established at the Lisbon summit in 2010. Ballistic missile defence, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, maintenance of readiness, training and force preparation, effective engagement and force protection – these are all on the list.

'Strengthening EU security and defence means strengthening NATO and EU-NATO cooperation too,' repeatedly stated the EU High Representative Federica Mogherini and NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg (EEAS 2017: 23). On July 8th, 2016, the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission, together with the Secretary-General of NATO signed a Joint Declaration in Warsaw with a view to giving new impetus and new substance to the EU-NATO strategic partnership.

The Council of the EU and foreign ministers of NATO adopted in parallel on December 6th, 2016, a common set of proposals for EU-NATO cooperation. This followed the Joint Declaration signed by EU leaders and the NATO Secretary-General in July 2016. The set of actions first comprised 42 concrete proposals for implementation in seven areas of cooperation. EU-NATO cooperation had been thus taken to a new level, 'at a moment when facing common challenges together is more important than ever' (European Security and Defence College 2017: 24). Altogether now 74 concrete actions are under implementation, in the following seven areas:

- Hybrid threats: 20 out of the 74 current proposals for cooperation are focussed on countering hybrid threats. The European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats (Hybrid COE) effectively contributes to strengthening EU-NATO cooperation in this area. This centre was launched both by the EU and NATO in October 2017 in Helsinki / Finland in order to combat hybrid threats and cyber attacks. Hybrid warfare threats are threats, 'where a wide range of overt and covert military, paramilitary, and civilian measures are employed in a highly integrated design' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014b: point 13). Thus, it is essential that NATO and the EU possess the necessary tools and procedures required to deter and respond effectively to hybrid threats, and the capabilities to reinforce national forces: 'This will also include enhancing strategic communications, developing exercise scenarios in light of hybrid threats, and strengthening coordination between NATO and other organizations' (ibid). Therefore, close cooperation between EU and NATO also takes place within the Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence (NATO StratCom COE), which was established in 2014 in Riga / Latvia (ibid). It is a NATO-accredited and a multinational international organization which initially was founded by Latvia, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Poland and the UK. The Netherlands, Finland, Sweden and Canada joined at a later stage. In 2018, France and Slovakia finalised their joining procedures. The Centre's mission 'is to contribute to the alliance's communication process by providing comprehensive analysis, timely advice, and practical support. Besides research studies and training for governments on strategic communication, the NATO StratCom COE has been developing significant expertise on counting hostile information activities by state and non-state actors' (NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence 2018: 1).
- Operational cooperation including maritime issues: EU and NATO staffs are engaged in exploring modalities to enhance coordination, complementarity and cooperation in the maritime domain. Staff regularly exchange ideas in the meetings of the mechanism Shared Awareness and de-Confliction in the Mediterranean (SHADE

MED), as the main forum for sharing information and coordination efforts.

- Cyber security: Active interaction at staff level is proceeding in the field of cyber on concepts and doctrines, existing and planned training and education courses, threat indicators, ad-hoc exchanges of threat alerts and assessments, cross-briefings, including on the cyber aspects of crisis management and regular meetings.
- Defence capabilities: Efforts continue to ensure coherence of output between the planning instruments and processes, namely the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO), the European Defence Funds (EDF), the EU Capability Development Plan, the Coordinated Annual Review on Defence (CARD) and respective NATO processes such as the NATO Defence Planning Process (NDPP) and the Partnership for Peace Planning and Review Process (PARP). Coherence and synergies between NATO and EU efforts are being made to improve military mobility.
- Defence industry and research: EU and NATO staffs continue the dialogue on industry matters, which includes regular updates on related NATO and EU activities. Special focus lies for example on the access of small- and medium-sized enterprises to defence supply chain and innovation, or industry engagement in specific areas.
- Exercises: During a first parallel and coordinated exercise in October 2017, EU and NATO trained and tested their mechanisms and practical cooperation to respond to crises, in particular in a hybrid context.
- Supporting partners' capacity building: Assisting partners in building their capacities and fostering resilience, in particular in the Western Balkans, and in the eastern and southern neighbourhood is a common objective. Information exchange, including informal staff-to-staff political consultations on the three pilot countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova and Tunisia) has intensified. The second progress report of December 2017 highlighted a financing decision by the EU to allocate €2 million for 2017 as a contribution to the NATO Building Integrity Programme, which aims at reducing the risk of corruption and promoting good governance in the defence and security sector.

- Strengthening political dialogue between EU and NATO: The established practice of mutual invitations to relevant ministerial meetings continued. Reciprocal cross-briefings on issues of mutual interest have become more frequent (European Union 2018: 2).

NATO relations with Russia

The NATO-Russia Council (NRC) was set up at the NATO-Russia Summit in Rome on May 28th, 2002, by the Declaration on 'NATO-Russia Relations: a New Quality'. It was conceived as a mechanism for consultation, consensus-building, cooperation, joint decision and joint action. The Rome Declaration builds on the goals and principles of the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security, which remains the formal basis for NATO-Russia relations. The NRC replaced the Permanent Joint Council (PJC), a forum for consultation and cooperation created by the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act. The 29 individual allies and Russia are equal partners in the NRC – instead of meeting in the bilateral 'NATO+1' format under the former PJC (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2017a: 1). Following Russia's illegal military intervention in Ukraine and its violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, the alliance suspended all practical cooperation between NATO and Russia including in the NRC in April 2014. However, the Alliance agreed to keep channels of communication open in the NRC and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council at the ambassadorial level and above, to allow the exchange of views, first and foremost on this crisis. NATO remains open to a periodic, focused and meaningful political dialogue with Russia on the basis of reciprocity, as agreed at the NATO Summit in Warsaw in July 2016. From a NATO perspective, 'Russia's aggressive actions against Ukraine have fundamentally challenged our vision of a Europe whole, free, and at peace' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014b: point 1).

During the 1990s, NATO launched military cooperation in crisis management with Russia. Despite a series of political disagreements, Russian peacekeepers served alongside their NATO peers for eight-and-a-half years with the common goal of building stability in both Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Kosovo. Russia withdrew its peacekeepers from both Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo in the summer of 2003. At the time,

Moscow argued that the objectives of the deployment had essentially been achieved, while expressing reservations about the impartiality of the NATO-led operation in Kosovo. This withdrawal followed more than a decade of a continuous military presence in the former Yugoslavia, beginning with deployment of a contingent in Croatia in the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in 1992 and covering most of the UN-mandated missions during the following eleven years (Nikitin 2004: 1). The size of the Russian military presence in the former Yugoslavia changed over the years. It grew from 900 soldiers in 1992 to 1,500 in 1994 in UNPROFOR in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, was around 1,340 in the Implementation Force (IFOR) and Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1996, with an additional 1,500 in the Kosovo Force (KFOR) from 1999 (ibid). Moreover, Moscow was less than enamoured with NATO policies, 'firstly as a result of NATO enlargement and secondly because of NATO's decision to launch air strikes against Yugoslavia without UN Security Council authorisation' (ibid). In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Russian brigade was deployed in the Multinational Division North (MND North), together with a Turkish brigade, a combined Nordic brigade including contingents from Denmark, Finland, Norway, Poland and Sweden, and the bulk of US forces. The Russian brigade, which consisted of airborne troops, had an area of responsibility of 1,750 square kilometres, including 75 kilometres of the inter-entity boundary line, the line running between the two entities, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska (ibid). The structure and chain of command in IFOR and SFOR 'were problematic for Russia,

> since they were extremely NATO-centric. The solution that was eventually found involved the appointment at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) of a Russian general as a Special Deputy to NATO's highest-ranking officer, the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (SACEUR), responsible for coordinating with SACEUR all matters concerning Russia's participation in IFOR and then SFOR. (Ibid: 2).

In this way, Russian peacekeepers in MND North received their orders and instructions from SACEUR through his Russian Deputy, but were under the tactical command of MND North for day-to-day operations. The Russian general, who had a staff of five officers, worked out strategic and

operational issues with SACEUR. Meanwhile, the commander of the Russian brigade on the ground in Bosnia and Herzegovina coordinated day-to-day operations with the US general commanding MND North. From a Russian standpoint, 'Russian public or policy-makers viewed NATO actions generally 'as being biased against the Serbs' (ibid).

Intervention in Kosovo was, from the Russian perspective, illustrative of NATO´s selective approach to security. In response to the launch of the NATO air campaign, Moscow froze all NATO-Russia military and political cooperation, including the Permanent Joint Council, withdrew its peacekeepers in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the NATO command structure and expelled the NATO information office. The disagreement was over who has the right to act on behalf of the international community, the circumstances under which intervention was legitimate and the limits to that intervention (ibid). For Russia, NATO was in violation of the UN Charter and therefore acting illegally when it launched coercive military action against a sovereign state in the absence of a specific mandate from the UN Security Council. The humanitarian justification for the intervention was dubious since genocide had not been established by recognised OSCE or UN mechanisms and the refugee exodus was greater after the beginning of the campaign than before. Moreover, NATO was creating 'a dangerous precedent by failing to exhaust diplomatic means of resolving the conflict before resorting to force and ignoring Chinese, Indian and Russian objections.' (ibid). Russia believed it was being marginalised in terms of decision-making on key issues of European security.

Eleven weeks after the beginning of the air campaign Allied Force, the Russian military rushed to participate in the international peacekeeping operation, which had a UN mandate (ibid). The speed of the Russian deployment in Kosovo probably surprised NATO. Russian peacekeepers travelled south from Bosnia and Herzegovina across Serbia to Prishtina airport where they met NATO forces advancing northwards from Macedonia / FYROM. The ensuing stand-off illustrated the importance of coordination in such operations and the need for political unity among coalition participants. Despite this incident, NATO and Russia managed to re-establish effective cooperation in peacekeeping during the next four years. Moreover, after the creation of the NATO-Russia Council in May

2002, a NATO-Russia Working Group on Peacekeeping was formed to analyse the experience from the former Yugoslavia and develop a Generic Concept of Joint NATO-Russia Peacekeeping Operations (ibid: 3). Moscow still looks to the United Nations as the focal point for political coordination of peacekeeping efforts (ibid).

Russia continued to cooperate with NATO militarily and joined Operation Active Endeavour. An exchange of letters between NATO and Russia in December 2004 paved the way for preparations for Russia's support for the operation. The Russian frigate Pytliviy, which participated in the operation in September 2006, was the first ship from a NATO partner country to actively support the operation. In September 2007, the Russian frigate RFS Ladniy participated in this maritime counter-terrorist operation. Cooperation with Russia was also launched as follows:

- Two-way transit arrangements offered by Russia in support of ISAF in Afghanistan.
- Joint training of counter narcotics personnel from Afghanistan, Central Asia, and Pakistan.
- The NATO-Russia-Council Helicopter Maintenance Trust Fund in support of a key Afghan National Security Force (ANSF).
- Growing counter piracy cooperation off the Horn of Africa.
- NATO-Russia Council aviation counter-terrorism programme.
- First civil-military NATO-Russia Council Counter-Terrorism exercise (NATO 2012b: point 38).

Relating to Russia, tensions between the US and the NATO member Turkey were growing when Turkey decided in December 2017 to sign a $2.5 billion agreement finalizing the purchase of the Russian-made S-400 long-range air and anti-missile defence system. In July 2019, the first parts of the S-400 arrived Turkey. The contract involves the acquisition of one S-400 system with an option to purchase a second system. The S-400 is a mobile system, but it is designed for deployment behind the lines to protect critical infrastructure. It has a very long range, while the Patriot is a medium-range system. In that sense these are two different classes of systems (Bodner 2018: 12). The S-400, which reportedly has a 250 km range and is designed to engage a variety of aircraft, only has four missiles per launcher (ibid). Turkish purchases of S-400 systems provide a number

of political victories: Turkey takes on a dependency on Russia, which pays potential dividends in Syria; it drives a wedge between Turkey and its NATO allies and it is a political win for Russian President Vladimir Putin at home (ibid). In the meantime, the US had decided to freeze the F-35 deliveries to Turkey, Turkey stands to lose out on the nearly $1 billion it contributed to F-35 development (ibid). Turkey's decision to negotiate and go for the S-400 system emerged shortly after Ankara and Moscow normalised their badly strained ties in June 2016. Russia sanctioned Turkey after the Turkish military shot down a Russian Suchoj Su-24 aircraft along Turkey's border with Syria in November 2015 (Bekdil 2018: 11). A Turkish acquisition of the Russian-made S-400 air and anti-missile system could stir new frictions between Turkey and its NATO allies: 'NATO's approach to Russia remains clear: defence and deterrence on the one hand, and dialogue on the other. But NATO and Russia cannot go back to business as usual as long as Moscow continues to violate international law.' (Bekdil 2017: 20). Furthermore, the S-400s cannot be integrated with Turkey's joint air defence assets with NATO and the US. They will be a stand-alone system if acquired. About half of Turkey's network-based air defence picture has been paid for by NATO. Turkey is part of the NATO Air Defence Ground Environment. Without NATO's consent, it will be impossible for Turkey to make any non-NATO system – especially one made by Russia – operable with these assets (ibid: 21).

After the annexation of Crimea into Russia, NATO continues its assistance to partners in the East, such as Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova 'to strengthen resilience and boost self-defence capabilities – in particular, with a comprehensive package of assistance for Ukraine and by strengthening the Substantial NATO-Georgia Package agreed at Wales' (The White House 2016: 3). According to the 2014 Wales Summit conclusions, NATO deployed four multinational battalions on a rotational basis in the Baltic States and Poland. The 'enhanced Forward Presence of four multinational combat-ready battalion-sized battlegroups in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland includes altogether over 4,500 troops from across the Alliance, able to operate alongside national home defence forces' (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2018: point 25). Additionally, the Multinational Division North East Headquarters had been established and achieved full capability in December 2018 (ibid). NATO had also developed tailored Forward

Presence in the Black Sea region. In Romania, a multinational framework brigade for training allies' land forces is in place (ibid: point 26).

According to NATO, the

> Euro-Atlantic security environment has become less stable and predictable as a result of Russia's illegal and illegitimate annexation of Crimea and ongoing destabilisation of eastern Ukraine; its military posture and provocative military activities, including near NATO borders, such as the deployment of modern dual-capable missiles in Kaliningrad, repeated violation of NATO Allied airspace, and the continued military build-up in Crimea; its significant investment in the modernization of its strategic forces; its irresponsible and aggressive nuclear rhetoric; its large-scale, no-notice snap exercises; and the growing number of its exercises with a nuclear dimension. […] Russia is also challenging Euro-Atlantic security and stability through hybrid actions, including attempted interference in the election process, and the sovereignty of our nations, as was the case in Montenegro, widespread disinformation campaigns, and malicious cyber activities. (Ibid: point 6)

NATO and Ukraine therefore work closely together in the field of capacity building in strategic communications, as well as in joint projects on logistics and standardization, explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) / counter-improvised explosive devices (C-IED) and in the implementation of new measures to assist Ukraine in ensuring the safety of its ammunition depots. Projects aimed at bolstering Ukraine's cyber defences, telemedicine and radioactive waste disposal were also completed (NATO 2018b: 1).

Migration policy – political aspects

More people are on the move than at any other time since World War II, according to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. Fear of migrants has contributed to the rise of right-wing, nationalist politics in both the US and Europe and was a major factor in the UK's vote to exit the EU (Baker & Addario 2016: 41). A migrant is a person who makes a choice to leave his/her country not due to a direct threat of persecution or death but mainly to seek a better life elsewhere. Unlike refugees, immigrants are free to return home any time.

Upon taking office in November 2014, European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker began to drive forward a new migration policy as part of the Commission's political programme that defines migration as one of ten policy areas for policy action, making intra-EU solidarity a key element. Subsequently, the European Agenda on Migration including a first package of implementing measures was presented by the Commission in May 2015. The Agenda provides for a comprehensive approach that is intended to improve the management of migration on all levels, comprising relocation and resettlement measures as well as an Action Plan against the smuggling of migrants (Bauer, Hajzer, Zelet-Dinova 2015: 5). When the EU drew up the first recommendations in May 2015 on how to handle the refugee and migration crisis and included a distribution key, it was met by stiff opposition from many states. The concept was revised again at the beginning of September 2015. Thus, the EU should at least have a principle on how the first 160,000 refugees and then more in the future could be distributed:

> The distribution key takes into account the population size, economic power, unemployment rate and the number of people entitled to asylum who are already in the countries and third: the refugees will be distributed to countries that best suit them. Do they have family, relatives or friends there? Do they speak the language? Have they already lived in the past (e.g. study trip)? Those are the starting points of the distribution key. (Himmelfreundpointner 2015: 89)

In September 2015, based on a proposal by the Commission, EU member states decided to set up an Emergency Relocation System to support Italy

and Greece who were faced with an unprecedented increase in arrivals. Two years on, almost all persons registered for relocation in Greece and Italy have been relocated – a total of over 29,000 persons in need of international protection. By June 2018, the Commission had mobilised over €1 billion in emergency assistance to help manage migration under the current financial framework (2014-2020) – support that has gone to the member states most affected such as Italy, Greece, Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, Sweden and Spain (European Commission 2018b: 1).

There is no patent remedy for the refugee crisis, but '[r]efugees cannot choose their destination', emphasised Jörg Wojahn, Representative of the EU Commission to Austria (Himmelfreundpointner 2015: 68). Since 2011, the EU has been supporting refugee camps near Syria with money, expertise, and specialists. And the EU has agreed with Turkey to help the refugees there: 'Our overriding goal is still for refugees to stay as close to their native country as possible. This is basically what they also want themselves,' said Wojahn (ibid: 69).

Jean-Claude Juncker, then-President of the EU Commission, continued to insist on the Commission's proposed quota system to share out the migrants between each country. The 'Visegrád 4' (V4 – Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic) took the line entirely contrary to that of the European Commission and German Chancellor Angela Merkel and they held firm in their refusal to take in migrant quotas directed from Brussels and Berlin.

In September 2015, Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán ordered a fence topped with razor-wire along the 175-kilometre border with Serbia. This meant that the flow across the Croatian border increased and so Hungary constructed another fence along the border (Murray 2017: 183). The flow moved further along, concentrating on the Slovenian border. In August 2015, Bulgaria began building a new fence along its borders with Turkey. In September 2015, Germany already temporarily introduced controls at its borders with Austria. On September 13th, 2015, the then German Interior Minister Thomas de Maizière announced that his country would reintroduce border controls. In the middle of September 2015, Hungary declared a state of emergency due to the huge number of asylum seekers and closed its border with Austria. Then Croatia closed its border

with Serbia. Soon Austria began the construction of a barrier along its border with Slovenia. The border fence was 'a door with sides' (according to then Austrian Chancellor Werner Faymann). Soon Slovenia was constructing a fence along its border with Croatia while Macedonia / FYROM began constructing a barrier along its border with Greece (ibid). Between summer 2015 and March 2016 800,000 people crossed the Western Balkan route, which is almost half of the Slovene population. At the peak of the crisis, 'up to 12,500 refugees and migrants entered Slovenia each day, while the total police force of Slovenia numbers half of that' (Footnote 6, Göbl, Lassen et al 2016: 3). Austria introduced the upper limit for refugees on January 20th, 2016 (37,500 refugees). The inflows from the summer of 2015 were 'a shock to all of us. The European Union was in no way prepared for such a number of people,' said János Perény, then Ambassador of Hungary to Austria (Himmelfreundpointner 2018c: 58).

According to Peter Mišík, Ambassador of Slovakia to Austria, the European Commission

> didn't think the problem through well enough and came up with the recommendation to solve the problem by way of migration quotas. Back then, we said that this wasn't going to work. You cannot force people to go to this or that country within the Schengen system. That also led to that cliché that we failed to act in solidarity, because we wouldn't accept a solution like that. Even though today, everyone knows that it just wasn't a good solution. (Ibid)

Furthermore, 'the problems with multicultural societies had already started to become apparent and were, from our point of view, neglected by the Western European political system', said Perény (ibid: 57). He additionally emphasised: 'That is our first point. We don't want anything to be forced onto us, we want to be able to make our own decisions.' (ibid). Thus, 'as per our estimate, the integration process of migrants has not succeeded in Western Europe. This is an important argument' (ibid: 58).

According to the Ambassador of the Czech Republic to Austria, Ivana Červenková,

> the number one priority is to secure the external borders, so that we can control who comes into our country. Quotas just aren't a practical approach here. They split the EU states. The people who come to us wanted to continue to Germany or to Austria and didn't even want to stay in the Czech Republic. We want to find a joint solution that is acceptable to all countries. (Ibid: 58)

In 2015, the EU launched the European Union Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF), which plans to pump nearly $3.52 billion into projects aimed at managing migration in more than 25 countries along major routes across Africa. As of July 2017, 116 programmes worth nearly $2.35 billion had been approved under the fund. Individual governments in Europe are paying for similar programs as well (Mahr 2017: 13). Solidarity is also needed to help overstretched countries on the frontiers, notably Greece and Italy. It is hard to see how the border-free Europe of today will be maintained without a well-resourced border protection and immigration service (Wolf 2015). The tide of refugees cannot be stopped, 'you cannot impose peace upon Libya and Syria or wish good government on Eritrea and Somalia' (The Economist 2015b: 9). 'There is a serious risk of Europe becoming a fortress', says Nathalie Tocci, special advisor to the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (Humer & Campbell 2016: 7). In the meantime, the Mediterranean Sea has become a mass grave (ibid).

In October 2013, after 366 migrants lost their lives off Lampedusa in another disaster, the Italian government launched the search-and-rescue operation 'Mare Nostrum'. This operation made use of an amphibious warship and two frigates, and had five naval vessels on patrol at all times as well as support from the coast guard. The navy claimed the operation led to the rescue of more than 150,000 people and the arrest of 330 smugglers. But a year after Mare Nostrum's launch by the government of Enrico Letta it was shut down by Angelino Alfano, interior minister in Matteo Renzi's then new left-right coalition. Alfano complained that it had the effect of making the navy part of the traffickers´ business plan. As the British government put it, there was an unintended 'pull factor, encouraging more migrants to attempt the dangerous sea crossing and thereby leading to more tragic and unnecessary deaths' (The Economist 2015a: 19).

On March 18th, 2016, mass resettlement was supposed to play a large part in the controversial German-inspired agreement struck between the EU and Turkey. The deal committed the EU to taking in one Syrian refugee from Turkey for every irregular Syrian sent back from Greece (The Economist 2016b: 11). The package is the fruit of five months of intense diplomacy driven by German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who sees Turkey as offering the only lasting solution to a crisis that has brought more than one million migrants to Germany, largely via Greece. Jean-Claude Juncker, European Commission President, insisted: 'There is no doubt [the plan] complies with the law' (Barker & Robinson & Hope 2016: 1). Turkey 'won €6bn in funding to support its 2.5m Syrian migrants and the promise of progress in its moribund EU membership talks. The EU also pledged to accept up to 72,000 Syrians directly from Turkey, matching one-for-one the numbers returned from Greek islands' (Barker et al. 2016: 1).

In the 2016 EU Global Strategy, the EU envisaged 'A More Effective Migration Policy' as follows:

> A special focus in our work on resilience will be on origin and transit countries of migrants and refugees. We will significantly step up our humanitarian efforts in these countries, focusing on education, women and children. Together with countries of origin and transit, we will develop common and tailor-made approaches to migration featuring development, diplomacy, mobility, legal migration, border management, readmission and return. Through development, trust funds, preventive diplomacy and mediation we will work with countries of origin to address and prevent the root causes of displacement, manage migration, and fight trans-border crime. We will support transit countries by improving reception and asylum capabilities, and by working on migrants' education, vocational training and livelihood opportunities. We must stem irregular flows by making returns more effective as well as by ensuring regular channels for human mobility. (European Global Strategy: point 27)

This means

> enhancing and implementing existing legal and circular channels for migration. It also means working on a more effective common European asylum system which upholds the right to seek asylum by ensuring the

safe, regulated and legal arrival of refugees seeking international protection in the EU. (ibid: point: 28)

The EU plans to 'establish more effective partnerships on migration management with UN agencies, emerging players, regional organisations, civil society and local communities' (ibid: point 28). Many of the refugees are victims of conflicts 'to which Western powers contributed both by what they did and did not do' (Stiglitz 2016: 340). The EU therefore aims at increasing its partnership with Libya in order to tackle migration as follows:

'Priority will be given to the following elements:

a) Training, equipment and support to the Libyan national coast guard and other relevant agencies;
b) Further efforts to disrupt the business model of smugglers through enhanced operational action, within an integrated approach involving Libya and other countries on the route and relevant international partners, engaged Member States, CSDP missions and operations, Europol and the European Border and Coast Guard;
c) Supporting where possible the development of local communities in Libya, especially in coastal areas and at Libyan land borders on the migratory routes, to improve their socio-economic situation and enhance their resilience as host communities;
d) Seeking to ensure adequate reception capacities and conditions in Libya for migrants, together with the UNHCR and IOM;
e) Supporting IOM in significantly stepping up assisted voluntary return activities;
f) Enhancing information campaigns and outreach addressed as migrants in Libya and countries of origin and transit, in cooperation with local actors and international organisations, particularly to counter the smugglers' business model;
g) Helping to reduce the pressure on Libya's land borders, working both with the Libyan authorities and all neighbours of Libya, including by supporting projects enhancing their border management capacity;
h) Keeping track of alternative routes and possible diversion of smugglers' activities, through cooperative efforts with Libya's neighbours and the countries under the Partnership Framework,

> with the support of Member States and all relevant EU agencies and by making available all necessary surveillance instruments; …' (European Council The President 2017: point 6)

The 1.3 million people who reached the continent in 2015 represented only 0.2 percent of the EU's total population. It should have been manageable. Germany alone took roughly 800,000 people. That is equivalent to one percent of its own population, and is the same number it absorbed in 1992 when people fled the Balkan wars and ethnic Germans left the former Soviet Union (Nougayrède 2016: 19). Demographers point out that the pivotal migration year for Europe was 2014. That is when Europe for the first time surpassed the US as a destination for immigrants, according to the French demographer François Héran. In 2014, around 1.9 million legal immigrants came to the EU (population 508 million) and one million to the US (population 319 million). With that, the European ration became 3.7 legal immigrants per 1,000 inhabitants, while the US's was 3.1. (ibid).

Most of the refugees still find it hard to get a job and to get full access to labour markets. They face a lot of competition in job-poor EU member states and have a lack of German or Swedish language. Germany, Sweden and Austria face 'a huge challenge integrating its newcomers, most of whom arrived with few language skills or qualifications, into its labour market and wider society'. That will take time, resources and political capital. In some countries, 'it will test assumptions about welfare, housing and employment' (The Economist 2016b: 3).

Population forecasts for the Arab world and, in particular, sub-Saharan Africa foreshadow growing migration pressures:

> Thirteen of the 15 countries with a total fertility rate (roughly, numbers of children per women) above five are in Africa. In 2050, according to UN forecasts, the population of Africa will be three times that of Europe, compared with less than twice as much today. The continent already struggles to find jobs for the 11m young men and women that reach working age every year. Governments are often content to see young people leave: emigrants relieve pressure on labour markets and send home juicy remittances. Europe will remain the destination of choice for most

> of them, but they may not be a good fit for the jobs on offer there. (The Economist 2016b: 9)

At the EU-Africa migration summit in Malta (November 2015), European leaders pleaded with African countries to help them to bring their migrant problem under their control. Countries that arrest people-smugglers, and accept the return of migrants whose asylum applications have been rejected, shall be given aid – €1.8 billion of it, said the European Commission – as well as more access to European markets and more visas for their citizens. As the summit was meeting, Sweden announced it would set limits on asylum applications (The Economist 2016a: 29).

As war and instability in regions neighbouring Europe, in which European powers were often intimately involved, led to a spike in the number of refugees and migrants trying to reach the continent. The overall direction of EU policy has been to push people back, closing down safe and legal routes to asylum. Governments failed to create a common asylum policy that would have helped frontline nations such as Italy and Greece. And the Italian government in power immediately before the Lega/MoVimento 5 Stelle coalition, run by the centre-left, cut deals with militias in Libya and cracked down on NGO rescues, in order to keep migrants from leaving North Africa (Trilling 2018: 18). The Italian Interior Minister Matteo Salvini called for reception centres to be set up on Libya's southern borders, he has sought to align himself with Hungary's Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and Austria's Chancellor Sebastian Kurz, who called for 'an axis of willing against illegal migration' between Italy, Germany and Austria (ibid). Italy wants the EU to adopt a quota system for refugee settlement, while Austria is dead against it. Politicians in Austria threaten to close the Schengen borders. Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria have already turned down the idea of establishing 'regional disembarkation centres' – holding camps for migrants. Salvini fundamentally refuses permission for rescue boats to dock at Italian ports. One of his first acts as minister was to visit Sicily and declare that the island 'cannot become Europe's refugee camp' (ibid).

Legal aspects of migration and asylum policy

In 2019, there were some 70 million displaced people around the world, more than at any time since World War II. The refugee in international law remains one of the most politically contested issues of our time. When the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was established, it was envisaged as a temporary institution with a lifespan of only three years. But UNHCR continues. The current international approach to refugees dates from the early 1950s, 'when European nations attempted to shelter and relocate millions of people who had been displaced by the Holocaust and of the World War II' (Betts, Collier 2015: 91). However, the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol remain the principal international instruments benefiting refugees (Goodwin-Gill, McAdam 2007: 37). According to article 33, the following rules must be respected:

> 1. Prohibition of expulsion or return ('refoulement'): No Contracting State shall expel or return ('refouler') a refugee in any manner whatsoever to the frontiers of territories where his life or freedom would be threatened on account of his race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion. (Ibid: 582)
> 2. The benefit of the present provision may not, however, be claimed by a refugee whom there are reasonable grounds for regarding as a danger to the security of the country in which he is, or who, having been convicted by a final judgement of a particularly serious crime, constitutes a danger to the community of that country. (Ibid: 582)

As a matter of international law, refoulement is not justifiable no matter how debilitating a sudden influx of refugees might be on a state's resources, economy, or political situation (ibid: 335). Nothing in article 33 of the 1951 Convention suggests its inapplicability to mass influx situations. The customary international law principle of non-refoulement encompasses 'non-rejection at the frontier' (ibid: 379).

In the EU according to the so-called Dublin regulation, it is the responsibility of the first European country that any asylum-seeker arrives in to have him/her fingerprinted and hear his/her application. If he/she is granted asylum, his/her right to remain applies only to that country. Particularly Italy and Greece argue that this places a disproportionate

burden on them. The European Asylum Support Office deployed teams to both countries to help them with the painstaking task of processing asylum applications. An EU wide automated fingerprint recognition system was integrated into the Schengen information system (Council Regulation (EC) No 2725/2000 of December 11th, 2000, concerning the establishment of 'Eurodac' for the comparison of fingerprints for the effective application of the Dublin Convention). The most relevant rules to tackle migration read as follows:

The 2001 Temporary Protection Directive[3] drew on European experience with large-scale movements of refugees out of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo during the 1990s. It establishes a mechanism to be triggered by a Council Decision adopted by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission and lays down minimum standards for dealing with a mass influx. Mass influx means the arrival in the community of a large number of displaced persons, who come from a specific country or geographical area (article 2(d)). It is an exceptional procedure which does not prejudice any individual's entitlement to Convention refugee status (Goodwin-Gill, MacAdam 2007: 40). Mass influx is a common catch phrase of asylum discourse, but it is not mentioned in the 1951 Convention, the 1967 Protocol, or the 1969 OAU (Organisation of African Unity – since 2002: African Union) Convention. The term is defined in the EU Temporary Protection Directive as the arrival of 'a large number of displaced persons, who come from a specific country or geographical area'. As UNHCR has noted, mass influx cannot be defined in absolute numerical terms because its very existence depends on the resources of the receiving state. If a state can process the flow of refugees through conventional individual status determination procedures, then a special mass influx response is not required (Goodwin-Gill, MacAdam 2007: 335).

According to article 2(c), the intended beneficiaries 'displaced persons' are defined as:

[3] EU Council Directive 2001/55/EC on minimum standards for giving temporary protection in the event of a mass influx of displaced persons and on measures promoting a balance of efforts between Member States in receiving such persons and bearing the consequences thereof.

> […] third-country nationals or stateless persons who have had to leave the country or region of origin, or have been evacuated, in particular in response to an appeal by international organisations, and are unable to return in safe and durable conditions because of the situation prevailing in that country, who may fall within the scope of Article 1A of the Geneva Convention or other international or national instruments giving international protection, in particular:
> (i) Persons who have fled areas of armed conflict or endemic violence;
> (ii) Persons at serious risk of, or who have been the victims of systematic or generalised violations of their human rights.' (Ibid: 40)

The Temporary Protection Directive (TPD) aims at promoting responsibly-sharing among the member states and at setting minimum standards for temporary protection in case of a large number of third-country nationals arriving to the EU. Temporary protection may be given for a period of a maximum of three years. Beneficiaries are allocated to EU member states based on their respective capacity to receive in accordance with a distribution key-based criteria such as GDP, size of population, unemployment rate and both past numbers of asylum seekers and resettled refugees. TPD establishes a legal framework for resettlement measures in cooperation with UNHCR. The TPD has never been used, although the Council considered triggering it on different occasions, due to the difficulty to secure a majority and the EU member states' concerns of it posing a 'pull factor' for migration (Bauer et al. 2015: 6).

The 2003 European Union Council Directive on the Reception of Asylum Seekers:

According to article 2(c) 'applicant' or 'asylum seeker' shall mean a third country national or a stateless person who has made an application for asylum in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken' (Goodwin-Gill, MacAdam 2007: 655).

According to article 2(d) 'family members' shall mean (i) 'the spouse of the asylum seeker or his or her unmarried partner in a stable relationship, where the legislation or practice of the Member State concerned treats unmarried couples in a way comparable to married couples under its law relating to aliens.' (ii) the minor children of the couple referred to in point (i) or of the applicant, dependent and regardless of whether they were born

in or out of wedlock or adopted as defined under the international law (ibid).
According to article 2(h) 'unaccompanied minors' 'shall mean persons below the age of eighteen who arrive in the territory of the Member States unaccompanied by an adult responsible for them whether by law or by custom' (ibid).

The 2003 European Union Council Regulation on the Criteria and Mechanisms for Determining the Member State responsible for examining an Asylum Application:

(1) A common policy on asylum, including a common European Asylum System, is a constituent part of the EU's objective, of progressively stabilising an area of freedom, security, and justice open to those who, forced by circumstances, legitimately seek protection in the Community.
(2) The European Council, at its special meeting in Tampere on October 15th-16th, 1999, agreed to work towards establishing a Common European Asylum System, based on the full and inclusive application of the Geneva Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of June 28th, 1951, as supplemented by the New York Protocol on January 31st, 1967, thus ensuring that nobody is sent back to persecution, i.e. maintaining the principle of non-refoulement. 'Member States, all respecting the principle of non-refoulement, are considered as safe countries for third-country nationals' (Goodwin-Gill, MacAdam 2007: 664).
(3) The Tampere conclusions also stated that 'this system should include, in the short term, a clear and workable method for determining the Member State responsible for the examination of an asylum application' (ibid).

For its part, the **2004 EU Qualification Directive** incorporates and interprets the 1951 Convention/1967 Protocol refugee definition, and makes provision for subsidiary protection. A person entitled to such protection is defined as:

> … a third country national or a stateless person who does not qualify as a refugee but in respect of whom substantial grounds have been shown for believing that the person concerned, if returned to his or her country of

> former habitual residence, would face a real risk of suffering serious harm as defined in Article 15, and to whom Article 17 (1) and (2) do not apply, and is unable, or, owing to such risk, unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country. (Article 2 (c)[4]

Article 15, in turn, defines serious harm as

> '(a) death penalty or execution; or
> (b) torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment of an applicant in the country of origin; or
> (c) serious and individual threat to a civilian's life or person by reason of indiscriminate violence in situations of international or internal armed conflict. This does not include all those 'who may be entitled to protection against removal under the European Convention on Human Rights' (Goodwin-Gill, MacAdam 2007: 40).

The Qualification Directive can certainly be seen 'as the most important instrument in the European asylum regime, and the most ambitious attempt to combine refugee law and human rights law […] to date' (ibid: 41). The complementary protection scheme 'adheres to a traditional, individualistic approach, requiring the claimant for protection to show that he or she is personally at risk' (ibid). 'One advantage of the EU scheme, at least, is to provide a status for those granted subsidiary protection, even if it is less than that accorded to Convention refugees' (ibid: 41).

Article 78.3 of the **Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)** enables the Commission to propose to the Council the adoption of 'provisional measures' for the benefit of affected EU member states in case of an emergency situation caused by a sudden mass influx of third-country nationals. Article 80 TFEU states that the implementation of the Union's policies on border checks, asylum and immigration shall be led by the 'principle of solidarity and fair sharing of responsibility, including its financial implications, between the Member States'. Together with articles 77 and 78.1 and 78.2, they establish a legal framework for the

[4] EU Council Directive 2004/83/EC of 29th April 2004 on minimum standards for the qualification and status of third country nationals or stateless persons as refugees or as persons who otherwise need international protection and the content of the protection granted.

implementation of the solidarity principle in the field of a common European asylum policy. According to Article 78.1 TFEU, the EU

> shall develop a common policy on asylum, subsidiary protection and temporary protection with a view to offering appropriate status to any third- country national requiring international protection and ensuring compliance with the principle of *non-refoulement*.

According to Article 78.2 TFEU, the European Parliament and the Council

> shall adopt measures for a common European asylum system comprising
>
> (a) a uniform status of asylum for nationals of third countries, valid throughout the Union;
> (b) a uniform status of subsidiary protection for nationals of third countries who, without obtaining European asylum, are in need of international protection;
> (c) a common system of temporary protection for displaced persons in the event of a massive inflow;
> (d) common procedures for the granting and withdrawing of uniform asylum or subsidiary protection status;
> (e) criteria and mechanisms for determining which Member State is responsible for considering an application for asylum or subsidiary protection;
> (f) standards concerning the conditions for the reception of applicant for asylum or subsidiary protection;
> (g) partnership and cooperation with third countries for the purpose of managing inflows of people applying for asylum or subsidiary or temporary protection.

However, prior to the making of the European Agenda on Migration, they have not been put to use accordingly to address emergency situations. In response to the emergency situation in Greece and Italy with constantly growing numbers of people risking their lives to reach the shores of the EU to apply for asylum, the European Commission announced its new migration policy, known as European Agenda on Migration, on May 13th, 2015. This was followed by a first set of implementation measures on May 27th, 2015, including a proposal for a Council Decision to initiate an emergency relocation of 40,000 asylum applicants in 'clear need of

international protection' from the frontline states Greece and Italy, to the other EU member states based on Article 78.3 of the TFEU (Bauer, Hajzer, Zelet-Dinova 2015: 6).

Additionally, according to Article 79.2 TFEU, the European Union

> shall develop a common immigration policy aimed at ensuring, at all stages, the efficient management of migration flows, fair treatment of third-country nationals residing legally in Member States, and the prevention of, and enhanced measures to combat, illegal immigration and trafficking in human beings.

Thus, the European Parliament and the Council 'shall adopt measures in the following areas:

(a) the conditions of entry and residence, and standards on the issue by Member States of long-term visas and residence permits, including those for the purpose of family reunification;
(b) the definition of the rights of third-country nationals residing legally in a Member State, including the conditions governing freedom of movement and of residence in other Member States;
(c) illegal immigration and unauthorised residence, including removal and repatriation of persons residing without authorisation;
(d) combating trafficking in persons, in particular women and children.

Furthermore, the EU 'may conclude agreements with third countries for the readmission to their countries of origin or provenance of third-country nationals who do not or who no longer fulfil the conditions for entry, presence or residence in the territory of one of the Member States' (article 79.3 TFEU). According to article 79.5 TFEU, this article 'shall not affect the right of Member States to determine volumes of admission of third-country nationals coming from third countries to their territory in order to seek work, whether employed or self-employed'.

Frontex – the European Border and Coast Guard Agency

Frontex took up its responsibilities on May 1st, 2005. Its tasks are assisting EU member states with implementing the operational aspects of external border management through joint operations and rapid border interventions, risk analysis, information exchange, relations with third countries and the return of returnees (Regulation 2016: point 9). In 2016, Frontex was renamed European Border and Coast Guard Agency, which continues to be commonly referred to as Frontex. It remains the same legal person, 'with full continuity in all its activities and procedures' (ibid: point 11).

At its meeting on June 25th-26th, 2015, the European Council called for wider efforts in resolving unprecedented migratory flows toward Union territory in a comprehensive manner, including by reinforcing border management to better manage growing migratory flows. At their informal meeting on migration on September 23rd, 2015, the EU heads of state or government stressed the need to tackle the dramatic situation at the external borders and to strengthen controls at those borders, in particular through additional resources for the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union – the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) –, and Europol, with human resources and technical contributions from member states (ibid: point 1). The objective of EU policy 'in the field of external border management is to develop and implement European integrated border management at national and Union level' (ibid: point 2). Thus,

> European integrated border management, based on the four-tier access control model, comprises measures in third countries, such as under the common visa policy, measures with neighbouring third countries, border control measures at the external borders, risk analysis and measures with the Schengen area and return. (Regulation: point 3)

Therefore, a European Border and Coast Guard should comprise the European Border and Coast Guard Agency ('the Agency') and national authorities which are responsible for border management, including coast guards to the extent that they carry out border control tasks (ibid: point 5).

While member states retain the primary responsibility for the management of their external borders in their interest and in the interest of all member states, the Agency should support the application of Union measures relating to the management of the external borders by reinforcing, assessing and coordinating the actions of member states which implement those measures (ibid: point 6).

The role of Frontex should be 'to monitor regularly the management of the external borders'. The Agency should ensure proper and effective monitoring through risk analysis, information exchange and European Border Surveillance System (EUROSUR), and also through the presence of experts from its own staff in member states. Frontex should therefore be able to deploy liaison officers to member states 'for a period of time during which the liaison officers report to the executive director' (ibid: point 20).

Frontex promotes, coordinates and develops European border management in line with the EU fundamental rights charter applying the concept of Integrated Border Management. EUROSUR is the information-exchange framework designed to improve the management of Europe's external borders. It aims to support member states by increasing their situational awareness and reaction capability in combating cross-border crime, tackling irregular migration and preventing loss of migrant lives at sea. The backbone of EUROSUR is a network of National Coordination Centres (NCCs). Each member state establishes a NCC, which groups the authorities responsible for border control in a given member state. The main role of the NCC is to coordinate the border surveillance activities on national level and serve as a hub for the exchange of information (Frontex 2016: 1).

Frontex should, at the request of a member state or on its own initiative, 'organise and coordinate joint operations for one or more Member States to deploy European Border and Coast Guard teams as well as the necessary technical equipment' (Regulation 2016: point 23).

> If a Member State does not comply within 30 days with that Council decision and does not cooperate with the Agency in the implementation of the measures contained in that decision, the Commission should be able to trigger the specific procedure provided for in Article 29 of

> Regulation (EU) 2016/399 of the European Parliament and of the Council to force exceptional circumstances putting the overall functioning of the area without internal border control at risk. (ibid: point 28)

Frontex,

> when launching rapid border interventions at the request of a Member State or in the context of a situation requiring urgent action, the Agency should be able to deploy, in the Member States, European Border and Coast Guard teams from a rapid reaction pool which should be a standing corps composed of border guards and other relevant staff. There should be a minimum of 1,500 border guards and other relevant staff in the pool. (ibid: 29)

Austria therefore contributes 34 staff members; Malta: 6; Cyprus: 8; Germany: 225; Spain: 111; France: 170; Italy: 125; Poland: 100; Hungary: 65; Netherlands: 50; Romania: 75; Portugal: 47; Slovenia and Slovakia: 35 each; Finland: 30; Croatia: 65; Denmark: 29; Bulgaria: 40; Belgium: 30; Czech Republic: 20. (Annex 1: Task of Contributors to be provided by each Member State to the Minimum Total Number of 1500 Border Guards and other relevant staff.)

Schengen countries are obliged to deploy sufficient staff and resources to ensure a 'high and uniform level of control' at the external borders of the Schengen area. They must also ensure that border guards are properly trained. EU and Schengen Associated Countries also assist each other with the effective application of border controls via operational cooperation, which is coordinated by the EU agency Frontex. Thus, Frontex is also mandated to assist EU countries in raising and harmonising border management standards with the aim of combating cross-border crime while making legitimate passage across the external border of the EU faster and easier. The Schengen area now extends along some 44,000 km of external sea borders and almost 9,000 km of land borders. Schengen comprises 26 countries (including a number of non-EU states, so-called Schengen Associated Countries), meaning free internal movement for nearly half a billion people. The Schengen border is only as strong as its weakest link. However, the Schengen Border Code clearly states that the primary responsibility of border control lies with those Schengen countries that

have an external border – including land and sea borders and international airports. One key requirement is that EU member states having an external frontier must ensure that proper checks and effective surveillance are carried out there (Frontex 2016: 1).

Conclusions

Security in and around Europe is not in a good shape. Violent conflicts have grown significantly more complex, more frequent and more destructive since the end of the Cold War. Some conflicts of old regional disputes are flaring up and some involve new issues (Stenner 2016: 14). Furthermore, eroding arms control, hybrid conflicts, snap military exercises and close military encounters are dangerous developments bringing uncertainty to the European security landscape. From an OSCE side, there is a strong need to update the Vienna Document, which is about confidence building, transparency, doing inspections, and modernising the regime of the Open Skies Treaty, which allows participating states to overfly territory to others, and thus gain a picture of what is happening there. European states and the Russian Federation urgently have to tackle common current security challenges. Nowadays, none of the existing international organisational or institutional arrangements – neither the UN Security Council, nor the NATO-Russia Council, nor the relationship that has existed for many years now between the EU and the Russian Federation – 'has been able to provide a framework for finding a peaceful settlement to the conflict over eastern Ukraine, including the Crimea situation' (Ischinger 2015: 30).

Furthermore, territorial disputes in Eastern Europe and the South Caucasus remain unresolved and present a permanent security threat. Those conflicts have poisoned relations between states, they also have hampered the implementation of international agreements on arms control and confidence-and-security-building measures (CSBMs) in areas under the control of de facto regimes. At the same time, disagreements exists over pan-European arms control mechanisms, particularly the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty and the Adapted CFE Treaty: 'In these contested areas status-neutral confidence-building and arms control measures can play an important role as a tool for both conflict prevention and conflict resolution. There is no question that status-neutral arms control is difficult.' (Kapanadze et al. 2016: 8). The OSCE is perhaps the only regional security organisation that possesses an agreed document on status-neutral steps to be taken in conflict situations. It is the almost-forgotten document 'Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations', adopted in 1993 (ibid). States and other parties can collaborate in crisis

prevention and management processes irrespective of their status if all sides agree to such an approach. Under the heading 'Measures of Transparency' we find 'extraordinary information exchange' or 'notification of certain military activities'. The section entitled 'Measures of Constraint' contains proposals such as 'treatment of irregular forces' or 'constraint on certain military activities' (ibid: 8). Furthermore, many of OSCE field operations have mediation and dialogue facilitation in their mandates (Stenner 2016: 14).

Russia's military engagement in Ukraine has triggered a swift response by European NATO member and non-aligned states to shore up its military readiness and capability (O'Dwyer 2014: 4). 'Over the past few years, the security situation in Europe has deteriorated', says Peter Hultqvist, Swedish Minister of Defence: 'Russian actions constitute a serious challenge to the European security order'. According to Hultqvist,

> Russia's conflict in Georgia in 2008 and the aggression against Ukraine in 2014, with the illegal annexation of Crimea, show that Russia is prepared to use military means to achieve political goals. Russian disinformation campaigns are a reality and something we take seriously. (Hultqvist 2017: 16)

Moreover,

> [w]e also see more Russian activity in the Arctic. We have seen an increase of military activity in the Murmansk region, near the Finnish border and about 300 kilometres from Sweden. Russia has demonstrated both the ability and willingness to act offensively, for example, by temporarily deploying Iskander systems to the Kaliningrad area, as well as conducting offensive exercises with strategic bombing over the Baltic Sea.

From a Swedish point of view, '[u]nity in the European Union with the upholding of the sanctions against Russia is essential, connected to international law' (ibid).

From an international law perspective, Russia violated the integrity and sovereignty of one of the members of the UN. Thus, Russia threatened basic international principals, which say that

- borders and territorial integrity cannot be changed by force;
- a country and its population have the right to determine their own future and
- all members of the international community are bound by certain rules and when these rules are violated, the international community should set some cost for that behaviour (Hämmerle 2016: 3).

The Russian annexation of Crimea is again a fact of deeply rooted conflicts between the US and Russia on NATO enlargement. In April 2008, NATO members agreed at the Bucharest Summit that Ukraine and Georgia will become members of NATO and that the Membership Action Plan would be the next step (Bucharest Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Bucharest on April 3rd, 2008). But Russia has again been quite critical about the possibility of a further round of NATO enlargement. Furthermore, the EU and NATO are President Putin's 'ultimate targets. To him, western institutions and values are more threatening than armies' (Dempsey 2015: 19).

Due to the annexation of the Crimea into Russia, the President of the European Commission Jean-Claude Juncker called for a European Army in 2015, but a few months later, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Federica Mogherini, said that there 'is absolutely no secret plan to install an EU army" (Himmelfreundpointner 2016a: 71). Juncker also said: 'Even if Europe may be proud of being a 'soft power' of global influence, we should not be naïve. A soft power is not enough in our increasingly dangerous world.' (ibid: 72). But since Donald Trump has been elected 45th President of the United States of America, it is more and more obvious how immature the plans by the EU for a common defence are. Trump has threatened to withdraw the US from NATO, if the European NATO states would not increase their military budgets. Translation: 'If you want security you have to pay (a lot more) for it yourself.' (ibid: 72). Currently, the EU has no political plan to create a European Army. Nevertheless, French President Emmanuel Macron demanded in a two-hour address at the Sorbonne in September 2017 a 'common intervention force, a common defence budget and a common

doctrine for action." (The Economist 2019: 21) On June 25th, 2018, nine states signed up to the resulting European Intervention Initiative (E2I). Notably, E2I stood independent of the EU and so welcomed Denmark, which opts out of the Commonon Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), and the United Kingdom planning to leave CSDP. The focus on E2I 'is not on establishing force packages but on strategic foresight and intelligence sharing, scenario development and planning, support to operations, and lessons learned and doctrine.' (Biscop 2018a: 194) President Macron and German Chancellor Angela Merkel caused a ruckus in 2018 when they endorsed a 'European Army'. On January 10th, 2019, Ursula von der Leyen, the then-German Minister of Defence, declared: 'Europe´s army is already taking shape.' (The Economist 2019: 21) On January 22nd, 2019, the Aachen Treaty between France and Germany promised to develop the 'efficiency, coherence and credibility of Europe in the military field.' (Ibid)

From a Finnish perspective, '[a] more capable and integrated Europe is also a stronger trans-Atlantic partner. In this respect, more EU does not mean less NATO.' (Niinistö 2018: 12) In non-aligned Finland, 'we do not see European strategic autonomy as an alternative to NATO or as an alternative to a strong trans-Atlantic link.' (ibid)

However, the mutual assistance clause based on article 42.7 TEU does not encompass the neutral and non-aligned EU nations in defence matters. By international law, neutral countries are responsible for their own defence. Thus, NATO still remains the foundation for the collective defence for those EU states which are members of it. According to article 42.7, the specific character of the security and defence policies of all EU member states is fully respected.

Both the EU and the OSCE 'are in the business of soft power, using economic, diplomatic, and other non-military instruments to achieve political objectives' (van Ham 2006: 161). However, both institutions lack military capabilities and 'have a particularly civilian take on dealing with security challenges' (ibid). The EU, OSCE, NATO and the UN shall act in a coordinated manner, but are dependent on state and major power interests.

The biggest weakness of the EU has been its ability to speak with one voice – migration still remains a huge challenge for the EU member states to tackle. The migration crisis has empowered nationalists and populist parties, which have grown in influence in all Europe. Overcrowded voyages to reach Europe were familiar. Long before Germany opened its doors, southern EU countries were facing a critical situation, their administrations and social services overwhelmed (The Economist 2018a: 14). Germany, Sweden, and Austria provided asylum in relatively more cases than other European countries. This has posed major challenges to societies in areas such as housing and social services, and Europe has taken certain measures to keep down the migration flows. But these measures are not enough to tackle this big challenge, European states need to get to the bottom of the causes.

Transatlantic rifts between the US, Canada and the EU still remain in trade issues and relating to the 2015 nuclear agreement with Iran (the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action – JCPOA) – also signed by Germany, France, the UK, China and Russia – which lifted many international sanctions on Iran in exchange for limits on Tehran's nuclear programme. US President Trump pulled America out of the JCPOA to roll back Iran's nuclear-weapons programme, saying it was 'rotten'. He reimposed all sanctions and gave foreign firms up to six months to stop doing business with Iran. Iran has said it will stay in the deal only if the Europeans guarantee it will continue to receive economic benefits (Peel 2018: 1). The UK, France and Germany said they would continue to honour the agreement, the EU has openly declared its firm support for the JCPOA in August 2018. The return of US sanctions against Tehran jeopardised both European companies with dealings in Iran and the EU's efforts to sustain the nuclear accord after US President Trump withdrew from the agreement on May 8th, 2018. The US set out 12 demands for Iran to meet, including stopping uranium enrichment, scrapping its ballistic missile programme and ending its involvement in Middle Eastern conflict including Yemen, Syria and Iraq (ibid). President Trump said that he is 'ready, willing and able' to negotiate a new deal that limits Iran's regional aggression as well as its nuclear weapons. Iran should end 'terrorist activities' in the region and stop the development of ballistic missiles (The Economist 2018g: 35). In January 2016, Iran was very near to completing the removal of some 14,000 uranium-enrichment centrifuges. The core of the Arak heavy-water reactor,

which had the potential to produce plutonium, was reportedly taken out on January 11th, 2016, and was filled with cement. Most of Iran's stockpile of low-enrichment uranium was sent to Russia and Kazakhstan in late December 2015. Nuclear proliferation experts were amazed at the speed with which Iran has acted (The Economist 2016f: 36). Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu compared the Iran nuclear deal to the 1938 Munich Agreement between European powers and Adolf Hitler: 'A failed act of appeasement', which in this case 'has begun the countdown to an Iranian nuclear arsenal in a little more than a decade' (Aitoro 2018: 9). Specifically, Netanyahu pointed to three flaws in the Iran deal, including lack of adequate restrictions on ballistic missile development, lack of comprehensive inspection, and eventual free reign to enrich uranium, once the 10-year restrictions expire. This creates a virtual highway to nuclear capabilities that are a direct threat to the region, said Netanyahu (ibid). US President Trump therefore is calling for immediate access to all sites by international weapons inspectors and the indefinite extension of limits on Iran's uranium enrichment and other nuclear activities (ibid).

Additionally, as US President Trump has stressed the importance of modernising the US´s nuclear arsenal, advancing a $1.2-trillion proposal, Trump has engaged in what critics have called a 'nuclear spending spree' in an attempt to deliver on promises to 'strengthen and expand' and 'modernise and rebuild' the country´s nuclear forces, at risk of a new arms race (Pigman 2019: 1). Therefore, in October 2018, President Trump announced his intention to 'terminate' the 1987 INF (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force) Treaty – a pillar of the US-Russian nuclear arms control architecture. Trump on the one hand cited repeated Russian violations, Russia on the other hand claims the INF has been repeatedly violated by the US 95 times (ibid). In the meantime, both countries officially suspended their treaty obilgations.

A further transatlantic rift focuses on US President Trump who thinks climate change is a hoax. Under his predecessor, Barack Obama, climate change was listed as a strategic threat to be assessed and countered. Trump's policies include pulling America out of the Paris climate agreement to limit global warming and championing coal (The Economist 2018f: 31).

Destabilising interventions by foreign powers like US, Russia, Saudi-Arabia, Iran, France and the UK brought some states of the Middle East and North African (MENA) region additionally into turmoil. Leaders were ousted by their own people and with foreign aid in the Arab uprisings of 2011: Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali of Tunisia fell in January that year, then Hosni Mubarak of Egypt in February. In Libya, Muammar Gaddafi was overthrown with help from Western air forces, then killed in October. In Yemen, Ali Abdullah Saleh, gravely wounded by a bomb, stepped down in November (The Economist 2016e: 4). In Egypt the army led a counter-revolution. Libya splintered into two rival administrations. In Yemen Houthi rebels toppled the then government, and are in turn being pushed back by a Saudi-led coalition (ibid).

Thus, in some places nonstate-militias are stronger than states, whereas state forces have degenerated into ragtag militias. Sectarianism has become acute. The contest between Saudi-Arabia, the self-appointed champion of the Sunnis, and Iran, the leading Shia power, makes everything worse. In Syria, outsiders have been sucked in. The US lead the air campaign against the 'Islamic State' and was sending more special forces. Russian forces prop up the President of Syria, Bashar al-Assad. In Yemen and in Syria, '[t]his is less a clash of civilisations than a clash within a civilisation. Increasingly the Arabs are a nation of refugees, exiles and migrants.' (The Economist 2016e: 4). Russia 'has effectively marginalised the United States and maneuverer into position as the dominant international player in Syria' (The New York Times International 2017: 10).

Moreover, the EU's reaction to major crises, including today's migration crisis that is still unsolved, 'is often regarded as hesitant and has permanently shaken the citizens' confidence in the European Union's ability to control the fate of Europe' (Jankowitsch 2016: 52). The most common response by some states was to return to policies 'that only serve national interests and disregard the European standards and rules which European solidarity agreed upon' (ibid). This has also contributed to European institutions such as the European Commission and the European Parliament 'losing more of their authority and ability to act' (ibid). European ideals 'are fading away and the desire for unlimited national autonomy has been revived' (ibid). European governments are still

unable to find appropriate answers to huge regional and global security challenges.

International organisations only can help states to provide common solutions to common problems. They are as strong as member states allow them to act.

Austrian Security Policy

Introduction

At a national strategic level, neutral Austria launched its first strategic defence concept (National Defence Plan) in 1983. This concept was based on the 1975 doctrine on 'Comprehensive National Defence' (*Umfassende Landesverteidigung* (*ULV*) in that it encompassed issues ranging from preparations for overall national defence to contributions to UN peacekeeping as well as to strengthening peace efforts in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) process (Hauser and Mantovani 2018: 198). Austrian military defence (*Militärische Landesverteidigung* (*MLV*) was based on three scenarios: crisis—the task of the Austrian Armed forces (*Bundesheer*) was to secure borders and to preserve air sovereignty; neutrality—the task of the *Bundesheer* was to respond to invasion of foreign troops into Austria; and defence (Bundeskanzleramt 1985: 41-2).

During the 1990s, European neutrals started to commit to the growing system of security and politico-military cooperation within the European Union and to support the tasks of NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP, including humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks, and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace enforcement. The core principle of neutrality remained aimed at avoiding involvement in wars with other states (Hauser 2006b: 140 and 143). Although being a member of the EU since 1995, security policy in Austria continues along the lines of pragmatic neutrality by mainly participating in EU and NATO PfP tasks with a focus on interoperability. Pragmatic neutrality allows 'the armed forces of neutral states to work in cooperation with military alliances, mostly under the auspices of UN, EU and NATO PfP, for purposes such as peacekeeping and even peace enforcement' (ibid: 144).

Despite its enhanced international engagement, defence budgets in Austria continue to be heavily reduced. However, the main challenge for the Austrian armed forces will be to reconcile massive budget cuts, new investments, and enhancing troop contributions with constitutional commitments.

Austria's guiding principle is comprehensive defence (military, psychological, civil and economic defence) embedded in the political concept of 'active' neutrality. Each male citizen has to join the armed forces (article 9a of the Federal Constitution). In 2006, compulsory military service was reduced from eight to six months. According to the Federal Constitution, compulsory military service can be refused in case of severe personal, ethical or religious reasons. The person concerned is then obliged to carry out civil service.

The armed forces have to protect the constitutionally established institutions and the population's democratic freedoms; to maintain order and security inside the country; to render assistance in the case of natural catastrophes and disasters of exceptional magnitude (flooding, avalanches). The mission of the Austrian Armed Forces is defined in the Constitution and the Army law. The main tasks are:

- military defence of the country, and
- assistance to the civil power in natural disasters and other scenarios, including border surveillance (as was the case during the Hungarian crisis of 1956, on the Italian border in 1967 to suppress support for South Tyrolean 'activists', or from 1990 until 2011 on the eastern border against illegal migration[5]), the anti-radiation measures taken in 1986 after the Chernobyl nuclear disaster, or the anti-anthrax surveillance in the early 2000s.
- Since 1965, with the passing of the Foreign Service Law, participation in international missions has also formally become a

[5] In 1989 the Iron Curtain fell. In spring and summer 1990, the henceforth virtually open border led to a dramatic increase in illegal border crossings of Eastern and South-Eastern European people. Customs officials and gendarmerie / police were no longer able to cope with the massive on-rush alone, amounting to more than 1,000 illegal border crossings per week. Aside from the ever increasing number of immigrants, it was, above all, the rapid growth of trans-border crime that prompted the Federal Government to take quick counter-measures. Between 1990 and 2011, soldiers from all over Austria have served at the borders to Slovakia and Hungary. The experience they gained there has been successfully used in other Austrian Armed Forces operations since. A point in case, which was recognised even by highest KFOR authorities, was the 2001 operation of Austrian companies in southern Kosovo at Dragas, surveying the Macedonian border (Gröbming 2006: 1).

> key task for the armed forces. In 1997, it was replaced by a new law facilitating the administrative procedures. Any participation in missions abroad has to be decided by the Austrian Council of Ministers and approved by the Main Committee of the Parliament (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014a: 1).

Since the end of the Cold War, the Austrian Armed Forces have been increasingly assisting the border police in safeguarding Austrian borders against illegal immigrants. Relating to the 2004 Austrian Armed Forces Reform Commission report, the mobilised establishment was lowered from approximately 110,000 to 55,000 troops, including about 3,000 ready for international peace operations. The latter figure was reduced to at least 1,100 in 2013 (Hauser and Mantovani 2018: 205). Fifty percent shall be made up by professional servicemen/women with (un)limited contracts. The 'militia' reserve component was integrated into the new structures and they serve on equal status. According to the 'Report on the Conscription Reform 2013 (Bericht zur Reform des Wehrdienstes 2013)' the principal task of the 'militia' reserve forces is to protect domestic critical infrastructure. The 'militia' reserve forces now account for nearly 50 percent of the soldiers serving out of area.

Relating to air defence, Austria was forced to remove traditional counter-air missions from the operational repertoire. However, air policing and surveillance are the primary missions for the Austrian air component based on highly aging Saab 105 and Eurofighter Typhoon (Newdick 2008: 11).

Austrian approach to neutrality – 'I do it my way'

At the beginning of the Cold War, Austria decided to become neutral due to her geopolitical situation between East and West. Austrian permanent neutrality was a *product* and a result of Soviet peaceful coexistence policy creating a neutral Alpine wedge together with Switzerland cutting the NATO Northern flank from the Southern flank (Hauser 2007: 46).

> Although Austria promised in the Moscow Memorandum to pursue a neutrality policy like Switzerland, the Austrian policy left this line by becoming a member of the UN in 1955. So the Austrian security policy started to walk a tightrope between neutrality and international solidarity

> because of her UN membership and membership in other organizations like EU or NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP) later on. (Zecha 2015: 317)

When the Austrian National Assembly passed the Federal Constitutional Law on Austria's neutrality on October 26th, 1955, 'it was taken for granted that Austrian neutrality would be modelled on that of Switzerland. But very soon, Austria's neutrality differed from that of Switzerland: as early as December 1955, Austria joined the United Nations' (Federal Chancellery 2002: 9). Together with 15 states, Austria became member of the United Nations Organization (UNO) on December 14th, 1955 – together with 15 following countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Lao PDR, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Sri Lanka.

> In relation to the United Nations, Austria's understanding until 1990 was that the organization was under an obligation to respect Austria's permanent neutrality and would therefore never call on Austria to take coercive measures in a military conflict between third countries. But in the course of the Gulf War of 1991, the legal view came to prevail in Austria that obligations under the Statute of the United Nations take precedence over obligations under neutrality. Thereby, the Swiss model of classical neutrality had lost its relevance. (ibid)

Thus, the Austrian Security and Defence Doctrine in 2001 stated: 'Austria's status in international law corresponds to that of a non-allied state rather than a neutral state' (ibid).

During the Cold War period, Austrian neutrality became important within the framework of an active and peaceful neutrality policy as stated by former Chancellor Bruno Kreisky (Zecha 2015: 321). When Austria joined the UN, the Austrian member of the international court at The Hague, Alfred Verdross, presented the following thesis: 'Austria has become a UN member as a neutral country, so the UN and its bodies have to be aware of this status. In other words, neutrality law beats UN law' (ibid: 319). Later on, this thesis was called 'Verdross Doctrine'. Along with the Kuwait crisis in 1990, that doctrine changed completely. On November 29th, 1990, the UN Security Council authorised all nations cooperating with the Kuwaiti government 'to use all means to implement Resolution 660, unless Iraq

implemented the resolution fully on or before January 15th, 1991 (Resolution 678)' (ibid: 323 and 324). However, Austria granted over-flight rights following Resolution 678 for all aircraft of the coalition, 'again together with a reservation of neutrality' (ibid: 324). Switzerland closed its airspace for military planes due to reasons of neutrality, a quite important difference to Austria's position (ibid). Consequently, Austria left the Verdross doctrine and moved to a new policy concerning UN Security Council measures. According to the Austrian political standpoint, UN Security Council measures 'are to be implemented because they can be seen as police actions (*Polizeiaktionen*) (Leidenmühler 2015: 30) and therefore they have no impact on the Austrian neutrality law'. In other words: 'UN law beats (Austrian) neutrality law.' Thus, '[w]hen the members of the United Nations act against an aggressor, there can be no question of neutrality, only of solidarity' then-Austrian Federal President Thomas Klestil stated in 1992 (Lahodynsky 2002: 24). So Klestil was the first president who departed from the Austrian policy of strict neutrality. One year before, during the crisis in Yugoslavia, military aircraft from Yugoslavia had briefly penetrated Austrian airspace 'on several occasions' (ibid).

In 1991, the Warsaw Pact vanished, and NATO partly rewrote its doctrine. Then-Austrian President Thomas Klestil, who took office in July 1992, stated in late September 1992, 'Austria's neutrality is not an end in itself'. Austria wished to be part of a collective security system in Europe because 'Europe's security is also our security' (ibid). Furthermore, in October 1992, he said: 'If a European security system – which does not currently exist – comes into being, that will be the time to re-examine our Neutrality Law' (ibid). With its accession to the EU, 'Austria obliged itself to participate in the CFSP (Common Foreign and Security Policy)' (Report of the Austrian Armed Forces Reform Commission 2004: 10). But the Social Democrats and the Greens, and since 2005 the Conservative Party and the Freedom Party again are opposed to any abolition of neutrality.

Since the fall of the Iron Curtain and Austria' s accession to the EU in January 1995, and to the NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP) in May 1995, the Austrian security and political situation is directly linked with developments in the EU and NATO. Austria's main defence policy objectives are the provision of military capabilities to maintain Austria's

sovereignty, territorial integrity, military assistance to the civilian authorities and finally participation in crisis management missions abroad – preferably under a UN mandate.

Austrian security policy in transition

For Austria, neutrality also included an active, positive foreign policy in pursuit of international peace and justice, in order to make contributions to peace and stability. As the then-Austrian Federal President Heinz Fischer explained during a presidential election campaign in 2004, 'only neutrality combined with international solidarity, only that kind of neutrality policy Austria is focusing on, can be the fundament for a new peace policy today, which the world needs particularly urgently' (Fischer 2004: 1). Austria signed the 'PfP Framework Document' in February 1995 as the twenty-fifth participating state (Hauser and Mantovani 2018: 199) and uses the NATO Planning and Review Process (PARP) and the Political-Military Framework (PMF) for NATO-led PfP operations as a planning mechanism for contributions to the Headline Goal of the European Security and Defence Policy within the framework of the 'tailored cooperation program' (Austrian Foreign Ministry 2006: 1): 'According to the Austrian PfP introductory document of May 1995, Austria's cooperation with NATO and the PfP participants aim, in particular, at cooperation regarding peacekeeping missions, humanitarian and disaster relief as well as search and rescue operations.' (ibid). Ever since, NATO and Austria have been detailing areas of cooperation and timelines in Austria's Individual Partnership and Cooperation Programme in accordance with NATO's new partnership policy (Hauser and Mantovani 2018: 199).

Austria runs the Centre for Operations Preparation, a Partnership Training and Education Centre. It also leads the Balkans Regional Working Group in the framework of the PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes (a voluntary association which works 'in the spirit of PfP', funded by Austria, Germany, Switzerland and the United States) (Austrian Foreign Ministry 2006: 1). In fact Austria 'is actively participating in two of the three core tasks of NATO defined in its 2010 Strategic Concept: Crisis Management and Cooperative Security (the core task of Collective Defence being for members only)' (Jandl 2016: 76). The initial intention of joining PfP and the Euro-Atlantic-Partnership Council

(EAPC) was to be able to take part in the transatlantic security dialogue, to get access to standards, education and training provided for backing up interoperability for the Austrian Armed Forces, and being able to participate in NATO-led operations open for partners and in which Austria has a security policy interest. Along with individual allies and partners, Austria has made contributions to the voluntary Trust Fund to support, for example, the destruction of mines and/or munitions in Albania, Kazakhstan, Montenegro, Serbia and Ukraine (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014a: 1).

In 1996, Austria and Sweden were founding members of the UN Multinational Standby High Readiness Brigade (SHIRBRIG), which was also founded by the NATO members Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and Poland. SHIRBRIG was headquartered close to Copenhagen and the Nordic battalion was integrated into that brigade. Austria contributed to SHIRBRIG mainly by deploying officers and non-commissioned officers (NCOs) for the headquarters (Zecha 2015: 325). Austria took the SHIRBRIG presidency in 2004, coordinating UN operations. SHIRBRIG was dissolved by June 30th, 2009. In the meantime, EU and NATO have been developing new force concepts and therefore launched the EU Battle Group Concept in 2004 and the NATO Response Forces Concept in 2006.

Austrian security is directly linked with developments in the EU. In 1998, a special provision (Article 23f, Article 23j since 2010) was added to the Austrian Federal Constitution to ensure that participation in the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) would not be restricted by the 1955 Neutrality Act.

Soon after elected in 2000, Austria's first centre-right coalition government initiated a debate on the country's declared defence perspective – the implications of which are likely to have far-reaching consequences for the planned national security doctrine and defence review. There existed consensus over the issue of Austrian participation in the EU security and defence based on *active neutrality policy* among the political parties represented in the parliament. Any change in Austria's traditional neutral status will likely provoke intense criticism from the main political parties of Austria and the Austrian public. After intensive discussions in a

parliamentary sub-committee specifically set up for this purpose in 2001, the National Assembly adopted by majority on December 12th, 2001, a new Security and Defence Doctrine (SDD) on the basis of the experts' draft analysis, which was approved by the Federal Government on January 23rd, 2001. For the first time since the adoption of the last National Defence Plan in 1983 based on the 1975 Defence Doctrine, Austria again had a basic political guideline for devising its security policy, based on the three fundamental principles:

- Principles of comprehensive security with due consideration of both the military and the non-military aspects of security (Federal Chancellery 2002: 1).
- 'The principle of preventive security replaced the concept of threat response. The active participation in international measures for conflict prevention and crisis management is an internal part of Austria's security policy.' (ibid)
- Therefore, the 'principle of European solidarity replaces the concept of autonomous security policy. The security of Austria and the security of the European Union are inseparably linked with each other. The new challenges and risks arising in the field of security policy cannot be met alone but only within the framework of international cooperation in the spirit of solidarity' (ibid).

Furthermore:

- The clearly perceivable threat scenario of the Cold War era has been replaced by a complex mix of dangers and risks. Its origins lie in the political, economic, military, social, ecological, cultural-religious and information technology areas (Hauser 2007: 48). The SDD provided for 'refining Comprehensive Defence by developing a comprehensive security system that takes into account the new risks and threats, and is based on adapted legislation. Therefore, Comprehensive Defence as a key element remains active – as stipulated in Article 9a of the Austrian Constitution – but has been refined to a new concept of a comprehensive security system on the basis of the present overall strategy and the relevant elements derived from it' (Ségur-Cabanac 2006: 1 and 2).
- A conventional military attack threatening the country's existence was not foreseeable in 2001, whereas the capability of countering punctual attacks were constantly maintained. This included steps to

maintain and develop all military core functions at a high technological level on a scale of forces operatively sustainable (Hauser 2007: 48). 'An act of aggression with conventional forces against Austria, threatening its existence, is only conceivable in case of a radical strategic change in the political situation in Europe; for such a case, present military strategic assessments would expect a lead-time of seven to ten years.' (Federal Chancellery 2002: 6)

- The SDD recommended the development of capabilities in order to participate in common defence efforts; 'to take part in the entire spectrum of the Petersberg[6] Tasks within a multinational framework up to the scale of a brigade or brigade equivalent' (ibid: 12) In the Report of the Austrian Armed Forces Reform Commission which was published in 2004, the notion 'framework brigade' is mentioned, 'that means providing the core functions of the brigade staff and at least two battalions of combat troops as well as the major part of the support elements and the provision of the logistic support for our own forces' (Report of the Austrian Armed Forces Reform Commission 2004: Footnote 12).
- Achievement of interoperability is a key task in order to carry out peace support operations abroad and for the defence of Austria. In terms of personnel 'this can only be achieved by maintaining universal conscription. However, the qualifications needed to call for a gradual increase in the degree of professionalization and in the share of volunteers' (Federal Chancellery 2002: 12).
- The SDD also recommends ensuring 'capacities for assistance operations to help in case of disasters, support the Federal Ministry of the Interior in case of terrorist threats, to control the country's borders and to guard sensitive infrastructure' (ibid).
- Promoting armament cooperation 'should enable Austria to achieve synergies, make armament procurement less costly and get access

[6] These tasks are named after the Petersberg, a conference center close to Bonn, Germany, where these tasks were adopted by the Western European Union in 1992. In 1997, these tasks became part of the EU Treaty of Amsterdam, article 17.2. In the enlarged Petersberg tasks spectrum, the tasks have been supplemented by the aspects of disarmament, consultation and support, and conflict prevention. Such activity options may also contribute to the fight against terrorism and additionally include the option of using sovereign territory of third states in order to fight terrorism.

to latest key technologies' (ibid: 13). According to the SDD, the Federal Ministry of Defence (MOD) will 'publish a White Paper every two years with a ten-year perspective, detailing the tasks, state and requirements of the Austrian Armed Forces, considering the prevailing situation' (ibid).

- The Federal MOD should 'seek opportunities for regional cooperation projects with a view to achieving synergies in various areas,' e.g. in joint armaments projects (ibid). 'Opportunities for co-operation within the framework of PfP should be fully exploited, and in addition to exercises and training, they should also embrace all aspects of research, especially in the field of security policy.' (ibid). Furthermore, 'NATO's enlargement process is welcomed as a contribution to the strengthening of security and stability in Europe and is thereby also in Austria's security interest. In light of the development within the field of security policy, Austria will continuously assess the value of NATO membership for its security and defence policy and the option of joining NATO will be kept open. Accession to NATO would only take place after prior consent of the Austrian people (referendum)' (ibid: 12).
- 'Geographical distance from areas of conflict no longer guarantees sufficient protection.' (ibid: 4). The new challenges and risks arising in the field of security policy cannot be met alone but only within the framework of international cooperation in the spirit of solidarity: 'The security of Austria and that of the EU are inseparably linked. Austria today implements its security policy essentially within the framework of the EU' (ibid: 3). 'Security and stability can be best guaranteed today through co-operation among functionally complementary supportive institutions. These include the United Nations and, at the European and Transatlantic level, especially the EU, NATO with its Partnership for Peace (PfP) and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council as well as the OSCE and the Council of Europe. Active participation in international measures of conflict prevention and crisis management is an important element of Austria's security policy.' (ibid: 7)
- The danger of domestically motivated political terrorism in 2001 was non-existent in Austria. In view of the progressive development and availability of long-range air assets, especially

ballistic missiles and cruise missiles, Austria may face a military threat even from regions outside Europe in a few years' time. Moreover, the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) 'may lead to new threats also for Austria despite appropriate non-proliferation regimes' (ibid: 6).

- Austria is also 'confronted with the negative effects of globalization, especially in the shape of organised crime and international terror, but also illegal immigration' (ibid).
- Additionally, sub-strategies should be elaborated 'for all areas relevant to security policy' based on the implementation of the SDD. These sub-strategies are to contain primarily such measures as are necessary to implement the recommendations and relate in particular the 'areas of foreign policy, defence policy and internal security'. In addition, sub-strategies are also to be worked out in the fields of 'economic, agricultural, transport, infrastructure and financial policy as well as education and information policy' (ibid).

Since the end of the Cold War, Austria's threat scenario has changed profoundly, which led to a 'readjustment of the security policy concept not only for Austria but also for Europe as a whole. Since the danger of a conflict between the Alliances has been eliminated, European integration is seen as the essential factor for the strengthening of European security' (Ségur-Cabanac 2006: 1). The then-Austrian Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel in 2001 declared that 'classical all-round neutrality must give way to common solidarity within the European family' (CNN 2001: 1) and called for mutual assistance under the umbrella of EU membership. In the 2001 Security and Defence Doctrine (SDD), NATO membership remained an option. The option of joining NATO was kept open by the Austrian People's Party (Österreichische Volkspartei) until October 2004, but never seemed to be a realistic possibility (Hauser 2006a: 211). In passing legislation on the 'Security and Defence Doctrine' (December 12th, 2001) the significance of controversial threats has been down-graded, whereas the new phenomenon of subversive-subconventional, terrorist and criminal threats have been emphasized' (Ségur-Cabanac 2006: 1).

In general, key elements of the 2001 SDD include:

- The transition away from strict neutrality – this began *de facto* with Austria's EU membership in January 1995 – without any provision for neutrality. According to SDD, Austria's international status was defined as 'non/aligned'.
- The participation in the whole spectrum of the EU Petersberg tasks encompasses humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking. Extending EU Petersberg tasks are foreseen in article 43 of the EU Lisbon Treaty and relate to disarmament operations, military advice and assistance talks and the fight against terrorism in various fields.
- The acceptance that there was no clearly defined military dominated threat-scenario, although there was the recognition of the key threats to Austria according to the 2003 European Security Strategy.
- The recognition that there was no reference to Austria's national security without reference to the concept of European security.
- The recognition that the predominance of US Forces in NATO will further direct the development of security policy on the European continent and will influence future stability. Therefore the basis of stability and security in Europe will be the maintenance and enhancement of transatlantic cooperation (Hauser 2007: 49).

The 2013 Austrian Security Strategy

The 2001 Austrian security doctrine was rewritten under its present name Austrian Security Strategy. The process started in 2010, but it was stopped by a debate on the conscript system, which was started by the then-Mayor of Vienna, Michael Häupl, shortly before the day of election of the Vienna Provincial Parliament in October 2010 (Die Presse 2013: 1). From that day on, the coalition partners were in discussion whether or not professional armed forces should be introduced in Austria. Because the coalition partners could not find a solution, a referendum was held on January 20th, 2013. The results were 59.7 percent in favour of the conscript army and civil service versus 40.3 percent in favour of professional armed forces (Zecha 2015: 327). The then-Minister of Defence Gerald Klug was given the task to improve the conscript system and to make it more attractive for the young soldiers. On the other hand, the armed forces had to suffer

severe budget restrictions caused by the new regulations after the financial crisis in 2008.

On July 3rd, 2013, the current Austrian Security Strategy was passed by the Austrian parliament. The Austrian security policy was subdivided into three levels: the national level; the European level; the international level (ibid). This strategy stresses the new cyber threats and cyber defence, and the definition of Austria's security policy status was changed to one of neutrality again. The national level includes comprehensive security provisions, domestic security, defence policy, civil-military cooperation, diplomacy and international site policy. The European level encompasses Justice and Interior, EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and policy related to the results of the Councils of the European Union. The international level comprises security of the interior, foreign security including UN policy, NATO PfP, OSCE, and international operations. It also stresses the new cyber threats and cyber defence. Since 2012, Austria has been participating in cyber exercises (such as Locked Shields) at the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence in Estonia within the framework of the NATO PfP (Zecha 2015: 328).

On March 20th, 2013 the Austrian Ministerial Council adopted the Austrian Cyber Security Strategy with the Ministry of Defence assuming responsibility for military cyber defence (Hauser and Mantovani 2018: 199). Subsequently, Military Cyber Emergency Readiness Teams (milCERT) were established as coordination centres in the Austrian Armed Forces in order to protect the military cyber system and 'to further develop the Cyber Security Survey' and to counter cyber-attacks (Republic of Austria 2013b: 11; and Der Soldat 2013: 9).

The main tasks of the Austrian Armed Forces currently are:

- '(1) guarantee full state sovereignty and integrity,
- (2) protect the constitutional institutions and the critical infrastructure,
- (3) protect the population, also in the area of disaster relief,
- (4) support the national capacity to act in strategic crisis situations,
- (5) contribute to the management of crises as an expression of solidarity, and

- (6) make a military contribution to EU security endeavours in the spirit of solidarity'. (Republic of Austria 2013a: 11)

Austria's Security Strategy includes the following principles: (ibid: 4)

- Comprehensive security policy 'means that external and internal aspects of security are inextricably interlinked, as are civil and military aspects'.
- 'Integrated security policy must be based on a cooperative approach between governmental and non-governmental actors', security being a 'comprehensive package'.
- 'Proactive security policy means working towards preventive threats from emerging in the first place or at least taking steps to mitigate their negative impact (shaping security).'
- 'Security policy based on solidarity takes into account that the security of neutral Austria is now largely interconnected with the security of the EU as a whole.'
- 'Conventional attacks against Austria have become unlikely for the foreseeable future. Instead, both Austria and the EU are all the more affected by new and existing challenges and risks.' (ibid: 7)
- 'Austria will craft its security policy predominantly within the UN, the EU, the OSCE, and its partnership with NATO and within the Council of Europe.' (ibid) Austria 'is a member of the EU on the constitutional basis of its permanent neutrality.' (ibid: 8) 'The EU provides the central framework of action for Austria's security policy. Austria will be involved in every dimension of EU security policy.' (ibid: 12)

At the end of the strategy, the criteria for a participation in international operations are defined as follows:

- 'the extent to which the particular situation affects the security of Austria;
- European solidarity and the importance of the respective activity for the security of the EU or Europe;
- international solidarity and the importance of the respective activity for global security;

- the impact participation will have in terms of Austria's position in the organisation in question;
- the geographical location of the mission in question;
- the availability of suitable Austrian forces in the civil and military sectors;
- the financial burdens resulting from participation' (ibid: 15).

Due to Austria's 'geo-political position and the degree to which its security is affected and in light of its expertise and networks, Austrian priorities will continue to lie first and foremost with missions in South-East and Eastern Europe as well as in the Middle East. In line with international developments, activities in these areas must be adapted and, if necessary, extended: for example from the Balkans to the Danube and Black Sea regions, or from the Golan Heights to other parts of the Middle East or North Africa' (ibid).

Austrian participation in international missions and operations

Austria's level of ambition for crisis response operations is, at any given time, at least 1,100 personnel[7] and up to 100 experts (also making use of the potential in the active reserve 'to be established by way of inter-ministerial coordination in order to support the Strategic Guidelines on Security and Development and for the purposes of reforming the security sector and contributing to military advisory tasks as well as for conflict prevention and post-crisis rehabilitation measure') (Republic of Austria 2013a: 22). 'All of the forces deployed by the Austrian Armed Forces must, in principle, be designed for dual use in, both national and international operations.' (ibid) However, '[t]argeted preparation must be made to enable some parts of the Austrian Armed Forces to cooperate in operations with the European Gendarmerie Force' (ibid). The strength of the Austrian Armed Forces encompasses 55,000 personnel (15,000 active soldiers, 10,000 conscripts, 30,000 'militia' reserve soldiers) (Cibulka 2014: 4), at various readiness levels 'including short-term deployments in humanitarian aid operations', (Republic of Austria 2014a: 21) and is based on general conscription. 'In their training, particular attention must be paid to military

[7] 'Austria´s participation in short-term deployments of the Battlegroups or operative reserve forces is independent of this.' (Republic of Austria 2013a: 22).

national defence, foreign commitments, disaster relief, protecting critical infrastructures, border surveillance, support for maintaining public order and security in Austria, according to Article 79 of the Constitutional Law of Austria, and cyber security.' (ibid: 20) Of this total, at least 12,500 personnel are available for national disaster relief operations (ibid: 21).

Austrian troops have been involved in UN peace support operations since 1960. This contingent was primarily a field hospital in support of the UN Mission in the former Belgian Congo. Since 1960, 'more than 100,000 Austrian soldiers and civilian helpers have participated in about 100 international peace support and humanitarian missions' (Klug 2014: 3). Austria has a long-standing tradition of participating in humanitarian and disaster relief operations, starting with assistance after the 1963 Skopje earthquake and three small medical teams sent to Nigeria in 1968-70. Involvement in a larger scale began with the international assistance following the devastating earthquake in northern Armenia (Spitak, Lori province) on December 7th, 1988,[8] which clearly revealed deficiencies in international relief management. In Austria, this led to the establishment of AFDRU in 1990, the Austrian [Armed] Forces Disaster Relief Unit within the framework of the NBC (Nuclear, Biological and Chemical) School (first in Vienna, later in Korneuburg). Among the most noteworthy deployments were those after flood disasters in Poland (1997) and in Mozambique (2000), after the earthquakes in Taiwan and in Turkey (1999), in Algeria and in Iran (2003) and in Sri Lanka (2005), after the tsunami disaster in South East Asia in 2004-05, and following the floods in Bosnia in 2014 (Bock 2015: 149). Increasingly important are police missions. In internal conflicts in particular, the police play an even more important role in stabilising a crisis zone than do soldiers, both fulfilling complementary tasks. Judges and judicial experts also fulfil an important role – experts speak of the 'three-legged school' of security (military), public order (police) and legal aspects (judiciary) as the basis for lasting reforms in crisis-torn countries, and as a major element of peace building efforts. Austrian NBC experts were also involved in the search for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq after 1991 (Schmidl and Young 2014: 20).

[8] This earthquake is regarded as one of the worst in recent decades, causing at least 25,000 deaths and one million homeless (Bock 2015: 147).

Since 1974, Austrian troops have been serving on the Golan Heights between Israel and Syria. Within this United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), Austrian soldiers were stationed on the Golan Heights permanently. The Austrian Armed Forces have ended UNDOF operations caused by the implications of the civil war in Syria (Zecha 2015: 328). The Austrian infantry battalion, consisting of up to 380 troops, was stationed in Syria from 1974 to 2013 (Hauser and Mantovani 2018: 200). In Cyprus, until 2001, Austria, together with Hungary and Slovenia, provided an infantry battalion for the UN (ibid).

Austria has been deploying troops to Bosnia and Herzegovina for NATO and EU missions since 1996 and to Kosovo since autumn 1999. In 2002, Austria provided about 75 personnel in support of ISAF mission in Afghanistan, providing expertise and logistical support (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014a: 1). Two years later, ten staff officers were deployed to Kabul. During the Election Support Operation in Afghanistan of autumn 2005, Austria deployed 95 infantry soldiers to operate in support and work alongside the German-led Provincial Reconstruction Team Kunduz (ibid).

On October 23rd, 2007, the European Council of the EU passed the decision to conduct the operation EUFOR Chad/RCA under the mandate of the UN Security Council. On November 7th, 2007, the Austrian Council of Ministers passed a decision to participate in EUFOR Chad/RCA with up to 160 troops for a limited time. In January 2008, the troops mainly consisting of Special Forces were deployed and came under fire immediately. It was the first time Austria went into an international operation with Special Forces (Zecha 2015: 327).

Up to 185 Austrian soldiers participate in the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). Originally, UNIFIL was established by the UNSC in March 1978 by its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) to confirm Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon; restore international peace and security; and assist the Lebanese Government in restoring its effective authority in the area. The concept of UNIFIL operations had to be adjusted twice: following the 1982 Israeli-Lebanese war when the UNIFIL positions were overrun and its functions were limited primarily to humanitarian assistance; and after the Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon to

the Blue Line in 2000, enabling the Force to resume its military functions (UNIFIL 2015: 1). Following the July/August 2006 Israeli-Hezbollah war, the Security Council, by resolution 1701 (2006) of August 11th, 2006, has significantly enhanced UNIFIL and expanded its original mandate to:

- monitor the cessation of hostilities;
- accompany and support the Lebanese Armed Forces as they deploy throughout the South, as Israel withdraws its armed forces from Lebanon;
- coordinate these activities with the governments of Lebanon and Israel;
- extend its assistance to help ensure humanitarian access to civilian populations and to support voluntary and safe return of displaced persons;
- assist the Lebanese Armed Forces in taking steps towards the establishment between the Blue Line and the Litani river of an area free of any armed personnel, assets and weapons other than those of the Government of Lebanon and of UNIFIL deployed in this area;
- assist the Government of Lebanon in securing its borders and other entry points to prevent the entry into Lebanon without its consent of arms or related material (UNIFIL 2015: 1).

The ambition to be able to deploy a minimum of 1,100 personnel abroad at any time so far has not been affected by the budgetary restraints. Currently Austria participates in two NATO led missions: KFOR, where Austria is the third largest troop contributor to KFOR and the largest Non-NATO-Troop Contributing Country with approximately 470 personnel, and Resolute Support Mission with 18 personnel (by July 2019). Additionally, Austria provides some 330 personnel for EUFOR Althea in Bosnia and Herzegovina and about 300 more for operations and missions led by EU, UN and OSCE.

These facts demonstrate that Austria, while maintaining a form of neutrality, is not taking a free ride. NATO membership did not enjoy high popularity in Austria. Till the US-led war on Iraq in spring 2003, only small parts of the *Österreichische Volkspartei* (Conservative Party) and the *Freiheitliche Partei* (Freedom Party) voiced their support for NATO

membership. Since this US-led invasion, all political parties agreed on neutrality as the principal security concept for Austria. In 2003, the EU officially had no union-wide position dealing with war on Iraq, and member states were split. Austria declared neutrality, because the UN Security Council had not mandated this US-led war. Austria therefore implored as the Presidency's Statement on Iraq, given in Athens on April 16th, 2003, the UN to 'play a central role including in the process leading towards self-government for the Iraqi people, utilising its unique capacity and experience in post-conflict nation building' (Hauser 2006a: 208).

Neutrality still enjoys high popularity among the Austrian population. According to various polls, more than two thirds of Austrians still favour neutrality. To lift neutrality, a qualified parliamentary majority is needed. A majority of the Austrian population also agrees a deep integration of Austrian Armed Forces into the Euro-Atlantic security process and into comprehensive security coordination within Central Europe. Thus, in 2010, Austria launched the Central European Defence Cooperation (CEDC) – together with the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Croatia and Slovenia. It 'is a security policy coordination forum' (Federal Minister for Defence and Sports 2016: 1). Poland has observer status. CEDC fosters 'regional military cooperation in selected areas through shared military projects' (ibid). The shared field of interest focuses on the sustained stabilisation of the Western Balkans. A cooperation by which security challenges are collectively met, for example Cross-Border Disaster Relief, CEDC enables a regional military partnership in the sense of pooling and sharing, which promotes armed forces modernisation through shared experience and synergies. Here Croatia is the framework nation for conducting training activities for Special Forces: exercises have been conducted by the Croatian and Austrian Special Operation Forces. Hungary is the framework nation for conducting training activities for Forward Air Controllers, Air Traffic Controllers and in the field of Counter-Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs). Training courses are vital to improve soldiers' protection against IEDs (Federal Minister for Defence and Sports 2016: 3). The ministers of defence of the CEDC countries Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia, held informal talks on April 1st, 2016, with their colleagues from (now) North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Poland in Vienna with the migration crisis top of the agenda (Casey and Holecek 2016: 1). Thus, the CEDC under the Austrian presidency adopted three

central goals: the launch of a joint initiative with respect to the security of the external borders; the closure of the Balkan route; and the launch of return measures. These goals have already nearly been achieved (Bundesheer 2016: 1).

In 2012 Austria took the leading role with regard to the EU Pooling and Sharing Mountain Training Initiative in order to standardise the military mountain training at EU level. Thus, the readiness of mountain troops is further developed with other European partners by means of this Austro-German initiative. Nine nations join this initiative, the permanent members being Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia and Sweden. Close coordination was established with the NATO Centre of Excellence (COE) for Mountain Warfare in Slovenia in order to exchange experience, especially within the lessons-learned process and in order to avoid duplication. The NATO COE focuses on doctrines and rules, the EU initiative on concrete educational and training cooperation (Grünwald 2016: 24).

Austrian soldiers had been part of EU Battlegroups in the first half year of 2011 (180 troops)[9], in the second half of 2012 (350 troops – logistic lead nation)[10] and in the second half of 2016 consisting of soldiers from Germany, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Ireland, Luxemburg, Croatia and Austria (340 troops – logistic lead nation) (Der Offizier 2016: 29). In 2016 for the first time, Austria participated in the EU Battlegroups with mechanised infantry (two companies) and with helicopters (in total: 520 troops).

According to the Austrian Security Strategy of 2013, '[t]he Austrian Armed Forces must be able to contribute to the pool of civil-military capabilities for the implementation of the EU Solidarity Clause' (Republic of Austria 2013a: 22). And '[f]urthermore, the capability of the Austrian Armed Forces must be maintained and organized to make a solidarity-based contribution within a potentially developing common European defence,

[9] Lead Nation: The Netherlands; further participting nations: Germany, Finland, Lithuania, Austria.
[10] Lead Nation: Germany; further participating nations: Austria, Czech Republic, Croatia, Ireland, Macedonia (FYROM).

taking into account the 'Irish Clause" (ibid). Austria supports the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) and therefore declared its readiness to participate in five PESCO projects as follows:

- Deployable Military Disaster Relief Capability Package;
- European Union Training Mission Competence Centre (EUTMCC);
- Military Mobility;
- Cyber Threats and Incident Response Information Sharing Platform; and
- CBRN SaaS – CBRN (weaponised or non-weaponised Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear materials) Surveillance as a Service. Austria declared its readiness to take the lead of the CBRN SaaS project in 2018 which is conducted together with Croatia, Hungary, Slovenia and France. Project observer nations are the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Italy, and Romania. The six nations Austria, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Slovenia and Croatia constitute the Central European Defence Cooperation (CEDC) that is renowned for its CBRN expertise. CBRN SaaS is built on a manned-unmanned sensor network deployable in support of EU and NATO missions and operations. (Central European Defence Cooperation 2019: 1)

Neutrals and non-aligned states in Europe

Historical and legal aspects of neutrality

Neutrality is a concept for avoiding involvement in wars with other states; this status was often proclaimed in history. Non-involvement in war-fighting was interpreted differently by neutral states and other states that were interested in becoming neutral themselves (Hauser 2003: 321). The recognition of the status of neutrality of any state was usually initiated not by the country in question but by a group of countries at war. For the first time, neutrality received recognition in international law in the Paris Agreement of November 20th, 1815, in which the major European powers recognised Switzerland's permanent neutrality and guaranteed its territorial integrity.

As former Austrian Chancellor Franz Vranitzky emphasized, 'the concept of neutrality is surrounded by a multitude of probably well-meant, but nevertheless irritating, clichés (Neuhold 1992: Foreword). Till the 19th century, two types of neutrality have been recognized: temporary neutrality during wartime – from the beginning to the end of an armed conflict – and permanent neutrality. The permanently neutral state must credibly arrange its peacetime foreign policy in order to avoid involvement in future conflicts.

On October 18th, 1907, the essential rights and duties of neutral states in wartime were codified for the first time in the Fifth and Thirteenth Hague Conventions. The main feature of the conventions is that the territory of neutral powers is inviolable (ibid). A neutral state is not allowed to start any war or to join a military coalition. Further obligations are impartiality toward belligerents, and agreements not to provide mercenaries for belligerents. Neutral states' foreign policy has to be arranged in such a way as to minimise the possibility of becoming entangled in any war. In order to avoid becoming a security risk to its neighbours, a neutral state must provide for an adequate internal defence. Neutral powers are obliged to prevent by force any attempts to violate their neutrality. This kind of resistance cannot be interpreted as a hostile act. It is the defensive strength of the neutral which gives credibility to its assertion of maintaining

neutrality under all circumstances. However, its neutral security policy stresses the goals of preventing conflict, of not becoming involved in any military conflicts if they occur, and in restoring territorial integrity if invaded. Neutrality can only be declared voluntarily, not by force – which would mean neutralism. Furthermore, belligerents are not allowed to establish any facilities on the territory of a neutral power for the purpose of non-public communication, nor are they permitted to recruit combatants in the neutral state. Non-public communication as mentioned in the Hague conventions implies that the communication is of a military nature. The neutral power is bound to prevent any business of the belligerents as long as such business takes place outside of the territory of the neutral.

Neutrality and its codification was the result of ruling the *ius ad bellum* in the early 20th century. In 1945, the former anti-Hitler coalition parties founded the United Nations Organization to establish and

> maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace. (Charter of the United Nations, Chapter I, Article 1)

Therefore, 'all members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action'. This article 2.5 of the UN Charter forbids impartiality when peace and security is endangered. Therfore, the system of classical war parties of the Hague conventions was replaced by a system of collective security that shall guarantee peace and stability: 'All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations' (article 2.4 UN Charter). The UN Security Council's task is to preserve international peace and security. It 'shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what

measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security' (article 39, Chapter VII, United Nations Charter). Articles 41 and 42 entail political, economic and military measures against a state violating the rules of peace.

During the Cold War, the United Nations (UN) system was not able to prevent wars, as the US and Soviet Union fought for global influence. Thus, at the beginning of the Cold War, many European states decided to become neutral – as did Austria, Finland and Sweden – due to their geopolitical situation between East and West. In Austria, the neutral status was a condition for the withdrawal of post-war Soviet and allied occupation forces. Ireland proclaimed its military neutrality while struggling for independence from Great Britain in 1921. All of these neutral countries became members of the United Nations. The opinion in these states was that UN membership would cause no damage to their neutrality. Only the Swiss government saw their neutrality to be in contradiction with the collective security system of the United Nations, however on September 10th, 2002, Switzerland became the 190th member of UN. For Austria, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, and Switzerland, neutrality also included an active, positive foreign policy in pursuit of international peace and justice to strengthen the rules of international law, in order to make contributions to peace and stability. The ingredients of such a policy have been: support for self-determination of nations, the quest for disarmament, peacekeeping, championing the rights of developing nations and the promotion of human rights.

In many European neutral states, neutrality has been ambiguous and ill-defined in the international context after the end of the Cold War. Neutrality is best defined in contrast to military alliances which involve an obligation to collective defence (Hauser 2003: 322). European neutrals (like Austria, Ireland, and Malta) and non-aligned countries (like Finland and Sweden) are committed to the growing system of security and military cooperation within the EU Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP). Thus, neutrality in its traditional form as defined by the Hague conventions has becoming more and more irrelevant in strengthening integrated European security structure. This understanding has evolved to what governments call pragmatic neutrality, which allows the armed forces of neutral states to increase cooperation

with security and military alliances for purposes like peacekeeping, peace enforcement, where appropriate, and to face cyber-attacks.

Switzerland

Switzerland provides the oldest example of neutrality policy in practice. Johann Rudolf Wettstein (Mayor of Basel) obtained foreign policy recognition of Switzerland's independence at Münster in Westphalia in 1648. At national level, neutrality is mentioned in the Federal Constitution (Bern, 1848) as a means of protecting independence. However, the Federal Council and Federal Assembly must supervise compliance with and observance of neutrality (articles 85 and 102). Neutrality is not a Swiss state objective. In 1998, neutrality remained unaffected by the amendment of the Federal Constitution. Article 173 of the Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation assigns the Federal Parliament the task of taking 'measures to safeguard the external security, the independence and the neutrality of Switzerland'. Switzerland still employs a policy of well-armed neutrality.

Switzerland as a Western state like Austria or Sweden tried to be integrated into the European political and economic integration process: all three states were founding members of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) in 1960 together with the United Kingdom (UK). When the UK applied for membership to the European Economic Community (EEC) in mid-1961, the three neutrals – Austria, Sweden and Switzerland – had to decide on their relationship with the EEC. In informal discussions among civil servants and specialists of international law and at a ministerial level in Vienna, the three neutrals tried to coordinate their policies vis-à-vis the Common Market. In their statements on the application before the EEC Council in July and September 1962, the ministers of the three neutrals asked for a quite far-reaching participation in the Common Market. Their objective was to fully adapt to EEC customs duties toward third countries and to negotiate the conditions for participation in the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). When then-French President Charles de Gaulle rejected the British request for EEC membership in January 1963, Sweden and Switzerland suspended their applications, whereas Austria continued its efforts to reach an agreement with the EEC. Finally, after many negotiations, the treaties between the European Communities (EC) and Austria, Sweden and Switzerland were signed in Brussels on July 22nd, 1972.

Finland followed to sign its free-trade agreements with the EC on October 5th, 1973. The main economic partners of all the neutrals in Europe have always been founding members of the EC and NATO (Hauser 2018: 110).

Nine years after the collapse of Soviet systems in Europe, the security report of Switzerland (Report 2000) entitled 'Security through Cooperation' states that threats of territorial warfare in Europe has diminished sharply while new risks, such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, organised crime, and the violation of human rights have become increasingly important. Switzerland was striving to join the UN. Therfore, a referendum was held in Switzerland on UN entry on March 3rd, 2002. 55 percent of the population welcomed this decision. On September 10th, 2002, Switzerland officially joined the UN. As a neutral state, Switzerland had already been joining UN sanctions like air-embargos against Libya and Yugoslavia during the 1990s. Swiss contributions to peacekeeping and peace support operations 'remain modest in size' (Hauser and Mantovani 2018: 210). As of 2019, there is one company-sized unit, SWISSCOY (short for Swiss company), which has been 'active as a part of KFOR since 1999' (ibid.) Moreover, there are two minor 'units': first, the Swiss contribution to the Neutral Nations´ Supervisory Commission, created to monitor the armistice on the Korean Peninsula, a mssion 'set up in 1953 with more than ninety Swiss military personnel, yet gradually reduced to five officers; and second, Switzerland´s contribution to the EUFOR Althea mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina since 2004.' (ibid) Switzerland joined NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP) in 1996, 'also by supporting specific projects and by attending and likewise offering training courses to partner states' (ibid: 211).

Ireland

Irish neutrality finds its origins in its struggle for independence from Britain. The Irish model of neutrality reflects partition and its relationships with Britain, a dominant power from which it separated in 1921. Since independence, neutrality has been the accepted policy of Ireland in military matters. Thus, neutrality defines a policy of non-involvement in military alliances which allows for peacekeeping and peace enforcement where appropriate. Ireland became first neutral member of the European Communities in 1973. This was the result of the ongoing CSCE

(Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe) process during the Cold War that was part of the Soviet strategy of peaceful coexistence and the German *Ostpolitik* heading toward peaceful relations with Eastern bloc countries by recognising the German-German border. So the Soviets approved Ireland to join the European Communities. When Austrian politicians proposed joining the ongoing European integration process during the 1950s, the Soviet government argued that Austria would violate its neutrality when joining an economic alliance which member states are part of NATO. During this time, the two most important economic partners of Austria were founding members of the European Communities – Germany (West) and Italy (Hauser 2018: 108).
For Ireland the concept of neutrality has been fostered through the creation of a separate nationalist identity and the assertion of statehood, primarily as a means of distinguishing itself from the adjoining major power. For Ireland, a military alliance with the UK, 'so can be argued, is a threat to the sovereignty of the nation' (Lake 2001: 12). Irish society has embraced a concept of 'military neutrality' which emphasises the Irish insistence in avoiding alliance commitments. Nevertheless, Irish neutrality is much closer to the Finnish-Swedish model than the Austro-Swiss model. The Finnish and Swedish models emphasise neutrality as a foreign policy position. The Austrian and Swiss model make binding constitutional commitments to neutrality.

Since 1959, Irish army personnel have successfully participated in UN missions in places such as Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, East Timor, El Salvador, Eritrea, Haiti, Iraq, Somalia, South Africa, West New Guinea and Yugoslavia. In accordance with Ireland's Defence Acts, Ireland will only participate in missions with a UN mandate. In 1999, Ireland joined NATO PfP (Lake 2001: 14).

Following the defeat of the first referendum proposal relating to the EU Treaty of Nice, the position in regard to Irish neutrality was confirmed by two declarations made at Seville in June 2002 signed by the Irish government and by the EU heads of state or government of all 15 member states during this time. The first declaration, signed by the Irish government, states that Ireland will uphold the principles of the UN Charter at every stage of its involvement in an EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). The government also reaffirmed its commitment to

Ireland's traditional status of military neutrality. The second declaration, which was also signed by the then 15 EU member states, confirms that Ireland is under no obligation to participate in a common defence policy. It also stresses that the development of an EU capacity to conduct humanitarian and crisis management tasks does not involve the establishment of a European army. The purpose of the Seville Declarations was

> to make clear, beyond any reasonable doubt, that the Treaty of Nice poses no threat to Ireland's traditional policy of military neutrality. The Declarations confirm that this understanding is shared by all 15 EU member states. This is in full conformity with the Government's position on ratification of the Treaty of Nice. (Department of Foreign Affairs 2002)

On June 19th, 2009, EU leaders agreed on the 'guarantees' requested by the Irish government following the first no vote in the Irish referendum on the Treaty of Lisbon, held in June 2008. The Irish government´s intention was to hold a second referendum in light of these 'guarantees' which consist of

- a decision of EU heads of state or government, relating to three specific issues: the right to life, family and education; tax issues; and defence;
- a declaration of the European Council relating to workers' rights, social policy and public services; and
- a declaration by Ireland relating defence issues (Peers 2009: 1).

However, it was recalled that the EU Court of Justice has no jurisdiction over defence matters, 'and would not have such jurisdiction under the Lisbon Treaty either.' (Ibid) Therefore, neutrality remains a potent symbol of Ireland's sovereignty and independence. This makes it more necessary to renew it when sovereignty is pooled or shared within the EU's system of political and security interdependence. Yet neutrality has remained flexible, stretching to accommodate the growing demands of Irish foreign policy. For Ireland, the concept of neutrality is a potent symbol of Ireland's sovereignty and independence, which is based on geographical and historical circumstances (Lake 2001: 12).

Finland

Finland, independent only since 1917, did not have a long tradition of neutrality. During the interwar period, Finland declared itself neutral, but its foreign policy was not neutral enough to satisfy the security concerns of the Soviet Union. Finland was attacked by the Soviet Union in 1939, drawing this country directly into World War II. During the war, Finland struggled to survive as an independent nation.

During the Cold War, it would have been more difficult for Finland to declare neutrality. Thus, Finland had to sign a 'Pact of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance' with the Soviet Union in 1948. This Finnish-Soviet Treaty was quite different from the treaties the Soviet Union concurrently concluded with the six East European countries. The main difference was that this Treaty did not establish a military alliance. According to this Trreaty, Helsinki accepted an obligation to defend its territory by all possible means should anyone attempt to invade the Soviet Union through Finland. (Häikiö 2000: 204) Article two obligated Finland to initiate consultation with the Soviet Union about military cooperation should it become apparent that Finland would be unable to prevent such an invasion alone. But the leading "Finnish idea was to avoid by all possible means the military cooperation and consultation with the Soviet Union." (ibid)

The preamble of the Treaty stated that Finland had the right to remain outside of great power politics (ibid). A first example of the Finnish policy of avoiding entanglements in superpower politics was the decision in early 1948 not to participate in the European Recovery Program, also known as the Marshall Plan. Finnish rejection of the much-needed aid was caused by Soviet contentions that the program was an effort on the part of the US to divide Europe into two camps (Hauser 2018: 108).

In that time the policy of neutrality was considered to be the best alternative to prevent a new conflict between Finland and the Soviet Union ideologically; and economically Finland became part of the West. During the Cold War, the Soviet Union aimed at decreasing NATO influence close to her borders. A major impediment was the membership of Denmark and Norway to NATO and hence their pledge to consider the deployment of

nuclear weapons on their territories in a time of crisis (Häikiö 2000: 213). Thus, Finland tried to introduce the concept of a Nordic Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone consisting of NATO members Denmark, Iceland, and Norway, and neutral Finland and Sweden – first introduced by Finnish President Urho K. Kekkonen against the background of a Europe increasingly armed with nuclear weapons. This zone had never been realised at the time it was initially proposed. Therefore, the Soviet Union spoke positively about Finnish neutral policy (ibid).

In 1969, Finland made a formal initiative for the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This process finally led to the signing of the Final Act of the CSCE in Helsinki in 1975 where the borders of Europe were confirmed. This process 'has been regarded as one of the cornerstones of Finnish neutrality.' (Ibid) Finland interpreted also her role as a host to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) as a proof that both superpowers recognised Finland´s neutrality policy (ibid). The official and "unconditional Soviet recognition of Finnish neutrality" happened only two weeks before the crackdown of the Berlin Wall on November 9th, 1989 (ibid).

In 1995, Finland joined EU – like Austria and Sweden. EU membership of Finland was part of the international post-Cold War transformation. The membership decision has been in accordance with Finland's active, pragmatic line of action in security policy (Ministry for Foreign Affairs 1995). Thus, EU membership gives Finland opportunities for influencing change and stability in its security environment. Nevertheless, Finland's military security remains its own responsibility. Finland has joined EU as a militarily non-aligned country which wishes to play an active and constructive role in creating and implementing a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CSDP). Finland's military policy calls for increased cooperation with, and participation in NATO and EU-led operations, while remaining outside formal alliances (ibid).

The term 'neutrality' began to disappear from Finnish terminology in the early 1990s when Finland submitted its application to join EU. After becoming a member of the EU, Finland felt that it cannot be 'neutral', because the country is on the side of EU, according to Finnish security policy expert Teija Tiilikainen (Helsingin Sanomat 2002). The concept of

neutrality was replaced by 'military non-alignment and an independent defence' (ibid). Finland and Sweden already qualify for NATO membership, 'but have chosen to remain outside of the Alliance for domestic political reasons – a position that has not resulted in free riding by member states' (Brattberg 2012: 2). But for Nordic leaders it is important not only to 'want to see a higher US and NATO presence in the Arctic High North and in the Baltic Sea, but closer security-building and defence-strengthening interactions and collaboration with their militaries' (O'Dwyer 2016: 12). Concerning Moscow's intervention in Ukraine and annexation of Crimea, all Nordic governments support US and EU trade and other sanctions against Russia.

> Nordic governments favour a twin-track strategic approach to dealing with an expansionist Russia. On the one hand this comprises defence-deepening. Secondly, Nordic leaders support maintaining a constructive open dialogue with Moscow to enhance transparency and reduce the risk of a build-up of security and military tensions in the region. (Ibid)

In 2016, Alexander Stubb, Finland's then-Finance Minister and leader of the National Coalition party, stated that 'Finland should, against the backdrop of an increasingly unpredictable Russia, take steps to join NATO' (ibid). On June 5th, 2012, Finland's deepening relationship with NATO provoked a frosty reaction by Russia's then-defence chief, General Nikolai Makarov. Makarov said it would be dangerous for Finland to join NATO and put at risk the well-developed trade and political relations between the two countries: 'Were Finland to join NATO, then Finland would constitute a threat to Russia, to which Russia would be forced to respond.' (O'Dwyer 2012: 23) In Finland, Makarov's remarks were regarded with some hostility, reviving Cold War-era memories of Moscow meddling in Finland's sovereign affairs (ibid). Moscow's hostility toward the prospect of military non-aligned Finland and Sweden joining NATO is linked to the growing importance of the Baltic Sea for Russian oil and gas shipments and trade with Europe. Moreover, Russia is nervous about the idea of having offensive missiles, or any part of NATO's ballistic missile defence system, located in neighbouring Finland (ibid). From a Swedish perspective therefore, the

> cooperation with Finland is a fundamental platform on our defence strategy. We have taken necessary steps, as two military nonaligned countries, to give our armed forces the tools to cooperate in case of crisis or war. The bilateral statement of intent with the United States is an important expression of common interest and mutual commitment. We have joined the British-led Joint Expeditionary Force and will continue to work closely with the U.K. (Hultqvist 2017: 16)

In October 2016, Finland signed a bilateral statement of intent on defence cooperation. This was later followed by a trilateral statement of intent between Finland, Sweden and the US in May 2018 (Niinistö 2018: 12).

Sweden

Swedish neutrality was not enshrined in any legal or formal context. It remained simply as a principle of foreign policy that can be changed as necessary. Neutrality was a policy established by unilateral declaration. It was neither guaranteed by other states nor constitutionally prescribed. During the Cold War, Sweden took far-reaching military measures to facilitate assistance from the West in case of Soviet attack. Furthermore, Sweden 'from the beginning of the 1960s developed extensive and close cooperation on military technology with the US.' (Molin 2000: 269) Swedish defence staff 'was involved in intelligence collaboration with Norway and Denmark and later on with the United Kingdom and the American Army and Air Force in Europe.' (Ibid) In 1992, the conservative government of the then-Prime Minister Carl Bildt managed to give a broader interpretation to the concept of neutrality. That allowed Sweden to join NATO's PfP program. Sweden enacted a historical foreign policy change on February 11th, 2002, with a proposal to drop the term *neutrality* from its security policy doctrine. Sweden is to remain militarily non-aligned, but will no longer adhere to strict neutrality. This doctrine was drafted jointly by the governing Social Democrats, as well as the conservative Moderate Party, the Christian Democrats, and the People's Party. Sweden's Green Party and the Left Party were opposed to that change, which they saw as a step toward NATO membership (Hauser 2018: 109). The previous doctrine dating back to 1992 stated that Sweden's militarily non-aligned status was aimed at neutrality in wars that take place in nearby areas. In the view of the Minister of Foreign Affairs during this time, Anna Lindh, it is unrealistic to think that Sweden would remain neutral in a situation in

which another EU member or one of Sweden's neighbours is attacked. Lindh emphasised that the neutrality option had been available. Finland's former Minister of Foreign Affairs Erkki Tuomioja saw Sweden's security policy doctrine as a being almost identical to the one that Finland has practised since becoming EU member. Since non-participation in military alliances is not the same as passivity, Sweden takes an active part in efforts to build and maintain peace in Europe (Lassinantti 2001: 101).

In 2008, Sweden's then coalition government, headed by the pro-NATO Moderates and Liberals, discussed the possibility of a 'mutual jump' approach to NATO membership with Finland. Allan Widman, the Liberal's spokesman on defence, said: 'There are few signs that Sweden is considering full membership in NATO. […] As a very small and militarily weak country, we are in no condition to face serious challenges to our security independently. Excluding ourselves means both insecurity and little opportunity for influence.' (O'Dwyer 2012: 23)

In 2013, Sweden's military had 'issued a wake-up call to government, warning that recent budget cuts and lack of investment have left the country unable to defend itself against a major attack for more than a week' (O'Dwyer 2013: 14). The 'one-week' scenario represented the Armed Forces Command's (AFC) strategic assessment of Sweden's defence capability, Armed Forces commander Gen. Sverker Göransson said:

> If Sweden is attacked on a broad military scale, we can possibly defend ourselves for one week. After that, we would need support from other countries. We do have the capacity to defend Sweden for a longer period if attacks have a limited objective, but for broader attacks from several different directions, we are talking about one week on our own. (Ibid)

Then-Defence Minister Karin Enström conceded that Sweden lacked the capability to receive military assistance, including adequate air base and naval station structures, but said measures 'are being taken, independently by Sweden and together with its Nordic neighbours and cooperation partner NATO, to strengthen the country's capacity to provide and receive military support' (ibid). Non-aligned Sweden participated more actively than many NATO members during the campaign Unified Protector in

Libya, sending 122 personnel and eight Gripen aircraft, at a monthly cost of $22 million (Brattberg 2012: 1).

Like many other nations in Europe, Sweden began to reassess its national security plans following Russia's 2014 invasion of Ukrainian territory. The Swedish government has created a new web of bilateral military agreements with a number of countries – including a 2016 agreement with the US – while strengthening ties with its Nordic neighbours (Mehta 2017: 18). The impact of the bilateral agreement with the US has been more exercises together, information sharing and strategic dialogue about the security situation in the northern part of Europe (ibid). Sweden will not apply for NATO membership. Sweden builds units together with Finland – e.g. the Swedish-Finnish Naval Task Force. Both countries cooperate around amphibious capabilities, 'and we have troops from Sweden in Finland exercising a scenario like defence of Finland, and we have Finish units in Sweden exercising defence of Sweden' Hultqvist said (ibid).

According to Hultqvist, '[o]n the military side, the Swedish government has increased national defence spending about 25 percent to 2020, activated conscription and refocused efforts on national defence including civilian defence' (Hultqvist 2017: 16). He added: 'Furthermore, the transatlantic link is necessary for the stability in our part of Europe and must remain strong.' (Ibid) For this purpose, the Swedish government has stationed 'permanent troops on the strategic island of Gotland located in the Baltic Sea, implemented NATO's Host Nation Support agreement, agreed to develop active cyber capabilities, intensified cooperation with our Baltic Sea partners and is acquiring next-generation submarines and fighter aircraft' (ibid). The Host Nation Support agreement also prepares Sweden for receiving assistance from alliance troops in case of emergency situations. A similar agreement is already in place in Finland. In the Swedish parliament, some 291 MP's backed the agreement and 29 voted against. Now it is easier to base NATO troops on Swedish territory: 'Cooperation with NATO is a priority, especially on information sharing and military exercises.' (Ibid)

Malta

The islands of Malta are strategically placed in the crossroads of the Mediterranean region, but are also situated at the crossroads of the

European continent and North Africa. As well as due to the adoption of a non-aligned stance between the East and the West, Malta during much of the 1970s and 1980s, tried to make the most out of the situation. In Malta, politicians discussed the adaption and definition of the concept of neutrality. The neutrality clause in the Constitution was drafted in 1987 and made specific reference to non-alignment with the US and Soviet Union. As former Prime Minister Karmenu Mifsud Bonnici explained

> Neutrality is our best security shield because if we are nobody's enemy, nobody will be against us. If NATO and Russia feel that their security is threatened, it transpires that a veritable security threat exists. If we join NATO and Russia, Malta will be subject to the same threat. Just because we are neutral we do not feel the fear that NATO and Russia feel. (Sansone 2002).

The Maltese neutrality does not permit the country to be used as a military airbase and it prevents Malta from falling into the vice of forming part of a military alliance. Malta joined the European Union on May 1st, 2004 and decided not to participate in EU security operations. The island has been positioning itself "as a Mediterranean Bridge" since the 1970s when Malta blocked the CSCE Helsinki Act from passing until a chapter on Mediterranean security was incorporated. President Guido de Marco asserted in 2009, 'how right was Malta to insist in the Helsinki summit of 1975 that no peace was possible in Europe unless there was peace in the Mediterranean.' (Briffa 2018: 4) In 2017, Foreign Minister Carmelo Abela emphasized again that 'Malta wishes to be considered by all stakeholders in the Israel-Palestinian conflict as a bridgebuilder (…) this is our vocation.' (ibid) Thus, Malta serves as Rapporteur of the UN Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, but held that it was 'constitutionally and structurally unable to contribute to international military combat operations.' (Ibid) Therefore, Malta collaborates in other spheres, 'ranging from logistics to the sharing of intelligence, participation in counter-terrorism, and anti-human trafficking operations.' (Ibid)

Malta joined NATO's Partnership for Peace in 1995 under a Nationalist Party administration, then pulled out of the PfP after Labour won in the 1996 parliamentary election 'amid concerns that it would violate the nation's constitutional neutrality.' (Ibid: 5) In 2008, Nationalist Prime

Minister Lawrence Gonzi reactivated the partnership with NATO, 'and today there is consensus between the parties that cooperation can take place in line with Malta's neutral position.' (Ibid) During the 2011 Libya crisis, NATO's top military commander, US Admiral James Stavridis, 'commended Malta for providing superb help to NATO with emergency landings and airspace.' (Ibid)

Cyprus

Cyprus is neither a neutral nor a non-aligned state. It is the only EU country where one part is still occupied by an EU aspirant country – Turkey. After joining the EU on May 1st, 2004, the whole state of Cyprus became part of the EU by international law. After the first version of the so-called Annan plan (named after UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan), which had been drafted in November 2002, had to be revised four times, the fifth version of the Annan plan was subject to separate referenda on April 24th, 2004, in both parts of the island. While 64.91 percent of the Turkish Cypriot voted in favour of the plan, an overwhelming majority of 75.83 percent of the Greek Cypriots rejected the plan on the recommendation of their political leadership. Therewith the reunification of Cyprus failed (Müller 2012: 128). The best hope yet of reuniting war-partitioned Cyprus was dashed at the end of May 2017 after reconciliation attempts were brought to an abrupt halt following two years of intense negotiations (The Guardian Weekly 2017a: 2). 'Without a prospect for common ground, there is no basis for continuing this shuttle diplomacy,' Espen Barth Eide, the UN special envoy, said. Eide now enters the long list of diplomats who, for the best part of fifty years, have attempted to solve one of the world's most intractable diplomatic disputes (ibid). Split between the majority population of Greeks in the south and Turks in the north, Cyprus has been divided since 1974, when Turkey invaded the island in response to an Athens-organised coup. In Nicos Anastasiades and Mustaf Akinci – the respective leaders of the island's Greek and Turkish communities – the two sides had found men who were not only moderate and born in the same town, Limassol, but willing to make the concessions necessary to find a solution. Both men had got to the point of poring over maps outlining territorial adjustments in an envisaged bi-zonal, bi-communal federation (ibid).

Conclusion

Neutrality is defined by international law in the Hague conventions, but since 1945 its political meaning changed. In practice, neutrality 'had a great deal to do with the size and consolidation of the state of the territory (territoriality), the geographical situation (geopolitics), the expansion of economic and trade relations (economy), but also with the changeability of politics (opportunism).' (Gehler 2014: 53) Thus, the tendency toward neutrality 'was closely connected not only with the safeguarding of territorial integrity and the striving for national independence but also with the will for national sovereignty.' (Ibid: 59) Considering all the cases of contemporary neutral states discussed above, one can argue that nowadays, the essence of neutrality is primarily reduced to the status of non-alignment (non-participation in military alliances). In part, this is because all neutral states in the world have pledged to support the goals and resolutions of the United Nations, up to and including military actions. Most of the neutral states in the EU participate in EU, NATO, and UN missions and operations. Furthermore, most of the neutral and non-aligned EU member states participate in wide-ranging military cooperation projects within PESCO—the Permanent Structured Cooperation process. Military cooperation in the sense of joint capability development in high technological, operational capabilities and international crisis management based on UN mandates do not pose a threat to the status of neutrality. However, joining a military alliance or a defence union would completely dissolve it. According to the EU mutual assistance clause (article 42.7 Treaty of Lisbon), every EU member state defines contributions to mutual defence within the EU framework depending on their political will and interest. This means that despite the above discussion about the various forms of military cooperation and integration, the EU neutrals are still solely responsible for their defence – while being under no formal obligation to aid other members militarily. On the international stage, the EU neutral and non-aligned states can strengthen international crisis management efforts and good offices policies. Their political influence in solving international disputes, on the other hand, remains limited.

ESDP / CSDP missions and operations

The geographical scope for EU CSDP missions and operations is not limited. In total, the EU conducted the following 37 missions and operations:

Africa:

- EUFOR Artemis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) (2003): EUFOR Artemis was the first autonomously EU-led operation. On June 12th, 2003, the Council adopted a decision on the launching of the Operation Artemis. This decision followed the Council's June 5th, 2003 adoption of a joint action on this operation. Artemis was conducted in accordance with the mandate set out in UN Security Council Resolution 1484 (May 30th, 2003). This Resolution authorised the deployment of an Interim Emergency Multinational Force in Bunia in close co-ordination with the United Nations Organization Mission in the DRC (MONUC) until September 1st, 2003. France acted as the framework nation for the operation. Major General Neveux was appointed EU operations commander; force commander was Brigadier-General Thonier. The operational headquarters were located in Paris and included staff members from the General Secretariat of the EU Council, as well as officers from several participating member states. Under responsibility of the Council, the Political and Security Committee (PSC) exercised the political control and strategic direction of the operation. A full 1,500 troops, most of them French, were sent to the north-eastern Congolese region of Ituri to stop fighting and atrocities, to contribute to the stabilisation of security conditions and of the humanitarian situation in and around the city of Bunia, and to ensure the protection of the airport and the internally displaced persons in the camps in Bunia and, if required, to contribute to the safety of the civilian population, UN personnel, and the humanitarian presence in the town. Non-EU partner countries: Brazil, Canada, Republic of South Africa.
- EUPOL Kinshasa (European Union Police Mission in Kinshasa / DRC) (2005-2007). The European Union conducted a police mission in Kinshasa from April 2005 to June 2007. This mission

played a key role in helping the Congolese National Police keep order during the DRC's transition to democracy, particularly during the electoral period in 2006. The purpose of EUPOL Kinshasa, the first civilian European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) operation to be deployed in Africa, was to support the Congolese National Police's Integrated Police Unit (IPU) in Kinshasa – which was set up with the support of the EU – once it was up and running under Congolese command. EU personnel were deployed within the IPU at different levels of the Congolese chain of command in order to monitor, mentor and advise their Congolese counterparts with the aim of ensuring that the IPU met international best practice. The mission also ran a training programme for the IPU and helped advice on the reform and reorganisation of the Congolese National Police. The mission numbered approximately 30 personnel. EUPOL Kinshasa was followed on July 1st, 2007, by EUPOL RD Congo, deployed to assist the DRC authorities with police reform. Non-EU partner countries: Canada, Turkey, Mali, Angola, Cabo Verde, Republic of South Africa.

- EUSEC RD Congo (2005-2016): Launched in June 2005, this mission provided practical support for Security Sector Reform (SSR) in RD Congo by giving advice and assistance directly to the Congolese authorities. Since the original mandate, which aimed to support the integration process in the Armed Forces of the DRC and to run the 'Chain of payments' project for ensuring the security of payments to the military, the mission has expanded its activities in this area with a view to modernising both administration and human resources management. This mission had also diversified its activities, providing assistance to its Congolese partners in the training of military officers. The general aim of the EUSEC mission was to support the Congolese authorities in rebuilding an army that shall guarantee security throughout the country and in creating conditions conducive to a return to economic and social development. The distribution of military identity cards has been successfully completed with the mission's support. An IT system for troop management and administration and biometric checks for staff have been implemented with EUSEC's support. This

management was used mainly for bank payments to military staff, implemented by national authorities. The headquarters was based in Kinshasa, detachment: Goma (North-Kivu).

- EUFOR RD Congo (2006): On April 25th, 2006, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1671 (2006), authorising the temporary deployment of an EU force to support MONUC during the period encompassing the elections in the DR Congo. The military operation was conducted in full agreement with the authorities of the DRC and in close coordination with them and MONUC. This autonomous EU-led operation was conducted in the framework of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). Operation EUFOR RD Congo was successfully concluded on November 30th, 2006. Medical support was provided by a German airmobile medical centre reinforced by medical troops from Switzerland and the Netherlands. Non-EU partner countries: Switzerland, Turkey.
- EU support of the African Union Mission AMIS in Darfur (Sudan) (2005-2007): The EU and its member states supported financially, personally and politically the efforts by the African Union (AU) to stabilise the situation in Darfur/Sudan with a wide range of measures. Thus, the EU supported the Abuja peace talks process and the Ceasefire Commission and contributed with planning and equipment and technical and financial support to the AU's mission in Sudan (AMIS). In December 2007, AMIS was handed over to the joint AU/UN peacekeeping operation in Darfur (UNAMID) in accordance with the UN Security Council resolution 1769 (2007). During its two-and-a-half-year term, the EU action made available equipment and assets, provided planning and technical assistance and deployed military observers. It trained African troops, helped with tactical and strategic transportation and provided police assistance and training. The EU deployed several dozen military and civilian personnel to AMIS during that period. This personnel comprised, on average, 30 police officers, 15 military experts and two military observers. In addition, military staff, a police officer and a political advisor were made available to support the EU Special Representative for Sudan in Addis Ababa in his contacts and cooperation with the AU. During the same period, EU

member states provided coordinated strategic airlifts for well over 2,000 AU personnel. The EU committed a total of over €300 million from the African Peace Facility in support of AMIS from June 2004 to December 2007. This funded personnel costs including salaries, allowances, insurance, travel, food rations and medical costs. In addition, EU member states made substantial bilateral contributions, financial as well as in kind – including expertise, equipment, food rations and airlifts – taking the overall EU contribution to AMIS to some €500 million.

- EUPOL RD Congo (2007-2014): The EU Police Mission for the DRC followed on from EUPOL Kinshasa, the EU's first civilian mission in Africa. Made up of international experts, the mission's members included police experts, criminal justice experts and civilian experts in the cross-cutting aspects of security sector reform (SSR): human rights, dialogue with civil society, protection of children in armed conflicts, gender equality and the fight against impunity and sexual violence. EUPOL RD Congo supported SSR in the field of the police and its interaction with the justice system. The mission cooperated closely with the EUSEC RD Congo, the EU delegation in DRC and the United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) in its efforts to help ensure that all SSR efforts deployed are consistent. The support and training held to the Judiciary Police and to the Technical and Scientific Police in Kinshasa, North and South-Kivu provided police officers with the know-how to conduct criminal investigations in a professional manner. In order to contribute to the stabilisation process in eastern DRC, the mission also had an office in Goma, province North-Kivu, thus responding to the training and monitoring needs identified by the national and provincial authorities.
- EUFOR Tchad/RCA (2008-2009): Launched on January 28th, 2008, acting in accordance with the mandate set out in the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1778 (2007), the military bridging operation EUFOR Tchad/RCA in eastern Chad and the north-east of the Central African Republic came to an end in 2009. EUFOR Tchad/RCA had the following objectives: to contribute to protecting civilians in danger, particularly refugees and displaced

persons; to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid and the free movement of humanitarian personnel by helping to improve security in the area of operations; to contribute to protecting UN personnel, facilities installations and equipment and to ensuring the security and freedom of movement of its own staff, UN staff and associated personnel. On January 14th, 2009, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1861 which approved of the deployment of MINURCAT – a UN military force to take over from the European force. EUFOR Tchad/RCA has been the largest, most multinational EU operation in Africa to-date, involving 3,700 troops. 23 EU member states were represented in the Operational Headquarters (OHQ). 19 states were represented in the theatre, three of which were third states. The operations commander of EUFOR Tchad/RCA was Lieutenant General Patrick Nash (Ireland) and the EU force commander was Brigadier General Jean-Philippe Ganascia (France).

- EU SSR Guinea-Bissau (2008-2010): The EU decided in February 2008 to establish an advice and assistance EU mission in support of the Security Sector Reform in Guinea-Bissau (EU SSR Guinea-Bissau). The mission was undertaken in partnership with the Guinea-Bissau authorities. It was conducted under the EU Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). EU SSR Guinea-Bissau provided advice and assistance on reform of the security sector in Guinea Bissau in order to contribute to creating the conditions for the implementation of the National Security Sector Reform Strategy. The mission was part of a coherent EU approach and complementary to the European Development Fund and other European Community activities. Particular emphasis was given to finalising basic legislation underpinning the new security structures in the sectors of defence, police and justice.
- EUFOR NAVFOR Atalanta (since 2008): The EU was concerned with the effect of Somali-based piracy and armed robbery at sea off the Horn of Africa and the Western Indian Ocean. Somali-based piracy is characterised by criminals taking control of vessels transiting the high risk area in the region and extorting ransom money for the crew, the vessel and cargo: this bears all the features

of organised crime. Crews held hostage by pirates often face a prolonged period of captivity, the average being five months, although some hostages have been held for almost three years. Moreover, piracy impacts on international trade and maritime security and on the economic activities and security of countries in the region. As a result, and as part of its Comprehensive Approach to Somalia, the EU launched the European Union Naval Force Atalanta (EU NAVOR) in December 2008 with the framework of CSDP. Atalanta protects vessels of the World Food Programme, of the African Union Mission in Somalia and other vulnerable shipping, deters and disrupts piracy and armed robbery at sea, supports UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO's) programmes to monitor fishing activities off the coast of Somalia, supports the EU missions and international organisations working to strengthen maritime security and capacity in the region; at the height of Somali piracy in January 2011, 736 hostages and 32 ships were being held by pirates. By October 2016 that number had dropped to no hostages and ships being held. Moreover, EU NAVFOR has conducted and supports numerous Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) rescue missions in the area, helping local, regional and international trading and fishing vessels in distress. Atalanta operates in an area of operations covering the Southern Red Sea, the Gulf of Aden and a large part of the Indian Ocean, including the Seychelles, Mauritius and Comoros. The area of operations also includes the Somali coastal territory, as well as its territorial and internal waters. This represents an area of about 4,700,000 square nautical miles (approximately 8,700,000 square kilometres). Atalanta is the EU's first military maritime operation for which the UK provided the Operation Commander. The EU announced on May 20th, 2009, to extend its Atalanta counterpiracy operation to include an area off the Seychelles, based on a recommendation by the Atalanta NavFor operations commander, Rear Adm. Philip Jones, who suggested that pirates may be using the islands as supply bases. Non-EU partner countries: Norway, Montenegro, Serbia, Ukraine, New Zealand. Atalanta maintains close relations to international military presence which is deployed in that area from the US, China, India, Japan, Korea, Russia and others to de-conflict and co-ordinate activities within the area of operations.

- EUTM Somalia (since 2010): On April 10th, 2010, the EU launched a military training mission in Somalia in order to strengthen the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) and the institutions of Somalia. EUTM has contributed to the training of soldiers from the Somali National Army with a focus on the training of non-commissioned officers (NCOs), junior officers, specialists and trainers. Furthermore, the training now focuses on commander up to company level, in addition to specialist training in the areas of military police, civilian-military cooperation, intelligence, company commander and combat engineering. Modules on international humanitarian law and human rights, and the protection of civilians are also delivered. EUTM Somalia first operated mainly in Uganda with the Mission Headquarters at Kampala and the training camp at Bihanga Training Centre (BTC) in Western Uganda, with a Liaison Office in Nairobi (Kenya), a Support Cell in Brussels but with a Mentoring Advisory and Training Element (MATE HQ) deployed in Mogadishu. This laydown changed in January 2014 when the centre of gravity of EUTM Somalia shifted with the relocation of the Mission HQ to Mogadishu, along with all advisory, mentoring and training activities, which led to closure of all locations in Uganda. EUTM Somalia operates on close cooperation and coordination with other international actors; in particular, the United Nations, the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM), and the United States of America.
- EUCAP Somalia (former EUCAP Nestor) (since 2012): In July 2012, the EU launched EUCAP Nestor, a civilian maritime capacity building mission operation in five states across the Horn of Africa and Western Indian Ocean (Djibouti, Somalia, Seychelles, Kenya and Tanzania). Following a comprehensive strategic review of the Mission in 2015, activities in all states except Somalia were phased out and a decision was made to focus efforts solely on Somalia and relocate the Mission Headquarters (MHQ) to Mogadishu. This EUCAP mission aims at strengthening Somalia's maritime security and capacity to effectively govern its waters and reinforce its ability to fight piracy. The Mission has personnel located in Somalia (MHQ in Mogadishu, field office in Hargeisa / Somaliland, and a field office in Garowe / Puntland), while maintaining a MHQ back-

office in Nairobi. The Mission's operational activities include supporting the practical implementation of legislation and policy frameworks. This includes training, mentoring and advising using embedded experts, as well as carrying out capacity-building activities in support of maritime law enforcement agencies and the judicial and prosecutorial actors responsible for the investigation and prosecution of suspected pirates and their leaders. The Mission demonstrates the EU's continued effort to develop maritime security capacities including through support to the criminal justice chain 'from crime to court', starting with the arrest and detention of suspects all the way to the investigation and prosecution of the crime. EUCAP's main beneficiaries are the Coast Guard, the Maritime Police Unit (MPU), prosecutors and judges. The Mission's strategic level advice is complemented by the coordination and facilitation of specialised training to support capacity-building efforts.

- EUCAP Sahel Niger (since 2012): In the framework of the EU Strategy for Security and Development in the Sahel, the EU at the request of Niger's government launched a civilian mission in July 2012 in order to contribute to the fight against crime and terrorism in Niger and abroad. The mission (HQ: Niamey) provides advice and training to support the Nigerien authorities in strengthening their security capabilities. On July 18th, 2016, its mandate was amended to also assist the Nigerien central and local authorities as well as the security forces in developing policies, techniques and procedures to better control and combat irregular migration. Liaison officers were deployed to Nouakchott (Mauritania) and Bamako (Mali). The crisis in Mali, instability in Libya and Boko Haram terrorism in the Lake Chad basin are all threatening Niger's security and development. In addition, the country is faced with the illegal trafficking of drugs, weapons and people on its territory. Some of this organised crime serves to fund terrorist groups which are using Niger's vast desert regions as trafficking routes or safe havens. This combination of threats makes it vital for Niger to have a well-functioning security sector. During the current mandate, EUCAP is increasing its assistance to Niger's regions, in particular the Agadez region (establishment of a permanent branch), which is

facing the highest number of security threats, to ensure better control of irregular migration and related trafficking, and the Diffa region. EUCAP Sahel Niger is also increasing its cooperation with the other CSDP missions in the region, namely EUBAM Libya and especially EUCAP Sahel Mali.

- EUAVSEC in South Sudan (2012-2014): The European Union Aviation Security Mission (EUAVSEC) in South Sudan was a non-executive civilian mission. It was established by the EU on January 18th, 2012, with a 19 months mandate until January 17th, 2014. EUAVSEC was the EU's first engagement in South Sudan under CSDP. Following half a century of war, South Sudan became an independent state in July 2011. The mission responded to South Sudan's request for EU support to strengthening security at Juba International Airport. A key challenge for South Sudan was to establish a fully operational transport hub for commercial and passenger purposes. The mission had a non-executive mandate: it aimed to assist and advise South Sudan authorities to establish the aviation security organisation at the ministry of transport. This mission trained and mentored security services, provided advice and assistance on aviation security, as well as support to the coordination of security activities related to aviation. In the period January to October 2013, more than 600 training certificates were issued.
- EUTM Mali (since 2013): The restoration of security and lasting peace in Mali is a major issue for the stabilisation of the Sahel region and, in the wider sense, for Africa and Europe. On February 18th, 2013, at the request of the Malian authorities, and in accordance with international decisions on the subject, in particular UN Security Council Resolution 2085 (2012), the EU launched a training mission for Malian armed forces, EUTM Mali. The EU's objective in Mali is to support efforts to fully restore constitutional and democratic order through the implementation of the road-map adopted on January 29th, 2015, by the National Assembly; help the Malian authorities to exercise fully their sovereignty over the whole of the country; and neutralise organised crime and terrorist threats. The aim of the mission is to support the rebuilding of the Malian armed forces and to meet their operational needs by providing

expertise and advice, in particular as regards operational and organic command, logistic support, human resources, operational preparation and intelligence. The Malian Armed Forces shall be enabled to conduct military operations aiming at restoring Malian territorial integrity and reducing the threat posed by terrorist groups by training combat units at the Koulikoro training camp. The mission is not involved in combat operations. The headquarters of the mission is located at Bamako and the training is carried out at Koulikoro (60 km north-east of Bamako).

- EUFOR RCA (2014-2015): On April 30th, 2014, EUFOR RCA had taken over responsibility from France's Operation Sangaris for the security and protection of Bangui Airport. Its objective was to secure the environment in Bangui until the UN mission (MINUSCA – United Nations Integrated Multidimensional Mission in the Central African Republic), could assume full responsibility for the area. Launched by the Council of the EU on April 1st, 2014, the operation came under the scope of UN Security Council Resolution 2134 and its aim, in support of the African Union's MISCA force, was to help restore stability and security in Bangui. EUFOR RCA was to provide temporary support in achieving a safe and secure environment in the Bagui area, with a view handing over to African partners. The force thereby contributed to international efforts to protect the populations most at risk, creating the conditions for providing humanitarian aid. The EU is a key partner of the CAR and the country's main donor. Relations are bound by the Cotonou Agreement. The EU had been concerned about the continuously deteriorating security, political and humanitarian situation in CAR, especially since 2012. The staggered implementation of previous peace agreements, combined with chronic underdevelopment and the country's long experience of political instability, led to the outbreak of a new conflict in December 2012. Despite the signing on January 11th, 2013, in Libreville of a political agreement initiating a transition period, tensions culminated in the violent seizure of power and the unconstitutional change of government by Seleka rebel groups in March 2013. On December 5th, 2013, the worst spate of violence since the outbreak of the crisis erupted in the capital and other

parts of the country, triggered by an attack by anti-Balaka militia and other armed groups against Seleka rebels in Bangui. Since then, there has been a reversal of the conflict dynamic sparking a cycle of violence and acts of retaliation, including against civilians, which culminated into a countrywide ethnic and religious divide. The crisis was affecting the majority of the population (4.6 million, half of them children). As of March 10th, 2015, there were more than 657,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) in CAR. The crisis has forced an estimated 188,000 people to seek refuge in neighbouring countries. The EU replaced EUFOR RCA in March 2015 with a military advisory mission (EUMAM RCA).

- EUCAP Sahel Mali (since 2015): This mission was launched on January 15th, 2015, based on the regional approach taken in the EU strategy for security and development in the Sahel. The EUCAP Sahel Mali mission is supporting the Malian government with the reform of its internal security forces. The crisis in Mali has highlighted the need to improve governance practices and institutional capacities to enable the people of Mali to exercise their rights in full, including the right to security and justice. In support of Mali's active efforts to restore state authority, and in close coordination with other international partners, particularly MINUSMA (United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali), EUCAP is providing assistance and advice to the national police, the national gendarmerie and the national guard in the implementation of the security reform set out by the government with a view to improving their operational efficiency, re-establishing their respective hierarchical chains, reinforcing the role of judicial and administrative authorities with regard to the management and supervision of their missions, facilitating their redeployment to the north of the country.
- EUMAM RCA (2015-2016): On March 16th, 2015, the Council had launched the EU's military advisory mission in the Central African Republic. It set out to support the Central African authorities in preparing a reform of the security sector with respect to the armed forces of the Central African Republic. In close cooperation with the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA), this mission

played a critical role in strengthening the security sector. EUMAM RCA advised the military authorities when transforming the CAR armed forces into a professional, democratically controlled and ethnically representative army. EUMAM was located in Bangui. Participating non-EU nations: Georgia, Moldova, Serbia.

- EUTM RCA (since 2016): In order to contribute to the defence sector reform (DSR) in the Central African Republic (CAR) within its security sector reform (SSR) process coordinated by MINUSCA (United Nations Integrated Multidimensional Mission in the Central African Republic), and working toward the goal of modernised, effective and democratically accountable Central African Armed Forces (FACA), EUTM is providing strategic advice to CAR's Ministry of Defence and military staff, education to the FACA's commissioned and non-commissioned officers and specialists, and operational training to the FACA. The coordination with MINUSCA (United Nations Integrated Multidimensional Mission in the Central African Republic), with a view to ensuring the coherence between the SSR process and the deployment of trained FACA elements is also part of the EUTM RCA mission. With its Mission Headquarters located in Bagui, EUTM RCA performs the functions of both Operational Headquarters and Force Headquarters and also has a support cell in Brussels.

Asia:

- Monitoring Mission in Aceh (Indonesia) (2005-2006): The European Union, together with contributing countries from ASEAN (Brunei, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand), as well as with Norway and Switzerland, deployed a monitoring mission in Aceh (Indonesia): Aceh Monitoring Mission (AMM). This mission was designed to monitor the implementation of various aspects of the peace agreement set out in the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed by the Government of Indonesia and the Free Aceh Movement (GAM) on August 15th, 2005. The AMM became operational one month later, the date on which the decommissioning of GAM armaments and the relocation of non-organic military and policy forces began. The AMM was concluded

on December 15th, 2006, following local elections in Aceh held four days before.

- EUPOL Afghanistan (2007-2016): This EU Police Mission was launched on June 15th, 2007. EUPOL Afghanistan followed Germany in the lead concerning the police reform and built on the efforts of the EU member states and other international actors in the field of police and rule of law. EUPOL's tasks were to 1. support the implementation of the National Police Strategy, especially with a view to the Afghan Uniformed Civilian Police and the Afghan Anti-Crime Police and the institutional development of the ministry of interior; 2. contribute to the establishment of a proactive, intelligence-led police force with an appropriate command, control and communication structure that addressed corruption and respected human rights and gender aspects; 3. support the development of criminal investigation capability, including for international cooperation in criminal matters; 4. address the linkages to the wider rule of law allowing an efficient penal process, particularly the police-prosecutor link; 5. within the remit of the mission, streamline and coordinate the international contributions in the field of police reform, especially through the International Police Coordination Board. EUPOL strategic objectives were to develop police command, control and communication for the Ministry of Interior and the Afghan National Police; to develop intelligence-led policing; build the capabilities of the Criminal Investigation Department; develop anti-corruption capacities; improve cooperation and coordination between Police and Judiciary, with a particular emphasis on prosecutors; mainstream gender and human rights aspects within the Ministry of the Interior and Afghan National Police.

Europe:

- EUPM (EU Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina) (2003-2012): The first EU mission ever started as a police operation on January 1st, 2003, in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH); the EU took over this mission from the United Nations' policing operation. The EUPM was part of a broader effort undertaken by the EU and other players to strengthen the rule of law in the country. Upon the

invitation by the governmental authorities, the EUPM continued its mission with modified mandates and size until June 30th, 2012. EUPM worked to create, under BiH ownership, a modern, sustainable, professional multi-ethnic police force, trained, equipped and able to assume full responsibility and to independently uphold law enforcement at the level of international standards. The EUPM key tasks have included the following: to strengthen the operational capacity and joint capability of the law enforcement agencies engaged in the fight against organised crime and corruption; to assist and support in the planning and conduct of investigations in the fight against organised crime and corruption in a systematic approach; to assist and promote development of criminal investigative capacities of BiH; to enhance police-prosecution cooperation; to strengthen police-penitentiary system cooperation; to contribute to ensuring a suitable level of accountability. The EUPM's main headquarters was in Sarajevo. In the last two years of its mandate, the mission maintained four regional offices in Sarajevo, Banja Luka, Mostar and Tuzla.

- EUFOR Concordia, Macedonia / FYROM (2003): The EU-NATO arrangements initiated on December 16th, 2002, permitted the EU to take over NATO's Task Force Fox/Allied Harmony mission in Macedonia / FYROM – the first EU military operation – starting on April 1st, 2003. This was the first concrete implementation of the Berlin Plus arrangements in support of EUFOR's Concordia, a small peacekeeping operation mounted using NATO assets and with NATO's Deputy Supreme Allied Commander in command. EUFOR Concordia was during its first period composed of 350 troops from thirteen EU member states and fourteen non-EU states and was led by France. At first, EUFOR had a six-month mandate to oversee the political reforms stated in the Ohrid Peace Agreement and to monitor the security situation. It was also responsible for the protection of international monitors from the EU and the OSCE. The operational commander was Admiral Reiner Feist (Germany), while the EUFOR commander was Brigadier-General Pierre Maral. Non-EU partner countries: Canada, Iceland, Norway, Turkey.

- EUPOL Proxima (EU Police Mission) in Macedonia / FYROM (2003-2005): EU police experts were monitoring, mentoring and advising the country's police thus helping to fight organised crime as well as promoting EU policing standards in line with the objectives of the Ohrid Framework Agreement of 2001. Proxima supported the consolidiation of law and order, including the fight against organised crime; the practical implementation of the comprehensive reform of the Minister of Interior, including the police; the creation of a border police; and the local police in building confidence with the population.
- EUFOR Althea, Bosnia and Herzegovina (since 2004): This military operation contributes to the maintenance of the safe and secure environment in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). The mandate for EUFOR's Althea is in two parts, executive and non-executive. The executive mandate is given by the UN Security Council, and the EUFOR mission is then based on the EU Foreign Affairs Council (FAC) Joint Action which includes an executive part derived from the UN Security Council (supporting the BiH authorities maintain a safe and secure environment). It also includes a non-executive part (capacity building and training for the Armed Forces of BiH). The decision to launch Operation Althea followed the decision by NATO to conclude its SFOR operation and the adoption by the UN Security Council of resolution 1575 (2004) authorising the deployment of an EU force in BiH. In the framework of Operation Althea, the EU first deployed 7,000 troops, under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, to ensure continued compliance with the Dayton/Paris Agreement (General Framework Agreement for Peace – GFAP) and to contribute to a safe and secure environment in BiH. Althea is carried out with recourse to NATO assets and capabilities, under the Berlin Plus arrangements. Since September 2012, the force numbers some 600 troops, backed up by over-the-horizon reserves. EUFOR supports the implementation of a number of tasks that have been transferred from the operation to local authorities, such as: countermines activities, military and civilian movement control of weapons and ammunition, as well as the management of weapons and ammunition and storage sites. EUFOR actively continues to provide support to the International

Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in pursuit of persons indicted for war crimes, while noting that the responsibility for full cooperation with ICTY rests with the authorities in Sarajevo. A multinational manoeuvre battalion is based in Sarajevo and EUFOR also retains its presence throughout the country through the Liaison and Observation Teams (LOTs). They are in touch with the local authorities and the population as well as other agencies in the country to monitor the general situation across BiH and to be aware of local issues that could affect the security situation. The LOTs provide information for the EUFOR Headquarters in Sarajevo and are guided by the LOT Coordination Centre (LCC) in Camp Butmir, Sarajevo. The Operation Commander is the Deputy NATO SACEUR. The EU's Political and Security Committee (PSC) exercises the political control and strategic direction of the operation, under the responsibility of the Council of the EU. Non-EU partner nations: Albania, Argentina, Canada, Chile, Macedonia, Morocco, Norway, New Zealand, Switzerland and Turkey.

- EU Border Assistance Mission to Moldova and Ukraine (since 2005): includes border police and customs officials from EU member states. EUBAM observes the situation on the common border between Moldova and Ukraine (length: 1,222 kilometres) and helps to prevent smuggling, trafficking, and customs fraud by providing advice and training to improve the capacity of Moldavian and Ukrainian border and customs services. An advisory, technical body is based in Odesa (Ukraine). It has an office in Chisinau and field offices on the Moldovan side of the joint border and on the Ukrainian side. The mission contributes to cross-border cooperation and confidence building, helping to improve efficiency, transparency and security along the Moldova-Ukraine border. The mission's aims are to work with Moldova and Ukraine to harmonise border control, and customs and trade standards and procedures with those in EU member states; to improve cross-border cooperation between the border guard and customs agencies and other law enforcement bodies; assist Moldova and Ukraine to fulfil the obligations of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) they have signed as part of their 2014 Association

Agreements with the EU; contribute to the peaceful settlement of the Transnistrian segment (453 kilometres) of the Moldova-Ukraine border. A Memorandum of Understanding signed by the European Commission and the governments both of Moldova and Ukraine in autumn 2005 is the legal basis for EUBAM, while an advisory board – which meets twice a year – acts as the Mission's governing body. The mandate of the Mission has already been extended five times (in 2007, 2009, 2011, 2015, and 2017). The Mission was at first funded from the Rapid Reaction Mechanism (RRM), and thereafter from TACIS. HQ: Odessa, six field offices on the Moldovan-Ukrainian border and in Odessa Port and four advisers on risk analysis, deployed in Chisinau and Kiev.

- EU Police Advisory Team (EUPAT) (2005-2006) in Macedonia / FYROM: The launch of EUPAT followed the termination on December 14th, 2005, of the mandate of the EU Police Mission Proxima, launched on December 15th, 2003. EUPAT supported the development of an efficient and professional police service based on European standards of policing. EU police experts monitored and mentored the country's police on priority issues in the field of Border Police, Public Peace and Order and Accountability, the fight against corruption and organised crime. EUPAT focused on the middle and senior levels of management. Special attention was given to overall implementation of police reform in the field; police judiciary cooperation; professional standards/internal control. The mission had a duration of six months and included around 30 police advisors.
- EULEX Kosovo (since 2008) became the largest ever conducted civilian mission. Within EULEX Kosovo, US police officers have been participating in an EU mission for the first time. The central aim is to assist and support the Kosovo authorities in the area of rule of law, specifically in the police, judiciary and customs areas. EULEX works closely with KFOR in the field. EULEX Kosovo was launched in 2008 as the largest civilian mission under the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) of the European Union. EULEX works within the framework of UN Security Council Resolution 1244. EULEX Mission supports relevant rule of law institutions in Kosovo on their path towards increased

effectiveness, sustainability, multi-ethnicity and accountability, free from political interference and in full compliance with EU best practices. Within its current mandate, the Mission undertakes monitoring activities and has limited executive functions. The Mission continues to support the Specialist Chambers and Specialist Prosecutor's Office in line with relevant Kosovo legislation. EULEX Kosovo implements its mandate through Monitoring and Operations Pillars. The Monitoring Pillar monitors selected cases and trials in the Kosovo justice system. The pillar focuses its monitoring activities on selected cases which were dealt with by EULEX under its previous mandate that ended in mid-June 2018 and were later handed over to the local judiciary as well as other cases that may affect Kosovo's European path. The Monitoring Pillar also supports the Kosovo Correctional Service in developing a consolidated and professional senior management team as well as sustainable capacities to counter undue interference and preferential treatment of inmates. EULEX continues to provide technical support to the implementation of relevant agreements of the EU-facilitated dialogue on normalisation of relations between Belgrade and Pristina. Operational functions are undertaken by the Mission's Operations Pillar which maintains a limited residual capability as a second security responder and provides continued support to Kosovo Police's crowd and riot control capability.

- EUAM Ukraine (since 2014): The European Union Advisory Mission (EUAM) (HQ: Kiyv) is an unarmed non-executive civilian mission of the EU that formally began operations from its headquarters in Kyiv on December 1st, 2014, following the Maidan revolution of 2013/14 and an invitation issued by the Ukrainian government. EUAM Ukraine aims to assist the Ukrainian authorities toward a sustainable reform of the civilian security sector through strategic advice and hands-on support for specific reform measures based on EU standards and international principles of good governance and human rights. The goal is to achieve a civilian security sector that is efficient, accountable, and enjoys the trust of the public. The civilian sector is comprised of agencies responsible for law enforcement and rule of law, such as

the Ministry of Internal Affairs, National Police, National Anti-Corruption Bureau, Security Service of Ukraine, State Border Guard Service, General Prosecutor's Office, local courts, with roles also played by civil society and the parliament of Ukraine. The EUAM is an unarmed, non-executive civilian mission, focussing on supporting the elaboration of revised security strategies and the implementation of reforms, as well as with the OSCE and other international partners.

Caucasus:

- EUJUST Themis: EU Rule of Law Mission in Georgia (2004-2005): The EU launched on July 16th, 2004, an EU Rule of Law Mission to Georgia (EUJUST Themis). This was the first rule of law mission launched by the EU in the context of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). In the framework of EUJUST Themis, senior and highly experienced personnel supported, mentored and advised ministers, senior officials and appropriate bodies at the level of the central government. EUJUST Themis was designed to support the Georgian authorities in addressing urgent challenges in the criminal justice system, assisting the Georgian government in developing a co-ordinated overall approach to the reform process. The operation achieved its main aims and successfully completed its tasks on July 14th, 2005.
- EUMM Georgia (since 2008): The EU Monitoring Mission in Georgia (EUMM) is an unarmed civilian monitoring mission. It was established by the EU on September 15th, 2008. Over 200 civilian monitors were sent by EU member states to contribute to the stabilisation of the situation on the ground following the August 2008 conflict. They monitor compliance by all sides with the EU-brokered Six-Point Agreement of August 12th, signed by both Georgia and Russia, and the Agreement on Implementing Measures of September 8th, 2008. The mission started its monitoring activities on October 1st, 2008, beginning with oversight of the withdrawal of Russian armed forces from the areas adjacent to South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Ever since, the mission has been patrolling day and night, particularly in the areas adjacent to the South Ossetian and Abkhazian Administrative Boundary Lines. The Mission's efforts

have been primarily directed at observing the situation on the ground, reporting on incidents, and, generally, through its presence in the relevant areas, contributing to improving the security situation. The Mission's mandate consists of stabilisation, normalisation and confidence-building, as well as reporting to the EU in order to inform European policy-making and thus contribute to the future EU engagement in the region. EUMM is mandated to cover the whole territory of Georgia, within the country's internationally recognised borders, but the de facto authorities in Abkhazia and South Ossetia have so far denied access to the territories under their control. First and foremost, the mission is working to prevent the renewal of an armed conflict, as well as to help make the areas adjacent to the Administrative Boundary Lines of the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia safe and secure for the local residents. The Mission wants to contribute to create conditions whereby civilians can cross the Administrative Boundary Lines of Abkhazia and South Ossetia in both directions without fear and obstacles, thus reducing the detrimental effects of dividing lines. The Mission has its headquarters in Tbilisi and three regional field offices in Mtskheta, Gori and Zugdidi. The monitors in each field office are split into three teams covering: Confidence building in the areas adjacent to the Abkhazian and South Ossetian Administrative Boundary Lines; Compliance with the Memoranda of Understanding signed between the Mission and the Georgian Ministries of Defence and Internal Affairs; Human security aspects of conflict management

Mediterranean:

- EUFOR Libya (2011): EU military operation in support of humanitarian assistance operations in Libya (Operational Headquarters: Rome). The Council decided on April 1st, 2011, on a military operation in support of humanitarian assistance operations in response to the crisis situation in Libya. The decision provides that the EU will, if requested by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), conduct a military operation in the framework of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) in order to support humanitarian assistance in the

region. More specifically, EUFOR Libya, if requested by the UN, aims at contributing to the safe movement and evacuation of displaced persons and support, with specific capabilities, the humanitarian agencies in their activities. The operation aims to underpin the mandates of UN Security Council Resolutions 1970 and 1973 regarding the availability of humanitarian assistance and the protection of civilian populations.

- EUBAM Libya (since 2013): The EU Integrated Border Management Assistance Mission in Libya was deployed on May 22nd, 2013. Its headquarters is located in Tripoli. EUBAM does not carry out any executive functions and it is to achieve its objectives mainly through the transfer of know-how, not funds. EUBAM attends to support the Libyan authorities through training and mentoring in developing border management and security at the country's land, sea and air borders. As a civilian crisis management mission with a capacity-building mandate, EUBAM assists Libyan authorities at strategic and operational level. The work is carried out through advising, training and mentoring Libyan counterparts in strengthening the border services in accordance with international standards and best practices, and by advising the Libyan authorities on the development of a national Integrated Border Management (IBM) strategy. At the strategic level EUBAM has helped the Libyan authorities to set up a cross-ministerial body, Border Management Working Group (BMWG), to coordinate the response among naval, police, border guards, customs, and all the other agencies involved. Training and advice has been delivered to hundreds of Libyan border management officials on aviation security, customs best practices, vehicle and passport checks, risk analysis, international and inter-agency cooperation and maritime search and rescue, among other topics. Due to the political and security situation in Libya, EUBAM has been operating from Tunisia since August 2014. With this limited capacity, the Mission has continued to support the Libyan Customs and Naval Coast Guard through workshops and seminars organised outside Libya.
- EUNAVFOR Med Sophia (since June 2015): The Council agreed on May 18th, 2015, to establish this military operation (Operational Headquarters: Rome). EUNAVFOR Med Operation Sophia is but

one element of a broader EU comprehensive response to the migration issue, which seeks to address not only its physical component, but also its root causes as well including conflict, poverty, climate change and persecution. The mission core mandate is to undertake systematic efforts to identify, capture and dispose of vessels and enabling assets used or suspected of being used by migrant smugglers or traffickers, in order to contribute to wider EU efforts to disrupt the business model of human smuggling and trafficking networks in the southern Central Mediterranean and prevent the further loss of life at sea. Since October 7th, 2015, the operation moved to phase 2 'International Waters', which entails boarding, search, seizure and diversion, on the high seas, of vessels suspected of being used for human smuggling or trafficking. On June 20th, 2016, the Council extended Operation Sophia's mandate reinforcing it by adding two supporting tasks: training of the Libyan coastguards and navy; contributing to the implementation of the UN arms embargo on the high seas off the coast of Libya. The first phase focuses on surveillance and assessment of human smuggling and trafficking networks in the southern Central Mediterranean. The second stage of the operation provides for the search and, if necessary, diversion of suspicious vessels. The third phase would allow the disposal of vessels and related assets, preferably before use, and to apprehend traffickers and smugglers. On August 23rd, 2016, the signature of the Memorandum of Understanding on the training of the Libyan Coast Guard and Navy between EUNAVFOR Med Operation Sophia and the Libyan Coast Guard took place in Rome. The operation now conducts a training programme of Libyan Coast Guards and Navy, in coordination with other EU agencies and international actors, in three consecutive phases – on the high sea on board of EUNAVFOR Med Operation Sophia units; ashore in a member state or Libya; and on Libyan Coastguard and patrol boats. The training programme will help improve the security of Libyan territorial waters, enhance the capacity of the Libyan Coast Guard and Navy to perform law enforcement actions to tackle human traffickers and smugglers, and contribute to prevent further loss of life at sea. The fourth and last phase will consist of withdrawal of forces and completion of the operation.

Near and Middle East:

- EU Border Assistance Mission for Rafah Crossing Point (EU BAM Rafah) (since 2005): The Council adopted the Joint Action to launch EU BAM Rafah on November 25th, 2005, in order to actively monitor, verify and evaluate the Palestinian Authority's performance with regard to the implementation of the Framework, Security and Customs Agreements concluded between the parties on the operation of the Rafah terminal; contribute, through mentoring, to building up the Palestinian capacity in all aspects of border management at Rafah; contribute to the liaison between the Palestinian, Israeli and Egyptian authorities in all respects regarding the management of the Rafah Crossing Point. EUBAM Rafah was established on the basis of the 'Agreement on Movement and Access' reached between Israel and the Palestinian Authority on November 15th, 2005, and following an invitation by the Palestinian Authority and Israel. The EU is the largest donor to Palestinians, a resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict is of strategic importance and priority of the EU.
- EUPOL COPPS (the EU Co-ordinating Office for Palestinian Police Support) (since 2005), established on January 1st, 2006, is the EU Police and Rule of Law Mission for the Palestinian Territories. Initially the Mission was established as a Police Mission comprising a Police Advisory Section. In 2008, a Rule of Law Section was added. EUPOL COPPS assists the Palestinian Authority in building its institutions, for a future Palestinian state, focused on security and justice sector reforms. This is effected under Palestinian ownership and in accordance with European and international standards. Ultimately the mission's objective is to improve the safety and security of the Palestinian people. The mission forms part of the wider EU effort to support Palestinian state building, in the context of working toward a comprehensive peace, based on a two-state solution. EUPOL COPPS is fully dedicated to the inclusion of human rights as well as a gender perspective and gender-mainstreaming standards in all of its activities. The tasks are to support the Palestinian Civil Police reform and development; to strengthen and support the Criminal Justice System; to improve

Prosecution-Police interaction; to coordinate and facilitate external donor assistance to the Palestinian Civil Police. EUPOL COPPS builds on the work of the EU Coordination Office for Palestinian Police Support, established earlier within the office of the EU Special Representative for the Middle East Peace Process. This initiative followed the expression by EU leaders in June 2004 of their readiness to support the Palestinian Authority in taking responsibility for law and order and, in particular, in improving its civil police and law enforcement capacity.

- EUJUST LEX-Iraq (2005-2013): The EU Integrated Rule of Law Mission for Iraq was a civilian crisis management mission conducted under the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). EUJUST LEX-Iraq was the EU's first integrated rule of law mission. Its mandate had been extended four times, after which the Council of the EU agreed that EUJUST LEX-Iraq ended on the December 31st, 2013. The operational phase of EUJUST LEX-Iraq started on July 1st, 2005, following an invitation by the then-Prime Minister of the Iraqi interim government, Ibrahim al-Jaafari, to the EU, calling for the start of integrated training activities for Iraqi professionals working in the criminal justice system. When taking office, the Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki extended his welcome and support for the mission and its activities. Moreover, the Prime Minister requested continued support from the EU in addressing the needs of the Iraqi criminal justice system through the activities of EUJUST LEX-Iraq. After having been based in Brussels for security reasons since its inception, EUJUST LEX-Iraq had been fully employed in Iraq since the spring of 2011. The headquarters of EUJUST LEX-Iraq was located in Baghdad, while there was one field office in Erbil (Kurdistan Region) and a satellite office in Basra. The mission also included a support office in Brussels, which supported and coordinated the mission's EU-based activities. EUJUST LEX-Iraq was established to strengthen the rule of law and to promote a culture of respect for human rights in Iraq by providing professional development opportunities for high and mid-level Iraqi officials from the criminal justice system.
- EUAM Iraq (since 2017): The EU Advisory Mission in support of Security Sector Reform in Iraq (EUAM Iraq) was launched to

respond to the request for advice and assistance by the Iraqi government. It focuses on assisting the Iraqi authorities in the implementation of the civilian aspects of the Iraqi security strategy. EU experts provide strategic advice and assistance in priority work areas responding to the needs of the relevant authorities, assist the EU delegation in the coordination of EU and member states actions in this sector and also to assess potential further EU engagement in the Security Sector Reform in the long term in the context of the future EU policy towards Iraq. The Iraqi national security strategy aims at building state institutions capable of consolidating security, peace and preventing conflicts under the rule of law, and outlines a number of threats to national security, including terrorism, corruption, political instability and ethnic and sectarian polarisation. The mission works in close coordination with the EU delegation to Iraq as well as international partners also present, including the UN Development Programme (UNDP), NATO and the global coalition against the 'Islamic State'. In response to a request from the Iraqi authorities for support in the area of civilian security sector reform, and in line with the Council conclusions on Iraq of June 19th, 2017, the EU agreed to launch a civilian CSDP mission in Baghdad and adopted the crisis management concept for the mission on July 17th, 2017.

References

Aakhunzzada, Ahmad Noor Baheige (2018): A Ray of Hope for Afghanistan, PRIF Spotlight 4/2018, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt / Leibniz-Institut Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, Frankfurt/Main.

Adamowski, Jaroslaw (2017): Ukraine: We want back in NATO, *Defense News*, June 19th, 2017, p. 30.

Adamowski, Jaroslaw (2016): Ramping Up Armament, *Defense News International*, September 12th, 2016, p. 18.

Aitoro, Jill (2018): Natanyahu, Kerry clash on Iran nuclear deal, *Defense News*, March 5th, 2018, p. 9.

Aitoro, Jill (2018b): Russia, Russia, Russia!, *Defense News*, June 25th, 2018, p. 28.

Aitoro, Jill (2017): Afghanistan sucked the oxygen out of the room. And it came at the worst time, *Defense News*, November 6th, 2017, p. 28.

Albano, Teresa (2016): Migration Makes Us Safer, Richer, Resilient and Secure, *Security Community* (The OSCE Magazine), Issue 1/2016, p. 19-20.

Alvear, Maria-Jose, Bartos, Blanka, Takácsová, Kristína (2016): Contribution of the CTBTO to the 2030 Development Agenda, RAUN Papers, December 2016.

Amorim, Luis (2017): The European Council and CSDP, in: European Security and Defence College (ESDC) (2017): Handbook CSDP. The Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union, Volume I, 3rd edition, edited by Jochen Rehrl, Directorate for Security Policy of the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria, Armed Forces Printing Centre, Vienna, pp. 46-54.

Aron, Leon (2015): Putinology, *American Interests*, Autumn (September/October), pp. 40-45.

Austrian Foreign Ministry (2006): Austrian Participation in the NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP) and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), https://cms.bmeia.at/en/forein-ministry/foreign-policy/europe/nato-partnership-for-peace.html [25/6/15].

Ayrault, Jean-Marc, Steinmeier, Frank-Walter (2016): A strong Europe in a world of uncertainties, Auswärtiges Amt and Ministère des affaires étrangères et du développement international.

Baker, Aryn, Addario, Lynsey (2016): Between the devil and the deep blue sea, *TIME,* September 12th-19th, 2016, pp. 34-45.

Bakke-Jensen, Frank (2017): The path to the next NATO summit, *Defense News*, December 11th, 2017, p. 18.

Balcer, Adam (2015): The eastern Partnership's Swan Song, *New Eastern Europe*, September-October No 5 (XVIII) 2015, pp. 98-105.

Banks, Martin (2018a): NATO command change to address 'deficiencies', *Defense News*, February 19th, 2018, p. 10.

Banks, Martin (2018b): EU defense ambitions trickle down to industry, *Defense News*, August 13th, 2018, p. 18.

Banks, Martin (2016), Greater EU Military Cooperation Sought, *Defense News International*, September 19th, 2016, pp. 22-23.

Barber, Tony (2016): Seven scenarios offer glimmer of hope to pierce the EU gloom, *Financial Times International*, September 21st, 2016, p. 3.

Barker, Alex, Robinson, Duncan, Hope, Kerin (2016): Europe gambles to stem migrant flow, *Financial Times Weekend Europe edition*, March 19th, 2016, pp. 1 and 4.

Baroudos, Constance (2016): ERI: Smart Response to European Threats, *Defense News*, March 21st, 2016, p. 29.

Bauer, Dominique, Hajzer Gergö, Zelet-Dinova, Dilyara (2015): Emergency relocation and the future of solidarity in the European Union – a fresh approach?, RAUN Papers, December 2015.

BBC (2014): EU enlargement: The next seven, 2nd September 2014, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-11283616 [20/5/16]

Bekdil, Burak Ege (2018): 'Shaking hands with the Russians'. Erdogan sole decision-maker on S-400 deal, *Defense News*, July 30th, 2018, pp. 10-11.

Bekdil, Burak Ege (2017): S-400 likely to cause Turkey-NATO rift, *Defense News*, March 13th, 2017, pp. 20-21.

Bennett, Brian (2017): Trump lashes out at Germany over NATO spaneding and trade after Merkel questions the U.S. commitment to its allies, *L.A. Times online*, May 31st, 2017, http.//www.latimes.com/politics/Washington/la-na-essential-washington-updeates-trump-lashes-out-at-germany-over-nato-1496153358_story.html [31/5/2017]

Betts, Alexander, Collier, Paul (2015): Help Refugees Help Themselves. Let Displaced Syrians Join the Labour Market, *Foreign Affairs*, November/December 2015, pp. 84-92.

Binnendijk, Hans, Joseph, Edward P. (2018): A Balkan initiative for the NATO summit, *Defense News*, May 21st, 2018, p. 29.

Biscop, Sven (2018a): PESCO. Strategic Autonomy, and Ambition, *Sicherheit und Frieden / Security and Peace*, 4/2018, Nomos Publishing, Baden-Baden, pp. 191-195.

Biscop, Sven (2018b): The EU and Multilateralism in an Age of Great Powers, in: Christian Echle, Patrick Rueppel, Magha Sarmah, Yeo Lay Hwee, Multilateralism in a Changing World Order, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, Singapore 2018, pp. 39-47.

Biscop, Sven (2017a): Oratio pro PESCO, *Egmont Paper* 91, published by Egmont – The Royal Institute for International Relations, Brussels, January 2017.
Biscop, Sven (2017b): Analysing the EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy, in: European Security and Defence College (ESDC) (2017): Handbook CSDP. The Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union, Volume I, 3rd edition, edited by Jochen Rehrl, Directorate for Security Policy of the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria, Armed Forces Printiing Centre, Vienna, pp. 28-34.

Biscop, Sven (2016): All or Nothing? European and British Strategic Autonomy after the Brexit, *Egmont Paper* 87, published by Egmont – The Royal Institute for International Relations, Brussels, September 2016.

Biscop, Sven (2014): The Summit of Our Ambition? European Defence between Brussels and Wales, *Egmont Security Policy Brief* No. 55, Egmont Royal Institute for International Security, Brussels, March 2014.

Biscop, Sven and Coelmont, Jo (2012), Europe, Strategy and Armed Forces. The making of a distinctive power, Cass Military Studies, Routledge Publishing, London and New York (Abingdon / Oxon UK).

Blom, Philipp (2018): The Rising Tide of Political Despair, *Cercle Diplomatique* 1/2018, pp. 54-56.

Bock, Markus (2015): 'Call the Austrians', 25 Jahre AFDRU, *Truppendienst* 2/2015, pp. 147-156.

Bodner, Matt (2018): The S-400 deal, from Russia's perspective, *Defense News*, July 30th, 2018, p. 12.

Brattberg, Erik (2012). Smart Partnerships for Smart Defense, 14th May 2012, Project Syndicate, http:///www.project-syndicate.org/print/smart-partnerships-for-smart-defense [2/10/12]

Bremmer, Ian (2016): The risk report: A disgruntled Iran causes trouble, *TIME*, September 12th-19th, 2016, p. 10.

Brennan, Kate (2012): After NATO Summit, Details Scarce On Strategic Defense Spending, *Defense News*, May 28th, 2012, p. 14.

Briffa, Hillary (2018): 'Malta: Bridge of the Mediterranean: Neutrality as a small state, status seeking grand strategy', *SSANSE: Small States and the New Security Environment*, no 17.

Bundesheer (2016): Doskozil zu CEDC: Gemeinsam die EU-Außengrenzen schützen, http://www.ots.at/presseaussendung/OTS_20160401_OTS0202/doskozil-zu-cedc-gemeinsam-die-eu-aussgrenze-schuetzen [12/4/16]

Bundesheerreformkommission (2004): Bericht der Bundesheerreformkommission – Bundesheer 2010, Vienna 2004.

Bundeskanzleramt (ed.) (1985): Landesverteidigungsplan, Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, Wien / Vienna, March 1985.

Casey, Nuala, Holecek, Oldrich (2016): Defence Ministers of the Central European and Balkan countries meet to discuss migration, Ministry of Defence & Aremd Forces of Czech Republic, http://www.army.cz/en7ministry-of-defence/newsroom/news/defence-ministers-of-the-central-european-and-balkan-coutnries-meet-to-discuss-migration [8/2/17]

Castle, Stephen (2016): U.K. yet to find the right path to 'Brexit', *International New York Times*, September 1st 2016, pp. 1 and 3.

Central European Defence Cooperation (2019): Rapid Deployment. Extended Reach. Enhanced Persistence. Superior Awareness, https://cbrnsaas.eu/ (15/6/2019]

Chazan, Guy, Olearchyk, Roman, Peel, Michael (2018): Germany aims to guard Kiev gas role, *Financial Times*, July 17th, 2018, p. 2.

Chuter, Andrew (2018): Britain Threatens EU in Satellite Row, *Defense News*, May 21st, 2018, p. 22.

Chuter, Andrew (2016): More for Defense; for Now. Western Europe's Spending Increase May Prove Temporary, *Defense News International*, 12th September 2016, p. 20.

Cibulka, Erich (2014): Bundesheer am Scheideweg, *Der Offizier*, Zeitschrift der Österreichischen Offiziersgesellschaft, Ausgabe 3/2014, pp. 4-5.

CNN (2001): 'Putin 'rates' Austrian neutrality,' CNN.com./WORLD, 8th February 2001, http://www.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/europe/02/08/moscow.austria/ [11/11/04]

Coelmont, Jo (2013), A European Global *Security* Strategy: Offering Seven-League Boots to become a Global Actor, *Egmont Security Policy Brief* No. 45, Egmont Royal Institute for International Relations, Brussels, March 2013.

Collard, Rebecca (2018): The Brief: The war in Syria has become a global battlefield, *TIME*, February 26th, 2018, pp 5 and 6.

Conflict Prevention Centre (2015): What is the Forum for Security Co-operation?, *OSCE Factsheet*, Vienna.

Council Decision (2015): Council Decision (CFSP) 2015/972 of June 22nd, 2015, launching the European Union military operation in the southern Central Mediterranean (EUNAVFOR MED), Brussels.

Council of the European Union (2016): Subject: Implementation Plan on Security and Defence, from High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Vice President of the European Commisison, and Head of the European Defence Agency, Brussels, 14th November 2016, 14392/16.

Council of the European Union (2014): Financing of military operations: the ATHENA mechanism, *Factsheet*, Brussels, January 10th, 2014.

Council of the European Union (2007): The European Union Battlegroups, *European Security and Defence Policy*, January 2007, pp. I-IV.

Courtney, Joe (2018): Russia's resurgent Navy demands a coherent response, *Defense News*, February 19th, 2018, p. 29.

Csizmazia, Gábor (2017): Decisive Change or Determined Continuity? The Trump Administration's Foreign and Security Policy Viewed from Central and Eastern Europe, *AARMS* (Academic and Applied Research in Military and public Management Science), Scientific Journal of the National University of Public Service (Hungary), Volume 16, Issue 3/2017, pp. 109-126.

De Coning, Cedric, Detzel, Julian, Hojem, Petter (2008): UN Peacekeeping Operations Capstone Doctrine, Report of the Training for Peace Oslo Doctrine Seminar, May 14th and 15th, 2008, Oslo, Norway.

Defense News (2018a): State of nuclear warheads, *Defense News*, 22nd January 2018, p. 22.

Defense News (2018b): At Arm's Length, inside the push to keep EU-UK defense ties alive, *Defense News*, June 11th, 2018, pp. 1, 32 and 33.

Defense News (2018c): Portugals minister of defense, José Alberto de Azeredo Lopes, The Interview, *Defense News*, June 25th, 2018, pp. 26-27.

Dempsey, Judy (2015): Double Take: Does Russia divide Europe, in: *New Eastern Europe*, September-October No 5 (XVIII)2015, pp 19-24.

De Ojeda, Diego (2017): The role of the European Commission in CSDP, in: in: European Security and Defence College (ESDC) (2017): Handbook CSDP. The Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union, Volume I, 3rd edition, edited by Jochen Rehrl, Directorate for Security Policy of the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria, Armed Forces Printing Centre, Vienna, pp. 55-57.

Department of Defense (2018): Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy of the United States of America. Sharpening the American Military's Competitive Edge, Washington.

Department of Foreign Affairs/An Roinn Gnóthaí Eachtracha (2002): Seville Declarations on the Nice Treaty, Press Release, Dublin, June 21st, 2002.

Der Offizier (2016): European Union Battlegroup (EU BG), *Der Offizier*, Zeitschrift der Österreichischen Offiziersgesellschaft, 1/2016, pp. 28-29.

Der Soldat (2013): Cyber Defence, *Der Soldat*, November 20th, 2013, p. 9.

Die Presse (2013): Pleiten, Pech und Pannen einer Amtszeit, *Die Presse*, 5th March 2013, p. 1.

Domecq, Jorge (2017): Building European defense initiatives, together, *Defense News*, December 11th, 2017, p. 26.

EEAS (European Union External Action Service) (2017): From Shared Vision to Common Action: Implementing the EU Global Strategy – Year 1. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy, June 2017.

El Baradei, Mohamed (2011): The Age of Deception. Nuclear Diplomacy in Treacherous Times, Metropolitian Books. Henry Holt and Company, New York.

Endo, Ken (2016): Brexit from an EU Perspective, *AJISS-Commentary*. The Association of Japanese Institutes of Strategic Studies, No. 239, Tokyo, November 21st, 2016.

EPP Group in the European Parliament (2013): Towards a stronger Union defence policy, edited by the Members of the European Parliament Arnaud Danjean, Michael Gahler and Krzysztof Lisek, Brussels, September 3rd, 2013.

Erlanger, Steven (2017): Catalonia puts E.U. in a bind, *The New York Times International Edition*, October 4th, 2017, p. 1 and 5.

EUNAVFOR (2016): The EU Comprehensive Approach against piracy in the Horn of Africa, Brussels.

European Commission (2018a): EU coordinates further assistance to help Sweden fight forest fires, Press Release, July 23rd, 2018.

European Commission (2018b): Migration: Commission steps up emergency assistance to Spain and Greece, Press Release, July 2nd, 2018.

European Commission (2017): Reflection Paper on the Future of European Defence, Brussels, COM(2017) 315 of June 7th, 2017.

European Commission (2013): Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Towards a more competitive and efficient defence and security sector, Brussels, 24.7.2013, COM(2013) 542 final.

European Commission (2009): The EU's relations with the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, http://ex.europa.eu/external_relations/organisations/osce/index_en.htm [18/10/09]

EU Commisson President Jean-Claude Juncker (2018): Joint EU-U.S. Statement following President Juncker's visit to the White House, European Commission Press Release, July 26th, 2018.

European Council (2017): Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) first collaborative PESCO projects – Overview, Brussels.

European Council (2013): Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC), http://www.consilium.europa.eu/eeas/security-defence/csdp-structures-and-instruments [16/4/13]

European Council The President (2017): Malta Declaration by the members of the European Council on the external aspects of migration: addressing the Central Mediterranean route, Press Release 43/17 03/02/2017.

European Parliament (2017): Workshop: Sectarianism in the Middle east, Authors: Toby Matthiesen, Simon Mabon, Raphaël Lefèvre, Renad Mansour, published by the Directorate-General for External Policies of the European Parliament, EP/EXPO IB/ AFET/2016/01, July 2017 – PE 603.843.

European Parliament (2015): EU-UN cooperation in peacekeeping and crisis management, Briefing, EPRS / European Parliamentary Research Service, Author: Carmen-Cristina Cirlig, PE 572.783, November 2015.

European Security and Defence College (ESDC) (2018): What we are – what we do. A manual of the European Security and Defence College, February-July 2018, 4th edition, Brussels, January 2018.

European Security and Defence College (ESDC) (2017): Handbook CSDP. The Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union, Volume I, 3rd edition, edited by Jochen Rehrl, Directorate for Security Policy of the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria, Armed Forces Printing Centre, Vienna.

European Union (2018): EU-NATO Cooperation, Updated: July 9th, 2018.

European Union (2016): Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy, June 2016.

European Union (2006): The common foreign and security policy: introduction, Last updated: July 13th, 2006, http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/r0001.htm [5/9/07]

European Union (2010): European Union Police Mission in Afghanistan, FACTSHEET, Brussels, September 2010.

European Union – EEAS (European External Action Service) (2015): The EEAS and the Libyan Crisis, 23/03/2015, http://eeas.europa.eu/crisis-response/where-we-work/libya/index_en.htm [24/4/15]

European Union External Action (2016): EU relations with Serbia, http://eeas.europa.eu/serbia/index_en.htm [20/5/16]

European Union External Action (2015): European Union Naval Force – Mediterranean, Update: August 2015, Brussels.

European Union External Action (2015b): EU-Ukraine relations, Fact Sheet, Brussels, 24th April 2015, 150424/05.

European Union External Action (2014): European Union Naval Force Somalia – Operation Atalanta, Brussles.

European Union External Action (2012), EEAS to contribute to NATO's Crisis Management Exercise CMX12, Brussels, November 2012.

European Union External Action (2014): Joint Statement. Geneva Statement on Ukraine, Geneva, April 17th, 2014, 140417/01.

Europe Diplomacy & Defence. The Agence Europe bulletin on ESDP and NATO (2010). WEU: Ten jointly announce dissolution of Western European Union, April 7th, No 308, p. 2.

Federal Chancellery (Republic of Austria) (2002): Austrian Security and Defence Doctrine. General Considerations. Resolution by the Austrian Parliament, Vienna 2002.

Federal Minister for Defence and Sports (Austria) (2016): Central European Defence Cooperation (CEDC), Vienna 2016.

Financial Times (2016): Rethink asylum rules for age of mass movement, *Financial Times*, September 21st, 2016, p. 10.

Fischer, Heinz (2004): 'Neutralität bewahren,' SPÖ Steiermark, April 22nd, 2004, Press Release of the Social Democrat Party of Austria.

Fisher, Max, Bennhold, Katrin (2018): The German crisis pushing Europe to the brink, *The New York Times International Edition*, July 5th, 2018, p. 5.

Flory, Peter (2010): After Lisbon, Execution Is Key, *Defense News*, November 29th, 2010, p. 21.

Frontex (2016): Roles and Responsibilities, http://frontex.europa.eu/operations/roles-and-responsibilities/ [3/6/16]

Galeotti, Mark (2019): We need to talk about Putin. How the West gets him wrong, Ebury Press, London.

Gareis, Sven Bernhard (2012): The United Nations. An Introduction, 2nd Edition, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke and New York.

Gehler, Michael (2014): Different Roads to the European Union: Neutral States and Integration 1945-1995. In: Adrian-Ciprian Paun and Dragos Paun (eds.), The Convergence of Diversity: The European Model, Cluj, Cluj University Press.

Giegerich, Bastian (2012): NATO's Smart Defence: Who's Buying?, in: *Survival*, vol. 54 No. 3, June-July 2012, pp. 69-77.

Giegerich, Bastian (2008): European Military Crisis Management. Connecting ambition and reality, Adelphi Paper 397, The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), Routledge Publishing, Abingdon/Oxon.

Gilli, Andrea (2011): EU's Military Decline, *Defense News*, June 20th, 2011, p. 52.

Göbl, Gabi, Lassen, Christian Kvorning, Lovec, Marko, Nic, Milan, Schmidt, Paul (2016): Central Europe and the Refugee Question: Cooperation, not Confrontation, Österreichische Gesellschaft für Europapolitik, *ÖGfE Policy Brief* 22'2016, Vienna, September 12th, 2016.

Goodwin-Gill, Guy S., McAdam, Jane (2016): The Refugee in International Law, Third Edition, Oxford University Press.

Gröbming, Wolfgang (2008): 15 Years of Border Surveillance, *Truppendienst International*, Edition 1/2006,

http://www.bmlv.gv.at/truppendienst/international/artikel.php?id=32 [9/6/08]

Grünwald, Peter (2016): 'Mountain Training Initiative'. *Der Offizier*. Zeitschrift der Österreichischen Offiziersgesellschaft, no. 1 (2016): pp. 24-27.

Häikiö, Martti (2000): Finland´s Neutrality 1944-1994, in: Gehler, Michael; Steininger, Rolf (eds.), The Neutrals and the European Integration 1945-1995, Institut für Zeitgeschichte der Universität Innsbruck, Arbeitskreis Europäische Integration. Historische Forschungen. Veröffentlichungen Band 3, Böhlau Publishing, Wien-Köln-Weimar, pp. 199-217.

Hämmerle, Katharina (2016), Cooperative Security and the OSCE. Panel Discussion, 20th June 2016, at the Amerika Haus, Vienna, Austrian Institute for International Affairs.

Hainzl, Gerald, Feichtinger, Walter (2017) (eds.): Transforming Violent Conflicts in Africa, Schriftenreihe der Landesverteidigungsakademie, Band 5/2017, Republic of Austria / Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports, Vienna, February 2017.

Hauser, Gunther (2018): Das europäische Sicherheits- und Verteiidgungssystem und siene Akteure, 8. Auflage, Amtliche Publikation der Republik Österreich / Bundesminister für Landesverteidigung, Redaktion: Landesverteidigungsakademie / Institut für Strategie und Sicherheitspolitik, Wien, February 15th, 2018.

Hauser, Gunther (2007): Austrian Security Policy – New Tasks and Challenges, *Obrana a strategy* (Defence & Strategy), Ročník / Volume 7, 1/2007, published by University of Defence, Institute for Strategic Studies, Brno 2007, 45-56.

Hauser, Gunther (2006a): ESDP and Austria: Security Policy between Engagement and Neutrality, in: Bischof, Günter; Pelinka, Anton; Gehler, Michael (Eds.), Austrian Foreign Policy in Historical Context, Contemporary Austrian Studies, Volume No. 14, New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers 2006, pp. 207-245.

Hauser, Gunther (2006b): The Concept of Neutrality in Today's Security Environment, *Defensor Pacis*, Issue 18, July 2006, published by The Defence Analyses Institute Review, Athens 2006, pp. 140-164.

Hauser, Gunther (2003): Military Security and the Concept of Neutrality, in: Jean Callaghan and Franz Kernic, Armed Forces and International Security. Global Trends and Issues, LIT Publishing, Münster, pp. 321-325.

Hauser, Gunther (2002): Visegrad and Austria – Comprehensive Relations, in: Marek Stastný (ed.), Visegrad Countries in an Enlarged Trans-Atlantic Community, Institute for Public Affairs, Bratislava, pp. 113-138.

Hauser, Gunther, Mantovani, Mauro (2018): Austria and Switzerland, in: Hugo Meijer & Marco Wyss (eds.), The Handbook of European Defence Policies & Armed Forces, Oxford University Press, Chapter 10, pp. 197-213.

Helsingin Sanomat (2002): Sweden to adopt new security policy doctrine – drops neutrality, *Helsingin Sanomat International Edition*, February 12th, 2002.

Himmelfreundpointner, Rainer (2018): Ambassador's Summit #6 'A Europeanisation of the Balkans and a Balkanisation of Europe', *Cercle Diplomatique* 1/2018, pp. 46-53.

Himmelfreundpointner, Rainer (2018b): 'We want an EU that is stronger when it comes to big questions.', Interview with Gernot Blümel, Minister for the EU, Arts, Culture and Media, *Cercle Diplomatique* 2/2018, pp. 74-79.

Himmelfreundpointner, Rainer (2018c): Ambassador's Summit #7, 'We have similar stories and have chosen a shared path toward integration.', Ambassadors: H.E. Peter Mišík (Slovakia), H.E. Ivana Červenková (Czech Republic), H.E. Jolanta Róża Kozłowska (Poland), H.E. János Perényi (Hungary), *Cercle Diplomatique*, Nr.2/2018, June-August, Summer 2018, pp. 54-60.

Himmelfreundpointner, Rainer (2017a): The Ambassador's Summit #3: 'Clearing the borders is no sustainable solution to the problem of migration', *Cercle Diplomatique* 1/2017, pp. 46-51.

Himmelfreundpointner, Rainer (2017b): H.E. Vasilka Poposka Trenevska: 'Macedonia remains committed to a solution to the 'Name Issue' with Greece', *Cercle Diplomatique* 3/2017, pp. 59-61.

Himmelfreundpointner, Rainer (2016a): Im Gleichschritt marsch? Forward march?, *Cercle Dipolmatique* 4/2016, pp. 68-73.

Himmelfreundpointner, Rainer (2016b): The Ambassador's Summit # 2: 'Do we have a migration challenge? We do. Can we solve it? Yes!, Interview with the Swedish Ambassador to Austria, H.E. Helen Eduards, and the Canadian Ambassador to Austria, H.E. Mark Bailey, *Cercle Diplomatique* 3/2016, September-November 2016, pp. 46-49.

Himmelfreundpointner, Rainer (2015): 'There is no patent remedy for the refugee crisis', *Circle Diplomatique* 4/2015, pp. 68-69.

Hope, Kerin (2016): Greek push to focus on migration 'hotspots' bears fruit on Leros, *Financial Times*, February 15th, 2016, p. 3.

Howorth, Jolyon (2000): European Integration and Defence: The Ultimate Challenge?, Chaillot Papers No 43, Institute for Security Studies / Western European Union (WEU), Paris, November 2000.

Hultqvist, Peter (2017): The need to up security cooperation in the EU, *Defense News*, December 11th, 2017, p. 16.

Humer, Matthias, Campbell, Conor (2016), Refugees and Brexit test Europe's frontiers, in: Scope. An Alpbach Media Academy Publication. European Forum Alpbach, September 2016, pp. 7-9.

Hutton, Will (2016): Leaving EU will cause real pain, *The Guardian Weekly*, September 2nd, 2016, p. 21.

Hwee, Yeo Lay (2018): The EU's and ASEAN's Responses to 'Multilateralism' in a Changing World, in: Christian Echle, Patrick Rueppel, Magha Sarmah, Yeo Lay Hwee, Multilateralism in a Changing World Order, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, Singapore, pp. 49-58.

Ischinger, Wolfgang (2015): Why is this panel necessary?, in: *Security Community* (The OSCE Magazine), Issue 1/2015, p. 30.

Jandl, Gerhard (2016): 20 Years of Austrian Partnership with NATO. Record and Outlook, *Politorbis* 1/2016, No. 61, Zeitschrift zur Aussenpolitik / Revue de politique étrangère/Rivista di politica estera, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (Directorate of Political Affairs, Division for Security Policy), pp. 75-80.

Jankowitsch, Peter (2016): Europe: from integration to disintegration, *Cercle Diplomatique* 3/2016, pp. 52-53.

Jerdén, Björn, Bohman, Viking (2019): China´s propaganda campaign in Sweden, 2018-2019, published by the Swedish Institute of International Affairs, UI Brief 4/2019.

Kapanadze, Sergi, Kühn, Uli, Richter, Wolfgang, Zellner, Wolfgang (2016): Stauts-neutral Arms Control: Promises and Pitfalls, *Security Community* (The OSCE Magazine), Issue 3/2016, pp. 8-9.

Kington, Tom (2018): Leonardo to head up EU naval drone program, *Defense News*, January 22nd, 2018, p. 10.

Kington, Tom (2015): Peace Prospects Fade as Libya Chaos Deepens, *Defense News*, February 23rd, 2015, p. 6.

Knowlton, Brian (2010): Gates Calls European Mood a Danger to Peace, The New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/24/world/europe/24nato.html?pagewanted=print February 24th 2010 [27/6/11]

Klimas, Jacqueline, O'Brien, Connor (2017): U.S. missile shiled not yet ready for North Korean nukes, in: *Politico*, Updated 07/05/2017,

http://www.politico.com/story/2017/07=05/north-korea-missile-defense-240246 [13/7/17]

Klug, Gerald (2014): Minister's Preface, in: Erwin A. Schmidl and Christine H. Young: Österreich: 55 Jahre Teilnahme an internationalen Einsätzen / Austria: 55 Years Participation in International Operations, edited by the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports, Vehling Medienservice und Verlag, Graz 2014, p. 3.

Kyivpost (2016): OSCE releases the 12-point protocol agreements reached between Ukraine, Russia and separatists in Minsk, 8 September 2014 3:49 p.m, http://www.kyivpost.com/opinion/op-ed/osce-releases-the-12-point-protocol-agreements-reached-between-Ukraine-Russia-and-separatists-in-Minsk [17/11/14].

Krastev, Ivan (2015): How to Avoid Europe's Disintegration, *New Eastern Europe*, September-October No 5 (XVIII) 2015, pp. 7-12.

Lachowski, Zdzisław (2009): The CFE Treaty one year after its suspension: A forlorn treaty?, *SIPRI Policy Brief*, Stockholm, January 2009.

Lahodynsky, Otmar (2002): The Changing Face of Austrian Neutrality, NATO Online library WEB Edition No. 6 – Dec 1992, Vol. 40 – p. 24-28. Updated: 16-Apr-2002, http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1992/9206-5.htm [13/1/03]

Lake, Brian William (2001): Irish Neutrality and the Common Foreign and Security Policy: An Analsysis, Department of Political Science, Memorial University of Newfoundland, September 2001.

Lassinantti, Gunnar (2001): Small States and Alliances – A Swedish Perspective, in: Erich Reiter and Heinz Gärtner (eds.), Small States and Alliances, Edition Physica, Heidelberg 2001, pp. 101-111.

Leidenmühler, Franz (2015): Neutralität und EU: Spagat oder Symbiose?, *Die Presse*, June 25th, 2015, p. 30.

Lynch, Justin (2018): Who's Who in NATO: Cyber Ambiguity. NATO's digital defense in doubt amid unstable alliances, *Defense News*, July 16th, 2018, pp. 12 and 14.

Mahr, Krista (2017): Flight Risk. Why the EU is spending billions to convince Africans not to come to Europe, *Newsweek*, September, 1st 2017, pp. 12-13.

Mankoff, Jeffrey (2014): Russia's Latest Land Grab. How Putin Won Crimea and Lost Ukraine, *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2014, pp. 60-68.

Marton, Kati (2016): Hungary's authoritarian descent, *International New York Times*, November 4th, 2014, p. 6.

Mehta, Aaron (2018): NATO to launch formal training mission in Iraq, *Defense News*, February 19th, 2018, p. 12.

Mehta, Aaron (2017): Interview: Peter Hultqvist, Swedish Minister of Defense, *Defense News*, June 12th, 2017, pp. 18-19.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs (1995): Security in a changing world. Guidelines for Finland's security policy, Report by the Council of State to the Parliament June 6th, 1995.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Republic of Poland (2016): Warsaw NATO Summit 2016. IAR dispatch. Minister Witold Waszczykowski: we react to growing Russian threat, July 8th, 2016.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (2013), United Nations Handbook 2013-14, Wellington, New Zealand, Fifty-first edition.

Missiroli, Antonio (2016): Foreword, in: Anderson, Jan Joel, Biscop, Sven, Giegerich, Bastian, Mölling, Christian (2016): Envisioning European Defence. Five Futures. *Chaillot Papers* N o 137, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris, March 2016, pp. 5-7.

Mogherini, Federica (2016): Foreword, in: European Union (2016): Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy, June 2016, pp 3-5.

Mogherini, Federica (2013): Preparing the December 2013 European Council on Security and Defence. Interim Report by the High Representative, Brussels, July 24th, 2013.

Molin, Karl (2000): The Central Issues of Swedish Neutrality Policy, in: Gehler, Michael; Steininger, Rolf (eds.), The Neutrals and the European Integration 1945-1995, Institut für Zeitgeschichte der Universität Innsbruck, Arbeitskreis Europäische Integration. Historische Forschungen. Veröffentlichungen Band 3, Böhlau Publishing, Wien-Köln-Weimar, pp. 261-275.

Müller. Nina Julia (2012): External Influences in the Cyprus Conflict: Help or Hindrance? The Role of the European Union, in: Müller, Nina Julia: The Cyprus Conflict and the Role of the European Union, in: *Südosteuropa Mitteilungen*, Nr 05-06/2012, pp. 127-136.

Murray, Douglas (2017): The Strange Death of Europe. Immigration, Identity, Islam, Bloomsbury Continuum, London / New York.

Naegele, Jolyon (2004): Russia: Austria' s Neutral Status Resurfaces With Putin Visit, *Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty*, n.d. http://www.rferl.org/nca/features/2001/02/08022001111948.asp [11/11/04]

NATO (2018a): Resolute Support Mission (RSM): Key Facts and Figures, June 2018.

NATO (2018b): Chairman's statement on NATO-Ukraine following the emeting of the North Atlantic Council with Georgia and Ukriane at the Brussels Summit, July 12th, 2018, Press Release (2018)098, Issued on July 12th, 2018, last updated: July 12th, 2018 10:58.

NATO (2018c): NATO's Command Structure, February 2018.

NATO (2018d): Military organisation and structures, Last updated: May 25th, 2018 15:03.

NATO (2018e): 'The Atlantic Charter'. Declaration of Principles issued by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, August 14th, 1941 / Last updated: July 2nd, 2018 13.58 hours.

NATO (2017): International Military Staff, Last updated: June 15th, 2017 13:44.

NATO (2016a): NATO Ballistic Missile Defence, Fact Sheet, July 2016.

NATO (2016b): Operation Sea Guardian, Last updated: Oct. 27th, 2016 11:16.

NATO (2015): Rapid Deployable Corps. Commanding NATO troops on missions wherever necessary, Last updated: Nov. 9th, 2015 13:24.

NATO (2012a): Deterrence and Defence Posture Review, NATO Chicago Summit, 20th May 2012, Press Release (2012) 063.

NATO (2012b): Chicago Summit Declaration, Issued by the heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Chicago on May 20th, 2012, Press release (2012) 062.

NATO (2011): NATO-EU: a strategic partnership, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49217.htm [30/9/11]

NATO (2008): NATO in Afghanistan, http://www.nato.int/issues/afghanistan/index.html [4/2/08]

NATO (2007): Russian ship prepares to support NATO's Operation Active Endeavour, 3-24 September 2007, http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2007/09-septemebr/e0903a.html [11/8/07]

NATO (2006): Individual Partnership Action Plans. Last updated: May 19th, 2005 15:33 http://ww.nato.int/issues/ipap/index.html [20/5/06]

NATO (2005a): Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI). Last updated: June 24th, 2005 9:48, Reaching out to the broader Middle East, http://www.nato.int/issues/ici/index.html [24/6/05]

NATO (2005b): NATO starts airlifting African Union troops to Darfur, NATO Update, Updated: July 7th, 2005, http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2005/07/-july/e0701a.htm [9/7/05]

NATO (2004): NATO-EU chronology, Last updated: July 29th, 2004 10:44, http://www.nato.int/issues/nato-eu/chronology.html [5/12/04]

NATO Kosovo Force (2017): NATO's Role in Kosovo, http://jfcnaples.nato.int/kfor/about-us/welcome-to-kfor/natos-role-in-kosovo [8/2/17]

NATO Kosovo Force (2016): Multinational Specialized Unit, http://jfcnaples.nato.int/kfor/about-us/units/msu [20/5/16]

NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence (2018): NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence hosted a flag rising ceremony, 3rd September 2018 21:53.

Neuhold, Hanspeter (1992): The European Neutrals in the 1990s. New Challenges and Opportunities, ed. Hanspeter Neuhold, Westview Press, Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford.

Newdick, Thomas (2008): As Typhoons Arrive, Austria Seeks Jet Trainers, Euro Cooperation, in: Defense News International, September 8th, 2008, p. 11.

Niinistö, Jussi (2018): Cooperation based on on shared interest, *Defense News*, December 10th, 2018, p. 12.

Nikitin, Alexander (2004): Partners in peacekeeping, NATO Review, winter 2004,
http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2004/issue4/english/special.html
[5/3/05]

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2018): Brussels Summit Declaration, Issued by the Heads of Sate and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Brussels, July 11th -12th, 2018, Press Release PR (2018)074.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2017a): NATO-Russia Council, Last updated: June 16th, 2017 15:25, http://www.nato.int/cps/it/natohq/topics_50091.htm [14/7/17]

North Atlantic Tretay Organization (2017b): EADRCC's Consequence Management Exercise 'BOSNA I HERCEGOVINA 2017', NATO Press Office, September 11th, 2017.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2017c): NATO Secretary-General welcomes new US South Asia strategy, Press release PR (2017) 126, August 22nd, 2017.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2014a): NATO's relations with Austria, Last updated: Mar. 10th, 2014 16:40, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_48901.htm [25/6/15]

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2014b): Wales Summit Declaration, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Wales, 5th Sept. 2014, Press Release (2014)120, Issued on 5th Sept. 2014, Last updated Sept. 29th, 2014 09:56.

Nougayrède, Natalie (2016): Europe's identity crisis is the problem, *The Guardian Weekly*, November 4th, 2016, p. 19.

NTI (2014): Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), Signed: 19 November 1990. Entered into force: 9 November 1992, http://www.nti.org/treaties-and-regimes/treaty-conventional-armed-forces-europe-cfe/ [7/5/14]

O'Dwyer (2017), Gerard: NATO on cyberattacks; Article 5, *Defense News*, June 12th, 2017, p. 9.

O'Dwyer, Gerard (2016): US Supports Drive for Nordic Defense Cooperation, *Defense News International*, May 23rd, 2016, p. 12.

O'Dwyer, Gerard (2014): Russia's Aggression Spurs Sweden To Boost Spending, Acquire New Capabilities, *Defense News*, May 5th, 2014, p. 4.

O'Dwyer, Gerard (2013): AFC: Sweden Can't Defend Itself More Than One Week, *Defense News*, January 14th, 2013, p. 14.

O'Dwyer, Gerard (2012): No NATO-Like Alliance For Nordic, Baltic Nations, *Defense News*, September 10th, 2012, p. 23.

OSCE (2016): The OSCE in Ukraine, in: Security Community, Issue 3/2016, pp. 4-5.

OSCE (2015): Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation, http://www.osce.org/networks/1111472 [15/9/15]

OSCE (2013): Who we are. Signing of the Helsinki Final Act, http://www.osce.org/who/43960 [8/5/13]

OSCE (2011): *OSCE Magazine*, Issue Number 2/2011.

Pecastaing, Camille (2017): Pathways to Crisis, *The American Interest*, Vol XIII, No. 2, November/December 2017, pp. 7-14.

Paile, Sylvan, Gell, Harald (eds.) (2013): IMAF 2013: Lessons Learnt from the International Miliatry Academic Forum 2013, Publication of the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria, Armed Forces Printing Centre, Vienna, November 2013.

Peel, Michael (2018): US dashes Europe hopes to relief from Iran sanctions, *Fincancial Times*, July 16th, 2018, p. 1.

Peers, Steve (2009): Analysis. Lisbon Treaty Guarantees for Ireland, University of Essex, June 19th, 2009.

Penttilä, Risto E.J. (1999): 'Non-alignment – Obsolete in Today's Europe?,' in, Mathias Jopp and Hanna Ojanen (eds.), The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Institut für Europäische Politik Bonn, and WEU Institute for Security Studies, Kauhava 1999, pp. 167-187.

Permanent Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2018): New NATO Joint Support and Enabling Command in Ulm, https://nato.diplo.de/nat-en-aktuelles/-/2107338 , June 14th, 2018 [4/9/18]

Permanent Mission of Finland to the OSCE, Vienna (2013): Institutions and bodies of the OSCE, http://www.finlandosce.org/public/default.aspx?nodeid=38949&contentlan=2&culture=en-US [8/5/13]

Periotto, Costanzo (Brigadier General) (2011): The 15th anniversary of the Arms Control Agreement in South-Eastern Europe, in: *OSCE Magazine* 2/2011, pp. 27-28.

Perruche, Jean-Paul (2006): The European Union Military Staff on Its Way Ahead, *Truppendienst* 1/2006, pp. 6-9.

Phillips, Leigh (2011): EU wins new powers at UN, transforming global body, EU observer, 03.05.11 22:03, http://euobserver.com/24/32262 [5/10/2011]

Pigman, Lincoln (2019): To Understand the INF Treaty´s Denmise, Look tot he US Republican Party, RUSI Commentary, Royal United Services Intitute (RUSI), London, February 8th, 2019.

Rachman, Gideon (2018): Trump's ideas are coherent, radical and bad, *Financial Times*, July 17th, 2018, p. 9.

Rachman, Gideon (2013): Disarmed Europe will face the world alone. One day Europeans may find that the US military is not there to deal with threats lapping at their frontiers, *Financial Times*, 18th February 2013 7:33 pm, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/b4c057d0-79be-11e2-9015-00144feabdc0.html [19/2/13]

Regulation (2016): Regulation (EU) 2016/1624 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 September 2016 on the European Border and Coast Guard and amending Regulation (EU) 2016/399 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repeling Regulation (EC) No 863/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Council Regulation (EC) No 2007/2004 and Council Decision 2005/267/EC, Official Journal of the Euroepan Union, L251, September 16th, 2016.

Rehrl, Jochen and Weisserth, Bernhard (eds.) (2012): Handbook CSDP. The Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union. Second Edition, Armed Forces Printing Centre, Vienna.

Reichard, Martin (2006): The EU-NATO Relationship. A Legal and Political Perspective, Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot (UK) and Burlington (Vt)

Report of the Austrian Armed Forces Reform Commission (2004), Vienna: Preface by Helmut Zilk, Cair of the Commission.

Republic of Austria (2013a): Austrian Security Strategy – Security in a new decade – Shaping Security, Federal Chancellery of Austria, Federal Ministry of Interior, Federal Ministry of Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs, Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports, Editor: Federal Chancellery of the Republic of Austria, Department IV – Coordination, Division IV/6 – Security Policy Affairs, Vienna, July 2013.

Republic of Austria (2013b): Austrian Cyber Security Strategy, Vienna, March 2013.

Sansone, Kurt (2002): As Russia and U.S. join hands, Karmenu embraces neutrality, *Malta Today*, June 2nd, 2002.

Schmidl, Erwin A./Young, Christine H., Österreich: 55 Jahre Teilnahme an internationalen Einsätzen / Austria: 55 Years Participation in International Operations, edited by the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports, Vehling Medienservice und Verlag, Graz 2014.

Security Community (The OSCE Magazine) (2016): Not a crisis about migration: a crisis about the governance of migration, in: *Security Community* (The OSCE Magazine), Issue 1/2016, p. 29.

Ségur-Cabanac, Christian (2006): Austria's Strategic Objectives for Foreign Missions of her Armed Forces, *Truppendienst International Edition* 1/2006, http://www.bmlv.gv.at/truppendienst/international/artikel.php?id=26 [9/6/08]

Simon, Jeffrey (2005): NATO Expeditionary Operations: Impacts Upon New Members and Partners, Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, *Occasional Paper* No. 1, Washington D.C., March 2005.

Simonet, Loïc (2012): Open Skies: successes and uncertainties of an iconic post-Cold War instrument, in: *OSCE Magazine* 1/2012, pp. 18-21.

Solana, Javier (2000): Where does the EU stand on Common Foreign and security Policy?, Speech at the Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik, Berlin, November 14th, 2000.

Sprenger, Sebastian (2018a): Germany and 2 percent for defense – it's complicated, in: Defense News, March 5th, 2018, p. 8.

Sprenger, Sebastian (2018b): How a US Senator came to embrace a European army, in: *Defense News*, March 5th, 2018, p. 6.

Sprenger, Sebastian (2018c): EU wants a way to move military equipment in a hurry, in: *Defense News*, April 9th 2018, p. 8.

Starlinger, Hans, Fuchshuber, Michael (2008): European Defence Agency. Building Capabilities for a Secure Europe, Information zur EDA, Bundesministerium für Landesverteidigung und Sport, Sektion II, Abteilung Wissenschaft, Forschung und Entwicklung, Wien (Vienna).

Stenner, Christina (2016): Teaming Up with Insider Mediators, *Security Community* (The OSCE Magazine), Issue 3/2016, pp. 14-15.

Stiglitz, Joseph E (2016): The Euro and its Threat to the Future of Europe. Allen Lane, an imprint of Penguin Books, London.

Stoltenberg, Jens (2017): Spend more, and smarter, on defense to preserve peace, *Defense News*, December 11th, 2017, p. 10.

Sutherland, Peter D. (2016): A Moral Opportunity, in: *Security Community* (The OSCE Magazine), Issue 1/2016, pp. 15-18.

The Economist (2019): The paper Euro-army, *The Economist*, February 2nd, 2019, pp. 21-22.

The Economist (2018a): Crossing continents, *The Economist*, August 25th, 2018, pp. 14-15.

The Economist (2018b): Elections in Egypt. Apathy and anger, *The Economist*, February 17th, 2018, p. 34 and 35.

The Economist (2018c): Rusty armed forces, *The Economist*, February 24th, 2018, p. 5.

The Economist (2018d): Spain and separatism, The long arm, *The Economist*, March 31st, 2018, p. 30.

The Economist (2018e): Russia and NATO: Outgunned, *The Economist*, March 10th, 2018, p. 26.

The Economist (2018f): Climate and national security: Unchanging, *The Economist*, February 24th, 2018, p. 31.

The Economist (2018g): Ditching the Iran deal: Nuclear fallout, *The Economist*, May 12th, 2018, pp. 35-36.

The Economist (2018h): NATO summit. Tetchy Trump, *The Economist*, July 14th, 2018, p. 27.

The Economist (2016a): High wall, narrow sea, *The Economist*, November 14th, 2015, p. 29.

The Economist (2016b): Looking for a home, *The Economist*, Special Report Migration, May 28th, 2016.

The Economist (2016c): The ungovernables, *The Economist*, September 3rd, 2016, p. 29.

The Economist (2016d): The future of the EU. Now what?, *The Economist*, September 3rd, 2016, p. 22.

The Economist (2016e): Special Report: The Arab World. The war within, *The Economist*, May 14th, 2016.

The Economist (2016f): The nuclear deal with Iran: The end of the beginning, *The Economist*, January 16th, 2016, p. 36-37.

The Economist (2015a): For those in peril, *The Economist*, April 25th, 2015, pp. 18-21.

The Economist (2015b): Europe's boat people, *The Economist*, April 25th, 2015, p. 9.

The Economist (2012): Special Report The Arctic, *The Economist*, June 16th, 2012.

The Guardian Weekly (2017a): Cyprus talks end without a solution, *The Guardian Weekly*, June 2nd, 2017, p. 2.

The Guardian Weekly (2017b): Russia-EU relations in 'deep' crisis, *The Guardian Weekly*, October 6th, 2017, p. 2.

The High Representative (2013): Preparing the December 2013 European Council on Security and Defence, Interim Report by the High Represnetative, Brussels, July 24th, 2013.

The New York Times International (2017): Can Russia Make Peace, or Just War?, *The New York Times International*, January 2nd, 2017, p. 10.

The White House (2016): Fact Sheet: NATO Warsaw Summit, Washington, July 8th, 2016.

Thiele, Ralph D. (2012): Smart Defense in the 21st Century, *The Korean Journal of Security Affairs*, Research Institute for National Security Affairs, Korean National Defense University, Volume 17, Number 1, Seoul, June 2012, pp. 83-99.

Tran, Pierre / Chuter, Andrew (2011), U.K., France Vault to Center of EuroDefense, *Defense News*, April 11th, 2011, p. 1 and 14.

Treaty on European Union (2010): Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union, Official Journal of the European Union, C83/13, March 30th, 2010; Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Official Journal of the European Union, C83/47, March 30th, 2010.

Trilling, Daniel (2018): Migrant fear has deadly price for Europe, *The Guardian Weekly*, July 6th, 2018, p. 18.

UNIFIL (2015), United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, Fact Sheet, http.//www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unifil/mandate.shtml [2/6/2015]

Union for the Mediterranean (2012): About the UfM, Press Release.

United Nations General Assembly (1970): Declaration on Principles of International Law Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (General Assembly, 1883rd plenary meeting, October 24th, 1970)

United Nations Organization (2018): How we are funded, https://peacekeeping.un.org [31/8/18]

United Nations Organization (2014): Financing peacekeeping, http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/financing.shtml [5/5/14]

United Nations Organization (2010a): United Nations Peacekeeping, http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/ [16/7/10]

United Nations Organization (2010b): United Nations Peacekeeping. Mission Statement of the Department of peacekeeping Operations, http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/info/mission.shtml [16/7/10]

United States Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe – The Helsinki Commission (2003): OSCE, Washington.

Van Ham, Peter (2006): EU, NATO, OSCE – Interaction, Cooperation and Confrontation, in: Gunther Hauser and Franz Kernic (eds.), Handbuch zur europäischen Sicherheit, Peter Lang Publishing, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 155-168.

Von Arx, Pierre (2012): Vienna Document 2011. Achievements and prospects fur further updates, *OSCE Magazine* 1/2012, pp. 9-11.

Wallace, William (2013): The UK Perspective in advance of the December 2013 European Council, in: Gross, Eva and Menon, Anand (eds.), CSDP between internal constraints and external challenges, *ISSUE Report* No. 17, EU Institute for Security Studies, Paris, October 2013, pp 11-18.

Weisserth, Hans-Bernhard (2014): Foreword, in: European Security and Defence College, Handbook for Decision Makers. The Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union, edited by Jochen Rehrl, Publication of the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria, published by the Directorate for Security Policy of the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria, Armed Forces Printing Centre, Vienna, p. 11.

Weisserth, Hans-Bernhard (2013): Foreword, in: Paile, Sylvan, Gell, Harald (eds.) (2013): IMAF 2013: Lessons Learnt from the International Military Academic Forum 2013, Publication oft the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria, Armed Forces Printing Centre, Vienna, November 2013, p. 8.

Wintour, Patrick (2016): Obama urges a united Europe, *The Guardian Weekly*, 29th April 2016, p. 10.

Wolf, Martin (2015): A refugee crisis that Europe cannot escape, *Financial Times online*, 22nd September 2015 6:18 pm, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/0/3967804c-604b-11e5-a28b-50226830d644.html [23/9/15]

Zannier, Lamberto (2016): *Security Community* (The OSCE Magazine), Issue 1/2016, p. 3.

Zecha, Wolfgang (2015): Austrian Security Policy Documents – a Walk on a Tightrope between Neutrality and International Solidarity, in: *AARMS* (Academic and Applied Research in Military and Public Management Science), Volume 14, Issue 14/2015, Scientific Journal of the National University of Public Service, Budapest 2015, pp. 317-330.

Zinkanell, Michael, Hainzl, Gerald (2017): Transforming Violent Conflicts in Africa – Challenges and Strategies, in: Gerald Hainzl and Walter Feichtinger (2017): Transforming Violent Conflicts in Africa, Schriftenreihe der Landesverteidigungsakademie, Band 5/2017, Republic of Austria / Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports, Vienna, February 2017, pp. 9-15.

Biography

Gunther Hauser, M.A. (political science/international law, University of Innsbruck), Ph.D. (political science/constitutional law, University of Salzburg) is Head of the Section International Security, senior researcher and lecturer at the Institute for Strategy and Security Policy (ISS), National Defence Academy, Vienna. In 2006, Dr. Hauser began lecturing at the Center for European Integration at Danube University Krems and was appointed Vice President of the Scientific Forum on International Security at the German Armed Forces Command and Staff College in Hamburg. Since 2014, he has held the title of honorary professor and member of the scientific board of the Department for Business Law and European Integration at Danube University Krems.

Band 12 / 2019

The security architecture in Europe has rapidly changed since the end of the Cold War. Since 2015, the fear of immigration is poisoning Western politics. Thus, in the second half of 2018, the third Austrian EU Presidency of the Council took place during a rather challenging period – Brexit, immigration, and the debate about the future of the EU in general. This book aims at analysing the state of the EU and particularly those international organisations which are formative for (Western and Central) European security. Moreover, Austria's role within the European security architecture is comprehensively analysed. The status of EU neutral and non-aligned member states is also debated. The book is based on official documents as well as on academic studies and public debates and shall contribute to a better understanding of inter(b)locking processes within the institution-building of European security.

ISBN: 978-3-903121-54-6