



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 27 June 2011**

**11631/1/11  
REV 1**

**LIMITE**

**CIVCOM 309  
COSDP 596  
PESC 783  
RELEX 660  
JAI 428  
PROCIV 84**

**COVER NOTE**

---

**From:** European External Action Service  
**To:** Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CivCom)  
**Subject:** Revised draft CIVCOM advice on Promoting Synergies between the EU Civil and Military Capability Development - Final report on the outcomes of Phase 2 of the Workplan

---

Delegations will find herewith a revised draft CIVCOM advice on "Promoting Synergies between the EU Civil and Military Capability Development - Final report on the outcomes of Phase 2 of the Workplan" (doc. 9850/11 of 17 May 2011).

**Encl.:** EEAS document ARES (2011) 752716.

# EUROPEAN EXTERNAL ACTION SERVICE



**Crisis Management and  
Planning Department (CMPD)**

**Brussels, 27 June 2011**

**ARES (2011) 752716**

**LIMITE**

## **NOTE**

---

From: Crisis Management and Planning Department (CMPD)  
To: Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management

---

Subject: Revised Draft CIVCOM advice on Promoting Synergies between the EU Civil and Military Capability Development - Final report on the outcomes of Phase 2 of the Workplan

---

Delegations will find herewith a revised draft CIVCOM advice on "Promoting Synergies between the EU Civil and Military Capability Development - Final report on the outcomes of Phase 2 of the Workplan" (doc. 9850/11 of 17 May 2011).

## Revised DRAFT CIVCOM ADVICE

### INTRODUCTION

1. On 16 November 2009, the Council agreed a document on the promotion of synergies between the EU civil and military capability development (doc. 15475/09). On 21 May 2010, the Political and Security Committee (PSC) noted a related workplan (doc. 8499/10), together with advice and recommendations provided by the EU Military Committee (EUMC), the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CivCom) and the Political Military Group (PMG).
2. Phase 1 of the workplan was conducted from June to September 2010. Phase 2 was conducted from December 2010 to April 2011.
3. On 07 June 2011, CMPD presented the final report on **the outcomes of Phase 2 of the Workplan** (doc. 9850/11).
4. PSC tasked CIVCOM and EUMC to issue their respective advices and PMG to issue recommendations on this report.
5. CIVCOM discussed the report in its meetings of 09 (jointly with PMG) and 20 June and agreed the following advice in its meeting of 27 June.

### CONSIDERATIONS

#### *General considerations*

6. CIVCOM reiterated its strong support to the work on promoting synergies between the EU civil and military capability development and considered that the undertaking has reached an important milestone with the final report **on the outcomes of Phase 2 of the Workplan**, and in this regard welcomed this document as a good basis to develop further work with a view to achieving more operational and effective capabilities in crisis management.



## *Methodology*

7. CIVCOM recognised the effectiveness of the methodology applied so far to successfully take work forward and welcomed the involvement of Member States in the process.
8. CIVCOM underlined that the inclusive and flexible nature of this methodology have fostered very good collaboration and cooperation among experts from various EU entities as well as Member States. It created a dynamic with focus on a common goal and the momentum has to be maintained to successfully materialize expectations in terms of achievements.
9. CIVCOM considered that a similar methodology should be pursued beyond phase 2 and re-evaluated in 2012 in the light of a comprehensive assessment of the achievements subsequent to a one year implementation period from July 2011 to June 2012. During this period, reports to PSC should be made as required, based on deliverables when finalised.

## *Outcomes of Phase 2*

10. CIVCOM noted with satisfaction progress achieved on the first series of 16 actions and acknowledged the potential for synergies of the 15 additional actions identified by the experts panels and presented in the final report.

## *Way ahead beyond Phase 2*

11. CIVCOM considered that all relevant EU entities and Member States should strive to commit adequate civilian and military expertise to allow conducting further work on all actions in parallel, while recognising their different implementation timelines based upon their specific nature. Difficulties encountered in this regard should be reported to PSC as appropriate.
12. CIVCOM recalled the importance for relevant Committees and Working Groups as well as Member States to remain closely involved in the follow-up work. In this connection, CIVCOM stressed that an adequate participatory approach based on inclusiveness should be sought and transparent planning as well as adequate reporting should be guaranteed. These would facilitate the tracking for Member States and most importantly, facilitate their active participation notably as regards scarce expertise.

13. In this respect, CIVCOM welcomed the establishment of Action Implementation Teams to further elaborate the actions and acknowledged the central role of CMPD in overseeing and coordinating work. Experts Panels should be put to a dormant status when not working on specific actions.
14. In order to facilitate decisions by Member States in the applicable fora, Action Implementation Teams should provide sufficient detail. This detail should include, inter alia, analysis and justification of the requirement; consideration of different options for meeting the requirement; and estimates of potential human and financial resource implications. Action Implementation Teams should also specify potential interactions with existing processes and structures, in order to demonstrate added value and prevent duplication.
15. CIVCOM stressed that Action Implementation Teams are under the overall political guidance of the PSC. They are to conduct work in full respect of decision-making processes applicable to the specific actions as well as the roles of relevant Committees and Working Groups. An agreement to launch further work on developing a potential action does not imply a decision to also implement the outcomes suggested.
16. CIVCOM underlined that the undertaking should yield concrete outcomes, which can materialize and offer value for money. CIVCOM furthermore stressed that, albeit work aims to provide opportunities to be more efficient, it should not lead to the establishment of new funding mechanisms or working bodies.
17. CIVCOM underlined that the list of actions presented in the final report may not be exhaustive and that, in taking work forward, there might be opportunities to identify new actions and investigate possible synergies between CSDP and other foreign policy instruments. In this connection, CIVCOM noted that the expert panel on lessons learned identified such possible new action and proposed that further work on such a new broadened action should also be considered.
18. CIVCOM recalled that further work should take full account of existing frameworks for specific projects (e.g. Global Monitoring for Environment and Security - GMES) as well as work on similar issues ongoing elsewhere (e.g. Commission-led work and EDA work on Unmanned Aircraft Systems - UAS).

## RECOMMENDATIONS

19. CIVCOM recommends that PSC agree work to be taken forward on the basis of the above considerations, and in particular to agree to launch further work on the 15 new potential actions presented in the report. This agreement to launch further work on developing potential actions does not imply a decision to also implement the outcomes suggested.

---