



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 20 September 2011

14277/11

LIMITE

**CSDP/PSDC 542
COSDP 853**

COVER NOTE

from: EEAS
date of receipt: 20 September 2011
to: Delegations
Subject: MILEX 11 Final Exercise Report

Delegations will find attached the EEAS document with reference EUMS 11753/11.

Encl.: EUMS 11753/11

EUROPEAN EXTERNAL ACTION SERVICE



EUROPEAN UNION MILITARY STAFF

Brussels, 20 September 2011

EUMS 11753/11

LIMITE

**CSDP/PSDC
COSDP**

NOTE

From: European Union Military Staff

To: European Union Military Committee

No. Prev. doc.: –

Subject: MILEX 11 Final Exercise Report

Delegations will find attached the MILEX 11 Final Exercise Report (FER), which was agreed by the EUMC on Wednesday 14 September 2011.

Distribution

External CEUMC
Military Representatives to the European Union Military Committee
CEUMCWG
CEUMCWG/HTF
CION - J. Perez

Info Cabinet HR - A. Guitton, J. Morrison
EEAS Corporate Board - P. Vimont, D. O'Sullivan, H. Schmid, M. Popowski
EEAS Counsellor - R. Cooper
EEAS MD for Crisis Response and Operational Coordination - A. Miozzo
EEAS Director Conflict Prevention and Security Policy - R. Wright
EEAS Security Policy Division - J. Tasso Vilallonga, D. Teilane
PSC Chair - O. Skoog
PMG Chair - B. Versmessen, A. Farrou
CIVCOM Chair - M-M. Leinonen
Nicolaidis Chair - S. Herrmann, C. Csernelhazi
CMPD - W. Stevens, J. Alhadeff, D. Lenoir, V. Cody, R. Barker, J. Korhonen, P. Seailles
CPCC - H. Haber, K. Deane, B. Loeser
SITCEN - I. Salmi
DGA 4 - K. Freidberg

Internal D list

References:

- A. MILEX 11 Draft Exercise Specification, EUMC Mtg doc 8/11, dated 14 April 2011.
- B. MILEX 11 Exercise Instructions, EUMC doc 9476/11, dated 28 April 2011.
- C. MILEX 11 First Impression Reports, dated 01 July 2011.

A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION

1. As agreed in the Exercise Programme 2011-2015, MILEX 11 took place from 16 to 27 May 2011, with DGEUMS as the Official Conducting the Exercise (OCE).
2. The exercise involved the following:
 - a. The training audience was composed of the EU FCdr and his EU FHQ, including primary and additional augmentees from Member States.
 - b. The other participants in the exercise were: the EUMS, an EU OHQ RC, located in the EU OPSCEN, and the EU Satellite Centre. In addition specific and focused expertise from the EU civilian actors was provided (in line with the agreed OHQ RC and FHQ manning guides). The EU Watch Keeping Capability (WKC) was also involved as a player in the exercise.
 - c. A DISTAFF was set up for the conduct of the exercise, including augmentees from MS and a representative of CMPD. CPCC and the Commission were represented on an on-call basis.
 - d. The LO to UN in New York was integrated into the Central DISTAFF Element.
3. The exercise focused on the interaction between an EU OHQ, represented by a Response Cell, and an EU FHQ in an EU-led military operation without recourse to NATO common assets and capabilities. It was planned and conducted in accordance with the Exercise Specifications (EXSPECs) as agreed by the EUMC on 14 April 2011.

B. DURATION OF THE EXERCISE

4. For the EU FHQ, 10 complete working days to conduct the Orientation and Concept Development phases proved to be sufficient.

5. In order to ensure that the exercise began at the right tempo and to build-up a sufficient background for all participants, a Work Up Staff Training (WUST) was conducted at different levels:
 - From 11 to 13 May, EU OHQ RC focused on EU procedures and exercise documentation.
 - On 16 and 17 May, DISTAFF, EU OHQ RC and EU FHQ carried out internal staff training and STARTEX-oriented preparation.

C. ACHIEVEMENT OF THE EXERCISE AIM AND OBJECTIVES

6. The aim of MILEX 11 was to exercise and evaluate military aspects of EU crisis management at the military strategic and especially at the operational level, based on a scenario for an envisaged EU-led military operation without recourse to NATO common assets and capabilities. The exercise was focusing on the interaction between the EU OHQ RC and the EU FHQ in an EU-led military operation. This aim and all exercise objectives were fully achieved.

D. EXERCISE PLANNING

7. Planning was carried out in accordance with the Exercise Planning Guide (EPG). Five Planning Meetings were held in the EUMCWG format: Pre-Initial, Initial, Central, Main and Final. A Manning Conference was held as part of the Central Planning Meeting. A CPT meeting took place in preparation of each of the Planning Meetings.
8. The time available for the exercise planning, approximately 14 months, was adequate for the development of the documents needed for the conduct. Nevertheless, due to the short-term announcement of the unavailability of the FR OHQ, the required amendments to the exercise documentation were incorporated immediately prior to the beginning of the conduct phase.
9. Due to a late withdrawal of the pre-identified EU OHQ (FR OHQ - Mont Valerien) which was announced during the Final Planning Meeting, EXSPECs and EXINSTs were adapted in a very short timeframe (one month), including the use of an EU OHQ RC; this concept was used for the first time in a EU exercise.
10. The necessary adaption of the planning documentation and the manning challenges concerning the EU OHQ RC could only be achieved through the full commitment of the EUMS, CMPD and Member States (MS).
11. As in previous years, a specific Internet website was set up for the exercise planning and conduct. The MILEX 11 Homepage allowed members of the CPT and representatives from Delegations to follow the evolution of the planning and to have access to updated documentation. During the conduct, the website was also used to inject media events.

Manning issues

12. The required manning identified for the exercise was almost completely met by DISTAFF, EU OHQ RC and EU FHQ. Nevertheless, certain shortfalls were identified, especially within the Specialist Staff in the EU OHQ RC (POLAD, LEGAD, Media Chief PIO, Gender Issues Advisor) and the unavailability of the POLAD during the second week in the EU FHQ.
13. The necessary professional experience, based on the functional background of the exercise participants, mostly matched their posts.
14. EU experience of participants in the exercise is depicted in the chart:

EXPERIENCE	DISTAFF	OHQ RC	FHQ	TOTAL
Familiar with Operational Planning	83.3 %	45.7 %	50 %	56 %
EU Foundation Training Course	33.3 %	28.6 %	45.5 %	34.7 %
Familiar with EU SOP	66.7 %	45.7 %	50 %	52 %
Previous participation in EU Exercises	50 %	48.6 %	40.9 %	46.7 %
Member of OHQ / FHQ	11.1 %	31.4 %	50 %	32 %

E. EXERCISE DOCUMENTATION ISSUES

15. The exercise documentation, based on the “ALISIA” scenario, has been improved to create a more complex scenario and a bigger challenge for the participating HQs. The use of a challenging scenario has contributed to the planning teams awareness of today's complex operations.
16. The planning documents were developed according to the schedule and their quality is assessed by the players to reflect those of real CSDP operations. As part of the exercise documentation the delivered Geo-Data reached a new level of quality, and the EU Satellite Centre provided excellent information for the HQs.
17. For MILEX 11 the cooperation between the EUMS and the EU SATCEN reached a very high standard; the Geo Data product was developed in great detail.

F. EXERCISE CONDUCT, INCLUDING PROBLEM AREAS EXPERIENCED

18. The training was not only limited to the scenario, especially in the EU OHQ RC. There were many examples of spontaneous additional training activities, to better explain some of the concepts and dimensions of this kind of operations.
19. The build-up of the EU OHQ RC was based on the procedures used for activation of the EU OPSCEN, and thus indirectly contributed to validating them.
20. The Mission Monitoring Team (MMT) was represented by a MMT Response Cell (as an integrated part of the Central DISTAFF), which highlighted the importance of this body for the planning at the political-strategic level.
21. At the outset some friction was experienced in the interaction between EU FHQ, EU OHQ RC and DISTAFF, due to a lack of a clear definition of the role of a EU OHQ RC in MILEX 11 and its integration in the exercise structure. However, clarification of this issue was achieved during the exercise.
22. Limited understanding of the EU OHQ and FHQ exact roles and functions in CSDP engagement interactions was observed, which had an impact on the conduct of the exercise. Closer liaison and coordination, throughout the whole timeframe would lead to a better awareness, especially at the operational level. Involving POLAD expertise on this at all levels , and for the whole duration of the conduct period, is a must.
23. The current EU HQ SOPs Book 2, concerning the planning process is based on the Guidelines for Operational Planning (GOP). This does not completely reflect the requirements of the comprehensive approach.
24. The creation of a common information environment between all levels involved in the planning process requires adequate planning tools. These tools are necessary in order to guarantee a timely information exchange and the appropriate information management.
25. The pre-exercise levels of training and knowledge of the Training Audience regarding EU procedures have been slightly improved in comparison with past exercises.

G. CIS AND INFO MANAGEMENT

26. All communication and information systems worked properly during the whole conduct of the exercise. Connectivity, including frequent VTCs, between all elements of the exercise was available throughout the exercise.

27. In particular the use of the Deployable Package (DP) was assessed as successful and met operational and technical CIS objectives. However, technical and procedural areas of improvement have been identified:
- the Security Accreditation procedures for the DP should be streamlined to be more efficient and pragmatic,
 - in view of the shelter procurement the DP configuration and infrastructure should be revised and checked in-line with the increasing requirements for EU-led Crisis Management Operations.
28. While operational and technical objectives for the DP have been met during MILEX 11, the conclusions from the organisational view are less than satisfactory. With the day-by-day support from the EUMS, the support to the DISTAFF, the OHQ RC and the deployed DP, the Military Security Administration Team (MILSAT) has already been working at its limits, although slightly reinforced by augmentees.
- Knowing that the level of ambition of real operations, requiring the support from the EUMS (day-by-day), OPSCEN (activated as OHQ) as well as two FHQs with two DPs each, is much higher than during MILEX 11, the experience from this exercise clearly underlines that CIS support (in particular manpower) in EUMS is inadequate for the required tasks.
29. Utilisation of the ELMA (EUMS Lessons Management Application) was achieved in support of the overall lessons collection process.
30. CAMEO training, provided by the agency European Dynamics, to the DISTAFF, OHQ RC and EU FHQ personnel, was helpful. The duration, one day for the EU FHQ and half a day for the remainder, is considered sufficient.

H. EXERCISE FINANCIAL ISSUES

31. The ATRIUM Accounting Software for the ATHENA financial and budgeting management was used for the first time for an EU Exercise. It provided a good training opportunity for the J8 personnel, however the generally positive effect was to some extent reduced by not having the previously envisaged OHQ. Prior to the conduct of the exercise, the OHQ RC and EU FHQ J8 personnel attended an ATRIUM training course provided by the ATHENA Team in Brussels.

I. OTHER ISSUES

32. Representatives from NATO were invited to and attended a briefing on the planning and conduct of the exercise in Brussels on 23 May, prepared by the DISTAFF.

J. RECOMMENDATIONS

33. The aim of MILEX 11, “to exercise and evaluate military aspects of EU crisis management” as stated in the EXSPEC has been fulfilled during the exercise. As highlighted in the EXINST, a generic Crisis Management Concept (CMC) also requires the contribution of multiple actors within the framework of the CSDP. This has to be taken into account during the preparation and conduct of future military exercises within CSDP framework.
34. While MILEX is first a military exercise, and given the opportunity provided by the creation of the EEAS, the participation of non-military actors during the active phase of the exercise should be expanded even further in the spirit of the EU comprehensive approach concept. POLAD, LEGAD/GENDAD, PIO and police specialists etc should take part in the whole active phase of future exercises. Furthermore both the Commission and the CPCC are encouraged to switch from on-call to a fully active role. Future MILEX scenario should be expanded to allow a full and challenging participation of non-military actors
35. The content of the EU HQs SOPs should be updated due to the need to cover the challenges of complex scenarios and reflect the EU comprehensive approach. Therefore a review of these procedures should be undertaken, particularly with regard to the operational planning process.
36. MS are encouraged to use the EU Training Guide to train designated personnel for future exercises as well as for operations.
37. The planning process should be supported by the use of appropriate and reasonably standardised planning tools.
38. The concept of OHQ response cell should be further developed. As operational constraints might require an OHQ response cell to be set up for an exercise in a very short timeframe, a host infrastructure should be pre-designated.