# Transatlantic Transformation:

## Building a NATO-EU Security Architecture

Frances G. Burwell
David C. Gompert
Leslie S. Lebl
Jan M. Lodal
Walter B. Slocombe

For further information about the Atlantic Council of the United States or its Program on Transatlantic Relations, please call (202) 778-4990.

Information on Atlantic Council programs and publications is available on the World Wide Web at http://www.acus.org

Requests or comments may be sent to info@acus.org

# THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL

## OF THE UNITED STATES

1101 15<sup>TH</sup> STREET NW, 11<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

# Table of Contents

# Foreword

The end of the Cold War has witnessed a fundamental reshaping of the transatlantic security agenda, and of the relationship between NATO and the European Union. In response to the new environment and changing threats, NATO has brought in new members and conducted combat missions far outside its traditional territory. The EU has developed its own security and defense policy and has deployed assets in a series of missions ranging from monitoring borders to peace enforcement. As the potential for overlap has grown, so has concern about the dangers of competition between NATO and the EU. While U.S. and European leaders have pledged many times to ensure that NATO and the EU work together, concrete examples of collaboration remain limited. In the United States, some view the EU's defense efforts as a way to encourage Europeans to take a greater role in providing for Europe's security, but others see the EU as an emerging competitor to NATO. Opinion in Europe is also divided, with the EU viewed either as a "counterweight" to the United States or as a key element of transatlantic security.

To explore the issue of NATO-EU relations, the Atlantic Council sent a delegation of senior defense and foreign policy analysts to Paris, London, and Brussels in the summer of 2005 to meet with representatives of governments, NATO, and the EU. The delegation was charged specifically with assessing the state of NATO-EU relations and identifying areas of potential cooperation. As NATO moves toward its November 2006 summit in Riga, the issue of how to transform the NATO-EU relationship into an effective partnership will be a key topic of debate. We at the Council hope that the conclusions and recommendations presented here will play a role in informing that discussion.

Jan M. Lodal
President, The Atlantic Council of the United States

# Transatlantic Transformation:
## Building a NATO-EU Security Architecture

## Executive Summary

Since 1989, the security environment facing the United States and its European allies has changed beyond recognition. The Soviet Union has disintegrated, as has the division of Europe between East and West, and new threats have arisen. The disintegration of Yugoslavia in the 1990s demonstrated that instability and war emerging from failing states could affect the peace and security of Europe. After 2001, global terrorism became the priority threat, especially when linked with the prospect of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

In response to these threats, NATO, as the primary transatlantic security organization, has taken on new tasks, brought in new members, and conducted missions far from its traditional theater of operations in Europe. Recognizing that its members can no longer be defended solely by military forces stationed at their borders, the Alliance has moved to develop more deployable forces.

Apart from NATO, the European governments responded to this new environment by adding a security and defense component to the European Union, while also bringing in new members and boosting internal security cooperation. The EU developed mechanisms for deploying military and civilian capabilities and launched a few small operations.

The changes made by NATO and the EU have been significant. But they have not given the transatlantic community a framework for common defense that adequately accommodates the advent of the EU as a security player and the emergence of new security threats since the end of the Cold War.

The gaps in the transatlantic security architecture are both operational and political. Operationally, the transatlantic security architecture must be transformed to permit NATO and the European Union to act together to counter the threats that both institutions have identified as priorities: terrorism, proliferation, and instability resulting from regional conflict and failing states.

This will require undertaking truly "combined" operations that have access to **all** the capabilities of both NATO and the EU.[1] If such operations are to become a reality, NATO and the EU must build new military structures that create the capacity for NATO and the EU to plan and rehearse combined operations.

Politically, the United States and key European states must overcome the political differences that have plagued efforts to build NATO-EU cooperation and begin again with a new commitment to transatlantic cooperation. It should now be possible to set aside the disagreements over implementation of NATO's Article 5 declaration of support for the United States in September 2001 and over the war in Iraq in favor of a focus on the much greater common interests faced by the United States and Europe. Structurally, political consultation mechanisms must be revised to accommodate more fully the roles played by both NATO and the EU, while continuing to respect the sovereignty of member states.

This revised transatlantic security architecture must be able to protect Europe and the United States within their borders, but it must also address the global nature of threats we all now face. It should be capable of bringing to bear traditional military war-fighting resources, but also of addressing a wide array of stabilization and reconstruction requirements.

If one side of this new transatlantic security structure is an enhanced partnership between NATO and the EU, the other is a stronger relationship between the United States and the EU, especially on security matters. Although the failure of the constitutional treaty raises some uncertainties about the future of European integration, it will not undo the significant steps taken by the EU to extend its role into security and defense issues. The European Union is already a major actor in European security, with capabilities that are especially valuable for stabilization and reconstruction tasks and a growing capacity in homeland security. Its involvement in security and defense policy is likely to grow. Those in the U.S. policy community who have been reluctant to accept the EU presence in the security field will have to learn to work with this new partner.

On a rhetorical level, a commitment to NATO-EU cooperation already exists, as reflected in major documents and policy statements from both institutions. The European Union's Security Strategy calls NATO "an important expression of the [transatlantic] relationship" and notes the EU and NATO's "common determination to tackle the challenges of the new century."[2] The NATO Secretary General, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer has remarked that "the roles of the European Union and NATO have become more and more intertwined," and that the "two organizations have come to rely on each other, both to build security on this continent and to project security beyond it."[3] The question now is how to move beyond this rhetoric and make these public pronouncements an operational reality. Some institutional adjustments have already been made to foster NATO-EU cooperation.

---

[1] In standard U.S. military terminology, "combined" refers to operations that involve different national militaries. This paper focuses on combined operations that could bring together the full range of military and civilian assets from the EU, NATO, and their members. Most operations would also be "joint" in the sense of involving more than one military service (air, land, sea).

[2] *A Secure Europe in a Better World*, adopted by the European Council, December 2003.

[3] *NATO and the European Union: Partners in Security*, speech by NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, May 6, 2004.

The most significant new mechanism is the "Berlin Plus" arrangement that allows an EU-led military operation to gain access to NATO assets. Berlin Plus has worked well in a few specific instances, but is too narrowly defined to accommodate significant combined operations, especially those that require prompt deployment or go beyond traditional military missions to include stabilization and reconstruction. Nor has Berlin Plus been immune to some of the difficult political issues that have stymied NATO-EU cooperation.

The political consensus necessary to bring NATO and the EU together in a truly cooperative relationship will only emerge when the member states of both organizations recognize that such a partnership is clearly in their strategic interests. Much of the basis for this recognition is already in place. Most significantly, the member governments have identified a similar set of threats and have acknowledged that NATO and the EU can provide a complementary set of capabilities for responding to these threats. They also understand that for many possible contingencies, working together is not simply an option — it is a necessity. The EU lacks the deployable military power to deal with even a medium sized war, and NATO — with its core focus on preparing and executing military operations — needs the EU's stronger post-conflict military and civilian capabilities (as well as its political support) to achieve successful outcomes. Continuing the current approach of paying rhetorical lip-service to NATO-EU cooperation while relying on limited measures such as Berlin Plus to enable real cooperative action will only patch a relationship that now requires fundamental shifts in structure and approach. In particular:

❖ **NATO and the EU must develop mechanisms that will permit a rapid coordinated response in times of crisis.** These mechanisms will be the core of this new security partnership. Unless these mechanisms are established and practiced in advance, they will be untried and irrelevant when the need arises. New mechanisms are needed in four key areas:

- **Joint planning.** A system for identifying future crisis scenarios and developing options for appropriate responses must be created. Related exercises should also be held, and NATO should welcome any EU planning capacity that strengthens capabilities to undertake complex combined operations.

- **Force generation.** A mechanism will be required to identify military and civilian assets relevant to a combined response. This process must be done collaboratively, or NATO and the EU will find themselves competing for valuable capabilities.

- **Military command structure.** This must bring together EU and NATO military institutions in a way that is coherent both at the staff and operational level.

- **Political oversight.** NATO and the EU must each agree, according to their own processes, to undertake any combined operation. While the North Atlantic Council (NAC) will exercise oversight of NATO operations and the Political and Security Committee (PSC) will oversee EU operations, additional steps must be taken in combined operations to ensure that both institutions are appropriately involved.

❖ **NATO and the EU must build compatible capabilities.** Two immediate steps will be essential:

- *NATO and the EU should give priority to ensuring the success of the NATO Response Force and the EU battle groups.* European governments must make the battle groups effective and compatible with NATO force transformation, while the United States should demonstrate its commitment to combined operations by offering combat forces to the NRF.

- *NATO and the European Defense Agency must establish a strong relationship in order to work together to build strong and compatible capabilities.* The United States should welcome efforts by the EDA and the European Commission to rationalize European procurement and efforts by European governments to integrate military forces and structures across national borders.

❖ **NATO and the EU must integrate military and civilian capabilities to deal with a full range of tasks, from war-fighting to reconstruction.** Two immediate steps are important:

- *Both NATO and the EU should develop "operational liaison offices"* to facilitate cooperation with all those involved in an operation but outside the military command structures.

- *Stronger ties should be established between the European Commission and NATO*, since it is the Commission that controls considerable funds for reconstruction as well as access to civilian expertise.

❖ **NATO and the EU must revitalize their consultations.** This dialogue should focus on likely future contingencies and current "hot spots."

- If the NAC-PSC channel remains blocked, *alternative settings for dialogue must be found.*

- To be effective in the NATO-EU context, *NATO should broaden its own political consultations, to accommodate an increasingly unified European view.*

- As NATO and the EU move further "out-of-area," even when no combined operations are anticipated, *they should consult prior to undertaking military action.*

To implement these recommendations, **the U.S. and European governments must make a new political commitment based on the recognition that both NATO and the European Union have crucial roles to play in providing transatlantic security.** The two institutions bring different but overlapping strengths to this effort; the focus should be on bringing them together in a way that is most effective in addressing current challenges.

With a new commitment to cooperation, the two sides should be able to reach the following compromises in revising the transatlantic security architecture:

- The United States will respect the judgment of its European allies that also belong to the EU when they conclude that a particular operation should be EU-led. In return, those same allies should fully support NATO as the lead institution for an operation when the United States must be significantly involved over a sustained period of time.

- The United States will be prepared to commit its military forces to NATO operations and to those EU operations where its resources would be useful and it serves U.S. interests. In return, EU members will be willing to make their military forces and civilian stabilization and reconstruction assets available to support NATO missions.

- Europeans will actively engage in NATO's military transformation, thus contributing to making the Alliance as effective as possible. In return, the United States will accept the EU as a military actor that does not need U.S. concurrence to launch operations, and will also deepen the U.S.-EU relationship on security issues.

U.S. and European efforts to ensure the security of the Euro-Atlantic region are at a critical juncture. Without a change in course, NATO and the EU will continue to evolve separately, with growing areas of overlap and increased potential for confusion and rivalry. Without forthright European support, NATO will atrophy; without U.S. power at its side, Europe will be unable to play its proper role in securing peace and security.

This is also a time of opportunity. The U.S. and European governments are now faced with the same global threats and know that these threats can be met more effectively together. Any security operations undertaken will undoubtedly require a wide range of military and civilian capabilities, from warfighting to reconstruction. NATO and the EU together could bring to bear a comprehensive array of complementary and valuable assets to provide these capabilities. It is time to construct a new transatlantic security architecture that will strengthen both institutions individually, while allowing them to be effective partners.

# Transatlantic Transformation:
## Building a NATO-EU Security Architecture

## NATO's Incomplete Transformation

### From Cold War Victory to New Threats

Since its creation in 1949, NATO has served as the primary institutional link between the United States and Europe on matters affecting the security of Europe. During the Cold War, the Alliance was focused exclusively on the defense of Western Europe against a single threat — attack by the Soviet Union. The Alliance tied together the fate of the United States and Western Europe in the face of a massive Soviet military buildup and the ideological challenge of communism.

In practice, NATO also provided a mechanism for ensuring that U.S. and European militaries were capable of fighting together. Its integrated military structure prepared war plans and carried out joint exercises. NATO also maintained an elaborate committee structure responsible for Alliance decision-making and providing guidance to military commanders. Headed by the North Atlantic Council (NAC), that structure also provided opportunities for political consultations on a range of security issues.

During this period, NATO's European members believed that a close alliance with the United States was essential for their territorial security. For the most part, they also regarded U.S. nuclear capabilities and worldwide military deployments as necessary to contain the Soviet Union. With this security arrangement in place, European governments could focus on rebuilding their economies destroyed during World War II and begin building an integrated Europe intended to end military rivalries permanently and ensure economic prosperity.

Since the end of the Soviet Union in 1991, NATO has faced unanticipated new threats and responded by moving far beyond its traditional Cold War role. The disintegration of Yugoslavia led to four years of war on the fringes of Europe, with bloody atrocities and refugee flows threatening the very foundation of a post-Cold War Europe "whole and free." A few years later, violence erupted again in Kosovo. NATO played the leading military role in imposing peace in Bosnia in 1995, and four years later did the same in Kosovo. In the process, it undertook military operations very different from those envisioned by its Cold War planners. Instead of defending the border of Western Europe against Soviet tanks, it deployed "out-of-area" for the first time, used military power to force a cessation of the conflict, and then provided stability for the long process of reconciliation and reconstruction.

NATO also responded to the potential instabilities of the post-Cold War era by assisting the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in their transition to democracy. The Alliance began programs to reform the militaries of these countries and created the Partnership for Peace as a way of connecting them more closely to the West. Many of these new "Partners" contributed forces to NATO missions in the Balkans. By the end of 2004, ten of the Central and Eastern European countries had joined NATO, and several more are expected to take that step by perhaps 2010.

The attacks of September 2001 immediately made terrorism a top priority for NATO. Within 24 hours, the Alliance had invoked Article 5, the common defense clause, for the first time ever. Although NATO was not included in the U.S. operations against the Taliban and Osama bin-Laden in Afghanistan, the Alliance contributed air surveillance and other assistance to the defense of the United States.

After the Taliban government fell, NATO has gradually taken on a leading role in the struggle against terrorism by working to stabilize Afghanistan. As the leader of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), NATO has extended its military presence throughout much of Afghanistan.[4] In the Mediterranean, Operation Active Endeavor has sought to protect shipping from terrorist attacks by monitoring vessels traveling through the area and providing escorts when merited. NATO has also reached the politically difficult decision to assist with training Iraqi security forces.

In the face of these new threats, NATO has changed from a regional security provider to a military alliance with global scope. The Cold War debate over "out-of-area" operations is no longer relevant. Preserving the security of the United States and Europe requires much more than simply safeguarding their borders. To protect the United States and Europe from terrorism, WMD proliferation, and the consequences of nearby instability, NATO must undertake operations well outside its traditional area of responsibility. Once focused on the North Atlantic region, NATO can no longer ignore developments in far corners of the globe.

## Transforming Commands and Military Forces

NATO's experience in the Balkans and Afghanistan has led to some practical improvements. The Alliance has streamlined its operational commands, reducing the number and reorganizing them along functional, rather than geographic, lines. The two commands that served as the backbone of NATO's military structure from the beginning were consolidated, with Supreme Allied Command Europe (SACEUR) and Supreme Allied Command Atlantic (SACLANT) reshaped into Allied Command Operations (ACO) and Allied Command Transformation (ACT). The latter, based in Virginia, works in close contact with the U.S. Joint Forces Command, which is responsible for much of the U.S. military transformation effort. ACT is charged with fostering the development of transformational capabilities and new doctrine within the Alliance, so that NATO can better meet the complex military challenges presented by current threats. Despite these changes, NATO has at times struggled to prepare for this new security environment. Convincing its member nations to develop appropriate and sufficient military capabilities has been a challenge — as indeed it was throughout the Cold War.

---

[4] For the most recent expansion of NATO's area of responsibility in Afghanistan, see the Final Communiqué, Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly, Brussels, December 8, 2005. www.NATO.int.

The 1999 Defense Capabilities Initiative identified a wide range of military shortcomings to be addressed, but by 2004 few had been met. It was succeeded by the Prague Capabilities Commitment, which narrowed the list of priorities, but few observers have noted any real progress.

Perhaps the most significant step NATO has taken toward developing better capabilities has been the creation of the NATO Response Force (NRF), and its future is now of central importance for both symbolic and practical reasons. Established by a November 2002 agreement, the NRF is intended to fill the gap in NATO's expeditionary capabilities by providing a joint multinational force that is technologically advanced and maintained at high readiness. The NRF is to be involved in the full range of Allied military operations, from war-fighting to stabilization. Elements of the NRF have already been deployed to provide security for the Afghan elections and disaster relief after the 2005 Pakistan earthquake. The NRF's training schedule is well underway; it is expected to reach operational capability by October 2006 with about 21,000 troops drawn from national forces.

Aside from its expeditionary role, the NRF is considered by many to be one of the main conduits of NATO force transformation. As national units rotate through the NRF, they are expected to serve as catalysts in their national militaries, returning with greater capacity for rapid deployment and creating pressure for further transformation in their own forces. The NRF is also the focal point for building Allied interoperability in new forms of network-centric warfare. Perhaps because of this transformational role, NATO members have been eager to participate — the first rotation of the NRF was made somewhat larger than anticipated in order to accommodate the fourteen contributors.

Nevertheless, the NRF must clear some significant hurdles before it can be considered a success. The quality of European military capabilities will affect the NRF's capacity to serve as an expeditionary force, especially in a high-intensity warfare environment. Whether the units rotated through the NRF will have any catalyzing effect on the national militaries is uncertain, especially given the limits on national defense budgets. Efforts to provide European forces with the equipment needed to remain interoperable with U.S. forces may also be hindered by tensions about technology transfer that have plagued the Alliance for many years.[5]

The NRF also faces some serious political questions. While U.S. policymakers initially viewed the NRF as a way to boost European capabilities, many in Europe have come to suspect that the U.S. commitment to this crucial force may be lacking. To date, the United States has contributed only enabling capabilities, such as communicators. To many European observers, the United States seems unwilling to commit its own forces to make the NRF succeed — a perspective that does nothing to foster European commitment.

Uncertainty also persists as to whether the NRF will actually be used for combat missions. High-intensity, expeditionary war-fighting operations will require consensus in the North Atlantic Council (NAC) — a consensus that may be hard to obtain. If it does not appear that NATO will use the NRF for war-fighting, the member nations may come to doubt the utility of the project and let their commitments fade.

---

[5] For a thorough discussion of the obstacles facing such technology transfer and their potential impact on the NRF, see *The NATO Response Force: Facilitating Coalition Warfare through Technology Transfer and Information Sharing*, by Jeffrey P. Bialos and Stuart L. Koehl (Defense and Technology Paper #18, Center for Transatlantic Relations, Johns Hopkins University), September 2005.

Even if the NRF succeeds, the change in NATO will still be inadequate. If the Alliance is to remain effective in its core purpose of organizing military operations against current threats, it must meet two further challenges. First, it must be able to integrate stabilization and reconstruction into "military" operations. The boundaries between war-fighting and stabilization tasks are often unclear, forcing troops to engage in combat one day and reconstruction the next. To succeed in this type of environment, NATO must not only ensure that it can put troops with the right kind of training, equipment, and support in a particular locale, but it must also develop ways of dealing effectively with other actors operating in that environment, including both civilian government agencies and non-governmental organizations. Although many military forces have the capacity to undertake civilian tasks, ranging from policing to humanitarian assistance, this is rarely an optimal solution, especially over a lengthy reconstruction period.

Second, NATO must be prepared to make the difficult decisions required to respond to unexpected crises. The Alliance has proven to be an effective mechanism for coordinating multinational military operations. But too often, reaching agreement among NATO members on the need for those operations, or negotiating specific procedures and conditions, can be a lengthy and acrimonious process. If this situation persists, NATO will find itself increasingly marginalized, while the United States looks for a more decisive partner. Many of the disagreements within NATO are rooted in differences over the evolving role of the European Union and its relationship to the Alliance. Rebuilding the political consensus required to respond to current threats will not happen without taking into account both the global context in which NATO now operates and the role and contributions of the European Union in the transatlantic security arena.

# The European Union: An Emerging Security Institution

## Creating New EU Security Institutions

As NATO expanded and adapted to the post-Cold War environment, the European Union moved to extend its mandate deep into the world of foreign policy and security. The key has been the building of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). The CFSP represents the increasingly coordinated approach of the 25 member states on a range of issues, including the threats of terrorism and WMD proliferation, human rights, and HIV/AIDS, as well as relations with the Middle East, Russia, and many other regions. There have been some significant failures in developing this coordinated approach, most notably the deep divisions within the EU over Iraq.

But predictions that the splits over Iraq would lead to the end of CFSP have proven false; if anything those divisions contributed to a renewed commitment to build a common foreign policy. Moreover, those countries hoping to join the EU in the future find themselves expected to adopt EU declarations and policies, extending CFSP to thirty-some countries.

The EU has also started to take steps in the security and defense field. The conflicts in the Balkans made clear to all EU members that any attempt to build a CFSP would have to include some capacity to back that policy with force. At the Helsinki European Council in 1999, EU leaders launched the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), establishing a range of plausible military missions and defining goals for capabilities. The initial aims were to be able to carry out the so-called "Petersberg Tasks," ranging from humanitarian intervention to peacemaking (see box on page 6). As for capabilities, the EU agreed on a "Headline Goal" that called for a 60,000-strong reaction force, deployable within 60 days and able to sustain operations for at least one year — a goal derived from the experience of the Balkans. The common territorial defense of Europe was to remain within the purview of NATO. Integral to ESDP has been the development of "civilian crisis management" capabilities designed to address stabilization and reconstruction tasks — given experiences in recent conflicts, these could be especially valuable.

In December 2003, EU leaders adopted the first European Security Strategy, setting out a policy framework for ESDP. The Petersburg tasks were expanded so that military missions deployed by the EU could now include disarmament operations as well as support for third countries in combating terrorism and reforming their security sectors. The Headline Goal 2010 calls for the establishment of high readiness battle groups of roughly 1,500 troops, capable of deploying 10 days after an EU decision to launch an operation. To date, EU member states have committed to set up thirteen battle groups. The first two, each numbering just under 1,000 troops, should be operational by 2007. The battle groups are, even collectively, undeniably smaller than the initial Headline Goal forces, they are directly based on EU operational experience in Africa, where rapidly deployable but small forces have been more valuable than slower units. The attraction of the battle groups to EU member governments has been strong. A few member states have created new units in order to participate, the first new combat-oriented forces in Europe for some time.

The building of CFSP and ESDP led to the construction of new institutions within the EU, which are in turn affecting the policy debates within Europe:

- The High Representative for CFSP.  In the last few years, the high representative, Javier Solana, has turned his post into an essential element of European policymaking.  He and his staff drafted the first-ever European Security Strategy and often act on behalf of the Union when there is agreement among the member states.

- The Political and Security Committee (PSC).  The PSC, which consists of member state ambassadors, focuses on foreign policy.  It has grown from a junior committee perched in a hostile environment of economic and domestic policy institutions to an organization with clout in the senior reaches of EU policymaking.  Meeting at least twice a week, it handles a broad range of issues, increasingly including military matters, and provides a forum for almost continuous discussion of foreign policy among EU members.  Along with the monthly foreign ministers' meeting and the summit meeting each quarter, EU meetings increasingly set both the calendar and the agenda for foreign policy discussions in Europe.

## The Petersberg Tasks

The term "Petersberg tasks" refers the types of military missions considered to be appropriate for EU intervention.  Established by the Western European Union Petersberg declaration of June 1992, these include:

- Humanitarian and rescue tasks;
- Peacekeeping tasks; and
- Tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacekeeping.

The Petersberg tasks were incorporated into Article 17 of the Treaty on European Union under the Amsterdam Treaty of 1999 and are now a central element of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP).

The 2003 European Security Strategy put forward the prospect that as European capabilities developed, these missions might also be expanded, possibly including "joint disarmament operations, support for third countries in combating terrorism and security sector reform."  This was reinforced when the same language was included in the Headline Goal 2010 adopted by the European Council in June 2004.

The proposed EU Constitutional Treaty included an expansion of the Petersberg tasks.  While the future of that treaty is in doubt, the enhancement of the EU's military missions was not generally controversial.  Even if the constitution is never adopted, it offers some guidance as to European views of the Petersberg tasks.  Specifically, the treaty states that:

- the Union may use its civil and military assets "on missions outside the Union for peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter" (Article I-41(1));

- EU civil and military assets may be used for missions that "include joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces undertaken for crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilization.  All of these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting third countries in combating terrorism in their territories." (Article III-309).

The Constitutional treaty includes a mutual defense clause (Article I-41(7)), although it is vague on exactly how member states will be obligated to respond.  It also includes a "solidarity clause" (Article I-43) in which the members pledge to act jointly to assist each other should any be struck by terrorism or a natural disaster.

Sources:
"A Secure Europe in a Better World: The European Security Strategy," December 2003.
Ortega, Martin. "Petersburg tasks, and missions for the EU military forces." <http://www.iss-eu.org/esdp/04-mo.pdf.>
The Petersburg Tasks. Europa Glossary.  <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/glossary/petersberg_tasks_en.htm

- The EU Military Staff (EUMS). This staff provides options to the political decision-makers and conducts some contingency planning. Attached to the EUMS are a 24-hour situation center and a civilian-military planning section that seeks to integrate military and non-military elements in operations. Political oversight of the EUMS rests with the EU's High Representative Javier Solana and the PSC.

- The EU Military Committee (EUMC). Consisting of the European chiefs of staff, the EUMC has to date played a largely advisory role.

- The European Defense Agency (EDA). A very new and small institution, the EDA is intended to help identify and address capabilities shortfalls in Europe, and to encourage member states to coordinate their defense procurement. European defense ministers, acting as the steering board for the EDA, now meet three times each year under the chairmanship of Javier Solana.

## EU Capabilities for Stabilization and Reconstruction

The experience in the Balkans and Afghanistan has demonstrated that modern wars can rarely be won by military forces alone. Preserving the security of the United States and Europe now requires a full range of military and non-military capabilities, along with the political commitment to use them for sustained periods of time.

The EU and its member states control significant civilian assets that can be applied to stabilization and reconstruction. Most obviously, the European Commission and the national governments have substantial funds for both humanitarian and reconstruction assistance. The EU's existence as a large trading bloc gives it substantial economic impact, especially among its neighbors and when it provides trade preferences. Even though coordination between the EU agencies and national governments is sometimes problematic, these assets represent a potentially significant contribution to global crisis management.

The EU has also started to create specific capabilities for assisting states emerging from conflict or on the verge of failing. Such unstable situations are identified in the European Security Strategy as a major threat, and in response the EU is organizing a range of resources capable of engaging in stabilization and reconstruction tasks. The first priority is to have civilian police available for deployment to crisis areas when requested. EU members are to identify up to 5,000 suitable police officers. A second task is to strengthen the rule of law. To that end, member states are to register nearly 300 prosecutors, judges, prison officers, or other officials with similar skills who can assist in rebuilding a judicial system. To boost civil administration, the EU has established a pool of experts to carry out essential governmental administrative tasks in either a post-conflict or failed state environment. Finally, in civil protection, the EU will assemble two to three rapidly deployable teams of consequence management experts able to assess and intervene in situations where natural disasters or conflicts have put the civilian population at risk.

Stabilization and reconstruction operations increasingly require the presence of security forces that are capable of operating in a less-than-permissive environment. Thus, in 2004, EU defense ministers established the European Gendarmerie Force, comprised of militarized police. France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain will contribute to the force, which held its initial training and exercises in 2005. Headquartered in Vicenza, it aims to deliver up to 800 gendarmes from contributing nations within 30 days. Technically, the force does not belong to the EU, but has its own High Level Inter-Ministry Committee, in this way avoiding the need to obtain unanimous EU agreement for its use. It is also intended to be available for operations run by other organizations, including the UN, NATO, and the OSCE.

Harnessing these military, police, and crisis management capabilities together is an ambitious goal, one that will take considerable time and effort under the best of circumstances. Both U.S. and European observers caution that the EU's capabilities should not be overestimated. As EU officials have learned through experience, there is a real difference between identifying shortcomings such as strategic lift and precision-guided munitions, and actually overcoming that gap. Similarly, pledging police officers to a roster for a future contingency is much easier than actually delivering them to a theater of operations, especially given Europe's own police needs at home.

## EU Operations: Putting Boots on the Ground

Since 2003, the EU has deployed military forces and civilian capabilities in a series of out-of-area missions (see Annex III). From the first small military mission, Concordia in Macedonia, the EU advanced to the Artemis mission in the Congo in summer 2003. The EU is now running Althea, the 7,000-troop successor to NATO in Bosnia-Herzegovina, as well as a police monitoring and training mission in that country. Although NATO has retained a small headquarters there, primarily to assist in the arrest of war criminals, the EU operation in Bosnia is significant, especially when the police and military functions are considered together. The EU has also undertaken a number of civilian missions, mostly focused on police training or monitoring, along with strengthening judicial systems and rule of law. These include a monitoring force in Aceh, where neither a United Nations, Australian, nor U.S. mission was acceptable. An EU mission in Gaza made it possible for the Palestinian-Egyptian border to reopen.

By gradually increasing the challenges presented by each operation, European leaders hope to build both capabilities and expertise. Thus, the first operation, Concordia, was small — many observers questioned the need for the operation given the level of stability already achieved in Macedonia. Artemis was basically a French operation with an EU label. Althea in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the first one of substantial size, represents the first real test of the EU's ability to manage a complex mix of civilian and military tasks.

As these operations demonstrate, the EU can mount small operations in relatively permissive environments, but it is not yet clear how effective it will be when faced with a more complex task on a larger scale. Under the best of circumstances, it will be some time before the EU will be ready to take on a major operation on its own, especially one requiring prolonged re-supply and extensive use of airlift.

Even then, gaining support among EU members for a substantial and risky operation is likely to be difficult. ESDP operations are also likely to be restrained by the requirement of some member states that the EU obtain approval from the UN Security Council before operating outside of Europe.

Nevertheless, the United States should welcome the development of ESDP. At least some EU missions have already proven helpful to U.S. interests. This was the case in the Balkans, where an EU mission allowed the UN and NATO to terminate obligations, and in Africa, where the EU provided an initial rapid deployment force for a UN mission in the Congo.

## NATO Response Force - EU Battle Group Comparison

| | NATO Response Force | EU-Battle Groups |
|---|---|---|
| **Goal** | To give NATO a rapid response capability using a technologically advanced and highly ready joint force. | To give the EU the ability to deploy force packages at high readiness in response to a crisis. |
| **Missions** | The NRF can be used as an initial entry force, facilitating the arrival of follow-on units; as part of a larger force, to contribute to the full range of Alliance military operations; and to prevent conflicts from escalating into wider disputes. | Battle Groups will be employable across the full range of Petersberg tasks, and those identified in the European Security Strategy, in particular the tasks of combat forces in crisis management. In doing so, Battle Groups can be used for autonomous rapid response operations either for stand-alone operations or for the initial phase of larger operations. |
| **Operating Capability** | November 2002: NATO Summit in Prague, decision to form NRF.<br>October 2004: reached Initial Operating Capability of around 17,000 troops<br>October 2006: Full Operating Capability with around 21,000 troops. | November 2004: EU Military Capability Commitment Conference, decision to form 13 EU Battle Groups.<br>2005-2006: Initial Operating Capability, one Battle Group deployable<br>January 2007: Full Operational Capability, up to two simultaneous Battlegroup-size operations. |
| **Components** | The NRF is composed of land, maritime and air components, as well as special forces. In total, 25.000 troops are at high readiness for each rotation. | 15 Battle Groups at 1500 troops each (battalion size) based on combined arms, and reinforced with combat support elements. It can be formed by a "framework nation" or by a multinational coalition of Member States. |
| **Deployment Requirements** | Within 5 days - anywhere in the world | Council decision to launch an operation within 5 days; deployment within 10 days after decision to launch; operate within 6000 km radius. |
| **Self-Sustainable** | Up to 30 days | Up to 120 days |
| **Command** | Rotates every 12 months among the three NATO joint force commands in Brunssum, Naples, and Lisbon (in 2005: Joint Command Lisbon) | Each Battle Group is associated with a Force Headquarters and, pre-identified transport and logistics elements. |
| **Member Contributions** | Member states commit forces to the NRF on a rotational basis for training and certification, followed by an operational stand-by period of six months. Permanent existence of a combat-ready deployable NRF is guaranteed. | Battle Groups are comprised of national or multinational forces, on rotating six-month standby periods. To qualify as an EU Battle Group the force packages will have to meet commonly defined and agreed standards and undergo a Battle Group generation process. |
| **Value Added** | NRF was designed as to be used as a catalyst for a broader process of transformation of military capabilities in NATO member states. | Reinforce NATO's NRF efforts; close the EU's capabilities gap by raising the need for European strategic transport, UAVs, etc. |

Sources: www.nato.int, europa.eu.int

## The Future of ESDP

Observers on both sides of the Atlantic remain skeptical of ESDP because of the uncertain political situation in Europe, particularly the defeat of the EU constitutional treaty in the French and Dutch referenda.  The treaty would have accelerated the EU's internal integration, and progress in this area may now be stalled. But the impact on foreign and defense policy is far less clear.  The treaty would have streamlined some elements of the cumbersome EU foreign policy structure, but its defeat can certainly be seen as a failure to make a gain, rather than as a loss that will hinder future ESDP activities.  Given that the European public has long supported efforts for the EU to take on a larger role in the world, it may be that foreign and defense policy will be one area in which Europe could forge ahead.[6]

Because many Europeans view ESDP as a way not only to develop military capacity but also to further European integration, there may be even more pressure for progress with ESDP, especially if integration in other areas is blocked.  The European Union is already a player in the transatlantic security arena, and despite the defeat of the constitutional treaty, it will not retreat from this new role.

Yet European defense budgets do impose very real limits on ESDP.  Since 1990, the combined defense budget of EU members declined despite the addition of new members.  By 2003, it totaled half of the U.S. defense budget, but even collectively, the Europeans did not have half the U.S. capability.[7]  There is no expectation among European defense analysts or political leaders of any budgetary increase in the foreseeable future.  Rather, it will be a considerable achievement if defense budgets do not fall even further.  But an amount equivalent to half the U.S. defense budget is still considerable, and could provide the basis for serious improvements in military capabilities through better use of existing resources..  Although some European militaries have instituted changes in order to undertake more expeditionary missions, improvements vary tremendously from country to country.  Given budgetary pressures, some countries will not be able to retain the full range of military forces, and will have to reallocate funds and other resources to a narrower set of assets if they are to boost capabilities.

The EU has taken a few specific steps toward encouraging its members to improve capabilities within existing budgetary constraints.  Through the European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP), the Union has sought to match capabilities with scenarios and identify shortcomings.  Although there is now widespread agreement on the nature of the shortcomings, there has been little movement in finding solutions.

Responsibility for the ECAP is scheduled to move to the EDA during the coming year, with hopes that this will bring a review of the shortcomings closer to the European defense procurement process.  The EDA, as part of its focus on rationalizing defense procurement, is also attempting to identify duplicative efforts, such as the twenty-some different armored troop carrier programs within the EU.

---

[6] For an argument along these lines, see "Security Could be Europe's Great Rallying Point," by French Defense Minister Michèle Alliot-Marie, Financial Times, December 5, 2005.

[7] In 1990, the EU-12 combined defense budget equaled $216.7 billion (what would become the EU-15 totaled $226.8 billion in 1990).  In 2003, the EU-15 defense budgets totaled $204.7 billion, and an EU-25 budget would have been $214 billion.  The U.S. defense budget in 2003 was $414.4 billion.  Figures counted in 2003 constant dollars.  Data is from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Military Expenditure Database (www.sipri.org).

The European Commission, which has traditionally kept its distance from the defense sector, has floated a proposal that member states reduce the use of the national security exception to protect their defense-related industries from competition. A voluntary "code of conduct" has just been instituted for those member states that wish to open their defense procurement to all European firms. These efforts are in the very earliest stages, however, and their impact is far from clear.

The initial decision to develop ESDP surprised many in the U.S. defense and foreign policy establishment and generated some suspicion that the EU was being groomed to displace U.S. forces and NATO. Some in Europe have undoubtedly supported such an ambition, even if only to hedge against a day when the United States might abandon Europe. However, realistic Europeans have recognized that for the foreseeable future, the EU and its members lack the capability for successful major combat operations without U.S. support. There is a fairly broad consensus that a significant military contingency, especially one that must be sustained over time and at a substantial distance from home bases, will require U.S. involvement through NATO.

The more realistic challenge of ESDP stems from the fact that both NATO and ESDP draw on the same national military forces for their operations. Given the current demands on these forces, there needs to be a way to manage disagreements over the units available for specific operations. Despite these issues, the European Union has much to offer as a partner in meeting the new security agenda. Its military capabilities will remain limited, but its assets for stabilization and reconstruction, even in hostile environments, are especially complementary to assets likely to be provided through NATO. It is this complementarity that could make NATO-EU operations particularly valuable.

# The Limits of Present NATO-EU Cooperation

The current mechanism for formal cooperation between NATO and the EU is the "Berlin Plus" arrangement, signed in March 2003 (see box on this page). Under this agreement, the EU has been given "assured access" to NATO assets, including planning capabilities, for EU-led military missions. In a "Berlin Plus" operation, the Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe (DSACEUR) is the operation commander and uses the force generation and planning capacities at SHAPE. But political control of the operation remains with the EU, once NATO members have agreed to the operation. Associated arrangements also provide for the sharing of classified information between EU and NATO staffs, based on the conclusion of security agreements between NATO and those EU member states that are not Alliance members.

Based on these agreements, some NATO-EU cooperation has developed, especially in military-to-military contacts and expert consultations between civilians from the two headquarters. For example, scenarios used by the EU to identify capabilities goals and shortcomings were developed with the assistance of NATO planners. An EU cell has recently been established at SHAPE, and a reciprocal arrangement is under negotiation at the EU Military Staff (EUMS).

Furthermore, these agreements have been successfully applied to two operations. Concordia in Macedonia, the first EU-led operation conducted under Berlin Plus, went forward smoothly, although its small size made such coordination less challenging. The Althea mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina put Berlin Plus arrangements more fully to the test. The EU, which

## Berlin Plus

Berlin Plus refers to the agreed framework for NATO-EU cooperation in crisis management, under which the EU would have access to NATO's collective assets, including planning capabilities, for EU-led operations. In 1996, a NATO ministerial in Berlin agreed that in principle NATO assets could be made available for crisis management operations led by the Western European Union. At the 1999 NATO summit in Washington, Alliance leaders initiated discussions on what became the main features of "Berlin Plus": assured EU access to NATO planning capabilities and presumed availability of certain NATO capabilities and common assets, along with determination of the role of NATO's Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe in EU-led operations.

Initially, these discussions took place between the Western European Union and NATO, but the role of the WEU was soon subsumed by the European Union. In January 2001, the EU and NATO began negotiations that eventually led to the "NATO-EU Declaration on ESDP" (December 16, 2002) and the Berlin Plus arrangements (March 17, 2003). The later included:

- A NATO-EU security agreement governing the exchange of classified information;
- Assured EU access to NATO's planning capabilities for EU-led crisis management operations;
- Availability of NATO capabilities and common assets, such as communication units and headquarters for EU-led operations;
- Procedures for release, monitoring, return, and recall of NATO assets and capabilities;
- Terms of reference for NATO's Deputy Supreme Allied Commander, who serves as the operation commander of an EU-led operation under Berlin Plus;
- NATO-EU consultation arrangements; and
- Incorporation within NATO's established defense planning system of the military needs and capabilities possibly required for EU-led military operations.

Sources:
NATO Handbook, 2001
"The NATO-EU Strategic Partnership," in Istanbul Summit Media Guide, NATO
"Berlin Plus Agreement." http://www.NATO.int/shape/news/2003/shape_eu/se030822a.htm

was already running the UN-sanctioned police operation in that country, assumed the bulk of NATO's military mission in December 2004.[8]  DSACEUR is the operation commander for Althea, as envisioned under Berlin Plus.  He is also NATO's military strategic coordinator with the European Union.  This arrangement allows him to ensure that proper coordination occurs and to promote synergies rather than duplication.  For example, in the recent past, tactical reserves from Althea have been made available to the NATO-led KFOR mission in Kosovo, while the KFOR reserve has also been made available for operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

It would be a mistake, however, to see these modest successes as indicators of a healthy NATO-EU relationship.  Berlin Plus applies to a very limited set of operations — those in which the EU takes the lead but wants access to certain NATO assets, such as the planning, force generation, and headquarters capabilities at SHAPE.  As for military capabilities, NATO owns only a few, notably its 17 AWACS planes. Berlin Plus does not provide EU access to troops and equipment belonging to NATO members, thus very much limiting the scope of any operation.  Nor does it provide a mechanism for combining military and civilian capabilities in a specific operation. Most important, Berlin Plus does not necessarily facilitate the process of deciding whether the EU and NATO should or could work together in response to a particular threat or crisis. It only applies after that decision is made, and only if the result is an EU-led operation.

The Darfur crisis in Sudan offered NATO and the EU a recent opportunity to demonstrate that they could cooperate in an operational setting.  In May 2005, the African Union asked both the European Union and NATO to provide assistance to the AU's peacekeeping mission in western Sudan.  Specifically, AU President Alpha Oumar Konore requested help in moving troops from various contributing countries in Africa to the theater of operations.  Both NATO and the EU responded positively.  However, they were unable to decide on a single command center for the strategic airlift, with the EU proposing to use the European Airlift Centre at Eindhoven, and NATO seeking to use SHAPE.  In the end, they agreed to disagree, and two separate airlifts were established, with the expectation that they would be coordinated by the African Union.

If members of both institutions had been willing, the support mission for the AU could have been a genuinely cooperative effort.  The two airlifts will continue at least through spring 2006.  In addition to transport, NATO has provided training for AU personnel in command and control and other areas.  The EU has provided training and other support for the police component of the AU mission, along with training, other technical expertise, and materiel support for the military component.  While the NATO and EU military staffs and working-level experts have been able keep these efforts in sync, their task has been made much harder by the failure of the political leadership to direct the two institutions to work together.

---

[8]  The Bosnia military missions (first IFOR and then SFOR) were also UN-sanctioned, although they were not UN "blue-helmet" operations.

# A Transformed Transatlantic Security Architecture

NATO and the EU now stand at a fork in the road.  The existing transatlantic security architecture never anticipated a European Union determined to create an independent ESDP.  The architecture itself must be revised to reflect the new reality: both NATO and the EU have crucial roles to play in providing transatlantic security.  New structures, processes, and political commitments are necessary if they are to work together effectively.

NATO could in principle carry out any necessary military operation without the help of the EU, provided that its individual members support the operation.  But most of NATO's members are also members of the EU, and the European states are determined to build the capability of the EU to act on behalf of its member states.  Thus, if the United States wants a NATO consensus for an operation, it will in most cases need the support of **both** the EU as an institution and its member states.  This will require accommodating the EU's need for involvement in the decision making process, and perhaps in the operation itself.  The EU, on the other hand, will need NATO assets to carry out even medium-sized operations, and therefore must accommodate NATO's role.

The limitations of Berlin Plus, along with the failure of NATO and the EU to agree to cooperate in the Darfur operation, demonstrate the weakness of continuing in the current mode of NATO-EU relations, or of making only minor, incremental adjustments.  Continuing down that path will lead to further drift across the Atlantic as NATO and the EU jostle for primacy and the United States looks for decisive partners to help with its global agenda.  Instead, it is time to rethink the existing transatlantic security relationship.

The first step has been taken: the United States, in its National Security Strategy of 2002, and the European Union, in its European Security Strategy of 2003, identified a range of shared security challenges. These include global terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and instability arising from regional conflicts and failed states.  The next step is to build a new transatlantic security arrangement capable of acting together to counter these threats.  The aim of that structure is to protect Europe and the United States within their borders, and enable them to reach out in combined operations to meet these threats at their origins. It is now time to take some additional steps.

❖ **NATO and the EU must develop the essential mechanisms that will allow them to launch combined operations in times of crisis — this will be the foundation of the new security architecture.**

Only if the structure for cooperation is well-established before the crisis arises, and involves the full range of capabilities, will NATO and the EU be able to respond effectively together.  Attempting to create real cooperation through ad hoc arrangements will be inadequate, especially if the U.S. and European governments are faced with the prospect of significant or sustained operations.  Preparations for the relatively uncontroversial EU take-over of the Bosnia mission from NATO took several months of sometimes difficult negotiations, despite the fact that Berlin Plus provided a basic framework, especially

## Possible Scenarios for Future Operations

Advance preparations will be especially vital for those complex operations which require a mix of capabilities, from war-fighting to reconstruction, or coordination with many domestic agencies. Yet, many of the scenarios NATO and the EU are likely to confront will require exactly that type of effort:

- The situation in Darfur suddenly deteriorates into sustained violence between the government and the rebels, with the civilian population in the middle. As fighting escalates beyond the capabilities of the African Union forces, the U.S. and European governments must decide whether to intervene with forces capable of both war-fighting and humanitarian relief.

- Building on its withdrawal from Gaza, Israel decides to pull out of certain areas in the West Bank. The Palestinian Authority is not yet ready to exert control, especially given the very complex geography of the operation, and there are real fears of a security vacuum. The EU may undertake a monitoring mission as it has done in Gaza, but the potential for violence is so much greater that a more robust military force, including U.S. troops, may be required as backup.

- A significant radiological weapon goes off in a European city. Along with many casualties, there is an evacuation and concerns about security within the stricken areas. The local authorities are incapacitated or overwhelmed. It is estimated that 25,000 soldiers will be required to secure and protect the area, and that relief supplies, including emergency shelter and food, are needed for 100,000 citizens and must be airlifted to the city.

- NATO continues to expand its efforts to provide security in Afghanistan, but throughout the country, there are serious outbreaks in violence as warlords come under pressure. A German-run PRT is taken hostage when a warlord captures a local airport. The Afghan government pleads for both heavily armed gendarmerie and more police training as narcotics trafficking booms. With operations ranging from war-fighting to stabilization and reconstruction — sometimes in the same locale — it is clear that a single command is needed.

for command arrangements. In the case of Darfur, there was no such pre-negotiated structure. With no advance preparations and under time pressure as the crisis worsened, NATO and the EU were unable to agree on how to cooperate and in the end were forced to launch separate operations, with the African Union charged with providing coordination. In reality, coordination between the two operations has been done on an ad hoc basis as the necessity arose.

Although there will be situations when a separate NATO or EU operation will be most suitable, most of the scenarios likely to be encountered (see box on this page for hypothetical examples) will require a range of capabilities that can best be applied through a combined operation. Such an operation would bring to bear a full range of assets — military, civilian, and economic — in a coordinated framework. But for such an operation to be a reality when it is needed, there must be preparation in at least four key areas:

- **Joint planning.** This must begin with some preparations for the type of future crisis scenarios that might require intervention. Plausible and threatening scenarios must be identified and options for appropriate responses must also be developed, along with a shared understanding of the roles to be played by each institution, as well as the national governments. Planning must take into account the need to address a wide range of tasks, from high-intensity fighting to reconstruction, often in the same locale. Planning will provide opportunities to identify the potential difficulties that hinder any operation. NATO and the EU should also run combined exercises, as a way of ensuring that plans will work. Eventually this planning mechanism may create a demand for a common threat assessment.

- **Force generation.** The key to any successful operation is having the right type of forces available and ready to be deployed in an appropriate period of time. Closer cooperation between NATO and the EU would maximize the use of military and civilian capabilities and avoid conflicts over such resources. With 19 countries belonging to both institutions, it should be remembered that "NATO forces" and "EU forces" are actually national capabilities, and often the same capabilities. Once contingency plans have been developed, it will be essential for NATO and the EU to establish a combined force generation mechanism. This mechanism should identify assets — both military and civilian — that would be relevant in an operation. This process must be collaborative, because the two institutions necessarily draw from the same pool of national forces. With the right coordination mechanism, the EU and NATO could bring together a full range of assets, from war-fighting to stabilization and reconstruction capabilities, while minimizing the possibility that an essential unit for one institution's mission is committed to the other at the time it is most needed.

- **Military command structure.** Just as in Berlin Plus, arrangements for military command must be developed before the actual contingency arises. The Berlin Plus command structure, headed by DSACEUR, provides an appropriate initial model. In addition, an operational staff that brings together elements of the EUMS and SHAPE will have to be designated. The two Military Committees could be combined, with each member designating one representative.[9]

- **Political oversight.** After an appropriate political and strategic dialogue covering long-term problems and developing urgent crises, both NATO and the EU will individually decide whether or not to undertake any specific mission. Once the member states have determined which institution will take the lead, either the NAC or the PSC will assume political oversight of the operations. Additional steps should be taken in combined operations to ensure that both institutions are represented at whichever decision-making table has the lead.

Developing those mechanisms will not be easy, so negotiations should begin as soon as practical. Despite the complications, combined operations would raise NATO-EU cooperation to a new level and make the two institutions more effective in addressing their shared threats. Without such cooperation, U.S. and European efforts to work together in meeting common threats are likely to be difficult and ineffective — a result that serves the interest of no one.

❖ **NATO and the EU must build effective and relevant capabilities.**

The members of NATO and the EU must develop capabilities to deal with a range of contingencies, from high-intensity war-fighting to stabilization and reconstruction. The U.S. and European militaries do not have to have the same capabilities, but they should be complementary and interoperable. Given European budgetary constraints, it will not be useful for the United States to harass its allies to increase defense budgets. European spending on defense is considerable and, with sufficient flexibility, defense monies and forces could be reallocated toward capabilities more relevant to current needs, *i.e.*, more deployable, more sustainable, and more effective in using new technologies. Most national governments in Europe could do much more in this area. Greater integration of military forces and structures across national borders — the development of "pooled" capabilities — could also contribute

---

[9] Many of the representatives to the NATO Military Committee and the EUMC are already "double-hatted."

to a more effective use of European defense budgets.[10]

The most immediate step toward developing those capabilities will be to ensure that the NATO Response Force and the EU Battle Groups are effective and compatible. Initially, there were fears that the NRF and battle groups — both of which require designating high quality national units to be committed as "available if needed" — would compete for troops, making them instruments of NATO-EU competition rather than cooperation.  Both forces draw on national units that are "triple-hatted," *i.e.*, potentially available for NATO, EU, or national missions.   However, compatible rotation and training schedules have ensured that no units will be assigned to these two forces at the same time.  Some U.S. observers worried that European countries with less capable forces would opt for the battle groups, rather than make the investments necessary to join the NRF.  This may have happened, but the battle groups may also provide an opportunity for some forces to prepare for later participation in the NRF.  The NRF and battle groups thus can be viewed as part of a transformation continuum.

These two forces could become a model of how NATO and the EU can develop complementary assets. European governments must take advantage of the transformational opportunities offered by these forces to improve their forces generally.  In addition, if the United States expects the NRF to attract continuing European commitments, it must demonstrate the seriousness it attaches to the initiative by committing U.S. combat forces, not just the "enablers" already promised, as important as those are. The bottom line is that both the U.S. and European governments need to make the success of the NRF and battle groups a top priority.

A second step in ensuring that the military capabilities of NATO and EU members are compatible and effective will be to establish a strong consultative relationship between the European Defense Agency and NATO.  Because the EDA is likely to play a major role in rationalizing European procurement programs, it will have a large impact on NATO capabilities. To date, the EDA's priorities include fostering better European capabilities in UAVs and ISTAR; command, control, and communication; and in armored fighting vehicles.  Advancements in these areas are likely to benefit both EU and NATO efforts, and this is to be welcomed.

The EDA will also play a role in establishing conditions under which the European defense procurement market might open for competition, including the impact on U.S. companies.  The EDA should not exclude U.S. companies from European procurements, and the United States must improve its technology transfer and "two-way street" policies and practices for that to be realistic.  The long-term effect on interoperability and the general ability of European and U.S. forces to fight together could be significant.  Just as the U.S. government should work diligently to ensure that European firms are not excluded from the U.S. defense market, so EDA should focus on spurring real competition while producing effective, interoperable capabilities.  A closer relationship with NATO could help both institutions achieve these goals.

---

[10]   For a thorough discussion of such options, see *European Defense Integration: Bridging the Gap Between Strategy and Capabilities*, by Michèle A. Flournoy and Julianne Smith (Washington DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies) October 2005.

❖ **NATO and the EU must integrate capabilities to deal with a full range of operational tasks, from war-fighting to reconstruction.**

Currently NATO brings to bear high-end military resources, including those of the United States, while the European Union brings both military and civilian assets, the latter ranging from police to reconstruction experts and foreign assistance. The United States also has considerable assets of this latter type that could be applied in a more focused manner to such conflicts. NATO and the EU must develop mechanisms that will allow them to integrate military and civilian assets to tackle the stabilization and reconstruction tasks that are central to complex civilian-military operations today. [11]

To facilitate combining these assets in an actual operation, both NATO and the EU should develop "operational liaison offices" located respectively at NATO headquarters and in the office of the high representative for CFSP. These offices would facilitate cooperation with all those involved in an operation, but outside of the military command structure. They would not replace the coordination cells at SHAPE and the EUMS, which are concerned with coordinating military interaction. They would provide a point of contact for the many NGOs involved in stabilization and reconstruction. In a NATO operation, this office could coordinate the non-military assets that the EU might provide, ensuring that they are put to effective use (EU military assets would be coordinated through SHAPE). Eventually, these offices could form the kernel of a combined NATO-EU staff for managing the non-military aspects of combined operations.

As a corollary of this effort to integrate military and civilian capabilities, NATO and the European Commission should develop a stronger, more direct relationship. The Commission controls numerous assets of value to crisis management missions, including the EU's humanitarian assistance and disaster relief programs. Given NATO's ability to provide strategic airlift, and the Commission's experience in providing emergency relief, this could be a partnership of benefit to both.

❖ **NATO and the EU must revitalize NATO-EU consultations.**

Discussions between NATO and the EU should focus on identifying future contingencies and potential joint responses involving both institutions. This could also include broader discussions of potential "hot spots" for crisis management that might benefit from the coordination of NATO military capabilities and EU civilian as well as military capabilities. These consultations must take into account the increasingly global scope of NATO and EU operations. During the Cold War, there was no expectation of transatlantic defense cooperation through NATO or other entities outside of the European region. But with both NATO and the EU now operating "out-of-area," the possibility is much greater that an operation by one institution could eventually lead to involvement by the other. U.S. officials often voice concern about being drawn into an operation to support an EU mission gone awry, while European governments worry that a U.S. military operation — even one conducted outside of NATO

---

[11] For an extensive discussion of how NATO forces might be organized to respond to these complex military operations, and how they might relate to EU assets, see "A New Military Framework for NATO" by Hans Binnendijk, David C. Gompert, and Richard L. Kugler. *Defense Horizons* #48, (Washington, DC: National Defense University), May 2005. For a discussion of the importance of NATO-EU cooperation in this area with the United Nations, see "New Directions for Transatlantic Security Cooperation," by James Dobbins, *Survival* (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies) Winter 2005-2006.

and far from Europe — could put allies at risk, or that they may be called on to help with stabilization and reconstruction once major combat operations are completed. Because of these risks, the United States, NATO, and the EU have an obligation to consult each other before undertaking significant military action anywhere in the world. Such consultation does not imply any need to grant permission, but it will give all parties the opportunity to put forward their concerns and possible offers of support.

The existing mechanism for NATO-EU consultations — the NAC-PSC forum — has generally been ineffective. Thus, alternative settings will have to be found. In recent months, there has been some movement toward a dialogue "at 32" on an informal basis. This should continue with more regularity and frequency. Continuing these meetings at the ministerial level is especially important, as it avoids the issue of two ambassadors with different mandates that has sometimes arisen in the NAC-PSC context. The European Commission, which is a serious contributor of expertise and funds to any reconstruction effort, should be involved from the beginning.

A new consultative forum should be established as soon as practical, probably at the ambassadorial level. This forum should include only one representative from each country, as well as the European Commission, and should be co-chaired by the NATO secretary general and the EU high representative for CFSP, and include a representative of the European Commission. Given its reduced numbers, this may be a more productive setting for discussion, even if the NAC-PSC becomes unblocked. Finally, regular bilateral consultations between the NATO secretary general and the EU high representative could also be an effective addition.

NATO must reinvigorate its own political consultations, if it is to be effective in these combined consultations. The NAC should actively discuss potential contingencies that may require a military response from NATO. For the United States, NATO is undoubtedly the best forum for such dialogue, given its position as a leading member. But if such dialogue is to be productive — and it is certainly in the U.S. interest that it be productive — the United States must be more willing to engage in genuine consultations, honestly considering other opinions and altering its own position when merited.

In addition, NATO consultations should no longer ignore the political integration of Europe, especially as the EU takes on more security issues. It is unlikely that a formal EU caucus will emerge in the near term, as many EU members see real advantages in a more flexible approach, especially as they consider their own bilateral relationship with the United States. But the reality of a more unified EU security policy has already contributed to an occasional de facto caucus within NATO, and with time this is likely to become more frequent and to affect a broader range of issues. For that reason, the United States must prepare for the prospect of a more unified approach among EU members in NATO.

# A Renewed Transatlantic Commitment

None of these mechanisms and capabilities will become reality unless the political leadership on both sides of the Atlantic is committed to a major revision of the transatlantic security architecture. This commitment must be demonstrated practically by a willingness to make compromises on both sides of the Atlantic. In particular:

● The United States should respect the judgment of its European allies that also belong to the EU when they conclude that a particular operation should be EU-led. In return, those same allies should fully support NATO as the lead institution for an operation when the United States must be significantly involved over a sustained period of time.

● The United States must be prepared to commit its military forces to NATO operations and to those EU operations where its resources would be useful and it serves U.S. interests. In return, EU members must be willing to make their forces and their civilian stabilization and reconstruction assets available to support NATO.

● Europeans should actively engage in NATO's military transformation, thus contributing to making the Alliance as effective as possible. In return, the United States will accept the EU as a military actor that does not need U.S. concurrence to launch operations, and will also deepen the U.S.-EU relationship on security issues.

Many U.S. and European policymakers will say that a commitment to revitalize transatlantic security cooperation already exists. And some of it does, in policy papers and speeches. But those rhetorical commitments do not reflect reality. Because some in the U.S. policy community worry that a stronger, more independent EU will undercut NATO, they have resisted the idea of autonomous EU operations, asserting that NATO should have the right of first refusal, *i.e.* a presumptive priority. The idea that U.S. forces could be deployed under an EU flag is even more anathema. Because some European policymakers view NATO as little more than the instrument of the United States, they have ignored its role in providing for transatlantic security, and discount the need for the large-scale capabilities that NATO brings from the United States and its own organizational resources. Assigning EU forces, such as a battle group, to a NATO mission seems only a remote possibility. While not all U.S. and European policymakers have adopted these views, enough have done so to make the idea of an effective NATO-EU partnership seem an unrealistic illusion.

It will remain an illusion unless NATO and the EU can overcome the mutual distrust that has plagued their relationship to date. To some degree, this is a case of "sibling rivalry" that has developed out of the natural competition between two institutions with somewhat overlapping mandates and capabilities. That institutional rivalry has been exacerbated by the sharp substantive disagreements across the Atlantic in recent years. The Iraq conflict has been only the most visible example; there have been tensions also over the Middle East peace process and the U.S. treatment of terrorist suspects. In the context of these differences, NATO is often viewed as a proxy for the United States. Cooperation with

NATO is viewed as providing support for the U.S. position, which many in Europe are loath to do. Iraq has brought to the fore differences between the United States and many European countries over the appropriate use of force and preemption. Because NATO is a military alliance, some Europeans fear that NATO-EU cooperation in countering terrorism and WMD proliferation may prejudice the solution in favor of a military option, and perhaps even a preemptive one.

Some will object to this new understanding as irrelevant because the United States and its European allies are inevitably drifting apart. Disagreements over the environment, human rights, and other issues, coupled with dissimilar priorities on social welfare versus defense spending, makes divorce inevitable. In this scenario, a NATO-EU partnership is irrelevant at best, especially as the United States increasingly focuses on Asia as both an economic partner and a security challenge. But apart from their shared struggle against terrorism and other threats, the United States and Europe have common interests in the resolution of many other global challenges, ranging from the future of global energy supplies to the prevention of global pandemics. They share a set of core values, including a commitment to democracy and a market-based economy. Above all, there is a recognition that, over the long term, neither the United States nor the European Union can preserve their own interests by working alone.

Finally, some will accept the need for accommodating the EU more fully, but only if the details can be worked out in advance. They specifically seek to define the circumstances in which either NATO or the EU should take the lead and the division of responsibilities between the two institutions. Although it is tempting to establish a fixed hierarchy in which either NATO or the EU has "right of first refusal," contingencies are always unpredictable. Planning should encompass a wide range of options, but the decision about leadership of any particular mission will undoubtedly happen on a case-by-case basis. It is time to move beyond theological discussions of when NATO or the EU should take the lead and instead focus on establishing the mechanisms that will facilitate cooperation.

It will take political courage to make this commitment a reality in such a skeptical and sometimes hostile environment. The United States must take the first step, by making a reality of its stated policy of accepting that the European Union will have a central role in European security. The United States has always encouraged the development of European military capabilities, but within the context of NATO. Its attitude to the prospect of independent European operations has been much more skeptical, despite official U.S. policy in support of ESDP. The United States should now bring its actions in line with its stated policy and go beyond agreeing that an EU-led "Berlin Plus" operation should have access to NATO assets. When European allies that belong to both NATO and the EU decide, after full consideration of U.S. views, that the EU is the more appropriate lead institution — and when the mission does not require a significant or sustained U.S. military contribution — the United States should accept the result. In those cases when an EU operation serves U.S. interests, the United States should consider contributing relevant assets (especially communications, intelligence, or an initial lift capacity) and participating in the EU contributors committee. When a mission is expected to involve a major sustained U.S. combat contribution, NATO will be the natural lead institution. But in no case should leadership be pre-determined; it should be agreed through transatlantic consensus in each specific instance.

The United States must take an additional step, however, and go beyond supporting EU-led operations when it agrees with the basic objective and feasibility. The United States should recognize that there could be situations — however unlikely — in which the EU decides to undertake a military operation

that the U.S. government views as misguided at best.  The United States would not therefore consent to the use of NATO assets, much less contribute from its own national capabilities.  But the United States should acknowledge the EU's right to undertake such operations, just as the U.S. government insists on its right to act alone or with a "coalition of the willing," when it judges that its fundamental interests so require, despite the lack of a NATO consensus. Moreover, the United States should accept that the EU will seek to develop the capabilities required to make such autonomous operations possible, and should not discourage that development.  A candid acknowledgment that the EU will want an option for autonomous action is likely to be far more effective in curtailing fruitless rivalry and wasteful duplication than is opposing the effort as a matter of principle.

European leaders must also take a bold step by abandoning any pretence that ESDP is a substitute for NATO.  The Alliance is essential for any contingency involving more than a few thousand troops, especially if access to U.S. force projection capabilities is required.  Most European officials understand this and accept that NATO remains the primary institution for the defense of the North Atlantic area.  But too often, they treat NATO as suspect and seem willing to engage only as a last resort.  A very few also have ambitions to have the European Union "balance" U.S. power in some way.  Eventually, this disengagement will so damage NATO's core consensus and ability to make decisions that the Alliance will not be able to provide the defense that is its *raison d'être*.  European governments must not only push for a stronger ESDP, they must also fully engage in the continuing transformation of NATO, so that it can effectively conduct essential operations.  As part of that engagement, EU members should consider contributing their "civilian crisis management" assets, as well as military resources such as a battle group, to NATO missions.[12]  Although these are technically national forces, they are generated and commanded through the EU.

A final part of this renewed commitment will be to develop an updated understanding of the roles of NATO and the EU in the security sphere and work to make both institutions as strong as possible (see Annexes I and II on NATO and the EU).  A rigid division of labor is not desirable, and it should certainly not be assumed that the EU will undertake the "soft" or civilian tasks while NATO addresses only the hard-core military requirements. The expectations of both institutions must reflect their evolution since the end of the Cold War.  Without a "meeting of the minds" on this issue, disagreements and competition will fester within the transatlantic community and make cooperation more difficult.

---

[12]  The Eurocorps, which is a multinational European force independent of the EU, has served as the command force for NATO's ISAF operation.

# The Diplomatic Challenges

If this transformed security architecture is to have a solid foundation, a diplomatic campaign focused on the national capitals will be required. It must particularly engage those who are skeptical of NATO-EU cooperation.

One of the first steps will be to overcome the obstacles Turkey has created to NATO-EU consultations and intelligence sharing. Periodic meetings between the NAC and PSC are the major channel of communication at the political level between the two institutions. In response to the EU decision to admit Cyprus as a member despite the continuing division of that island, Turkey has insisted that strategic dialogue in the NAC-PSC forum is restricted to those EU member states that also belong to NATO or the Partnership for Peace - criteria that exclude Cyprus and Malta. The EU insists that all 25 members must be allowed to participate in discussions that go beyond current Berlin Plus operations. As a result, for more than a year the NAC-PSC meetings discussed only the EU's mission to Bosnia. Attempts to discuss such issues as recent events in Ukraine or Darfur failed. Turkey has also limited the sharing of classified information between NATO and the EU by insisting that NATO classified information can only be shared with EU member states that have signed a security agreement with NATO. Again, Cyprus and Malta are excluded. As a result, NATO classified information can only be given to the EUMS if the latter ensures that its Cypriot and Maltese officers will not have access to that material.[13] In June 2005, Turkey agreed that Darfur and a few other topics could be discussed in an "informal forum" and also agreed to an informal meeting of all 32 NATO and EU foreign ministers. A few of these discussions have taken place, but it is not yet clear whether this represents a major breakthrough or a brief and temporary compromise.

Ideally, Turkey should be convinced that continuing its block of NATO-EU interaction is counter to its own interests. It does not contribute to Turkey's own ambitions for EU membership, nor has it moved the Cyprus conflict closer to resolution. Moreover, blocking NATO-EU interaction will only ensure that NATO members, including Turkey, have fewer opportunities to influence ESDP and will marginalize NATO from European discussions about a range of security issues. Despite the stakes, there has not been an energetic effort to overcome Turkish objections and few governments seem ready to make resolving this matter a priority. This should change. Given the crucial importance of NATO-EU cooperation in meeting the key security challenges facing the North Atlantic region, the current stalemate should not be allowed to persist.

Overcoming Turkey's objections is only a first step, not a final one, however. In the past, NAC-PSC meetings were usually rather stilted, with EU members sticking to a previously agreed position or refusing to discuss a topic because an EU position did not yet exist. Far more important will be creating a commitment to NATO-EU cooperation among those EU members who believe the Union is more likely to develop an independent military capability only if NATO is kept at arms length.

---

[13] Turkey is not the only NATO or EU member to use Berlin Plus in this way. Shortly after the Turks lifted an earlier hold on the Berlin Plus arrangements at the end of 2001, Greece acted through the EU to put another block on the negotiations. Berlin Plus was only concluded after Greece lifted that hold in late 2002.

The greatest diplomatic challenge remains France. French policy toward the Alliance seems guided by the desire to prevent any opportunity for NATO or the United States to confine the EU, and this has led the French government to regard NATO-EU cooperation with suspicion. Convincing the French government to accept the necessity of a restructured transatlantic security relationship based on stronger NATO-EU ties will be crucial, but it will also be an enormous diplomatic undertaking.

Although France left NATO's integrated military structure in 1966, it has continued to be active in NATO operations, making major contributions to NATO operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan, as well as to the NRF. Its military-to-military relationships within the Alliance are considered excellent, and French officers are present at SHAPE. France clearly recognizes the importance of NATO as a provider of military experience and training, and seems determined to ensure that French troops remain able to operate in an Alliance context. Closer French attachment to NATO's military structure should be encouraged. The exclusion of the French military from U.S.-run military exercises (in which the French had previously participated) in the wake of the Iraq disagreement was a step in the wrong direction. Given that a French general served as the ISAF commander when the Eurocorps was the lead contributor, the question of France holding a NATO command, or even rejoining the integrated military structure, may be ripe for discussion.

France re-engaging with NATO is not just a military question, however. The success of this diplomatic effort will rest on convincing French policymakers that the United States genuinely supports the development of a strong ESDP. Deepening the U.S.-EU relationship on security issues will be an essential part of this strategy. U.S. officials will also have to overcome their skepticism about the legitimacy of autonomous EU operations. This re-engagement will not happen overnight. In the meantime, it should be recognized that French actions regarding NATO are sometimes more constructive than the rhetoric would imply. Despite the assertion of some French officials that NATO does not belong in Africa, the NAC did agree to the Darfur mission, an agreement that could not have been achieved in the face of French objections. Focusing on French actions rather than statements may help provide the climate diplomacy needs to be successful.

The United States, should it undertake the recommended diplomatic initiative, will find strong support in many quarters. Poland, Britain, Denmark, and many of the new members would be enthusiastic. The new German government has a strong interest in revitalizing the Alliance. Thus, notwithstanding the challenges of achieving agreement with France and Turkey, the greatest challenge remains convincing the U.S. government to undertake the effort. Should it do so with enthusiasm and determination, there is no reason to rule out success.

# Conclusions and Recommendations

❖ *NATO and the EU must develop mechanisms that will permit a rapid coordinated response in times of crisis.* Unless these mechanisms are established and practiced in advance, they will be untried when the need arises. New mechanisms are needed in four areas:
   - *Joint planning* to identify future crisis scenarios and develop options for response;
   - *Force generation* to identify military and civilian assets relevant to a combined mission;
   - *Military command* structure that brings together EU and NATO military institutions in a way that is coherent at the staff and operational level;
   - *Political oversight* that ensures that both institutions are appropriately involved.

❖ *NATO and the EU must build compatible capabilities.* Two steps are needed:
   - NATO and the EU should give priority to ensuring the success of the NRF and the EU battle groups;
   - NATO and the European Defense Agency must establish a strong relationship in order to work together to build strong and compatible capabilities.

❖ *NATO and the EU should integrate military and civilian capabilities to deal with a full range of tasks, from war-fighting to reconstruction.* In particular:
   - NATO and the EU should develop "operational liaison offices" to facilitate cooperation with those involved in operations but not under military command;
   - Stronger ties should be established between the European Commission and NATO, since the Commission controls expertise and funds for reconstruction.

❖ *NATO and the EU should revitalize their consultations.* This dialogue should focus on likely future contingencies and current "hot spots."
   - If the NAC-PSC remains blocked, alternative settings for dialogue must be found.
   - To be effective in the NATO-EU context, NATO should broaden its own political consultations, to accommodate an increasingly unified European view.
   - As NATO and the EU move further "out-of-area," even when no combined operations are involved, they should consult prior to undertaking military action.

*Leadership on both sides of the Atlantic must make a new political commitment based on the recognition that both NATO and the European Union have crucial roles to play in providing transatlantic security.* With this new commitment, the following compromises should be attainable:

● The United States will respect the judgment of its European allies that also belong to the EU when they conclude that a particular operation should be EU-led. In return, those same allies should fully support NATO as the lead institution for an operation when the United States must be significantly involved over a sustained period of time.

● The United States will be prepared to commit its military forces to NATO operations and to those EU operations where its resources would be useful and it serves U.S. interests. In return, EU members will be willing to make their military forces and civilian stabilization and reconstruction assets available to support NATO missions.

● Europeans will actively engage in NATO's military transformation, to make NATO as effective as possible. In return, the United States will accept the EU as a military actor that does not need U.S. concurrence to launch operations, and will also deepen the U.S.-EU relationship on security issues.

# ANNEX I:  Strengthening NATO as a Military Alliance

NATO remains the best instrument for serious military operations, especially those involving U.S. forces.  The Alliance should focus on what it does best: military planning and operations, building the NRF, and facilitating the continued modernization of both old and new members' military forces. It has taken the lead in operations in the Balkans and Afghanistan, and the future will undoubtedly bring even more missions. Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has worked with non-member militaries through such programs as the Partnership for Peace and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative to foster defense reform and improved military effectiveness.

But NATO should be cautious about expanding into non-military tasks.  It has explored participation in civil emergency planning, and some analysts have proposed that it engage in the broader aspects of homeland security and counter-terrorism[14].  NATO's recent airlift to assist the Pakistani earthquake victims demonstrated the value of military planning and airlift command in such desperate situations.  On counter-terrorism, Operation Active Endeavor has proven the value of military interdiction. But NATO should not normally be involved in humanitarian relief; the Pakistani situation was unusual because of its magnitude and isolation. NATO's relevance for anti-terrorism efforts in law enforcement, border security, or port security is very limited.

NATO instead should focus on developing its global military reach.  The Alliance should be prepared to operate wherever it is needed in response to the threats of global terrorism and WMD proliferation. But this cannot happen in a vacuum.  If NATO is to be as strong as possible as a military institution, the U.S. and European governments must overcome their mutual suspicions about the other's commitment to the Alliance.  Although Europeans were pleased by President Bush's statements in early 2005 about the importance of the NATO, many suspect that in a future crisis the United States would work through "coalitions of the willing" rather than NATO.  When the United States rebuffed the possibility of a major combat role for NATO in Afghanistan in 2001, despite the invocation of Article 5, it gave many allies the impression that NATO was irrelevant for its own national defense. Many U.S. observers doubt whether European governments — with a few exceptions — will make the investments required to improve their defense capabilities.  They also question the efficiency of Alliance decision-making, particularly if an additional layer of EU decision-making is required.

If NATO is to remain an effective military alliance with an increasingly global scope to its operations, European governments must actively engage in NATO's transformation.  Two additional requirements must also be met:

● The United States must fully engage with NATO operations and forces.  In Afghanistan, U.S. participation in ISAF was limited even after NATO took over ISAF command in August 2003. The United States focused its efforts on Operation Enduring Freedom.  Although both ISAF and the U.S.-led coalition established Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) to provide local

---

[14] See, for example, *Maximizing NATO for the War on Terror* (Washington DC: Center for the Study of the Presidency) May 2005.

security and reconstruction assistance, it was only in 2005, that it was finally agreed to move some of the U.S.-led PRTs into ISAF.  The United States must be actively engaged in ISAF, just as it should also contribute combat forces to the NRF[15].

● NATO must also learn to work hand-in-hand with the European Union, which is increasingly the central forum for discussion of security matters among European governments.  Unless this is taken into account, a number of the European members of NATO are unlikely to accept the Alliance's increasingly global agenda.  More to the point, without active coordination, NATO and the EU are likely to stumble into each other as they both address global security concerns.

---

[15] According to a May 20, 2005 "Letter from the President [George W. Bush] to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate," approximately 90 U.S. personnel are assigned to ISAF.  This letter is provided consistent with requirements of the War Powers Act and can be viewed at www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/05/print/20050520-8.html.  In September 2005, ISAF was comprised of more than 8,000 troops from 36 nations.  Further details are at www.afnorth.NATO.int/ISAF/structure/structure_structure.htm.

# ANNEX II:  Deepening the U.S.-EU Security Relationship

The increasing activity of the EU on a range of security issues is very much in the interest of the United States. The EU's initial forays into security policy focused on regional concerns, such as building stability in the Balkans, and preventing conflicts between the newly democratizing states of Central and Eastern Europe. Along with NATO expansion, these efforts did much to create "Europe, whole and free."  The EU has also been active on WMD proliferation, as demonstrated by the efforts of the "EU-3" (France, Britain, Germany) to negotiate with Iran on its nuclear ambitions.  The EU has long made the Middle East a priority, and although there have been transatlantic tensions, the EU has contributed both money and political effort to the peace process throughout the years. Having a stronger, more coherent Europe in the security area gives the United States a more capable partner, one that brings a different but compatible set of diplomatic and economic tools to the current agenda[16].

Of particular importance to the United States is the EU's role in fighting terrorism, which has developed directly from its responsibility for building and maintaining a single market for the free movement of goods, services, and people.  Starting in the late 1990s, the EU committed itself to creating an internal "area of freedom, security, and justice" that would eventually involve a common asylum and migration policy; expanded cooperation among member states on judicial and police matters, and a Union-wide campaign against organized and transnational crime. After September 2001, the process accelerated significantly, and this has been reinforced by the Madrid and London bombings.  While the constitutional treaty would have given the EU stronger decision-making powers in this area, there is no indication that its failure will stall or reverse the current activist trend.  Member states remain responsible for actual policing and implementation of policies, but policy decisions about the fight against terrorism are increasingly made in Brussels.

Because of the EU's growing activism on security matters, an essential element in this new transatlantic architecture will be a stronger U.S.-EU relationship in the security sphere. This does not mean that the United States can neglect its relations with individual EU member states.  To the contrary, bilateral relations with key member states are critical to understanding the EU position and securing cooperation. But engaging directly with the European Union allows the United States to be closer to the course of decision-making in Europe.

For the past decade, U.S. and EU officials at various levels have met regularly to discuss a wide range of foreign policy and trade issues.  These discussions have usually focused on issues somewhat secondary to current transatlantic security priorities, such as regulatory matters, trafficking in humans, sanctions, Balkan reconstruction, and others. Until very recently, the agendas for U.S.-EU discussions were inevitably compared to laundry lists, with many particular topics to be covered briefly.

---

[16]  For a discussion of U.S. interests in a stronger European Union, see Ronald D. Asmus, "Rethinking the EU: Why Washington Needs to Support European Integration," *Survival*, vol. 47, #3, Autumn 2005.

Even at the annual summits, which generally last less than half a day, there has been little opportunity for dialogue about broader strategic perspectives until recently[17].

The relationship has deepened in response to the EU's increased activism on terrorism. Since 2001, the European Union and the United States have engaged directly on law enforcement cooperation, freezing of terrorists' financial assets, and border and transportation security. After some painful disagreements, they completed agreements designed to facilitate police cooperation and sharing of evidence, safeguard shipping containers, and identify suspect airline passengers. The U.S.-EU Policy Dialogue on Borders and Transportation Security (PDBTS) brings together top officials from both the United States and the EU with responsibility for fighting terrorism. Regular meetings between the U.S. attorney general and the EU interior and justice ministers have also focused on the law enforcement aspect of anti-terrorism.[18]

This relationship should now be strengthened in other areas of security policy. In particular, the U.S.-EU dialogue should include more strategic discussions about potential threats and possible responses. New mechanisms, such as the U.S.-EU dialogue on Asia, should help foster such dialogue, with the aim of developing a coordinated response as the security situation throughout Asia evolves. U.S. cooperation with the EU-3 on Iran is a very positive development, and the continuing refusal of Iran to work with the international community only underlines the importance of even deeper transatlantic cooperation. While NATO will remain the primary channel for U.S.-European cooperation on military matters, U.S.-EU discussions should also embrace some of the defense issues that have previously been off limits, but where the EU is now gaining jurisdiction. Specifically, as EDA and the European Commission begin to develop competence over issues of concern to the defense industry, these should come on the U.S.-EU agenda. There will be opposition from some U.S. policymakers who fear that discussing even this narrow section of the defense agenda will undercut NATO, and by European policymakers who fear they will lead to U.S. domination of the EU. But without moving forward in this way, the U.S.-EU relationship will not reflect the real needs of transatlantic security policy.

---

[17] In fact, the summits were considered so unproductive that in 2001 it was decided to reduce them from twice a year to just once.

[18] For further information on U.S.-EU cooperation against terrorism, see The Post-9/11 Partnership: Transatlantic Cooperation against Terrorism, Atlantic Council Policy Paper, December 2004.

# ANNEX III: European Union ESDP Missions, 2003-2006

### 1. European Union Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina: EUPM

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | January 1, 2003 - present |
| Goals | In line with the general objectives of the Paris/Dayton Agreement, EUPM seeks to establish sustainable policing arrangements under BiH ownership in accordance with best European and international practice |
| Composition | Approximately 500 police officers from more than thirty countries |
| Cost of Operation | €14 million for start-up costs (including equipment and the planning team) for 2002, to be financed out of the EC budget; up to €38 million for yearly running costs for the years 2003 to 2005; the final budget for the years 2003 to 2005 shall be decided by the Council of the EU on an annual basis |
| Chain of Command | Mission Chief reports to Secretary-General/High Representative for CFSP through special representative for BiH. |

### 2. EUFOR mission in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Concordia

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | March 31 - December 15, 2003 |
| Goals | Contribute to the establishment of a stable and secure environment in Macedonia, leading to a situation in which an international security presence is no longer needed |
| Composition | 400 persons from 26 countries |
| Cost of Operation | The common costs of the operation are €6.2 million; personnel and other items are on a "costs lie where they fall" basis, i.e. member states pay from their own budgets for their own forces and for their support in the field |
| Chain of Command | Operation commander: DSCEUR; chief of staff of the EU command element: EUFOR; force commander: EUFOR. EU operation headquarters will be located at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe. |

### 3. EU Military Operation in Democratic Republic of Congo: DRC/Artemis

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | June 5 - September 1, 2003 |
| Goals | Contribute to the stabilization of the security conditions and the improvement of the humanitarian situation in Bunia; ensure the protection of the airport, the internally displaced persons in the camps in Bunia; and, if the situation requires it, contribute to the safety of the civilian population |
| Composition | 1,800 mostly French soldiers |
| Cost of Operation | Approximately €7 million |
| Chain of Command | France acted as the "framework nation" for the operation. EU operational commander: French Major General; EU force commander: French Brigadier General. Headquarters of the military force was installed in Entebbe,Uganda, with an outpost in Bunia, DRC. |

## 4. EU Police Mission in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: EUPOL Proxima

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | December 15, 2003 - present |
| Goals | Consolidation of law and order, including the fight against organized crime; practical implementation of Ministry of Interior reforms, including the police; operational transition toward, and creation of a border police, as a part of the wider EU effort to promote integrated border management; the local police in building confidence within the population; enhanced co-operation with neighboring States in the field of policing |
| Composition | 170 personnel from EU member states and other countries, both uniformed police personnel and civilian internationals; additionally, the mission employs about 150 local staff in support functions |
| Cost of Operation | A maximum amount of €7.3 million for start-up costs of the mission; a maximum of €650,000 for running costs for 2003; a maximum of €7.06 million for running costs for 2004, not including per diems, all to be financed out of the European Community budget |
| Chain of Command | Head of the EU mission and police commissioner closely cooperates with the EU special representative in Skopje and reports to the EU Secretary-General/High Representative for CFSP through the EU special representative. |

## 5. EU Rule of Law Mission to Georgia: EUJUST Themis

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | July 16, 2004 – July 16, 2005 |
| Goals | To provide urgent guidance for the new criminal justice reform strategy; to support the overall coordinating role of the relevant Georgian authorities in the field of judicial reform and anti-corruption; to support the planning for new legislation as necessary, e.g. Criminal Procedure Code; to support the development of international as well as regional cooperation in the area of criminal justice. |
| Composition | Approximately 10 international civilian experts, plus local staff |
| Cost of Operation | €4.65 million |
| Chain of Command | Head of mission reports to Secretary-General/High Representative for CFSP through the EU Special Representative for the Southern Caucasus. |

## 6. EU Military Operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina: EUFOR Althea

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | December 2, 2004 - present |
| Goals | Provide deterrence, continued compliance with the responsibility to fulfill the role specified in Annexes 1A and 2 of the Dayton/Paris Agreement (General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzogovina); contribute to a safe and secure environment in BiH, in line with its mandate, required to achieve core tasks in the OHR's Mission Implementation Plan and the Stabilization and Association Process (SAP) |
| Composition | The EU deployed a robust force (EUFOR) - at the same force levels as SFOR (7,000 troops); in addition to 22 EU member states, the following countries are participating in the Althea Operation: Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Switzerland, and Turkey |
| Cost of Operation | Common costs of the operation are €71.7 million; personnel and other items are on a "costs lie where they fall" basis |
| Chain of Command | EU operation commander (OpCdr): DSACEUR, with the EU operation headquarters located at Supreme Headquarters for the Allied forces in Europe; EU force commander: EUFOR. The basic decisions on the operation are taken by the Council of the European Union. The EU's Political and Security Committee will exercise the political control and strategic decision of the operation. EU operations commander will direct Althea through the EU Command Element in Naples and EUFOR HQ in Sarajevo. |

### 7. European Union Police Mission in Kinshasa (DRC): EUPOL Kinshasa

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | January 2005 - present |
| Goals | Monitor, mentor, and advise the setting up and the initial running of the Integrated Police Unit in order to ensure that the IPU acts follow the training received in the Academy Centre and are in accordance with international best practices in this field |
| Composition | The mission will consist of approximately 30 staff members who form a headquarters (HQ) located in the IPU operational base; the HQ will consist of the office of the head of the mission, a monitor, mentor and advisor branch, an administration support branch and liaison officers to the most relevant actors regarding the IPU |
| Cost of Operation | A maximum amount of €4.37 million to cover the costs during the planning phase and the year 2005 |
| Chain of Command | Head of the mission/police commissioner reports to the Secretary-General/High Representative for CFSP through EU special representative. All police officers remain under full command of appropriate national authorities. |

### 8. Integrated rule-of-law mission for Iraq: EUJUST LEX

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | February 2005 - present |
| Goals | Training of some 520 judges, investigating magistrates, senior police and penitentiary officers in senior management and of some 250 investigating magistrates and senior police in criminal investigation |
| Composition | TBA |
| Cost of Operation | €10 million from the EU budget is intended to cover the common costs of the mission; member states will contribute training courses and trainers. |
| Chain of Command | As a crisis management operation, the structure of EUJUST LEX has a unified chain of command. The Political and Security Committee provides the political control and strategic direction. The head of mission assumes coordination and day-to-day management. The head of mission reports to the Secretary-General/High Representative for CFSP. |

### 9. EU Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (EUSEC DR Congo)

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | May 2005 - present |
| Goals | Provide practical support for the integration of the Congolese army and good governance in the field of security, as set out in the general concept; identify and contribute to the development of various projects and options that the European Union and/or its member states may decide to support in this area |
| Composition | Mission experts shall be seconded by member states and by the EU institutions; international civilian staff and local staff shall be recruited on a contractual basis by the mission as required |
| Cost of Operation | €1.6 million |
| Chain of Command | Head of mission leads the advice and assistance team, assumes day-to-day management and reports to the Secretary-General/High Representative for CFSP through the EU special representative. EU special representative reports to the Political and Security Committee and to the Council through the Secretary-General/High Representative for CFSP. |

## 10. Aceh Monitoring Mission: AMM

| Dates | September 2005 – March 2006 |
|---|---|
| Goals | This mission is 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 on 15 August 2005. |
| Composition | The AMM numbers some 226 international unarmed personnel, of which 130 are from EU Member States as well as Norway and Switzerland, and 96 from the five participating ASEAN countries(Brunei, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand). |
| Cost of Operation | €9 million from the EU budget is intended to cover the common costs of the mission; €6 million will come from member states. |
| Chain of Command | The EU's Political and Security Committee (PSC) will exercise the political control and the strategic guidance of the AMM under the responsibility of the Council of the EU. The Head of the mission, Pieter Feith, seconded from the EU Council Secretariat, is supported by three deputies, two EU and one from ASEAN. |

## 11. EU Border Assistance Mission at Rafah Crossing Point in the Palestinian Territories: EU BAM Rafah

| Dates | November 2005 – November 2006 |
|---|---|
| Goals | The European Union is to monitor the operations at the Rafah border crossing point. |
| Composition | The mission will be composed of 70 personnel seconded from EU member states. |
| Cost of Operation | Unspecified |
| Chain of Command | The EU's Political and Security Committee (PSC) will exercise the political control and the strategic guidance of the mission under the responsibility of the Council of the EU. The Head of the mission is Major General Pietro Pistolese. |

## 12. EU Police Mission in the Palestinian Territories: EUPOL COPPS

| Dates | January 2006 –January 2009 |
|---|---|
| Goals | Assist in the implementation of the Palestinian Civil Police Development Plan, advise and mentor senior members of the Civil Police and criminal justice system and co-ordinate EU and, where requested, international assistance. |
| Composition | It will include approximately 33 unarmed personnel mainly seconded from EU Member States |
| Cost of Operation | The financial reference amount intended to cover the expenditure related until the end of 2006 will be 6.1 million euros (common costs). |
| Chain of Command | It will build on the work of the EU Coordinating Office for Palestinian Police Support.The EU's Political and Security Committee will exercise political control and strategic direction. High Representative Javier Solana will give guidance to the Head of Mission. |

# Members of the Delegation

**Frances G. Burwell** is director of the Atlantic Council's Program on Transatlantic Relations and a specialist on U.S.-European Union relations.

**David C. Gompert** is a senior fellow at RAND. He has been a distinguished research professor at the National Defense University, president of RAND Europe, senior director for Europe and Eurasia on the National Security Council staff, deputy assistant secretary of state for Europe, and senior advisor for national security with the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq.

**Leslie S. Lebl** is a non-resident senior fellow at the Atlantic Council focusing on political and military aspects of transatlantic relations. A career diplomat, she served most recently as minister counselor for political affairs at the U.S. Mission to the European Union and as political advisor to the commander of SFOR in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

**Jan M. Lodal** is president of the Atlantic Council of the United States. He has previously served as principal deputy under secretary of defense for policy, with responsibility for NATO and Europe policy, and on the staff of the National Security Council.

**Walter B. Slocombe** is an attorney with Caplin & Drysdale's Washington, DC office and a member of the board of directors of the Atlantic Council. He has held a number of senior positions at the Department of Defense, most recently under secretary of defense for policy and senior advisor for national defense with the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq.