



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 3 November 2005

13983/05

**DOCUMENT PARTIALLY
ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC**

LIMITE

**COSDP 742
CIVCOM 315
COPOL 9
RELEX 587**

NOTE

from : Politico-Military Group
to : Political and Security Committee

Subject : Draft EU Concept for Comprehensive Planning

Further to the PMG meeting of 3 November 2005, delegations will find attached the Draft EU Concept for Comprehensive Planning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>
A.	Introduction
B.	Purpose of the Concept
C.	Definition
D.	Scope
E.	The Comprehensive Planning Processes
	Advance planning and preparatory actions
	Detection of the crisis and analysis of the situation
	Consideration that EU action is appropriate; Development and finalisation of the Crisis Management Concept
	Presentation of the Crisis Management Concept
	Refocusing of EU Action, including possible termination of operations

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

References:

- A. Treaty on European Union
- B. European Union Concept for Military Strategic Planning (final) - EUMC 30/01 dated 12 Sep 01.
- C. Civil-Military Co-operation (CIMIC) Concept for EU-led Crisis Management Operations – CI 7106/02 dated 18 Mar 02.
- D. EU crisis management and conflict prevention – Guidelines on fact-finding missions – Col 15461/02, dated 10 December 2002
- E. Suggestions for Procedures for Coherent, Comprehensive EU Crisis Management – Col 11127/03 dated 3 Jul 03.
- F. EUMS Crisis Management Manual – CCD 05-03/06-COS 232/03 dated 7 Oct 03.
- G. Civil Military Co-ordination (CMCO) – CI 14457/03 dated 7 Nov 03.
- H. European Security Strategy – Col 15895/03, dated 8 December 2003
- I. UN Guidelines on the use of military and civil defence assets in disaster relief - UN DHA Geneva - Project DPR 213/3 MCDA (Oslo Guidelines)
- J. European Defence: NATO/EU Consultation, Planning and Operations – CI 13990/1/04 Rev 1 dated 7 Dec 04.
- K. Improving the Community Civil protection Mechanism – COM(2005) 137 final dated 20 Apr 05.
- L. Reinforcing EU Disaster and Crisis Response in Third Countries – COM(2005) 153 final; dated 20 Apr 05.
- M. Follow Up to the EU Action Plan Following the Earthquake and Tsunamis in the Indian Ocean - CI 8204/05 dated 20 Apr 05.
- N The Joint Declaration by the Council and the Commission of 29 September 2003 on the use of the Community civil protection mechanism on Crisis Management.

A. INTRODUCTION

1. The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) has been developed in support of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) to strengthen the EU's contribution to international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations (UN) Charter.

2. Complex crises demand a comprehensive response including a mixture of instruments and actors. In failed states for instance, military instruments may be needed to restore order alongside humanitarian efforts to manage the immediate crisis. In the post conflict phase, military assets and effective policing may be needed in conjunction with political, humanitarian and development actors. With its broad set of civilian and military instruments and its Civil Military Co-ordination (CMCO) approach to crisis management the European Union is particularly well equipped to respond to such multi-faceted situations.

3. The European Security Strategy recognises that security and development are linked. Insecurity, lawlessness, and violent conflict are among the biggest obstacles to achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Poverty, underdevelopment and fragile states create fertile conditions for conflict and the emergence of new security threats, including international crime and terrorism.¹

B. PURPOSE OF CONCEPT

4. The purpose of this concept is to define a practical framework for effective planning co-ordination between EU actors for EU crisis management in accordance with the agreed EU Crisis Management Procedures. This planning approach enhances the possibility for the EU to address complex crises in a coherent manner. It takes into account relevant EU planning and crisis response instruments and Council instances, at all levels in order to achieve synergy and focus.

5. This document should be considered as a living document to be improved over time as agreed by the PSC, on the basis of lessons learned and in the light of experience gained, as a better understanding emerges of the links between sectors, the underlying causes of crises and how to address them. Developing other aspects of CMCO, including improving co-ordination in-theatre will also improve EU's comprehensive approach to crisis management. Possible examples might include: an enhanced role for the EUSR with a dedicated staff to support him; co-location of in-theatre headquarters; and joint and comprehensive pre-deployment training. Other international initiatives in this area² could also be taken into account. This document is intended to be read in conjunction with the EU Crisis Management Procedures and does not supersede them.

¹ The European Security Strategy 15895/03

² **DELETED**

C. DEFINITION

6. Comprehensive Planning is defined as follows:

“Comprehensive Planning is a systematic approach designed to address the need for effective intra-pillar and inter-pillar co-ordination of activity by all relevant EU actors in crisis management planning. It contributes to the development and delivery of a co-ordinated and coherent response to a crisis on the basis of an all-inclusive analysis of the situation, in particular where more than one EU instrument is engaged. It includes identification and consideration of interdependencies, priorities and sequence of activities and harnesses resources in an effective and efficient manner, through a coherent framework that permits review of progress to be made. The Council Secretariat and the Commission work together to this end. This approach applies to all phases of the planning process for a crisis management operation conducted under the political control and strategic direction of the Political and Security Committee under the responsibility of the Council, and in accordance with the established procedures for EU crisis management.”

D. SCOPE

7. Comprehensive Planning is part of CMCO, as defined in the Framework for CMCO:

“Civil-Military Co-ordination (CMCO) in the context of CFSP/ESDP addresses the need for effective co-ordination of the actions of all relevant EU actors involved in the planning and subsequent implementation of EU's response to the crisis.”³

8. Comprehensive Planning is suitable for all types of possible EU-led operations involving more than one EU instrument, including fully integrated operations (civil-civil or civil-military), parallel operations, civilian operations with military support and/or protection, and missions transitioning from military to civilian elements. This planning approach is applicable to all phases of crisis management including conflict prevention and post-conflict activities, and the full range of tasks foreseen in Article 17 TEU⁴.

³ Civil Military Co-ordination (CMCO) 14457/03

⁴ Humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.

9. This concept aims to contribute to the provision of a practical framework within which planning for specific EU and Community activities can take place, without affecting the competencies of the relevant bodies within the Union as reflected in the appropriate treaty provisions and Council decisions. Comprehensive Planning focuses on the preparation and conduct of EU crisis management operations. It should contribute to improving coherence of the EU's external action, and be part of the EU's overall approach in a particular country or region.

10. EU CMCO including Comprehensive Planning implies unity of effort while respecting each actor's integrity, specific expertise and contribution to EU crisis management.

E. THE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROCESSES

11. Under the authority of the Council, the PSC exercises political control and strategic direction of EU-led crisis management operations. Thus, the PSC has a central role to play in Comprehensive Planning and in ensuring co-ordinated actions on the basis of decisions taken by the Council and, with the Commission, for ensuring coherence in the Union's response to a crisis.⁵

12. For significant benefit to be realised, all the EU actors with a role in crisis management need to be engaged from the earliest phases of crisis management planning. Consultations and contacts with external actors (e.g. UN, NATO, OSCE, non-EU European NATO members) are to be carried out in each phase in accordance with the Crisis Management Procedures.

⁵ "the Council body which deals with crisis situations and examines all the options that might be considered as the Union's response within the single institutional framework and without prejudice to the decision-making and implementation procedures of each pillar." "Without prejudice to the role of the Commission, it supervises the implementation of the measures adopted and assesses their effects. The Commission informs the PSC of the measures it has adopted or is envisaging."

"Coreper exercises the role conferred on it by Article 207 of the Treaty establishing the European Community and by Article 19 of the Council's Rules of Procedure." The PSC "co-ordinates, supervises and monitors discussions on CFSP issues in various Working Parties", whose expertise needs to be taken fully into account, further ensuring the coherence of the EU's overall approach." Nice, Annex I II to Annex VI – PSC TOR.

13. **Advance planning and preparatory actions.** Advance planning including strategic contingency planning represents a necessary tool for the EU to be able to respond rapidly and effectively to a crisis. Advance planning may be comprehensive, but only in terms of the particular issue or requirement that is being addressed. When a comprehensive approach to planning is deemed necessary it may be in an effort to resolve a crisis before it turns into armed conflict, albeit continuing to plan for that eventuality and for stabilisation and reconstruction thereafter. This process may be able to utilise plans that have been developed under advance or contingency planning processes.

14. **Detection of the crisis and analysis of the situation.** Early consideration and detailed understanding of the emerging crisis through a joint assessment sets the conditions for developing a coherent and comprehensive plan. In accordance with the EU Crisis Management Procedures the EU SITCEN collects information from various sources e.g. the Commission, Member States and agreed external channels (including UN, NATO, OSCE and other international organisations). It takes steps to analyse the problem from all angles, and to ensure coverage of all the issues affecting the crisis. This contributes to a comprehensive approach to the work on detecting crises and assessing the political situations. PSC-authorized fact finding missions, possibly conducted jointly with the Commission, could contribute to the assessment process which includes identifying the underlying causes and dynamics of the crisis as well as key actors. This usually requires access to subject matter experts⁶.

15. **Consideration that EU action is appropriate; Development and finalisation of the crisis management concept** The joint assessment feeds into the discussion in the PSC which considers the extent of EU interest in the crisis, with advice from the EUMC, CIVCOM and geographical working group as appropriate, and taking into account activities carried out under the responsibility of the Commission. This assessment initiates both the conduct of a more detailed analysis and the development of the strategic plan, i.e. the Crisis Management Concept. The Crisis Management Concept could, in turn, form a basis for a joint approach to other documents. At an early stage in the planning process the PSC should where possible on a preliminary basis, and without prejudice to a future Joint Action, identify the OHQ/Operation Centre to be used, or the equivalent command arrangements in respect of a civilian crisis management mission. Discussions should also include the role of the EUSR if one is appointed.

⁶ For example: national authorities; and experts in governance, justice, development, security, DDR, SSR,

Development of the Crisis Management Concept. A draft Crisis Management Concept is prepared for Member States' consideration by an ad hoc crisis response co-ordination team (CRCT)⁷ with assistance or contribution by e.g. the Civ/Mil Cell. The Crisis Management Concept will be delivered on the basis of combined contributions of the various actors throughout the strategic to the tactical levels. The Crisis Management Concept ensures full coherence between the different EU actors allowing them to conduct their respective activities in line with a shared endstate and objectives. It should identify the critical links and interdependencies between the different tasks, clearly sequencing the different EU activities. It is important that vital elements of any EU crisis response such as human rights, standards of behaviour and gender aspects are considered where appropriate. The plan should also take account, wherever possible, of the views of local stakeholders in order to address legitimacy and dependency issues. This approach does not present a template solution but should be applied as a way of thinking tailored to the specific situation using the Crisis Management Concept template as appropriate. The Crisis Management Concept should include the following:

General endstate. The general endstate (e.g. a stable democratic and self-sustaining state) should be the single, unambiguous and realistic purpose towards which the plan is directed. It will be attained by the achievement of the key objectives, and will form the basis of an exit strategy. Its definition should flow from the analysis of the situation and form the start point of the Crisis Management Concept. It should take into account the international context.

information, police, customs, human rights, and electoral matters.

⁷ The CRCT consists of officials from relevant services in the Council Secretariat and the Commission, Suggestions for Procedures for Coherent, Comprehensive EU Crisis Management, Annex 2.

Key and interim objectives. The key objectives (e.g. legitimate and effective governance) are the conditions that need to be met in order to reach the required endstate. They are realised through the achievement of a number of outcomes or effects. They should be derived from an analysis of the desired endstate, and may be grouped into a number of sectors e.g. governance and participation; security; economic and social well-being; justice: reconciliation; the rule of law; and the international context. In delivering these objectives it may be that certain activities and tasks have to be prioritised in relation to each other. Linked to the key objectives are a set of interim objectives which establishes benchmarks by which to judge the overall progress of an operation. Successful achievement of the objectives will rely on both the EU and the national stakeholders.

Delivery of key objectives. Having defined the key and interim objectives the next step is to deduce which series of outcomes (e.g. re-establish rule of law), activities (e.g. police mission) and tasks (e.g. training of national police force) are necessary to deliver each of the objectives. They must be grouped in the logical order in which they need to be achieved, sequenced over time. Linkages should be identified across the sectors where progress in one area is dependent on another. Only as a result of these steps will a clear view emerge of which EU actors will be involved.

Measuring success. To allow accurate review of progress a clear measurement of success needs to be defined for each outcome, activity and task.

16. Presentation of the Crisis Management Concept. The drawing together of the different elements is likely to result in a multilayered approach to the Crisis Management Concept and subsequent planning documents. A number of actors may need to contribute towards the same outcomes and effects. Progress in one sector will often rely upon or facilitate progress in another. There needs to be a clear linkage between the strategic objectives and tasks on the ground to be agreed at a later stage in the planning process. These interdependencies should be represented in a holistic plan to support the PSC, which exercises political control and strategic direction to the crisis management operation, as well as all the other actors involved.

17. **Refocusing of EU Action, including possible termination of operations.** A review process should inform actors at appropriate levels on the developments of the EU response and thereby enable them to consider any refocusing of EU action, including the option of terminating some or all elements of the operation, for final agreement by the Council. This needs to be a joint activity involving all EU actors in a given operation and cover all the sectors. The frequency of these reviews will depend on the situation.

Methodology. The methodology to measure progress needs to incorporate all the sectors. This is dependent on: Data availability; the time period over which outcomes become apparent and difficulties in linking cause and effect. Success criteria need to be defined for all outcomes, activities and tasks wherever possible in the development of the Crisis Management Concept. The rigour and validity of the review can be improved through establishing a connection from the general endstate to tactical activities and tasks and by establishing benchmarks through identifying interim objectives.

Areas for assessment. There are three general areas for consideration: the context within which the plan is set; improvements in the capability and capacity of the local stakeholders to address their known problems; and the resolution of the underlying issues in order that intervention is not required again.

Strategic Context. A review of the strategic context will need consideration of: Perceptions of the legitimacy of the international mandate; the freedoms exercised by and constraints placed upon the EU actors involved; the willingness of the local people to accept and engage with the plan; and the ability of the plan to meet the expectations of the local population.

Local Capability. The second area for consideration should be the assessment of the local capability and when future assistance is required to help strengthen those capabilities. Questions include whether there exist a security sector capable of restoring and ensuring stability; effective governance; social and economic infrastructure; and functioning rule of law.

Resolution of Underlying Issues. The third area should review how successful the plan has been in resolving the underlying causes of the crisis. It must address the dynamics of the instability and revise the plan as appropriate to achieve the necessary outcomes.
