



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 2 June 2021
(OR. en)

9378/21

LIMITE

PESCO 21
COPS 218
POLMIL 81
EUMC 120
CSDP/PSDC 293

COVER NOTE

From: European External Action Service (EEAS)
To: Delegations
Subject: PESCO Projects Progress Reports

DOCUMENT PARTIALLY ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC (29.07.2022)

Delegations will find attached, as received via the EEAS, PESCO Secretariat communication no. PESCO20210051 containing the 46 reports by the participating Member States on the progress made towards the implementation of PESCO projects.

Encl.: PESCO Secretariat communication no. PESCO20210051

PESCO SECRETARIAT COMMUNICATION

PESCO20210051/ARO

31 May 2021

PESCO Secretariat documentation for Government use only

To: PSC Ambassadors

Copy: EUMC, PMG Delegates

PESCO PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORTS TO THE COUNCIL

References: A - Council Decision (CFSP) 2017/2315 of 11 December 2017

B - Council Decision (CFSP) 2018/909 of 25 June 2018

Annex: 1 - PESCO Projects Progress Report

2- PESCO Projects Definitions and their meaning document of 27 November 2020

Having regard to the Article 5(3) of Council Decision (CFSP) 2017/2315 of 11 December 2017 establishing the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) and determining the list of participating Member States (pMS) and in accordance with the Article 2 and Article 3(c) of the Council Decision (CFSP) 2018/909 of 25 June 2018 establishing a common set of governance rules for PESCO projects, *"...the Council shall be duly informed by the project members on the development of the respective PESCO projects once a year"*.

On 18 January 2021, the PESCO secretariat sent the communication to the pMS (PESCO20210045) with a view to collect the consolidated information on the PESCO projects and transmit to the Council. Following that call, the project members, through the project coordinators, reported to the PESCO secretariat on the progress achieved within the respective PESCO projects.

Please find in the Annex, the reports on the progress made towards the implementation of 46 PESCO projects.

Director General

Deputy Secretary-General for CSDP
and Crisis Response

Chief Executive

EU Military Staff

European External Action Service

European Defence Agency

VADM Hervé Bléjean

Charles Fries

Jiří Šedivý



PESCO SECRETARIAT
COMMUNICATION



ANNEX

PESCO PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORTS

PESCO Secretariat documentation for Government use only

May 2021

PUBLIC

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Contents

Introduction	5
A. PESCO Projects Progress Overview	6
B. Indicators of Progress of Projects.....	8
C. Risk Indicators.....	8
D. Project Phases Definitions.....	9
1) Projects in Training, Facilities domain.....	11
(IT) European Training Certification Centre for European Armies	12
(EL) Helicopter Hot and High Training (H3 Training)	14
(EL) Joint EU Intelligence School (JEIS).....	16
(FR, SE) EU Test and Evaluation Centers (EUTEC).....	18
(HU) Integrated European Joint Training and Simulation Centre (EUROSIM).....	20
(PT) EU Cyber Academia and Innovation Hub (EU CAIH).....	22
(PL) SOF Medical Training Centre (SMTC).....	24
(RO) CBRN Defence Training Range (CBRNTR)	26
(RO) European Union Network of Diving Centres (EUNDC)	28
2) Projects in Land, Formations, Systems domain.....	31
(DE) EUFOR Crisis Response Operation Core (EUFOR CROC)	32
(IT) Deployable Military Disaster Relief Capability Package (DM-DRCP)	34
(IT) Armoured Infantry Fighting Vehicle / Amphibious Assault Vehicle / Light Armoured Vehicle (AIFV/AAV/LAV)	36
(SK) Indirect Fire Support Capability (EuroArtillery)	38
(EE) Integrated Unmanned Ground System (iUGS)	40
(FR) EU Beyond Line Of Sight (BLOS) Land Battlefield Missile Systems (EU BLOS).....	42
3) Projects in Maritime domain	45
(BE) Maritime (semi) Autonomous Systems for Mine Countermeasures (MAS-MCM)	46
(IT) Harbour and Maritime Surveillance and Protection (HARMSPRO).....	48
(EL) Upgrade of Maritime Surveillance.....	50
(BG) Deployable Modular Underwater Intervention Capability Package (DIVEPACK)	52
(PT) Maritime Unmanned Anti-Submarine System (MUSAS).....	54

(IT) European Patrol Corvette (EPC)	56
4) Projects in Air domain	59
(DE) European MALE RPAS	60
(FR) TIGER Mark III	62
(IT) Counter Unmanned Aerial System (C-UAS).....	64
(ES) Airborne Electronic Attack (AEA).....	66
5) Projects in Cyber C4ISR domain	69
(EL) Cyber Threats and Incident Response Information Sharing Platform (CTISP).....	70
(LT) Cyber Rapid Response Teams and Mutual Assistance in Cyber Security (CRRT).....	72
(ES) Strategic C2 System for CSDP Missions and Operations (EUMILCOM)	74
(FR) European Secure Software defined Radio (ESSOR).....	76
(IT) European High Atmosphere Airship Platform – Persistent ISR Capability (EHAAP).....	78
(EL) One Deployable SOF Tactical C2 Command Post (CP) – (SOCC) for SJO.....	80
(CZ) Electronic Warfare Capability and Interoperability Programme for Future JISR Cooperation	82
(DE) Cyber and Information Domain Coordination Center (CIDCC)	84
6) Projects in Joint, Enabling domain	87
(NL) Military Mobility.....	88
(DE) European Medical Command (EMC).....	90
(DE) Network of Logistic Hubs in Europe and Support to Operations.....	92
(FR) Energy Operational Function (EOF).....	94
(AT) CBRN Surveillance as a Service (CBDRN SaaS)	96
(FR) Co-basing	98
(DE) Geo-meteorological and Oceanographic (GeoMETOC) Support Coordination Element (GMSCE)	100
(FR) Timely Warning and Interception with Space-based TheatER surveillance (TWISTER)	102
(FR) Materials and components for technological EU competitiveness (MAC-EU).....	104
(FR) EU Collaborative Warfare Capabilities (ECoWAR).....	106
(IT) European Global RPAS Insertion Architecture System (GLORIA)	108
7) Projects in Space domain.....	111
(FR) EU Radionavigation Solution (EURAS)	112
(IT) European Military Space Surveillance Awareness Network.....	114

Introduction

This PESCO Projects Progress Report is prepared in accordance with Article 5 (3) of the Council Decision (CFSP) 2017/2315 of 11 December 2017, establishing Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) which defines that the Council shall be regularly informed on the developments of the projects. The Council Decision (CFSP) 2018/909 of 25 June 2018 establishing a common set of governance rules for PESCO projects also specifies the need for the Council to be duly informed about the development of the PESCO projects once a year. In addition, as laid down in Article 2 (2) of the Council Decision (CFSP) 2018/909 of 25 June stressed that these reports shall contain consolidated information on progress made towards the implementation of the project, its roadmap, objectives and milestones, and its contribution to the fulfilment of the relevant more binding commitments.

In April 2020, the High Representative (HR) in his Annual Report on the Status of the PESCO Implementation (HR (2020)54) mentioned that there was a scope to develop clear and transparent criteria and parameters to assess the progress of the implementation of the PESCO projects. Additionally, in June 2020, the Council Recommendation (2020/C 204/01 of 17 June 2020) recalled that there was a need to reinforce the reviewing process of the progress of PESCO projects. It stressed that, when project members identify that projects are encountering difficulties in delivering results, those projects should either be revived or closed, in order to ensure the relevance and credibility of all PESCO projects and make recommendations for maintaining a steady pace towards concrete deliverables, notably on the basis of dedicated roadmaps provided by the project members. On that basis the PESCO Secretariat develop the document “PESCO projects definitions and their meaning” (PESCO20200045) which was agreed by pMS on 27 November 2020.

The necessary information to deliver an overview on the progress of PESCO projects was provided and updated by the project coordinators using the PESCO Common Workspace (CWS) available at <https://cws.pesco.europa.eu/>. On that basis, 46 individual project factsheets were developed by the PESCO secretariat taking into account a further clarification obtained during the workshop on the progress of PESCO Projects. These information were validated by the project coordinators.

The Report is composed by the project factsheets and presented per operational domain. At the beginning of each domain a summary is provided. The layout of the individual project factsheet has been amended to reflect the Council Conclusions and the new elements agreed with the document on “PESCO projects definitions and their meaning”. The factsheet provides on two pages the key information on the project and its progress more accurately, as requested by the Council, being organized in the following categories: list of participants/observers, project’s phase, contribution to the more binding commitments, capability perspective and operational viewpoint, project description, objectives, resources and financial support, third States participation, roadmap/milestones and additional information. Also, the “N/A” reference in the projects factsheets is related with non-applicability of information.

The definitions of the four project phases (ideation, incubation, execution, closure) are again included. In addition, the progress and risk indicators used to present the overview on the projects are listed in this introduction.

DELETED

PUBLIC

DELETED

PUBLIC

B. Indicators of Progress

The indicators of progress are quantitative or qualitative variables indicating changes or progress made towards the implementation of PESCO projects. The indicators have been agreed with the document “PESCO projects definitions and their meaning”. The information related to the indicators is reported by the project coordinators on behalf of the project members through the CWS. The definitions related to the indicators of progress of the projects are:

- a. **Project Completion Year (PCY):** The year, by which the project objectives will have been met and the outcome has been delivered. Key activities related to the project completion and closing of the project are agreed by the project members. *(Note: This indicator replaces FOC – Full Operational Capability - which was used until now).*
- b. **Project Execution Year (PEY):** Project execution year (or implementation) is the year by which the plan designed in the prior phases of the project life is put into action. The purpose of project execution is to deliver the project expected results (deliverables and other direct outputs) by the foreseen completion date *(Note: This indicator replaces IOC – Initial Operational Capability – which was used until now).*
- c. **Roadmap:** Overview of the project’s objectives, milestones, deliverables, and planned resources.
- d. **Phase of Project’s Lifecycle:** The phase in which the project is in: Ideation, Incubation, Execution or Closing.

Taking into account the PESCO project report of last year, it could be stated that 11 projects are progressing according to their plans. For 33 projects changes were reported regarding their roadmaps. 1 project had tested and technically confirmed its full operational capability to be formally declared by the project members. For 2 projects objectives, scope and deliverables are under assessment.

C. Risk Indicators

The risk indicators allow to evaluate the likelihood that a PESCO project will fail to fully or partially deliver its objectives. They are supposed to be identified by the Project Members and reported by the Project Coordinator. The following agreed risk indicators are included in this reporting system and in each PESCO Project Factsheet:

- Delay in the implementation of the agreed project milestones and timelines.
- Decrease in the level of participation *(which leads to an amendment of the CD on the list of PESCO projects).*
- Change in the objectives, the scope or the deliverables.
- Lack of notably financial resources (national or EU).

Taking into account these agreed project risk indicators for the first time, it could be stated that for 15 projects delays have been reported regarding the original’s timelines. For 6 projects the project

coordinators have reported the pandemic situation as a cause for their delay. No significant changes regarding the participation have been identified, only 3 projects reported a decrease of level of participation. For 20 projects it is reported that there no national financial resources have been allocated so far.

D. Projects Phases Definitions

1. IDEATION

The **Ideation Phase** of a project is a conceptual phase. An outcome of this phase is likely to be a statement by project members on what the project is intended to deliver (in the form of a project initiating document), including: an estimate how long it will take to achieve the desired output; resources required (including any Through-Life Management Costs); the potential return on investment (if appropriate); likely stakeholders; how the end product or service will be used by operating authorities; and what are the risks involved. High-level staff requirements will be considered in this phase. A feasibility study to assess the project viability may be undertaken, as a precursor for the Incubation Phase.

2. INCUBATION

The **Incubation Phase** of a project is where more detailed assessment and planning are undertaken by project members and concludes with a decision as a key milestone. In this phase the scope of a project is to be defined, which includes: a detailed assessment of the activities to be undertaken within the project; derivation of a project plan, encompassing activity scheduled, resources (financial and human), communication, stakeholder engagement, and how the solution will be obtained; the methodology for detailing possible risks/ issues. All these elements will be included in the Business Case with a view to monitor the progress of a project. There may be a need for a Memorandum of Understanding to cover facilities, doctrine or resources of the project. Critically, planning will need to be undertaken to ensure that the perceived benefits of the project will be realized by the end-user in the form of a Benefits Management Plan. The Project Board will review the outcomes of this phase leading to Project Authorization.

3. EXECUTION

Within the **Execution Phase** of a project the work is executed according to the approved project management plan. If the solution is derived under contract, then a kick-off meeting is held with the contracting authority. Changes might be introduced to the implementation plan of the project, if necessary. Periodic reports are to be made available to the stakeholders on the progress of the project and performance of the project members, including the use of the resources. In the event of risks or issues being realized contingency plans are activated. Within this phase, solutions could be tested as a 'pilot activity' to assess where expected deliverables meet desired specifications. Feedback is solicited, project outputs as 'quick-wins' are accepted and lessons identified and shared as 'project knowledge'. The outcome of this Phase should be accepted deliverables against those planned.

4. CLOSURE

In the **Closure Phase** of a project, an assessment as to whether the work done meets the requirements / specifications (this may result in an Acceptance Certificate) is undertaken. Critically, the output is handed over to the end-user with a subsequent assessment of impact made according to the Benefits Management Plan. Procurement processes are closed, records archived, and lessons updated for the organizational knowledge base.



THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DELETED FROM THIS POINT UNTIL THE END OF THE DOCUMENT (page 115)

PUBLIC