

**Speaking points for Dr Lars-Erik Lundin at the SEDE public hearing on ESS and ESDP  
July 13, 2006**

- Grateful to EP for this invitation to speak on a topic, which is key, both to security and development. I will try to address the topic at hand focussing on the importance but also the limits of power. Coming back very recently from an EU political directors troika to Baghdad, for me this seems a natural and appropriate approach. It may seem a trivial statement that security is a condition for development and vice versa. It is not. In neither direction.
- Iraq and the failure of the EU to get its act together on that major issue of international security not only gave birth to ESS. The situation in and around Iraq today illustrates the fundamental problems the international community is facing also in other areas of the world in seeking to help host countries to help themselves. And I am not only referring to the Middle East but also to parts of Eurasia and certainly to parts of Africa.
- This situation also illustrates the wisdom built into both the ESS and ESDP that problems very seldom have only military solutions, that the main efforts in support of peace and development almost always have to be made by the governments and peoples of the host countries, that the international community in most cases can only catalyse progress, and above all that the EU very seldom can be alone in its programs and operations but needs to work closely with the relevant international and regional organisations – if I mention a country like Afghanistan both the UN and NATO have very important roles. This has been a longstanding principle of the emergency assistance that the Community has delivered to help stabilise countries emerging from violent conflict. Iraq also illustrates the fundamental requirements of successful humanitarian assistance, as set out in the Oslo guidelines. At the same time Iraq has shown that in some environments also the United Nations, independent humanitarian organizations, NGOs and indeed free media have great difficulties to work effectively and need security.
- It should go without saying that the future of international development assistance cannot be to work in armoured convoys. Still, this is the requirement we sometimes do face in areas where kidnappings, hostage taking and IED:s are favourite tools not only of terrorists but also sectarian militias and common criminals.
- So the issue of civil-military cooperation is also not confined to that small box labelled CIMIC traditionally seen far down the chain of command in the organigram of a military peace support operation. For the EU it must be the joining up of objectives for external action both as regards the concepts for civil and military operations inside the ESDP and for overall EU external action, including the actions of our member States bilaterally and through international and regional organisations. For the Commission, civil-military coordination also must include considerations of how we can best work with, and support the expertise and resources of NGOs to work better and how we can promote ownership by the host countries.
- For us, it has therefore been an important step forward when the EU decided to establish the so called civil military cell and invited the Commission to appoint two officials to provide liaison with the cell. This has – going beyond the strict context of civil-military coordination - already helped us to establish a better understanding of the needs for disaster and crisis response and the potential use of military assets in this context. It has also helped us to achieve a more realistic and I would say holistic

approach to planning in Aceh, Kosovo Congo, and elsewhere where the ESDP and the EC are present to provide support through complementary tools.

- This coordination is, in turn, a natural continuation of the cooperation which we already since long have established in the area of conflict prevention and early warning, where the Council policy unit and situational centre are doing vital work and where the Commission services can add its detailed in-country assessments through its some 130 delegations on the ground in most partner countries around the world.
- Let me in this context also say a word about the role of the PSC, the political and security committee, the EU Military Committee where I am proud to be the Commission representative and the structures of the Council secretariat including the EU military staff set up for ESDP. These bodies have in the few years since the birth of ESDP added significant capabilities to the EU to think about the security aspects before it acts in sometimes increasingly difficult environments. Of course we still have a long way to go before we totally get our act together but significant improvements have taken place. In addition to the thirteen operations we have now a global strategic outlook and a certain situational awareness also in areas where the ESDP has not yet deployed. For me thus ESDP is very far from the symbolic type of actions mentioned by Professor Cox.
- And I would like to stress that civil-military cooperation very much is a question of joining up objectives and to make minds meet between sometimes very different cultures. The distinction is here not so much between the Commission and the Council structures but between the development community, the security and defense community and those EU formations which are mainly dealing with the enlargement of the EU, our neighbourhood policies and the increasingly strong justice and home affairs component of EU external action.
- We all need to feel ownership of EU external action. So on the one hand it is good that the visibility and specificity of ESDP is promoted, on the other we still need that Foreign Minister who can symbolise that this is a part of overall EU external action.
- The more specific discussion of CMCO inside the EU has proceeded during the three presidencies of the UK, Austria and now Finland on the basis of a joint paper stressing the need for in-field coordination and coherence and the need for comprehensive planning with a view to the comprehensive end state after ESDP operations are over. In our view comprehensive planning means taking a strategic view of how Community instruments and ESDP instruments can contribute to a shared political objective. Community instruments can be rapidly deployed, but importantly work with a long-term perspective. They will be further strengthened when the Stability Instrument comes on stream next year.
- Let me mention a few concrete examples of progress achieved so far. First the deployment of joint fact finding missions as was done for Aceh and recently for Kosovo. Secondly, the experiment of double hatting of EUSRs and heads of Commission delegations as currently underway in FYROM. Thirdly, the deployment of Community operations in close coordination and with the support of EUSRs as is the case with the Community border mission in Moldova. Fourth the mutual supportive roles between the EC and the ESDP developed in DRC where the Commission through EDF and the ESDP are working together to address the reform of the Security Sector. And now we see a military ESDP operation set up to provide flanking support for the elections in that country and the EU electoral mission there, in a similar way as the Artemis military operation in the Ituri province some three years ago provided some of the necessary conditions for UN and EU humanitarian work to proceed. Fifth, the joining up of concepts for security sector reform work in the field

first through an ESDP paper late last year and now through a Commission communication. Sixth, the work on improving security of personnel in the field through better communication and situation awareness tools which was discussed in large conference organised by the Commission late last year and which we now hope will proceed under the Finnish presidency. It should be noted that the development of such tools are very much supported through the Community security research program and there already exists an extensive network of European and international companies and research institutes working in this area, including as regards Galileo, GMES and other space assets.

- Let me finally say how much we welcome the support and interest shown by the European Parliament and indeed this Committee for these issues. Work inside the EU institutions still lack in accountability and visibility and the Commission Plan D underway to promote democracy, debate and dialogue is perhaps particularly important in the field of security where there is – paradoxically - very strong popular support for EU action but still too low support for the institutions set out to do the job. Joint meetings of the Foreign Affairs Committees of the European and national Parliaments as well as public hearings such as this today can help to reach out to a wider audience and to reduce the information gap. And there must not only be a close relationship between security and development but also indeed between security and democracy. For us in the Commission and not least for the Commissioner for whom I specifically work the concept of human security is a vital one, as illustrated by the Barcelona report circulated in the documentation for this meeting. In this context we are extremely grateful for the support of the European Parliament in developing not only the extensive mine actions programs through Community instruments the last five years or so but also for pilot projects to explore new ways in which the EU can promote human security.