

**Committee on Foreign Affairs  
Subcommittee on Security and Defence.**

**Public Hearing**

**The European Security Strategy and the Future of the European Security and  
Defence Policy.**

**Thursday, 13 July 2006**

**Title of Section: The Civil-Military Cooperation**

**Speaker: Lieutenant General Jean-Paul PERRUCHE, Director-General of the  
EU Military Staff, Council of the European Union**

**SUMMARY**

General Perruche focused his presentation on the most recent initiatives in the area of civil-military cooperation and provided information about the work that was underway in the Council. He explained that, at the end of 2003, under the Italian Presidency, it was suggested that the capability of the EU Military Staff (EUMS) should be strengthened through the establishment of a civil-military cell. The main tasks of the cell were to be: the integration of the work done within the EU in conflict prevention and post-conflict stabilisation; the development of expertise and management of civil-military interaction; the advancement of strategic planning for civil military operations, along with support for the Commander of an EU-led autonomous operation.

General Perruche clarified that this civil-military cell has become a reality and has been up and running for over one year. The people employed in the cell come from different backgrounds. The cell is divided into two parts: one is responsible for strategic planning and is made up of 15 members of staff, the other has a permanent core that is also made up of 15 staff.

General Perruche concentrated his presentation on describing the strategic part of the cell. In that part of the cell there were seven people who were specialised in police operations and in justice systems. There were also two representatives of the Commission working full time who are tasked to act as a bridge between the Commission and the Council and to ensure that there is better coordination of action between the two bodies, (particularly when it comes to achieving complementary between humanitarian assistance, development aid and security operations).

He clarified that although the primary option for managing an independent operation was the use of a national Headquarters, the cell was to establish in Brussels an Operation Centre to be used when a combined civil-military response was required, and particularly when no Headquarters was available.

He argued that the cell had already played an important role, particularly for the operation in Aceh (Indonesia) and more recently for the electoral support process in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The Operation Centre was going to be operational by the end of 2006 and, at that point, it would be able to provide new capabilities for the EU in its autonomous operations.

General Perruche stated that the approach adopted towards achieving closer coherence between the civilian and military aspects has been based on a review of the lessons learnt from previous operations. He described the work done by three successive Presidencies: UK, Austria and Finland. In June 2005, these Presidencies presented a non paper and in that document they underlined the need for a global approach in crisis management in the EU. The paper also proposed the manner in which civil and military coordination would be tackled over the successive Presidencies. This work allowed for a long-term view of those capacities to be developed and the work addressed the question of defining what was to be done, when and by whom. The three Presidencies attempted to define a number of criteria, which were:

1. **global analysis of the crises** in order to arrive at a mutual assessment of the situation and a mutual understanding of the objectives.
2. **global planning**: procedures to allow all actors to be involved in planning operations
3. **management of operations**: particularly for operations that were to use more than one instrument: either fully integrated civil-military operation or civil operation with military back up or support mission, as, for example, the Amis mission in Darfur (Sudan)
4. **assessment of results**: a joint review of experience that would allow staff to measure the progress that had been made and the quality of operations. These reviews are to be based on using agreed references and objectives.
5. **capabilities management**: ensuring that the potential synergies for resources were analysed and interoperable.

General Perruche briefly outlined the work undertaken by the British and Austrian Presidencies. The British Presidency presented the work on the EU concept for global planning to the Political and Security Committee and this was approved. The document analysed the different instruments that would allow the EUMS to respond to crises as well as the body in Council that could provide synergy and convergence. The Austrian Presidency focused on the management of operations and the improvement of civil military coordination between the different actors in the field.<sup>1</sup>

General Perruche stressed that even though each EU operation had its own specific characteristics, which meant that "one size fit for all solutions did not work", the document for the Framework for crisis management contained specific recommendations and solutions to ensure civil and military coordination in the field. This document would serve as a guide to the EUMS for the work they would undertake in the future. He explained that the recent results of that work could already

---

<sup>1</sup> By different actors one could mean the representatives of Member States, the EU Representative and the Commissions along with the operational and force commanders and heads of missions from different types of operations that could be present in one given country, e.g Bosnia or the DRC. This point was not fully clear in the presentation.

be seen in the reviews that had been undertaken of missions, particularly in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The incumbent Finnish Presidency was undertaking the third part of the work by concentrating on better management of operations. He announced that a working seminar on the issue would be held in September. The result of that working group would lead to recommendations for the Council bodies.

General Perruche also explained that, following on from the Heads of State Informal Meeting at Hampton Court in November 2005, the Council had to adjust its structures and procedures. Dr Javier Solana, the High Representative for CFSP, was called on to ensure that the Council's crisis management structures are capable to deal with new crises and in particular that they are able to deal with natural disasters. Dr Solana has recently made proposals to improve, among others, the organisation of the General Secretariat of the Council. The adjustments are targeted at improving coherence, the evaluation procedures and also management of operation and implementation of crises. He stressed that the changes made so far did not modify the terms of references of the different organisations and were only the absolute minimum necessary.

General Perruche concluded his speech by stating that one of the key outstanding issues that needed to be tackled was the question of cooperation with other bodies, and organisations: the United Nations, NATO, the Africa Union and NGOs. Permanent or ad-hoc cooperation had been established with them via liaison officers and also through occasional meetings but he thought that flexibility was going to remain the rule in this issue-area.