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Overview

- General Picture - Core Challenges
- 10 Years of Cooperation: Successes and Failures
- The Road beyond 2014: An Opening for Europe’s Return to UN Peacekeeping?
- Way Forward for Unlocking the Partnership’s Full Potential
General Picture: **Now or Never**

- Significant Advances and Successes during the Last 10 Years in EU-UN Peacekeeping Cooperation
- Some Operational Advances, mostly Institutional Successes
- Danger of EU-UN Fatigue: Key is now to commit resources, political will and stronger European re-engagement
- Issue of UN Reform (incl. Command and Control), but also on Future Direction of CSDP
- Role of European Parliament and Avant-garde of 6-7 “Friends of UN Peacekeeping”…
Withdrawal of Europeans and “West” from UN-led Peacekeeping since mid-1990s

Deep-seated suspicions towards UN Capacities (including Command and Control / Political Aspects)

Differing Preferences Across EU Member States (UN-Friends vs. UN-Skeptics)

Since mid-1990s: Focus on NATO and EU CSDP
EU-UN Relations in Peacekeeping: Some General Remarks: 2003 - 2013

+ **Dilemma of CSDP**: autonomous EU profile vs. strong UN rhetoric and partial UN-support (cf. Effective Multilateralism)

+ (Political) Investment in CSDP drained to some extent UN efforts (e.g. UN SHIRBRIG vs. EU Battlegroups) – CSDP as “indirect” support

+ **Since 2003**: far-reaching Inter-organizational and Institutional Advances (Steering Committees, UNLOPS, Action Plan)
Institutional Successes


+ Strong Value of UN-EU Steering Committee Meetings (Reformed and enhanced in 2013)

+ Value of UN Liaison Office Peace and Security since 2011

+ Value of CSDP “Plan of Action to Enhance UN PK”
Operational Successes

- European Commitment to UN SHIRBRIG (at least until 2009)
- EU CSDP-UN Cooperation in DRC (2003 / 2006)
- EU CSDP-UN Cooperation in Tchad/CAR (2008-2009)
- “Lighter Foot-print” Cooperation since 2009
- Build-up of lessons learned (even though more formal lessons learned needs to be done) and Inter-organizational Understandings
Failures

- Level of Deep Institutionalization not matched yet by translation into operationalisation
- Member State buy-in into EU ‘Action Plan’?
- EU Support to UN remains highly selective and restrictionist
- Inbuilt tensions between EU’s Ambitions and Support for UN (including resource shortage..visibility..etc)
- Limited Inter-organizational “Best Practices”
- Lost UN-EU Opportunity: SHIRBRIG – Linking EU-UN-AU
Rise and fall of SHIRBRIG: Difficulties worth Keeping in Mind

- Closest we have come to a “UN Army” so far (Rapid Reaction Intervention Tool)
- Set up after Rwanda and Srebrenica in 1999/2000
- Denmark, Netherlands and Canada in the lead
- 23 Countries, joint Headquarters, Joint Training
- 6 Deployments in Peacekeeping Operations
- Capacity-Building to African Standby Force
Rise and fall of SHIRBRI:
Difficulties worth Keeping in Mind

+ Strong European component (16 out of 23 members were members of the EU)
+ Calls for EU-SHIRBRI coordination since 2004
+ Rivalry between EU Battlegroups, NATO Response Force and SHIRBRI
+ Nordics lead the charge in lobbying for Closure in 2009
+ Missed Chances and Lost Opportunities of 60 year attempt of creating a Global Peacekeeping Tool
Persistent Problems

- Persistent Skepticism of EU countries towards UN C2 (Command and Control) and UN Ability to lead robustly
- Witness UNIFIL II Arrangement
- Persistent Problems of Political Will / Mandate
- Inter-organizational Rivalries / EU-UN Resource Competition
- Preference for “Strong Political Influence” (NATO, EU)
- Preference for “Western-style” organization
After 2014: A Unique Window?

- Key Assumption – Once ISAF winds down, resources are freed for commitment to UN Peacekeeping
- EU Military missions diminish
- European Armies need to be “in training”
- New commitment to United Nations by:
  - France, Denmark, Belgium, Finland, Norway, Austria, Ireland, Sweden?
Way Forward?

+ 6-7 “Friends of UN” among Europeans that are open to re-engaging
+ BUT: On “European” terms
+ Much depends on development of EU capabilities and ambitions (witness Mali)
+ Political outreach (on C2) needed
+ Ongoing issue of UN Reform
+ Political Buy-In from Member States on Action Plan
What the EP Can Do…

- Support Outreach and Dialogue with UN DPKO (particularly UNLOPS)
- Keep attention on EU CSDP – UN Action Plan
- Facilitate Debate on “Europe’s Return to Peacekeeping” (with Circle of Friends)
- Strong voice on the overall goal of CSDP – autonomous capacity or strong enabler of UN? (Ideally both…)
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## Comparative Overview Key EU States (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>UN (Ranking)</th>
<th>NATO ISAF</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>89 (71&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>196 (51&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>59 (72&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>29 (85&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>387 (41&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>129 (60&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>39 (82&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300 (Atalanta)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>280 (47&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,066 (24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>193 (52&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,451 (KFOR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1,127 (20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>4,046</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leading UN Contributors (1/4 of all troops)

+ Rank 1: Pakistan (8,967)
+ Rank 2: Bangladesh (8,826)
+ Rank 3: India (7,839)
+ Italy Rank 20: 1,127
+ EU total: 6,312 (7%) (ca. 3,200 UNIFIL)

Source: UN DPKO, Jan. 2013 & Providing for Peacekeeping, December 2012
EU-UN Relations: Nobel Inter-organizational Cooperation or Rivalry?

- Inter-organizational Culture Clashes
- EU Visibility and “Quick Impact” vs. UN Long-term Approach
- Lack of “Re-hatting”
- Restructuring of EU International Security Approach (from Crisis Management to Crisis Response)
- Resource Rivalries