



# EU-CIVCAP

Improving EU capabilities for peacebuilding

## Newsletter

Volume 1, Issue 4

November 2016

## Editorial

### Contents

Editorial .....	1
Learning in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>	
Events .....	2
Publications .....	3
Brexit Blog .....	4
News from the Partners <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>	
Contact us .....	6

### Deliverables completed

- DL2.1 Report on capability-based analysis of technologies, personnel and procedures
- DL 2.2 Workshop on technologies, personnel and procedures in conflict prevention and peacebuilding
- DL 4.1 Reacting to Conflict: Civilian Capabilities in the EU, UN and OSCE
- DL 8.8 Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Forum 2
- DL 8.13 Research Meets Policy Seminar 1

### Fostering Resilience through Shared Capabilities

The European Union has become one of the most relevant actors in the field of conflict prevention and peacebuilding. However, this is mainly because the EU adds value to the actions implemented by other national, regional and international stakeholders in the maintenance of security and stability at the global level. While the need to acquire autonomous capabilities to address contemporary threats was recognised early after the end of the Cold War, starting with the European Councils of Cologne and Feira in 1999-2000, the European Union is still heavily dependent on its Member States' resources and their political will to put them at the disposal of the Union to conduct civilian and military actions.

On the basis of this assumption, a meaningful analysis of the strengths and gaps of the EU in the fields of conflict prevention and peacebuilding has to start from the mapping of the capabilities available at national level and the assessment of the procedures and incentives to 'Europeanise' them.

An overview of key Member States' capabilities in terms of personnel, procedures and technologies conducted by IAI and EUSC in the framework of EU CIVCAP clearly showed the persistence of significant imbalances and differentiated approaches within the EU in terms of standards, employability and development. The number and expertise of civilian personnel vary widely, together with the training resources and curricula and the recruitment process for

supporting EU action. At the same time, the acquisition and the possibility to utilise more dual-use technologies, including satellites and drones, for early warning, sensing and communication purposes in the EU's conflict prevention and peacebuilding system are not taken for granted in national capitals. That is why more research is needed on challenges and opportunities for the development of civilian human and technological resources in Member States and the scope for pooling and sharing of training facilities, personnel rosters and dual-use technologies to advance the EU's ability to detect crises, prevent them and build effective resilience to conflicts.



*Nicoletta Pirozzi is a Senior Fellow at the Istituto Affari Internazionali in Rome. She holds a Ph.D. in Institutions and Politics from the Catholic University in Milan. At IAI, she works mainly on EU civilian crisis management, policy and institutional developments in CFSP/CSDP, EU relations with the United Nations and the African Union.*

<http://www.iai.it/en/persone/nicoletta-pirozzi>

## Events

### Forthcoming events

Wednesday 25 January (afternoon): Executive Board meeting, Brussels.

Friday 27 January (full day): Workshop on EU conflict prevention, Brussels.

March 2017: Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Forum 3, Brussels.

18-19 May 2017: Workshop on EU, UN and OSCE capabilities in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, Brussels.

May 2017: EU-CIVCAP panel at EUSA conference, Miami (proposed).

### Past events

#### Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Forum 2

On 29 September 2016, a lunchtime event hosted by the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) in Brussels, Belgium, brought together a number of researchers and policy experts from Europe to assess the ways to implement the EU Global Strategy, insofar as conflict prevention and peacebuilding are concerned.

The event was chaired by Steven Blockmans (Head of EU Foreign Policy at CEPS) and the speakers were Anna Penfrat (Senior Policy Officer of EU-CIVCAP partner EPLO), Erwan Fouéré (Former EU Special Representative to FYROM and Senior Associate Researcher at CEPS), Erik de Feijter (Deputy PSC Representative and CivCom delegate at the Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the EU) and René van Nes (Deputy Head of Division, CSDP Coordination & Support at the European External Action Service). The seminar was organised in cooperation with the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO), a partner in the EU-CIVCAP project.

#### Research Meets Policy Seminar 1

On 25 October 2016, a seminar hosted by the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) brought together EU policy-makers, practitioners and researchers to discuss synergies between policy needs and research outputs. This first “Research Meets Policy” seminar focused on new policy and operational developments affecting

(EEAS) and Clément Boutillier (European Commission, DG DEVCO). The second panel on Security Sector Reform was moderated by Anna Penfrat (EPLO) and the speakers were Filip Ejdus (University of Bristol), Olivier Louis (European Commission, DG DEVCO) and Gabriella Vogelaar (Whole of Society Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding). The seminar was organised by the Centre for



*CIVCAP researchers discuss “technologies, procedures and personnel in conflict prevention and peacebuilding” in Rome, 18 November 2016.*

the EU’s comprehensive approach (CA) and the new EU-wide strategic framework for security sector reform (SSR). Participants exchanged views on the current state (and needs) of CA and SSR, hence identifying key research questions that could feed back into the consortium’s agenda and future research priorities for H2020 security research, to better support policy formulation.

The first panel on the EU’s Comprehensive Approach was moderated by Giovanni Faleg (CEPS) and the speakers were Joachim Koops (Vesalius College), Susanne Wendt

European Policy Studies and EPLO in cooperation with partners in the EU-CIVCAP project.

#### Workshop on Technologies, Procedures and Personnel in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding

On 18 November 2016, Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) in Rome hosted a workshop on EU technologies, personnel and procedures in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, bringing together experts from the eleven consortium associates, external practitioners and researchers. The workshop was the

occasion to present and discuss the results of the report on technologies, personnel and procedures produced by IAI (D2.1) and to be submitted to the Commission on 30 November 2016.

During the first part of the workshop, Bernardo Venturi (IAI) and Tommaso De Zan (IAI) presented the research findings, while the second part of the workshop was articulated into two separate thematic sessions. The first thematic session, centred on the use of

technologies for EU conflict prevention and peacebuilding, was chaired by Christian Bueger (Cardiff University) and involved as key speakers Silvio Rossignoli (Aero Sekur) and Nicolò Sartori (IAI). In the second thematic session, focused on personnel and procedures in conflict prevention and peacebuilding and was chaired by Ana E. Juncos (University of Bristol). Thierry Tardy (EU Institute for Security Studies), Annalisa Creta and Leonardo Nader (Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna) discussed the current

situation, drawing the attention on possible developments and recommendations.

For the latest event updates, see: <http://www.eu-civcap.net/events/>

## Deliverables

### DL 2.1 Preventing Conflicts: Personnel, Procedures and Technology in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding

In order to prevent the outbreak of conflict and promote sustainable peace, the European Union (EU) and its Members States need adequate capabilities. This report aims to provide an overview of such capabilities by specifically focusing on personnel, procedures and technology, including civilian expertise and dual-use technologies. Given the importance of assets and manpower at the national level, this paper assesses country-level civilian capabilities and how these relate to the EU's External Action. In doing so, the report evaluates the current level of EU's capabilities in the peacebuilding and conflict prevention domain and

suggests recommendations to fill potential gaps.

### DL 4.1 Reacting to Conflict: Civilian Capabilities in the EU, UN and OSCE, available [here](#)

International organisations increasingly send civilians on crisis operations. Whether they are police deployed as an integrated unit, rule of law experts mentoring local officials, or monitors looking after the implementation of a peace agreement, the purpose of these operations is to improve security. The EU, UN and the OSCE are the most prominent providers of civilian missions. When these organisations establish such civilian missions, they need to resource them. Civilian missions need to be planned and financed. Mission staff needs to be recruited and trained. And

civilian missions require equipment and mission support. This report analyses the question "How, and through which mechanisms, do the EU, UN and OSCE make resources available for civilian missions?"

This study compared civilian capabilities of the EU, UN and OSCE and found that the EU is the *least comprehensive* actor in civilian crisis management. EU civilian mandates tend to be restricted to niches. While EU missions, for instance, often have a mandate to support local police, few missions focus also on the judiciary and penitentiary. Similarly, the EU tends to leave monitoring, mediation, and DDR to the UN, even though these are critical conflict prevention and peacebuilding tasks. If the EU is to be a comprehensive actor, the current approach requires a fundamental rethink.

## Expert Network

### Expert of the Month blog articles:

September 2016: Christian Schweiger, "The EU's steady decline as a legitimate external crisis manager", available [here](#). "The almost exclusive focus on the eurozone resulted in the profound neglect of other strategic policy issues – most of all defence and security but also asylum and migration," writes Schweiger, Senior Lecturer in

Government, School of Government and International Affairs, Durham University (UK). However, "the European public expects the EU to act as a resolute and efficient crisis manager who helps to protect the internal security of member states. The inevitable need to regroup after Brexit should therefore lead towards a profound overhaul of the policy agenda and the mechanisms of

the EU's external relations management."

October 2016: Christian Bueger, "Developing and Securing Africa's seas: How the EU should support good ocean governance after the Lomé summit", available [here](#). Bueger, Reader in International Relations at Cardiff

University, argues: “Considerable efforts will be required to keep the [Lomé] charter alive and to ensure that its ideas do not remain abstract but are put to action. Mainstreaming good ocean governance across all dialogue between the EU and the African continent will be important to keep the traction gained in Lomé going.”

November 2016: Dennis Blease, “EU Support in Countering Corruption in the Eastern Partnership Countries”, available [here](#). Blease, a Senior Security & Justice Advisor and Director of DBA Security Sector Reform (SSR) Consultants Ltd., asks three basic questions: “First, there

are a number of actors beside the EU offering support in this field but no overarching tool for coordinating the individual efforts to the benefit of the



*Press conference after the 7th EaP Informal Dialogue meeting of the ministers of economy in Kiev on 12 July 2016. EC Photo/Genya Savilov*

host nation. TI and NATO are particularly active in this field but, for example, does the EU coordinate its activities with either organisation? Second, whilst Ukraine is receiving considerable support, is this matched by the support offered to the other EaP countries? And, third, when corruption is endemic and ingrained in the political societal culture, it requires a change in mindset and behaviour at every level of society to achieve progress. Are the EU programmes assisting the EaP countries actually addressing that type of fundamental behavioural change?”

## Implementation of the EU Global Strategy

Several members of the EU-CIVCAP Consortium and the Expert Network have been busy dissecting the content and prospects for implementation of the EU Global Strategy.

Dijkstra, H. (2016), “Introduction: one-and-a-half cheers for the EU Global Strategy”, *Contemporary Security Policy*, 37(3), 369-373.

EU High Representative Federica Mogherini presented her EU Global Strategy (EUGS) in June 2016. Encircled by security crises, it is difficult to think of something more important for Europe than collective action with the aim of weathering the storm. The EUGS, in this respect, seeks to define common ends and identify means. So what do we make of the EUGS? What does the EUGS tell us about the current role of the EU in global affairs? And how will the withdrawal of the UK from the EU affect foreign and security policy? As a way of introduction to the forum, this article notes that the EUGS focuses on the neighbourhood, puts the interests of European citizens first, identifies civilian means, and has created momentum on security policy. The key question, however, remains

whether there is any interest in the EUGS beyond the foreign policy elites. KEYWORDS: European Union, foreign policy, security policy, strategy, EU Global Strategy

Howorth, J. (2016), “EU Global Strategy in a changing world: Brussels’ approach to the emerging powers”, *Contemporary Security Policy*, 37(3), 389-401.

The world is entering a period of power transition, at the outcome of which some new form of global order (or disorder) is likely to emerge. Critical to this process is the interaction between the established powers, the USA and the European Union (EU), and the emerging powers, particularly China, Brazil, India and Russia. Many analysts have classified the EU as a declining power, a perception that has been enhanced with the triple crises of sovereignty that have rocked the Union since the mid-2000s (money, borders and defence). In this context, the publication of the EU Global Strategy was an opportunity for the EU to state clearly the nature of its ongoing and future relations with the rest of the world. This article argues that, in reality, Europe as a bloc (as opposed to its member states

severally) has very limited purchase with the other major powers, and an ambivalent or ill-defined grasp of how to engage with them. They, for their part, have difficulty in knowing how to understand the EU as an actor and prefer to deal bilaterally with its key member states. KEYWORDS: European Union, EU Global Strategy, emerging powers, China, BRICs

Smith, M.E. (2016), “Implementing the Global Strategy where it matters most: the EU’s credibility deficit and the European neighbourhood”, *Contemporary Security Policy*, 37(3), 446-460.

The EU Global Strategy (EUGS) is a broad and ambitious document in terms of its geographic scope and thematic priorities. However, the EU cannot devote equal attention to all aspects of the EUGS; so there is still scope for more clarity regarding the EU’s core strategic aims. This article argues that in addition to fostering internal cohesion, the EU’s strategic priority must involve stabilizing its own neighbourhood. This task has challenged the EU for decades because of an inherent credibility deficit

regarding the EU’s own capabilities, yet the EUGS does not diagnose and remedy this problem as effectively as it could have. Therefore much more work will need to be done in terms of reforming EU institutions and developing common capabilities if the EU hopes to achieve its central internal and external security goals as outlined in the EUGS and related policy statements. **KEYWORDS:** European Union, global strategy, CFSP, CSDP, security policy, European Neighbourhood Police

Hylke Dijkstra, Petar Petrov and Ewa Mahr, “Implementing the EU Global Strategy: Action Points for Civilian Crisis Management”, *EU-CIVCAP Blog*, 16 November 2016, available [here](#).

“The Implementation Plan on Security and Defence provides important guidelines for improving civilian crisis management. Based on our recent EU-CIVCAP study [[available here](#)] comparing

civilian capabilities of the EU, UN and OSCE, we offer our recommendations.”



*Federica Mogherini. EC Photo/Eric Vidal*

Juncos, A.E. (2016), “Resilience as the new EU foreign policy paradigm: a pragmatist turn?” *European Security*, 1-18.

This article examines the rise of resilience discourses in EU foreign policy. The European Union Global Strategy (EUGS) refers to building state and societal resilience in its neighbourhood as one of the key strategic priorities of the EU. This article argues that the

discourse of resilience that permeates the EUGS chimes well with a pragmatist turn in social sciences and global governance. The EUGS introduces resilience-building alongside an emphasis on flexibility, tailor-made approaches and the need for local ownership, capacity-building and comprehensiveness. More importantly, the new EUGS proposes “principled pragmatism” as a new operating principle in its foreign policy. While this might suggest a more pragmatic EU foreign policy, a closer examination of the EUGS discourse reveals significant tensions between a pragmatic and a principled foreign policy, which undermine the added value of resilience-building as a new foreign policy paradigm. **KEYWORDS:** EU Global Strategy, European foreign policy, resilience, pragmatism

## Brexit Blog

A dedicated section of the EU-CIVCAP website ([available here](#)) continued publishing articles about the implications of Brexit for EU conflict prevention and peacebuilding.

The latest post, by Simon Duke, considers whether security and defence might supply the post-Brexit EU with a compelling narrative to rekindle enthusiasm for European integration. “Security and defence as the (unlikely)

saviours of the integration project?” is [available here](#).

Duke, a member of the Expert Network, writes: “The EU desperately needs a compelling narrative to rekindle enthusiasm for European integration within the EU and interest beyond it. Rather surprisingly, given the history of Europe’s post-war integration, the political momentum has been converging on security and

defence.” Duke warns that strengthening the EU’s security dimension is a “formidable task” even without the UK and that “failure to make demonstrable progress in this area may also undermine the credibility of the [EU Global Strategy] in other areas.”

If you wish to publish any blogs on the consequences of Brexit for the UK or the EU’s ability to deal with conflicts, please contact [eu-civcap@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:eu-civcap@bristol.ac.uk).

## Miscellaneous

### **New advisory board members:**

Thierry Tardy (EU-ISS), Annalisa Creta (SSSUP)

**New beneficiary:** Royal Danish Defence College (Annemarie Peen Rodt)

**New linked party (with EPLO):** Conciliation Resources (Felix Colchester)

**New team members:** Cristian Barbeiri (IAI), Johannes Tvilling (RDDC), Nabila Habbida (EPLO), Felix Colchester (CR)

## Contact us

---

**Website:** <http://www.eu-civcap.net/>

**Facebook:** <https://www.facebook.com/eucivcap>

**Email:** [eu-civcap@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:eu-civcap@bristol.ac.uk)

**Twitter:** <https://twitter.com/eucivcap>

## Horizon 2020 funded

---



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no.: 653227. The content reflects only the authors' views, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

## EU-CIVCAP Partners

---



ROYAL DANISH DEFENCE COLLEGE

