

EUROPEAN EXTERNAL ACTION SERVICE



EUROPEAN UNION MILITARY STAFF

Brussels, 26 October 2011

EEAS 268/11

**DOCUMENT PARTIALLY
ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC
(17.07.2013)**

LIMITE

**CSDP/PSDC
COSDP**

NOTE

From:	European Union Military Staff
To:	European Union Military Committee
No. Prev. doc.:	-
Subject:	Draft Military Recommendation on Pooling and Sharing

AO: Cdr Philippe Valin Tel. 02-281 5756

Delegations will find attached a Draft Military Recommendation to PSC on Pooling and Sharing.

Member States are invited to provide written comments by 12h00, Friday 4 November 2011.

References:

- A. Military Recommendation to PSC on Pooling and Sharing (Doc. 9847/11, dated 19 May 2011).
- B. Council conclusions on Pooling and Sharing of military capabilities (3091st FOREIGN AFFAIRS Council meeting, 23 May 2011).
- C. Letter of the Chairman of the EUMC to CHODs (CEUMC 7924/11, dated 17 June 2011).
- D. Compilation of Member States' analysis on Pooling and Sharing (Doc. EUMS 12883/1/11 REV 1, dated 19 October 2011).
- E. Pooling and Sharing - first analysis of Member States' final findings - update (Doc. EEAS 266/11, dated 19 October 2011).

A. BACKGROUND

1. The Foreign Affairs Council on 23 May 2011, taking into account the Military Recommendations (Ref. A), welcomed the initial inputs and findings from MS and called for a structured and long term approach to pooling and sharing (Ref. B). The Chairman of the EUMC, in his letter to CHODs (Ref. C), inter alia asked for additional information on the national analyses of military capabilities and support structures. The EUMS compiled Member States answers (Ref. D) and identified, in a first analysis (Ref. E), potential new projects.

B. AIM

2. The aim of this document is to provide a Military Recommendation to PSC on Pooling and Sharing with a view to the 30 November Foreign Affairs Council in MoD format.

C. CONSIDERATIONS

3. Pooling and Sharing has gained favour as a timely means to sustain existing, and develop, new capabilities by applying multinational solutions, as Member States are facing severe financial pressure on their respective Defence budgets. The criteria to be achieved to be considered as a candidate project must be whether they would mitigate identified EU shortfalls.
4. The conclusion of Member States' national analysis of military capabilities and support structures appears to point to this initiative as the first step to coping with their respective financial challenges. However, only a limited number of the proposals have the potential to play a determining role in addressing identified EU shortfalls. This underlines again impediments that seem to continue to hamper more ambitious proposals. Many of these challenges, such as the industrial, economic and social (i.e. on Armed Forces human resources) impact of Pooling and Sharing projects, remain issues to be first addressed at the political level. Unsurprisingly, the bottom-up methodology has thus shown it is somewhat limited. Accordingly, a reinforced top-down approach with implicit strengthening of political involvement as well as a more proactive role for EU bodies, could be considered as a prerequisite to changing the current mindset. Moreover, Pooling and Sharing must not be seen as a short-term initiative but as a longer term effort.
5. A clear motivator for Pooling and Sharing would be to ensure that savings resulting from projects, or at least a part of it, will be reinvested in defence¹. Additionally, this would increase the value of Pooling and Sharing projects not directly linked to identified shortfalls. However, it should be noted that initial short term investments are necessary in order to realise longer term savings.
6. Longer term projects need the involvement of the governments' Research & Technology as well as defence industrial area. Developing the European Defence Technological and Industrial Base would facilitate the development of new projects that more broadly should have positive economic consequences for the European Union and its Member States. Accordingly such projects should be supported.

¹ This has also been identified by EDA as one of the key issues, EDA 'Food for Thought' Paper No. 2011/01 on Pooling and Sharing dated 5 October 2011.

7. Any loss of sovereignty when entering into Pooling and Sharing projects, especially the assurance that shared assets will remain operationally available whenever required by any of the partners, is a major constraint within this initiative. All its dimensions (inter alia employability, sustainability, reversibility) have to be considered in developing projects. Nevertheless it is believed that in many cases an acceptable solution should be achievable.
8. Member States in their final findings confirmed the regional or small group approach being the most appropriate way to initiate projects. However, in many cases increase in potential benefits, in terms of savings or employability and interoperability, is in direct proportion with the number of participants. Projects prepared regionally or within a small number of participants could, on a case by case basis, be extended, when mature, to other Member States.
9. Another factor to be considered when entering into pooling and sharing of projects is the modular approach. This is specially important when applied for scarce and cost-intensive capabilities by developing standards for modules of a capability with Member States before they, individually, develop the modules on their own. This would increase interoperability and would ensure autonomy for Member States regarding their modules.
10. The EUMC has agreed that CHODs' answers and the associated EUMS' first analysis should usefully help shape work on Pooling and Sharing conducted by the EDA, whose role as a key facilitator in the EU is widely recognized. Accordingly merging of this initiative with EDA sponsored work must be undertaken to result in a single list driven by EDA. The exception regards facilitating Training and Education which should remain under EUMS's ambit.
11. Within the political limitations, EU-NATO cooperation to avoid unnecessary duplication has so far generated excellent results at staff level. This cooperation was conducted in the understanding that there will be no competition between the organisations and that finally Member States will decide which projects to follow and, if appropriate, which organisation to ask for support.

D. CONCLUSIONS

12. In May 2011 (Ref A), four projects were already announced, during the EUMC in CHOD format, and three of them have already been taken forward (see Annex) which are either facilitated by EDA, specified in the context of the work of the NATO Task Force on multinational and innovative approaches or developed on a multinational basis.
13. The EUMS analysis has shown that one third of Member States' proposals relate to Training and Education - a domain which is the less sensitive to sovereignty issues, as it does not directly involve operational employment of forces. Consequently, the EUMC has asked the EUMS, in close cooperation with EDA, to propose options to facilitate Member States' activities in this area.
14. The initiative to develop medical facilities, encompassing the modular as well as the regional / small group approach, could serve as model for many other projects, like for instance CBRN capabilities, by transferring the concept and standards for the development of modules, agreed within a limited group of participants, to other interested Member States.
15. Based on the EUMS analysis of Member States' final findings (Ref. E), a list of potential new projects has been developed by the EUMC which needs further discussion and Lead Nations to carry the work forward (see annex). Political involvement and support will be needed to bring them forward, in particular for those which are of larger scale. A reinforced top-down approach could be considered.
16. While not having, for the vast majority of projects, the potential to significantly address the most pressing shortfalls, those proposed projects may lead to savings which could be reinvested in capabilities addressing the identified shortfalls. EU bodies, in particular the EDA, could add significant value to many of them. A consolidated list at EU level would enable Member States to have a better overview. Once implemented, they could represent strong incentives towards more ambitious initiatives.

17. It will be important to further develop and strengthen the European Defence Technological and Industrial Base which would offer additional impetus to multinational solutions.
18. Close cooperation within relevant EU bodies and continuous exchange of information with NATO at staff level remains important.

E. RECOMMENDATION

19. The EUMC invites the PSC to take into account the considerations and conclusions developed in this document in preparation for the Foreign Affairs Council in MoD format on 30 November 2011.
-

DELETED

DELETED