

Security post-2014: what role for the EU and NATO?

EU-NATO relations ahead of the European Council in
December 2013



DCAF
a centre for security,
development and
the rule of law



Security post-2014: what role for the EU and NATO?

EU-NATO relations ahead of the European Council in December 2013

Edited by Giji Gya, DCAF; meeting summaries by NATO PA Staff.

European Parliament
Delegation for relations with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly

JOINT MEETING

with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly (NATO PA)

in association with the
Centre for Democratic Control of the Armed Forces (DCAF)

25 September 2013

Published December 2013

DCAF's ongoing series of papers on Crisis Management, edited by Giji Gya. This range of papers began in 2011 and initially investigated crisis management in the EU institutions, in three papers in cooperation with ISIS Europe: *Security Sector Reform Missions under CSDP: Addressing Current Needs*; *The politics of EU civilian interventions and the strategic deficit of CSDP* and *International Peace Mediation: A new crossroads for the European Union*. The series now continues with other partners, in a broader spectrum of analysis - investigating global conceptualisations of crisis management and international responses to current crises and development of security systems and human security. This includes: [NATO Missile Defence : Political and Budgetary Implications](#) - Proceedings of the joint NATO PA and European Parliament seminar in 2012; and an analysis on [The EU's Comprehensive Approach to Crisis Management](#).

This paper continues our reporting on NATO PA EP seminars and shows the practical side of discussion on security and defence policy between NATO and the EU in 2013, in preparation for the meeting of the European Council in December 2013.

DCAF would like to thank the colleagues at the NATO PA for collaboration in this publication.

Contents

Introduction.....2

Programme4

Opening Remarks

Jacek SARYUSZ WOLSKI, Chair of the European Parliament Delegation for Relations with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly 6

Philippe VITEL, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Environmental and Energy Security of the Science and Technology Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.....7

NATO’s post-2014 narrative and prospects for a strengthened NATO-EU Cooperation

James APPATHURAI, Deputy Assistant Secretary General, PASP, NATO.....9

Security post-2014: What role for the EU and NATO

Brigadier General Ret. Jo COELMONT, Former Belgian Permanent Military Representative to the EUMC, Senior Associate Fellow, EGMONT Institute.....11

Expectations and Priorities for the EU Summit

H.E. Mr Michael ZILMER-JOHNS, Special Advisor on Common Security and Defence Policy to the HR/VP 13

General Debate..... 18

Closing Remarks22

Introduction

In the framework of its cooperation with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and funded by the Swiss Ministry of Defence as a contribution to the Partnership for Peace programme, the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) facilitates an annual joint European Parliament - NATO Parliamentary Assembly conference.

In what follows, the reader will find presentations and minutes of the 25 September 2013 Joint Meeting between the European Parliament Delegation for Relations with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and the NATO Parliamentary Assembly on *Security post-2014: what role for the EU and NATO?*

The Joint Meeting took place at the European Parliament in Brussels.

Programme

25 September 2013 - 09:30 - 12:45

European Parliament, Brussels
Building Altiero Spinelli (ASP) Room 1E2

Wednesday 25 September 2013

9:30 - 9:35

Welcome and opening remarks by:

- **Jacek SARYUSZ-WOLSKI**, Chairman of the delegation for relations with the NATO PA, European Parliament
- **Philippe VITEL**, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Environmental and Energy Security of the Science and Technology Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly

9:35 -10:20

Presentations by:

- **James APPATHURAI**, Deputy Assistant Secretary General, PASP, on *NATO's post-2014 narrative and prospects for a strengthened NATO-EU Cooperation*
- **Brigadier General Ret. Jo COELMONT**, Former Belgian Permanent Military Representative to the EUMC, Senior Associate Fellow, EGMONT Institute, on *Security post-2014: What role for the EU and NATO*
- **H.E. Mr Michael ZILMER-JOHNS**, Special Advisor on Common Security and Defence Policy to the HR/VP, on *Expectations and Priorities for the EU Summit*

Moderator:

Simon LUNN, Senior Fellow, DCAF

10:20 -11:50

General debate

11:50 -12:00

Concluding Remarks by Mr SARYUSZ-WOLSKI and Mr VITEL

* * *

Opening Remarks

Jacek Saryusz Wolski, Chair of the European Parliament Delegation for Relations with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly

The meeting was opened by **Mr. Saryusz Wolski**, Chair of the European Parliament Delegation for Relations with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, who welcomed the guests and emphasized the timeliness of this event as a precursor to the forthcoming EU Council meeting in December 2013, dedicated to security. The ideas explored in the Council will certainly influence not only the EU's defence policy and missions, but also the future of NATO. In his view, a strong EU means strong NATO as well. Mr. Saryusz Wolski reminded the participants of NATO Secretary General Rasmussen recent comments that both organisations need to react to new threats and develop new capabilities.

Another important issue raised by the Chair, were the possible ways to increase visibility and strength of European Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), especially in terms of improvement of its crisis management systems and developing comprehensive capabilities. The EU should also work to define CSDP goals jointly with NATO, in order to define common interests.

Mr. Saryusz Wolski reflected on the challenging geo-strategic environment, the indispensability of the transatlantic alliance and stressed that cooperation is of the utmost importance. The situation in Afghanistan, a point of strategic interest for both NATO and the EU, could form the basis of a new strategic concept for both the EU and NATO. The Afghanistan experience illustrates how both organisations are each capable of covering different aspects of security and capacity building. A more comprehensive NATO – EU cooperation could further the capabilities of both organisations.

Following the Chair's introduction, **Mr. Philippe Vitel**, President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly Sub-Committee on Energy Security and the Environment, emphasized that difficult economic times presented a prime opportunity to move forward on joint interests between the EU and NATO. He noted that the two organisations must have complementary roles in the post-2014 framework for security. Mr. Vitel also stressed that the EU must be clear that post

2014 it will be an actor and not just a spectator. This will benefit NATO, because the two organisations are indeed strategic partners that face the same challenges. The Chair noted that lessons can be learned from past missions, especially Libya, where the different strengths of both the EU and NATO were used effectively. NATO has the capacity to respond quickly, while the EU has skills in peace building and police training. These features of both organisations should be further exploited and opportunities to strengthen joint NATO – EU ambitions must not be missed.

Philippe Vitel, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Environmental and Energy Security of the Science and Technology Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly

Dear colleagues, first of all I should like to thank the European Parliament for hosting this event today. I also want to thank the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces for its support. Lastly, I thank our experts for agreeing to give us their views on our topic for discussion today, that is to say, the role of NATO and the European Union in global security post 2014.

This joint meeting is further evidence of the excellent co-operation between the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and the European Parliament. Events such as this provide a unique opportunity for open discussion of interests common to NATO and the European Union. Besides, there is the hope that our fruitful co-operation may be an example for relations between NATO and the European Union generally.

Let me briefly introduce my colleagues from the NATO Parliamentary Assembly here today. Our group consists of seven parliamentarians representing four Alliance member countries and two partner-countries.

Our discussions today will focus on relations between the European Union and NATO with the December 2013 European Summit in mind, and hence on the security role to be assigned to the two organisations in the post-2014 context.

This issue is of particular importance to the Alliance, as it is to the European Union.

Europeans must make sure that Europe will be a valued player on a worldwide scale in the post-2014 context, not a mere spectator of world events. It is essential for this purpose to strengthen the relations between the European Union and NATO. In fact both organisations are in the forefront as strategic partners. European security depends on action by the European Union, but also on action by NATO.

Today the European Union is facing the same challenges as NATO, whether these arise in North Africa, the Middle East, Afghanistan or elsewhere in the world. It will be the same after 2014. In an increasingly complex and changing international security environment, doing more together is becoming one of the major priorities for the future.

We must learn the lessons from past operations. In Afghanistan, Libya or Mali, Europeans have had to deal with yawning gaps in various areas of capability. The current cuts in defence budgets make it essential for us to co-ordinate our efforts even more. NATO and the European Union need to complement each other further in the future, and to allocate and use their financial and human resources better. Our taxpayers quite rightly would not understand if this was not the case.

On many occasions in recent history NATO and the European Union have already demonstrated their ability to work together for our common security. NATO has the capability to act quickly and effectively in response to crises, while the European Union has shown its ability to consolidate peace. The recent advances in Kosovo are the perfect example of this exceptional complementarity.

The December European Council and the 2014 NATO summit are two opportunities not to be missed in reaffirming our shared ambitions, those of a transatlantic community united around a shared vision of the world, and having the capabilities to bring it into being.

These issues are at the heart of our concerns as parliamentarians, so I am delighted that we can take part in this discussion today.

My thanks again to the European Parliament for hosting this joint meeting.

NATO's post-2014 narrative and prospects for a strengthened NATO-EU Cooperation

James Appathurai, Deputy Assistant Secretary General, PASP, NATO

Mr. James Appathurai, Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy at NATO, speaking in his private capacity, welcomed the timeliness of the seminar. He noted the importance of the forthcoming December EU Council meeting and the NATO Summit in 2014. He stressed that coherence is needed since major decisions regarding Afghanistan and future cooperation between the EU and NATO will be taken during the next year. Mr. Appathurai outlined several future themes for NATO. Firstly, he explained that the end of ISAF marks a decrease in the size of NATO operations overall. He said that after ISAF, NATO would have a 'lower operational tempo', even if NATO will still be present where needed.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary General described a range of new challenges confronting NATO and the EU. He mentioned North Africa as an unstable region where more engagement is needed; that Libya is getting worse, with huge challenges in dealing with unsecured weapons caches. Also, extremists are moving through extensive open borders and fuelling instability. The Caucasus' are also an area of concern. Iran requires close surveillance; and Russia's policies towards its neighbouring countries require attention. Mr. Appathurai also mentioned cyber defence as a persistent and growing threat.

Mr. Appathurai also focused on defence budget cuts as a core issue of concern. During the past several years, European nations have cut billions from their defence budgets. The US is on track to cut USD 500 billion during the next decade, and if the sequestration continues, the cut will amount to USD 1 trillion. These budget decreases are happening at a time when defence spending is increasing elsewhere in the world.

NATO is the only organisation which can command large and medium scale operation of any complexity, Mr. Appathurai stressed. Only NATO has the structure and the necessary capabilities to achieve this. The Deputy Assistant Secretary General reflected on the capability that NATO has developed during its ISAF mission in Afghanistan, which has provided NATO

with an interoperable and highly integrated military capacity as well as a robust partnership network. After 2014, there will be a shifting of focus from operation to readiness. Capability development will continue to be high on the agenda, including not just NATO's Smart Defence efforts but also the EU's pooling and sharing efforts. He noted that many countries can no longer afford to purchase capabilities on their own, so developing capabilities and maintaining interoperability with each other and partners is vital.

Mr. Appathurai believed that NATO will increasingly engage in capacity building – which it has already been doing in Kosovo, Bosnia & Herzegovina and other countries. Moreover, NATO will support other international organisations, to develop and improve their crisis management capabilities. NATO and the EU cannot afford to create duplication but instead need complementarity, since both have their own competences. For example NATO provides more military capabilities in a tougher environment while the EU has other expertise, as its work with the police in Afghanistan has shown. This mode for cooperation goes beyond just the EU, as NATO is increasingly working with the UN in various programs such as counter IED (improvised explosive device) training for UN personnel and providing air transport African Union missions.

The fact that capacity coherence with the EU must be ensured, was stressed by Mr. Appathurai, but top-down direction and instruction from leading decision makers is required. The staff of the two organisations need to be instructed from the highest positions to be open and work together.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary General concluded by saying that NATO needs a strong EU with a global perspective. While two decades ago there was concern that the EU would be too strong, now the fear is that it will not be strong enough. There is a growing narrative in Congress that the US has to provide too much for the security of Europeans, and Europe needs to be more willing and able to carry some of the security burden.

Security post-2014: What role for the EU and NATO

*Brigadier General Ret. Jo Coelmont,
Former Belgian Permanent Military Representative to the EUMC,
Senior Associate Fellow, EGMONT Institute*

Brigadier General Ret. Jo Coelmont, the former Belgian Permanent Military Representative to the EUMC, presented his view on the evolving relationship between the EU and NATO. According to General Coelmont, the specificities of any given crisis will determine which organisation, NATO or the EU, will be in the lead, but both will need to become more complementary. Recalibrating the relations between the EU and US, and between CSDP and NATO has become more urgent than ever.

Brigadier General Coelmont questioned the opinion that an EU Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP)-NATO operational relationship would remain impossible. If the organisations had tackled the reasons for lack of cooperation up until now (namely Turkey/Cyprus), they would have entered a quagmire. Today however, Transatlantic relations and Europe's relations with Turkey, both have changed and it would be counterproductive not to address this issue as a matter of urgency.

Secondly, he argued of the need to reverse CSDP fatigue, which will be increasingly crucial in the years to come. It is about the credibility of European defence, not about the competitiveness between two organisations. He further noted that European defence will either be European or it will not exist at all and because of its structure, European defence policies need to be part of a broader foreign policy developed within the EU framework. Europe's failed attempt at developing defence outside of the European process - the now defunct West European Union - proves that this cannot work. Europe needs an EU pillar within NATO as well. There should be more information sharing and institutionalized representation between both organisations.

Brigadier General Coelmont also stressed the need to improve military capabilities. He argued that it is an illusion to hope that simply optimizing the instructional relations between CSDP and NATO will generate additional capabilities. To his opinion added value lies in making better use of existing capabilities and expertise of both organisations. The famous three Ds;

no discrimination, no duplication, and no decoupling - still a valid concept, however no longer capturing the issues at stake - need to be replaced by three Cs; cooperation, co-ownership and capabilities. At the overarching political level, the EU and the US need a strategic security compact, a joint vision on security that expands beyond defence and becomes part and parcel of their existing “EU-US strategic partnership”. For greater cooperation, he recommends that US and Canadian governmental representatives should be present within the EU’s European External Action Service and CSDP structures. EU representatives should be welcomed within the US National Security Council and even the US National Economic Council.

Co-ownership calls for a new dialogue and relationship between the two organisations, as joint military meetings in the past gave a richer debate than today. Whenever a military operation is launched within NATO or the EU, there must be comprehensive support, additionally, all the assets of either organisation (HQ’s and civil-military capabilities as they are financed by countries) should be immediately transferrable during crisis management, based on the principle of “supported and supporting organisation”. This implies “Berlin Plus” to be replaced by a new arrangement.

Regarding capabilities, they are of the essence and a security compact without capabilities is impossible. For this to succeed, the EU must develop more capabilities and create strategic autonomy. To conclude, Brigadier General Coelmont emphasized that it is time to coordinate defence planning with top-down steering, which should be addressed in the December EU Council. The sense of competition needs to be removed and the one capability that needs to be preserved for the future is interoperability – as a capability in its own right.

Expectations and Priorities for the EU Summit

H.E. Mr Michael Zilmer-Johns, Special Advisor on Common Security and Defence Policy to the High Representative/Vice-President of the EU

I have been invited to tell about preparations for the meeting of European Heads of State and Government in December which will be devoted to the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). As NATO is our closest strategic partner in the security field this partnership and the perspectives for its further development will be one of the key issues to be discussed.

To prepare the debate in December, the EU High Representative, Catherine Ashton, has been invited by member states to develop proposals and actions to strengthen CSDP and improve availability of capabilities – civilian and military - and to report to EU President Van Rompuy later this month.

She presented an interim report in July which was discussed earlier this month at an informal EU Ministers of Defence meeting in Vilnius with the participation of NATO Secretary-General Rasmussen. This very fact – the Secretary General of NATO taking active part in the EU Defence Ministers discussion on the future of European defence - is a strong demonstration of how far we have come already in building a strong partnership between the two most important global providers of security.

Later today I will be going with the Executive Secretary General of the European External Action Service (EEAS), Pierre Vimont, to NATO for his first ever official meeting with the North Atlantic Council. Now this does not mean that all is well in EU-NATO cooperation. We are still far from making full use of the huge potential for synergy. I will come back to this later.

The point of departure for the EU High Representative's report to EU President Van Rompuy, is that Europe faces rising challenges, within a changing geostrategic context, while the financial crisis is increasingly affecting its security and defence capabilities.

The EU needs to protect its interests and act as a security provider in its neighbourhood and at the international level. To be credible, this requires capabilities and Member States' commitment. A strong industrial base is needed to provide the capabilities, in addition to being a source of jobs and growth and a driver of innovation.

The report contains proposals and actions set out in three clusters:

- strengthening CSDP's efficiency and visibility;
- enhancing European defense capabilities
- reinforcing Europe's' defense industry.

In all three areas, it depicts the state of play, lists progress and key themes, and includes suggestions on way forward.

Regarding the European defense industry the European Commission has made an important contribution with its Communication on defence published in July.

And there is indeed an urgent need to tackle the challenges in this area. As Secretary General Rasmussen stressed in Vilnius, long-term sustainability of Europe's defence industrial base hangs in the balance. We must safeguard this strategic asset.

The European industrial base is essential to sustain capabilities – which we need to guarantee our freedom of action, so that EU retains its ability to act, in other words, its strategic autonomy.

Furthermore, there is need to enhance and broaden arrangements on security of supply, hybrid standards, certification and military airworthiness, through the European Defence Agency (EDA) and in cooperation with the European Commission. There is also need to rationalise demand through increased cooperation and collaborative projects.

Finally, on the importance of Research and Technology (R&T), we need both to stem cuts to national defence research budgets and to stimulate synergies between defence and civil R&T through:

- Increased R&T cooperation;
- Joint research programmes co-funded by Member States and the Commission;

- Innovative funding solutions for stimulating private funding in defence R&T; and
- A Commission Preparatory Action on CSDP-related Research seeking synergies with national programmes.

The EU High Representative has stressed the need for commitments to concrete capability projects and incentives for cooperation.

At the EEAS and the EDA, we are fully aware of NATO's on-going work in these areas where we must, of course, ensure that efforts on both sides are mutually reinforcing. We cannot afford any duplication: Thus NATO's Connected Forces Initiative (for increasing preparedness and interoperability of NATO forces, post ISAF), is perfectly in line with our efforts to make EU Battle groups more usable. Better trained and more interoperable forces will benefit both organisations.

The EDA is also ready to co-ordinate closely with NATO on its four priority initiatives on capability projects, corresponding to shortfalls highlighted by recent operations:

- Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (Drones): includes preparing for the next generation of Medium Altitude Long Endurance (MALE), certification, technologies, and insertion in regulated airspace.
- Air-to-Air Refueling: establishing a multinational fleet, in close cooperation with OCCAR and in full transparency with NATO (NATO Agency NSPA).
- Satellite communications: preparing the next generation.
- Cyber defense: protection of EU assets, training.

In the broader context of the so-called comprehensive approach, we need to pursue the work done in cooperation with the Commission in order to enhance the EU's ability to answer in a comprehensive manner both from a sectorial or geographical point of view.

We can only achieve our goals by working more together. In a globalising world, Europe simply can no longer afford to fragment its efforts. The future of our industry, our capabilities, our political influence and ultimately our security depend on it.

Stepping up our defence cooperation touches on fundamental political issues, however. That is why it is necessary to charter a new course for European Common Security and Defence Policy

on the highest level and that is why we are taking this to Heads of State and Government in December.

But Europe cannot achieve its global objectives alone. We need partners and none more than NATO and our two transatlantic allies.

As I said initially, we have come a long way since the early years of competition and mutual suspicion. The EU is working closely with NATO and non EU NATO-allies in various theatres. Just to name a few examples, we have a so-called Berlin+ EU-operation in Bosnia, we work hand in hand with NATO in Kosovo, in Afghanistan and in the combat against piracy around the Horn of Africa.

The partnership with NATO is the jewel in the crown, but we are committed to further enhance our other Partnerships – also with new partners like the African Union, with whom we have developed a most successful partnership on Somalia. As the interim report notes, "*enabling partners is becoming a core capability*". Our training mission in Mali is another prominent example.

In fact, an important lesson learnt is that our training missions require close cooperation with other actors to achieve sustainable outcomes. Training is part of a broader joint effort in which there need to be arrangements for selection, transportation, monitoring, provision of basic equipment etc. Sometimes we can rely on the input of others, but we also need to organise ourselves better to ensure best use of our instruments.

I hope that my presentation has made it clear how much we have already achieved in enhancing EU-NATO cooperation, but the fact remains that we are still short of realising the full potential.

In a world where our relative economic and military strength is decreasing and our coming values under pressure it is absurd that we cannot have a structured debate between the EU and NATO on global crisis or challenges where we both are involved and have important roles to play. It is a sad fact that all joint exercises which have been planned since 2014 have had to be cancelled for political reasons. We all know the background for these difficulties and I certainly do not underestimate the effort it will take to overcome them. But we cannot allow ourselves the luxury of not making that effort.

Honourable Members of Parliament, I hope in my presentation I have made it clear, that with the many challenges ahead, the time is not for complacency, but for difficult and painful choices and decisions to be made in order to safeguard our future security. This is the central mandate for both the EU and NATO.

We are aiming for European Heads of State and Government to make these necessary choices and decisions at the European Council in December. But they will be painful and difficult choices and decisions and you as parliamentarians will have a key role in ensuring the necessary public and parliamentary support.

General Debate

In the ensuing discussion NATO parliamentarians and Members of the European Parliament raised a broad range of questions, including on military capabilities, lessons learned from Libya, the crisis in Syria, and NATO-Russia relations.

Military Capabilities, EU-NATO cooperation

In reply to statements by two members from the European Parliament questioning the usefulness and added value of CSDP missions and regretting the lack of discussion on the financial cost of these missions, Ambassador Zilmer-Johns disagreed with the proposition that the EU is duplicating NATO. The EU official stressed that CSDP missions are efficient and needed as an interface between military and civilian tasks. As an example, he mentioned the European Union Rule of Law mission (EULEX) in Kosovo which, he pointed out, is providing added value to NATO's work while avoiding duplication.

Another member of the European Parliament argued that the EU is getting involved in areas – such as the Horn of Africa - where it neither has any interest nor a clear idea of how to improve security. Moreover, the MEP suggested, the engagement in Somalia had led to an aggravation of the security situation in neighbouring countries. Mr Zilmer-Johns disagreed with this view and argued that the EU has a clear interest off the Horn of Africa, namely the freedom of navigation and uninterrupted flow of trade,. He added that the EU and the international community need to do more to help stabilise the region. Both he and General (ret.) Coelmont argued that the European Security Strategy, which was devised and agreed upon in 2003, should to be updated.

Several comments touched upon declining defence budgets of European member states and the role of the United States for European security. James Appathurai and several members agreed that the U.S. engagement and presence in Europe remains essential to European security and stability. Asked about the budget of NATO, Mr Appathurai noted that it is smaller than the budget of the New York City Police Department; even the EU budget for Central Asia is significantly larger than NATO's. He continued by arguing that while governments in Europe provide considerable financial resources to the EU European members of the Alliance have been and are still reducing their contributions to NATO. Continued cuts in member nations' defence budget reduce capabilities; over time, these capabilities disappear – which means that

the political options for states to tackle security crises will be reduced. In this context he mentioned the Dutch decision to abandon their tank force and the shrinking of the Royal Navy as example. In the latter case, he reminding participants that the number of combat vessels of the UK has shrunk from 80 during the Falkland war to now 18.

NATO's "Smart Defence" and the EU's "Pooling and Sharing" can help alleviate some problems that arise from shrinking defence budgets, speakers noted. However, this raises the question of trust, namely that Allies which have reduced or abandoned certain military capabilities will need to have access to shared military capabilities in times of crisis. Mr Appathurai agreed that the question of trust among contributing Allies is critical for building up joint capabilities. This issue can be crucial for operations as countries need to provide capabilities for all operations. For example, Germany chose to remove all of its aircrews from the NATO Operation Unified Protector in Libya over disagreement in the campaign's direction. He expressed the hope that all Allies will agree to provide the contributions they have agreed upon in future operations and not remove them in case of political disagreements. In other words, a key question for joint capabilities is whether the availability of these capabilities can be presumed. In many cases however the answer is "no". It is important therefore that nations develop mechanisms and policies that ensure the availability of capabilities.

General (ret) Coelmont argued that the development of a similar culture for crisis management operations by NATO and the EU can help deepen and accelerate pooling and sharing. He and Ambassador Michael Zilmer-Johns held different views on whether or not pooling and sharing meant a loss of sovereignty, though both agreed that pooling and sharing allows member states to maintain their defence capacity despite decreasing their defence budgets. Mr Zilmer-Johns added that if member states cannot agree on joint acquisitions of military capabilities, the use of common standards is already a great step ahead. General Coelmont warned that the absence of a common effort in capability development and acquisition would leave Allies incapable of launching an operation on their own. He pointed out that in this sense pooling and sharing is about reconstructing sovereignty, and that if the European Union and NATO want to be global security players, there is no other possible approach.

On a related issue, a parliamentarian warned that the European Commission's latest suggestions on the future of the European defence industry could "destroy" the European industry, and in particular those in the smaller countries. He added that pooling and sharing is

not about cooperation, but rather about competition in the defence industry – a process through which the weakest businesses will eventually disappear.

Lessons learned from Libya

Asked about the lessons of the operations in **Libya** and the impact of arms poured in from outside, Mr Appathurai said that the number of small arms and light weapons that are currently floating around the country is a critical issue. Libya has the largest cache of small and medium weapons in the world. In addition, weapons in Libya also made their way into neighbouring countries, thus increasing the number of weapons which were already in the Sahel. There is a clear causality, he argued: The movement of small arms and light weapons to neighbouring regions has generated instability. Mr Appathurai stressed that the international community needs to put more emphasis on the flow of small and light weapons. Therefore, the first step in any post conflict environment should be to secure weapons caches. Unfortunately, not enough resources are being deployed for this at present.

Asked about his opinion on the French operation in Mali, Ambassador Michael Zilmer-Johns answered that it had been a success. He said that if France had not intervened, it would have been a disaster for the whole region as well as for European security. He noted that European allies were quick to provide France with assistance and that the support of the European Union was strong throughout the operation.

The crisis in Syria

In reply to a question about the impact of the international community's inaction towards the civil war in Syria, Mr Appathurai reminded participants that the end of the Libya operation was a fundamental shock for Russia. He anticipated that we will see a reflexive Russian opposition to any operation under chapter 7 of the UN charter, including by NATO. However, a total deadlock in the Security Council will be a major problem – not only in Syria but in the future.

NATO-Russia relations

Responding to a question on the current status of NATO-Russia relations Mr Appathurai said that the NATO Russia Council (NRC) is often underestimated as a lot of cooperation is going on at the practical level. He elaborated by pointing out that the NRC has a series of substructures where the Allies and Russia discuss and cooperate on a number of areas,

including counter terrorism, airspace management, training for Afghan helicopter pilots, and training of anti-drug officers from Central Asia.

Closing remarks

In conclusion, **Simon Lunn** noted that EU-NATO cooperation has improved over the past decade. Despite their differences, progress has been made in moving those two organisations together. Both share the same budgetary problems and face the same challenges. He pointed out that some similarity should lead them to cooperate more in order to make sure that no duplication exists.

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski said he hoped that the cooperation between NATO and the EU will continue to increase. He noted that European citizens feel less secure today in particular because of the striking disparity between growing Russian and Chinese capabilities and the decreasing ability of the Europeans to defend themselves. He concluded his remarks by emphasizing that NATO is weakening and that the EU is not yet capable of replacing the Alliance as a provider of security.

Philippe Vitel:

Mr. President, first of all I would like to thank you and the European Parliament once again for hosting this meeting today. My thanks also to all of our contributors for making this discussion so interesting and useful. I also wish to thank my colleagues in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly for their active participation in our discussions on the role of NATO and the European Union post 2014.

Given its crucial importance to the Alliance, this topic will obviously continue to feature on the agenda of NATO Parliamentary Assembly discussions. In about two weeks we will be meeting again, in Dubrovnik, for the 59th Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. The topics we have discussed today will be debated again in all the Committees, especially in the Defence and Security Committee, which will be discussing a report by our colleague Nicole Ameline on implementing the New Strategic Concept through co-operation and partnership, in particular with the European Union. Moreover, in the same Committee Mr Xavier Pintat will submit a report examining how bilateral European Union-NATO projects can promote and advance the pooling and sharing of resources and research and development in national defence industries.

Let me end with a final observation. As our discussions today have shown, many efforts have already been made to enhance co-operation between the European Union and NATO. However, there is still much room for improvement in this relationship. Faced as we are with the post-2014 challenges, reinforcing this relationship is not only desirable but essential, in order to guarantee the security of the Euro-Atlantic area, and beyond that, the stability of the world. I am convinced that the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, through the active dialogue that it has established with European institutions and with the European Parliament in particular, has a crucial role to play in this process of reinforcement.

I will conclude on that note of optimism. Thank you all once again for your attendance and for your participation.

DCAF promotes good governance and reform of the security sector. The Centre conducts research on good practices, encourages the development of appropriate norms at national and international levels, makes policy recommendations and provides in country advice and assistance programmes. DCAF's partners include governments, parliamentarians, civil society, international organisations and the range of security sector actors such as police, judiciary, intelligence agencies, border security services and the military.

Visit us at www.dcaf.ch

DCAF Brussels office

Place du Congrès 1

1000 Brussels

Belgium

Tel : +32 2 229 39 66