

Roundtable A Finnish View on EU Peacebuilding and Civilian CSDP

Wednesday, 5 February 2013, 09h00 – 15h15

Representation of the European Commission in Finland, Malminkatu 16 FI-00101, Helsinki

Report

1) The State of Play: Finnish and EU Policies Related to EU Peacebuilding

a. Keynote speaker: Mr Erkki Tuomioja, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland¹

The Minister made a keynote speech and participated in a discussion on Finland's approach to Civilian Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and EU external policy, which included the following points:

- Mr Tuomioja believes that it is in the interest of all EU Member States that the EU has a strong and coherent security and defence policy;
- Finland is a strong supporter of CSDP and EU crisis management, including by being the biggest contributor to civilian crisis management missions in relation to the size of its population, pushing for an ambitious agenda in the December 2013 European Council and supporting efforts to strengthen the EU's Comprehensive Approach;
- Finland supports a more flexible and speedy decision-making process when it comes to deploying CSDP missions and battle groups.

On the Council Conclusions issued at the European Council of December 2013 on CSDP:

- Finland is satisfied with the Council Conclusions of the European Council, as it can be seen as an important milestone in furthering CSDP and defence cooperation and mobilises EU Member States to make political commitments;
- Finland supports a strong foreign and security policy strategy and would have liked to see further steps taken at the European Council with regards to building a common analysis of the European strategic context and more ambitious tasking of the HRVP;
- Finland is satisfied with the calendar set at the Summit which EU Member States should use to build on the positive momentum and continue to give strategic guidance to the further development of CSDP;

On mobilising EU Member States' support to EU external action:

- Mr Tuomioja believes that Finland is a champion of collective action, in contrast to other Member States who focus on bilateral action. EU Member States show less political commitment than six years ago, notwithstanding the Lisbon Treaty. Some Member States use the EU only when they see the need to and seem to take it less seriously, which increases the risk of disappointing the expectations of EU citizens on CFSP. Globally, the EU is perceived as the most important peacebuilding actor after the UN. The EU can and does make a difference.

¹ The full speech is available upon request.

b. The state of play of EU policies related to peacebuilding

Finland has been influential beyond its size and is more supportive of peacebuilding agenda than other Member States. The following analysis shows that there is space for Finland to continue to play a role in making the EU more effective in peacebuilding.

Positive developments

The EU is actively supporting peace around the world. There are numerous examples, for instance CSDP missions supporting long term peace such as EUMM Georgia, mediation support in Myanmar or high profile examples such as the facilitated dialogue between Kosovo and Serbia. The EU now has resources dedicated to conflict prevention, including a division in the EEAS dedicated to conflict analysis and integrating conflict prevention across the EU.

Important political initiatives and statements were made in 2013 which show a renewed interest in the role and effectiveness of EU external action, although they have yet to be fully translated into practice. These include the mid-term review of the EEAS, the [Joint Communication on the Comprehensive Approach](#) which was approved by the European Commission and the EEAS in November 2013, and the European Council Conclusions on CSDP in December 2013.

In country, the EU external action has 139 EU delegations globally, whose Heads of Missions have ambassadorial presence.

Challenges

However, there is a sense of frustration about the fact that the EU could be a much bigger international player. Even with the economic crisis, the EU has many resources to support peace at its disposal. There is also a sense of exhaustion around the EU's ability to prevent conflict, especially in situations of conflict which seem intractable. New trends in conflict such as violence from political groups are also a challenge for EU peacebuilding.

Implementing preventive policies is challenged by issues of visibility and credit for preventing conflict at the political level, as the situation in the Central African Republic shows. The EU has resources to do conflict prevention but has yet to operationalize their use.

Regarding its governance and structure, key challenges within the EU institutions include:

- **Leadership and competence:** the appointment of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs & Security Policy/Vice-President of the European Commission (HR/VP) was not based on competence and leadership skills; other related internal challenges in the EEAS include culture of risk aversion and excessive focus on crisis response rather than prevention.
- **Tools:** lack of staff and expertise (particularly in delegations).
- **Bureaucracy:** the weight of EU bureaucracy is a factor in the re-nationalisation of external action by Member States who tend to reinvest in bilateral activities out of frustration with the EU rules and procedures.
- **Proliferation of EU actors and actions:** lack of common position; an example of the challenge of the bureaucracy is the EU's response to the Arab spring (proliferation of new initiatives and institutions such as the European Endowment for Democracy). In this sense, supporting EU action requires to be aware of the risks of creating additional burdens for EU staff, in particular in delegations.
- **Competing understanding of security among EU actors:** there is a tension between human security and state security (building strong states? Focus on military response?).

Developments of interest in Finnish foreign policy

- An Action Plan on fragility in preparation in 2014;
- The Finnish Minister for International Development Mr Pekka Haavisto is the new co-chair of International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS);
- Finland will second a diplomat to the OSCE in 2014.

c. Discussion

Participants discussed the points made by making the following comments:

- The High Representative Catherine Ashton became a personalised scapegoat to claim for any failures of EU policies. This may be a necessary step to develop an EU identity in foreign policy.
- The US have different approach on global issues: it is more strategic and focuses on specific parts of the world. The EU and others could use the space left to play a role in crisis management and in political missions. The US does not seem hostile to EU defence capabilities, as shows the shift in the UK's position on CSDP development.
- While some participants argued that decision-makers should make specific thematic and geographic priorities for the EU's role in the world and use the existing political space to prevent conflict, others were convinced that engaging in policy-making processes such as regional prioritisation is time-consuming and inefficient and tends to create more tension between Member States.
- Some participants argued that for specific regions, EU policy-makers should rely more on the EU special representatives' work on analysis and preventive diplomacy;
- The Nordic Cooperation is not what it used to be: its members are also driven by their own individual interests, as recent incidents between Finland and Sweden have shown.
- The shrinking of resources and funding is a factor in the disengagement of the US in certain regions and of EU Member States in the EU action.
- Several participants insisted on the lack of common understanding of EU security because of competing approaches among and within Member States: is it about building strong states? Focus on military response / intervention?
- Other participants argued that the engagements and discussions on fragility are a useful avenue to use as an entry point to mobilise collective action and EU instruments in a specific area.

Recommendations to policy-makers

EU officials:

- Ensure that EU policies are developed in line with the Comprehensive Approach commitments and that the notion of the EU as an economic power is taken into account;
- Further develop operational tools for conflict prevention to move beyond discourse and act ahead of short-term crisis response;

Government officials in Finland and in the EU Member States:

- Continue to foster cooperation with other Member States on EU external affairs, building on Finland's record as a Member State influential beyond its size in EU policies related to peacebuilding;
- On the appointment of the next HR/VP and the new Commissioner for Development: focus on leadership, competence and potential to overcome the culture of risk aversion;

- Enhance and strengthen the tools of the EEAS (including staff, resources, expertise in Brussels and in delegations);
- Increase the number of seconded staff in the EU institutions, as they have proved to be instrumental in supporting collective action and key peacebuilding recommendations in some cases (including Finland);
- Strengthen the EU as an effective actor in development by taking into consideration the latest evidence, acknowledging its political dimension while defending the DAC criteria so as not to accept the use of development assistance for military action;
- Continue to develop capacity-building activities in the security sector in third countries as highlighted in the European Council Conclusions of December 2013.

2) Mediation

a. Finland's support to mediation

Finland's mediation activities are coordinated by the UN and General Global Affairs Unit of the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The main track for this work is the United Nations and the OSCE. The Finnish Foreign Minister has a Special Representative to regional mediation tasks. The UN and General Global Affairs Unit coordinates with other ministries, civil society (national coordination group with Civil society organisations) and academia.

[The Group of Friends of Mediation](#) was established by Finland and Turkey in 2010 to strengthen mediation. The Group supported the adoption by the UN General Assembly of two resolutions on mediation in 2011 and 2012. While not substantive, they established that mediation will be discussed every other year. The Group is open to everyone: Montenegro, Kenya and the US recently joined and Denmark is interested. A priority for 2014 is cooperation with regional organisations and capacity building at regional level. **The Group of Friends of Mediation in the EU** was created last year in Brussels, which is co-chaired by Finland and Spain.

In Finland, mediation work is funded both through development cooperation funds and special funding for mediation from civilian crisis management funds (400 000"). The latter's goal is to be able to give fast and efficient support as needs arise in conflict situations (1-2 days). It is open to any organisation to apply and there is no specific criteria. Examples of mediation support through development aid programmes include mediation capacity-building for the African Union and training of religious and traditional leaders on gender and mediation skills.

Finland's cooperation with the EU in the field of mediation focuses on capacity building activities (support to peace processes in Myanmar, capacity building at the African Union) and the implementation of the UNSC resolution 1325. Finland also supports the strengthening of the mediation capacity of the EEAS. Priorities of Finland for EU support to mediation include:

- Enhancing the cooperation between the EU and the UN;
- Promoting a UNGA resolution on regional organisations;
- The European Institute of Peace (EIP), which should be launched on May 9, 2014 by Finland, Poland, Luxembourg, Switzerland and the European Parliament;
- Support the increase of funding dedicated to EU mediation activities.

The priorities of Finland for EU crisis management are preventive response, collecting experiences, supporting EU Special Representatives and improving conflict analysis within the EU institutions.

The challenges for Finland in this field include:

- Cooperation between security, development, economic and political actors;
- Implementing prevention before crisis management;
- Ensuring women's participation in peace processes;
- Including peace and stability/security (including mediation) in the Post-2015 agenda priorities of the EU and Finland;
- Definition of peacebuilding: there are differences between crisis management division and the mediation unit.

b. The Mediation Support Team in the EEAS: developments and challenges

As the EU is a complex organisation, it is crucial for partners to understand what it is doing in the field of peace mediation in order to build trust. Mediation is part of the EU preventive diplomacy and an integral component of the EU's comprehensive toolbox in the area of conflict prevention and peacebuilding in conflict countries. Based on the [Concept on Strengthening EU Mediation and Dialogue Capacities](#) adopted by the Member States in 2009, the EU has set up its own [Mediation Support Team \(MST\)](#).

The EU's definition of mediation

The EU's understanding of peace mediation is to help parties find an acceptable solution² and is in line with the UN guidance on effective mediation. It is important to highlight that the EU mostly supports others in mediation. EU mediation support fits in the Comprehensive Approach of the wider toolbox of the EU. The EU has also a normative commitment to support women's participation in peace processes based on values; in addition, it should be highlighted that a reason for the EU to promote it is that it is more effective. Initiatives like the pilot workshop [Gender and Inclusive mediation training for High Level mediators](#) co-hosted by Finland and Norway in October 2013 are excellent opportunities to make that point, mainstream skills and build common understanding.

The Mediation Support Team's work

The MST has the following work streams:

- Deployment of in-house and external expertise: this proved to contribute to real culture change and makes EU action much more effective. Heads of Delegation in countries where there are peace processes can rely on the MST to access internal resources but also to access external expertise (NGOs, networks, Stand-by teams);
- Knowledge management: there is an increasing demand from EU delegations for expertise and support. For example, the EU delegation in Salvador recently requested help on dealing with gun violence by armed non-state actors. The MST has produced a series of factsheets and a lessons learnt study. It has also been engaged in debriefing senior EU envoys and aims to prepare a synthesis report of highlights from the debriefings later in 2014.

² The full definition is a way of assisting negotiations between conflict parties and transforming conflicts with the support of an acceptable third party. The general goal of mediation is to enable parties in conflict to reach agreements they find satisfactory and are willing to implement.

- Coaching & training: the MST organises an annual flagship mediation training towards the end of June. It also welcomes cooperation with Member States and opportunities to participate in external seminars.

Challenges

- Lack of understanding of mediation definition and mediation support work;
- Regionalisation of mediation and accusation of interventionism (*why would the EU do work outside of EU?*): confining regional organisations to the conflicts within their region is not realistic or effective; at UN level, mediation support can be seen as interventionist but on the ground, there is a demand for EU proposals in mediation support;
- Lack of staffing: professional work requires adequate staffing;
- Cooperation with Member States diplomatic services: some Member States tend to be wary of the EEAS taking initiatives in the area of mediation; moreover it has been difficult trying to reconcile different goals from EU capitals in Brussels while work with medium-sized groups of Member States with common goals proved helpful;
- Lack of visibility: the MST welcomes questions from Member States and civil society organisations on its mandate and activities.

An interesting opportunity for the MST is the global discussion on fragility: it is a useful issue for all EU instruments, including mediation, to be organised around.

c. A mediation civil society organisation's perspective: CMI's work on EU mediation support

Crisis Management Initiative (CMI) has been deeply involved in supporting the EU to build up its mediation capacities since early 2000:

- Concrete cooperation in conflict areas where the EU has an active role as a mediator or as supporter of peace processes (such as Aceh, Caucasus, Moldova, Middle East and Africa);
- Member of the Consortium of five organisations specialising in conflict mediation (CMI, HD Center, Search For Common Ground, International Alert, ACCORD), that supports the work of the EEAS Mediation Support Team by providing technical assistance to conflict parties and mediators engaged in peace processes (ERMES - European Resources for Mediation Support);
- Organising thematic workshops and exchanges of lessons learned between the EU and other regional organisations and seminars on the EU's role (together with EPLO).

Justifications for mediation support in the EU framework

There are several reasons why the EU should invest in mediation:

- It is more cost effective than military operations;
- It is a better response to the complexity of modern conflicts, in particular dealing with non-recognised groups;
- Among the basic external policy tools (military, economic and policy tools), there is more space to use policy instruments, including mediation): in a set situation, political departments are more inclined to agree to initiative than military or economic ministries. This reveals to be true in the UN with the Department for Political Affairs has more opportunities and space to work than the Department for Peacekeeping Operations as operations are harder to launch. A similar analysis can be made for EU.

The EU is a different regional organisation in the sense that it is not meant to deal with internal conflicts (as opposed to the African Union for example). In comparison to other players such as the UN, it has more space to use its soft power and political tools, in cooperation with Member States.

The K2 division in the EEAS

The division for conflict prevention, peacebuilding and mediation instruments (K2 . which includes the MST) within the EEAS is a crucial development. It has done substantial work to clarify the definition of mediation and could help further the development of international standards and the mainstreaming of mediation skills to all EU staff. It is also an entry point for civil society working in mediation. Much more cooperation with Member States could be done, especially in terms of sharing funding.

Challenges

- Contextual analysis needs to be included in EU strategy: It does not matter how the EU perceives itself but how it is perceived outside its borders. For example, in Myanmar, it is perceived as an altruistic actor who can support work, whereas it is probably less well perceived in the Middle East. It would be naive to think it is perceived as altruistic in the Eastern Neighbourhood.
- Unicity+of the EU outside its borders: For conflict parties, the EU is often perceived as one block. EU officials need to acknowledge that there is little understanding of the European Commission or the EEAS or DG Trade outside of Brussels.
- The European Institute for Peace (EIP): Its mandate is not clear and is likely to add to the confusion around the proliferation of actors in Brussels. It seems best to improve the existing structure rather than creating new tools.
- More strategic thinking: The EU needs joint strategies between units based on a rational needs assessment. For example, being a global economic power, the EU needs to foster cooperation between the trade and development to avoid doing harm.

d. Discussion

Participants discussed the points made by making the following comments:

- Funding of mediation activities of Finnish CSOs: applications for funding are often clashing with the development aid logic.
- Linking the mediation tracks at EU level is included in the mediation action plan but it is hard to translate in practice without a comprehensive vision. The EEAS corporate board should be able to have instantly a view of EU action in specific areas and request action from MST and others.
- EU-UN relations on mediation: cooperation between the EU and the UN is not natural in this field, and in some cases the EU's mediation support work is perceived as direct competition. Some participants mentioned this was the case in Mali.
- The EU is perceived as one block outside its borders: in many third countries, there is little or no understanding of differences between the European Commission, the EEAS and sometimes Member States.
- The EU should be a substitute for Member States activities: bilateral engagement of EU Member States adds to the proliferation of actors and creates a competition for visibility, in the context of competition between the EU, the UN and the OSCE. It fragments EU action and makes it inefficient in times of crisis. In many conflict-affected countries, local

- actors want strong political action rather than a string of projects than are visible on the outside.
- The UN is still a good platform for collective action and guidance in the field of mediation.
 - Some participants argued that the creation of the EEAS restrains opportunities for collective action. The presidency system was working better in relation to mediation work even though mediation was not in the mandate.

Recommendations to policy-makers

EU officials:

- Further clarify the EU's profile in mediation and differentiate between mediation and other types of external action, such as coordination or influence, to prevent suspicion and hostility;
- Disseminate a common overview in the EU Member States of the EU's normative commitment to support women's participation, emphasizing the fact that it is more effective;
- Increase cooperation with Member States, such as sharing funding as a mutually beneficial tool for cohesion and flexibility in mediation support;
- Rely more on the Mediation Support Team's work to lay out scenarios for EU action in response to specific conflicts;
- Continue to mainstream mediation skills among EU staff and promote expert postings in delegations in challenging conflict-affected regions;

Government officials in Finland and in the Member States:

- Continue to set common goals with like-minded/sized EU Member states (such as the Nordic cooperation or with neutral Member States);
- Continue to reach out to the EEAS and the Mediation Support Team (MST) in mediation-related activities at national level, such as pre-deployment seminars or conferences;
- Continue to enquire about the Mediation Support Team's work and support its existing mandate among reluctant Member States who would like to have more control over its activities;
- Clarify the mandate of the European Institute for Peace (EIP) to avoid confusion among mediation actors in the EU;

Recommendations to civil society (including think tanks and academics):

- Recognise that all EU instruments used for EU external action have specific goals and different logics and are not necessarily designed for peacebuilding;
- Continue to engage with the Mediation Support Team and enquire about activities and its results.

3) The European Council of December 2013

a. Finland's approach to EU crisis management

The Finnish government worked hard to keep civilian crisis management on the agenda and develop these capacities: it participated in the drafting of several non-papers on this issue. CSDP is the most important framework it engages in on crisis management and Finland looks at contributing substantially to the formulation of the development of civilian CSDP. From the point of view of the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, EU civilian crisis management was strengthened by the European Council of December 2013. It created political will and there is a momentum to use, in particular related to financing and making mechanisms faster. The crisis in the Central African Republic was the first test after the EU Council, which reveals that contributions of Member States are a key issue.

The EU Council focused more on the military dimension, which is not necessarily a bad thing as such because military and civilian CSDP should not be opposed or competing. In Finland, they have different budget lines, therefore they are not competing. The discussion of the 2nd and 3rd cluster at the European Council (items related to defence capabilities, pilot projects, defence markets, jobs, research and development) came out to the public, which is positive. CSDP should be measured by successful operations.

Finland makes the biggest contribution to crisis management in the EU proportionally to the size of its population (100 staff). The largest CSDP missions Finland participates in are EULEX Kosovo, EUPOL Afghanistan and EUMM Georgia (which was launched in 2008 during Finland's chairmanship of the OSCE).

On the military side, large, long-term NATO operations are closing (Bosnia, Kosovo and ISAF) which will create a structural change: Finnish resources might focus more on Africa and UN peacekeeping operations. There is a shift in the Finnish engagement in crisis management away from the EU and CSDP. A challenge for Finland and EU Member States is planning around the restructuring / shrinking of large CSDP missions such as EULEX Kosovo and EUPOL Afghanistan. Finland is willing to contribute to new large civilian CSDP missions by sending experts.

b. Preparations and developments of the Summit by the EEAS

Within the European External Action Service, the [Crisis Management and Planning Directorate \(CMPD\)](#) supports the development of crisis related concepts and capabilities and conducts the political-strategic planning of CSDP civilian missions and military operations.

Preparations and expectations for the European Council

The first debate about this European Council started in 2008 but the actual preparations started in December 2012. It was decided that the European Council meeting in December 2013 would review progress achieved in pursuing these goals, assess the situation and, on the basis of recommendations by its President, provide guidance, including by setting priorities and timelines, to ensure the effectiveness of EU efforts aimed at meeting Europe's security responsibilities.

The European Council was seen as an opportunity to lay the framework for a more efficient CSDP, to mobilise Member States and to express EU collective expectations. The main issue was to enable the EU to assume increased responsibility as a security provider. The goal of the EEAS for the Council was to have a genuine debate with concrete outcomes: strategic guidance, more commitment from EU leaders, more visibility for CSDP, a strong narrative,

concrete proposals and a follow-up calendar. It was important to avoid the impression of a one-off event.

The preparatory process started with the European Commission's [Communication on the European Defence and Security Sector](#) (July 2013). It was followed by [the High Representative's final report on CSDP](#) (October 2013) and the [Council Conclusions of November 2013](#). There were two key elements in preparation process: the good cooperation between players and the interactions with Member States (many papers from Member States, academics and the industry contributed to the debate).

What the European Council delivered

EU leaders looked at the changing strategic context and the economic constraints on EU defence capabilities. The [European Council Conclusions of December 2013](#) focused on the following:

- Increase the effectiveness, visibility and impact of CSDP: the EU needs to speed up its deployment of civilian mission, improve its rapid response capabilities and financing mechanisms, and take specific actions in the areas of cyberdefence, maritime security and border management;
- Enhance the development of defence capabilities: the European Council stressed the importance of cooperation in the area of military capabilities;
- Strengthen Europe's defence industry: EU leaders want a more competitive, integrated and sustainable European defence industry.

The outcome was positive in the sense that it produced a set of 59 tasks to follow up on. Most of them were already decided in the previous preparatory meetings and 19 stem directly from the European Council Conclusions. These Conclusions reveal a genuine commitment from the Member States and recognition of the Comprehensive Approach. Other objectives aim at fostering EU Member State cooperation. One element that is lacking in the Conclusions is an overarching vision for CSDP. The next European Council meeting on CSDP was set to take place in June 2015, which is an opportunity for the new EU leadership to be appointed in 2014 to follow up on CSDP.

On Civilian CSDP

It should be clarified that CSDP is not either/or military/civilian, both dimensions are not competitive, rather mutually reinforcing. The European Council identified a set of tasks related to civilian CSDP, including the following:

- Rapid response: implementing the [Roadmap on strengthening the ties between CSDP and Freedom/Security/Justice](#), setting up a shared services center, enhance deployment, evaluation and impact assessment (including via Athena mechanism);
- Civilian capabilities: increase transparency in the recruitment procedures, document lessons learned.

EU Member States have a direct role on the following events where CSDP will be discussed:

- Discussion on the implementation of the Conclusions in 20-22 February in Athens;
- Foreign Affairs Council in April in Luxembourg;
- Progress report on CSDP to be delivered in June 2014;
- Preparing the new EU leadership in 2015 (European Commission and High Representative) and change in EU parliament in 2014.

c. Peacebuilding perspective on the European Council Conclusions

From a peacebuilding perspective, civilian CSDP was not strengthened. Overall, the debate should be more balanced and the civilian dimension should not be perceived as a threat to military dimension of CSDP.

Context analysis

There were positive elements in the preparation and outcome of the Council, such as the support of some Member States (including Germany and Finland) to include the civilian dimension. The context in which the European Council took place was influenced by the following elements:

- There were some positive developments in the EU institutions last year, including: work on concepts, border management and new approaches to CSDP, documenting lessons learned, new openness to civil society (including in strategic reviews of CSDP missions), gradual mainstreaming of interaction with local population and development of exit strategies;
- The preparatory debate focused mostly on the military side of CSDP based on the argument that the EU cannot be a global actor without military power;
- The [HR/VP's final report on CSDP](#) was not very useful and the November 2013 Council Conclusions on CSDP focused on military questions.

Action points from the European Council Conclusions related to civilian CSDP

- CSDP is now being included in an overall strategy based on the Comprehensive Approach;
- Focus on building the capacity of others, being an enabler rather than a direct actor (Point 7 of the European Council Conclusions);
- Bringing together procurement procedures (Point 12);
- Capabilities development plan (Point 15);
- Funding the defence industry (Point 18 and 20): there is no co-relation between security issues and effectiveness of CSDP on the one hand and supporting the defence industry on the other hand; making CSDP more effective is based on a wider combination of complex factors.

Recommendations

- Integration of conflict analysis into mission planning based on human security;
- Revision of civilian CSDP Concepts;
- Rigorous and participatory evaluation of CSDP missions;
- Improvement of the relationship between CSDP missions and local populations;
- Focus on supporting responsible states rather than strengthening questionable states;
- Fully addressing the question of leadership of civilian CSDP missions, acknowledging that military officials cannot properly lead a complex Rule of Law mission.

d. Discussion

Participants discussed the points made by making the following comments.

On scenarios for CSDP:

- In the military domain, work on scenarios is already taking place in the Battle Groups and the European Council agreed that military rapid response should be based on different concepts and scenarios;
- NATO is moving away from scenario planning;
- On the Capability Development Plan: Member States should spot shortfalls and contribute collectively to defining scenarios.

On the effectiveness of CSDP

- Rapid deployment of CSDP missions has proved its value;
- The evaluation process of missions is not transparent and there is no evaluation of the impact and results of CSDP as a whole;
- The work on Lessons Learned is a good step but such reports tend to be technical, tactical and are not elevated to strategic level where issues need to be addressed.

On the role of CSDP and the Comprehensive Approach

- 90% of CSDP missions/tasks are about transition and transformation, which are long term processes;
- EU officials should use the lens of fragility more often in planning for CSDP missions; as illustrated by the New Deal, initiatives on fragility are about legitimate politics and Rule of Law, which are typical tasks of CSDP missions;
- The Joint Communication on the Comprehensive Approach mentions CSDP but there is no reference to fragility.

On women's participation and UN Resolution 1325

- There is a double standard on the EU gender equality agenda: gender equality is a policy priority but there are not enough women in high level positions in CSDP missions;
- Including women in both civilian and military missions make CSDP missions more effective;
- How to take into account UN resolution 1325 in planning missions and training?
- There is no discrimination in the recruitment for military missions but it takes time to implement change because fewer women apply.

Recommendations to policy-makers

EU officials:

- Further review the concepts underlying CSDP to ensure that they are based on evidence about effective response to conflict (for example, the World Development Report of 2011);
- Make the assessment of threats to human security a starting point in planning CSDP missions;
- Ensure the involvement of civil society and local populations in the planning, implementation and evaluation of CSDP missions;
- Review the process through which heads of CSDP missions are appointed, on the basis of competence and in relation to the type of CSDP mission deployed (civilian or military);
- Develop strong mid-level strategies to translate the existing overarching objectives and norms related to CSDP;
- Evaluate CSDP missions more transparently at a strategic level, with standard criteria and as part of accountability to the EU tax payer, as opposed to current sui generis strategic reviews which focus only technical or tactical aspects;

Government officials in Finland and EU Member States:

- Decide the EU course of action on the basis of the wider political framework for crisis management, not on the sole CSDP framework;
- Redefine the role of CSDP by acknowledging that civilian activities can be done outside of the CSDP framework and deciding whether missions should be confined to a specific type of action such as stabilisation, recognizing that most of CSDP missions/tasks are related to transition and transformation, which are long-term processes;
- Use the lens of fragility when discussing CSDP missions and make links with the New Deal compacts, which relate to typical tasks of CSDP missions such as support to the rule of law.



This meeting was funded with the support of the Europe for Citizens Programme of the European Union. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

EPLO is grateful for the support of the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust.