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Executive Summary

EU security has reached a critical point unparalleled since the end of the cold war. The threat of Jihadism, instability in Eastern Europe, failing states and human trafficking are problems it must deal with at a moment at which the United States is seeking to play a lesser role in European defence. Although as many as 34 civilian and military operations have been conducted during the 16 years in which the CSDP has been active, this instrument is far from being sufficient to meet the EU’s security requirements.

Of the various areas in which the CSDP must now be strengthened – which range from strategy definition and the development of common capacities to financing and force structure – the most important is Command and Control, a point that has been resolved at the political-strategic level but remains pending at the military-strategic level due to the lack of a permanent European operational headquarters (OHQ) that obliges the Union to negotiate specific agreements in every instance that one is required. None of the three current options for establishing an OHQ satisfies the availability, rapid response and capacity requirements for conducting CSDP operations. The use of NATO assets contemplated in the Berlin Plus agreement has for all intents and purposes been blocked by the diplomatic deadlock between Cyprus and Turkey, the response provided by national OHQs (which are not exclusively devoted to EU defence) is slow, and the capacity of the EU Centre of Operations is severely limited.

This problem can only be resolved by creating a permanent, joint, combined, modular and sustainable European Operational Headquarters (EOHQ) with the planning, command, control and coordination capacities needed to guarantee that a
military commander can carry out his responsibilities in close coordination with the commander of civilian operations and the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability.

An EOHQ would give the CSDP the visibility and rapid response capability it must have to work effectively in an increasingly unstable environment in which heightened security measures are essential and the launch of new operations is inevitable. Its establishment would have a multiplier effect in that it would lead to other initiatives that would pave the way for the expansion of the CSDP – a crucial step towards the common European defence envisioned in EU Treaties that should be a key EU objective.

Promoting the creation of this structure and participating in its realisation should be one of the priorities of those Member States, including Spain, that are in favour of strengthening the CSDP as part of a process of political convergence, and consider such a measure to be the most appropriate, urgent and effective action to afford European citizens a higher level of security and a collective contribution towards the achievement of the paramount goal of peace.
1. Introduction

With the signing of the first Treaty on European Union (TUE) and the establishment of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) in Maastricht in 1992, the European Union acquired a legal personality and moved beyond its initial process of internal convergence to become an actor in global affairs, even though its role in this regard has been somewhat tempered by the reluctance of certain Member States (MSs) to share their foreign security policies. When it met in Cologne in June 1999, the European Council approved a fundamental element of the CFSP: the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), which was conceived to capacitate the EU to carry out civilian and military operations as a part of its foreign common policy in the scope of 'Petersberg tasks', which cover humanitarian aid and rescue, peace-keeping, and the use of combat forces in crisis management including peace-making.

The Lisbon Treaty (2007), which came into force in 2009, provided a significant impetus for the CFSP by extending the responsibilities of the new High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, making the holder of that office a Vice-President of the European and chair of the EU Foreign Affairs Council and creating the European External Action Service (EEAS) – an entity conceived specifically to support his or her efforts. In line with the objectives of the CFSP and its intergovernmental nature, the Lisbon Treaty also contained other provisions of importance to the ESDP (which henceforth would be referred to officially as the Common Security and Defence Policy) especially in terms of the development of common capacities. These provisions, which sanctioned greater competences for the European Defence Agency (EDA) created in July 2004 and introduced the concept of Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO), gave like-minded MSs the opportunity to further EU convergence in the area of defence by developing joint capabilities and providing combat units for common missions. This
treaty also extended the scope and range of joint missions, which going forward were to include disarmament, military assessment and assistance and post-conflict stabilisation activities.

Nevertheless, from a political perspective, the undoubtedly most important novelty introduced in the consolidated Lisbon Treaty was the mutual defence clause contained in article 42.7. This article, which derived from article 5 of the Brussels Treaty, the document that established the former Western European Union, states that if a Member State is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, all other Member States have the obligation to aid and assist it by all means in their power in accordance with article 51 of the United Nations charter. Although its inclusion gave the EU the status of a military alliance, the mutual defence clause contains two restricting provisions. The first is that it 'shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States' (those considered to be neutral or non-aligned) and the second is that 'commitments and cooperation in this area shall be consistent with commitments under the North American Treaty organisation (NATO), which for those States which are members of this organisation, remains the foundation of their collective defence and the forum of its implementation'. These two provisions (particularly the latter) and the absence of plans for any common defence organisations or structures, currently reduce the status of article 42.7 to little more than ink on paper. Nevertheless, its inclusion in the Lisbon Treaty leaves a door ajar through which to pursue the development of the common defence contemplated in the TUE since Maastricht, albeit without a time frame and contingent upon the unanimous approval of Member States.

The CSDP grew out of the December 1998 Franco-British St. Malo Declaration, by which France acknowledged the pre-eminence of NATO commitments and the United Kingdom admitted the possibility of autonomous European Union defensive actions and recognised the importance of strengthening European military capability. This event laid the foundations for and continues to inform the development of EU defence policy. The CSDP was not conceived as a vehicle for European security – a role delegated to NATO – but rather as a complementary tool that could be used to deal with situations that the alliance did not consider of sufficient importance to merit NATO engagement, generally in non-critical operations such as the EU mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 2003 and its involvement in the stabilisation process in Bosnia-Herzegovina.
It is due to this perception of its role that the development of the CSDP has not kept pace with that of other European common policies and 16 years after its creation continues to lack a number of key capacities, an adequate force structure and, above all, the Command and Control structure at every level that would facilitate mission planning and conduct without external or Member State support. A lack of political will on the part of certain MSs has hindered the implementation of Permanent Structured Cooperation, attempts to review the current European security strategy, progress towards the common financing of operations and the development of common capacities that are sorely needed in the context of current budget restrictions.

The world has changed significantly over the past 16 years. What might have seemed adequate at the time the CSDP was created may appear less than sufficient if viewed from the perspective of today’s circumstances. The EU is now obliged to shoulder an ever-greater responsibility for its security, a situation due, in part, to the deterioration of order along its own periphery, but also the result of a mentality shift on the part of its main ally, the United States, which is seeking to reduce its engagement in Europe without renouncing its overall commitment to world peace. In this context, we should consider the pending project of building a future European common defence, for which the EU should at some point begin to create the required structures.

It is in the light of the above circumstances that we have analysed the present structures and capacities of the CSDP to determine whether or not they are adequate to meet the EU's present and foreseeable security challenges and, should they fall short, to identify the areas in which they must be improved and the priorities that must be set in order to develop the common instruments needed to carry out efficient missions and move forward towards a common defence. From our perspective, this will entail the enhancement of Command and Control by means of the creation of a permanent European Operational Headquarters, the planning, command and control capacities of which must be sufficient to deal with the level of ambition established for CSDP operations.

To this purpose, we will begin with a brief analysis of the present strategic environment and its impact on the EU’s needs in the area of security and defence before moving on to an examination of the common capabilities currently at our disposal to deal with these challenges and an evaluation of the present weaknesses and strengths of the CSDP. On the basis of this information, we will then identify the steps we believe must be taken to ensure the success of the CSDP going forward in terms of strategy, capacity building and structural development. In the
final section of this report we will focus on Command and Control, a function we consider essential to the implementation of civilian and military operations alike, beginning with a description of the manner in which it is currently organised, existing structures and present deficiencies before offering the rationale for the creation a European HQO in the near future and an outline of the characteristics and capacities it should have.

Our main objective is therefore to present a sound argument for establishing a European OHQ. Given that the structure and characteristics of such an entity will greatly depend on the technical means Member States are willing to provide and to an even greater extent on the level of ambition they establish for the operations it will plan and conduct, the descriptions of a future European OHQ contained in this document are intended solely to provide a general idea of what such an endeavour would entail. What we are advocating here is a political decision in favour of establishing an OHQ; its final nature and specifications would be determined on the basis of future technical studies.
5. The resolution of CSDP command and control issues

Of the gaps and deficits that the CSDP presently suffers, the most critical are related to Command and Control (C2). As the EU has no permanent C2 framework in place, temporary structures must be created for every mission and operation it undertakes. As we will see in this chapter, this state of affairs reduces the speed with which the EU is able to react to unexpected situations and limits the visibility and effectiveness of crisis management operations it mounts.

Although present CSDP capacities are very limited, they are more than sufficient to guarantee the viability of crisis interventions such as those undertaken in Mali in January 2013 and the Central African Republic in December of that same year. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that France was forced to intervene in both cases due to the torpidity and inefficiency of the instruments available for mounting CSDP operations, a weakness attributable in large part not only to tepid political will but also to the lack of a permanent C2 structure at the strategic-military level capable of carrying out advanced crisis planning in a timely fashion and conducting operations.

5.1. The political and military structures of the CSDP

The CSDP is directed by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy/Vice-President of the Commission (HR/VP), a position currently held by Federica Mogherini. The HR presides over the Council of Foreign Affairs, a collective organ composed of the foreign ministers of Member States that is responsible for making decisions regarding the launch of new CSDP missions and operations, their possible extension and termination and any changes that may be effected during the course of their execution. The EU does not have a permanent
council of defence ministers. At present, the ministers of defence of Member States attend informal twice-yearly meetings organised in the country of the current rotating presidency of the Council of the European Union at which they discuss matters related to the CSDP including any operations underway. The most recent was held in Luxembourg September 2–3 2015. The institutionalisation of a defence council specifically charged with responsibility for matters related to the CSDP under the leadership of the HR would not only constitute a great leap forward in the development of common policy in this area, but would also establish a more logical arrangement given that its members would be the ministers responsible for matters related to military capacities, defence industries, command and force structures and military operations in their respective countries.

The HR is assisted in the fulfilment of all her duties, including those related to the CSDP, by the European External Action Service (EEAS), a body established in the Lisbon Treaty and formally launched in July 2010. Since its creation, the EEAS has assumed authority over EU political and military structures responsible for crisis management, the majority of which were created by the European Council in Nice in December 2000. The following are the most important:

- **The Political and Security Committee (PSC)**, which is comprised of ambassadorial level representatives of EU Member States, is chaired by an ambassador from the EEAS designated by the HR, who reserves the right to preside over the entity whenever appropriate. The main functions of this organ, which supports decision-making at the Council level, are the monitoring of international situations and the definition of EU policy related to the CFSP and the CSDP. The PSC prepares a coherent EU response to a given crisis and exercises its political control and strategic direction.

- **The European Union Military Committee (EUMC)**, which is the highest military body within EU hierarchy, is comprised of the chiefs of defence (CHODS) of Member States, who are normally represented by permanent military representatives (MiReps). The EUMC has a permanent chairman selected by the CHODs and officially appointed by the Council. Its function is to provide advice and recommendations to the PSC on all military matters.

- **The European Union Military Staff (EUMS)**, which functions under the authority of the HR and the EUMC, provides analysis and military expertise and coordinates military operations and missions as well as other types of operations and missions
that require military support. It provides early warning through the EU's Single Intelligence Analysis Capacity, situation assessment, strategic planning, communications and information systems, concept development, training and education and support for partnerships. It is also in charge of the EU's centre of operations (EU OPCEN) and provides its core staff when it is activated.

- **The Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CivCom)** is an advisory body that provides information, recommendations and opinions to the PSC regarding crisis management in coordination with the EUMC. As such, it is the principal structure for the planning of civilian missions.

- **The Politico-Military Group (PMG)** carries out preparatory fieldwork on CSDP matters for the PSC. Its chairperson is designated by the HR. The PMG addresses the political aspects of EU military and civilian-military matters, including concepts, capacities and missions. It contributes to the development of horizontal policies and facilitates exchanges of information between structures involved and has a special responsibility regarding partnerships with third states and other organisations such as NATO.

- **The Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD)**, created in 2009, is the most recently created structure within the CSDP framework. It contributes to political and strategic planning for CSDP civilian missions and military operations by ensuring their coherence and effectiveness within the overall context of EU crisis management and developing CSDP partnerships, policies, concepts and capabilities.

- **The Civilian Planning and Conduct Capacity Directorate (CPCC)** is in charge of the execution of all civilian CSDP operations. The role of this permanent structure, which operates under the political direction of the PSC and HR, is to ensure the effective planning and execution of civilian CSDP crisis management missions and the proper implementation of related tasks.

Organisational changes to the EEAS carried out by the present HR in September 2015 have supposed the elimination of Management Directorate VII (MD VII), a Crisis Response Operational Coordination unit responsible for operation and crisis response planning that included a Situation Centre and an Intelligence Analysis Centre. As a result of the 2015 reorganisation, all CSDP-related structures and organs have been placed under the direction of a new Deputy Secretary General for CSDP and Crisis Response (a position currently held by Spanish career diplomat Pedro Serrano de Haro) in a unit that includes the CMPD, the CPCC, a unified
Intelligence and Situation Centre and a Security policy and conflict prevention Division, in addition to the EUMS that reports directly to the HR. This change will undoubtedly lead to a greater rationalisation of resources and enhance the efficiency of management of CSPD activities.

5.2. Military planning

In accord with the EU Concept for Military Planning drafted by the EUMS and approved by the EUMC in June 2008, EU military planning is conducted at four levels:

- The political and strategic level (EU institutional level)
- The military-strategic level (operational headquarters or OHQ level)
- The operational level (force headquarters or FHQ level), and
- The tactical level (component headquarters level and below).

In practice, given their limited scope and the fact that they usually involve a single component (land or naval forces), force headquarters for EU crisis management operations are organised at the tactical level and operational level responsibilities are absorbed by the OHQ, which acts mainly on what is referred to as the strategic-operational level.

Military planning can be broken down into two basic categories: advanced planning and crisis response planning. Advanced planning, the purpose of which is to ensure that the EU is prepared to face crisis scenarios that may materialise in the future, can be divided into two subcategories: generic and contingency planning.

- Generic planning involves drafting basic plans for operations that may be necessary in the future with the knowledge that certain conditioning factors may not yet be fully identified or accounted for. This type of planning is meant to provide a general picture of capacities a particular type of operation would require.
- Contingency planning, in contrast, entails the production of detailed plans for potential operations for which conditioning factors have been identified and taken into account. Contingency plans, which include a description of
resources required and options for deployment, constitute the basis for subsequent crisis response planning.

Both the EUMS and the CMPD carry out advanced planning at the political-strategic level within the present CSDP framework. However, in the absence of a permanent OHQ, no advanced planning is currently being conducted at the military-strategic level despite the value of this type of preparation in capability planning and the importance of being able to consult such documents when crises actually arise and operational plans must be prepared quickly. As no one knows which headquarters will be conducting an operation until the moment that it is activated, it is clear that no prior preparation for such an operation is carried out at this level.

Crisis response planning is conducted to prepare the EU to handle real crises. As stated before, it is ideally based on previously prepared advanced planning documents, which are adapted to the actual circumstances that must be dealt with – a procedure that can only be followed if such documents are available.

5.3. Crisis planning at the political and strategic level

Crisis Response Planning begins as soon as an emerging crisis is identified by the EU and a determination is made at the political level that an intervention may be necessary. This leads to the preparation of a Crisis Management Concept (CMC), which depending on the gravity of the situation being monitored, may be followed by the generation of a Military Strategic Options (MSO) document which can lead to an Initiating Military Directive (IMD). The IMD designates an Operation Commander (OpCdr) and the OHQ that will provide support for the planning and subsequent conduct of the operation. The OpCdr then prepares a Concept of Operations (CONOPS) and an Operational Plan (OPLAN) that is sent to the PSC and the Council for approval.

This linear, sequential planning process should be regarded an ideal rather than a mandatory chain of procedures. In practice, time constraints or other circumstances call for a greater margin of flexibility and pragmatism and certain steps are sometimes skipped or carried out simultaneously.
FIGURE 3. POLITICAL AND STRATEGIC LEVEL PLANNING PROCESS
Source: EU Concept for Military Planning at the Political and Strategic level (Doc. 10687/08)

The EUMC provides military advice to support the decision-making process. If, on the basis of this and other counsel (perhaps provided by the Security policy and conflict prevention Division), the PSC determines that the situation calls for an action on the part of the EU, a Crisis Management Concept (CMC) document is subsequently generated. The CMC is a conceptual framework describing the EU's overall approach to the management of a particular crisis. The EUMS contributes to the development of the CMC by analysing and prioritising the military parameters of the envisaged operation. The EUMS also evaluates the feasibility of the options presented and provides an initial estimate of the military capabilities required for each. Although it does not appear in the diagram (having been created after the publication of the document in which it was featured) the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD) also contributes to the development of the CMC by assessing the PSC on the political implications of an operation and the relationships of the EU with other strategic actors.

Once the Council has approved the CMC, the PCS requests that the EUMC task the EUMS with the preparation of a Military Strategic Options Directive (MSOD) that that expresses the intentions of the PCS in military terms and prioritises the options
under consideration. This document should contain a range of military strategic options designed to achieve the objectives defined in the CMC as well as an outline of the military course of action proposed, the resources required and perceived constraints of each. Each option should also include a feasibility and risk assessment, an outline of the Command and Control structure and an indicative force capability as well as an objective, desired End State, Exit Strategy and an indication of the degree to which military force will be employed, all of which should be derived from the CMC.

Once the Council has expressed a preference for one of the strategic military options proposed, the EUMS produces an Initiating Military Directive (IMD) that is submitted to the EUMC for its consideration, endorsement and counsel before being presented to the PSC for approval. Following its approval by the PSC, the EUMC authorises the IMD to forward it on to the Operation Commander (OpCdr). The IMD should provide a clear description of the EU’s political and military objectives and the military mission envisaged to achieve them. It should also include any political constraints and assumptions that the OpCdr should take into account when preparing a Concept of Operations (CONOPS), Provisional Statement of Requirement (PSOR), Operation Plan (OPLAN) and Rules of Engagement Request (ROEREQ) as well as the projected outcome (e.g. the achievement of the End State and Exit Strategy).

Military planning at the political and strategic level does not end once the IMD is sent to the OpCdr. The EUMS continues to provide support for military planning carried out at the subordinate strategic-military level to ensure a smooth transition in the planning process between the two levels. After the operation has been launched, the EUMS continues to monitor the strategic environment and carry out assessment and analysis at the political and strategic level in support of the activities of the OpCdr and OHQ throughout the implementation period and prepares for whatever adjustments must be made in response to changes in the situation.

5.4. The planning and implementation of civil missions

Planning for CSDP civilian missions at the political and strategic level is very similar to that undertaken for military operations. In fact, the Crisis Management Concept (CMC) document may contain civilian as well as military options or a
combination of both, although CMCs are generally oriented in one of these directions from the outset.

The Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CivCom) plays much the same role in PCS civilian operation planning that the EUMC plays in the planning of military operations. Its tasks are carried out in parallel with those of the EUMC. The CIVCOM, created by the Council in May 2000, is composed of representatives of EU Member States. Its mission is to prepare planning documents for upcoming missions, make recommendations to the PCS regarding the Union's civilian crisis response planning, and propose strategies and policies for civilian crisis management and the development of civilian capacities.

Although CIVCOM is a structure vital to civilian mission planning, the PCS may also request advice from the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD) regarding the preparation of the CMC for a civilian mission, the strategic options document and the Directive that will trigger the planning on the lower level, which corresponds in civil matters to the military strategic level.

During a meeting in Hampton Court in October 2005, the European Council decided to create the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC) under the leadership of a Civilian Operations Commander. The holder of this position exercises command and control at the strategic level for the planning and conduct of all civilian CSDP missions under the political control and strategic direction of the PCS and the overall authority of the HR. The Civilian Operations Commander takes care of operational planning and contributes to the strategic planning for all civilian missions with the assistance of CPCC staff.

The CPCC, which was established in August 2007 but did not achieve full operational capacity until November 2008, functions within the framework of the EEAS in Brussels. It has a permanent staff of 60, half of whom are police, legal, procurement, logistics and financial experts recruited from Member States. Its mission is to ensure the effective planning and conduct of CSDP civilian missions and support the work of the Civilian Operations Commander. At present, the CPCC is providing supervision and support for twelve missions. Its tasks include training, assessment, organisation and oversight related to policing, customs, rule of law and the general reform of security sectors. As such, it functions as the civil counterpart of a permanent military OHQ. Although civilian CSDP missions do not suffer
deficiencies in terms of Command and Control capacity, the CPCC’s resources, which are severely stretched given the number of missions it is called upon to support, should be augmented and provided with external support.

5.5. Command and Control of military operations

As previously noted, the command and control of military operations is carried out at four different levels: political and strategic, military-strategic, operational and tactical.

The PCS exercises the political control and strategic direction of EU military operations at the political and strategic level under the authority of the Council and the direction of the HR on the basis of the advice and recommendations of the Military Committee (EUMC).

The Operation Commander (OpCdr) carries out his work at the military-strategic level. He is designated by the Council to direct a specific operation and in that capacity authorised to exercise operational command or operational control over the assigned forces. He is responsible for the preparation of the Concept of Operations (CONOPS) and the Operation Plan (OPLAN) and for directing the force generation process in concert with the military authorities of contributing Member States. Once an operation has been launched, the OpCdr coordinates the deployment, sustainment and redeployment of these forces. An OpCdr is supported by an Operational Headquarters (OHQ) located outside the Area of Operations (AOO).

Below this level stands the Force Commander (FCdr) acting under the authority of the OpCdr whose duty is to execute a military operation within a designated AOO. A Force Headquarters (FHQ) situated within the AOO supports the FCdr in planning, conducting and exercising command and control over the forces deployed there. As previously mentioned, the FHQ is theoretically positioned at the operational level of the hierarchy. At the next, or tactical, level are, according to the needs of the overall mission, the land, naval, air and special operations Component Commanders. The hierarchy just described is, however, theoretical given that due to their size and nature CSDP military operations do not usually have Component Commanders. We can thus, for all practical intents and purposes, assume that the FHQ functions at the tactical level and that the OHQ constitutes the strategic-operational level of a mission’s structure. Military operations not
requiring the designation of an OpCdr or OHQ due to their limited scope – one example being the EU training mission in Mali – are exceptions to this rule. In such cases, the FCdr reports directly to the PCS through the EUMC and is responsible for preparing the mission OPLAN.

The fact that the only permanent structures in place are situated at the political and strategic level supposes a serious gap at the military-strategic level. Despite their essential role in mission planning and execution, the OHQs for CSDP operations are invariably designated on a case-by-case basis. At present, there are three options available for designating an OHQ for a CSDP military operation:

1. **Relying on common NATO resources and capabilities**

   In response to the concern expressed by some Member States belonging to NATO – particularly the United Kingdom – that the development of an EU military command structure would place the Union on a competitive track with NATO, the European Council decided that it would rely on NATO resources for its operations rather than duplicating that organisation’s capabilities. The Berlin Plus agreement, which was reached in December 2002 after a long period of negotiation between both organisations made difficult by differences of opinion and tensions between Greece and Turkey, consists of seven agreements that allow EU access to NATO planning and conduct capabilities for operations in which the alliance as a whole is not involved. The arrangement was formalised on 17 March 2003 with the exchange of letters between the Secretary General of NATO and the EU HR containing the protocols of NATO-EU consultation and cooperation.

   Less than a month after this agreement was finalised, the EU launched its first military operation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Operation Concordia, which was conducted with NATO assets and capabilities as a follow-up to NATO’s Operation Allied Harmony, lasted until mid December 2003. The second CSDP operation to be executed through the Berlin Plus agreement is Operation Althea (still underway), which was implemented in December 2004 to provide continuity following the withdrawal of NATO’s Stabilisation Force (SFOR) from Bosnia-Herzegovina. The OHQ for each of these missions was established at the installations of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) located in Mons Belgium, the headquarters of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, whose deputy commander (always a European) assumed the role of OpCdr.
Up to the present moment, NATO assets and capabilities have only been employed in these two operations. As both have been follow-up actions to NATO operations, it is difficult to know how this arrangement would function in the circumstances of a new CSDP operation to which NATO had no connection. Should the EU ever call upon NATO to provide an OHQ for a purely EU operation, it would be requesting a structure that does not yet exist within the Alliance and would have to be negotiated. This would involve the organisation of an ad-hoc chain of command, a difficult and delicate process. The negotiations for operation Althea, for example, stretched on for eight months. This system is therefore not valid for crises that demand a rapid response (which one must assume will almost invariably be the case).

Furthermore, European members of the planning team at SHAPE from non-NATO countries do not have access to NATO classified documents. Likewise, those from NATO countries that do not belong to the European Union have no access to EU classified documents. EU countries that do not belong to NATO are somewhat wary of the idea that CSDP operations in which they might one day participate will be conducted at the military-strategic level from a NATO OHQ. Another important issue is the absence of civilian instruments at NATO OHQs, a problem that renders them inappropriate for civilian-military operations or military operations with strong civilian ramifications of the type the EU is likely to be involved in.

Nonetheless, the main problem with this system is that in the Berlin Plus agreements NATO reserves the right not only to monitor an EU operation, but also withdraw its support or even block it should it so desire. For all intents and purposes, this stipulation makes the EU a subsidiary of NATO in the sphere of military operations. The veto of just one member of NATO or EU Member State can hinder the activation of this mechanism. In any case, recourse to the Berlin Plus mechanism has been effectively been blocked since the entry of Cyprus into the EU due to the constant confrontation between this country and Turkey and the ways in which both strive to use the structures of NATO and the EU to defend their interests. Until this conflict is resolved, it is impossible to envisage the launch of any new CSDP operations whose Command and Control structure would depend on NATO assets and capabilities.
2. Using national OHQs offered by Member States

This C2 mechanism for CSDP operations is based on a nation-framework system by which an MS offers an HQ on its territory for an EU operation, the staff of which is augmented by professionals provided by other Member States participating in the mission. At present, the EU has HQs available for this purpose in five Member States: Mont-Valérien, Paris (France), Northwood (UK), Potsdam, Berlin (Germany), Rome (Italy) and Larissa (Greece).

The EU relied on this system for the implementation of Operation Artemis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which was launched in June 2003 and concluded the following September. The OHQ that supported the planning and execution of this mission was located in France, the framework nation that contributed with the greatest number of forces to the operation. The Command and Control for another mission carried out in the same country under the title EUFOR RD Congo, which lasted from April to November 2006, was conducted from a German OHQ located in Potsdam. The OHQ for the EUFOR Tchad/Republic of Central Africa operation, which began in late January 2008 and concluded in mid-March 2009, was also French, and the OHQ for EUFOR RCA, conducted in the Republic of Central Africa from February 2010 to March 2015, was located in Larissa, Greece. EUNAVFOR Atalanta, an ongoing operation that was launched off the coast of Somalia in December 2008, is under the command of the British OHQ located in Northwood and EUNAVFOR Med, the first phase of which was launched in June 2015, is being conducted under the command of an OHQ in Rome. Due to their limited scope, the three other EU military operations currently underway in addition to Operation Althea (EUTM Mali, EUMAM RCA and EUTM Somalia) do not have individual OHQs and are being conducted under the direct command of the PCS through the EUMC, whose chairman is the immediate interlocutor with all three commanders in the field.

As each of the five OHQs made available by MSs have now been utilised at least once, it is now possible to assess of the use of this option. All of these facilities must be activated, ‘multinationalized’ and augmented whenever designated as the OHQ for an EU operation. The host HQ usually provides a nuclear staff of between 40 and 50 that must be supplemented by personnel from other participating Member States. The initial phase of operations is always somewhat hindered by the fact that none of these professionals have ever worked together or at the HQ in question before. The activation of Mont Valérien for Operation Artemis proceeded smoothly, but the activation of Potsdam for Operation EUFOR RD Congo in 2006
was a delayed a full month due to the reluctance of the German commander to assume the mission until he was provided with more information – data, which by protocols established, he was responsible for producing himself.

The main problem is that none of these OHQs can begin planning a given operation before it has been officially designated, which does not occur until an Initiating Military Directive (IMD) has been issued. This implies that the OHQ eventually designated has neither the opportunity to contribute input during the political and strategic planning of a mission nor the possibility of undertaking the tasks that should be carried out in parallel up until the planning is practically completed. Furthermore, the fact that these facilities must continue to fulfil their obligations as national HQs whilst the CSDP operation is underway implies a demand on their resources that consequently limits the duration of any EU operation mounted in this manner. Last but not least, like NATO facilities, national OHQs frequently lack the civilian capabilities that are frequently called for in EU operations. Given that they cannot provide the C2 needs of the CSDP on a permanent basis, it is obvious that the utilisation of national OHQs can only be considered a stopgap solution.

3. Activating an EU Operations Centre

In April 2003, Germany, France, Belgium and Luxembourg proposed the creation of a European OHQ in Tervuren, on the outskirts of Brussels. However, due to the reluctance of certain other Member States (especially the United Kingdom) to contemplate any development of the CSDP outside of NATO control, this initiative was shelved. In December of that year the European Council consequently decided to strengthen the EUMS and facilitate the exchange of liaison teams between the EUMS and the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE). An agreement was finally reached in 2005 to create permanent liaison cells within the each organisation's framework comprised of an EU team at SHAPE devoted to the support of operation planning and implementation and an OTAN team at EUMS facilities. That same year a civilian-military cell devoted to contingency and crisis response planning was incorporated into the EUMS for the purpose of aiding designated OHQs or, in the event that circumstances should require it, activate an Operations Centre (OpsCen) from which operations limited to the size of a Battlegroup (BG) of 2,000 could be conducted.
On the basis of that decision, the EU has had a third option for conducting CSDP military operations at the strategic-military level since January 2007: activating the EU Operations Centre located in Brussels, which is staffed by a small permanent core team of eight professionals, four of which are staff officers. Activation, which is contemplated only for operations of limited scope (particularly those of a civilian-military nature) for which no national OHQ has been designated, must be carried out by a staff drawn primarily from the EUMS and participating MSs. The Operation Centre can theoretically be operational within five days of its activation and completely functional with a staff of approximately one hundred military and civilian personnel within twenty days.

The Council activated the Operation Centre for the first time on 23 March 2012, to strengthen coordination and synergies between the three CSDP missions underway in the Horn of Africa: the military operation EUNAVFOR Atalanta, the military training mission EUTM Somalia and the civilian maritime training and capacity building mission EUCAP Nestor being carried out in Djibouti, Kenya, Somalia, Seychelles and Tanzania. For the duration of this mission, the Operation Centre will have a dedicated staff of 16 officers working under the command of a Navy Captain. It functions as a coordination body rather than an OHQ given that the operations involved are being conducted in the same geographic zone and each operation has its own Command and Control structure.

The activation of the OpsCen could well prove to be a viable emergency solution in instances that operations must be launched at very short notice and represents beyond all doubt the only exclusively Community option currently available. However, given that any operations it launched would need to be very small in scope for their entire duration, involve a limited staff working with limited resources and the OpsCen would only be activated on a temporary basis, it does not provide a viable, definitive solution to the chronic C2 problem that plagues CSDP military operations. Its direct link to the EUMS presents an additional problem that would be very difficult resolve. The EUMS is an entity conceived to provide military assessment at the political and strategic level at which it supports the PCS through the EUMC. Should it attempt to act simultaneously at its assigned level and another (i.e. provide support to an OpsCdr at the strategic-military level), it will not be able to discharge its obligations to both in a satisfactory manner. Should resources be spread so thin, the EUMC will be left without the staff it needs to carry out advance planning and properly prepare CMCs, MSOs and IMDs, tasks in which the EUMS is heavily involved.
5.6. The need for a European operational headquarters

As we have seen, none of three options available – all of which involve setting up temporary C2 structures for military operations on a case-by-case basis – offer the minimum criteria that must be met to ensure that CSDP functions are adequately carried out. None of the OHQs described above are capable of conducting advanced, generic or contingency planning at either the military-strategic or operational level because none are devoted to CSDP on a permanent basis; they are only activated once an Initiating Military Directive has been issued. Nevertheless, this planning is crucial to the timely and coherent preparation of the OPLAN for any operation and cannot be substituted by what is done at the political level, which is focused on other objectives. The Berlin Plus system is, for all intents and purposes, blocked and thus does not appear to be a viable option going forward. Both options – making use of NATO assets and capabilities or national OHQs – entail agreements and negotiations that require time, a factor that makes the rapid activation of an OHQ in circumstances that call for a rapid response impossible. They also lack civilian capabilities. The only alternative that offers operational readiness on a short notice is the activation of the Operations Centre, which is only viable for operations of a very limited scope and inevitably absorbs EUMS capabilities needed for other functions.

All of this leads us to the conclusion that the creation of a permanent European Operational Headquarters (EOHQ) with the capacity to plan and conduct all of the EU's present and future military operations in a timely manner is not only essential but also constitutes the only means of remediating the Command and Control deficit within the CSDP that is presently undermining the efficiency and credibility of European crisis management operations.

Regardless of whether the prevailing argument that a EOHQ would duplicate existing NATO structures was ever truly valid, future access to NATO assets and capabilities by means of the Berlin Plus agreement will remain blocked until the confrontation between Cyprus and Turkey is (if ever) resolved. The lack of a permanent structure impedes the EU from carrying out advanced planning at the strategic-military level or conducting medium- or large-scale operations without previously entering into negotiations for setting up an ad hoc Command and Control structure. An EOHQ would not duplicate any existing entity but rather fill a gap that is having a very negative impact on the CSDP.
The planning carried out at the political and strategic level must be accompanied by ongoing planning conducted in parallel at the military-strategic level that enriches its analysis on a continuous basis and facilitates information on points such as force requirements and capacity that only an OHQ can properly evaluate. This cannot be accomplished in the absence of a robust established structure or under circumstances that delay the performance of essential tasks until such time that an OHQ is designated and activated is simply not viable.

On the other hand, European strategy as defined by the European Security Strategy document and implemented to date takes a comprehensive approach that contemplates the use of all available instruments – military and civilian alike – in crisis management. The integration of civilian and military action is an essential component of the CSDP. NATO and national OHQ frameworks do not offer civilian capabilities. The EEAS sustains such capabilities on a permanent basis through the CPCC. The existence of a permanent EOHQ would facilitate the integration of civilian and military capabilities or at least an effective coordination between the two, a priority goal given the fact that missions often require military and civilian teams to work in close proximity in the same zone.

Furthermore, the concentration of all operational planning and direction activities within an EOHQ would enable the EU to have an ongoing, comprehensive, integral picture of all operations being carried out at any given moment – an advantage in terms of policy management that is not possible under the current circumstances in which operation planning and command is dispersed and fragmented across a number of countries (and at SHAPE). The creation of an EOHQ would suppose having a permanent information and communication system in place at the strategic-military level that would meet military security criteria and facilitate and provide a global vision of missions and operations being directed from a single point.

Last, but not least, the concentration of all operations under the umbrella of a single OHQ would open up the possibility of drawing on accumulated experience and lessons learnt from previous operations that might be applicable to future endeavours, which is not possible under present circumstances in which C2 structures are created on a case-by-case basis, dismantled at the termination of each operation and information that could be reutilised is lost.
Although the motives for establishing an EOHQ are technical rather than political, its very creation would send a powerful political message regarding the future of the CSDP and by extension the CFSP and the EU's intention of reinforcing its role in international affairs as a global power. It would also serve as a catalyst for the revitalisation of the CSDP and further steps that could lead, in the first instance, to a common defence policy and, in the second, to the common defence foreseen in the Treaties.

And this is precisely what the Member States that oppose the creation of an EOHQ fear. Not even the most hesitant question the fact that an EOHQ would boost the CSDP's efficiency from a technical perspective and remedy the current lack of the permanent C2 structure required to ensure that its operations run smoothly. The point under debate is whether the existence of an EOHQ would weaken NATO and put the EU on an independent track as far as defence is concerned, a possibility that some MSs led by the United Kingdom reject for political motives rooted in a desire to ensure that European security maintains a privileged alignment with the United States at any cost.

Nevertheless, Washington is now calling on the EU to assume greater responsibility for its own defence and global security. Furthermore, geopolitical realities demand a higher level of CSDP engagement that will not be possible without adequate Command and Control structures in place. The creation of an EOHQ can no longer be put off. It must be implemented as a technical tool of the CSDP as soon as possible and the decision to do so must be considered apart from all other proposals regarding the future defence of Europe, which can be debated following their own timelines as required.

Of all of the steps that can and should be taken now to promote and enhance the CSDP, the creation of an EOHQ is far and away the most urgent and necessary, given that it will rectify the deficit that most urgently needs to be addressed: the lack of the permanent planning, Command and Control capacity required for European operations.
6. A European operational headquarters

As we noted in the introduction, the main purpose of this document is to present a cogent argument regarding the pressing need to create a permanent European Operational Headquarters (EOHQ). We believe that we have fulfilled that objective in the preceding pages. The European Council must make a political decision on this issue. Once this has been accomplished, technical studies should subsequently be undertaken to determine the characteristics of this HQ in terms of capabilities, composition, structure, size and location, which will, to a substantial degree, depend upon the level of ambition established in the White Paper on European Security and Defence proposed in chapter 3 and the will and availability of the MSs that participate in its creation.

This chapter provides a brief outline of the basic characteristics that an EU headquarters would be likely to have based on general experience and a comparison between the particular needs of the CSDP and the characteristics of other existing HQs. It is offered here with the sole intention of providing a general idea that will contribute to a constructive debate regarding this crucial step forward for the CSDP.

6.1. Main characteristics of a European OHQ

As noted in the previous chapter, the EOHQ would be hierarchically situated at the strategic-military level, subordinate to the Council of the European Union through the PCS and under the supervision of the HR. It should also be able to carry out functions on the operational level whenever the Force HQ is situated at the tactical level due to its size or when composed of a single service.
The European EOHQ must have the following general characteristics:

- **Permanent.** It must be permanent in order to carry out advanced planning and participate in upper echelon planning, conduct crisis planning without requiring an activation process, as well as conduct operations that are invariably, at any point in time, underway. Member States participating in the permanent HQ structure must make a pledge that their personnel will continue to fulfil their functions whether or not their forces are involved in a given EU operation.
- **Joint.** It must have the capacity to plan and conduct joint land, naval, air and special operations or any combination of these types of operations. To this purpose, it must be staffed with a balanced mix of members of all these services.
- **Combined.** As any structure of the EU, the EOHQ must be multinational. In principle, all MSs should be represented apart, perhaps, from Denmark, which does not participate in any CSDP activities due to its opt-out status on defence. The proportional representation of countries within the permanent structure should be decided by participating MSs, including the possibility of rotating positions of responsibility, as is the case at other multinational HQs.
- **Modular.** A European OHQ must have a basic permanent structure that covers essential functions and can be adapted by means of integrating, changing or withdrawing modules designed to carry out any specific functions required for a mission (for example, special or demining operations). As its permanent staff will need to be augmented with additional personnel to meet the requirements of some operations, Member States should be called upon to maintain updated rosters of national military personnel available for such assignments.
- **Sustainable.** An EU headquarters must have the resources, including those related to technical support, communications and information systems (CIS), maintenance, personnel support and security, necessary to function autonomously.

**6.2. Capabilities**

The EOHQ will support the functions of the Operation Commander (OpCdr). To that purpose, it must have the planning, command, control and coordination capabilities that the OpCdr requires to carry out his duties, which will fundamentally be:
• To conduct advanced, generic and contingency planning on an ongoing basis as required and contribute to planning carried out at the higher echelon by the EUMS and the Crisis Management Planning Directorate.
• To carry out crisis planning at the military-strategic level, including the preparation of Concept of Operations (CONOPS), Statement of Requirements (SOR), Operational Plan (OPLAN) and Rules of Engagement (ROE) documents.
• To coordinate the required force generation with participating Member States.
• To conduct military operations at the military-strategic level of command and coordinate troop deployment, the end of the operation and the redeployment
• To maintain the PCS and contributing MSs informed via the EUMC.
• To coordinate, as required, with the following parties and entities: MSs and other non-EU contributing states, the Civilian Operations Commander and the CPCC, the European Union Satellite Centre, international organisations and the European Commission.

The EOHQ must have the capacity to conduct several operations simultaneously in alignment with the level of ambition established for its activities. Given that there will always be operations underway, it must be permanently activated. In the instance that a new operation requires additional personnel or modular adjustments, the OHQ must be able to achieve Initial Operational Capability (IOC) within a period of five days and Full Operational Capability (FOC) – to be declared by the OpCdr – within a period of 20 days.

6.3. Composition and structure

Although, as mentioned previously, the composition of the EOHQ should be determined by the MSs on the basis of the scope of the role they expect it to play and their level of commitment, it will most likely adopt a structure similar to that of other OHQs at the same level such as the United States European Command headquarters in Stuttgart, the Permanent Joint Headquarters in Northwood and the Bundeswehr Joint Operations Command in Potsdam (the latter two of which are currently available as national OHQs for EU operations). The outline contained in this document, which has been based on arrangements in place at these structures, should be considered illustrative.
The General Staff of the EOHQ, under the direction of the General Chief of Staff and directly subordinate to the OpCdr, could be composed of the following Divisions:

J1 – Personnel. Responsible for the control and administration of the HQ's human resources, including the maintenance and review of national roster lists and support to personnel and their families.

J2 – Intelligence. Responsible for collecting and organising intelligence from the upper echelon, forces in the field and other sources (EEAS, EU Satellite Centre, NATO, etc.), generating intelligence at the operational level required for the planning and execution of operations and providing the OpCdr early warnings, situation reports, relevant predictive estimates and strategic context assessment. It shall contribute to, along with J3, to the activation of the Joint Operations Centre.
J3 – Operations. Responsible for the direction and control of operations underway as well as keeping the OpCdr updated regarding situational status and available options. It will prepare modifications for the OPLAN whenever necessary as well as supplementary plans, activate the Joint Operations Centre (JOC) in concert with J2 with the support of other sections divisions and subsequently monitor the situation and conduct operations from the JOC.

It will be necessary to create JOC Mission Teams for every operation underway, each of which will be responsible for the monitoring and execution of a single operation and all to share resources and assets available within the HQ. Mission Teams should include at least one representative of J2 and J4 (although these individuals need not necessarily devote 100% of their time to the JOC Team) as well as experts from other combat support units such as helicopter transport or communications as required.

J4 - Logistics. This division will coordinate logistic support for operations underway in collaboration with the personnel of participating Member States in charge of logistical support for their forces and optimise joint and combined capabilities, especially in terms of shared functions such as medical support, transport, engineering and essential supplies such as water and fuel.

J5 – Planning. This division will carry out advanced, generic and contingency planning in collaboration with the upper echelon. It will prepare crisis-planning documents such as the CONOPS and OPLAN in coordination with sections J2, J3 and J4. Once an operation has been launched, J3 will conduct further planning needed for that operation and J5 will move on to the planning of future operations. It will also develop policies for OpCdr relations with other structures within the EU and international military and civilian organisations.

J6 – Communications and Information System (CIS). This division will ensure the secure and timely flow of information between the OpCdr and subordinate commanders and facilitate coordination between them by means of the HQ’s CIS.

J7 – Exercises and Doctrine. Whenever appropriate and feasible, J7 will design and direct exercises to prepare personnel from the command posts to the troop level for participation in EU operations, and disseminate doctrine and standardised operating procedures so as to enhance the interoperability of European military units.
J8 – Budgeting and Administration. This division will prepare the documentation that the OpCdr is responsible for in relation to the Athena mechanism as well as expenditure proposals to be submitted to the Special Committee and will also monitor common costs of the operation.

J9 – External Relations. This division will provide support for OpCdr relations with international, military, civilian and non-governmental organisations, academic institutions and civil society as well as OpCdr relations with authorities in the countries that operations are being conducted.

The functions of the Chief of Staff could be supported by two deputy chiefs of staff: one for Operations, who would coordinate divisions J2, J3, J5 and J7 and another for Support, who would coordinate J1, J4, J6, J8 and J9, although all sections would ultimately be accountable to the Chief of Staff.

As stated previously, the General Staff could also create modules intended to be activated in support of special areas of responsibility that OpCdrs must cover during the course of the operations they are assigned to such as medical support, engineering and special operations.

In addition to the general staff dispositions described above, OpCdrs will require a Special Staff that could include a Political Advisor (POLAD), a Legal Advisor (LEGAD), Gender Advisor, Cultural Advisor, a Security and Law Enforcement advisor, officers in charge of Chaplin services, a Visitors' Office and – above all – a Press and Information Centre (PIC) equipped to manage media relations.

The sustainability of the HQ alluded to earlier in the section on main characteristics will depend upon the creation of a battalion-type unit responsible for the operation of information and communications systems, technical maintenance, personnel support and security. This unit could report directly to the Chief of Staff.

Other personnel attached to the HQ would include National Liaison Teams (NLTs) from participating Member States and other countries (which are essential to the coordination of operations, especially in the area of logistics) as well as National Intelligence Cells (NICs), which would be integrated into J2 to ensure the timely and adequate flow of information between individual governments and the EOHQ.
6.4. EOHQ liaisons

In order to ensure optimal coordination and collaboration, the EOHQ must establish liaisons with organisations and actors directly or indirectly involved in the operations it undertakes apart from existing liaison teams and cells of participating countries at the EOHQ. These liaisons should be set up at all levels, from the upper, political and strategic level to the Force HQ deployed on the field. As a general rule, they should be incorporated at the planning stage of an operation so as to benefit from the valuable input they have to offer and ensure that as many interests as possible are taken into account.

Two kinds of liaison teams need to be created: one with EU entities and structures, and another with external actors and organisations. Generally speaking, the first will normally include the MSs, the European Commission, the EUMC, the EUMS, the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate, the EU Intelligence and Situation Centre and the EU Satellite Centre, as well as the EU Special Representatives in the countries in which operations are being carried out, and the members of the Committees of Contributors (CoC) formed by participating countries. Liaison between the HQ and the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability Directorate, which merits special attention, will be addressed further on.

The external liaison requirements could include Host Nations, non-EU contributing countries, the OpCdrs of other CSDP operations (if they remain after the formation of the EOHQ) and international organisations such as the UN and the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe in the event that they are involved in a particular crisis, although these liaisons could be established at a higher level as well.

Establishing a strong link between the EOHQ and NATO's Command Structure by means of permanent reciprocal liaison units situated in SHAPE headquarters in Mons (Belgium) and EU headquarters is of particular importance, as this will facilitate coordination between the two organisations, mutual support and the exchange of intelligence (the limits of which shall be established by MSs and NATO).

6.5. Size

The size of the permanent staff of the EOHQ as well as the augmentees at its disposition to cover punctual needs will depend, as previously noted, on the level
of ambition established by the Member States in the proposed European White Paper on Security and Defence, which will specify the number and size of operations that can be conducted simultaneously within the framework of the CSDP. If we take, for example, the level of ambition established in the Declaration by the European Council on the Enhancement of the European Security and Defence Policy of December 2008 as a reference, the EOHQ should be capable of simultaneously conducting (purely civilian missions aside): two major stabilisation and reconstruction operations with a civil component supported by a maximum of 10,000 men for at least two years; two rapid response operations of limited duration using, inter alia, EU Battlegroups; an emergency operation for the evacuation of European nationals (within a period of less than ten days); a maritime or air surveillance/interdiction mission and a civilian-military humanitarian assistance operation lasting up to 90 days.

At present, aside from Operation Althea (which is being directed from NATO SHAPE headquarters), the EU has only two executive military operations requiring OHQs underway: EUNAVFOR Somalia (Atalanta) and EUNAVFOR Med, directed respectively by OHQs in Northwood and Rome. The other three operations currently being carried out (EUTM Mali, EUMAM RCA and EUTM Somalia) are being run directly by the PCS through the EUMC and do not have individual Operational Headquarters. Between SHAPE, Northwood, Rome and the EUMS, a total of approximately 400 people are directly involved in the direction of these operations. Nevertheless, a new operation falling within the scope of ambition established in the Council declaration that might require the activation of another OHQ or the OpsCen at EUMS could be organised at any moment.

The EUMS will need to prepare a permanent staff roster in coordination with Member States to be sent to the EUMC for ratification and subsequently routed through the PCS to the Council so that it can be presented to the Member States for approval. This list could be reviewed every two years, or at whatever interval Member States choose to stipulate, following the same procedures for its approval, and taking into account the inputs from the EOHQ.

In the absence of parameters established by Member States and on the basis of the above information, we can theoretically estimate that the CGEO could carry out its permanent (planning) functions and conduct operations at the present or a similar level with a staff of between 400 and 500 people, half of whom should be general staff officers drawn from the three branches of the armed forces of
Member States. To these one must add the members of the HQ Battalion (to include CIS personnel), which would suppose an additional 500 or 600 professionals. We can therefore project a base staff of between 1,000 and 1,100 people apart from Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability personnel, a contingent we will address further on.

It will also be necessary to establish a periodically reviewed and updated database of augmentees approved by MSs available for assignment to the EOHQ whenever its permanent staff cannot cover the needs of a given operation. Armed forces personnel included on this list can be periodically given short-term assignments at the EOHQ to ensure they become familiar with its procedures. Some could be organised into modules devoted to particular specialities or functions that could be activated and incorporated into the EOHQ whenever such capacity is required. This database should be maintained by the EOHQ with the knowledge of the EUMC and the EUMS.

6.6. Location and facilities

Any decision concerning the location of the CGEO would logically rest with the Council. Suggestions have already been informally made regarding the possibility of establishing an EU OHQ at one of the national OHQs currently available to the EU such as Fort Mont Valérien in France. Nevertheless, it would seem evident that Brussels would be a more appropriate choice as it would situate the EOHQ in close proximity to EU structures at the political-strategic level and facilitate immediate contact between the OpCdr and the HR and the Council whenever necessary.

This is not to infer that the OHQ would be physically attached to EU political and strategic structures or have recourse to the facilities in which they are currently housed. In consideration of its estimated size, to give it the necessary level of autonomy and avoid any possible interference between echelons, it should have its own installations properly equipped for the functions it will carry out. If at all possible, headquarters facilities and the HQ Battalion garrison should be located within the same complex.

The facility housing the EOHQ must be fully equipped for the activities it will be expected to carry out, especially in terms of the communications and information systems (CIS) required to fulfil Command and Control responsibilities in a spectrum of distant, isolated geographic zones in optimal conditions of security. It
should also have a Situation Centre large enough to allow for the Command and Control of several operations at any given moment that accommodates the JOC and other auxiliary services.

6.7. Operation Commander

An EU Operation Commander (OpCdr) is designated by the Council by means of an Initiating Military Directive (IMD) granting him or her Operational Command (OPCOM) or Operational Control (OPCON) of EU MS forces (and eventually non-MS forces if participating in the operation). OpCdrs receive their mandates by means of a Transfer of Authority (TOA). At present, IMDs also designate the OHQs (from the available options described previously) for each particular operation.

Once an EOHQ has been established, such a designation process will no longer be necessary. Should the Council decide to continue designating a different OpCdr for each operation undertaken, the EOHQ will naturally be bound to provide support for all of them. However, this would obviously not be the most appropriate course of action to take considering the fact that there are always several operations underway at any given moment and the task of providing simultaneous support to a number of OpCdrs would prove to be excessively problematic and unwieldy for the EOHQ. It would therefore make more sense for the Council to designate (for a set period of time) a single OpCdr for all of the operations being carried out. This person would also serve as the Chief of Headquarters just as the Civilian Operations Commander serves as the head of the CPCC and assumes command of all civilian missions underway during his or her tenure.

In order to be able to direct all of the operations simultaneously underway, the OpCdr will need the support of Deputy Commanders, who could either be officers permanently assigned to the EOHQ or specially designated to assist the OpCdr in the command of a specific operation. These Deputy Commanders would coordinate the individual operations to which they are assigned, monitoring the work of the corresponding Mission Team and advising the OpCdr without prejudice to the responsibilities of the Chief of Staff, Deputy Military Chief of Staff for Operations and the Chief of J3.
6.8. Civilian-military coordination

One of the questions that will need to be addressed is whether civilian missions (which constitute the bulk of CSDP operations) should also be planned and conducted from this EOHQ. Their inclusion would not only concentrate resources under one roof and therefore cut costs considerably, but also facilitate the integration of military and civilian activities, both of which are important facets of the CSDP.

Although military and civilian efforts may at times converge in terms of specific tasks or geographic locations, they must be acknowledged as very distinct fields of action. Just as law enforcement officers or customs agents are not in a position to direct military operations, military personnel should not plan or direct missions focusing on issues related to rule of law. It would not be appropriate, for example, for a military OpCdr to be in charge of a civilian mission. This should be done by the Commander of Civilian Operations (CivOpCdr), who directs civilian missions with the support of the Civilian Planning and Conduct Directorate (CPCC), an entity that fulfils the functions of a civilian general staff specialised in the type of missions the EU carries out. The CPCC performs its duties very well in spite of the ambitious workload its staff of approximately 60 is charged with managing, which currently includes 12 missions, each with very different characteristics and entailing different tasks.

It will be necessary to conceive an arrangement that allows for the optimisation of resources and facilitates civilian-military coordination whilst preserving the autonomy of both lines of command. The solution may lie in housing the CPCC and the EOHQ in the same installations so as to create a synergy between the two structures and allow each to tap into the other's resources or capacities under specific circumstances. They could share the EOHQ's Situation Centre, and the intelligence that each of them has gathered. The EOHQ would have the benefit of the CPCC's experience with civilian and security issues during the planning and execution of military operations and the CPCC could make use of the capabilities of the EOHQ in areas such as logistics and communications rather than recruiting their own specialists in these fields. Civilian-military operations could be assigned to one of the chains of command, which would receive support from the other. In such a scenario, the two would carry out the planning and direction jointly as well as manage coordination and mutual support in the field whenever civilian and military operations are underway in the same
Civilian-military coordination is essential at all levels of the CSDP. At the political and strategic level this should be carried out by the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate and between this entity and the EUMC. Whenever civilian and military operations are launched in the same geographic area, there should be coordination in the field between the Military Force Commander and the Civilian Chief of Mission (if necessary through liaison detachments) and between both commanders and the EU Special Representative, providing one is appointed in the country.

6.9. The position of Spain regarding the EOHQ

The creation of an EOHQ would offer Spain several political and military advantages that should be considered in developing a national position on this issue. Firstly, the Spanish contribution to such a structure could be relatively
significant given the number of Spanish military personnel with extensive experience at the command structures of multinational HQs such as NATO HQs and those at lower levels such as the Eurocorps HQ and the High Readiness Force Land HQ at Bétera, who could adapt to work at the level of an OHQ. Likewise, the experience of Spanish professionals who had served in the OHQ would be highly applicable to our own national command structures such as the Operations Command at the General Headquarters of Spanish Defence Staff (EMAD).

On the other hand, the fact that Spain has never made a national OHQ available to the EU situates it (in terms of the CSDP) behind other Member States that have done so (Germany, France, Greece, Italy and the United Kingdom) and have also commanded EU operations. Nevertheless, the creation of an EOHQ would put Spain on an equal footing with its fellow Member States and open up the possibility of eventually assuming an important role within the structure should it care to do so or to be chosen to provide personnel for key rotating positions including the post of OpCdr.

Finally and most importantly, the creation of an EOHQ would give the CSDP a significant impulse in that it would enhance its visibility and efficiency and improve its capacity to provide a rapid response to unexpected crisis situations that could suppose direct or indirect threat to our country. Anything that would contribute to the improvement of the CSDP would be positive for Spain, especially given the growing instability so near our shores. Spain has always supported the development of the CSDP, viewing it as an essential vector for political and economic convergence that is making the EU an ever stronger and more solidarity-focused entity. An EOHQ will strengthen the CSDP and pave the way for a European common defence in which our country will be more secure. Spain should therefore fully support the creation of an EOHQ and join other countries in favour of the project such as France to promote the idea until it becomes a reality.
### Basic list of acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Political and Security Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOHQ</td>
<td>European Operational Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>Crisis Management Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONOPS</td>
<td>Concept of Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Member State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUMS</td>
<td>European Union Military Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD</td>
<td>Initiating Military Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSO</td>
<td>Military Strategic Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPLAN</td>
<td>Operation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSDP</td>
<td>Common Security and Defence Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSP</td>
<td>Common Foreign and Security Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESDP</td>
<td>European Security and Defence Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEAS</td>
<td>European External Action Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>