

Compared Analysis of capability plannings per European Union countries and prospects for common orientations within the ESDP framework and impact on the national plannings

Study realized under the direction of Jean-Pierre Maulny

Research Fellows : Sylvie Matelly & Fabio Liberti

Marché public passé selon une procédure adaptée n° 2004/005 - Septembre 2005

Synthesis

This aim of this study is the analyzis of the main planning models of the European Union countries with two objectives:

- to allow the comparison of these planning models in their methodology and their finality;
- to help with a better make out of the contents of these plannings by analysing the methodology used and the purpose of these plannings.

From this comparative analysis, the objective is to determine how it is possible to harmonize these plannings or make them compatible so as to obtain a better rationalization of the use of budget allocations in Europe and thus to obtain an increase of the military capabilities of the European Union.

In a first part the planning processes of eight Member States of the European Union are studied:

Germany

Spain

Finland

France

Italy

Poland

The United Kingdom

Sweden

In a second part the NATO and the European Union planning processes are studied. The objective is to determine how they influence the national planning processes or how they can be used to bring together these planning processes.

Finally, the third part makes the synthesis of these studies and enumerates a certain number of proposals which would make it possible to obtain a better synergy of the national planning processes so as to sustain the ESDP.

The conclusions brought out are numerous:

1) form and contents of the plannings

- putting the defense policy within a national framework or within a collective security framework determines to a large extent the form and the content of the planning processes;
- therefore it is unrealistic to seek to impose a single model of military planning to the European Union members;
- the capability planning is reserved either for the countries which place their defense policy within a national framework or for the collective defense organizations which have a military planning activity;

At this stage two recommendations can be made:

- to establish common standards of planning model in term of duration, of content and of capability typology so as to be able to gain from a common interpretative framework of national plannings for lack of having a unified planning process for all EU members;
- to support dialogue between the countries likely to establish common planning models on the basis of objective factors influencing their planning model (putting the defense policy within a national framework, existence of a DTIB or maintenance of competence in the advanced technologies, similar vision of external action, etc).

2) military planning, financial planning

- too often, a lack of coordination appears between the military planning carried out within the Defense ministries, and the financial planning (when this one does exist) ratified within an

interdepartmental framework. The result from this is the inability to apply the plannings worked out within the ministry of defense. This implies less capability efficiency as well within a national as a collective framework. We can see, in some cases that the decoupling between the political and military authorities is made inside the ministry of Defense.

Recommendation

- It is recommended to set up a financial planning at the State level in which the ministry of defense would be included as it is the case in the United Kingdom. Because of the impossibility of making economic and budgetary forecast in a long term, this planning would be drawn up over 4 years. The military planning would be drawn up from this financial planning . Eventually, such a plan could be set up at the European Union level and it is already recommended to place as much as possible the budgetary planning of the European Defense Agency within a community framework.

3) military planning, industrial policy

- Many European countries see their military planning being influenced by industrial policy factors. This is not criticizable because it gives the possibility to maintain and even develop a European DTIB able to preserve the strategic autonomy of the European Union. However these policies, which remain placed to a great extent within a national framework, have a double pernicious effect:

- sometimes the acquisition policies are made to the detriment of capability needs;
- the absence of coordination of the industrial policies leads at the same time to the development of capability shortcomings and on the contrary to overcapacity situations.

In the industrial field industrial overcapacities and undercapacities are also noted.

Recommendations

- First and foremost, it is necessary to continue the Europeanization of the defense industries;
- During an intermediate period it is necessary to make use of the monitoring of industrial and technological capacities of defense jointly conducted by the European Defense Agency and

the Enterprise Directorate General of the European Commission in order to identify well the industrial overcapacities and undercapacities so as to better harmonize the industrial policies in the field of defense.

4) harmonization of technological plannings

- This question is related essentially to the existence of industrial capacities. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish the countries which have an industrial capacity from the other ones. Generally, the technological policies are not coordinated. An underfinancing of research and technology in Europe is noted as well as an applied research oriented policy in order to gain from a return on investments as well in term of product and market as of capability application. It is thus necessary to obtain a better synergy and a better complementarity between the research and technology policy in the field of defense. The European Defense Agency could have a leading role in its set up.

There are two types of recommendations:

- to set up projects, at the EDA level of the, about technological demonstrators with Member States wishing to be involved. These projects would give place to the appointment of an industrial project manager (or a consortium of project managers) which would distribute the tasks between the various countries and different manufacturers taking part in the project;
- As regards the LoI signatory countries, a technological research plan should be drafted over 25 years. This research program funded by the EDA would include research on technologies with a “market” application and more fundamental long term research. Non-member countries of the LoI could take part in this research program without being able to determine its content. This research plan first requires the setting up of a technological capacities monitoring.

5) NATO and EU’s ability to harmonize the processes of planning

A certain complementarity is noted. The European Union's advantages correspond to the NATO's planning processes disadvantages and vice versa.

Thus we can note that the NATO has some assets that the European Union doesn't have:

- human and financial means for collective planning;
- ability to plan military missions (in particular collective defense) on the whole spectrum;
- ability to qualify the capacities provided by the Member States

On its side, the European Union has three advantages the NATO does not have:

- a greater political legitimacy;
- possibility of coupling the civil capacities with the military capacities. This is essential in the crisis management field;
- a bottom-up process which has a formative quality in term of adoption of a capability approach at the national planning level .

There are two recommendations:

- It is necessary to obtain transparency about the national planning processes in order to be able to identify the fields in which the European Union countries wish to privilege certain capacities. This way, it will be possible to identify the fields in which it is necessary to carry out capability distributions, those in which it is necessary to share the efforts to fill certain capability gaps or those in which it is necessary to carry out the elimination of overcapacities. The capacitaire distribution process also has the advantage of leading a State to set up a planning in a capability perspective and not in a perspective of force. This has a formative quality in term of planning process. In this case, it could be useful that the European Union gives assistance to national authorities wanting to set up a capability approach;

- It is essential that the European Union has the ability to qualify the capacities it is granted by the States. This requires the organization of operations having the qualification of these capacities for subject.

General recommendations

- It is preferable to aim at the complementarity of plannings rather than their standardization which, as we have already seen, is impossible;
- It is necessary to set up a better transparency regarding the national planning processes. It seems to be a pre requisite to any attempt of harmonization and making complementary the national planning processes to reinforce the ESPD.