

European Security Forum 2014

Defining Europe's Strategic Priorities



European Security Forum 2014 Defining Europe's Strategic Priorities

Introduction

The European Security Forum, initiated by Christoph Raab, Chairman of the European Security Round Table, has been jointly set-up in Brussels by European Security Round Table, the Konrad-Adenauer-Foundation, the Kangaroo Group and Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique on 17-18 November 2014. The conference, aimed to fill a gap of having regular *fora* for leaders to share views on the status of CSDP with top level experts and to provide a debate that has an impact in beyond Brussels, arose just after the NATO Wales Summit, in a very timely moment to discuss the future of CSDP in Europe. Our sincere appreciation goes to Michael Gahler MEP, Conference President, who believed in this project from its very beginning. Also thanks to the cross-party political support (EPP Group and S&D Group) and the wide international network of Partners, the European Security Forum 2014 attracted over 200 participants. Among the numerous organisations supporting the project, a special thanks goes to the official Partners: Bundesakademie für Sicherheitspolitik (BAKS, Berlin), Egmont Royal Institute for International Relation (Brussels), Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI, Rome), College of Europe and Instytut Studiów Strategicznych (ISS, Krakow). The contributors –speakers and participants- came from 44 cities across 29 countries. Among them, 90 different organisations-institutions were represented, including officials from 29 Governments.

The European Security Forum 2014 consisted in six panel discussions on the further developments and challenges of CSDP, the management of the Mediterranean area, the complex EU-NATO relations, different security perceptions in Europe, the response to the Ukrainian crisis and concrete proposals for the upcoming legislative term. Pavlo Klimkin, Ukrainian Minister of Foreign Affairs underlined how Ukraine, which has the experience of confrontation in a “hybrid war” was ready to initiate respective reforms. The issue, according to Klimkin, concerns the experience of combating propaganda and ensuring freedom of the media, as well as the establishment of an effective regional system for the control of weapons. Among further high ranking speakers were Dimitris Avramopoulos, EU Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs and Citizenship, Elmar Brok MEP, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Michel Barnier, former Vice President of the European Commission for Internal Market and the Chief Executive of the European Defence Agency Claude France Arnould.

We would like to express our sincere thanks once more to our sponsors Safran, Diehl and Airbus for supporting this initiative that, given the first edition's success, will take place again in October 2015.

Summary of the Conference

“Only together we can create a security environment preserving our values”

Opening speech by the Conference President Michael Gahler MEP



Christoph Raab, Chairman of the European Security Round Table and Conference Initiator, Pavlo Klimkin, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ukraine and Michael Gahler MEP, Conference President

Opening the Forum, **Michael Gahler** MEP, Member of the EPP Group in the European Parliament and Conference President, underlined three essential challenges for the EU concerning the outlining of a real common security and defence policy. As the threats are coming closer to our borders (see Libya, Algeria, Russia and foreign fighters)

the EU, the individual Member States and NATO need to coordinate their strategies in order to establish collective security architecture. As the USA are turning towards Asia,

the Europeans have to become more conscious that they are responsible for their own security and cannot only rely on the hard power and influence of our Atlantic Ally. Furthermore the reality of uncoordinated cuts in Member State budgets and the fact that no country respects the 2% of the GDP spending required by the NATO membership has to come to an end. There is a real need to create a European defence industry in order to address nowadays challenges but also to adapt to the dire economic situation we are living in since the crisis. Europe, argues Michael Gahler MEP, needs to become a Security Provider in order to avoid energy crises, to create solid cyber defences but also to provide stability in its neighborhood. To become such a security provider there is no way around crafting a new strategy for nowadays multipolar world. Only together we can create a security environment preserving our values. And our financial constraints should bring us together in order to create synergies and more efficiency when it comes to our defence

spending and the organization of our military industry. But it seems that the Council is unable to produce real suggestions towards these goals and only presents comprehensive approaches. The bad managing of the Ukraine Crisis and the weak Triton following Mare Nostrum are symptoms of our lack of coordination. The Member States need to stay realistic in matters of hard power in order to let our soft power remain credible. If not, we will only lose credibility in scenarios like in Ukraine or in Georgia in 2008. How can we achieve our goals? By creating a concrete structure financing a real CFSP based on realistic projects and a single defence market.

“Ukraine is a test for the European Union”

Keynote speech by Pavlo Klimkin – Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine



In his keynote speech, Ukrainian Foreign Affairs Minister **Pavlo Klimkin** defines the notion of Security as a mix of trust and rules. Today's rules were created after the Second World War but Russia broke all political and legal treaties in the last year by annexing Crimea and intervening in Eastern Ukraine.

The Budapest Memorandum was not respected; the OSCE and treaties are not binding for Putin anymore. The NATO-Bucharest summit showed that even if Russia was not perceived as a security threat, Ukraine could not enter the organization because the issue was too sensitive even 20 years after the crumbling of the URSS. But Klimkin, already at that time, felt that only integrating an economic organization without integrating the Western security realm was not enough. Now Ukraine is being punished by Russia for its steps towards Europe. Ukrainians want to live in a European State but Russia denies them the right to implement the needed reforms

(such as rule of law reforms, decentralization, good governance and anti-corruption laws) and the Kremlin succeeds in its politic because of the weak Ukrainian security environment. There is a small window of opportunity for Ukraine. The country needs assistance, a unanimous European position against Russia, solidarity on trade and energy and a real deterrent factor such as real economic sanctions against Russia in order to survive as a nation walking towards the European Union. Indeed, the Minsk treaty was clearly broken and we now have a frozen conflict in Ukraine. How can the rules be implemented if those who break them are not punished? How should these rule-breakers be punished? How can smart power be used to stop Russia without escalating the conflict any further? The situation in Ukraine is a test for the European Union; it's about raising stakes. A clear answer from the EU is needed in order to solve the conflict.

Moderated Discussion on European Security Challenges

The first discussion, moderated by **Antonio Missiroli**, Director of the European Institute for Security Studies, was about the current challenges concerning the European Security realm.

Like Michael Gahler during his opening speech, the participants were calling for a more coordinated and responsible CFSP. Even though during the last 25 years the international relations were stable, Russia's aggressive politics in the East call for a change in the European Security strategy. The new world created by the Russian invasion seems to refuse an order based on treaties and Institutions. Nowadays challenges seem to be a mix of new asymmetric warfare and classical security scenarios and the threats spread fast. But the European Union is not addressing them with a single voice since for some Member States the situation in Ukraine is compared to a "Maginot Line" of European values whereas other States are more concerned with the immigrants coming from Libya or Syria. The EU-CSFP is our main instrument but needs profound reforms, missions and not only experts. The European Council needs to address the challenges of the new security reality. Vague notions such as "pooling and sharing" certainly

contain a part of truth but what is necessary nowadays is a concrete action plan and harmonization of the defence policies and industries. The NATO could be used a tool to achieve such synchronization but the Member States need to tackle the issue more seriously instead of slowly moving toward the direction of a real CFSP. Indeed, as argued by **Sandra Kalniete MEP**, the EU produces an enormous amount of strategic documents but still cannot find a common position in the Ukrainian crisis. Even though many Member States know from past experience that Russia can be a threat to sovereign States no further action was staged after the 5 days war in Georgia in the frame of the Strategic Agreement or after the annexing of Crimea. Ukraine might be just the beginning. Russia lives in a Hobbesian world. Seeing that in November the Russian Army had already violated the European space around 40 times, a military confrontation should be seriously considered. But the EU is not ready for such an end game because of the Member States which are afraid to give up parts of their sovereignty and are not able to find common positions on foreign challenges. We are not ready and not used to defend ourselves anymore. "What can the EU do?" asked **Eduards Stiprais**, Political Director of the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We need to assess the reality and to re-adjust our capabilities. If our strategic priority is to create welfare we have to reconsider our defence policy since security touches upon every dossier: from Energy to immigration.

Openness and security as prerequisites for having social cohesion and sustainable growth

Keynote Speech by Dimitris Avramopoulos , EU Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs & Citizenship



During his keynote speech at the European Security Forum 2014, Dimitris Avramopoulos, the European Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs and Citizenship, said that the prerequisites for having social cohesion and sustainable economic growth in Europe are openness and security, pillars of the European Union. Deepening the openness issue in terms of migration, the latter goes along with mobility and, in a

globalised world, "Europe has to maximise the benefits of international mobility". Europe needs a migration policy that brings skills and talent to the EU and therefore supports the economic growth and the protection of the social norms and model within Europe. To pursue such a goal, developing a new regular migration-policy will be a top priority, pointed out Commissioner Avramopoulos. Further on, empowering Frontex will be a key element in assisting the control of external borders as well as, together with other relevant actors at the EU level, "the creation of a European System of Border Guards", he said.

For "A secure Europe that protects its citizens and their fundamental rights, that protects as well our way of living and our democratic values" is more than necessary to arrange and expand an

efficient cooperation, stated Commissioner Avramopoulos. No single Member State is able to respond alone effectively to threats such as international terrorism or organised crime.

The implementation of the Terrorist Financing Tracking Programme is crucial to cut networks that facilitate terrorist actions. In this regards, Commissioner Avramopoulos plans to elaborate a security model to improve operational cooperation among Member States. This model will be aimed to ensure that the EU can act jointly in case of major crisis and enhance effective information – sharing among Member States' law enforcement, judicial authorities and relevant EU Agencies. "Our policy response to the threat of foreign fighters' needs to focus above all on prevention, making a better use of the existing tools and improving our capacity to detect people with ill intentions", he concluded.

Panel I: Managing the Mediterranean Area - Challenges for European Security Policies

"Many of the security crises which we are facing due stem from southern neighbourhood" began **Dr Nathalie Tocci**, Deputy Director of the IAI, Istituto Affari Internazionali, moderator of the panel session on the management of the Mediterranean area. Dr Tocci pointed some of the issues the Region is currently facing: the Middle East Conflict, the state collapse in Libya, "the polarisation and increasing pockets of ungoverned spaces in countries like Egypt" and last but not least "the major challenge which we are facing today with an unravelling of the states essentially both in Syria and Iraq" and the rise of the so called "Islamic State" (IS). "All of these crises have both ideological and very material connotations to them", explains Tocci, as they have inter-sectarian and intra-sectarian characteristics. But there is also "a struggle for power, land and resources in many respects. All of these crises lead to a set of security challenges for Europe to face". Talking crises and security challenges which are varying from classical to asymmetrical threats, **Gianni Pittella** MEP, Chairman of the S&D Group in the European Parliament, stated that "the European Union is in the most difficult security situation since its creation". He emphasised that "Europe is

surrounded by a circle of crises. Both in the south neighbourhood and the Eastern one". While the crisis in Ukraine is on top of the EU's political agenda, "the Mediterranean and the Middle East are areas of strategic relevance for the EU and its member States "we should stimulate the internal reforms and reinforce the democratic institutions", said Pittella. The EU "should make it clear to the Libyan people that there is no military solution for their crisis". **Prof John Nomikos**, Director of the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS), pleaded for the implementation of a European Union Maritime Security Strategy and for the constitution of a "Mediterranean Fusion Centre", including Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Cyprus. The Centre would be aimed to oppose the threat of organised crime enabled through illegal immigration from North Africa and the Middle East. Further on, this project would provide expertise, intelligence-sharing collaboration among the Mediterranean countries with the goal of maximizing their ability to detect, prevent, investigate and respond to criminal and terrorist activity. **Beate Gminder**, Head of Unit Maritime Policy in the Mediterranean and Black Sea within the Directorate-General Maritime Affairs and Fisheries of the European Commission, offered an insight into what has been already implemented of the European Maritime Security Strategy, with a special focus on the Mediterranean area which has been adopted by the Council under the Greek presidency in June 2014. The EU Maritime Security Strategy is translated into an action plan "which keeps intact all the principles we have agreed. The Document keeps up about what is already existing", explained Gminder by emphasising its strategic relevance for the EU. **Vincet Cochetel**, Director of the UNHCR - Bureau for Europe, took a critical stance on the EU crisis management concerning the current migration and refugee problem. "There is no political solution that I am aware of. It is time to wake up!" he said. He appealed on the responsibility of all Member States and argued for a solidarity mechanism among them. The largest group of refugees coming from the crisis in North Africa and the Middle East are Syrians, followed by Palestinians from Gaza, Libyans and Egyptians. Most of them are not staying in Italy and refuse to register themselves in order to go to Sweden or Germany. "This is a totally abnormal

situation!” In addition to this, Cochetel opined the EU Member States should have better external cooperation (e.g. a security dialogue) with third States: not only with Africa, but especially with countries at its borders, like Turkey and the Western Balkans. **Dr Matthias Ruete**, Director General of the Directorate General for Home Affairs of the European Commission, presented the three-pronged strategy of the EU to deal with the migration and refugee problem. Looking at the situation in third countries, Dr Ruete explained that to improve the current situation, it is needed to make a step forward in terms of cooperation, external relations and interior policy. This is what the Commission in charge, hopefully, will be doing for bringing these elements together as much as they need to be”. Dr Ruete reviewed critically the fact that all the Member States are developing different policies. He remarked that “a much more coordinated fight against smuggling is needed”. The EU and its Member States have the instruments but the problem of how to implement them in terms of dealing with the migration issue still remains.

Panel II: Learning from Each Other? The Complex EU-NATO Relations

NATO Relations **Professor Lindley-French**, Senior Fellow at the Institute of Statecraft, Director of Europa Analytica and Distinguished Visiting Research Fellow, National Defence University in Washington moderates the panel on EU-NATO relations at the European Security Forum 2014. Inspired by his own experience, he stated that the worst meeting has been between the one between EU and NATO – it simply hasn’t worked out – what else and indeed where next – we cannot longer afford to mess around with this question. **Yves Boyer**, Deputy Director of Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique, took a critical stance on the current strategic concept of the EU by making a huge analysis on the geopolitical developments around the globe. “Passion rather than Realpolitik analysis is now prevailing not only about the Ukraine but also on other topics relating to international relations. The need for a European deterrence strategy - the framework nation concept within the EU looks rather on artificial if not surrealistic questions”. He stressed that first the economic crisis within the EU should be resolved before anything else.

“The lack of EU diplomatic creativity and vitality is the mirror of a deep economic and democratic crisis that is affecting the EU. If those European weaknesses remain unsolved the EU will be seen by the growing part of its citizen more as a joke than as a source of pride and protection.”

Dr Hans Dieter Heumann, President of the Federal Academy for Security Policy (BAKS) and former Ambassador, opined that both organisations – NATO and EU – have an added value to each other. This was emphasised on the EU Councils conclusion in December 2013. “The EU-Nato issue has to be seen in the framework of transatlantic relations and they are changing. We don't get back to the traditional transatlantic relations. They are changing because the world is changing to a multi polar world”. Heumann talked also about the main strategic differences between EU and NATO, as the EU has a comprehensive approach which NATO doesn't have: “The strength of the comprehensive approach is that it combines the means of the Commission with the means of the European Council having a civil military approach. That is a strength which NATO does not have”. Heumann took the civil and military missions of the EU in Northern Africa as an example as there are no NATO missions. But on the other side there is a “division of labour” between the EU and NATO by “looking at the Eastern neighbourhood where both organisations play a role”; especially in the Ukraine. Furthermore Heumann stressed that “in every crisis there is a chance”. In terms of the financial crisis, there is the possibility to come to a pooling of sovereignty. “Governance tend to think it is about abandoning sovereignty, but it is about pooling sovereignty. In this context let's give the frame work initiative a chance”. In addition Heumann suggests that the EU “need a focus on interests not only on challenges”. **Rini Goos**, Deputy Chief Executive of the European Defence Agency, begun with his statement by saying: “EU and NATO are not competitors. They are partners; and the time of the beauty contest between them is over”. In a time of austerity nobody can afford duplication, he added. By referring to the last NATO summit in Wales, Goos said that the NATO and EU efforts to strengthen defence capabilities are complementary. It is a change of paradigm in terms of moving away from duplication. “EDA and NATO cannot formerly conclude an arrangement. But that does not mean

that we cannot cooperate. With agility and flexibility we can maximise our playing field for the benefit of all our allies”, he argued by exemplifying the case of air to air refuelling and the EDAs support for the establishment of a multinational field of tankers and support of NATO on Counter IED (example Afghanistan) and Helicopters (common exercises). EDA invest in multinational capabilities. “In doing so we do support NATO by delivering capability gaps”. Furthermore NATO is integrated at tactical level at SESAR (Single European Sky ATM Research). The EDA and NATO are cooperating very closely. Goos also criticised the fragmentation of the several different Defence capabilities between all member states which "are almost killing us". He stressed the need of pooling and sharing between the Member states. But all in all the EU NATO relationship, Goos concluded “is not more duplication but complementary. We do everything on the base of pragmatism.”

“We have to frame security policies in the right picture not to overlap security with the whole picture”

Keynote speech by Lapo Pistelli, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy



During the last keynote speech of the first day, Deputy Italian Foreign Minister **Lapo Pistelli** pointed out what security, security policy and the phenomenon of securitization currently mean.

“We have to frame security policies in the right picture not to overlap security with the whole picture.” Lapo Pistelli, Deputy Foreign Minister of Italy, was very clear while emphasising the importance of a Forum like the ESF to determine the “shyness to talk about security issues” at the EU level. A Securitization

of non-security issues can be dangerous and constraining at the same time. His suggestion to

avoid this is “rather than a growing securitization of non-security issues, we should explore both conceptually and in policy terms the links between security and non-security issues; at the same time, we should foster the distinctive contribution of these different domains.” For instance, migration, energy and climate could share several instruments available in these different areas.

Further on, organised smuggling of weapons in the Sahel and Sahara Regions and the fighters returning back from Syria or Iraq and the possibility of traveling freely in the entire Schengen area can be an enormous threat. Therefore, security is linked to the movement of people as well as to the increasing porousness of borders. Since it is theoretically problematic and empirically ineffective to overcome those challenges, Mr Pistelli made clear that security instruments are not enough. Furthermore he pointed out how an enhanced diplomacy and the development of new strategies are more than necessary. For instance, Russia has so far succeeded in challenging and violating Ukrainian's sovereignty not only through classical military means but also through actions, which are known under “hybrid warfare”. That alone shows that “a much more sophisticated mix of governance, development, energy, economic as well as security and defence policies is needed.”

Tuesday 18 November

Panel III: We agree to disagree - Security Perceptions in Europe

The third panel of the European Security Forum focused on the inherent differences the 28 Member States have concerning their perception of security challenges.

During its policy insight, Prof. **Stephan Keukeleire**, Jean Monnet Professor at the University of Leuven, claims that the Member States of the European Union disagree on many topics and even when they agree, they still don't act. We don't think strategically, we only react to crises. For example: France warned many years ago that the situation in the Sahel was getting worse but no action was taken. There is a real need for creating a long-term perception and anticipation in order to avoid crises. We need to detect factors, which led to the radicalization of individuals and movements. We need to create preventive strategies. The situation in Ukraine could certainly also have been avoided if we had dealt with Moscow in another way. And the EU/NATO/Western policy in Afghanistan, the Middle-East and Libya were certainly also not flawless. In order to avoid crisis there is a need to raise the interest about security challenges but with 28 Member States it seems impossible to create a unified response. Therefore we should focus on a better division of the tasks among Member States, specialise and respect that some Member States have other means and interests to tackle some issues. There should be an institutionalized way to share the tasks for a better cooperation.

A common consensus among the participants emerged explaining that there were deep and structural differences but that the real problem is that the EU addresses all issues it's confronted with. The Member States have certainly geographically biased priorities but substantially they believe in the same system and even share trans border threat perceptions on issues such as terrorism or cyber security. The EU wanted to be a global player and implement a comprehensive approach based on values and norms. But we need to admit that we can be more efficient in some areas more than others. We need to do less but better. There is also a necessity to

understand the actual challenges better. To give to example: nobody in Europe understood the nature of the Arab Springs and there was no EU implication other than of technocratic nature in Ukraine between 2008 and 2013. The EU has to focus more on analysis in order to assess its strengths and to see where it can have real leverage. **Arnaud Danjean** MEP, EPP, Vice-Chairman of the Delegation for relations with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, concluded that we first need to be a credible regional actor and to strengthen our Eastern and Southern Partnership as well as our collaboration with the Balkan countries. There is a need for more concentration and more flexibility. The principle of unanimity inside the Council is a hindrance in the moment of action.

The EU is certainly able to manage its internal affairs alone but when it comes to external security the situation becomes more complex. The intervention in Libya for example showed a clear lack of solidarity among Member States when it comes to military engagement. France particularly is the largest defence contributor in the Union but doesn't benefit from any budget exemptions despite its military expenses spent in order to assure European Security. There is too much reliance on the bigger power, the small states reduced their armies but the targets are the same for all. A solution for that situation would be the creation of regional clusters including smaller States sharing the burden with the big powers if it's impossible to create a comprehensive EU defence community. Since the EU cannot rely on the Americans anymore when it comes to solve external security problems such as the conflict in Ukraine, that the financial crisis forces States to cut their military expenses and that the member States have different geographical priorities the emergence of EU-clusters in the Security and defence sector based on the sharing of costs and specialized troops should only be a matter of time.

European Security Forum 2014
Defining Europe's Strategic Priorities

“It is a common interest for the EU and Russia to get along with each other”

Keynote speech by Elmar Brok MEP, Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs



Under the legal framework of the EU's responsibilities, ideally, every conflict could be solved in a peaceful manner. **Elmar Brok MEP** made clear that the European Union, European Institutions in Brussels as well as NATO have to recast their strategy since we cannot be sure to have an eternal peace after the end of the cold war. The most important question is indeed how we can make it possible that “no country loses its sovereignty”, he continued. The answer lays in the pillars of the international law: no changes of borders without the approval of all stakeholders; territorial integrity and the sovereign decision that states have in signing negotiation treaties, a decision that has to be respected by every other state.

As regards the Ukrainian crisis, Mr Brok stated that talking to Russia would be successful only if both sides have the same security standards. As long as member States of the EU decrease steadily their expenditures on defence while Russia increases them, this seems to be impossible. This underlines the fact that no further developments in terms of security integration has so far been made.

“The European Union supports every country which is willing to have a successful transformation and economic growth”, he continued. In order to succeed, it is a “common interest for the EU and Russia to come along with each other – strategically as well as economically”, he concluded.

Panel IV: Recasting European Security Policy — European Political Response to the Ukrainian Crisis

Janusz Reiter, former Ambassador and Chairman of the Foundation Board of the Centre for International Relations in Poland, stated that we are facing a real worrying situation, as well as it is real the need of having more than academic debates and discussions on this matter. Since the Ukrainian crisis is not only about Ukraine but also about Europe, it is our job to focus on EU responses, continued Ambassador Reiter. Through the pressure of Russia, Europe is forced to create a security order without compromising the basic principles of the EU.

Robert Walter, Member of the British Parliament, made clear that “this was a crisis which was waiting to happen.” Being a member of the EU Council brings with obligations to respect sovereignty of each member state and territorial integrity. On the other side, Russia’s point of view has to be understood: “So, if you were sitting in Moscow looking at all these developments and you have been excluded from joining NATO, from being part of the eastern partnership, concluding a free trade agreement with the European Union you might feel threatened, you might feel that everybody is against you.”

Mr Walter pointed out that it is important to go back to our principles because unilaterally redrawing the boundaries of Europe, the annexation of parts of other member states is unacceptable. “The situation in eastern Ukraine has to be resolved, the militarisation of eastern Ukraine has to be reserved and Russia must stop trying to bully its near neighbours”, he concluded.



Vladimir Chizhov, Ambassador of the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the EU, remarked that the focus of our mutual problems, today, is the lack of trust, started some time ago. The aim of the Federation of Russia was to create a pan-European architecture of security, which would have provided equal security for all countries on our continent. Ambassador Chizhov underlined that Russia tried to pursue a good cooperation with NATO by signing the founding act and the creation of

the Russian NATO council; when the idea of expanding security guarantees that NATO has for its Members was rejected, the cooperation was harmed. Looking at Crimea, “the stationing of Russian forces was a humanitarian intervention because it prevented a bloodshed and would have been bloodier because of the mood of the population and the concentration of Ukrainian forces on the peninsula” said Ambassador Chizhov. However, the final aim of Russia in this crisis is that the Ukraine is a peaceful, democratic, prosperous country, which is for all inhabitants comfortable to live in. **Prof. Igor Nikolaevich Koval**, Rector of the Odessa I.I. Mechnikov National University observed that Russia succeeded in using the misbalance of forces with the west: this lead to the current situation in which for Ukraine the threat of losing its sovereignty is concrete. It is necessary to explain the Ukrainian society in detail the advantages of the EU Membership. In particular, Prof. Koval underlined that “A vital important task for Ukraine is its survival as a sovereign integral government and mighty State with a regime that guarantees human rights and provide for the European state development. So to say: it is modernisation and at the same time “westernisation” – everything else is optional.” **Bogdan Klich**, Polish Senator and former Minister of National Defence, believes that the model of security still exists, although it was undermined by the recent Russian invasion in Ukraine. In his opinion, Russia is fuelling this conflict in order to prevent Ukraine from applying the positive European scenario. The revival of the Russian

Imperialism seems to be a constant political trend and is an increasingly more dangerous phenomenon. This fact destroys the fundamental principles of coordination within countries in Europe. The separatists who are strongly supported by Russia systematically violate this fire. To overcome this conflict the EU should focus on the terms and conditions agreed under the framework of the Minsk agreement. The EU should maintain a permanent pressure on Moscow to reduce the temperature of this conflict. In the long-term prospective we have to be actively engaged in the transition process of this State: the economic and the security system of the country should receive an appropriate support. **Michael Gahler**, Member of the EPP Group in the European Parliament and Conference President, expressed that until recent times the EU did not substantially improve its security and defence policy unless we were facing a substantial US disengagement or an existential crisis from outside. Now, we have to learn from these combined challenges. As regards the crisis in Ukraine, Mr Gahler remarked that "it is not about NATO enlargement, it is not about EU enlargement, it is not about our free trade agreement, it basically is about domestic issues in Russia that have motivated the government or the president to act as he did, because of the fear that the Russian society would also stand up." "Let us, in a united way, help Ukraine to stabilise, let us keep the necessary pressure on Russia to refrain from further destabilisation", he concluded.

Panel V: Making CSDP Concrete- A Work Plan for the Next Legislative Period

Given the shared wishes to have a work plan on European defence issues, **Stefani Weiss**, Director of the Europe's Future Programme at the Brussels Office of the Bertelsmann Stiftung, was grateful that the organisers of the ESF 2014 were able to fill the panel with speakers who could bring an expert insight on these matters.

European Security Forum 2014
Defining Europe's Strategic Priorities

During her speech at the European Security Forum 2014, **Claude – France Arnould**, Chief



Executive of the European Defence Agency and Member of the ESRT Advisory Board, remarked that all Member States of the EU committed to give defence issues a clear priority. Responsible Ministers of the Member States have to point out in their country that defence is nowadays a huge issue, starting from with the determination of cutting budgets, to the decline of investments in equipment, to research and technologies. “There is political will but it is difficult to start action”, because national ministers face budget constraints, remarks Ms Arnould. Lastly, Ms Arnould pointed out that “You can’t enhance capabilities if there

is no technical and industrial basement, you need security of supply and a well-functioning market.” **Daniel Calleja Crespo**, Director General, Directorate-General for Enterprise and Industry of the European Commission, remarked that in order to build a more effective European defence and security political will, effective decision making mechanisms and a bigger budget are needed, as well as it is needed to draw the awareness of citizens on the importance of a strong European industrial base. Without it, it will not be possible to deliver the necessary solutions. The core task of the Commission will be to create and strengthen an internal market in the defence industry, given the current fragmentation in this market sector, he said. **Michael Langer**, Vice President for External Affairs EU-NATO and Head of the Diehl Representation in Brussels, emphasises that progress is needed in terms of involving the industry into policy strategies. For having a successful cooperation programme between industry and European Institutions, we all need motivation and a leading nation which has good relations with; a baseline has to be implemented for talking with each other and learn from each other.

Dr Christian Ehler MEP, Vice-Chairman of the EP's Subcommittee on Security and Defence, stated that creating a security research programme associated with funding, founded by the European Parliament, was the only possibility to discuss security and defence issues. Having this programme, the European Parliament is now able to give financial support, enhancing and fulfilling the tasks assigned by the Council to the EDA. However, Dr. Ehler remarked that the financial regulations are a disaster: at European missions equipment was still missing after six months. The European Parliament was able to deliver financial support through the security research programme to ensure the needed equipment. **Brig General Jo Coelmont**, Senior Associate Fellow at the Egmont Royal Institute for International Relations in Belgium underlined that for defining a defence and security policy a strategy is needed, but what exactly is the strategy? "If you ask a Head of State to receive money for developing capabilities, the first question will be why, to do what, where and with whom? – If you don't have an answer, forget about the money", concluded Brig. Gen. Coelmont. If all Member States would use the instruments developed within the European Union, they could overcome their main weakness. All instruments have to be used to their full extend because the time for achieving defence policy and capability is running out. **Brig General Heinz Krieb**, Director of Concepts and Capabilities at the EUMS said that there is "No consent of command: Who is doing what? Who is commanding? You won't find a command and control structure." General Krieb doubts that the planned strategy in defence and security is broad enough to cover all our civilian and military needs.