



OPERATION EUFOR TCHAD/RCA AND THE EUROPEAN UNION'S COMMON SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY

Bjoern H. Seibert

Visit our website for other free publication
downloads

<http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/>

[To rate this publication click here.](#)



STRATEGIC STUDIES INSTITUTE



The Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) is part of the U.S. Army War College and is the strategic level study agent for issues related to national security and military strategy with emphasis on geostrategic analysis.

The mission of SSI is to use independent analysis to conduct strategic studies that develop policy recommendations on:

- Strategy, planning and policy for joint and combined employment of military forces;
- Regional strategic appraisals;
- The nature of land warfare;
- Matters affecting the Army's future;
- The concepts, philosophy, and theory of strategy; and
- Other issues of importance to the leadership of the Army.

Studies produced by civilian and military analysts concern topics having strategic implications for the Army, the Department of Defense, and the larger national security community.

In addition to its studies, SSI publishes special reports on topics of special or immediate interest. These include edited proceedings of conferences and topically-oriented roundtables, expanded trip reports, and quick reaction responses to senior Army leaders.

The Institute provides a valuable analytical capability within the Army to address strategic and other issues in support of Army participation in national security policy formulation.

SSI Monograph

OPERATION EUFOR TCHAD/RCA AND THE EUROPEAN UNION'S COMMON SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY

Bjoern H. Seibert

October 2010

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. Authors of Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications enjoy full academic freedom, provided they do not disclose classified information, jeopardize operations security, or misrepresent official U.S. policy. Such academic freedom empowers them to offer new and sometimes controversial perspectives in the interest of furthering debate on key issues. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

This publication is subject to Title 17, United States Code, Sections 101 and 105. It is in the public domain and may not be copyrighted.

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Ave, Carlisle, PA 17013-5244.

The author thanks Barry R. Posen (MIT), Dan Hamilton (SAIS) and Michael Clarke (RUSI) for hosting him during parts of his research at their respective institutions and for supporting his research.

This manuscript was funded by the U.S. Army War College External Research Associates Program. Information on this program is available on our website, *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*, at the Publishing button.

All Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications may be downloaded free of charge from the SSI website. Hard copies of this report may also be obtained free of charge by placing an order on the SSI website. The SSI website address is: *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*.

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please subscribe on the SSI website at *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/newsletter/*.

ISBN 1-58487-465-1

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Foreword..... | v |
| About the Author..... | vii |
| Summary..... | ix |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Chapter 1: Case Study Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA..... | 7 |
| Background: The Road to EUFOR..... | 7 |
| Phase 1: Decisionmaking and Planning..... | 11 |
| Phase 2: Preparation: Achieving Initial Operational Capability..... | 18 |
| Phase 3: Execution..... | 23 |
| Phase 4: Hand Over..... | 33 |
| Assessment and Evaluation..... | 35 |
| Chapter 2: Lessons Learned and Future Relevance..... | 43 |
| Lessons Learned..... | 43 |
| The Way Forward..... | 64 |
| Chapter 3: Implications for U.S. Policy..... | 69 |
| Endnotes..... | 77 |
| Appendix 1. Acronyms..... | 113 |
| Appendix 2. Chronology: Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA..... | 119 |
| Appendix 3. Overview of National Participation at FOC..... | 125 |

FOREWORD

In the post-September 11, 2001 (9/11) security environment, the United States faces a complex combination of threats. These range from state to nonstate actors, many of regional or even global reach. In this environment, weak and fragile states have become a predominant security challenge for the United States, by providing breeding grounds for terrorism, weapons proliferation, and trafficking in humans and narcotics.

Addressing the challenges posed by these weak and failed states will require increasingly demanding military interventions, often over a great distance and prolonged periods of time. As a result of several engagements over the last decade—starting with the Balkans and today with Iraq and Afghanistan—the U.S. military has gained valuable experience in undertaking stability operations. But as the global demand for such operations grows, the United States should not be expected to carry that burden alone; we must look to our partners and allies to share some of the global responsibility. In this, Europe is unquestionably the most capable and natural U.S. ally.

Despite substantial cuts in the aftermath of the Cold War, European militaries continue to constitute a global force matched only by that of the United States. Since the Kosovo War, Europeans have been slowly building their own security institutions within the European Union (EU). Since then, the EU's role has increased in the field of security and defense, most recently through the adoption of the Treaty of Lisbon. While most U.S. policymakers are familiar with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), developments in the field of security and defense within the EU have thus far received little attention in the United States, despite the EU's increasing importance.

In this monograph, Mr. Bjoern Seibert provides timely and interesting insights into the EU's new security structure. He examines the largest and most complex EU mili-

tary operation in Africa, Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, and provides an unprecedented look inside the workings of an EU military operation. Mr. Seibert highlights both successes and failures and then scrutinizes the impact of the operation on the ground. He then addresses an extensive list of lessons that can be drawn from this complex multinational stability operation in Africa. He correctly observes that the operation underscores the EU's long remaining road toward realizing its ambitious agenda. This will not merely require a more expeditionary mindset, but also substantial shifts in budget priorities and reinvestment. Though the process may take years to complete, it is undoubtedly the right course for Europe to take, and would be in the best interest of the United States.

Mr. Seibert concludes that the United States must remain involved and supportive of the EU's efforts to build a stronger Common Security and Defense Policy. The United States has much to gain from having a strong and effective ally in Europe, and should provide advice and perhaps even material support if the EU is to realize its ambitious agenda.

The Strategic Studies Institute is pleased to offer this monograph as a topic of debate concerning European security and defense issues.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr." in a cursive script.

DOUGLAS C. LOVELACE, JR.
Director
Strategic Studies Institute

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

BJOERN H. SEIBERT is a Non-Resident Fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) of The Johns Hopkins University and an Associate Fellow at the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). Starting November 2010, he will be a Visting Scholar at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard University. He is also a Research Affiliate at the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Previously, Mr. Seibert was a Research Analyst at the Foreign and Defense Policy Studies Program at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) in Washington, DC and a Teaching Fellow at the Department of Government at Harvard University. His research focuses on European military capabilities, European security and defence policy, NATO, and European procurement policy. Mr. Seibert is widely published on security and defense matters, and his work has been cited by major publications around the world, including in *The New York Times*, *Le Monde*, and *The Economist*, as well as specialized defense publications such as *Jane's Defence Weekly* and *DefenseNews*. He has also given numerous interviews to major international media outlets. Mr. Seibert has studied at Cambridge University (Kings College), the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, MIT, Georgetown, and Harvard University.

SUMMARY

Based on the assessments made herein, this monograph recommends embracing the European Union's (EU) Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). This recommendation is based on the following key findings:

- The new security environment increasingly requires cooperation between allies to address emerging security threats;
- A militarily stronger Europe that carries a greater share of global responsibility is an important asset for U.S. foreign policy;
- The EU's CSDP has the potential to deliver the political will needed for a militarily more proactive Europe;
- The EU's CSDP may thus be critical to overcoming the recognized stagnation in capability improvements and mobilizing serious European capabilities development.

To be successful, practical steps that entail shifts in U.S. thinking as well as organization are required. First, establish the necessary capacities to strengthen the U.S. understanding of the EU's CSDP in order to overcome existing blind spots and gain a deeper understanding of the CSDP. This may require organizational changes in U.S. embassies in Europe, as well as U.S. Missions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the EU, in order to better identify, track, and decide whether and how to seek to influence the CSDP.

Second, encourage European members to focus on increasing their defense budgets. Moreover, empha-

size the need for more efficient defense spending in Europe through cooperation and pooling of assets. Concretely, this could be undertaken by improving the relationship between NATO and the European Defense Agency (EDA).

Third, emphasize European responsibility for crises occurring on Europe's periphery. This would encourage a sense of ownership of crisis response and help Europeans undertake the critical steps needed to address existing capability shortfalls.

Fourth, seek to improve the relationship between NATO and the EU. At the same time accept that Europe needs to have the necessary structures to act autonomously, including a limited permanent planning capacity outside NATO.

Fifth, support the development of a common U.S.-EU framework for stability operations, including doctrine and training. This would allow for increased, but less ad hoc, coordination between the United States and the EU in the field, and encourage a sharing of lessons learned.

OPERATION EUFOR TCHAD/RCA AND THE EUROPEAN UNION'S COMMON SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY

INTRODUCTION

The key feature of the post-September 11, 2001 (9/11) security environment is that challenges from weak rather than strong states will constitute the major security threat to U.S. interests.¹ Weak, failing, or failed states, unable to control parts of their territory, provide security, or deliver major services to large segments of their population are the biggest security threat. They are vulnerable to a variety of actors and armed groups—terrorists, criminals, insurgents, and militias—that operate within their territories.² These events are, unfortunately, no longer the exception; they promise to be a persistent part of the new security environment for years to come.

It is in this environment that stability operations have become of critical importance. This landmark shift was translated at the national level with the 2005 Department of Defense (DoD) Directive 3000.05, which instructed the U.S. military to treat stability and reconstruction operations with equal priority to combat operations. Despite its unrivaled military power and potential, it has already become clear that the U.S. military—and specifically the U.S. Army—cannot carry this burden alone. Increasingly, the United States must rely on its allies and partners to respond to the growing global security demands. In this, Europe is unquestionably the most capable U.S. ally.³ European countries constitute a global force matched only by the United States. Collectively, European states have sustained 50,000-100,000 troops in operations outside

of home countries for most of the past 2 decades—often in close cooperation with the United States.⁴ As a whole, Europe still accounts for about 21 percent of the world’s military spending—jointly outspending the combined defense budgets of China, India, Russia, and Brazil by a factor of two.⁵ Europe is hence the natural U.S. partner in sharing the burden of stability operations.

In the wake of the European failure during the Yugoslav war, Europe has slowly been building its security institutions under the European Union (EU). Since then, the EU has conducted 23 civilian and military missions abroad within the framework of its Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP),⁶ and shown an increasing readiness and willingness to engage in stability operations in its wider neighborhood.⁷

Given its importance as the most capable U.S. partner, Europe’s common defense aspirations and their future evolution will heavily influence U.S. strategic options. Studying those aspirations and how they translate in reality, as well as the EU’s evolving security institutions, is critical for U.S. policymakers and the broader U.S. military establishment. As it moves forward in an era of more limited resources, the United States has much to gain from understanding what its European partners are capable of, and hence how much of the burden they can—and should—be expected to carry.

Today, however, both U.S. policymakers and security experts pay little attention to the EU. A recent study underlined the shocking dearth of capabilities the United States invests in analyzing security and defense related developments within the EU.⁸ Against the background of the importance of allies in the new

security environment, coupled with scarce resources, this approach comes at an increasingly higher cost.

Approach.

The state of the EU's defense aspirations can be assessed in different ways. One way is to provide a comprehensive overview of the EU's complex and ever changing institutional architecture;⁹ yet another is to focus on European military capabilities.¹⁰ This monograph takes a different, more dynamic, approach. Since an important self-stated goal of the CSDP is to enable Europe to undertake military operations autonomously—that is, without U.S. support—this monograph attempts to assess the EU and its members' progress by focusing precisely on this goal. Military operations in fact offer a dynamic view of how the politics, institutions, and capabilities interact in reality, and thus present an accurate and encompassing image of the EU's military progress. Studying the EU's military operations, I believe, allows for a better understanding of the EU's potential and limitations, what is being done to address the limitations, and the way forward.¹¹ Rather than providing a brief overview of the multiple EU-led military operations undertaken to date, however, this monograph provides an in-depth case study of the EU's largest, longest, and most challenging military operation in Africa—Operation EUROPEAN UNION FORCE CHAD/CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC (EUFOR TCHAD/RCA)—as a window into European defense policy and capability.¹²

Though EUFOR TCHAD/RCA was, in absolute terms, a small operation, it can nonetheless provide insights into the state of affairs of the CSDP. On the one hand, stability operations are demanding and

complex. This is especially true in current multinational stability operations, where military forces are increasingly tasked to cooperate at a much lower level.¹³ Conducting them successfully thus requires a greater level of cooperation and coordination between multiple actors, often facilitated by a range of institutional arrangements. Given that the EU is a relatively new security actor, its ability to master such challenges allows for drawing conclusions about its current state of affairs.

On the other hand, Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA is specifically destined to provide broader insights into the CSDP, as it set new benchmarks for EU-led military operations in a number of ways:

- First, the operation was the most complex operation the EU has yet undertaken. Unlike previous operations that either reinforced or replaced existing operations, EUFOR TCHAD/RCA was the entry force. The EU thus had to build an operation from scratch, far from Europe, in an area characterized by isolation and the absence of basic infrastructure.
- Second, though relatively small, the operation was still far less limited in terms of size, duration, and geographic reach than previous EU military operations. For 16 months, EUFOR operated in an area half the size of France.
- Third, despite strong French participation, the Operation was the most multinational military operation the EU has undertaken in Africa.¹⁴

The combination of these factors makes Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA a good test case for the EU CSDP.

Structure.

The first section of this monograph will consist of a comprehensive overview and assessment of Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA. It will provide insights into the different phases of the operation—preparation, deployment, execution, and redeployment.

The second section will outline the lessons of Operations EUFOR TCHAD/RCA and the way forward. It thereby places the operation in the larger context of the rising CSDP. This part is also meant to give policymakers an understanding about the possible trajectory of CSDP.

The third and last section of the monograph will address what the findings of the previous two parts mean for the United States and provide recommendations for U.S. policymakers, and particularly the DoD leadership, in its dealings with the CSDP.

Limitations.

It is important to point out that the following is not without limitations. Information on EU operations is notoriously scarce—which explains the dearth of in-depth studies on previous EU operations.¹⁵ There is also a tendency in the existing literature to focus on the planning process of an operation, rather than the field perspective.¹⁶ However, as the implementation perspective is of key importance, the author of this monograph has conducted a large number of interviews over a period of 15 months with numerous European officials and military officers involved in the operation.¹⁷ Aside from numerous European officials, officials from Chad, Central African Republic (CAR),

and the United States, as well as the United Nations (UN), were also interviewed for the monograph. Given the sensitivity of the information provided, most interviews were only possible on a “not-for-attribution” basis, which is a clear limitation of the monograph. Moreover, despite the lengthy research on the topic, given that the study will seek to provide an overview over a period of about 2 years, it will remain incomplete and its conclusions will be tentative. Having underlined these limitations, the author hopes to provide an in-depth case study of Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, which offers valuable insights into the EU’s CSDP.

CHAPTER 1

CASE STUDY OPERATION EUFOR TCHAD/RCA

BACKGROUND: THE ROAD TO EUFOR

The Crisis in Eastern Chad/CAR.

The origins of Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA go back to mid-2006.¹⁸ Growing insecurity in eastern Chad, which borders the western Sudanese Darfur region, increasingly appeared on the international community's radar. As a result, in June 2006, the UN Security Council dispatched a fact-finding mission, which recommended a security presence to protect refugees and displaced persons in the UN camps in eastern Chad bordering Sudan.¹⁹

An International Force for Chad and CAR?

Given the fear of regionalization of the crisis in Darfur, France, supported by other members of the Security Council, increasingly advocated in favor of an international security presence in eastern Chad.²⁰ These efforts bore fruit in late August 2006 when UN Security Council Resolution 1706 broadened the mandate of the UN Mission in the Sudan (UNAMIS) to include a security presence in eastern Chad and CAR.²¹ The resolution was intended to place operations in Darfur and Chad/CAR under a single umbrella. On the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 1706, a Department of Peace Keeping Operations (DPKO) assessment mission was dispatched to Chad/CAR, in late November 2006.

The DPKO assessment mission proposed two principal options: a monitoring or a monitoring/protection mission.²² It was assessed that the monitoring mission would require a brigade-size operation (6,000 troops), and the monitoring/protection mission would require a division-size operation (10,900 troops), in addition to a smaller police presence (580 Chadian police/160 UN police).²³ Overall, however, skepticism prevailed. First, it was understood that a military operation would pose enormous challenges.²⁴ Second, it was feared that a force would be operating in the midst of continuing hostilities—i.e., there would be no peace to keep—and lack a clear exit strategy. UN Secretary-General Annan concluded that “the conditions for an effective UN peacekeeping operation do not, therefore, seem to be in place as of the time of writing of the present report.” If, notwithstanding, the UN Security Council nonetheless considered pursuing the idea, the Secretary-General recommended a monitoring/protection mission.²⁵

The Chadian President Idriss Déby was also skeptical. Given his support for Sudanese rebel groups in the border region, he rejected the idea of establishing a border-monitoring mission. Another red line for him was any international presence inside the camps, which served as important recruitment bases for the Chadian armed forces as well as Sudanese rebel groups.²⁶ It thus became increasingly clear that President Déby would reject an international force presence.

The new UN Secretary-General, Ban-Ki Moon, dispatched another UN assessment mission to Chad and CAR in February 2007. While the findings and proposed concept for an operation essentially validated

the previous findings (including the two previous proposed options and recommendation for the larger force), the overall tone of the new UN Secretary-General was notably more positive towards such a force. The UN Secretary-General report, however, also contained proposals to include a political dimension to the mission, which was another contentious matter for President Déby. The situation thus remained blocked and a UN deployment seemed increasingly unlikely. The situation would only change with the outcome of the French Presidential elections in May 2007.

An EU Military Operation in Chad and CAR.

The new French government under President Nicolas Sarkozy was keen on doing something about Darfur.²⁷ President Sarkozy's interest was strongly shared by new French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner.²⁸ Despite these desires, there was soon a realization in Paris that, as things stood, very little could be done about Darfur. Internationally, there was already broad support for the deployment of the African Union/UN Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) and thus little political space for new initiatives.²⁹ The focus of the new French government then moved to Chad. This shift was also supported by the fact that France had more interests in Chad than in Darfur, and a far greater ability to influence the Chadian leadership.³⁰

Thus, France proposed to deploy an EU—rather than UN—force, which would serve as a bridging operation until a UN force followed. For France, this proposal had at least two benefits. First, Chad was much more likely to accept a European force—with a strong French presence—than an UN force. France has a military-technical cooperation agreement with Chad, and French forces, as part of Operation EPERVIER (Opera-

tion SPARROWHAWK), have been stationed in Chad for several decades.³¹ President Déby felt comfortable with the French.³² Second, the proposal also fit well into the larger French policy agenda of promoting the CSDP—especially as such an operation would highlight the military, as opposed to the purely civilian character of the CSDP.³³ The UN, however, was divided on the issue; skepticism prevailed in the UN DPKO.³⁴


Officially approached by France in late May, most European countries were suspicious of French motives.³⁵ Critically, most European countries feared being instrumentalized for a French agenda. France in fact maintained a close relationship with Chadian President Déby. There was hence widespread suspicion in European capitals that France's true motive for pushing for a European force was to shield Chadian President Déby from rebel groups, rather than to protect civilians.³⁶ Moreover, as in previous operations, the EU member states also worried about French efforts to Europeanize the costs for its military engagement in Africa.³⁷ These suspicions were compounded by general disagreement on the nature of the CSDP; indeed, not all EU member states agreed with France's focus on militarizing it. To overcome this skepticism, France spent a great deal of political capital to convince its European partners.³⁸

France's immense political effort to launch the operation bore fruit in August 2007. France managed to secure political support for the operation in Europe, notwithstanding remaining skepticism, especially in Germany. France also secured President Déby's support by promising him that any political mandate for the force would be excluded, and that Chad would retain control of the border and the refugee/internally displaced person (IDP) camps. While the UN DPKO

continued to be skeptical, France drafted a resolution in late August 2007, which was to authorize a European “bridging force” in eastern Chad and northeastern CAR. In August, the EU Military Staff (EUMS) undertook an information-gathering mission to Chad.³⁹

PHASE 1: DECISIONMAKING AND PLANNING⁴⁰

Despite persistent skepticism from most EU member states, France managed to find sufficient political support to launch the EU’s crisis management decisionmaking and planning process.⁴¹ Figure 1 gives a brief overview of the three formal phases that lead to the launch of an operation: development of a Crisis Management Concept (CMC), development of (military) strategic options, and finally operation planning.



See Appendix 1 for acronym definitions.

Figure 1. European Union’s Planning Process.⁴²

It is beyond the scope of this monograph to reiterate the EU planning doctrine in detail⁴³ – especially as the EU has not always followed these procedures in the past.⁴⁴ Rather, this section will give a very brief overview of the decisionmaking and planning process in Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA.⁴⁵

Planning on the EU-level began with the EU's top-level political committee – the Political and Security Committee (PSC)⁴⁶ – tasking the General Council Secretariat to lay out the conceptual framework for a possible EU crisis response, the CMC. However, differences between the member states on the response led to lengthy debates, so that the member states only approved the CMC by mid-September 2007.⁴⁷ The agreed conceptual framework laid out the EU's comprehensive response to the crisis in eastern Chad/northeastern CAR, which included humanitarian and development assistance, in addition to a military dimension.⁴⁸

Building on this conceptual framework, the EUMS was officially tasked to develop military strategic options (MSO).⁴⁹ Despite its limited resources, the EUMS drew up four different military options, on the basis of a fact-finding mission, varying in size between a land maneuver force of one to four battalions.⁵⁰ These options were put forth to the highest military body, the EU Military Committee (EUMC), and the PSC.⁵¹ Disagreement over the options ensued in both the EUMC and the PSC.⁵² Eventually, in early October 2007, the decision was made to adopt the military option that proposed to protect the population and support UN operations. This option called for a land maneuver force of four battalions, to be deployed simultaneously.⁵³

A month earlier, prior to the agreement on the military option, the PSC had given the planning

authority to the French Military Headquarters in Mont Valérien (near Paris) to become the operational headquarters (HQ).⁵⁴ The alternative to using one of the national HQs—the activation of the EU Operations Center (EU OpsCenter)⁵⁵—was considered but eventually dropped for practical concerns.⁵⁶ The process of activation and internationalization of the French Operation Headquarters (OHQ) began in early September, overseen by a French colonel.⁵⁷

In mid-October 2007, the EU member states legally established the operation, and officially appointed Lieutenant General Patrick Nash from Ireland as Operation Commander and French Brigadier General Jean-Philippe Ganascia as Force Commander. The Operation Commander arrived in Mont Valérien after his appointment, which had been activated for almost 1 1/2 months prior to his arrival.⁵⁸ Based on the given Initiating Military Directive, the Operation Commander and his staff were put under pressure to process the key planning documents, the Concept of Operations (CONOPS) including the Statement of Requirements (SOR) and the Operation Plan (OPLAN).

Military Planning Process.

The CONOPS for Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA laid out the broad conception of the operation. It situated the operation in the context of the larger political objectives of the EU. The focus was on preventing the Darfur crisis from either worsening or spilling into neighboring regions. It thus situated the operation in the larger context of EU support for the UNAMID. More specifically, the CONOPS laid out the following missions for the operation:

- a. Protect civilians in danger
- b. Facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid and the free movement of humanitarian personnel through improved security
- c. Protect UN and associated personnel
- d. Encourage the voluntary return of IDPs, especially in the Dar Sila region.

The CONOPS stated that the desired military end-state of the international community was the establishment of a self-sustaining Safe and Secure Environment (SASE) in eastern Chad and northeastern CAR. The military end-date for the Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA however was set at 1 year after the achievement of Initial Operational Capability (IOC). The EU's exit strategy was to be a UN follow-on force. It also confirmed the need for posture and operations to be impartial and independent, as failure to do so would put the mission's accomplishment at risk.⁵⁹ At the same time, freedom of movement throughout the entire Area of Operation (AOO), including the border area, had to be established. The only exception to this would be the refugee and IDP camps and their vicinity, where the EUFOR could not operate or intervene except in extreme cases. While the CONOPS put the focus on Chad, it underscored that deterring armed groups within the entire AOO, and especially those transiting from Sudan to Chad via CAR, was one of the military objectives.

The Operation Commander requested a total of 4,199 troops.⁶⁰ The land component of the requested force was to be made up of a maneuver force of three battalions (total strength, 1,575 troops) supported by Combat Support (CS) and Combat Service Support (CSS) of 440 troops. In addition, the SOR requested a Combined Joint Special Operations Task Forces

(CJSOTF) (strength, 200 troops) and a battalion-sized strategic reserve (strength, 600 troops).⁶¹

The OPLAN outlines the proposed conduct of the operation based on the CONOPS. In the case of Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, the OPLAN laid out the following key military tasks on the basis of the member states' approved Initiating Military Directive (IMD):

1. Contribute to the provision of security to the *Mission des Nations Unies en République Centrafricaine et au Tchad* (Mission of the United Nations in the Republic of Central Africa and to Chad [MINURCAT]).

2. Contribute to the provision of security in the AOO to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian support.

3. Support the creation of the conditions required for the voluntary return of internally displaced peoples, especially in the Dar Sila region.

4. Support the creation of the conditions for launching a longer-term civilian reconstruction and development effort necessary for the return of these persons.

5. Contribute to the protection of civilians in danger, particularly refugees and displaced persons.

6. In CAR, deter the movement of armed groups, specifically those transiting from Sudan to Chad via CAR.

7. Conduct military information activities to support the EU information strategy.

To achieve these key military tasks, the OPLAN affirmed that the center of military gravity (CoG) was the credibility of the EU military force. It also warned that loss of credibility could put the mission's accomplishment at risk; and thus emphasized the need to establish a credible presence in order for deterrence to work.

The OPLAN confirmed that the operation would have an end-date, rather than an end-state. The end-date for the operation was set at 12 months from IOC. According to the OPLAN's timetable, IOC was to be reached 4-6 weeks after the decision was made to launch the operation. Full Operational Capability (FOC) was to be reached in mid-May 2008—just before the beginning of the rainy season in Chad, which renders roads and communications exceedingly difficult. The AOO encompassed eastern Chad and north-eastern Central African Republic.

Force Generation.⁶²

After the Political and Security Committee adopted the CONOPS and SOR, the official force-generation process began.⁶³ Although political consent for the CONOPS is necessary, it is in the force-generation process that member states demonstrate their true political will. The ensuing force-generation process proved that politically supporting the CONOPS and OPLAN and actually resourcing the operation are two very different things.⁶⁴

The first force-generation conference took place in early November 2007. As few countries were willing to contribute to the operation, considerable gaps remained, and four additional force-balancing conferences were necessary.⁶⁵ The second and third force-balancing conferences in mid-November 2007 did not generate new announcements of capability. This created tensions among the European partners and concerns that the process might break down.⁶⁶ The reluctance of Germany and the United Kingdom (UK) to contribute any troops and/or equipment made filling existing gaps especially difficult.⁶⁷ Increasingly frustrated by other EU member states, France turned to

non-EU countries such as Ukraine and Russia to contribute personnel and equipment for the operation.⁶⁸ Gaps in critical capacities—such as tactical airlift assets (fixed- and rotary-wing) and deployable medical facilities—remained, however. As it became increasingly clear that the SOR would not be fulfilled, the Operation Commander was asked to revise his request downwards and to submit a list of assets that would be absolutely critical for the mission's launch. To avoid further embarrassment and failure, President Sarkozy reluctantly agreed in late December 2007 to provide much of the lacking troop and rotary-wing assets and agreed for France to assume the role of logistical lead nation.⁶⁹ These concessions increased the French participation to over 55 percent—well beyond the original goal of providing no more than 40 percent of troops, which was meant to avoid the appearance of a French operation.⁷⁰

With the additional French contributions, and against a background of increasing political pressure, the Operation Commander recommended launching the operation in late January 2008, despite continuing gaps in the SOR. The shortfalls notably included tactical and rotary wing assets—and with no strategic reserve preidentified. While the force generation process would officially continue after the launch of the operation, senior EU military officials had few illusions that substantial further contributions would be forthcoming. Indeed, some countries could not even sustain their original contributions.⁷¹

PHASE 2: PREPARATION: ACHIEVING INITIAL OPERATIONAL CAPABILITY

The preparation phase lasted from late January 2008 to mid-March 2008. This phase had two key objectives: First, establish an initial visible presence in the AOO through a multinational Initial Entry Force (IEF), and second, start preparation for the arrival of the main force. A special emphasis was put on the establishment of EUFOR as a credible and impartial force.⁷²

The first test came just hours after the official decision to launch the operation. In a swift response to the EU's decision, a coalition of Chadian rebel groups supported by Sudan launched a major offensive to seize power in the Chadian capital, N'Djamena.⁷³ After crossing unopposed nearly 700 kilometers (km) of semi-desert, government forces unsuccessfully attempted to stop the rebel advance near the capital.⁷⁴ The rebels entered N'Djamena on February 3, 2008. While the situation did not test EUFOR—only very few troops were already in theater—all eyes were on France's reaction. In the last major rebel offensive in 2006, France intervened on behalf of the Chadian government under its defense agreement with Chad.⁷⁵ This time, aware of the reservations of its European partners, France showed more restraint.⁷⁶ The rebels encircled the presidential palace where President Déby and his most loyal forces were entrenched. After hard fighting, President Déby's troops—mainly the State Security Service (DGSSIE) units—succeeded, with external support, in pushing the rebels out of the city.⁷⁷ Despite the failure of the rebels to overthrow

President Déby, the attempt underlined the fragility of the Chadian government. Against this background, the EU temporarily suspended the deployment process, to reassess the evolving situation.

A Logistical Mt. Everest.⁷⁸

Despite doubts, deployment resumed in mid-February 2008, with newfound urgency. Timely deployment, in fact, became even more important as the rainy season (mid-May-October) was approaching.⁷⁹ The logistical challenges were, however, formidable. As an autonomous EU operation carried out in a challenging environment, EUFOR TCHAD/RCA tested the limits of the EU's logistical capabilities. The key logistical challenge in the operation was the deployment of the force into theater, given its remote location, the poor transport infrastructure and the lack of host-nation support.⁸⁰ As in previous EU military operations, the responsibility for deployment of personnel and equipment to theater rests with the individual Troop Contributing Nations (TCN).⁸¹ Thus, each TCN needs to develop a logistics plan for deployment. This created its own set of problems as, aside from France, this was, in fact, the first broader military experience in Africa for most of the participating European countries.

For strategic deployment of a force, both strategic airlift and strategic sealift were used.⁸² Given the high costs of strategic airlift, most countries relied heavily on strategic sealift/road transport, especially for their main forces. The air-route entailed strategic airlift from Europe to N'Djamena, followed by a combination of tactical airlift and road movement to the AOO (another 800 km).⁸³ The air route was especially

used for the Initial Entry Force (IEF) in order to have advanced units early in the AOO. Given European shortfalls in strategic airlift, most troop-contributing countries made heavy use of Russian/Ukrainian aircraft—Il-76 *Candid* and An-124 *Condor*—operated by private contractors. A total of 176 sorties of Il-76/An-124 were utilized in deployment alone.⁸⁴ In addition, some countries also used tactical aircraft, mostly C-130s.

The strategic sealift entailed sealift to Douala Seaport and from there through Cameroon and Chad to the AOO. A second line of communication from the Benghazi Seaport (Libya) through the Sahara desert was considered but not used during the deployment phase.⁸⁵ The sealift option was, however, very time consuming. From Europe to Douala Port (Cameroon) the sealift would take about 15 days. From Douala Port, another 2000 km of rail and road movement was needed to get to Abéché in eastern Chad. The overland transport, which was largely outsourced to private companies, alone took about 25 days.⁸⁶ Furthermore, political turmoil in Cameroon caused further delays in the deployment.⁸⁷ For the deployment alone, about 3,500 troops, their equipment and weapons, ammunition, housing, and life support materials, together with 1,500 containers and 900 vehicles had to be transported to a very isolated and remote area in Africa.⁸⁸ This required a total of nine sealift transportations by cargo ship from Europe to Douala, and subsequently 21 large rail convoys and 140 road convoys from Douala through Cameroon.⁸⁹

Deployment was further complicated by the lack of basic infrastructure in the AOO and the need for substantial infrastructure build-up. Through the EU's common financing system, N'Djamena and Abéché airports had to be upgraded in order to increase their

capabilities and facilitate deployment.⁹⁰ The costs of these infrastructure updates amounted to a total of about 70 million Euros. Their timely completion was only possible as preparations began prior to the official launch of the operation.⁹¹ At the same time, the construction of operational camps began. Given the absence of host-nation support, a total of six camps had to be built. These included a rear camp in N'Djamena (Europa Camp), the main camp in Abéché (Stars Camp) with a capacity for 2,000 personnel and three main Forward Operating Bases (FOB) in Iribia (north), Forchana (center) and Goz Beida (south) with a capacity for 600 personnel each.⁹² While the camps were being built, the Force Headquarters was located in the French military base in N'Djamena, and IEFs were mainly located at the French Camp Croci in Abéché.⁹³

Operations Begin: Establishing Visibility and Credibility.

Parallel to the preparation of the deployment of the main force, the IEF began its operation. As in previous EU military operations in Africa, Special Operations Forces (SOF) acted as the IEF. They were able to deploy quickly with a light logistical footprint, and remain relatively self-sustainable under harsh conditions.⁹⁴ The CJSOTF was composed of six Special Forces Task Groups (two French, one Swedish, one Belgian, one Irish, and one Austrian) and one Special Forces Air Task Group (with fixed and rotary-wing assets), in total 450 troops.⁹⁵ Different from EUFOR's conventional forces, CJSOTF was directly under the command of the Operational Headquarters.

A first incident happened in early March 2008 when a single vehicle of the Initial Entry Forces near

Tissi in the three-border region of Chad, Sudan and CAR, crossed accidentally into Sudan during a reconnaissance mission.⁹⁶ The vehicle was subsequently engaged by Sudanese Armed Forces.⁹⁷ In the exchange of fire, one of the two French soldiers in the vehicle was killed.⁹⁸ The second soldier was recovered by a rescue mission. The incident and subsequent rescue operations underlined the IEF's willingness to resort to force when needed. After the incident, CJSOTF remained very active until mid-April when their presence was significantly reduced.⁹⁹

While engaged in Special Forces operations, the CJSOTF importantly contributed to EUFOR's situational awareness by conducting special Surveillance and Reconnaissance (SR) operations. At the same time, the presence of SOF was also meant as a symbolic show of intentions and will to go beyond the rhetoric. It signaled the robustness of EUFOR, despite the very light footprint of the initial force, and that the force was not a "paper tiger," but a real force to be reckoned with. This may have helped preempt any major tests to the force's resolve. Moreover, CJSOTF also underlined that the EU was capable of conducting a rapid deployment of multinational units and of having "boots on the ground" anywhere in Africa.

The Declaration of Initial Operational Capability.

Despite various delays in deployment, Initial Operational Capability (IOC) was declared in mid-March 2008. This date was significant as the end-date of the operation was defined by the mandate as being 12 months after IOC.¹⁰⁰ The decision to declare IOC was not uncontroversial, as the operation remained very fragile in mid-March. The delays in deployment had a

negative effect on the operation's footprint, which was lighter than envisioned. Instead of the full maneuver battalion declared by the OPLAN as the target for IOC, only a company size element without real maneuver capability had been deployed in the French sector. Additionally, situational awareness was minimal despite the CJSOTF's effort, and the operation was hence essentially blind. Moreover, Command and Control (C2) was affected by delays in Communications and Information Systems (CIS) equipment, which restricted communication between the Force Headquarters and forward deployed elements. Finally, there was no operational reserve, with the exception of a CJSOTF Quick Reaction Force (QRF) with limited capability. Despite these shortfalls, the Operation Commander declared IOC, which was understood to be a political rather than a military IOC.¹⁰¹

The UN mission, MINURCAT, faced even more difficulties. Protracted negotiations between the UN and the Chadian government over specifics of the Chadian police element caused great delays in MINURCAT's deployment. It thus became increasingly clear that an integrated component of the international response, the UN operation, would be significantly delayed.

PHASE 3: EXECUTION

The Execution Phase lasted from mid-March 2008 to mid-March 2009. It can be divided into three distinct phases: IOC to Rainy Season (Mid-March to June); The Rainy Season (July-October); and the Post-Rainy Season to Hand-Over (November-March).

From IOC to Rainy Season (mid-March to June 2008).

The Operation Plan had called for FOC to be reached before the rainy season, during which deployment would become very difficult. Thus, one objective for the period from mid-March to June was to consolidate deployment, as well as to take the necessary steps to prepare for the rainy season. At the same time, EUFOR also attempted to seize opportunities to demonstrate its ability to tangibly affect the security environment. For the latter objective, May was declared to be the decisive month by the Force Commander.

Increasing the Operation's Footprint.

The buildup of the main force continued to be slow even after IOC was declared.¹⁰² The “French” sectors (central Chad and CAR sector) were the most advanced in buildup, while the remaining two sectors – the “Irish” sector in the south (Goz Beida) and the “Polish” sector in the north (Iriba) – experienced more delays. The Irish sector, Multi-National Base-South (MNB-South) became operational in mid-June, as the main Irish elements arrived in the AOO in late May. The buildup of the Polish sector experienced the most difficulties, as water shortages continued to hamper the deployment.¹⁰³ At the same time, the deployment of MINURCAT, and especially the UN training of Chadian police officers, were further delayed due to protracted negotiations between the UN and the GoC. It thus became increasingly clear that EUFOR would be a stand-alone force, rather than being embedded into a multinational framework. This led to growing frustration among EUFOR officials and further limited the operation's footprint.

Doubts About the Mission.

Despite the increase in EUFOR's strength in the field in May 2008, doubts about the mission surfaced. EUFOR officials started questioning EUFOR's ability to achieve its key objective of protecting civilians and humanitarian actors.¹⁰⁴ It became increasingly clear to them that the greatest threat to civilians and humanitarian organizations was banditry, which often involved local authorities, the Chadian military, police or gendarmerie. As EUFOR's mandate did not entail addressing criminality (this was the task of the MINURCAT-trained Chadian Police (DIS)), EUFOR senior officials publicly wondered whether the right force had been deployed.¹⁰⁵

Doubts also arose on the issue of return of IDPs. While according to the OPLAN, encouraging the voluntary return of IDPs was part of EUFOR's mandate, the humanitarian community was largely opposed to many EUFOR actions that would encourage the return of IDPs. While both EUFOR officials and humanitarian actors agreed on the desirability of IDP returns, tensions arose over the timeline of such returns. EUFOR officials—pressed by the need to show tangible results, which was most clearly articulated by French Foreign Minister Kouchner—were eager to undertake quick impact projects, which could possibly speed up the return process. This was critically opposed by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), which argued that the conditions for return were not achieved and stressed the need for voluntary return. As tensions heightened, EUFOR officials reached out to the humanitarian community and quietly dropped the objective of encouraging the return of IDPs.

Despite these doubts and the challenges in deployment of the main forces, by the beginning of the end of the dry season the two French sectors (MNB-Center and MNB-CAR) were fully operational, and the Irish sector (MNB-South) became increasingly operational with the arrival of the main elements in June (two Irish infantry companies and one Dutch reconnaissance platoon). The main problem remained the north Polish sector (MNB-North), which was plagued by a combination of delayed deployment and difficulties setting up the Polish Forward Operating Bases in Iribia in the northern part of the AOO due to water shortages. While some of the tasks were taken over by the Combined Joint Special Operations Component Command (CJSOCC), an imbalance between the northern sector and the rest of the AOO continued to exist, affecting the operation's visibility and effectiveness.¹⁰⁶

The Rainy Season (July 2008 – October 2008).

In Chad, the beginning of the rainy season marks a hiatus in fighting. As weather conditions make movements very difficult, the conflict between the GoC and rebels is largely frozen. EUFOR's commanders had different plans, however. They saw the rainy-season as an opportunity to highlight to the different armed groups in the AOO that, unlike them, EUFOR was an all-weather, fully mobile force, even under very difficult seasonal conditions. The rationale was to thereby strengthen its deterrent effect and thus set the terms for the end of the rainy season.

Establishment of Joint Combined Operations.

This goal was, however, weakened by the fact that EUFOR did not reach FOC before the onset of the rainy season. Until September, MNB-CAR, MNB-South and MNB-Center only combined a total strength of five infantry companies and two reconnaissance platoons.

EUFOR commanders realized these operational limitations and sought to offset them. Their solution was to conduct Joint Combined Operations in successive areas, which were also meant to at least partially address the problem of criminality and stress the multinational character of the European force. Involving up to two companies, the operations lasted up to 10 days.¹⁰⁷ In July, the focus was Birao (MNB-CAR), where EUFOR's footprint was the smallest and not multinational, as envisioned.¹⁰⁸ Undertaking Joint Combined Operations was thus meant to underline Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA's identity and to temporarily offset the operational limitations of MNB-CAR. Conducting combined operations in CAR was however not an easy task, as national restrictions (caveats) complicated the task of achieving a combined effort. Subsequently, Joint Combined Operations shifted to the rest of the AOO.

Reaching Full Operational Capability.

With the arrival of the Polish main element, which became operational in September, the Operational Commander declared FOC of the deployed elements in mid-September 2008. This allowed for a more balanced EUFOR presence in the AOO, and allowed for a better situational awareness of the northern AOO, in which many of the Sudanese refugees were located.

However, even at full operational capability, the number of troops available for operations was limited. This was partially due to the requirements of force protection and a QRF.¹⁰⁹ The redeployment of the Swedish contingent (two infantry platoons)¹¹⁰ and the drawdown of the forces assigned to the CJSOCC further affected both force protection and the provision of QRFs—at both theater and battalion level.

Changes in the Security Environment.

This period was also marked by an increased concern over turmoil in Sudan. The Sudanese response to the International Criminal Court's (ICC) attempt to seek criminal indictment of President Bashir was difficult to forecast, which increased concerns about large inflows of refugees into eastern Chad. This was especially a concern given EUFOR's lack of situational awareness of western Sudan. This was partially due to the lack of information exchange between EUFOR and UNAMID on the operational level, despite EUFOR's attempts to establish official and/or unofficial links between the two forces. Additionally, in combination with the deterioration of relations between Chad and Sudan in the aftermath of the failed attack by the Sudanese rebel group Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) on Khartoum in May 2008, this raised concerns about a possible indirect air-threat to EUFOR, particularly in Abéché, EUFOR's operational center of gravity.¹¹¹

While EUFOR continued to undertake operations during the rainy season, both the Chadian Government and the rebels used the time to prepare for the subsequent fighting season. The most important development during this phase was the ongoing shift of

the balance of power in favor of the GoC. Most critically for the shift was the increased military procurement by the GoC in the aftermath of the February rebel attack.¹¹² The focus was to strengthen the close air support capability of the Chadian Air Force by purchasing fixed-wing (two Su-25 *Frogfoot*, one PC-9) as well as rotary-wing (three MI-35 *Hind*) aircraft.¹¹³ The Chadian rebels on the other hand, continued to suffer. They were further weakened by successful attempts by the GoC to rally rebels to the Government's camp.¹¹⁴ While the Government of Sudan provided additional equipment to the rebels—the lack of trust in the rebels prevented the Government of Sudan from handing over weaponry that would have allowed the Chadian rebels to counter the increased Chadian air power (e.g., man portable air defense systems [MANPADS]).

In sum, EUFOR's ability to avoid a logistic paralysis and continue its operations during the rainy season was a remarkable achievement in itself. Moreover the joint combined operations appeared to be helpful in extending EUFOR's light footprint and thereby overcoming some of the existing lack of troops. They also increased the deterrent effect in remote areas of low EUFOR presence. The Joint Combined Operations also had a positive effect by outlining the multinational identity of the force and enhancing trust building between the various countries involved. At the same time, however, they led to a better understanding of the problems of insecurity in the AOO; though this only confirmed the previous assessment that the problem of insecurity in eastern Chad had important structural origins, in which EUFOR had little ability to intervene. IDPs interviewed by EUFOR's civil-military coordination (CIMIC) teams expressed unwillingness

to return to their original areas for reasons that EUFOR was largely unable to solve or even address.¹¹⁵

End of Rainy Season to End of Operation.

The end of the rainy season in mid/late October 2008 allowed for the return of overall ground mobility and the resumption of criminality/banditry, interethnic clashes as a result of seasonal migration, as well as rebel activity. The priority for EUFOR's effort in this period was two-fold. First, contribute to a safe and secure environment, with a focus on preventing outbreaks of interethnic clashes. Second, facilitate the deployment of MINURCAT through cooperation so as to optimise the conditions for the transition.

Extending the footprint further. In October 2008, the emphasis on preventing interethnic clashes was linked to seasonal factors. The beginning of the dry season is the principal harvest season in Chad, which traditionally leads to strong competition and increased tensions between nomadic breeders and sedentary farmers. The focus lay on previously identified areas where tensions were most likely to occur (southern Wadi Fira, Ouaddai, and Dar Sila). While EUFOR was supposed to be at full strength, due to relief in place EUFOR experienced a temporary reduction of its operational capability.¹¹⁶ To offset these and achieve an extension of EUFOR's footprint and underline its multinational identity, additional combined joint operations were undertaken in select areas. These were undertaken at different strength and command arrangements and were conducted in addition to "nomadic" long-range patrols to reach even remote parts of the AOO. Additionally, in early January 2009, EUFOR's tactical airlift capability, under strength during

most of the operation, was reinforced by the arrival of four Russian MI-8 *Hip* helicopters.

This period was also characterized by an increased footprint of UN-trained Chadian police units (DIS) in the AOO. After substantial delays in deployment, in mid-November, about 200 DIS officers deployed in the AOO.¹¹⁷ Difficulties remained, however, as DIS units suffered from a lack of equipment, controversy over salaries, and conflicts over jurisdiction with local authorities. The actual effectiveness of the DIS units in addressing some of the causes of insecurity in eastern Chad thus remained contested. Moreover, as the envisioned DIS strength of 850 Chadian officers was not reached before the end of EUFOR's mandate, Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA remained essentially a stand-alone operation.

Increase in interethnic clashes. The level of criminality/banditry decreased in November 2008 from previous hikes in late September/early October 2008. (The September/October increase seemed linked to factors external to the presence of European troops.)¹¹⁸ At the same time, November experienced a significant increase in interethnic violence. The most serious incidents took place in the northern AOO, especially around the area of Birak, where clashes between Zaghawa and Tama ethnic groups occurred. Numerous attacks of Tama villages by Zaghawa armed groups led to the death and displacement of numerous Tama and the destruction of crops and livestock.¹¹⁹ The attacks were significant as they involved up to 200 armed men mounted on horses and camels and driving pick-up trucks. In a response, EUFOR undertook Operation WILMA, deploying forces in the area around Birak.¹²⁰ While EUFOR's presence improved the situation locally, and reassured NGOs/International Organiza-

tions (IOs) working in the area, most ethnic Tama left the area and refused to return, fearing further attacks. There was also little illusion that the European force's ability to address the underlying causes of interethnic violence was very limited. While in December levels of violence decreased and interethnic clashes were reduced, it was unclear whether this was a result of seasonal factors or of increased presence in critical areas of both European, and perhaps more importantly, Chadian forces.

Return of the Fighting Season.

Whereas a resumption of confrontation between *Forces Armées et de Sécurité* (FAS) and rebels, including another coordinated rebel attack on N'Djamena, was expected, the situation remained uncharacteristically calm. There are, however, doubts as to whether this was related to EUFOR's presence. Rather, the Chadian rebels, despite the establishment of a new coalition, continued to be weakened by internal disputes and lack of cohesion. At the same time, the Chadian Armed Forces reinforced their defensive layout in eastern Chad, effectively blocking the major avenues of approach. An increasingly unfavorable force ratio appeared to have deterred any rebel attack. The lack of means to counter the Chadian air superiority left the rebels especially vulnerable.¹²¹ Finally, the rebels also remained weakened as a result of defections to the Chadian Armed Forces.

In sum, as EUFOR was fully operational, with the return of the dry-season the force was able to conduct numerous short- and long-range patrols that increased the visibility of the force. This especially as EUFOR's footprint also extended over the entire AOO and its

tactical airlift capability was reinforced by the availability of the Russian rotary-wing assets. Despite EUFOR presence, however, the fighting season returned, and led in several cases to ethnic clashes, which resulted in civilian deaths. While EUFOR responded to the most critical cases, Operation WILMA underlined that EUFOR appeared ill-equipped to have a longer-term effect on the security situation in the AOO. Moreover, the situation had also changed substantially in comparison to previous years, as a more capable presence of Chadian Armed Forces had changed the balance of power on the ground.

PHASE 4: HAND OVER

The EU-led operation was officially handed over to the UN follow-on force (FoF) on March 15, 2009. The EU thereby followed through with its plan to stick to the 12-months mandate—nearly independently of UN readiness to take over the operation.

In Theory.

In principle, the concept of bridging operations was in many ways conceived as mutually beneficial for both the EU and the UN. For the EU, the limited duration agreed upon from the outset of the operation had a positive impact on the political willingness of member states to participate. Presumably, without a plausible exit strategy and fixed end-date, it is unlikely the operation would have been authorized by the member states.¹²² For the UN, this arrangement provided—in theory—enough time to understand the requirements of the operation and find sufficient troops to eventually undertake the operation. Moreover, the

UN would take over an up and running operation, including infrastructure such as bases, contracts, and intelligence products. Finally, it also meant potentially having some European states rehatting their troops to the UN FoF. Against the background that the UN had long sought to convince European troops to participate in its operations, the latter reason was seen as an important benefit. As this was not the first time the EU and UN had cooperated in an operation and various lessons learned processes had taken place, it was hoped that the operation would set a new standard for improved EU-UN cooperation in crisis management operations.¹²³

In Practice.

In practice, however, the handover from the EU to the UN force was far from smooth, and both EU and UN officials have been critical of the process. A key reason for the handover process being considered unsuccessful by most EU officials was that by the time of handover, the UN was not ready to take over the mission.¹²⁴ While the FoF had been discussed at length between EU and UN officials, the UN Security Council Resolution authorizing the follow-on force was only passed in early 2009, leaving too little time to generate the mandated force of 5,200 troops.¹²⁵ While European officials understood that the UN would thus not be ready to take over the mission, the EU went to great lengths to stick to its exit strategy. By putting pressure on the UN, the EU ensured that at the least the official handover would take place in accordance with the EU's OPLAN. At the same time, however, this was only possible by convincing the participating member states to rehat. To achieve the promised handover, EUFOR agreed to rehat nearly 90 percent of

its troops to the UN FoF. Moreover, EUFOR handed over infrastructure, including all its camps, to the UN. It also agreed to keep a QRF for the first month at the disposal of the UN force, and handed over parts of its intelligence database to the UN. But, as European nations were interested in gradually withdrawing their forces and the UN remained unable to replace them, the number of forces available to the UN FoF eventually decreased from March 2009 to March 2010. The UN FoF hence never reached its mandated strength of 5,200 troops.

In conclusion, the hand-over from the EU force to the UN force was widely perceived as unsuccessful. Despite the potential for mutual benefits of the concept of bridging operations, the operation underlined the challenges of effective cooperation between the EU and the UN in the field.

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Assessment.

The following part will attempt to evaluate how effective the EUFOR was and what its strengths and weaknesses were. It will also attempt to evaluate whether the EUFOR's shortcomings were due to its own limitations, or whether they were the result of and/or reflect larger problems with European security policy.

The key challenge in the assessment of stability operations is how to measure success. Unsurprisingly, there is little agreement on what constitutes success. Broadly speaking there are two approaches to measuring success.¹²⁶ The first defines success narrowly and focuses on the question of whether an operation's

mandate was fulfilled. The second defines success more broadly to include the impact a stability operation has on the conflict it was meant to address. Both approaches have merits and weaknesses. However, given the absence of an accepted way of measuring success the operation will be assessed through both lenses.

Success Defined Narrowly.

In the narrow definition of success, the EU-led operation could be considered successful if its above-stated objectives were reached. As described earlier, the key objective of the EU-led operation stated in the OPLAN was “*to contribute to establishing a Safe and Secure Environment (SASE) in the Area of Operation*” (emphasis added) in order *to contribute to*:

- a. The protection of civilians in danger,
- b. Facilitating the delivery of humanitarian aid and the free movement of humanitarian personnel through improved security,
- c. The protection of UN and associated personnel, and
- d. Encouraging the voluntary return of IDPs, especially in the Dar Sila region.

As in previous operations, however, measuring the operation’s impact is difficult, not at least given the absence of reliable statics. In Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, it can however be stated with a reasonable amount of confidence that EUFOR did positively impact the security situation for civilians, if only marginally. The challenge in this case was to protect a dispersed population in a very large area of operation. Anecdotal evidence suggests that EUFOR’s largest impact on civilian protection was in close proximity to

its bases, including the five FOBs. Overall, however, EUFOR's impact was limited and should not be overstated. Since the mandate only called for *a contribution to* the protection of civilians, even marginal improvements can be considered as contributions and hence a fulfillment of the mandate.

As for the protection task of humanitarian personnel, we come to a similar finding. Protecting the humanitarian organizations operating dispersed in a very large area of operation from smaller threats would have required either a large operational footprint or, alternatively, armed escorts. The EU force, however, neither had a large operational footprint, nor were most NGOs and IOs willing to accept armed escorts, fearing that this would compromise their "neutrality."¹²⁷ The alternative chosen by EUFOR—communicating itineraries of its patrols to humanitarian actors—allowed it to provide some protection to humanitarians.¹²⁸ This impact should again not be overestimated. Indeed some NGOs even reported an increase in acts of criminality and banditry during EUFOR's presence.

The third objective, protecting UN personnel, lost its relevance during most of the operation due to the substantial deployment delays of the UN mission.

Finally, the objective of encouraging the voluntary return of IDPs was gradually dropped, as it led to disputes and disagreement with the humanitarian community. It was in fact not uncontroversial, as mentioned earlier. Though it appeared as an easy—and quantifiable—measure of success, it was seen by the humanitarian community—and some within EUFOR—as inadequate and problematic, as it put pressure on IDPs to return, which was seen by the humanitarian community as antithetical to voluntary return.

In sum, if success is defined as the fulfillment of the mandate, an argument can be made that, despite its limited effect on the ground, EUFOR did *contribute* to the protection of civilians in danger and humanitarian, and could thereby arguably be said to have met the low threshold it had set for itself. The mandate in fact set a very low bar for success, which would have been difficult to miss.

Success Broadly Defined.

The overall assessment would, not surprisingly, look different if a broader definition of success is used, which would include the impact on the ground. In this case, the overall marginal impact on the crisis is the determining factor. Indeed if one uses such a definition of success, it could be argued that the operation's outcome was characterized by underachievement. Five reasons for such an assessment stand out.

1. *Evolving Situation on the Ground.* First, the situation on the ground had evolved considerably by the time the force became operational. The idea for the force took shape in mid to the end of 2006, against a background of widespread suffering of civilians—especially Sudanese refugees—in eastern Chad, which was partially caused by cross-border raids by Sudanese militias.¹²⁹ But within the 18 months it took to get the force operational, the situation on the ground looked little like 2006, and yet the operation's political and military planning process continued with the events of 2006 as its reference. In January 2008, when the mission was finally launched, the AOO was characterized by intensive fighting between Chadian government forces and Chadian rebels at times, but civilians were not explicitly targeted by armed groups.¹³⁰

The situation thus differed substantially from the situation military forces had confronted in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1992-95) or Rwanda (1994), or even neighboring Darfur. The result was a discrepancy between the force concept and mandate and the reality on the ground.

2. *Light Footprint.* The second reason for EUFOR's underachievement was the very light footprint of the force. EUFOR's force-to-space ratio was only 0.018 troops per km²—a low figure in comparison to other stabilization operations.¹³¹ The limited number of FOBs further limited the footprint in the AOO.¹³² This was especially problematic as the threat was caused by small rebel/militia groups and bandits, not large military units, which meant that detecting and engaging them was akin to policing. This problem was partially addressed through short and long-range patrols, which extended EUFOR's presence and were more adapted to the nature of the threat. Additionally, detecting the movements of small units of spoiler groups required good situational awareness. But, while EUFOR had some organic intelligence assets at its disposal, its situational awareness was limited.¹³³

3. *Rigid Division between Military and Law and Order Tasks.* Though, as mentioned above, the sources of threat were mainly rebel groups and bandits, a lack of flexibility concerning the blurred line between military action and maintenance of law and order on the military-strategic level of the operation hindered EUFOR's ability to adapt to a changing situation on the ground. This was especially the case as the border between these two types of operations is often blurred and the areas of responsibility less clearly defined in Chad and CAR. While EUFOR's long-range "nomadic" patrols, which were similar to policing efforts in Africa, were a step in the right direction, they were not

sufficient. Even as it became clear that EUFOR would be a stand-alone operation,¹³⁴ there was a reluctance to adapt strategies to the changing situation on the ground by allowing the military force to engage in law and order activities.¹³⁵

4. *Limited Mandate.* The fourth reason for the marginal impact on the crisis was EUFOR's limited mandate. The mandate authorized an isolated military force, with no adequate political measures to complement the military presence. Given that there was no peace to keep and no ongoing political reconciliation process, the root causes of the conflict were not addressed. The absence of a broader strategy hindered any possibility of a long-term effect on the situation on the ground. As mentioned earlier, this was one of the conditions for securing President Déby's approval of the force. This does not solve the serious problems of sending a force with an inadequate mandate.

5. *Short Duration.* The final reason for the force's underachievement was the short duration of the operation. As stated earlier, the limited timeframe was crucial for member states to sign on to the operation. With no solid timeline and clear exit strategy, no European member state would have been likely to come on board. On the other hand, given the particular circumstances of the operation – such as the lengthy and delayed deployment and the long rainy season – the actual time from when the force became fully operational (mid-September) to handover (mid-March) was very brief and thus did not lend itself to achievements on the ground.

Evaluation.

Overall, the above assessment has shown that Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA had a marginal impact on the crisis situation in eastern Chad and northeastern CAR. This does not necessarily mean that the operation was unsuccessful, however. Rather, depending on the definition of success different assessments can be reached.

If one chooses the narrow definition of success, the EU can claim that Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA has been successful – at least militarily. This evaluation would be based on the fact that Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA fulfilled its key objective of *contributing* to the establishment of a safe and secure environment in the AOO. This finding is perhaps unsatisfactory, as it appeared to be nearly impossible for this objective not to have been reached. It also appears to obscure the fact that the European forces only had a marginal effect on ground, or that the increased stability may have been due to factors outside the force – such as the drastic change in the balance of power on the ground in favor of the Government of Chad.

The broader definition of success, which includes the effect of the forces on the situation on the ground, is hence preferred as a method of evaluating the success of stability operations. If one uses this broader definition of success, the lack of impact on the ground casts doubt on the finding that Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA has been successful. Rather, several factors led to shortfalls that overall led to underachievement. It is worth noting, however, that the source of these shortcomings mostly falls within the political decision-making process prior to the launch of the operation. Most importantly, these shortcomings were the lack of

political willingness to engage in the political crisis in Chad, lack of political willingness to engage militarily for a longer period of time, and lack of political willingness to adequately resource the operation.

Against this background of preexisting shortfalls, Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA was almost destined, from the outset, to have a limited effect on the situation on the ground. Thus, the lack of impact on the crisis is less to be found in the implementation process, but in the process prior to the launch leading to inherent limitations in the operation, which limited the overall effect of the operation.

CHAPTER 2

LESSONS LEARNED AND FUTURE RELEVANCE

The previous chapter provided insights into the largest and most complex EU-led military operation in Africa. The aim of this chapter is to go a step further. As the EU is a relatively new security actor, it is still in the process of establishing the institutions and capabilities necessary to undertake complex military operations. Thus in many ways, EU military operations can be seen as a “laboratory” in the development of a Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).¹³⁶

As such, the lessons that can be drawn from Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA—as well as other operations—can give important insights into the state of CSDP. But also, by exposing various strengths and weaknesses they can give clues about the future trajectory of CSDP and its potential as a tool for developing Europe’s military capability.

This chapter is hence divided into two parts. The first part will consider the lessons that can be drawn from Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA. The second part is concerned with the way forward for CSDP.

LESSONS LEARNED

This section is divided into two subparts. First, lessons that can be drawn from the preparation phase of the operation; and second, lessons that can be drawn from the implementation phase of the operation.

Preparation.

Before launching the operation, three critical steps had to be undertaken: troops and enablers were generated (resourcing), an agreement on the common costs was taken (funding), and the military planning process took place (planning). In each, the operation offered several lessons.

Resourcing. The EU itself has no significant autonomous military capabilities and thus needs to rely on its member states to provide the needed troops and enablers.¹³⁷ Despite the relatively small scale of Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, the EU had difficulties finding sufficient resources to launch the operation. Member states would not pledge sufficient troops and enablers, and the force generation process dragged on, embarrassingly, for months. This undermined the credibility of the EU as a security actor. Several lessons can be drawn from this.

Political will is critical. While all EU member states voted in favor of the operation, few were willing to back their political support with significant military commitments. Few member states felt nonhumanitarian interests were at stake in eastern Chad/CAR; and hence, for most European states, EUFOR TCHAD/RCA was a “discretionary” operation.¹³⁸ Given competing claims for European forces from other operations, most states were reluctant to commit troops and equipment for this operation.¹³⁹ Of the 23 EU member states participating in the operation, only four contributed more than 100 troops.¹⁴⁰

As a result, the operation relied very heavily on France, which provided 53 percent of the troops in addition to the largest share of tactical airlift, both fixed and rotary-wing.¹⁴¹ France also became the lead nation in several fields, most notably becoming logistical

lead nation, which entailed heavily supporting and financially underwriting the deployment of other contingents.¹⁴² Though a similar problem exists within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in relation to the United States, the critical difference is that the EU lacks a member state that dwarfs others in terms of economic and military power. Thus, in the case of the EU—and hence CSDP—if one or more of the larger member states lack the political will to provide troops and enablers, the other large member state(s) need to provide a disproportionate national effort for the operation to be launched. As most EU operations so far, and in the foreseeable future, are likely to be seen as discretionary, this situation will not be exceptional. It underlines the importance for at least one large member state to heavily support and be politically willing to financially underwrite EU military operations.¹⁴³ As mentioned earlier, this is not without problems in the context of the EU. No EU member state has the resources to play the role the United States plays in NATO. In this case, the operation put extreme stress on France, making it a very costly endeavor.¹⁴⁴

Capability shortfalls continue to afflict even small-size military operations. The lack of political will was not the only cause of force-generation difficulties, however. European states' capability shortfalls in key areas also seriously affect the EU's ability to undertake operations. In addition to the well-known shortfalls in strategic airlift and deployable communication and information systems (CIS),¹⁴⁵ Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA underlined growing problems with deployable medical facilities and tactical airlift.

The lack of deployable medical facilities risks developing into a showstopper for future operations.¹⁴⁶ As most European countries have either significantly reduced or abolished their military hospitals and the

demand for deployable units has increased, important shortfalls surfaced. Additionally, medical standards have remained largely unchanged since the Cold War. Providing these standards of medical support in stability operations in remote locations is considerably more difficult than providing them on national territories, however. These high standards of medical support also strongly limit the possibilities of enlisting non-European providers to fill the gaps in European capabilities in that area. These and other limitations will be of even greater importance as the EU decides to undertake larger military operations.

As for tactical airlift, the operation underlined increasing shortfalls in both fixed and rotary-wing assets. European tactical air fleets are aging and have low serviceability rates due to the current operational tempo. Meanwhile, their replacement programs—such as the *Airbus* A400M and the NH-90—are plagued by considerable delays, which will create gaps in the near future.¹⁴⁷ This is especially concerning as Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA and others before it have underlined that outsourcing tactical airlift is far less feasible than outsourcing strategic airlift. An alternative, used in this case, is to rely on non-EU member states to provide lacking assets; this option has its limits, however.

Non-EU member states can reinforce some lacking capabilities, but the EU will largely need to carry its own weight. Given the challenges to generating troops and critical enablers from EU member states, France sought to help spread the burden and reinforce some lacking capabilities—such as critical enablers (e.g., rotary-wing assets)—by calling on non-EU member states.¹⁴⁸ While three non-EU member states decided to participate, the operation highlighted the limits of

such involvement. The process of involving non-EU contributors is long and cumbersome. As the participation of non-EU contributors is politically sensitive, it requires political agreement among the member states before discussions with the non-EU contributors can even begin.¹⁴⁹ Once they begin, a substantial amount of time is needed to draw up detailed and complicated technical agreements, which requires the participation of a large number of actors.¹⁵⁰ This process has to be successfully concluded before the non-EU contributors can have access to key documents of the operation—including the CONOPS and OPLAN. This long and cumbersome process is perhaps best highlighted by the case of the Russian participation. From the point of discussion on the EU political level to the participation of Russian troops the process lasted over a year, and the troops only made it to theater 3 months before the end of the operation.¹⁵¹ In sum, judging from Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, it appears unlikely that the EU could heavily rely on non-EU states in its operations in the near future. EU states will have to carry their own weight.

The EU Battlegroups (EUBGs), the EU's standing rapid reaction force, are unlikely to be used in their current form. As described in the previous chapter, there were lengthy debates about whether the proposed operation could be a "Battlegroup situation," meaning an opportunity to validate the EUBGs in practice—especially as the initial concept had envisioned them for bridging operations in Africa.¹⁵² Furthermore, the best-trained and equipped EUBG—the Nordic Battlegroup (NBG) led by Sweden—was on stand-by in the first half of 2008 when the operation was launched.¹⁵³ A showstopper, however, was the lack of political agreement in Stockholm and Brussels, which prevented the

use of the NBG in Chad/CAR.¹⁵⁴ This raised questions about the EUBG concept, especially as the nonuse of stand-by forces further limits the troops available for deployment for an operation—given the low overall number of deployable troops.¹⁵⁵

Funding. A closely related, but separate issue in the preparation phase is operational funding. As is the case in NATO, the primary funding mechanism for EU military operations is that nations absorb costs associated with their participation (“costs lie where they fall”). Exceptionally, some predetermined costs are commonly financed through a mechanism known as the Athena mechanism.¹⁵⁶ As EU operations are undertaken by a “coalition of the willing,” the Athena mechanism is an instrument that allows for a more equitable division of the financial burden. In the case of Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, the definition of common costs was particularly relevant as the costs for the operation were exceptionally high, given the remote location of the AOO, underdeveloped infrastructure, and the lack of host nation support. Though difficult to calculate, the total costs are estimated to have been as high as €1 billion (approx. \$1.5 billion U.S.).¹⁵⁷ Of these, the total common costs were only about €100 million (\$145 million).¹⁵⁸ With respect to financing, at least two lessons can be drawn from Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA.

Common funding will remain a contentious issue in the short-term.¹⁵⁹ Prior to the launch of the operation, France was especially keen on broadening the base for common funding. It was particularly interested in extending common costs to include strategic airlift, select enablers (mainly rotary-wing assets) and information acquisition (mainly air-to-ground sur-

veillance).¹⁶⁰ France's request was not unusual, as in some NATO operations these costs are commonly financed.¹⁶¹ However, prior to and during the operation, these attempts to broaden common costs failed. The other large EU member states were especially unwilling to bankroll the operation.¹⁶² Contributing states thus needed to cover the costs of their deployment and sustainment.¹⁶³ Subsequent efforts by the French EU presidency to extend funding for EU operations more generally were also largely unsuccessful.¹⁶⁴ Thus the EU definition of common costs will likely remain more restrictive than NATO's, at least in the near future.

Extending common funding is not a silver bullet. While it is often assumed that extending common funding would solve the participation gap, the nonuse of the EU NBG in Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA was particularly enlightening in this regard. The nonuse of the NBG was importantly linked to Germany and the UK's unwillingness to sign off on its deployment. While several factors certainly played into this position, their unwillingness was crucially linked to the extended common funding specifically granted to the Battlegroups in order to facilitate their use.¹⁶⁵ This would have meant an increased burden for the larger EU member states—especially Germany and the UK. In other words, extended funding, meant to facilitate the use of the Battlegroups, in fact made their use less likely.¹⁶⁶ There is reason to believe that extending common costs in operations would have a similar effect—that is decrease the likelihood of political support for an operation from EU member states that are unwilling to contribute. As unanimity is required to launch operations, the likelihood of blockage would increase.¹⁶⁷

Planning. A final critical aspect in the preparation phase is the military planning of an operation. In the absence of permanent structures, EU military operations have consistently experienced difficulties.¹⁶⁸ The question of a permanent EU Headquarters has, in fact, become the site of heated debates. Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA offers several lessons.

The absence of permanent planning capacity hinders the planning of EU military operations. In the absence of permanent planning structures, the planning of EU operations will continue to experience difficulties. These existed on a number of levels. The first set of challenges was related to the role and capacity of the EU Military Staff (EUMS). While the EUMS is meant to support the planning process in the predecision phase – by contributing to the Crisis Management Concept (CMC) and drafting the Military Strategic Options (MSO) – it has very limited capacity to undertake detailed military planning. Despite this limited capacity, however, the EUMS had to conduct detailed military planning, mainly due to the excessively slow build-up of the Operational Headquarters (OHQ).¹⁶⁹

A second related challenge was the activation of the OHQ. The EU has five national OHQs. Once a decision is made to launch an operation, a decision has to be made as to which one of these OHQs will be activated. That OHQ then has to be activated and “multinationalized” – a process, which has been lengthy in the past. While the OHQ was activated comparatively early in the planning process for operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, the late designation of the Operation Commander (OpCdr) limited the effect of the early activation.¹⁷⁰ Arriving nearly 1 1/2 months after the OHQ activation, the OpCdr was not familiar with the previous months of political and military

deliberations on the operation. Thus, while a skeleton CONOPS and OPLAN existed upon his arrival, the OpCdr requested additional time to familiarize himself with previous months of political and military deliberations. The buildup of the OHQ was also slowed by the lengthy process of multinationalization of the OHQ. National augmentees arrived late and were often unaware of CSDP concepts and procedures. As a result, it took 2 months to put together 90 percent of the OHQ staff.¹⁷¹ Two months later, the first to arrive had already been relieved, each being recalled by their national commands.¹⁷² In sum, the planning process lacked harmony and contributed to delays in launching the operation, which was mostly due to the lack of permanent planning arrangements.

The existing alternatives are limited. Two institutional alternatives to activating a national HQ exist, in theory. The operation underlined that neither the EU Operations Centre (EU OpsCentre) nor NATO's Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) are usable alternatives in practice.

The EU OpsCentre is meant to plan and run a particular operation when no national HQ is identified. The EU OpsCentre is not a standing, fully manned HQ, but can be fairly rapidly activated.¹⁷³ Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA underlined that, paradoxically, the very reason that ensures the EU OpsCentre's rapid activation—namely that it draws heavily on the EU Military Staff—is the reason it is unlikely to be used in an operation in its current configuration. Prior to the Chad/CAR operation, the Chairman of the EU Military Committee (EUMC) and the Director-General of the EUMC urged France not to seek an activation of the EU OpsCentre. The reason was simple: Given the strain the activation would have put on the EUMS, the

use of the EUOpsCenter for the operation was considered inconceivable.¹⁷⁴

The other available alternative, using NATO's SHAPE through the Berlin-Plus agreement, was not seriously considered for the operation in Chad/CAR. Aside from challenges arising from the Turkish-Cypriot dispute, the arrangement in its current configuration is largely perceived to be too cumbersome.¹⁷⁵ While the current arrangement appears to be workable in situations where the EU is taking over a NATO operation, such as Operation EUFOR ATHENA, additional coordination, though burdensome, is required. The same is not true for operations without current or previous NATO participation.

Implementation.

The successful implementation of the mission depended on several critical dimensions: the force needed to be deployed and sustained in theater (Logistics), put under the authority and directed by a properly designated commander (Command, Control and Communication [C3]), provided with situational awareness (Intelligence), and coordinate with civilian counterparts (Comprehensive Approach). Given the challenges of the operation, especially the inhospitable environmental conditions, several important lessons can be drawn.

Logistics.¹⁷⁶

As described earlier, EUFOR TCHAD/RCA tested the limits of European logistical capabilities. The key logistical challenge in the operation was to deploy and sustain forces in a very challenging environment with

poor transport infrastructure and lack of host-nation support.¹⁷⁷ Capturing the complexity of this task, the Chairman of the EUMC described the logistics for Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA as “an operation within an operation.”¹⁷⁸

As in NATO operations, logistical support to deployed troops and equipment remains a national responsibility. This created its own challenges in this operation as, aside from France, it was the first broad military experience in Africa for most of the participating European countries.¹⁷⁹ Several lessons can be drawn from the experience.

The importance, and limits, of a Logistical Lead Nation. Given the logistical challenges of the operation, the existence of a logistical lead nation in facilitating the deployment and sustainment of participating states was critical. France possessed unique capabilities that allowed it to assume the role of an effective logistical lead nation.¹⁸⁰ The combination of considerable operational experience in Africa and the presence of prepositioned forces in Chad (Operation EPERVIER) and in Central African Republic (Operation BOALI) allowed France to play this critical role. France supported the deployment of participating states, by putting readily available bases, hospitals, communication assets and means of transportation at the disposal of other participating countries. During the deployment phase, French Operation EPERVIER committed more than half of its 1,200 troops to facilitate EUFOR’s deployment.¹⁸¹ Similarly, France played a critical role in facilitating the sustainment of all forces during the operation. As the framework nation, France was responsible for several critical items and services,¹⁸² which eased some of the logistical burden and enabled the involvement of some of the participating states. The

function fulfilled by the logistical lead nation was so critical in this case that it is hard to conceive both deployment and sustainment absent France's role.

While the operation validated the concept of a logistical lead nation, it also posed important questions. It highlighted that the bar for assuming the role of lead nation is high. The lead nation has to be politically committed, not only to commit the largest force, but also willing to financially underwrite the operation.¹⁸³ Moreover, the lead nation needs to possess the adequate national competence to undertake this role. This limits the number of EU states that could play this very important role. Currently, aside from France, it is unlikely any other member state would be willing and able to assume this critical role.

The need for greater mutualization in logistics. In many ways, the cooperation, coordination, and logistical support between the different participating members was encouraging. From the beginning, there was an emphasis on coordination to achieve maximum efficiency by using multinational solutions for logistics. Moreover, during the operation, larger troop contributing countries supported smaller contingents. Thus, France provided full support to Slovenia and Albania, Poland to Croatia, and Ireland to the Netherlands.¹⁸⁴ Also, the readiness of mutual support between the countries in terms of airlift or use of national equipment by other nations had positive effects on cooperation.¹⁸⁵ Notwithstanding, the operation underlined the overall need for greater mutualization between the different troop contributing countries. This could at least partially be achieved by making increased use of already existing instruments, such as the Movement Coordination Centre Europe (MCCE).¹⁸⁶

The importance, and limits, of outsourcing logistics. As in previous EU military operations, outsourcing of logistics to private contractors played an important role in the operation.¹⁸⁷ In Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, major functions including catering services and camp management, but also strategic transport and intratheater lift were entrusted to private providers.¹⁸⁸ Thus, unsurprisingly, the costs of outsourcing amounted to a significant portion of the overall costs of the operation.¹⁸⁹ The outsourcing of strategic transport—both strategic airlift and strategic sealift—played a particularly important role in Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA.¹⁹⁰ Moreover, outsourcing also played a critical role in the overland transport through the Douala Corridor to N'Djamena.¹⁹¹ This allowed reducing the number of troops otherwise required for these tasks.

At the same time, however, Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA underlined that outsourcing is not a silver bullet in solving European logistics problems. First, outsourcing logistics is relatively expensive; it is questionable whether outsourcing logistics to private contractors is a way to save costs.¹⁹² Second, outsourcing logistics can limit flexibility and reduce responsiveness in case of unforeseen circumstances.¹⁹³ Third, outsourcing logistics is not always feasible. The operation underlined especially the limitations in outsourcing tactical lift to private contractors.

Command, Control, and Communications (C3). As in previous EU military operations, the command and control organization for Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA was complex, but unified. Figure 2 provides an overview of the command and control and coordination architecture of the operation.




Figure 2. Overview of Command and Control and Coordination Architecture.¹⁹⁴

The EU's Political and Security Committee (PSC) exercises the political control and provides the strategic direction for the military operation. At the military-political level, the Chairman of the Military Committee (CEUMC) is responsible for providing the PSC with military advice.¹⁹⁵ The headquarters at this level is the EU Military Staff. At the operational level, the OpCdr uses the OHQ and at the theater level, the Force Commander (FCdr) uses the Force Headquarters (FHQ).

Initially deployed under national command, EUFOR troops came under the authority of the EU when the EU formally assumed control of the operation. Thereafter, depending on their size, national contingents maintained their own internal command structure. Each contingent commander reported to the FCdr in the FHQ in Abéché,¹⁹⁶ who reported to the OpCdr in the OHQ in Paris. The OpCdr and his staff

at OHQ then made regular reports to the EU Military Committee and the Political and Security Committee in Brussels. Two lessons can however be learned from the conduct of the operation in terms of C3:

1. *Complex Command and Control Architecture.* Overall, the command and control structure, with the strategic decisionmaking centre in Brussels, the strategic command (OHQ) near Paris, France, and the operational command (FHQ) in Abéché, Chad, proved to be complex and unwieldy. This given, it appears to be preferable for the OHQ and FHQ command levels to be provided by the same member state.¹⁹⁷ This appeared to have allowed for better coordination between the strategic and operational command than in Operation EUFOR RD CONGO, where the OHQ and FHQ were held by two different nations (Germany and France, respectively).¹⁹⁸ Partially due to this, the critical OHQ-FHQ relationship was notably better in EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, which allowed the Force Commander to conduct his military mission without being micromanaged by a remote committee structure.

2. *The Difficulties of Establishing Communications in the Field.* In addition to the complexity growing out of the command and control architecture, the difficulties in establishing secure communication within the chain of command negatively affected efficient and effective command and control. Despite France's important role as the communications and information systems (CIS) lead nation, there was an initial lack of secure communications within the chain of command. While the communication links between the OHQ and FHQ worked well, the links between FHQ and the FOBs were limited during the first months of the operation, and thereby limited communications within the chain of command.¹⁹⁹ These challenges were only

overcome when France provided the technical assets needed to establish computers and phone connections to EUFOR's battalions to communicate with the FHQ. And though the lead nation model eventually seemed to work in this case, its usability for larger operations is questionable, given the limitations in CIS capacity already underlined in this operation.

The negative effects of caveats. The operation also underscored that, as in previous operations, national restrictions (caveats) negatively affect the Force Commander's ability to employ and use forces in theater.²⁰⁰ While the participating states agreed to common Rules of Engagement (ROE), all troop contributing states placed restrictions on the use of their forces. In the given operation, caveats differed, ranging from restrictions on deployment locations, to use of force.²⁰¹ While most of the caveats were disclosed when the forces were transferred to EUFOR control, the National Contingent Commanders (NCC) retained the authority to place additional restrictions on their employment. Both stated and unstated caveats, however, further complicated the task of employing and using forces in theater.²⁰²

Intelligence.²⁰³

The collection and analysis of intelligence is a critical factor in any military operation. At the same time, it also represents one of the most sensitive issues in multinational operations, and is known as an area where European shortfalls exist.²⁰⁴ As in previous operations, intelligence support consisted of three bodies: the organic intelligence assets of EUFOR Tchad/RCA, the national supporting arrangements with National Intelligence Liaison Officers (NILO) and National In-

telligence Cells (NICs), and intelligence support by the EU, mainly the EUMS and the EU Satellite Center (EUSC).²⁰⁵ Furthermore, the operation established intelligence liaison arrangements with other actors in the field.




Figure 3. Intelligence Architecture.²⁰⁶

Given the large AOO and the complex and volatile political situation, there was an important need for the operation to gain situational awareness. Thus, supporting the operation by developing and maintaining the best possible situational awareness was a key task for the intelligence community. This was required for both force protection reasons (e.g., understanding of potential military/security/criminal threats against EUFOR) and for EUFOR to fulfill its mandate. Several lessons in regards to intelligence can be drawn from the operation.

The need to provide an operation with adequate organic collection assets. The operation underlined that the EU member states continue to have difficulties providing the necessary intelligence collection assets to an operation. While the operation benefitted in terms of imagery intelligence (IMINT) from the availability of assets from French Operation EPERVIER (Mirage F1CR),²⁰⁷ EUFOR's organic collection IMINT assets were limited. This was partly related to the relatively low number and range of the available unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs).²⁰⁸ Even more limited was EUFOR's organic human intelligence (HUMINT) capability, as few HUMINT teams were provided. Finally, EUFOR had no permanent sensor with signal intelligence (SIGINT) capability. Requested assets, such as equipped maritime patrol aircraft (MPA), were not provided by the member states. Given the very few available organic collection assets, the provision of permanent intelligence support from the EU member states was critical for the operation, which was, however, not easy.²⁰⁹

The need for improved intelligence sharing. Despite the need for intelligence from EU member states, the operation highlighted the continued reluctance in intelligence sharing.²¹⁰ To smooth the process and encourage enhanced intelligence sharing, France, as intelligence framework nation, was responsible for coordination with the intelligence services of the participating states. Yet intelligence cooperation was challenging, especially at the operational level. As in previous operations, participating member states deployed NICs in theater, which remained under national command lines.²¹¹ NICs were meant to complement EUFOR's intelligence picture through national channels.²¹² The relationship was meant to be mutually beneficial, as

NICs needed information from EUFOR collection assets to provide national authorities with information.²¹³ Despite this, the cooperation between EUFOR and the NICs deployed in theater was difficult. As no formal arrangements for intelligence provision were provided, EUFOR needed to rely on the goodwill of NICs to share intelligence. A mutual reluctance to exchange information and/or intelligence, however, prevented effective cooperation. Thus, at the operational level, senior EUFOR officials considered the contributions of the NICs to the operation to be limited at best.²¹⁴

*The need to strengthen the EU Satellite Center (EUSC).*²¹⁵ In terms of cooperation with EU agencies, the cooperation with the EUSC was perceived to have worked well. The EUSC's involvement at an earlier stage than in previous operations and its access to French Helios II satellite imagery for the operation proved to be important steps forward. The EUSC was able to provide the operation with both satellite imagery, and, especially important in the early phase of the operation, accurate maps. At the same time, however, the operation also underlined that further improvements could increase the impact of the EUSC on EU military operations. The role of the EUSC in supporting operations was limited by the fact that it was, largely for technical reasons, only linked to the OHQ. Thus, while the OHQ could request satellite IMINT from the EUSC, the Force Headquarters could only benefit from the EUSC indirectly through the OHQ. Moreover, the operation also underlined the limited capacity of the EUSC. The EUSC mobilized about 60 percent of its capacity in support of Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA.²¹⁶ Given that the EU has set itself the goal to participate in simultaneously in two larger stability operations, the EUSC capacity appears too limited.

The need for cooperation with other actors on the ground. Finally, the operation underlined the importance of liaison and information exchange arrangements with IOs and NGOs in the field, given their knowledge of the situation on the ground. In this regard, EUFOR's Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) teams played a critical role for EUFOR. Shortfalls existed, however, in regards to liaison and information exchange arrangement with UNAMID, the UN force on the other side of the border in Darfur. Given the unwillingness of UNAMID to share information with EUFOR on an operational level,²¹⁷ EUFOR's understanding of the situation in Darfur was limited at best. Given the multiple links with the situation in Darfur, the lack of links between the two forces on the operational level was problematic.²¹⁸

Comprehensive Approach. Increasingly, military forces are required to coordinate with their civilian counterparts in the conduct of operations. The EU, which has both civilian and military instruments at its disposal, has recognized the importance of such a comprehensive approach in its operations. Despite this, however, the EU has had difficulty achieving a truly comprehensive approach in previous operations. Overall, Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA underlines that these challenges continue. More specifically, two lessons can be drawn from the operation in regards to the achievement of a comprehensive approach:

1. *Difficulties integrating different instruments in the field.* The Operation underlined that the EU continues to have difficulties integrating its different instruments in the field. While in the planning phase attempts were made to include a wider range of tools, including development tools, in the field integrating the multiple instruments proved difficult. While the

European Commission, through its funds (Instrument for Stability and the European Development Fund) supported the operation – most importantly providing €10 million for the deployment and training of Chadian special police units under the UN mission²¹⁹ – the integration of developmental and security policies, for example, remained largely elusive during the course of the operation.²²⁰ Cooperation between EUFOR and the European Commission (EC), responsible for the EU's development policy in Chad/CAR in the field, remained difficult.²²¹ The strained relationship in the field was at least partially an extension of the bureaucratic divide in Europe between those responsible for security and for developmental policy.²²² Beyond the bureaucratic divide, there also appears to be a greater conceptual divide in Europe. The tendency to maintain a clear division between developmental and security policies and thereby maintain the independence of developmental policy, remains a key objective for European development agencies both on an EU and national level.²²³

2. *The relationship with NGOs was difficult. Particularly in regards to cooperation in the field.* From the onset of the operation, the relationship between EUFOR and the NGOs was difficult. This partially reflected generally difficult relations between military and humanitarian organizations. While operating in the same context, most NGOs did not share the same perspective and, above all, used very different means. Many NGOs, in the humanitarian and other areas, were in fact often reluctant to work alongside EUFOR – even though some of these NGOs had requested military assistance to stabilize the situation. However, beyond these general challenges, the relationship between EUFOR and the NGOs was strained for other reasons.²²⁴

Though relations between EUFOR and the NGOs had improved significantly towards the end of the operation, which allowed the above mentioned information-sharing, many NGOs appear to have remained critical of EUFOR's overall achievements.²²⁵

THE WAY FORWARD

Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA has revealed numerous outstanding challenges and existing shortfalls in the EU and its members' ability to undertake difficult military operations. Many of these issues are not limited to EU-military operations, and often affect European participation in NATO operations as well. Yet, as the United States fills existing gaps in NATO operations, EU nations' actual challenges and shortfalls are masked.²²⁶ EU military operations, on the other hand, tend to expose these difficulties more forcefully.

By doing so, EU military operations have in fact played—and will continue to play—a very important role in the development of the CSDP. By stressing existing shortfalls, they offer the opportunity and justification for capability improvements.²²⁷ To many in the EU, military operations are seen primarily as a laboratory in which various aspects of CSDP are tested and subsequently improved. Indeed, this has been the *modus operandi* of the CSDP over the past 10 years, as CSDP has largely been driven by the EU's military operations.

By highlighting the challenges of expeditionary operations, Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA—like others before it—has provided many important learning opportunities for both EU institutions and EU member states. It has already served as a catalyst for capability improvements and initiatives in a number of

areas. These improvements have largely been achieved through strengthening existing institutional arrangements, pooling of resources, and harmonization of capabilities. Examples include efforts to strengthen the planning capacity of both the EU Council Secretariat (by establishing a Crisis Management Planning Directorate (CMPD) and the EU Military Staff. These improvements could prove important in future EU military operations – and help avoid some of the planning difficulties identified above.²²⁸

The operation also helped launch concrete schemes to improve existing capabilities, most importantly the establishment of the Franco-British helicopter initiative. The initiative, which aims at increasing the availability of helicopters for military operations, was born out of the lack of helicopters in previous operations – including Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA.²²⁹ By providing funding to upgrade existing helicopter fleets in select European countries, its aim is to increase their use in operations. The operation also had an impact on important pooling initiatives. By underlining the problems in tactical airlift the operation helped speed up the process of the establishment of the European Air Transport Command (EATC) in early 2010.²³⁰ As one of the most important recent pooling initiatives, the EATC will combine the fixed-wing transport fleets of four European countries (Germany, France, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands) under a single operational command in Eindhoven.²³¹

New initiatives are not always immediately successful, however. Thus, while the operation also led to a renewed debate on how to increase the usability of the EU stand-by force, the EUBGs,²³² and to the launch of several initiatives to reform the current common funding mechanism to improve its effectiveness,²³³

these two issues remain largely unresolved. At the same time however, the establishment of the EATC outlined above, whose origins date back over 10 years, is an example of how even incremental steps can lead over time to significant changes.²³⁴

The above examples all show how EU operations help lead to what the former Chief Executive of the European Defence Agency (EDA) called a “point of critical mass of impatience,” that is a point where European policymakers get together and start to seriously tackle outstanding issues.²³⁵ This is certainly no coincidence. As mentioned earlier, for many European officials the benchmark for success of EU military operations is how far these operations advance the European defense project and contribute to building institutions and capabilities for a militarily stronger Europe. Their impact on a crisis on the ground—especially if it does not affect important European interests—is often only secondary. These operations are thus seen as part and parcel of the larger European project, and they both contribute to and benefit from their integration in the larger EU edifice.

This view is clearly problematic in the assessment of the EU’s effectiveness in addressing given crises—in this case the crisis in Chad and CAR.²³⁶ It does, however, illustrate a mindset among European policy elites that serves as a critical driver for the transformation of Europe into an increasingly capable security actor.

The entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty in early 2010 should provide the CSDP with renewed momentum. As mentioned above, EU operations suffer from issues linked to political will, inadequate institutional arrangements, and capability shortfalls. By opening new institutional avenues for increased defense coop-

eration (in the framework of the Permanent Structure Cooperation) and establishing a European diplomatic service (known as External Action Service) the Lisbon Treaty could help address some of the problems identified earlier.²³⁷ Whether or not improvements actually materialize will remain to be seen; but the potential for transformation exists.

CHAPTER 3

IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY

The demilitarization of Europe—where large swaths of the general public and political class are averse to military force and the risks that go with it—has gone from a blessing in the 20th century to an impediment to achieving real security and lasting peace in the 21st.”²³⁸

Robert M. Gates,
U.S. Secretary of Defense

For the past half century, U.S. policy has been largely supportive of a more cohesive Europe that could effectively act as America’s partner on the European continent and beyond.²³⁹ Yet, since Europeans moved to establish an increasingly “common” security and defense policy, U.S. policy has become more ambivalent. On the one hand, U.S. policy is often supportive, and, on the other, a more skeptical to outright hostile attitude towards the CSDP has existed in parallel. The sources of this ambivalence towards CSDP at least partially reflect remaining sentiments of nostalgia about the transatlantic relationship in the Cold War.

The ambivalence has also translated into lack of coherence and consistency in U.S. policy towards the CSDP. This inconsistency comes at an increasingly high price, however. The changes in the post- 9/11 security environment create a greater need for allies to address existing security challenges and place a greater importance on U.S. cooperation with its allies, most importantly its most capable allies in Europe. It is against this background that U.S. policymakers

need to reevaluate the current U.S. policy towards the EU's CSDP, and develop a much-needed coherent and consistent long-term strategy vis-à-vis its European allies, in line with today's U.S. interests.

POLICY OPTIONS

Broadly speaking, the United States has three options in responding to the EU's Common Security and Defense Policy:

1. Opposing the CSDP
2. Neutral Stance
3. Embracing the CSDP.

The three options are distinct and reflect different rationales and assumptions.

Option 1: Opposing the CSDP.

This strategy would entail a policy that aims to weaken the CSDP. The strategy's objective would be to attempt to hinder and/or prevent the EU's CSDP from succeeding. Behind this option is the assumption that a militarily strong Europe would be harmful to U.S. national interests. In the best case, the CSDP is seen as a distraction from serious security challenges, in the worst case as a sinister effort to counter U.S. influence in Europe.²⁴⁰

Option 2: Neutral Stance towards the CSDP.

This strategy would entail a policy that adopts a less activist stance towards the CSDP and takes a "wait and see" attitude. The strategy's objective would be neither to weaken nor to strengthen the CSDP. The

rationale behind this choice would be the assumption that whether or not the EU becomes a capable security actor is of limited importance to the United States. Thus, rather than spending political capital on either opposing or supporting the EU aspirations, the United States should merely be a bystander in the process and react to the outcomes.

Option 3: Embracing the CSDP.

This option entails a policy that aims to cultivate a stronger CSDP. The strategy's objective would be to actively engage with and try to strengthen the current development of a common European security and defense policy. The assumption behind this choice is that a militarily capable EU is commensurate with U.S. interests. Moreover, the value-added by a more capable Europe would balance the potential loss of U.S. dominance over European security policy.

Analysis.

In evaluating these three options, two questions are key: (1) Is a militarily strong Europe in the U.S. national interest? and (2) Does the CSDP have the potential to strengthen Europe militarily?

The strategies of opposition and the neutral stance either assume that a militarily strong Europe is not in the U.S. national interest and/or that even if it were, the CSDP's ability to strengthen Europe militarily is limited. The strategy of support is underpinned by the assumptions that a militarily strong Europe is in the U.S. national interest and, importantly, that the CSDP is a vehicle that can deliver the much-needed capability.

Is a militarily strong Europe in the U.S. national interest? The answer to this question is perhaps more evident if the question is formulated slightly differently, namely: Is a militarily *weak* Europe in the U.S. national interest? On this question, a wide consensus emerges. Both policymakers and wider policy/academic circles largely agree that a militarily weak Europe would be detrimental to U.S. national interests. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates recently explained it eloquently: “The demilitarization of Europe . . . has gone from a blessing in the 20th century to an impediment to achieving real security and lasting peace in the 21st.”²⁴¹

Underlying this view is an important assumption. Namely, that basic American and European values and interests have not diverged — not at the end of the Cold War, and not after 9/11.²⁴² Today, Europe finds itself confronted with the same threats arising from the new security environment. For Europe, as for the United States, weak, failing, or failed states will constitute the major security challenge in the near future.²⁴³ This new security environment places great emphasis on stability operations, for which many European forces are well-suited.²⁴⁴

Hence, a Europe that is able and willing to take on more responsibility for managing crises, with less reliance on the United States, would be an asset to U.S. foreign policy. It would allow Europeans to tackle security problems where and when the United States cannot or would rather not get involved. This would reduce American burdens in Europe and make Europe a better and more capable partner.²⁴⁵ At the same time, fears that Europe could turn into a superpower competitor to the United States are unfounded. Europe has neither the resources nor the appetite to become a superpower.

In sum, there appears to be wide agreement that the development of a militarily strong Europe is in the U.S. national interest. This finding puts into question some of the assumptions of the first two policy options, namely that a militarily stronger Europe is either not in the U.S. interest or does not affect U.S. interests. On the other hand, it puts stronger emphasis on the question of how Europe can become militarily stronger and whether the CSDP is the right vehicle for it.

Can the EU deliver? The second question is whether the EU's CSDP can be a vehicle that delivers a militarily strong Europe. Given the recognized lack of progress NATO has achieved in respect to capability improvements, skepticism appears well placed. At the same time however, there are several reasons to believe that the EU has the potential to deliver both the political will and the military capability to facilitate, through the CSDP, the development of a militarily stronger and more proactive Europe.

First, as highlighted in the previous chapter, the CSDP has a remarkable track record. In a relatively brief period of time, through the CSDP, the EU built both the political support and the necessary institutions (EUMS, EUMC, EUSC, EDA) to conduct increasingly challenging military operations far beyond Europe's borders.

Second, the EU label appears to mobilize Europeans to spend money on boosting military capabilities in a way that NATO could not.²⁴⁶ The CSDP is widely seen as a critical element in Europe's aspiration of building an ever closer union; it is hence seen as part of the larger European edifice. In addition to the broad political support for the project, the CSDP also emphasizes the development of expeditionary capability,

not at least because the territorial defense of Europe remains the undisputed key function of NATO.²⁴⁷ In regard to its expeditionary goals, the EU has recently specified its headline goal. Over the next years, the EU set itself the ambition to be able to plan and conduct two major stabilization operations of up 10,000 troops simultaneously.²⁴⁸ The significance of this ambition lays in the fact that it is born out of a European initiative, rather than dictated by Washington. As such, it may be easier for European nations to receive domestic support for the necessary defense budgets if the assets are billed for the EU headline goal as opposed to NATO's force goals.²⁴⁹

Third, the opportunities to free ride are more limited in the EU. A more equitable distribution of economic and military power among the EU's larger member states limits the possibility for one state to bear a disproportionate share of the burden.²⁵⁰ The result is greater peer pressure for a more equitable share in the CSDP. This is especially true as the EU member states cooperate on a wide range of policy areas, where they require each other's support. The more equitable power distribution also creates the impetus for pooling schemes that would maximize resources and produce the needed capabilities.

While the abovementioned reasons suggest that the EU's CSDP could strengthen Europe militarily, it remains to be seen if it can live up to its potential. Even if it does, the progress is, in the absence of a major crisis in Europe's immediate periphery, likely going to be slow. It would thus require the United States to show an unprecedented level of patience.²⁵¹

At the same time, however, the CSDP's potential should be seen against the background that current U.S. efforts in European capability improvement are

largely stagnant. Despite enormous U.S. political efforts, most European states have still not fully subscribed to the U.S.-led reform process in the post-Cold War era. Thus, any institution facilitating greater reform efforts—possibly due to a stronger sense of European ownership of the process—offers at least the possibility of improvement of the current situation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above assessment, this monograph recommends the third option: embracing the EU's CSDP. This recommendation is based on the following key findings:

- The new security environment increasingly requires cooperation between allies to address emerging security threats;
- A militarily stronger Europe that carries a greater share of global responsibility is an important asset for U.S. foreign policy;
- The EU's CSDP has the potential to deliver the political will needed for a militarily more proactive Europe;
- The CSDP may thus be critical to overcoming the EU's recognized stagnation in capability improvements and mobilizing serious European capabilities development.

Practical Steps.

To be successful, practical steps that entail shifts in U.S. thinking as well as organization are required. First, establish the necessary capacities to strengthen the U.S. understanding of the EU's CSDP, to overcome existing blind spots, and to gain a deeper understand-

ing of the CSDP. This may require organizational changes in U.S. embassies in Europe, as well as U.S. Missions to NATO and the EU—to better identify, track, and decide whether and how to seek to influence the CSDP.²⁵²

Second, encourage European members to focus on increasing their defense budgets. Moreover, emphasize the need for more efficient defense spending in Europe through cooperation and pooling of assets. Concretely, this could be undertaken by improving the relationship between the NATO and the EDA.

Third, emphasize European responsibility for crises occurring on Europe's periphery. This would encourage a sense of ownership of the crisis response and help Europeans undertake the critical steps needed to address existing capability shortfalls.

Fourth, seek to improve the relationship between NATO and the EU. At the same time accept that Europe needs to have the necessary structures to act autonomously, including a limited permanent planning capacity outside NATO.

Fifth, support the development of a common U.S.-EU framework, including doctrine and training, for stability operations. This would allow for increased, but less ad-hoc, coordination between the United States and the EU in the field, and encourage a sharing of lessons learned.

ENDNOTES

1. For a recent and detailed discussion of this new security environment and its requirements, see Roy Godson and Richard Shultz, *Adapting America's Security Paradigm and Security Agenda*, Washington, DC: National Strategy Information Center, 2010.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Europe's true military prowess is, however, disguised by its reluctance to fund or deploy military force on the scale the United States does, which has given European militaries a bad reputation. See Andrew Moravcsik, "Europe: Quietly Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World," in Alan S. Alexandroff and Andrew Fenton Cooper, eds., *Rising States, Rising Institutions: The Challenge of Global Governance*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010.

4. *Ibid.* See also Bastian Giegerich and William Wallace, "Not Such a Soft Power: the External Deployment of European Forces," *Survival*, Vol. 46, No. 2, 2004.

5. Based on figures provided by the *Military Balance* in the year 2008. Europe (EU member states only) spent in 2008 according to the *Military Balance* an estimated total of \$300,554M. In comparison, the *Military Balance* estimates that China spent \$60,187M; Russia spent \$40,484M; India spent \$31,540M; Brazil spent \$26,254M—or combined a total of \$158,465M. See *The Military Balance 2010*, London, UK: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2010.

6. With the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty, the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) became known as the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). To avoid confusion, the following monograph will use new Lisbon terminology and refer to the CSDP.

7. Thus far, the EU has undertaken six military operations: Operation CONCORDIA (former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 2003); Operation ARTEMIS (Congo, 2003); Operation EUFOR

ATHENA (Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2004-ongoing); Operation EUFOR RD CONGO (Congo, 2006); Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA (Chad and Central African Republic 2008-09), and Operation ATALANTA (East Africa, 2009-ongoing).

8. According to the report, there is currently only one person at the U.S. Mission to the EU assigned to work with Europeans on defense cooperation via the EU. See Daniel S. Hamilton, ed., *Shoulder to Shoulder: Forging a Strategic U.S.-EU Partnership*, Washington, DC: Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, 2010, p. 63.

9. There is a rich literature on the institutional evolution of the CSDP. One such excellent overview is provided by Jolyon Howorth, *Security and Defence Policy in the European Union*, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

10. For example, see Giovanni Grevi and Daniel Keohane, "Military Resources for ESDP," in Giovanni Grevi et al., eds., *European Security and Defence Policy: The First 10 Years (1999-2009)*, Paris, France: EU Institute for Security Studies 2009, pp. 71-89; *European Military Capabilities: Building Armed Forces for Modern Operations*, London, UK: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2008; Daniel C. Keohane and Tomáš Valášek, *Willing and Able?* London, UK: Centre for European Reform, 2008; Hans-Christian Hagman, *European Crisis Management and Defence: The Search for Capabilities*, Adelphi Papers, No. 353, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2002.

11. Over the past years, there has been an increasing interest in providing analysis of EU-led military operations in Africa. Some of the works include: On Operation Artemis: Ståle Ulriksen et al., "Operation ARTEMIS: The Shape of Things to Come?" *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 11, No. 3, September 2004, pp. 508-525; Paul Cornish, "ARTEMIS and CORAL British Perspectives on European Union Crisis Management Operations in the Democratic Republic of Congo," Unpublished Paper, July 28, 2003; Niagalé Bagayoko, "L'opération Artémis, un tournant pour la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense?" ("Operation ARTEMIS, A Turning Point for the European Security and Defence?"), *Afrique contemporaine*, Vol. 2, No. 2004, pp. 101-116; Bruno Neveux, "Vers une Union opérationnelle? ARTEMIS" ("Towards an EU Opera-

tional? ARTEMIS”), *Defense nationale*, Vol. 60, No. 2004, pp. 11-24; Sébastien Loisel, “Les leçons d’Artémis: vers une approche européenne de la gestion militaire des crises” (“The lessons of Artemis: Towards a European Military Crisis Management”), *Les Champs de Mars*, No. 16, 2004, pp. 69-92; Fred Tanner, “Operation Artemis – Richtungsmodell zukünftiger EU-Friedenseinsätze?” (“Operation Artemis – The Direction of Future Model of EU Peacekeeping Missions?”), *Allgemeine schweizerische Militärzeitschrift*, Vol. 170, No. 2, 2004; Fernanda Faria, *Crisis Management in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Role of the European Union*, Occasional Papers No. 51, Paris, France: EU Institute for Security Studies, 2004; Kees Homan, “Operation Artemis in the Democratic Republic of Congo” in Andrea Ricci and Eero Kytömaa, eds., *Faster and More United? The Debate about Europe’s Crisis Response Capacity*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2006; James Dobbins, *Europe’s Role in Nation-Building: From the Balkans to the Congo*, Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008; François Grignon, “The Artemis Operation in the Democratic Republic of Congo: Lessons for the Future of EU Peacekeeping in Africa,” presentation at The Challenges of Europe-Africa Relations: An Agenda for Priorities, Lisbon, Portugal, 2003; Marta Martinelli, “Implementing the ESDP in Africa: The Case of the Democratic Republic of Congo,” in Michael Merlingen and Rasa Ostrauskaite, ed., *European Security and Defence Policy: An Implementation Perspective*, London, UK, and New York: Routledge, 2008. On Operation EUFOR RD CONGO: Helmut Fritsch, *EUFOR RD Congo: A Misunderstood Operation?* Martello Papers No. 33, Kingston, Ontario, Canada: Centre for International Relations, Queen’s University, 2008; European Union Operation Headquarters Potsdam, *Operation EUFOR RD CONGO*, Potsdam, Germany, 2007; Hans-Georg Ehrhart, “EUFOR RD Congo: A Preliminary Assessment,” *European Security Review*, No. 32, March 2007; Claudia Major, “EUFOR RD Congo” in Grevi et al., pp. 311-323; Denis M. Tull, “EUFOR RD Congo: A Success, But Not a Model,” in Muriel Asseburg and Ronja Kempin, eds., *The EU as a Strategic Actor in the Realm of Security and Defence? A Systematic Assessment of ESDP Missions and Operations*, Berlin, Germany: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2009; Alexander Mattelaer, “EUFOR RDC and the Development of the ESDP,” *Studia Diplomatica*, Vol. 60, No. 3, 2007, pp. 73-89; Marta Martinelli, “Implementing the ESDP in Africa: The Case of the Democratic Republic of Congo,” in Michael Merlingen and Rasa Ostrauskaite, ed., *European Security and Defence Policy: An Implementation Perspective*, London, UK, and New York: Routledge, 2008.

12. For example, see Grevi *et al.*; Muriel Asseburg and Ronja Kempin, eds., *The EU as a Strategic Actor in the Realm of Security and Defence? A Systematic Assessment of ESDP Missions and Operations*, Berlin, Germany: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2009; James Dobbins, *Europe's Role in Nation-Building: From the Balkans to the Congo*, Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008.

13. Today, it is common for units as small as battalions to operate together under an integrated command structure. For more on this point, see Anthony King, "Towards a Transnational Europe: The Case of the Armed Forces," *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol 8, Issue 3, p. 328.

14. For an overview of the participating states, see Appendix 3.

15. The EU releases only limited information on their operations. In addition to the EU website on the operation, information is available from www.consilium.europa.eu/eufor-tchad-rca. Further, if limited, information can be found in European Union Operation Headquarters Mont-Valérien, *Operation EUFOR Tchad/RCA*, Mont-Valérien, France, 2009. (Hereafter EU OHQ Mont-Valérien.)

16. See Anand Menon, "Empowering Paradise? The ESDP at Ten," *International Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 2, 2009, p. 228. A remarkable expectation is Lieutenant Colonel Fritsch's case study on Operation EUFOR RD CONGO. See Helmut Fritsch, *EUFOR RD Congo: A Misunderstood Operation?* Martello Papers No. 33, Kingston, Ontario, Canada: Centre for International Relations, Queen's University, 2008.

17. Individual interviews were conducted with, among many others, Director-General EU Military Staff (EUMS) Lieutenant-General David Leakey (UK), EUFOR's Operation Commander Lieutenant-General Patrick Nash (Ireland), and Force Commander Brigadier-General Jean-Philippe Ganascia (France).

18. It is important to emphasize that the origins for the operation lay earlier than mid-2007 when the EU started discussing a possible involvement. Many aspects of the operation were, in fact, determined by the situation on the ground in mid-2006, including the general contours of the military concept of the operation.

19. The mission was headed by British Ambassador Emrys Jones Parry. See Jones Parry, "Taking Stock, Looking Forward," *E-Sharp Magazine*, January 29, 2009.

20. France undertook several interministerial fact-finding missions in mid-2006 to gain a better understanding of the situation in Sudanese refugee and Chadian internally displaced persons (IDPs) camps.

21. UN Security Council Resolution 1706, S/RES/1706, August 31, 2006.

22. While the monitoring mission would merely observe the situation in the border area, the monitoring/protection mission would additionally attempt to protect civilians in Chad/CAR from imminent threat. See Report of the Secretary-General on Chad and the Central African Republic pursuant to paragraphs 9 (d) and 13 of Security Council resolution 1706 (2006), December 22, 2006.

23. *Ibid.*

24. *Ibid.* One concern was the difficult terrain and extreme weather conditions, which would require heavy reliance on air transport.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 84.

26. Interviews conducted by the author with French Defense Ministry (MOD) officials, November 2008 and October 2009.

27. The reason for this interest was at least twofold. First, President Nicolas Sarkozy had promised in his campaign to do something about Darfur (as did his rival candidate, Ségolène Royal). At the same time, doing something about human suffering in Darfur promised political gains both domestically and internationally. For a more detailed analysis, see Roland Marchal, "Understand French Policy Towards Sudan/Chad? A Difficult Task," *Making Sense of Darfur Blog*, June 4, 2009.

28. *Ibid.*

29. Interviews conducted by the author with French MoD officials, November 2008 and October 2009.

30. The idea of focusing efforts on Chad, and to a lesser extent on CAR, was, however, not uncontroversial within the French government.

31. The military French Operation EPERVIER is based on the Cooperation Agreement of 1976 and Additional Protocols of 1990 and 1998. The agreement entails France to provide the Chadian Army with training, medical assistance, logistics (airlift and fuel), and intelligence (mainly imagery intelligence). See Jérôme Tubiana, *The Chad-Sudan Proxy War and the 'Darfurization' of Chad: Myths and Reality*, Geneva, Switzerland: Small Arms Survey, Graduate Institute of International Studies, 2008, p. 55.

32. The French, in fact, promised President Déby that the European force would be equivalent to Operation EPERVIER *Plus*.

33. Interviews conducted by the author with French Ministry of Defense (MoD) officials, November 2008 and October 2009.

34. UN Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Jean-Marie Guéhenno was especially skeptical. For one, the UN was already struggling with several highly complex operations, including UNAMID in Darfur, and there was little interest in embarking on yet another one. This became an important issue as it was clear that the European force would only stay for a limited period and then hand the mission over to the UN. Under-Secretary-General Guéhenno also saw particular difficulties with the conditions the Chadians wanted to impose – e.g., no political mandate to the mission. To many, undertaking such an operation seemed like a step back to the pre-Brahimi report era. Moreover and among other things, the soundness of the concept for the police element was questioned by Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) officials. Interviews conducted by the author with UN officials, November 2009.

35. See *European Union Operational Chains of Command*, Paris, France: Defence Committee, West European Union (WEU) Assembly, 2008, p. 10.

36. Some fears were related to lack of understanding of the region as for most European countries Chad and CAR were literally a “black hole,” and they thus had to rely heavily on French analysis without the ability to independently confirm it because most European countries do not have an embassy in Chad. At the same time, it was understood that the infrastructure upgrades required – especially the airports N’Djamena and Abéché – would at least partially be beneficial to France.

37. See “Colonial Baggage,” *The Economist*, February 9, 2008. The fear appears at times not far fetched. See Antoine Sadoux, “La PESD: un moyen d’assurer la position de la France en Afrique?” (“The ESDP: A Means to Secure the Position of France in Africa?”), *Defense nationale*, Vol. 61, No. 10, 2005, p. 67.

38. Minister Kouchner placed his special advisor for crises and conflicts and confidant, Eric Chevallier, in charge of the EUFOR portfolio, thus signaling the importance of the issue. See also *La Lettre du Continent*, “Sarkozy-Déby, qui tient qui?” (“Deby-Sarkozy, Who is Who?”), November 8, 2007; *La Lettre du Continent*, “Les risques politiques de l’opération Eufor” (“The Political Risks of Operation EUFOR”), November 22, 2007; Hugué Vincent, “L’Eufor a des faiblesses” (“EUFOR has Weaknesses”), *L’Express*, October 2, 2008.

39. This mission was led by the Director-General of the EUMS Lieutenant-General David Leakey. France had by then selected a force commander, Brigadier General Jean-Philippe Ganascia, who participated in the mission to Chad.

40. The following section is based on interviews not for attribution between January 2008 and October 2009, with persons who were involved with/in Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA and had direct knowledge of planning and/or conduct of the operation.

41. The German government remained especially skeptical, a view which was largely echoed by Germany’s security community. See Denis M. Tull, “The Chad Crisis and Operation EUFOR Chad/CAR,” *SWP Comments*, Vol. No. 2008; Kathrin Brockmann and Daniel Göler, “Europäische Streitkräfte im Treibsand: Ein zweifelhafter ‘europäischer’ Einsatz im Tschad und in der

Zentralafrikanischen Republik" ("European Forces in Quicksand: A Dubious 'European' Operations in Chad and the Central African Republic"), *DGAP Standpunkt*, Vol. No. 7, May 2008.

42. EU Military Staff, "EU Concept for Military Planning at the Political and Strategic Level," Brussels, Belgium, 10687/08, June 16, 2008.

43. For a more detailed description of the EU's military planning process, see Council of the European Union, *EU Concept for Military Planning at the Political and Strategic level*, doc. 110687/08, dated June 16, 2008. See also Annika Björkdahl and Maria Ström-vik, *EU Crisis Management Operations: ESDP Bodies and Decision-making Procedures*, Copenhagen, Denmark: Institute for International Studies, 2008. More specifically, see Alexander Mattelaer, *The Strategic Planning of EU Military Operations – The Case of EU-FOR Tchad/RCA*, Working Paper, No. 5, Brussels, Belgium: Institute for European Studies, 2008.

44. For example, in Operation CONCORDIA, there was neither a Military Strategic Option Directive (MSOD), nor a Military Strategic Option (MSO) nor a Concept of Operations (CONOPS). In Operation ARTEMIS, only a Crisis Management Concept (CMC) and the Operation Plan (OPLAN) were developed. In Operation EUFOR RD Congo, an Option Paper following a fact-finding mission replaced the Crisis Management Concept (CMC), and no MSOs were developed. See EU OHQ Potsdam, Operation EUFOR CONGO RD, Potsdam, Germany, 2007.

45. For a more comprehensive discussion and detailed description, see Mattelaer; and Hylke Dijkstra, "Military Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA," Unpublished, Maastricht, The Netherlands, 2009.

46. The Political and Security Committee (PSC) is the EU's equivalent to the North Atlantic Council (NAC) comprised of senior Ambassadors. For a brief overview of the relevant institutional actors of European Security, see Nicolas Gros-Verheyde, "The structures of Europe of Defence," *Europolitics*, No. 3630, November 3, 2008.

47. For a discussion of the reasons for the disagreement, see Mattelaer.

48. See Luis Simón, *Planning for EU Military Operations*, Occasional Papers, No. 81, Paris, France: EU Institute for Security Studies, 2010, p. 36.

49. Informally, however, the EUMS had already begun developing military options, while negotiations on the CMC were still ongoing. See Mattelaer, p. 16.

50. *Ibid.*

51. The European Union Military Committee (EUMC) is the supreme military body of the EU, and the equivalent of the NATO Military Committee (MC). The EUMC is composed of the Chiefs of Defence (CHOD), represented by their military representatives (Milreps). The chair of the EUMC must be a four-star officer, while the other committee members who represent the CHODs should hold the rank of a three-star General/Admiral.

52. For example, see Mai'a K. Davis Cross, *Cooperation by Committee: The EU Military Committee and the Committee for Civilian Crisis Management*, Occasional Papers, No. 82, Paris, France: EU Institute for Security Studies, 2010, p. 22.

53. Mattelaer, p. 16.

54. In absence of a permanent Headquarters, five EU member states have volunteered in setting up national HQ's, which can function as EU OHQ; Britain: Permanent Joint Headquarters (PJHQ); France: *Centre de Planification et de Conduite des Opérations* (CPCO); Germany: *Einsatzführungskommando* (EFK); Italy: *Comando Operativo di vertice Interforze* (COI); and Greece's OHQ in Larissa. For more detailed explanation, see WEU Assembly, *European Union Operational Chains of Command*, Paris, France: Defence Committee, WEU Assembly, 2008.

55. EU OpsCentre is also not a standing, fully manned HQ, but it can be more rapidly activated. It is located within the EU Military Staff, and consists of a permanent key nucleus consisting of about 10 personnel and is reinforced by earmarked officers from

the EUMS. See WEU Assembly, *European Union Operational Chains of Command*, Paris, France: Defence Committee, WEU Assembly, 2008, p. 9. In practice this means that activating the EU OpsCentre puts a considerable strain on the EUMS. During a command post exercise in 2007 (MILEX 07), the EU OpsCenter was manned by 32 members of the EUMS and augmented by 44 officers from EU member states. See Nicholas Fiorenza, "EU Activates Operations Centre for the First Time during MILEX Exercise," *Jane's Defence Weekly*, June 15, 2007.

56. According to the former French Military Representative to the EU, Vice Admiral Jean-Pierre Tiffou, prior to the Chad operation, the Chairman of the EUMC and the Director-General of the EUMS urged France not to ask for the operations center to be activated. Given the strain the activation would have meant on the EUMS, the use of the EU OpsCenter for the operation was considered inconceivable. Vice Admiral Jean-Pierre Tiffou, former French Military Representative to the EU, interview by author, Paris, October 12, 2009. See also Jean-Pierre Tiffou, "Le merveilleux destin de la Politique de sécurité et de défense commune" ("The Destiny of Security Policy and Defence Policy"), *Défense nationale et sécurité collective*, No. 7, 2008.

57. See *The European Union Mission in Chad: EUFOR Tchad/RCA*, Paris, France: Defence Committee, WEU Assembly, 2008, p. 13.

58. *Ibid.*

59. On the neutrality, see also Damien Helly, "The EU Military Operation in the Republic of Chad and in the Central African Republic," in Grevi, *et al.*, p. 341.

60. Mattelaer, p. 23.

61. The SOR also called for 20 helicopters: six light reconnaissance helicopters; six medium utility helicopters; three heavy utility helicopters; and three MEDEVAC helicopters. See Patrick Nash, "Operational Needs, Current Situation, Lessons Learned," presentation at EDA Helicopters Conference, European Defence Agency, Brussels, Belgium, March 2009.

62. For a more detailed description of the EU's force generation procedures, see Council of the European Union, *EU Concept for Force Generation*, doc. 10690/08, dated June 16, 2008.

63. Previous force-generation requests had already underlined little commitment by European countries.

64. The same also applies for NATO. See David M. Toczec, "Knowing the Rules: Planning Considerations for NATO Operations," *Military Review*, Vol. 86, No. 1, 2006, p. 62.

65. See *Europolitics*, "EU/Chad: Concept Approved, Generation of Forces Begins," November 13, 2007.

66. See Brooks Tigner, "EU Identifies Capability Gaps for Chad, CAR," *International Defence Review*, December 1, 2007.

67. Germany—and especially the German MoD—was very skeptical about the French proposal from the very beginning. However, for political reasons, Berlin agreed to provide political support for the operation—essentially agreeing not to veto it—but stressed that it would not contribute any troops and/or equipment. While the UK—in the form of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)—had been very supportive of the idea of an international force for Chad and CAR, there was little willingness on behalf of the UK's MoD to provide any troops and/or equipment, not in the least because of the heavy engagement in Iraq and Afghanistan. Interviews conducted by the author with German and UK MOD officials, April and October 2008.

68. See *Europolitics*, "EUFOR/Chad: Paris Turns to Russia for Help," December 11, 2007; "Russland verspricht Hubschrauber für Tschad-Einsatz" ("Russia Promises Helicopter for Chad Operation"), *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, January 12, 2008.

69. Without these additional French contributions, the operation may indeed not have been launched. Given France's insistence on undertaking the operation, most countries expected France to "do the heavy lifting."

70. The decision was not uncontroversial within France as it also meant that the costs of the French participation would

substantially increase as well as put further strain on an already stretched-thin French helicopter fleet. Interviews conducted by the author with French MoD officials, November 2008 and October 2009.

71. Romania, for example, had pledged to contribute one company. Over the course of the operation, it became clear that for mainly domestic political reasons, Romania would not send the pledged troops. See for example "EUFOR Chad: Romania Hesitant," *Europolitics*, February 14, 2008.

72. EU OHQ Mont-Valérien.

73. See "Battle for N'Djamena," *Africa Research Bulletin: Political, Social and Cultural Series*, Vol. 45, No. 1, January 2008.

74. Key battles took place on the main road to N'Djamena in Massakory and Massaguet. For more analysis, see "Déby—Caught between Paris and Khartoum," *Africa Confidential*, Vol. 49 No. 4, February 2008, pp. 6-7.

75. See "Déby Hangs On," *Africa Confidential*, Vol. 47, No. 9, April 2006; "Rebels Knock on Chad's Palace Door," *Jane's Intelligence Weekly*, April 25, 2006.

76. France launched in response to the rebel attack, a non-combatant evacuation operation (NEO). The operation, known as Operation CHARI BAGUIRMI, was conducted by the 21eme Régiment d'Infanterie de Marine, (21st Marine Infantry Regiment, RIMa) and evacuated 1753 persons (577 French nationals). See Xavier Collignon, "Operation CHARI BAGUIRMI," *Doctrine*, Vol. No. 16, September 2009, pp. 56-57. Operation CHARI BAGUIRMI was also the first application of the lead-state in crisis concept for consular action adopted by the EU Council on June 18, 2007. See Madelene Lindström, "EU Consular Cooperation in Crisis Situations," in Stefan Olsson, ed., *Crisis Management in the European Union: Cooperation in the Face of Emergencies*, Berlin, Germany; London, UK: Springer, 2009, p. 117.

77. The exact nature of French military support to Chad during the rebel attack remains disputed. Undisputed is that France provided intelligence and logistical support to the government

as part of a technical agreement with the Government of Chad (GoC). French forces also repelled a rebel attack outside the airport, which was considered vital for French military operations. Airport protection was also crucial in the GoC's success as it ensured continued military and other supplies to the GoC and the safety of its sorties. Some French newspapers reported further French military involvement, which was, however, denied by the French MoD.

78. The Operation Commander, Lieutenant General Nash, coined this phrase.

79. The AOO is criss-crossed by riverbeds that, while dry for much of the year, can flood in minutes during the rainy season (May–October). Most roads are sand or dirt tracks that become impassable during this period, resulting in the cutting off of large sections of territory for long periods of time.

80. For an earlier discussion of this issue by the author, see Bjoern H. Seibert, *African Adventure? Assessing the European Union's Military intervention in Chad and the Central African Republic*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Security Studies Program, 2007, pp. 30-35; Bjoern H. Seibert, "EUFOR Chad/CAR: A Logistical Litmus Test," *RUSI Analysis*, January 2008. See also "EUFOR CHAD/CAR Mission: A Colossal Logistical Challenge," *Special Dossier, Europolitics*, April 24, 2008.

81. EU OHQ Mont-Valérien.

82. See Seibert, *African Adventure?* pp. 17-30.

83. The road movement from N'Djamena to the AOO lasted up to 10 days. See Operational Headquarters Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, "Operation EUFOR Tchad/RCA," undated.

84. See Patrick Nash, "EU Peacekeeping in Action: EUFOR Chad/RCA," presentation at Institute for International and European Affairs (IIEA), Dublin, Ireland, September 10, 2009. In total (deployment/sustainment), 540 strategic Air transport flights from Europe were conducted, relying on a combination of Il-76/An-124 and C-130s. See Operational Headquarters Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, *Operation EUFOR Tchad/RCA*, undated.

85. This route was, however, used by Italy in the recovery of its Role II hospital.

86. See EU OHQ Mont-Valérien. For CAR, the existing French camp was merely renamed and thus did not have to be built.

87. According to Deputy Operation Commander Major General Bogusław Pacek, political turmoil in neighboring Cameroon which led to labor unrest in Douala, the main Sea Port for the EUFOR deployment, caused serious delays for road convoys from Cameroon to Chad for 2 weeks and led to blockage of the storage facilities of the harbor. See Bogusław Pacek, "Operation EUFOR Tchad/RCA: Lessons Learned," presentation at Polish Institute of International Affairs, Warsaw, Poland, March 17, 2010.

88. Figures based on a presentation of the former Deputy Operation Commander, Major General Bogusław Pacek.

89. See François D'Alençon, "La mission impossible des Européens au Tchad" ("Mission Impossible for Europeans in Chad"), *La Croix*, December 16, 2008; EU OHQ Mont-Valérien.

90. *Ibid.* Also see Bogusław Pacek, "Operation EUFOR Tchad/RCA: Lessons Learned," presentation at Polish Institute of International Affairs, Warsaw, Poland, March 17, 2010. Prior to deployment, it was assessed that N'Djamena airport did not possess the cargo handling capacity to facilitate the deployment of the main force. Upgrade included building a new aircraft apron capable of handling 12 Tactical Air Transport aircraft and a 200-container storage area.

91. According to Operational Commander Patrick Nash, contracts for infrastructure upgrades were signed before the operation was officially launched in late January 2008. See Patrick Nash, "EU Peacekeeping in Action: EUFOR Chad/RCA," presentation at Institute for International and European Affairs (IIEA), Dublin, Ireland, September 10, 2009.

92. *Ibid.*

93. See "Special Dossier EUFOR Chad/CAR Mission: A Colossal Logistical Challenge," *Europolitics*, April 24, 2008.

94. See Ronny Modigs, *Special Forces Capabilities of the European Union Military Forces*, Fort Leavenworth, KS: School of Advanced Military Studies, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 2004.

95. See EU OHQ Mont-Valérien.

96. EUFOR TCHAD/RCA, "Lieutenant General Nash appeal for information on missing EUFOR peacekeeper," *Press Release*, March 4, 2008.

97. See Jean-Dominique Merchet, "Comment a été tué le sergent Polin, au cours d'un incident frontalier avec le Soudan" ("How was Sergeant Polin killed during a border incident with Sudan"), *Secret Défense Blog*, Libération, March 17, 2008.

98. See also "Assembly is Western European Union," *The European Union Mission in Chad: EUFOR Tchad/RCA*, Paris, France: Defence Committee, 2008, p. 14.

99. From mid-April 2009, the number of Task Groups was reduced from six to three, with only a third of the teams left. Moreover, the Special Operations component no longer had a SF Air Task Group. Under this configuration, it became the Combined Joint Special Operations Component Command Element (CJSOC-CE), operating under the Force Commanders operational command.

100. See EU OHQ Mont-Valérien.

101. The decision to declare IOC was taken by the Operation Commander against the backdrop of strong political pressures to stick to given deadlines.

102. See also Nicolas Gros-Verheyde, "Troop Deployment: A Colossal Logistical Challenge," *Europolitics Special Dossier: EUFOR Chad/CAR Mission*, April, 2008, p. 4.

103. At the same time, the late arrival of the Polish main force also contributed to the delays.

104. See Laurent Zecchini, “La Force est au Tchad, mais où est l’ennemi?” (“The Force Is in Chad, But Where Is the Enemy?”), *Le Monde*, May 24, 2008.

105. *Ibid.*

106. In the absence of the Polish Battalion, CJSOCC’s main effort was to conduct Special Surveillance and Reconnaissance (SR) operations in the MNB-North AOR, maintaining close liaison with local authorities and humanitarian actors.

107. The operation undertook several different types of operations. The largest, Centralized Operations (CENTOPS), involved a minimum of two coys (companies), were under FHQ command and would last up to 1 week. CENTOPS would involve up to three platoons, were conducted under FHQ command and would last up to 48 hours. Decentralized Operations (DECENTOPS) were conducted by the troops assigned to each MNB—with troop reinforcements from other MNBs and FHQ—under the MNBs command in each AOR.

108. The following forces were permanently assigned to MNB-CAR: 1 HQ—CSS Platoon and 1 (FR) Infantry Company. Given its remote location, the logistical support was provided from French Operation BOALI until June 2008.

109. Each MNB provided one platoon on a rotational basis for Stars Camp (*Camp des Etoiles*).

110. The Swedish contingent was replaced with an Albanian contingent (two platoons), which was limited to N’Djamena due to national caveats.

111. The concern was about a possible Sudanese retaliation against Chadian air assets based in Abéché, which would have led to collateral damage to EUFOR troops and equipment, especially as the European force had not deployed any air-defense weapon systems in the AOO.

112. It is estimated that the GoC spent as much as \$500 million on additional military hardware between February and October 2008 alone.

113. Additionally, DGSSIE units were strengthened through the purchase of armed vehicles.

114. While all rebel groups were affected, Timan Erdimi's (President Déby's nephew) RFC movement suffered most, as approximately half of the RFC rallied to President Déby's side, including handing over their weapons.

115. According to EUFOR officials, the main reasons for the IDPs' unwillingness to return were, in the order of importance, as follows: (1) The proliferation of weapons; (2) The absence of efforts against impunity; (3) The absence of efforts to quell inter-community/ethnic violence; and (4) The lack of development efforts.

116. The effects were however unequal. Most difficulties were experienced in MNB-North where the Polish contingent had to disrupt its activities for weeks in November 2008.

117. In mid-November, the DIS deployment was as follows: Abéché (45), Farchana (53), Goz Beida (51), and Iriba (49).

118. The increase in late September/early October 2008 appears to have been linked to the end of the Islamic month of fasting (*Ramadan*). Thereafter, the level of criminality/banditry returned to its "normal" level.

119. The village of Korko, Chad, located south of Birak, was attacked on at least three different occasions on November 6, 8 and 10. At least 50 villagers were reported to have been killed.

120. Operation WILMA lasted from November 14-21, 2008. It was led by the MNB-Center, but supported by other MNBs and CJSOCC.

121. Despite some reports to the contrary, the Government of Sudan appears not to have trusted the Chadian rebels sufficiently to provide them with MANPADS. Thus the rebels were exposed to Chadian fixed and rotary-wing assets based in Abéché.

122. For example, see Austrian Ministry of Defense, "Austrian Informal Workshops: Lessons Learned from the Chad Operation," Unpublished Paper, 2009.

123. For example, see Claudia Major, "EU-UN Cooperation in Military Crisis Management: The Experience of EUFOR RD Congo in 2006," Occasional Paper No. 72, Paris, France: EU Institute for Security Studies, 2008; Thierry Tardy, "UN-EU Relations in Crisis Management: Taking Stock and Looking Ahead," presentation at International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations, French Ministry of Defense, Paris, France, October, 2008; Alexandra Novosseloff and Clara Lee, "Cooperation in Peace Operations: The United Nations and Europe," Favorita Papers, Vienna, Austria: Diplomatic Academy Vienna, 2003; Richard Gowan, "ESDP and the United Nations," in Grevi *et al.*

124. See Patrick Nash, "EU Peacekeeping in Action: EUFOR Chad/RCA," presentation at Institute for International and European Affairs (IIEA), Dublin, Ireland, September 10, 2009.

125. The initial authorizing UN Security Council Resolution 1778 had called for the possibility of an international follow-on force. However, the language was insufficient to enable the UN's Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) to start the planning or force generation process.

126. See Annemarie Peen Rodt, "Success in EU Military Conflict Management Operations: What is it?," *CFSP Forum*, Vol. 8, No. 1, January 2010. A similar approach is also used by Muriel Asseburg and Ronja Kempin (ed.), *The EU as a Strategic Actor in the Realm of Security and Defence? A Systematic Assessment of ESDP Missions and Operations*, Berlin, Germany: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2009.

127. For example, see "Chad: Aid Groups Face Dilemma over EU Protection," *IRIN*, May 16, 2008.

128. This allowed NGOs and International Organizations to operate in proximity of EUFOR, without appearing as too closely linked to the European force.

129. Interministerial fact-finding missions conducted by France in 2006 and 2007, however, also found that criminality/ banditry, as well as the general absence of law and order, were

among the key causes of human suffering in the area. Interviews conducted by the author with French MOD officials, November 2008 and October 2009.

130. For example, in the rebel attack on N'Djamena in January/February 2008, rebels did not attack Sudanese refugees or IDPs in eastern Chad.

131. This ratio of 0.018 troops per km² was also only achieved at FOC several months after the operation was launched. Operation TURQUOISE in Rwanda, for example, which largely failed due to an insufficiently large force, had a force-to-space ratio of 0.35 troops per km². The Safe Humanitarian Zone (SHZ) in Rwanda encompassed 5,180 km² in which 1,800 French troops were deployed. See Alan J. Kuperman, *The Limits of Humanitarian Intervention: Genocide in Rwanda*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2001.

132. Out of the five FOBs, three were Battalion-sized (Irbia, Goz Beida, and Farchana), one company-sized (Birao) and one platoon-sized (Guereda). The reason for the limited number of FOBs was force protection.

133. Perhaps most importantly was the sheer size of the area of operation.

134. The UN-trained Chadian police would only deploy towards the end of the European operation.

135. Interestingly, in other operations the EU had adopted a less rigid division between military and maintenance of law and order tasks. For example, in the EU-led mission in Bosnia (Operation ATHENA), European troops adapted to the situation on the ground and engaged in fighting against organized crime. Nor is the separation between military and maintenance of law and order tasks strictly upheld in other EU operations in Africa either. A recent example is the EU-led operation against piracy off the coast of Somalia (Operation ATALANTA), in which European forces have undertaken tasks akin to law enforcement, and not only strictly military actions.

136. The phrase was used by the former Force Commander of Operation EUFOR RD CONGO, Major General Christian Damay.

See Major General Damay cited in SDA, *The EU's Africa Strategy: What are the Lessons of the Congo Mission?* SDA Discussion Paper, Brussels, Belgium: Security and Defence Agenda, 2007, p. 9.

137. See Bastian Giegerich, *European Military Crisis Management: Connecting Ambition and Reality*, Adelphi Papers No. 397, Abingdon, UK: Routledge for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2008.

138. *Ibid.*

139. In 2007, an estimated 71,000 military personnel from European nations were deployed in a total of 38 operations.

140. See also Appendix 3 for a breakdown of participating troops. This increasing tokenism comes with its own set of issues. The result is that EU-led operations tend to suffer from the fact that large numbers of nations participate largely with token contributions. While this may be desirable from the point of view of legitimacy, in terms of effectiveness the results are largely less positive. Often the coordination and bureaucracy needed to facilitate the smooth running of the operation do not match the value added in terms of effectiveness. On the issue of crisis management and tokenism, see also Jyri Raitasalo, "Should Small States Do Expeditionary Operations?" in Susanna Eskola, ed., *Crisis Management in Crisis?* Helsinki, Finland: National Defence University, 2008, pp. 87-104.

141. The French level of participation is even higher if one includes the support given to Operation EUFOR by French Operation EPERVIER. During the deployment about half of the 1,200 troops as part of Operation EPERVIER supported the deployment of Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA. See Bogusław Pacek, "Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA: Lessons Learned," presentation at Polish Institute of International Affairs, Warsaw, Poland, March 17, 2010.

142. This led to some internal criticism within France. For example, see Guillaume Etienne, *L'opération EUFOR Tchad/RCA: Succès et limites d'une initiative européenne* (EUFOR Chad/CAR: Successes and Limitations of a European Initiative), Paris, France: Terra Nova, 2009.

143. This was already the case in previous operations. For example, see François Grignon, "The Artemis Operation in the Democratic Republic of Congo: Lessons for the Future of EU Peacekeeping in Africa," presentation at Challenges of Europe-Africa Relations: An Agenda for Priorities, Lisbon, Portugal, 2003, p. 4.

144. See also Etienne, *L'opération EUFOR Tchad/RCA*.

145. For example, see Michèle A Flournoy *et al.*, *European Defense Integration Bridging the Gap between Strategy and Capabilities*, Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2005.

146. Patrick Nash, "EU Peacekeeping in Action: EUFOR Chad/RCA," presentation at Institute for International and European Affairs (IIEA), Dublin, Ireland, September 10, 2009.

147. This will particularly affect France. See Assemblée Nationale, *Rapport d'information sur l'aéromobilité (Report on Air Mobility)*, No. 666, Paris, France: Commission de la défense nationale et des forces armées, 2008; Bernard Bombeau, "L'aéromobilité frappée de déficit capacitaire" ("Air Mobility Struck by Capability Gap"), *Air et Cosmos*, February 22, 2008.

148. Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA was not the first EU military operation where non-EU member states participated. For example, in Operation ARTEMIS, South Africa provided two heavy utility helicopters. See Bruno Neveux, "The Account of Major General Bruno Neveux," *Doctrine*, February 2007, p. 57; Henri Bentégeat, "Helicopters – Key to Mobility," presentation at EDA Helicopters Conference, Brussels, Belgium, March 10, 2009.

149. The decision to open an operation to a non-EU contributor has to be approved by the Political and Security Committee (PSC), before discussions about the details of the participation can begin. Based on a presentation "Lessons from EUFOR Tchad/RCA," EU Institute for Security Studies, March 2010.

150. The agreement needs to include all the military aspects of the mission, including the number of men needed, the type of

mission and tasks accepted by contributors (caveats), the type of equipment, the C2 structures and the contribution to these structures (number and level), the logistics and financial aspects.

151. The first debates about a Russian participation in the operation took place during the force generation process in late 2007. While first meetings on the technical agreement took place in March 2008, an agreement was only signed in November 2008. In December 2008 the deployment took place, and the Russian helicopters became operational in January 2009—i.e., only 3 months before the end of the operation. Based on presentation at EU Institute for Security Studies, Lessons from EUFOR Tchad/RCA, March 2010.

152. For a more detailed description of the EU Battlegroups, see Gustav Lindstrom, "Enter the EU Battlegroups," Paris, France: European Union Institute for Security Studies, 2007; Yves Boyer, "The Battle Groups: Catalyst for a European Defence Policy," Briefing Paper, Brussels, Belgium, Subcommittee on Security and Defence, European Parliament, 2007; Jan Joel Andersson, "Armed and Ready? The EU Battlegroup Concept and the Nordic Battlegroup," Stockholm: Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies, 2006; Mika Kerttunen *et al.*, "EU Battlegroups: Theory and Development in the Light of Finnish-Swedish Cooperation," Helsinki, Finland: National Defence College, 2005; Niklas Granholm, "EU-Battlegroups: Some New Capabilities, Actually," *RUSI Journal*, Vol. 151, No. 6, 2007, pp. 62-67; Christian F. Anrig, "EU-Kampfgruppen: Normative Determinanten im europäischen Streitkräftetransformationsprozess" ("The EU Battle Groups: Normative Determinants in European Armed Forces Transformation Process"), *Allgemeine schweizerische Militärzeitschrift*, Vol. 172, No. 11, 2006; "The Battlegroup Concept—UK/France/Germany Food for Thought Paper," in EU Institute for Security Studies, *EU Security and Defence: Core Documents 2004*, Chaillot Papers, No. 75, Paris, France: European Union Institute for Security Studies, 2005; Claudia Major, "Europe is What Member States Make of it: An Assessment of the Influence of Nation States on the European Security and Defence Policy," Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham, 2008, p. 218.

153. Sweden, as lead nation of the NBG, seriously considered committing the Nordic Battlegroup to the operation. In August

2007 Sweden had sent a fact-finding mission led by Swedish Foreign Minister Carl Bildt and NBG's Operation Commander Major-General Bengt Andersson to Chad. Upon return, Major-General Andersson advised against the use of the NBG in Chad/CAR. This view was apparently shared by both Swedish Foreign Bildt and Defense Minister Sten Tolgfors. Interviews conducted by the author with Swedish officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Defense, Stockholm December 2008.

154. On the Swedish side, concerns about the costs or combination of costs of the operation weighted heavy in addition to the negative findings of the fact-finding operation. In Brussels, EU member states disagreed over whether the situation would qualify as a "Battlegroup situation" according to the EUBG concept. The argument brought forth by the member states that were opposed to using the EUBG (including Germany and Britain) was, that the situation in Chad and CAR was not an emergency that required a rapid response and thus did not require the use of the EUBG, but rather the 'normal' force generation process. Behind these seemingly conceptual disagreements were concerns about financial implications. Had an EUBG been used, the common costs would have been extended to include, for example, deployment costs, such as strategic airlift. See Laurent Paccaud and Emmanuel Saliot, "Athéna sous l'impulsion d'opérations militaires de plus en plus complexes" ("Athena Under Increasingly Complex Military Operations"), *Défense Nationale et sécurité collective*, Vol. 65, No. 8/9, 2009, p. 8.

155. This was, for example, the case for Sweden. See Wade Jacoby and Christopher Jones, "The EU Battle Groups in Sweden and the Czech Republic: What National Defense Reforms Tell Us about European Rapid Reaction Capabilities," *European Security*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 2008, p. 328.

156. The ATHENA mechanism covers the costs related to both Operational HQs and Force HQs. Other costs could be regarded as "common" (e.g. transport and lodging for forces, information gathering, certain medical costs) when agreed upon, on a case-by-case basis. For a detailed description of the EU's financing of operations see Paccaud and Saliot, "Athéna sous l'impulsion d'opérations militaires de plus en plus complexes"; Antonio Misiroli, "Euros for ESDP: Financing EU Operations," Occasional

Papers No. 45, Paris, France: EU Institute for Security Studies, 2003; David Scannell, "Financing ESDP Military Operations," *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 9, 2004, pp. 529-549; Annegret Bendiek and Hannah Whitney-Steele, *The Financing of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy: Solving the Conundrum*, Berlin, Germany: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2006.

157. This figure is provided by the EU's own think-tank, the EUISS. See Helly, in Grevi *et al.*

158. The total ATHENA budget was €138,2 million (€119,6 million for 2007-08 and €18,6 million for 2008-09). However, the operation came out under budget, partially due to refunds from the UN. After refunds, the total common costs were about €100 million. Figures based on personal interview with the Operation Commander Lieutenant General Patrick Nash, Ireland, November 2009.

159. See also Pierre Bourlot, "Les opérations de la PESD," ("The Operations of the ESDP"), *Défense Nationale et sécurité collective*, Vol. 64, No. 7, 2008, pp. 72-79.

160. Based on interview with French Foreign Ministry officials. See also Bourlot.

161. "Placing Defence of Europe in a New Orbit," *Europolitics*, July 1, 2008.

162. In the case of NATO, the same countries have less difficulty agreeing to an extension of common costs. One reason obviously being that the United States pays for a large amount of the common cost.

163. According to former Chairman for the EUMC, General Henri Bentégeat, the deployment costs were about 60 Million Euros. See Henri Bentégeat, "Commercializing Logistics? The European Military Vision of Logistics," presentation at European Defense Agency (EDA), Brussels, Belgium, February 27, 2008.

164. See Laurent Paccaud and Emmanuel Saliot; "Minor Changes to Athena Financing Mechanism," *Europolitics*, January 12, 2009.

165. Had the Battlegroups been used, the common costs would have been extended to include, for example, deployment costs, such as strategic airlift. See Paccaud and Saliot, "Minor Changes," p. 8.

166. See also Anand Menon, "Empowering Paradise? The ESDP at Ten," *International Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 2, 2009, p. 239.

167. *Ibid.*

168. This was especially the case in Operation EUFOR RD CONGO. See, for example, Helmut Fritsch, *EUFOR RD Congo: A Misunderstood Operation?* Martello Papers No. 33, Kingston, Ontario, Canada: Centre for International Relations, Queen's University, 2008

169. According to an EUMS official, "since politicians delay a decision on an OHQ and OpCdr, we are forced into acting as a de facto OHQ when we clearly do not have the means to do OHQ work," cited in Simón, p. 37. This was acknowledged by the Director-General of EUMS, Lieutenant General David Leakey, in a testimony at the WEU Assembly. See also "Defence Council: Strategic Planning Capacity Needs Reinforcement," *Europolitics*, November 9, 2007. According to Lieutenant General David Leakey, the result is also that a large number of the EU Military Staff are tied up in the process, which leaves little resources to focus on concepts and capability. See Gerrard Cowan, "Interview with Lieutenant General David Leakey, Chief of the EU Military Staff," *Jane's Defence Weekly*, June 2, 2009.

170. See also Simón, *Planning for EU Military Operations*.

171. See Tiffou, "The Destiny of Security Policy."

172. *Ibid.*

173. For a more extensive discussion on the origins, see Simón, pp. 22-23.

174. Interview with Vice Admiral Jean-Pierre Tiffou, Paris, October 2009. See also Tiffou, "The Destiny of Security Policy."

175. This view has, for example, been expressed by the Chairman of EU Military Committee, Bentégeat, cited in *European Union Operational Chains of Command*, WEU Assembly, p. 14. See also Simón.

176. The following section partially relies on the findings of a seminar EU lessons learned seminar. See EU Institute for Security Studies, *Lessons from EUFOR Tchad/RCA*, Seminar, Paris, France, March 2010.

177. For an earlier discussion of this issue by the author, see Seibert, *African Adventure?* pp. 30-35. See also "EUFOR Chad/CAR Mission: A Colossal Logistical Challenge," *Europolitics Special Dossier*, April 24, 2008.

178. Cited in EDA, *Commercialising Logistics*, Annual Conference Report, Brussels, Belgium: European Defence Agency, 2008.

179. Keen to avoid errors and reduce risks, many participating states were overly cautious, resulting in inadequate or too heavy equipment to support their troops, which were not well adapted to African realities. For example, many participating states brought large quantities of ammunition to the AOO—more than 10 containers at times—that were exaggerated compared to the threats in the AOO.

180. See Serge Duval, "L'organisation du soutien d'une opération européenne: EUFOR Tchad RCA" ("The Organisation of the Support of a European Operation: EUFOR Tchad RCA"), presentation at CESA Workshop: Airpower in the European Union's Crises Management, Paris, France, October, 2008.

181. At the same time, French Operation BOALI provided logistical support for EUFOR's forward deployed base in CAR until mid June 2008. Figure based on *Lessons from EUFOR Tchad/RCA*, March 2010.

182. These included, for example, Class 1 supply (food and water), Class 3 supply (fuel support theater-level), intra-theater overland transport, medical support (Role 2 in N'Djamena),

maintenance of air strips, and limited air transport capacity. See also Duval.

183. Unsurprisingly, the logistical lead nation concept caused in some instances difference over the responsibility for the provision of certain services. See Duval. At times, French officials felt that they were seen by other participating countries as a “cash cow.” Based on discussions at the EU Institute for Security Studies, *Lessons from EUFOR Tchad/RCA*, March 2010.

184. See Bogusław Pacek, “Operation EUFOR Tchad/RCA: Lessons Learned,” presentation at Polish Institute of International Affairs, Warsaw, Poland, March 17, 2010.

185. *Ibid.*

186. *Ibid.*

187. See Gerard Heckel, “EU Third Party Logistic Support Platform,” *Presentation*, Brussels, Belgium: European Defence Agency, 2009.

188. Duval.

189. *Ibid.* The EDA estimates that about 45 percent of the costs for outsourcing mounted to about 45 percent of the total cost of the operation. It should be noted however that in the study the EDA put the total costs of the operation at €400 million, much lower than most other estimates.

190. Bentégeat, “Commercializing Logistics?”

191. Duval.

192. This question was also posed by the Chairman of the EU Military Committee. See Bentégeat.

193. For a more detailed account on the impact of the rebel attack on N’Djamena in regards to outsourced services see Paul Peugeot, “L’impact du facteur aérien dans la planification d’une opération européenne” (“The Impact of Air Factor in Planning a European Operation”), presentation at CESA Workshop, Paris, October, 2008; Duval.

194. Patrick Nash, "EU Peacekeeping in Action: EUFOR Chad/RCA," Presentation, Dublin, Ireland, Institute for International and European Affairs (IIEA), September 10, 2009.

195. During the operation, the Chairman of the Military Committee (CEUMC) is the point of contact with the Operation Commander.

196. Until IOC was reached, the FHQ was located in N'Djamena.

197. This issue was raised by the former Force Commander of Operation EUFOR RD CONGO, Lieutenant General Christian Damay, prior to the operation. See Christian Damay, "Lessons Learned from Recent ESDP Operations," presentation at Bundestag, Berlin, Germany, February 2007, p. 17.

198. On the FHQ-OHQ relationship in Operation EUFOR RD CONGO, see Clémence Ducastel, "Roles and Lessons Learned from European Union's Military Operations," *Doctrine*, Vol. 13, October 2007, p. 110.

199. As CIS lead nation, France provide the satellite infrastructure for the operation (*Syracuse satellite*). The costs for the military satellite communications, utilized throughout the operation, were paid through the ATHENA mechanism. See Paccaud and Saliot, pp. 35-46.

200. Bastian Giegerich, "European Capabilities and the Operational Context," *Studia Diplomatica*, Vol. 60, No. 3, 2007, pp. 126-127.

201. While EUFOR Tchad/RCA had common Rules of Engagement (ROE), most states placed restrictions on them.

202. See also Helly, in Grevi *et al.*, p. 349.

203. The following section benefited from the findings and discussions of the Austrian Ministry of Defense, "Austrian Informal Workshops: Lessons Learned from the Chad Operation," 2009, and, "Lessons from EUFOR Tchad/RCA," March 2010.

204. Hagman.

205. Some of the findings in the following section are based on an unpublished presentation by the former head of J2 at the OHQ, at the EU Institute for Security Studies, *Lessons from EUFOR Tchad/RCA*, Seminar, March 2010. For a larger debate on intelligence within the EU, see Björn Müller-Wille, "For our Eyes Only? Shaping an Intelligence Community within the EU," Occasional Paper No. 50, Paris, France: EU Institute for Security Studies, 2004.

206. Based on interviews with various EUFOR senior officials.

207. See Peugnet; Nicolas Gros-Verheyde, "Information Becomes Crucial in Times of Instability," *Europolitics Special Dossier: EUFOR Chad/CAR Mission*, April, 2008. The close cooperation between Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA and French Operation EPERVIER was also highlighted by the fact that the images collected by the F1CR were sent to Operation EPERVIER for analysis. Thus, Operation EPERVIER benefited from the IMINT collected by Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA.

208. On the French UAVs in Chad, see Jean-Dominique Merchet, "Des drones français au Tchad" ("French Drones in Chad"), *Liberation*, June 28, 2008.

209. Damir Črnčec, "A New Intelligence Paradigm and the European Union," *Journal of Criminal Justice and Security*, Vol. 1, 2009, pp. 156-161.

210. The problem of a lack of intelligence sharing is not new, as it has been a problem in previous operations as well. For example, see an account of the former Operation Commander of Operation ARTEMIS, Major General Neveux: Bruno Neveux, "The Account of Major General Bruno Neveux," *Doctrine*, February 2007, p. 58; Bruno Neveux, "Experiences in Military Peacekeeping Operations in Sub-Saharan Africa," presentation at WEU Conference: Peacekeeping in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Practical Approach, Brussels, Belgium, September 20-21, 2005.

211. Gros-Verheyde. In previous EU operations, NICs played important roles. For example, see Pierre Maral, "The First Opera-

tion of the European Union in Macedonia (Operation CONCORDIA)," *Doctrine*, No. 48, February 2007, p. 52.

212. This model has also been used in previous operations. For example, see Tony van Diepenbrugge, "Peacekeeping and Intelligence: An Experience in Bosnia-Herzegovina," in De Jong *et al.*, pp. 31-40.

213. See also Renaud Theunens, "Intelligence and Peace Support Operations: Some Practical Concepts," in Ben De Jong *et al.*, eds., *Peacekeeping Intelligence: Emerging Concepts for the Future*, Oakton, VA: OSS International Press, 2003, p. 67.

214. In some cases, the NIC's actions even harmed the operation. The most prominent example was the arrest of Finnish and Swedish NICs personnel in southern Chad in May 2008, which led to an embarrassment for EUFOR with the Chadian government. See "Chad: Government Arrests 4 EUFOR Troops," *IRIN*, May 9, 2008. On the strategic level, the relationship between NIOs and EUFOR appeared to be more beneficial, despite some reluctance to share critical intelligence. Based on not-for-attribution interviews conducted by the author with senior EUFOR officials.

215. For a more detailed description of the EU Satellite Center (EUSC) see Simon Duke, "Intelligence, Security and Information Flows in CFSP," *Intelligence and National Security*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 2006, pp. 621-624.

216. Anonymous, Senior Official, EU Satellite Center, interview by author, Paris, October 12 2009. According to the EUSC senior official, the EUSC support for Operation ATALANTA mobilized roughly the same capacity.

217. Presumably, the reluctance to establish links was due to UMAMID's difficult relationship with the Government of Sudan.

218. This was especially concerning as the Sudanese reaction to the International Criminal Court's (ICC) indictment of Sudanese President Omar Al Bashir could have had a critical effect on EUFOR's AOO.

219. See also Helly, in Grevi *et al.* p. 343.

220. The cooperation between EUFOR and the Delegation European Commission in the field was, according to senior EUFOR officials, limited at best. Also, aside from the support to DIS, during the operation few funds were spent on development projects. The largest projects included road restoration, medical facilities (in Abdi and Kerfi), and drilling for wells and installation of distribution systems for drinking water in the area of Abdi, totaling just about €2.2 million.

221. According to EUFOR officials, the Delegation European Commission in Chad and specially the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO) remained ambiguous in their support of EUFOR mainly due to an alignment with the most radical NGOs on IDP returns and small impact projects and to a desire to prevent a rapprochement between the first and second Pillars of the EU. In an interview with the author, a senior level EC official however denied these claims.

222. The EU's development policy is, in fact, largely a domain of the EU Commission, while security is dominated by the EU Council Secretariat. As a result, even the nomination of an EU Special Representative did not improve cooperation on the ground, as he was seen as an additional extension of the Council Secretariat at the expense of the EU Commission. For a more comprehensive overview of the bureaucratic divide between the EU Commission and the Council Secretariat, see Hylke Dijkstra, "Commission Versus Council Secretariat: An Analysis of Bureaucratic Rivalry in European Foreign Policy," *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2, 2009.

223. See James Dobbins *et al.*, *Europe's Role in Nation-Building: From the Balkans to the Congo*, Washington, DC: RAND Cooperation, 2008.

224. One of EUFOR's key stated aims was to allow humanitarian assistance to resume and extend further, but also to contribute to the facilitation of the return of IDPs. Political pressure to use IDP return figures as benchmarks for success for the operation put EUFOR in direct opposition to most NGOs which stressed the need for voluntary returns. As EUFOR gradually dropped the aim for facilitating IDP returns, the relationship improved.

225. *Chad: Powder Keg in the East*, Africa Report 149, Brussels, Belgium: International Crisis Group, April 2009, p. 18.

226. For example, in Afghanistan, European troops equally lack critical enablers, such as tactical air support for protection, theater lift (fixed and rotary-wing), medical, and logistical support. The United States is filling the majority of those requirements. William deCamp, "ESDP: NATO's Demise or Opportunities for NATO?" Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, 2005, p. 13.

227. On the importance of operations in terms of learning, see also Paul Cornish and Geoffrey Edwards, "The Strategic Culture of the European Union," *International Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 4, 2005, pp. 807-810.

228. On the developments within the EU Council Secretariat, see Carmen Gebhard, "Recalibrating ESDP Conduct and Planning Capacities," *CFSP Forum*, Vol. 7, No. 3, July 2009; for the changes in the EU Military Staff known as the Post-Wiesbaden process, see Claire Nestier, "Post Wiesbaden: Improving Strategic Planning," *Impetus*, Issue 5, Spring/Summer 2008, pp. 8-10.

229. For example, see "Franco-British Helicopter Initiative Taking Shape," *Europolitics*, May 15, 2008; Jim Dorschner, "Multi-national Helicopter Fleet Initiative Matures," *Jane's Defence Weekly*, August 8, 2008.

230. The origins of the European Air Transport Command (EATC) dates back much further. The initiative for the creation of an EATC dates back to the Franco-German Summit at Strasbourg in November 1999. However, Operation EUFOR TCHAD/RCA provided new impetus to launch the EATC. See also Gilles Desclaux, "L'emploi opérationnel de la puissance aérospatiale: état des lieux et perspectives" ("The Operational Use of Aerospace Power – The Shape of Things to Come"), *Défense nationale et sécurité collective*, No. 6., June 2009.

231. In early 2010, Belgium, Germany, France, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands have established the European Air Transport Command (EATC), to be located at Eindhoven Air Base, The Netherlands. Once operational, the EATC will have operational command over about 170 aircraft—including long-range (*Airbus*

A320, A330) and tactical aircraft (C-160 *Transall*, C130 *Hercules*), and thus regulate the military air movements of the four countries. Once fully operational, expected to be in late 2010, the EATC will include nearly 170 officers based in Eindhoven, including 65 German and 46 French officers. Once the delayed *Airbus A400M* becomes available, it will come under the EATC command, and moreover an integrated structure of both EATC crews and maintenance is envisioned. See Margriet Drent and Dick Zandee, *Breaking Pillars: Towards a Civil-Military Security Approach for the European Union*, The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael, 2010, p. 72-73; Nicolas Gros-Verheyde, "Feu vert au commandement aérien européen EATC: Une petite révolution" ("Green light for European Air Command EATC: A Small Revolution"), *Bruxelles2*, March 5, 2010; Desclaux; Luftwaffe, "Startschuß für das Europäische Lufttransportkommando" ("The Start of the European Air Transport Command"), Berlin, Germany: Luftwaffe, February 25, 2010.

232. See "Swedish EU Presidency: Sweden to Seek Greater Flexibility on Use of EU Battlegroups," *Europolitics*, July 2, 2009.

233. See for example "ESDP Operation: Proposal to Reform Athena Mechanism," *Europolitics*, October 15, 2008; Paccaud and Saliot, pp. 35-46.

234. This method may be the reason for the very success of the Common Security and Defense Policy, as opposed to previous failed attempts to build common European Defense. See also Frédéric Mérand, *European Defence Policy: Beyond the Nation State*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 28.

235. Nick Witney cited in United Kingdom Parliament, *Adapting the EU's Approach to Today's Security Challenges: The Review of the 2003 European Security Strategy*, London, UK: House of Lords, 2008, p. 23.

236. For example, see Gorm Rye Olsen, "The EU and Military Conflict Management in Africa: For the Good of Africa or Europe?" *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 2009; Alex Vines, "Rhetoric from Brussels and Reality on the Ground: The EU and Security in Africa," presentation at Pembroke College, University of Cambridge, UK, October 2009.

237. For a more detailed explanation of the impact of the Lisbon Treaty and CSDP, see Steven Blockmans and Ramses A Wessel, *The European Union and Crises Management: Will the Lisbon Treaty Make the EU More Effective?* Working Paper 2009 No. 1, The Hague, The Netherlands: T. M. C. Asser Institute, 2009.

238. Robert M. Gates, "NATO Strategic Concept," Remarks delivered at National Defense University, Washington, DC, February 23, 2010.

239. See Daniel Hamilton, "American Perspectives on the European Security and Defence Policy," in Jess Pilegaard, ed., *The Politics of European Security*, Copenhagen, Denmark: Institute for International Studies, 2004.

240. *Ibid.*

241. Gates.

242. See Chantal de Jonge Oudraat, "U.S. Attitudes Evolve about EU Security Ambitions," *European Affairs*, Summer-Fall, 2007.

243. See also see Godson and Shultz.

244. *Ibid.*

245. See David C. Gompert and Uwe Nerlich, *Shoulder to Shoulder: The Road to U.S.-European Military Cooperability*, Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2002.

246. See also Barry R. Posen, "The Case for Restraint," *The American Interest*, Vol. 3, No. 1, November-December 2007.

247. This argument has largely been made by Europeans. See Leo Michel, "Observations on the Special Relationship in Security and Defence Matters," in Jeffrey D. McCausland and Douglas T. Stuart, eds., *U.S.-UK Relations at the Start of the 21st Century*, Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2006, p. 169. However, it has also been made by U.S. policymak-

ers, including Robert Zoellick. See Robert Zoellick, cited in Gilles Andréani *et al.*, *Europe's Military Revolution*, London, UK: Centre for European Reform, 2001, p. 38.

248. See for example the Long-Term Vision of the European Defense Agency (EDA), which highlights the EU's focus on expeditionary operations. European Defence Agency, *An Initial Long-Term Vision for European Defence Capability and Capacity Needs*, Brussels, Belgium: European Defence Agency, October 2006.

249. See *Council of the European Union*, Presidency Conclusion, Ref. 17271/1/08, Brussels, Belgium: December 2008, p. 16. In addition to the two "major" stabilization operations, it sets itself the goal of being able to simultaneously conduct two "rapid response operations" by means of the EUBG, and several smaller, largely civil-military operations.

250. See also William deCamp, *ESDP: NATO's Demise or Opportunities for NATO?* Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, 2005, p. 13.

251. This does not mean that the military burden of operation needs necessarily be equally shared between the larger EU member states. However, in the long run, the Common Security and Defense Policy is only viable if the large EU member states, above all UK, France, and Germany, contribute roughly similarly.

252. See also Edward G. Gunning, *The Common European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP)*, INSS Occasional Paper No. 41, Colorado Springs, CO: USAF Institute for National Security Studies, USAF Academy, 2001.

253. A similar suggestion was made by Leo Michel, "Observations on the Special Relationship in Security and Defence Matters," in Jeffrey D. McCausland and Douglas T. Stuart, eds., *U.S.-UK Relations at the Start of the 21st Century*, Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2006, p. 171.

APPENDIX I

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---------|--|
| AMIS | African Mission in Sudan |
| AOI | Area Of Interest |
| AOO | Area Of Operation |
| AOR | Area of Responsibility |
| APOD | Airport of Disembarkation |
| APOE | Airport of Embarkation |
| AU | African Union |
| Bn | Battalion |
| C2 | Command and Control |
| C3 | Command, Control, Communication |
| CAR | Central African Republic |
| CAS | Close Air Support |
| CENTOPS | Centralized Operations |
| CEUMC | Chairman of the European Union Military Committee |
| CHOD | Chiefs of Defense |
| CIMIC | Civil Military Cooperation |
| CIS | Communications and Information Systems |
| CJSOR | Combined Joint Statement Of Requirements |
| CMC | Crisis Management Concept |
| CMCO | Civil Military Coordination |
| CMPD | Crisis Management Planning Director |
| CoG | Centre of Gravity |
| CONOPS | Concept of Operations |
| CJSOTF | Combined Joint Special Operations Task-Force |
| CJSOCC | Combined Joint Special Operations Component Command |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| CJSOCCE | Comined Joint Special Operations Component Command Element |
| CS | Combat Support |
| CSDP | Common Security and Defense Policy |
| CSS | Combat Service Support |
| DECENTOPS | Decentralized Operations |
| DGSSIE | State Security Service |
| DoD | Department of Defense |
| DPKO | Department of Peace Keeping Operations |
| EATC | European Air Transport Command |
| EC | European Commission |
| ECHO | European Commission Humanitarian Office |
| EDA | European Defense Agency |
| ESDP | European Security Defence Policy |
| EU | European Union |
| EUBG | European Union Battlegroups |
| EUFOR | European Force |
| EUMC | European Union Military Committee |
| EUMCC | EU Movement Co-ordination Centre |
| EUMS | European Union Military Staff |
| EU Ops Center | European Union Operations Center |
| EUSC | EU Satellite Centre |
| EUSR | European Union Special Representative |
| FAS | Forces Armees et de Securite |
| FCdr | Force Commander |
| FCO | Foreign and Commonwealth Office |
| FHQ | Force Headquarters |
| FOB | Forward Operating Base |
| FOC | Full Operational Capability |
| FoF | Follow-on Force |
| GAERC | General Affairs and External Relations Council |

| | |
|----------|---|
| GoC | Government of Chad |
| GSC | General Secretariat of the Council |
| HNS | Host Nation Support |
| HO | Humanitarian Organization |
| HQ | Headquarters |
| HUMINT | Human Intelligence |
| ICC | International Criminal Court |
| IDP | Internally Displaced Person |
| IEF | Initial Entry Forces |
| IMD | Initiating Military Directive |
| IMINT | Imagery Intelligence |
| IO | International Organization |
| IOC | Initial Operational Capability |
| ISTAR | Intelligence Surveillance Target Acquisition Reconnaissance |
| JEM | Justice and Equality Movement |
| JFACC | Joint Force Air Component Command |
| LOC | Lines of Communications |
| MANPADS | Man Portable Air Defense Systems |
| MCCE | Movement Co-ordination Centre Europe |
| MEDEVAC | Medical Evacuation |
| Milreps | Military Representatives |
| MINURCAT | <i>Mission des Nations Unies en République Centrale Africaine et au Tchad</i> (Mission of the UN in the Central African Republic and to Chad) |
| MNB | Multinational Base |
| MOD | Ministry of Defense |
| MPA | Maritime Patrol Aircraft |
| MSO | Military Strategic Options |
| MSOD | Military Strategic Option Directive |
| NAC | North Atlantic Council |
| NATO | North Atlantic Treaty Organization |
| NBG | Northern (Nordic) Battlegroup |

| | |
|--------|---|
| NCC | National Contingent Commanders |
| NEO | Noncombatant Evacuation Operation |
| NGO | Nongovernmental Organization |
| NIC | National Intelligence Cell |
| NILO | National Intelligence Liaison Officer |
| OHQ | Operation Headquarters |
| OpCdr | Operation Commander |
| OPCON | Operational Control |
| OPLAN | Operation Plan |
| POD | Port of Disembarkation |
| POE | Port of Embarkation |
| PSC | Political and Security Committee |
| PSOR | Provisional Statement of Requirement |
| QRF | Quick Reaction Force |
| RCA | <i>République Centre-Africaine</i> (Central African Republic) |
| ROE | Rules Of Engagement |
| SASE | Safe and Secure Environment |
| SG/HR | Secretary General / High Representative |
| SHAPE | Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe |
| SIGINT | Signal Intelligence |
| SOF | Special Operations Forces |
| SOFA | Status of Forces Agreement |
| SOR | Statement of Requirement |
| SPOD | Seaport of Disembarkation |
| SR | Surveillance Reconnaissance |
| TCN | Troop Contributing Nation |
| TF | Task Force |
| ToA | Transfer of Authority |
| UAV | Unmanned Aerial Vehicles |
| UK | United Kingdom |
| UN | United Nations |

| | |
|--------|--|
| UNAMID | United Nations / African Union Hybrid Operation in Darfur |
| UNAMIS | UN mission of the Sudan |
| UNSC | United Nations Security Council |
| UNSCR | United Nations Security Council Resolution |
| UNSG | United Nations Secretary General |
| WEU | Western European Union |

APPENDIX II

CHRONOLOGY: OPERATION EUFOR TCHAD/RCA¹

May 2007

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 21 May 2007 | France suggests an initiative for Chad |
|-------------|--|

Preparation Phase

July 2007

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 13 Jul 2007 | Joint Council-Commission Options Paper |
| 23 Jul 2007 | General Affairs and External Relations Council (GAERC) gives planning authority to Council Secretariat |
| 27 Jul 2007 | PSC issues CMC tasker |

September 2007

| | |
|-------------|---|
| 3 Sep 2007 | OHQ preactivation |
| 10 Sep 2007 | PSC approves CMC and gives planning authority to Mont Valerien |
| 12 Sep 2007 | OHQ Council approves CMC; MSO paper is released |
| 24 Sep 2007 | Indicative force generation conference; draft mission analysis brief reviewed |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 25 Sep 2007 | UN Security Council approves Resolution 1778 |
|-------------|--|

October 2007

| | |
|-------------|---|
| 4 Oct 2007 | MSO 3 adopted |
| 15 Oct 2007 | Council issues Joint Action; Operation Commander arrives in OHQ |
| 23 Oct 2007 | Initiating Military Directive issued by EUMC |

November 2007

| | |
|-------------|---------------------------------|
| 8 Nov 2007 | PSC adopts CONOPS |
| 9 Nov 2007 | 1st force generation conference |
| 12 Nov 2007 | Council adopts CONOPS |

January 2008

| | |
|-------------|---|
| 11 Jan 2008 | 5th and last force generation conference |
| 14 Jan 2008 | Operation Commander presents draft OPLAN |
| 18 Jan 2008 | Revised OPLAN released |
| 28 Jan 2008 | Council accepts OPLAN and formally launches operation |

Deployment Phase

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|
| 31 Jan 2008 | Chadian Rebels enter N'Djamena |
| 1-2 Feb 2008 | Fighting in N'Djamena |
| 3 Feb 2008 | Rebels retreat from N'Djamena |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 6 Feb 2008 | Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with Cameroon signed |
| 12 Feb 2008 | First flight into the Area of Operation (Swedish C-130) |
| 19 Feb 2008 | First operation by EUFOR Initial Entry Forces in the AOO |
| 21 Feb 2008 | First EUFOR convoy departs N'Djamena for Abeche |
| 3 Mar 2008 | First EUFOR casualty (KIA: Adjudant Gilles Polin, 1er Régiment de Parachutistes d'Infanterie de Marine (1st Marine Parachute Infantry Regiment, RPIMa) |
| 6 Mar 2008 | Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with Chad signed |
| 15 Mar 2008 | Initial Operating Capability declared by Operation Commander |

Execution Phase

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 24 Mar 2008 | Exchange of Letter between EU Secretary General / High Representative and UN Secretary General on EUFOR-MINURCAT cooperation |
| 16 Apr 2008 | SOFA with Central African Republic signed |
| 1 May 2008 | Death of Pascal Marlinge (Director Chad, Save the Children) in AOO |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| 14 Jun 2008 | Rebel attack on Goz Beida |
| 17-24 Jun 2008 | EU-UN Joint Assessment Mission to AOO to prepare mid-Mandate Review |
| 7-12 Jul 2008 | First of several Combined Joint Operations in theater |
| 17-18 Jul 2008 | Deployment of two Albanian Platoons to Chad |
| 18 Aug 2008 | Am Nabak incident |
| 15 Sep 2008 | Full Operational Capability (FOC) of assigned forces attained |
| 25 Sep 2008 | UN Security Council adopts Resolution 1834 (2008) which expresses intention to authorize the deployment of a UN military component to follow-up on EUFOR |
| 4-7 Oct 2008 | Deployment of Croatian personnel to Chad |
| 8 Nov 2008 | Evacuation of nine NGO personnel from Ouandja area in CAR |
| 8 Dec 2008 | Arrival of four Russian MI-8 helicopters in N'Djamena |
| 14 Jan 2009 | UN Security Council adopts Resolution 1861 (2009) authorizing the deployment of a military component of MINURCAT to follow up EUFOR with the transfer of authority on March 15, 2009 |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| 24 Jan 2009 | The first member of MINURCAT Core Planning Team arrives in Chad to commence establishment of the MINURCAT FHQ |
| 27 Jan 2009 | Technical Agreement between the UN and EUFOR on the Handover of the Operation is signed |
| 15 Mar 2009 | Transfer of Authority from EUFOR TCHAD/RCA to MINURCAT |
| 7 Apr 2009 | Incident in Stars Camp (Abéché) leading to the death of two EUFOR soldiers, one MINURCAT soldier and a Chadian civilian |

ENDNOTES - APPENDIX II

1. Based on various interviews and Alexander Mattelaer, *The Strategic Planning of EU Military Operations – The Case of EUFOR Tchad/RCA*, Working Paper, No. 5, Brussels, Belgium: Institute for European Studies, 2008.

APPENDIX III

OVERVIEW OF NATIONAL PARTICIPATION AT FOC¹

| Country | OHQ | FHQ | Forces | Forces Total |
|---------------------|------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| Austria | 4 | 13 | 156 | 173 |
| Belgium | 6 | 4 | 68 | 78 |
| Bulgaria | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Cyprus | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Czech Republic | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Germany | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Greece | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Finland | 2 | 2 | 58 | 62 |
| France | 69 | 114 | 1775 | 1958 |
| Hungary | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Ireland | 18 | 10 | 422 | 450 |
| Italy | 4 | 2 | 97 | 103 |
| Lithuania | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Luxembourg | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Netherlands | 3 | 5 | 66 | 74 |
| Poland | 4 | 5 | 409 | 418 |
| Portugal | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Romania | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Sweden ² | 4 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| Slovakia | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Slovenia | 1 | 1 | 24 | 26 |
| Spain | 3 | 3 | 81 | 87 |
| United Kingdom | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| EU | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Albania | 0 | 0 | 63 | 63 |
| Croatia | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| Russia | 0 | 0 | 79 | 79 |
| Total | 141 | 173 | 3314 | 3628 |

ENDNOTES - APPENDIX III

1. Patrick Nash, "EU Peacekeeping in Action: EUFOR Chad/RCA," Presentation, Institute for International and European Affairs (IIEA), Dublin, Ireland, September 10, 2009.

2. Sweden participated with 120 troops in the early phase of the operation, but had largely withdrawn at FOC.

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE

**Major General Gregg F. Martin
Commandant**

STRATEGIC STUDIES INSTITUTE

**Director
Professor Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr.**

**Director of Research
Dr. Antulio J. Echevarria II**

**Author
Mr. Bjoern H. Seibert**

**Director of Publications
Dr. James G. Pierce**

**Publications Assistant
Ms. Rita A. Rummel**

**Composition
Mrs. Jennifer E. Nevil**



FOR THIS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS, VISIT US AT
StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil

ISBN 1-58487-465-1



9 781584 874652

9 0000 >

