EUROPEAN DEFENCE COOPERATION

SOVEREIGNTY AND THE CAPACITY TO ACT

No. 78, January 2012

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
ADVIESRAAD INTERNATIONALE VRAAGSTUKKEN
A I V

Members of the Advisory Council on International Affairs

Chair	F. Korthals Altes
Vice-chair	Professor W.J.M. van Genugten
Members	Professor J. Gupta Dr P.C. Plooij-van Gorsel Professor A. de Ruijter Ms M. Sie Dhian Ho Professor A. van Staden Lt. Gen. M.L.M. Urlings (ret.) Ms H.M. Verrijn Stuart Professor J.J.C. Voorhoeve
Executive Secretary	T.D.J. Oostenbrink

P.O. Box 20061
2500 EB The Hague
The Netherlands

Telephone + 31 70 348 5108/6060
Fax + 31 70 348 6256
aiv@minbuza.nl
www.aiv-advice.nl

Combined European Defence Cooperation Committee

Chair Professor A. van Staden

Vice-chair Lt. Gen. M.L.M. Urlings (ret.)

Members
Professor M.G.W. den Boer
Professor J. Colijn
Dr M. Drent
Dr W.F. van Eekelen
Dr B.T. van Ginkel
Professor M. de Goede
Dr A.R. Korteweg
Dr C.M. Megens
Lt. Gen. H.W.M. Satter (ret.)
Professor J.G. Siccama

Executive Secretary M.W.M. Waanders

Contents

Foreword

Introduction 7

I Perspectives on defence cooperation 11

I.1 Sovereignty and defence cooperation 11
I.2 Multilateral defence cooperation 14
I.2.1 NATO capabilities initiatives 14
I.2.2 EU capabilities development 17
I.2.3 Regional defence cooperation 22
I.3 Bilateral partnerships 24
I.4 Other partnerships 27

II Lessons from European defence cooperation 31

II.1 Sovereignty, cooperation and the importance of the strategic culture 31
II.2 Joint maintenance of materiel 32
II.3 Standardisation as a multiplier of cooperation 32
II.4 The obstructive power of industrial and economic interests 33
II.5 No savings without investment 34
II.6 Greater emphasis on civil-military cooperation in the EU 34
II.7 Cooperation creates obligations 35
II.8 EU-NATO cooperation 35
II.9 Rapid reaction forces of the EU and NATO 36

III Deepening European defence cooperation 37

III.1 Top-down strategy for European security cooperation 37
III.2 Bottom-up approach to bilateral cooperation 38
III.3 Bilateral cooperation: with whom? 39
III.4 New possibilities for bilateral cooperation 42
III.5 Coordination of bilateral and multilateral cooperation 47

IV Conclusions and recommendations 48

Annexe I Request for advice
Annexe II Definitions of terms
Annexe III List of abbreviations
Annexe IV List of persons consulted

Foreword

On 20 June 2011, the government asked the Advisory Council on International Affairs (AIV) to produce an advisory report on deepening international defence cooperation by the Dutch armed forces. According to the request, cooperation should be deepened for the sake of European security and burden-sharing in the transatlantic partnership (political and strategic interest) and in order to end military shortfalls and keep military capability up to standard as far as possible (military interest). The government's questions focus on the implications for national sovereignty of the various forms of defence cooperation and on the lessons that can be learned from multinational programmes in the past. Logically, the next question is about the future possibilities for defence cooperation with partner countries in a bilateral or multilateral context. It is also apparent from the request for advice that the government considers it important to improve cooperation between the EU and NATO. However, the AIV believes that this subject need not be dealt with at length in this report since it was considered in detail in the report published in January 2010 on NATO's New Strategic Concept.[1] Nonetheless, observations about relations between the two organisations will be made at various places in this report. The full text of the request for advice is included as an annexe.

This report is structured as follows. The introduction starts by briefly describing the political context in which the present debate on European defence cooperation is being conducted. It goes on to list various forms of defence cooperation and raises a few important questions about sovereignty and dependence.

Chapter I – Perspectives on defence cooperation – deals with a number of sovereignty issues connected with defence cooperation. It also examines the initiatives for capability enhancement that have been developed in NATO and the EU, as well as some regional and bilateral initiatives.

Chapter II – Lessons from European defence cooperation – identifies the main lessons that can be learned from defence cooperation in Europe in practice.

Chapter III – Deepening European defence cooperation – makes specific proposals for further measures to embed the Dutch armed forces in an international framework.

Finally, in chapter IV – Conclusions and recommendations – the AIV considers the need for more far-reaching European defence cooperation and makes policy recommendations for a cohesive approach to this subject.

The request for advice mentions both *international* and *European* defence cooperation. Since this advisory report places the emphasis on the latter, as is apparent from the structure outlined above, the AIV considered it appropriate to refer to European cooperation in the title.

1 AIV advisory report no. 67, 'NATO's New Strategic Concept', The Hague, January 2010.

In preparing this report the AIV set up a combined committee consisting of Professor A. van Staden (chair), Lieutenant General M.L.M. Urlings (ret.) (vice-chair), Professor M.G.W. den Boer, Professor J. Colijn, Dr M. Drent, Dr W.F. van Eekelen, Dr B.T. van Ginkel, Professor M. de Goede, Dr A.R. Korteweg, Dr C.M. Megens, Lieutenant General H.W.M. Satter (ret.) and Professor J.G. Siccama. The executive secretary was M.W.M. Waanders (secretary to the Peace and Security Committee), who was assisted by trainees Ms Q.J. Genee, R.J.H. van Altvorst and M.V. Buijs. The committee met seven times between July 2011 and January 2012. In September some of the members paid a working visit to Brussels in order to obtain information at first hand on current developments in the field of capability cooperation at the EU and NATO. The committee also held discussions with a number of experts in The Hague. Annexe IV lists the persons consulted. The AIV is very grateful to them for their contribution.

The AIV adopted this report at its meeting on 27 January 2012.

Introduction

As a consequence of the financial crisis in 2008 and 2009, major defence spending cuts will be made in large parts of Europe, including the Netherlands, in the next few years. The total defence expenditure of NATO's European members shrank by €29 billion in 2009 and 2010 alone. This is equivalent to almost four times the Netherlands' current annual defence budget.[2] In the past it was apparent that the national approaches adopted by defence ministries to spending cuts often prevailed over a coherent European approach. European governments first decided independently to phase out or cut back on military capabilities, after which the consequences for joint military capability were discussed within NATO and the EU. And in decision-making on the current round of cuts in defence expenditure, there has once again been insufficient consultation or coordination between the European capitals. This last point is of particular concern. On this subject a former director of the European Defence Agency (EDA) said:

> 'What is worrying is not so much the scale of cuts as the way they have been made: strictly on a national basis, without any attempt at consultation or coordination within either NATO or the EU, and with no regard to the overall defence capability which will result from the sum of these national decisions.'[3]

The financial crisis brings not only risks (shrinking defence budgets) but also a new challenge (deepening European defence cooperation). This is why the EU defence ministers have seized the opportunity presented by this crisis to breathe new life into the debate on European defence cooperation. In the autumn of 2010 they launched the Ghent Initiative, which is designed to identify the benefits of pooling and sharing military capabilities and a further deepening of defence cooperation. The main reasons for more defence cooperation between European countries are to improve military deployability and interoperability (more capable forces), combat unnecessary duplication of military assets, make expected cost savings, strengthen political ties, serve common interests and show solidarity among allies. The AIV notes in respect of the cost savings referred to above that more defence cooperation should not be seen as paving the way for new cuts in the defence budget.

The AIV considers that the first question to be dealt with is what security risks Europe will face in the future and to what extent the EU must be able to operate independently of the United States if necessary in crisis situations. For the time being the EU will not be able to undertake large-scale military operations without an American contribution.[4] As American foreign and security policy comes to focus more and more on Asia and the Pacific and the significance of the transatlantic relationship diminishes for the United States, Europe will increasingly often have to chart an independent course and assume

2 NATO Press Release, 'Financial and Economic Data Relating to NATO Defence', 10 March 2011.

3 Nick Witney, 'How to stop the demilitarisation of Europe', European Council on Foreign Relations Policy Brief, November 2011, p. 2.

4 Tomas Valasek, 'What Libya says about the future of the transatlantic alliance', Centre for European Reform, July 2011; Michael Clarke et al. 'Accidental Heroes: Britain, France and the Libya operation', RUSI Interim Libya Campaign Report, September 2011.

responsibility – including military responsibility – in crisis situations in Europe or the surrounding region.[5] The United States expects to see a more resolute Europe that is willing and able to mount robust military action along its external borders.[6] Europe ought no longer to assume that the United States will be willing to act in all circumstances as guarantor of its security and as strategic 'backstop'.

As our continent is being thrown more and more upon its own resources, there is a growing need for European countries to develop a common security strategy that can also serve as a compass for developing joint military and civil capabilities. What is at stake is nothing less than the credibility of Europe's ambitions to make its own recognisable contribution to strengthening international security, especially in its immediate vicinity. The 2003 European Security Strategy (ESS) was widely regarded as providing a sound analysis of the security risks at the start of the 21st century, but failed to lay down practical guidelines for European security policy. Joint defence planning was limited to listing the total capabilities needed and gave no indication of how and by whom they were to be provided. The 2008 report on the implementation of the ESS was also incomplete as it failed to specify the EU's concrete security aims or assess the military and civil assets needed to perform as a strategic actor on the global stage.[7]

The Netherlands, which prefers to see itself as a medium-sized European power,[8] has made the strengthening of European military capabilities one of the priorities of its defence policy since 1999. In 2003 the AIV advised on the advantages and disadvantages of various forms of defence cooperation in Europe.[9] At that time it concluded that pooling and materiel cooperation offered the best possibilities for deepening cooperation in the short term as states would then largely retain their independent power to decide on the deployment of their armed forces.

As long ago as 2003 the government noted in its response to the AIV advisory report that the Netherlands would be unable in the long term to sustain credible and affordable armed forces without far-reaching international cooperation.[10] In view of the present

5 German Marshall Fund of the United States, 'Transatlantic Trends 2011'; interview with Tomas Valasek, The Hague, 30 September 2011. The new defence plans announced by President Obama on 5 January 2012 – known as Defence Strategic Guidance – confirm the strategic reorientation of the United States.

6 Farewell speech by US Secretary of Defence Robert Gates, 'Reflections on the status and future of the transatlantic alliance', Brussels, 10 June 2011.

7 Sven Biscop and Jo Coelmont, 'Europe, Strategy and Armed Forces: The making of a distinctive power', Routledge, London, 2011, pp. 11-13; The Swedish Institute of International Affairs, 'The European Security Strategy: Reinvigorate, Revise or Reinvent?', Occasional Papers No. 7, 10 June 2011.

8 Ruben van Genderen, 'Nederland als middelgrote mogendheid: van streven naar erkenning tot poging tot volwassenheid?' (The Netherlands as a medium-sized power: from striving for recognition to attempt at adulthood), *Internationale Spectator* 65 (1), January 2011, p.15; Defence White Paper 2000, 29 November 1999, p. 32.

9 AIV advisory report no. 31, 'Military cooperation in Europe: possibilities and limitations', The Hague, April 2003.

10 See the government's response to AIV advisory report no. 31, 'Military cooperation in Europe: possibilities and limitations', The Hague, 17 October 2003.

cuts in the defence budget this observation has, if anything, become even more pertinent. Indeed, the urgent need for more international cooperation has increased still further. Important questions concerning new cooperation possibilities, deepening existing defence cooperation, the conditions in which this cooperation can be achieved, lessons from earlier multinational programmes and the implications for sovereignty must be considered in this connection.

Forms of cooperation
International defence cooperation takes many forms and therefore needs to be defined. At a strategic level, a distinction can first of all be made between bilateral and multilateral forms of defence cooperation. The Netherlands' most important partners in the security field in Europe are Belgium, Germany and the United Kingdom. The Belgian-Dutch Navy Cooperation (Benesam), the German/Netherlands Corps[11] and the UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force are the product of the close bilateral relations with these countries. However, it does not follow from this cooperation in matters of capability that the Netherlands will in all cases participate jointly with these countries in military missions. This is due to national caveats about the use of capabilities and differing assessments of the desirability of participation in missions. In addition, the Netherlands is involved in military capability cooperation at multilateral level within the EU and NATO and in various ad hoc capability initiatives, for example in relation to airlift capability.

At strategic level a distinction is also made between top-down and bottom-up approaches to international defence cooperation. At the time of the Cold War, NATO was an alliance that relied on top-down military planning and integrated cooperation to defend its external borders. Capability cooperation initiatives such as NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative (1999) and the EU's Helsinki Headline Goal (1999) also had a markedly top-down character. The problem with this approach is that neither NATO nor the EU has its own military capabilities, at least to any significant extent. The position has been summed up by a Dutch expert in Brussels in the following terms: 'The EU and NATO design the frameworks for capability cooperation, but it is the member states themselves that have to get things done.' In the case of a bottom-up approach to defence cooperation, the member states themselves search, within the designated political frameworks, for suitable partners with which to cooperate. In doing so they can build on existing forms of practical cooperation between the armed forces of two or more countries.

At a practical level it is possible to distinguish between various types of international defence cooperation. In the following list, each successive example involves a deeper level of cooperation:

- joint chartering of military or civil capabilities, for example for airlift (SALIS), sealift and satellite communication;
- pooling of military capabilities, which may yield benefits in the area of joint education and training (Belgian-Netherlands Naval Mine Warfare School and the German-Dutch armoured howitzer training), joint maintenance and logistics (Benesam and NAMSA) and joint command (Admiral Benelux and the EATC);
- joint procurement and sharing of military capabilities (AWACS and SAC/C-17 transport aircraft);
- operational cooperation (EU Battlegroups and the NRF);

11 Since 2002 in the form of a high readiness forces headquarters, without combat units permanently under command.

- integrated operational cooperation (high readiness forces headquarters of the German/Netherlands Corps);
- role and task specialisation, possibly in the context of permanent structured cooperation.

These different forms of defence cooperation and how they interrelate are discussed in the next chapter.

Sovereignty and dependence

One of the key issues in investigating the scope for international defence cooperation is national sovereignty. Sovereignty is often seen as an obstacle to cooperation, certainly in the politically sensitive area of defence and national security. In its request for advice the government states that international defence cooperation and national sovereignty should not be seen as opposites: 'deepening international cooperation by the armed forces is designed to strengthen joint military effectiveness and thereby enhance our security and sovereignty.'[12] Indeed, in an era of ongoing globalisation, bilateral and multilateral cooperation are actually a way of retaining as much international presence and influence as possible in military and security matters.

The AIV notes that important questions arise in relation to the dependence of the Dutch armed forces on other countries and private and other organisations. To form a clear picture of these issues, this report examines the relationship between sovereignty, national autonomy and military cooperation. How is sovereignty defined precisely and what forms of sovereignty are at issue in relation to international defence cooperation? How do existing military partnerships deal with the sovereignty issue and what can we learn from this?

12 See Annexe I.

I Perspectives on defence cooperation

This chapter first examines the sovereignty issue and explores it in the light of Dutch experience of existing forms of international defence cooperation. Various cooperation initiatives in the context of NATO, the EU and regional, bilateral or other partnerships are analysed by reference to the following questions:

- what are the political, military strategy and financial objectives of each of the initiatives?
- what results have been achieved?
- how have they affected national sovereignty and the dependence of the Dutch armed forces?

I.1 Sovereignty and defence cooperation

Before considering existing examples of cooperation, this section examines how sovereignty is defined and interpreted in an era of globalisation and hybrid military conflicts. National sovereignty is a key concept in international law denoting the claim to the exercise of exclusive authority by a state, the national power of decision, or, to put it another way, 'control of one's own fate'.[13] Nation states generally recognise no higher power than themselves and possess a monopoly on the use of force within their own territory. It is worthwhile distinguishing between external and internal sovereignty.[14] External sovereignty involves legal recognition of the borders of a state and independence within the international state system. Recognition by other states and international organisations confers on a state international legal sovereignty and hence at the same time the right to settle its internal affairs without external interference. External sovereignty is often associated with the rejection of external interference (*par in parem non habet imperium*).[15] Internal sovereignty refers to the authority of the nation state and the degree of control it can exercise within its territory. This concept of sovereignty is about the effectiveness of national authority and administration. Stephen Krasner shows that the different forms of sovereignty need not always coincide.[16] For example, a state may have international legal recognition, but be unable to exercise effective control over its own territory. Or it may have both international legal recognition and effective control of its territory, but be unable to control transborder problems or movements.[17]

13 Laurens Jan Brinkhorst, 'Europese Unie en nationale soevereiniteit' (European Union and national sovereignty) (inaugural speech given when accepting the chair in international and European law and administration at the University of Leiden), 8 April 2008, p. 6.

14 Tanja Aalbers, 'Sovereignty. Evolution of an idea' (review essay), *Acta Politica*, 2009, 44, pp. 280-283.

15 Literally, an equal has no power over an equal.

16 Professor of political science at Stanford University and former director of policy planning at the U.S. State Department.

17 Stephen Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organised Hypocrisy*, Princeton University Press, 1999, pp. 3-4.

Sovereignty is therefore not a historically fixed concept and occurs in varying degrees and forms. The era of globalisation is bringing changes to the theory and practice of sovereignty. International conventions in the fields of human rights or environmental policy are creating new international standards with which states must comply. In so far as these standards are set forth in conventions by which states consent to be bound, this is keeping with sovereignty in the classical sense. In addition, however, there are rules of a peremptory nature (*jus cogens*) by which states are also bound, even if they are not party to the conventions introducing them. The principle of 'responsibility to protect', which was accepted by the United Nations in 2005, also underlines the responsibility of states to protect their population against mass violations of human rights.[18] At the same time, this principle provides the international community with a basis for providing assistance in such cases and even intervening if states are in serious breach of their obligations. Resolution 1973 of the UN Security Council of March 2011, which formed the basis for the military intervention in Libya, referred explicitly to the protection of the civilian population by way of justification.[19]

Nation states are increasingly confronted with external threats (such as environmental disasters, cross-border crime, terrorism and cyber warfare) which they are unable to tackle on their own and which require a joint approach.[20] Mutual consultation and collective responsibility are the only way of dealing with cross-border threats. International cooperation is therefore not a matter of voluntary choice but a vital necessity and the only way of guaranteeing national security and maintaining national potency. National autonomy and the capacity to act are presently at odds with one another. By trying to sustain at any cost the – now fictitious – notion of autonomous decision-making power the nation state risks losing influence, effectiveness and, ultimately, the right of co-decision in international forums.

These international developments have led to a reconsideration of the concept of sovereignty and recognition that a strictly legal approach to the concept is insufficient. This modern interpretation of the concept is facilitated by the fact that sovereignty has never been viewed as an absolute concept in international law. Besides the legal recognition of sovereignty by others, the concept also includes control of territory and the possibility of actually exercising power. In the new political approach to the concept of sovereignty, attention focuses above all on the capacity of national states to act effectively and the requirements that can be imposed in this respect in an era of globalisation. On this point Anne-Marie Slaughter[21] has noted that 'States can only

18 The 2005 resolution of the UN General Assembly on the Responsibility to Protect refers not only to mass violations of human rights but also to genocide, war crimes, etnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

19 As regards the conflict in Libya, the AIV will not consider in the context of this advisory report whether the limits of the resolution were exceeded. See also AIV advisory report no. 70, 'The Netherlands and the Responsibility to Protect: the responsibility to protect people from mass atrocities', The Hague, June 2010.

20 Ulrich Beck, 'The Terrorist Threat: World Risk Society Revisited', *Theory, Culture and Society* 19 (4), 2002.

21 American lawyer, political scientist and former adviser to President Obama.

govern effectively by actively cooperating with other states ...'[22] According to Slaughter, the 'new sovereignty' is determined by the capacity of a state to cooperate effectively in international forums and to participate with authority in international networks. Only in this way can a modern state achieve the goals connected with sovereignty in the classical sense and guarantee security for its citizens.

The sovereignty debate can be summarised as being about balancing the need to increase the capacity to act against the need to preserve freedom of action. The AIV considers that the modern interpretation of the concept of sovereignty should be adopted and consequently that security and sovereignty are served by having armed forces that can cooperate effectively in a European and broader international context. The Netherlands is already engaged in forms of cooperation in NATO and the EU. The deployability of its national armed forces is therefore dependent on coordination and cooperation with other countries. In other words, if sovereignty is summarised as the capacity to act, international cooperation is essential.[23] The Netherlands would be unable and unwilling to carry out crisis management operations of any size on its own. Only through participation in bilateral and multilateral arrangements and through structured European cooperation can the Netherlands maintain international influence and enhance its military effectiveness. From this perspective the importance of shared European sovereignty is, in reality, greater than that of (unshared) national sovereignty.

Nonetheless, closer international cooperation is at odds with national autonomy or, rather, freedom of action. The practical significance of a country having control over its own armed forces is limited if the deployment of these armed forces is dependent on political and military decision-making in NATO, the EU or the UN. Naturally, a government can always decide against deploying military personnel to a crisis area if it concludes that there is insufficient political and public support for this in its own country. However, such a decision may harm the political prestige and national interests of the country if it acts in a manner contrary to the express wishes of a substantial majority of the member states of, say, NATO or the EU. Calls for alliance solidarity can put a wavering government under pressure to reconsider and decide to deploy troops after all.

Conversely, a government that intends to deploy military personnel within the context of NATO or the EU is dependent on the outcome of intergovernmental decision-making. A member state that casts a veto can thus, in principle, block a military mission within the context of the alliance. A special aspect of dependence occurs where military personnel are deployed within the context of integrated bilateral or multilateral cooperation. For example, the high readiness forces headquarters of the German/Netherlands Corps can be deployed only by the mutual agreement of the two countries. Without Dutch participation Germany has no functioning headquarters and vice versa. There is therefore a high degree of mutual dependence, which requires close consultation between the partner countries in circumstances where an incipient crisis may necessitate deployment. The same dependence could arise in decisions on the deployment of the NATO Response Force (NRF) and the EU Battlegroups, where in the event of an unexpected crisis the countries concerned have to agree a joint position on the political desirability and military feasibility

22 Anne-Marie Slaughter, 'Sovereignty and Power in a Networked World Order', *Stanford Journal of International Law* 40, 2004, p. 284.

23 Margriet Drent et al., 'Internationale Militaire Samenwerking: Knelpunten en Kansen' (International Military Cooperation: Problems and Opportunities), Clingendael Policy Brief no. 6, September 2011, p. 5.

of actual deployment of their response force. Since the relationship between the partners could be gravely harmed if one of them were to adopt a different position, this should be avoided. Consequently, careful consideration is necessary when choosing partners for close operational cooperation and determining the conditions. A country's political decision-making process, strategic culture and willingness to take risks in deploying its own military personnel are important factors in the choice of partners (see section II.1).

In the future, countries may conceivably become so dependent on their partners' military capability that they cannot effectively undertake military operations without their active cooperation. The AIV considers that in such circumstances the risk of paralysis in the preparation of operations because certain countries decide not to become involved is greater than the risk of loss of national decision-making power. In intergovernmental decision-making of the kind that takes place within both NATO and the EU, member states cannot, after all, be forced to cooperate in implementing majority decisions. It is also hard to imagine that critical and vigilant national parliaments such as the Dutch parliament would endorse participation in military operations purely because other countries have become dependent on Dutch military capabilities and might be exerting political pressure to make these capabilities available; especially in the case of high-risk land operations at a low tactical level, where the dangers to military personnel are most apparent. When considering whether or not to endorse a mission, national parliaments often attach decisive importance to the degree to which their country's own troops would run safety risks in the event of joint deployment with the troops of another country and to the nature of the national security interests involved. It is therefore up to governments to make clear to parliaments that the risks are acceptable when viewed in the light of the aims of a military operation and the expected results.[24]

I.2 Multilateral defence cooperation

Multilateral defence cooperation in Europe goes back to the establishment of NATO in 1949. Collective defence of alliance territory was the rationale. The dependence of the Dutch armed forces on other countries, in particular on the United States, in protecting territorial integrity was inevitable and was indeed regarded for many decades as the best insurance for our national sovereignty.

The end of the Cold War threat and the gradual transformation of the armed forces to play an expeditionary role gave new impetus to military cooperation within NATO and also within the EU. The emphasis was placed on greater capability cooperation. This section deals with the objectives and results of the various capability initiatives of NATO and the EU in the past two decades.

I.2.1 NATO capabilities initiatives

As a result of the operational shortfalls of the countries that took part in the Kosovo Campaign in 1999, capabilities cooperation has become a new priority for the NATO Alliance. The Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) was launched at the end of 1999 and was intended above all to improve the strategic mobility of the armed forces, in other words the capacity to move military units over relatively long distances. This required extra expenditure on scarce airlift capability and international coordination to make the most efficient use of it. Since 1999 the Netherlands has been working to pool airlift and

24 AIV advisory report no. 48, 'Society and the armed forces', The Hague, April 2006.

sealift capability with its European allies and thereby reduce dependence on external civilian charters (see also section I.3).[25]

The follow-up to the highly ambitious DCI came at the NATO summit in Prague in 2002 in the form of an initiative known as the Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC), which was essentially a ‘shopping list’ of the capabilities required in order to meet new security threats. The rather less wide-ranging PCC once again put much emphasis on strategic transport capability and on logistical support for expeditionary operations.

Allied Command Transformation
The Allied Command Transformation (ACT) was established in 2003 and is NATO’s second strategic headquarters. The aim of ACT is to coordinate the defence efforts of NATO member countries in developing new doctrine and thus shape how future operations are carried out and determine what capabilities are needed for this purpose. It develops operational concepts and supports them by means of research, experimentation and technological development. ACT also plays an important role in implementing operational concepts through education and training. It oversees the production of the biennial Defence Requirement Review, which sets out the strategic vision for the development of NATO armed forces. The study helps to identify the capabilities required and the shortfalls. This information in turn provides a basis for the capability development initiatives. One aspect of this is the aim of achieving greater multinational coordination and allowing joint capability development in the interests of shared European and transatlantic sovereignty. However, ACT can only steer this process and is not in a position itself to compel capability development.

Strategic transport
Owing to the increase in the number of out-of-area operations, greater demands are being made on scarce airlift and sealift capabilities in order to move military equipment and personnel over long distances. Although some – mainly large – European countries have ordered the new A400M transport aircraft, delivery is not expected until 2014. This is one reason why 16 NATO countries, including the Netherlands, and two partner countries entered into an agreement with Russia and Ukraine in 2006 to charter six large Antonov transport aircraft. This agreement, known as the Strategic Airlift Interim Solution (SALIS), provides a temporary remedy for the shortages within NATO of large transport aircraft, but at the same time reveals the extent of the operational dependence on external providers. SALIS expires in 2012.

Complementing the SALIS agreement, ten NATO countries – including the Netherlands – and two partner countries have jointly decided to acquire three Boeing C-17 transport aircraft. Many of the countries taking part in this Strategic Airlift Capability (SAC) are unable to purchase a strategic transport aircraft on their own. Each participating partner has undertaken to purchase a fixed number of flying hours on an annual basis. For example, the Netherlands has 500 flying hours a year at its disposal, which is the equivalent of half a C-17 aircraft. By jointly acquiring and sharing the three C-17 transport aircraft, small and medium-sized countries are better able to meet their own needs for strategic transport capability in the event of out-of-area operations and are less dependent on chartering from external public and private providers.

25 Defence White Paper 2000, 29 November 1999, p. 53.

Logistical support for expeditionary operations
All NATO member states are confronted with complex and expensive planning and implementation when providing logistical support for out-of-area operations and large-scale exercises. The NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA) has evolved in recent years from an international organisation specialising in weapons systems maintenance into a logistical service provider and contracting agency for military operations and large-scale exercises. NAMSA is responsible, for example, for almost the entire organisation and stationing of ISAF military personnel at Kandahar Airfield and the ISAF headquarters in Kabul. The Dutch Minister of Defence noted in a recent speech that, thanks to international contracts concluded through NAMSA, the costs of stationing Dutch military personnel at Kandahar Airfield had been cut by half. International logistics cooperation through NAMSA thus generates substantial savings and can create scope for extra expenditure on scarce military capabilities.[26]

Smart Defence
NATO's Secretary-General argued in a speech in early 2011 that states are duty-bound to build greater security even in times of financial crisis and shrinking defence budgets.[27] He advocated a new twin-track approach known as Smart Defence: getting more security from limited resources and investing enough in our future security. How can greater security be achieved with limited resources? His answer is by pooling scarce and often expensive capabilities, by setting the right priorities in the security field, by slimming down bureaucracy and by international coordination of spending cuts in national defence budgets. NATO can also assist by making its expertise available to member states. For the second track – investing in our future security – extra expenditure is needed on cross-border research and development. A shift from national to multinational research programmes is required for this purpose, together with closer links with the private sector.

An ACT-led Multinational Approaches to Capability Development Task Force (MNA TF) is currently making proposals for multinational cooperation in the procurement, operation and maintenance of military capabilities to enable decisions on new joint projects to be taken at the NATO summit in 2012.[28] These proposals further develop the Lisbon Capability Package, consisting of 10 priority capabilities, which was agreed at the NATO summit in Lisbon in November 2010. For the implementation of the Smart Defence initiative NATO is reliant on close cooperation with the EU in order to avoid duplication with the Ghent Initiative (see section I.2.2). The AIV notes that, since 1999, NATO has made modest progress in reducing military shortfalls within the Alliance. Agreements between heads of government and state of the NATO member countries about joint capability development have been most effective in the area of strategic transport and logistical cooperation. Although the establishment of the ACT in 2003 did provide impetus for the joint development of military doctrines and operational concepts, including the NATO Response Force (NRF), it has hitherto made only a limited

26 Address given by the Minister of Defence at the opening of the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency seminar, Rijswijk, 20 May 2011.

27 Keynote speech by the Secretary-General of NATO, 'Building security in an age of austerity', Munich Security Conference, 4 February 2011.

28 Minister of Defence, 'Letter to parliament with annotated agenda of the meeting of NATO defence ministers in Brussels on 8 and 9 June next', The Hague, 26 May 2011.

contribution to multinational initiatives for the procurement and utilisation of military capabilities. This highlights the limitations of a top-down approach to joint capability development.

I.2.2 EU capabilities development

In 1999 the EU launched the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), one of whose main aims is to strengthen European military capabilities. The emphasis was on remedying the shortfalls in the fields of strategic transport, logistics, strategic intelligence, engineer units and NBC protection. The Netherlands made an active contribution to strengthening the military capability of the EU under the European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP) and the Headline Goal, although there was a need to avoid the duplication of capabilities with NATO. The ECAP had a markedly bottom-up approach; the highly promising ECAP projects have been the responsibility of the European Defence Agency since 2004.[29]

European Defence Agency

The establishment of the European Defence Agency (EDA) in 2004 was a compromise between the French desire to create a strong top-down instrument for managing European capability development and the British wish to invest as little as possible in European institutions. The EDA started life as a small agency with a modest budget and the aim of generating synergy between EU member states in the field of the identification of military requirements, materiel policy, defence research and technology and harmonisation of defence procurement. The EDA encourages bottom-up cooperation through joint programmes and projects in which, in principle, all member states and third countries and/or parties can participate. In reality there are hardly any programmes in which all member states participate. Nor is this necessary. Within the EDA many different forms of ad hoc cooperation are established between limited numbers of countries in such varied areas as capabilities, materiel, research and technology. The rationale for these forms of cooperation is in fact very simple: invest in the short term in order to save in the long term.[30] They are relatively small programmes such as a helicopter training programme for expeditionary operations, a mobile laboratory for incidents involving improvised explosive devices (IEDs), data and information exchange for maritime surveillance (MARSUR) and the development of a new generation of maritime mine countermeasure systems, including unmanned maritime systems (UMS).[31]

What have all these efforts yielded? Tangible results are as yet fairly few and far between, partly due to British misgivings. The most concrete results have been achieved by the helicopter training programme, which started in 2009 in consultation with NATO. Of the 114 helicopter crews who trained for expeditionary operations in 2009 and 2010, 63 have since been posted to Afghanistan. At the same time, the shortage of helicopters within NATO for out-of-area operations is being remedied by technically upgrading obsolete East European helicopters. The EDA helicopter training programme, in combination with the NATO helicopter project, has helped to reduce the shortage of

29 See the government's response to AIV advisory report no. 31, 'Military Cooperation in Europe: Possibilities and Limitations', The Hague, 17 October 2003; Defence Budget 2005, pp. 108-109.

30 Interview with Jon Mullin, EDA Capability Director, Brussels, 9 September 2011.

31 Interview with Claude-France Arnould, chief executive of the EDA, Brussels, 8 September 2011; see also <http://www.eda.europa.eu/Publications>, consulted on 6 October 2011.

helicopters for out-of-area operations, in this case in Afghanistan.

The EDA has not for the time being launched any major new programmes, such as the development of a new type of unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) or an armoured vehicle, because priority is being given to the interests of national industries in major projects. Only 20% of all European expenditure on the procurement of defence materiel is financed on a binational or multinational basis. Joint procurement therefore tends to be the exception rather than the rule.[32] This is due to the improper use made of article 346 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, which permits member states not to apply the rules of the internal market where the essential interests of national security are at stake. National industrial and economic interests weigh more heavily than the shared interests of European capability development and sovereignty. This limits the scope for standardisation of defence materiel and encourages fragmentation of the European defence market. However, the EDA has created greater transparency in the defence procurement process between member states by introducing a politically binding code of conduct on defence procurement. This provides that member states allow suppliers from other EU countries to tender for all defence procurement contracts worth €1 million or more.[33]

The NATO operation over Libya also revealed crucial shortfalls on the European side in certain fields. Examples include the ability to identify and eliminate enemy targets with great precision and to refuel fighter aircraft in flight. The lessons learned from the NATO operation over Libya are expected to result in new joint capability programmes within the EDA, for example in respect of air-to-air refuelling, smart munitions and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance. The EU defence ministers intend to take decisions on this in the spring of 2012.[34]

Treaty of Lisbon

Article 42 (6) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), as amended by the Treaty of Lisbon, provides for the possibility of permanent structured cooperation (PSC) for member states whose military capabilities fulfil strict criteria with a view to implementation of the most demanding missions. A separate protocol attached to the Treaty lists the following criteria for participation in PSC:

- achieve objectives for the level of investment in defence equipment;
- bring their defence apparatus into line with each other as far as possible, particularly by harmonising the identification of their military requirements, by pooling and, where appropriate, specialising their defence means and capabilities and by encouraging cooperation in the fields of training and logistics;
- take concrete measures to enhance the availability, interoperability, flexibility and deployability of their forces;

32 Interview with Dick Zandee, Brussels, 9 September 2011; Directorate-General for External Policies of the Union, 'The Impact of the Financial Crisis on European Defence', Brussels, April 2011, p. 9.

33 Dick Zandee, 'Europese defensiesamenwerking: kiezen en delen!' (European defence cooperation: choosing and sharing), *Atlantisch perspectief* no. 2, 2007.

34 Interview with Jon Mullin, EDA Capability Director, Brussels, 9 September 2011.

- work together to address the shortfalls perceived in the framework of European defence;
- take part in EDA equipment programmes.[35]

PSC is the most far-reaching form of defence cooperation and ranges from pooling and joint training to integrated military operations and role specialisation. It is also regarded as a catalyst for a credible Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), as the ESDP has become known. Under article 3 of the PSC Protocol, the EDA must regularly assess whether the countries participating in PSC are fulfilling the capability obligations they have voluntarily entered into and must report annually on this.[36]

Today, two years after the Treaty of Lisbon entered into force, the EU member states are having cold feet about actually implementing PSC. This became apparent, for example, during a seminar on PSC during the Spanish EU presidency in March 2010. It is still unclear, for example, whether the PSC mechanism is intended to form a single leading group or whether more than one leading group is possible. Another concern is that if a leading group of member states were to be formed and cooperate together more closely, this might prove divisive within the Union. There is a real risk that the gap between the leading group and the 'stragglers' among the EU member states would widen still further.[37]

Apart from PSC the Treaty of Lisbon has also introduced two other new provisions which are worth noting in this context. Referring to article 51 of the UN Charter, article 42 (7) of the consolidated Treaty on European Union introduces an obligation on all member states to provide aid and assistance 'by all the means in their power' if a member state is the victim of armed aggression on its territory. This provision is similar in purport to article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty[38] and means that for the first time the CSDP includes an obligation to provide military assistance, although it is expressly stated that this must be consistent with NATO commitments and may not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of neutral member states that have negotiated an exceptional position.[39]

35 Article 2 of the Protocol on Permanent Structured Cooperation, established by article 42 of the Treaty on European Union.

36 Sven Biscop and Jo Coelmont, 'Europe, Strategy and Armed Forces: The making of a distinctive power', Routledge, London, 2011, pp. 75-76; Margriet Drent and Dick Zandee, 'Breaking Pillars: Towards a civil-military security approach for the European Union', Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', January 2010, p. 72.

37 Margriet Drent and Dick Zandee, ibid. p. 74.

38 In fact the wording of this aid and assistance obligation is stricter because EU member states have an 'obligation of aid and assistance by all the means in their power'. Under the North Atlantic Treaty the member states are free to choose their own means.

39 Kees Homan, 'Europese Defensie na Lissabon' (European Defence after Lisbon), Armex, June 2008, p. 4; S.N. Mengelberg and M.E. Drent, 'Een effectievere Europese Unie? De gevolgen van het Verdrag van Lissabon voor het Gemeenschappelijk Veiligheids- en Defensiebeleid' (A more effective European Union? The consequences of the Treaty of Lisbon for the Common Security and Defence Policy), *Militaire Spectator* no. 11, 2010, p. 549.

In addition, the Treaty of Lisbon introduced a solidarity clause, article 222 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.[40] The contents of this provision are not in fact new because after the terrorist attacks in Madrid the European Council issued a (legally non-binding) declaration to the same effect on 25 March 2004. The solidarity clause can be activated if one or more member states are the object of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or man-made disaster. It envisages a possible role for defence capabilities and is intended to establish an effective link between internal and external security.[41] The Union makes use of all instruments at its disposal, including military resources offered by the member states, in order to avert the threat of a terrorist attack on European territory or provide assistance in the event of a natural or man-made disaster. The member states are to coordinate their actions in the Council. The implementation by the Union of the solidarity clause is regulated by a decision adopted by the Council acting on a joint proposal by the Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. To enable the Union and its member states to take effective action the European Council regularly assesses the threats facing the Union.[42]

In the light of the solidarity clause the European Parliament has drawn attention to the need to establish a European civil protection force, which could be rapidly mobilised in the event of a terrorist attack or natural or man-made disaster.[43] Of particular interest in this connection is the Barnier Report,[44] which recommends a systematic analysis of the complementary role which military resources could play in this connection. For example, teams established to deliver emergency humanitarian assistance should also include military personnel. The AIV considers that this would be a practical way of giving further substance to civil-military cooperation in Europe.

Ghent Initiative

In the autumn of 2010 EU defence ministers agreed, in response to pressure from the financial crisis and shrinking defence budgets, to raise European cooperation to a higher level. The widespread realisation that spending cuts to the armed forces may jeopardise the CSDP's level of ambition, and that more far-reaching defence cooperation

40 Part II of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), Part 5 – External action by the Union, Title VII - Solidarity clause.

41 Memorandum on the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy against the backdrop of the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon. Letter from the Ministers of Defence and Foreign Affairs, No. 973, General Affairs Council and Foreign Affairs Council, 21 501-02, 16 June 2010; see <https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/kst-21501-02-973.html>.

42 See: <http://www.europesworld.org/NewEnglish/Home_old/PartnerPosts/tabid/671/PostID/2242/language/en-US/Default.aspx>; Sara Myrdal and Mark Rhinard, 'The European Union's Solidarity Clause: Empty Letter or Effective Tool?', Occasional Papers No. 2, 2010, Swedish Institute of International Affairs.

43 S.N. Mengelberg and M.E. Drent, ibid. p. 551. Resolution of the European Parliament of 19 June 2008 on stepping up the Union's disaster response capacity, in 27.11.2009, C 286 E/15.

44 'For a European civil protection force: Europe aid', report by Michel Barnier of 9 May 2006. <http://ec.europa.eu/archives/commission_2004-2009/president/pdf/rapport_barnier_en.pdf>. Consulted on 17 January 2012.

is now more necessary than ever, underlies the so-called Ghent Initiative. By putting the emphasis in the Ghent Initiative on ways of pooling and sharing military capabilities the defence ministers have for the time being opted for less far-reaching forms of defence cooperation than PSC. In a German-Swedish discussion paper it was proposed that all member states should make a systematic analysis of their military capabilities and divide them into three categories: capabilities that must be maintained at a strictly national level because they are deemed essential for national purposes, capabilities that can be pooled with other countries without creating unduly strong mutual dependence, and capabilities that would be suitable for international role and task specialisation and where there would be direct dependence on other countries.[45] The EDA and the EU Military Committee have been asked to formulate specific proposals for defence cooperation between member states, in particular in the area of pooling and sharing, on the basis of these national analyses.[46] The following criteria must be taken into account when identifying opportunities for cooperation: the need to strengthen military capability, improve interoperability, make cost savings through economies of scale and the desired political implications of cooperation. Although at a time of retrenchment attention is naturally focused on cost savings, the AIV considers that the other criteria are equally important.

Dutch ESDP funds: the MALE UAV case[47]
To strengthen European military capabilities, the Netherlands set aside a total of €130 million in its defence budget in the period 2003-2006 and since then it has reserved an annual amount of €50 million from the ESDP facility.[48] Analysis of how these ESDP funds are disbursed can shed more light on the effectiveness of Dutch efforts in this respect. They concern, for example, the development of a joint MALE UAV capacity with France, an air transport agreement with Germany, the conversion of the headquarters of the German/Netherlands Corps and the training of extra gendarmerie for deployment on international civilian police missions. The reference to the ESDP in the name of the facility is in fact somewhat misleading as the funds are intended to strengthen the capability of not only the ESDP (now the CSDP) but also NATO.

An analysis of the intended cooperation with France provides an insight into the conditions for such projects. In May 2001 the Netherlands and France concluded an agreement to work together to develop MALE UAVs. The original aim of the agreement was to develop a binational UAV capacity consisting of a French and a Dutch element. The intended cooperation went further than the joint development and acquisition of unmanned aerial vehicles. It also included joint training, maintenance and logistics. There was even talk of possible joint deployment in crisis management operations.[49]

45 German-Swedish food-for-thought paper: ‘European Imperative – Intensifying Military Cooperation in Europe’, November 2010.

46 Council Conclusions on Military Capability Development, 3055th Foreign Affairs (Defence) Council meeting, Brussels, 9 December 2010.

47 Medium-Altitude Long-Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicle.

48 Letter to parliament on the ‘Defence and the Strategic Accord’ of 8 November 2002.

49 Letter to parliament from Frank de Grave, Minister of Defence, of 28 May 2002, Parliamentary Paper 28 000, no. 30

In 2006 the joint project was not renewed: France had unilaterally chosen to have a EuroMALE developed by the European Aeronautic Defence and Space Company (EADS), in which France is strongly represented. The Netherlands was not informed about this decision in advance and subsequently withdrew, giving as its formal reason that its preference was for an off-the-shelf MALE UAV system.[50]

Why did this cooperation with France fail? The decision to work with France despite the Dutch air force's traditionally closer ties with the United States should be seen in the broader context of the growing Dutch interest in European defence cooperation in the period in question. Moreover, the then Dutch government was keen to improve Franco-Dutch relations and to this end established a Franco-Dutch Cooperation Council in February 2000. The MALE UAV project was part of this trend. Owing to this broader politico-strategic interest there was pressure from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Defence and State Secretary for Defence to make a success of the project. There was therefore a strong political dimension to the project's inspiration. However, the partners' relative lack of experience of bilateral cooperation in the defence field undermined the project. Communication between the two countries was poor and they failed to reach agreement on standardising the system. The Netherlands contributed 25% of the costs of the project and was treated as a junior partner. The degree of serious participation in the project by the Netherlands was therefore insufficient. Another factor was that as time passed the United States air force's MALE UAV – the Predator – became operational and achieved good results. Finally, the Dutch air force had little experience of dealing with the French defence sector, with the closely interwoven interests between the French defence ministry and the French defence industry.[51] At that time the competing defence companies Thales and EADS were interested in developing the MALE UAV system. This meant that the needs and interests of the Netherlands were consigned to the background, culminating in the French defence minister's announcement – taking the Netherlands by surprise – that France had chosen EuroMALE.

I.2.3 Regional defence cooperation

There are also calls for the generation of military capabilities to be left to regional partnerships or clusters of like-minded countries who would then offer them to both NATO and the EU. Regional clusters of countries are said to be better placed to deepen their military capability cooperation. However, a former EDA official has pointed out that capability cooperation at the level of these clusters also has limitations; for example, deepening cooperation at operational and strategic level (operational headquarters and command structure) is possible only in the context of NATO and the EU.[52]

Benelux cooperation

The cooperation between the Benelux countries in the immediate post-war period had great political significance as an example for the later European Economic Community (EEC). It was not without reason that the Benelux was considered a testing ground

50 Letter to parliament from Cees van der Knaap, State Secretary for Defence, on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) of 20 September 2006, Parliamentary Paper 30 806, no. 1.

51 Interview with a Ministry of Defence official, 28 October 2011.

52 Tomas Valasek, 'Surviving Austerity. The case for a new approach to EU military collaboration', Centre for European Reform, April 2011. Interview with Dick Zandee, Brussels, 9 September 2011.

for closer cooperation. With the advent of the EEC and later the EU, the significance of the Benelux diminished. However, the three member countries continued with 'Benelux Political Cooperation' in order to coordinate their positions prior to European consultations and thus maximise their political leverage.[53]

A debate is currently under way in both the Netherlands and Belgium on the desirability of greater political and military cooperation for security purposes within the Benelux. According to a Belgian defence expert, a precondition for closer cooperation would have to be the joint discussion by the Benelux partners of their national defence plans before adoption. The joint procurement, stationing and maintenance of transport and/or fighter aircraft represents a major step that could be taken towards closer cooperation between their air forces, along the same lines as the navy cooperation between the Netherlands and Belgium (see section I.3).[54]

Nordic cooperation
In 2009 the defence ministers of Denmark, Finland, Norway, Iceland and Sweden launched the Nordic Defence Cooperation (NORDEFCO), an umbrella mechanism for regional defence cooperation. Owing to their geographic location and history the Scandinavian countries have similar political and strategic interests, despite the fact that Norway and Iceland belong to NATO, Sweden and Finland to the European Union and Denmark belongs to both. NORDEFCO has singled out five areas for closer cooperation, each having its own lead nation:

- strategic development (Sweden);
- capabilities (Finland);
- human resources and education (Denmark);
- training and exercises (Norway);
- operational cooperation (Sweden).[55]

NORDEFCO's main aim is to strengthen the armed forces of the participating countries and to harness the synergy between them. According to a report by Thorvald Stoltenberg, a former foreign and defence minister of Norway, without closer cooperation the Scandinavian countries will be unable in 15 to 20 years' time to maintain credible defence forces.[56] NORDEFCO is not intended to establish a defence union. However, this example does show that the Scandinavian countries apply a modern interpretation of the concept of sovereignty with a view to increasing the capabilities of the separate armed forces through closer cooperation. The foreign ministers of the participating countries have issued a declaration on solidarity, which includes the following passage:

53 Kees Homan and Jan Rood, 'Een nieuw leven voor de Benelux?' (A new life for the Benelux?), *Atlantisch perspectief* no. 4, 2011, pp. 14-18; AIV advisory report no. 53, 'The Benelux: the benefits and necessity of enhanced cooperation', The Hague, February 2007.

54 Professor Sven Biscop, Brussels, 8 September 2011.

55 NORDEFCO Military Level Annual Report 2010, February 2011.

56 Thorvald Stoltenberg, 'Nordic Cooperation on Foreign and Security Policy. Proposals presented to the extraordinary meeting of Nordic foreign ministers in Oslo on 9 February 2009', February 2009, p. 28. Thorvald Stoltenberg is the father of Jens Stoltenberg, the current Norwegian Prime Minister.

> 'Ministers discussed potential risks inter alia natural and man-made disasters, cyber and terrorist attacks. Should a Nordic country be affected, the others will, upon request from that country, assist with relevant means. […] The Ministers pointed out that the Nordic declaration on solidarity will be followed up through practical measures, such as cooperation in the field of cyber security, as a first step.'[57]

The Norwegian decision to purchase the American JSF fighter aircraft rather than the Swedish Gripen caused great dismay in Stockholm. It is apparent from this example that the Scandinavian countries do not necessarily give priority to cooperation within NORDEFCO over other forms of international cooperation.

I.3 Bilateral partnerships

The Dutch armed forces have bilateral contacts with a large number of countries with which they cooperate to a greater or lesser degree. Only with a small number of countries do they have a close working relationship, and even then this is often limited to just one of the three services. The Netherlands' three main bilateral partnerships are the Belgian-Dutch Navy Cooperation (Benesam), the German/Netherlands Corps and the UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force. Later in this section there is also a brief consideration of the aims and initial results of the recent Franco-British defence and security cooperation treaty, which was signed in November 2010.

Benesam

The origins of the navy cooperation between Belgium and the Netherlands date back to 1948 when the two countries decided to put their navies under a single command in time of war. After the end of the Cold War both navies concluded that much could be gained, not least financially, from closer cooperation in peacetime as well. In consequence more and more agreements were made about cooperation in the procurement and maintenance of navy vessels and joint training and exercises. In 1996 this cooperation was put on an institutional footing when the headquarters of Admiral Benelux were established in Den Helder.[58] Although they share operational headquarters, the Netherlands and Belgium can still decide entirely independently of each other on the operational deployment of their vessels with their own crews. National governments and parliaments retain their decision-making power with regard to deployment. This form of cooperation combines the financial and other benefits of far-reaching integration of navy staffs and the division of labour in respect of ship maintenance with the right of each country to decide autonomously on the operational deployment of its own vessels with their own crews. As a result, both countries make savings and are thus able to maintain navy capabilities that would otherwise be too expensive for each of them separately.

This is most apparent in the manner in which the cooperation in respect of frigates and mine countermeasure vessels is arranged. The basis for this cooperation is the use of the same materiel. Both the Netherlands and Belgium have multipurpose frigates built by the Netherlands and Tripartite class minehunters. The agreed division of responsibilities between them is that Belgium maintains the minehunters and provides for the education and training of their crews, and Netherlands does the same

57 The Nordic Declaration on Solidarity, Helsinki, 5 April 2011.

58 See: <http://www.defensie.nl/marine/organisatie_marine/commando_zeestrijdkrachten/internationale_samenwerking/samenwerking_met_belgie>. Accessed on 20 October 2011.

for the multipurpose frigates and their crews.[59] Both countries have also decided to purchase the maritime version of the NH-90 helicopter, which can also operate from the multipurpose frigates.[60] The scope for the joint purchase of these helicopters and for joint training and maintenance is now being studied and would form a logical continuation of the existing cooperation. In the medium to long term it is easy to envisage the Dutch and Belgian navies formulating plans together to help redress European navy shortfalls.

The Dutch and Belgian navies have great confidence in each other. This was well illustrated by Belgium's wish to command the EU's Operation Atalanta off the coast of Somalia in 2010 during its EU presidency. A request was made to the Netherlands in this connection to provide a command frigate, as Belgium did not have this capability itself.[61]

German/Netherlands Corps

Close cooperation between the German and Dutch armies arose at the time of the Cold War, when the operational area of 1 Netherlands Army Corps was on the North German Plain and various army units were stationed in Germany. Fifty years after the end of the Second World War, on 30 August 1995, the Netherlands and Germany made history by establishing 1 German/Netherlands Corps in the presence of the Dutch Prime Minister Wim Kok and the German Chancellor Helmut Kohl. For the first time in European history, the corps headquarters of two different nations were fully integrated. Within the new headquarters all positions were divided equally between the two countries and both the command and a number of other key posts rotated between them. The fact that a commander had authority over the military personnel of another country even in the army camp was unique. To this extent, therefore, national sovereignty had been relinquished, although any deployment of the military units concerned was still a matter for decision in the national capitals.

Since the turn of the century the headquarters of the binational corps has been converted into a multinational High Readiness Forces Headquarters (HRFHQ) to meet a pressing need within NATO and the EU. Germany and the Netherlands together fulfil the leading role within the HRFHQ, which has a staff of 420. Unlike the position with Benesam, the Netherlands and Germany cannot decide independently to deploy the headquarters or parts of it.

The cooperation in 1 German/Netherlands Corps has been instrumental in the joint deployment of German and Dutch army units in various crisis management operations, including KFOR in 1999/2000 and ISAF in 2002/2003 and currently in Kunduz. The HRFHQ has twice been deployed as ISAF headquarters (in 2003 and 2009) and twice as headquarters of the land component of the NATO Response Force (in 2005 and 2008); it has also played an important role in the development of the NATO Response Force Headquarters (NRF).

59 Kees Homan and Jan Rood, ibid. p. 17.

60 See: <http://www.mil.be/aircomp/subject/index.asp?LAN=nl&FILE=&ID=272&PAGE=11&MENU=0>. Accessed on 7 November 2011.

61 Ultimately France was unwilling to transfer command of the EU's Operation Atalanta to Belgium and the request was therefore withdrawn. Interview with Sven Biscop, Brussels, 8 September 2011.

The cooperation within the corps has also boosted cooperation between the Netherlands and Germany in matters relating to materiel, in particular in the development of the Fennek reconnaissance vehicle, the Boxer armoured vehicle and the armoured howitzer. This cooperation has in turn resulted in the establishment of joint training courses, for example for the armoured howitzer. The present HRFHQ is expected to continue serving as a catalyst for enhanced cooperation between the German and Dutch armies. Both countries regard the forces headquarters as a solid basis for effective military cooperation.[62]

UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force

The UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force (UKNLAF) is a partnership that dates from 1975. Two years earlier both navies had been confronted with spending cuts and in the Netherlands it even seemed possible that the Marine Corps might have to be disbanded. To avoid such an eventuality an approach was made to the British, resulting in the addition of a Dutch battalion of marines to 3 Commando Brigade Royal Marines. Together they form the landing unit of the UK/NL Amphibious Force. It should be noted that this is not an integrated unit and that the British and Dutch components can therefore be deployed independently of each other. Nor is there permanent cooperation between them; however, joint exercises on the basis of a common doctrine are held as often as possible. Materiel procurement and training courses are also coordinated.[63]

Although units of the UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force have taken part in a few land operations since the late 1980s, for example in northern Iraq to protect the Kurdish population[64] and in Sarajevo during the Bosnian War, the force has never been deployed in its entirety or in an amphibious operation. In early 2010 it formed the core of the British-Dutch Battlegroup, but was once again not deployed. Various publications have pointed to the differing political traditions of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, particularly as regards the deployment of troops. For example, the United Kingdom is generally less reluctant than the Netherlands to use military force in pursuance of political objectives. Moreover, the UK parliament has much less control over the deployment of military units than the Dutch parliament.[65] These differences may continue to be an obstacle to the operational deployment of the UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force in the future.[66]

62 See: <http://www.defensie.nl/actueel/nieuws/2011/05/10/46182412/Nederland_en_Duitsland_verdiepen_samenwerking>. Accessed on 7 November 2011.

63 Marc Brinkman, ‘The Dutch Contribution to the UK/NL Amphibious Force: Adapting to changes in the global security situation’, *RUSI Military Operations Today*, Summer 2006.

64 During Operation Provide Comfort a battalion of marines and an engineer auxiliary battalion of the Dutch army were placed under the command of the British 3 Commando Brigade Royal Marines.

65 The debate about the role of the UK parliament in decisions on the deployment of military personnel has revived as a result of the NATO operation in Libya. The British Foreign Secretary William Hague has announced that a bill will be introduced to make it obligatory in future to consult parliament in the event of military action.

66 Margriet Drent et al., ibid; M. Houben and D. Peters, ‘The Deployment of Multinational Military Formations: Taking political institutions into account’, CEPS Policy letter no. 36, June 2003.

Franco-British defence cooperation
By signing the Franco-British Defence and Security Cooperation Treaty, the Union's two largest military powers agreed not only to establish a Combined Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF), but also to work more closely together in the field of nuclear arms technology, logistics and training for the future A400M military transporter fleet, procurement of a new generation of UAVs, shared use of aircraft carriers and the development of submarine technology. The negotiations on this cooperation treaty, which started in 2007, did not produce a result until 2010.

The immediate reason for the close operational and industrial collaboration between the two countries is the financial constraints facing their armed forces and the realisation that neither of them can any longer pack a punch militarily on its own. Prime Minister David Cameron and President Nicolas Sarkozy have emphasised that the cooperation will not in any way detract from the sovereignty of the two countries. Nonetheless, the agreements point to growing mutual dependence in a number of fields and gradual integration of some capabilities. It will be some years, however, before the cooperation produces tangible results, especially in the area of joint procurement.[67]

The political and strategic significance of the Franco-British defence cooperation is far from easy to define. Does it provide a foundation for a new European military capability that circumvents the decision-making procedures and institutional obstacles within NATO and the EU in the security field? Or does it constitute a Franco-British cluster which will make its combined military capability available for EU, NATO or UN crisis management operations?[68] The AIV notes that the establishment of the Franco-British partnership may be indicative of their waning confidence in NATO and the EU as security institutions in all circumstances. France and the United Kingdom thus appear to be saying that their national security interests are not adequately safeguarded by the existing security cooperation within NATO and the EU.

I.4 Other partnerships

Movement Coordination Centre Europe
Strategic air and sea transport have been identified by NATO and the EU as scarce capabilities. However, both the purchase and the maintenance of such assets are very expensive. Various multinational initiatives have been developed in recent years to generate extra airlift capability (SALIS/Antonov, SAC/C-17 and A400M) and sealift capability (roll-on-roll-off vessels) for the movement of military equipment and personnel.

The Movement Coordination Centre Europe (MCCE) is the product of a merger in 2007 between the European Airlift Centre (EAC) and the Sealift Coordination Centre (SCC). Besides providing strategic air and sea transport the MCCE also coordinates inland surface transport (road and rail) and the deployment of tanker aircraft. The 25 participating countries, all of which are members of NATO and/or the EU, can notify the MCCE what transport capability they need at any particular time, so that loads, routes

67 Interview met Tomas Valasek, The Hague, 30 September 2011; Dick Zandee, 'Brits-Franse defensiesamenwerking: pro of contra Europa?' (Franco-British defence cooperation: for or against Europe?), Internationale Spectator vol. 65 no. 2, February 2011, pp. 67-70.

68 Julian Lindley-French, 'Britain and France: Bringing strategic sanity back to Europe?', *Atlantisch Perspectief* 2011 no. 1, pp. 17-19.

and destinations can be coordinated. The basic principle is that countries that have residual capacity can make their means of transport available to other countries. For example, assets of country X that airlift or sealift military equipment to an operational area can be used on the return journey by country Y to repatriate its equipment from the same area. This helps to maximise the utilisation rate.[69]

European Air Transport Command
In 2006 Germany and France decided to establish a more far-reaching form of cooperation for air transport. Whereas the MCCE focuses on coordinating transport needs by making optimal use of residual capacity, the two countries wished to place their entire air transport fleet under a joint command structure. Later the Netherlands and Belgium too decided to join this initiative. This resulted in the signature of an agreement (transfer of authority) in 2010 under which these four countries largely transferred their national control over their own air transport fleets to the European Air Transport Command (EATC). Since the end of 2010 the operational command centre, with its 160 staff, has been located at Eindhoven Airbase.[70]

The main advantages of the EATC are the more effective use of the available aircraft, savings on chartering aircraft and a reduction in operational staff capacity. For example, the Netherlands expects that as a result of its participation in the EATC it will make savings of around ten to fifteen per cent on the costs of chartering transport aircraft, and Germany and Belgium have disbanded their national air transport commands since the establishment of the EATC. The risks connected with a joint air transport command are freeriding and the limitation of national autonomy. To mitigate the limitation of national autonomy, the concept of a national 'red card holder' has been agreed; this enables the participating countries to claim their own aircraft for national airlift operations in exceptional situations. To prevent freeriding, use is made of a virtual accounting system known as ATARES, which is based on a calculation of the costs of a C-130 flying hour. ATARES makes it possible for the costs of using all different kinds of aircraft to be settled up between the participating countries.[71]

The aim is to extend the arrangements in due course, beyond the pooling of transport aircraft and a joint command structure, to include aircraft maintenance and staff training. Allowance has already been made for this in the organisational structure of the EATC. However, the participating countries remain fully autonomous in terms of operational deployment and fly only with their own crews.

European Gendarmerie Force
The European Gendarmerie Force (EGF) is an initiative of five EU member states (France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain). Romania too has been a member since the end of 2008. Together the participating national gendarmerie forces have some quarter of a million gendarmes at their disposal. Turkey has the status of observer,

69 MCCE Working Board Director's Report, January 2011.

70 Stefan Wilmers and Christian John, 'European Air Transport Command. Transition from ATC to EATC', European Security and Defence, April 2011, pp. 37-38.

71 Interview with Colonel T. Rikken, former project leader at the EATC, The Hague, 14 October 2011.

while Lithuania and Poland are EGF partners.[72] The aim of the initiative is to strengthen civilian crisis management capabilities, and police services have been tasked with its implementation. It is intended that the EGF should supplement or replace local police. The civilian capabilities can, if necessary, be extended to include a military component as part of Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC).[73] The EGF headquarters are situated in Vicenza (Italy), where provisions have been made to allow rapid deployment in crisis areas. The EGF is an ad hoc police force that is available at short notice (30 days) and not a standing force. The force consists of a maximum of 800 gendarmes, but can be increased to 2,300 on the basis of the Helsinki Force Catalogue.

An EGF force operates in accordance with the operational concepts developed by the EU as an integrated police unit. This means that it consists of three components:

- a mobile element that concentrates on general police duties, including maintenance of public order and safety;
- a specialist element that concentrates on police capabilities, such as investigation teams, SWAT teams and border control experts;
- a logistics element for the provision of logistical support.[74]

The EGF can be deployed as part of a civilian police mission, but can also be placed under military command.[75] The force can therefore be regarded as a versatile instrument capable of deployment in various ways.

Although the EGF is available first and foremost for deployment by the EU, it may also be used by NATO, the UN, the OSCE and ad hoc coalitions. Where used by the EU, the EGF comes under the political responsibility of the Political and Security Committee, which is the permanent EU body responsible for political control and strategic direction of the ESDP. Politico-military coordination is the responsibility of the High-Level Interdepartmental Committee (CIMIN), on which representatives of the participating EGF member states sit. CIMIN is also responsible for appointing the commander of the EGF. The key positions in the EGF are held by the six participating countries in rotation, in accordance with an agreed schedule.

To date the EGF has been used for three police missions. The first was the EU's Operation ALTHEA in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which began in December 2004. The EGF has also been made available to the UN as part of the United Nations Stabilisation Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) following the earthquake in January 2010. And it is still playing an important role (in qualitative terms) in the ISAF/NTM-A[76] police training

72 <http://www.eurogendfor.org/referencetexts/Observer%20and%20procedures%20for%20LNOs.pdf>.

73 Marleen Easton, Monica den Boer, Jelle Janssens, René Moelker and Tom Vander Beken (eds.), 'Blurring Military and Police Roles', The Hague, Eleven Publishers, 2010.

74 This involves supplies, restocking, maintenance, recovery and evacuation of equipment, transportation, medical and health care.

75 Michiel de Weger, 'The Potential of the European Gendarmerie Force', Netherlands Institute of International Relations, March 2009.

76 The abbreviation NTM-A stands for NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan.

mission in Afghanistan.[77] The EGF's contribution to the NATO operations in Afghanistan is greater than that of the European Union Police Mission in Afghanistan (EUPOL) and consists mainly of providing civilian police expertise. Finally, a scenario analysis and planning study have been carried out for the EGF's possible deployment to Libya. However, no request to this effect has been received.

In summary, the EGF can be classified as a multilateral and flexible form of cooperation having a fixed command structure and home base. As it fills a unique niche in the range of police services, serious consideration should be given to the adoption of further measures to strengthen it.[78] The AIV has two possibilities in mind. First of all, partner status in the EGF could be expanded to include countries that participate in the European Neighbourhood Policy and possibly even other countries that are members of the OSCE.[79] As the EGF is a partnership of six EU member states (together with partners and observers), another way of strengthening it would be to give it a firmer foundation within the EU. This could be done by expanding the arrangement into a form of permanent structured cooperation or establishing it as a form of enhanced cooperation under article 20 of the Treaty on European Union.

77 J.L. Hovens and G.A.G. Elk (eds.), 'Gendarmeries and the Security Challenges of the 21st Century', The Hague, 2011, pp. 10, 139 and 149.

78 Michiel de Weger, ibid.

79 It is important to distinguish between membership and cooperation. The Declaration of Intent of 2004 indicated that cooperation is possible with many different organisations in a specific situation (in practice, EGF units also hold exercises with other possible partners). Under the Declaration of Intent, however, more far-reaching cooperation is possible only within the context of membership. For this purpose membership is deemed to include members (EU countries that have a gendarmerie), observers (official EU candidate countries that have a gendarmerie) and partners (EU countries that have an organisation that does not meet the definition of a gendarmerie in all respects).

II Lessons from European defence cooperation

For many decades the political, military and financial benefits of increased defence cooperation in Europe have been trumpeted far and wide, not least in the Netherlands. The advocates of such cooperation, ranging from politicians and senior military figures to independent think-tanks, argue that it creates a win-win situation for all concerned. Nonetheless, in practice, cooperation often proves problematic. The previous chapter therefore looked at various multilateral, regional and bilateral forms of defence cooperation intended to be effective and cost saving. The present chapter sets out the salient lessons that can be learned from past experience. These can be helpful in arriving at the specific recommendations on the further international embedding of the Dutch armed forces which the government seeks in its request for advice.

II.1 Sovereignty, cooperation and the importance of the strategic culture

Countries' concern about loss of national sovereignty in the traditional sense and hence loss of control over their own armed forces is an important – if not the main – reason why agreements about integrated operational cooperation have tended to be the exception rather than the rule. Paradoxically, the armed forces of European countries are deployed jointly in international operations, but each country often prepares for such operations independently. If sovereignty is interpreted as the capacity to best serve national interests through external action, closer cooperation within Europe and in a broader international context is more essential than ever in order to safeguard our interests and acquire influence. As noted previously, the importance of shared European sovereignty is, in reality, greater than that of (unshared) national sovereignty.

The lack of a common vision on European defence is the main obstacle to achieving cooperation. Such a vision is easier to achieve between like-minded countries. What does this mean for countries that choose to deepen their operational cooperation with partner countries? In choosing partners they should ascertain whether the political decision-making process in respect of the deployment of military units, the strategic culture and the willingness to share risks more or less match their own. These three parameters are important preconditions for the success of cooperation in the case of joint military deployment. For example, in the Netherlands and Germany political decisions on the participation of military personnel in out-of-area operations are taken in close consultation between government and parliament. In both these countries military personnel can be deployed in practice only if a parliamentary majority is in favour. In the United Kingdom, by contrast, the government can decide on the deployment of an expeditionary force without consulting parliament. This difference in political decision-making may explain why the high readiness forces headquarters of the German/Netherlands Corps has been deployed in its totality in crisis management operations whereas the UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force so far has not.

The strategic culture of a country consists of a shared set of beliefs, ideas and standards regarding the use of the military to achieve security objectives. It derives from the history of the country and its geopolitical situation, political institutions and historical experience of deploying the armed forces. The strategic culture influences to a large degree a country's willingness to deploy its armed forces outside national borders and in high-risk situations. Countries with a similar strategic culture are better able to work together in an operational context. Examples of well-matched pairs are the United

States and the United Kingdom as well as France and the United Kingdom. By contrast, France and Germany have been unable to deploy their binational brigade in Afghanistan owing to differences of opinion about the character of the military action and the caveats applicable to it.[80]

Hitherto, the Dutch strategic culture has been located somewhere between the vigorous military culture of countries like the United States, the United Kingdom and France and the more cautious military culture of the Federal Republic of Germany. The Netherlands is prepared to use its armed forces to participate in high-risk missions, but only on condition that they have a mandate under international law and are embedded in a coherent civil-military approach designed to strengthen security, stability and the legal order. This stance has enabled the Netherlands to seek cooperation with countries that have differing strategic cultures, such as Germany and the United Kingdom. This may perhaps enable it to act as a bridge between different clusters of cooperation within Europe.

II.2 Joint maintenance of materiel

The joint maintenance of defence materiel may not perhaps capture the imagination like the joint deployment of military units during operations, but it is in precisely this area that cost savings can be achieved through economies of scale. Naturally, the weapons systems currently used in the member states must be taken as the starting point. For example, the Netherlands is attempting to concentrate the maintenance of F-16 fighter aircraft in Woensdrecht (sometimes known as 'Maintenance Valley'), although to date insufficient use has been made of this facility by other European countries. It would also be logical to extend the existing joint maintenance arrangements with Germany to include the armoured howitzers, the Patriot air defence units and the Boxer and Fennek wheeled vehicles. Joint maintenance, spare parts procurement and ammunition management could yield savings for the Royal Netherlands Army on a par with those now achieved by the Royal Netherlands Navy through the agreements with Belgium for the joint maintenance of multipurpose frigates and mine countermeasure vessels.

Concentrating maintenance activities at a single location is bound to entail job losses elsewhere. This is why this form of cooperation is hard to achieve and may meet with political and public opposition, especially in times of economic crisis. If this resistance is to be overcome, the costs and the benefits of concentrating maintenance must be fairly shared by the participating countries.

Combining the provision of logistical services for military operations, as in the case of NAMSA as contracting agency for NATO operations, can both improve the quality of the logistical chain and yield major cost savings for troop-contributing countries. However, countries must then be prepared to make available their own expert military personnel to NAMSA or another multinational contracting agency.

II.3 Standardisation as a multiplier of cooperation

More standardisation can, in principle, limit the development and procurement costs of weapons systems. In practice, however, it is not so simple. For example, no fewer

80 Tomas Valasek, 'Surviving Austerity. The case for a new approach to EU military collaboration', Centre for European Reform, April 2011, p. 21; Rem Korteweg, 'The Superpower, the Bridge-Builder and the Hesitant Ally. How Defense Transformation Divided NATO (1991-2008)', Leiden University Press, 2011, pp. 407-411.

than 23 different types of armoured vehicles with varying calibres of ammunition will be commissioned in Europe in the next ten years. With the exception of the German-Dutch Boxer, these armoured vehicles are the result of the national identification of needs and a national development process resulting in a nationally manufactured product. Similarly, the great variety of navy vessels in Europe is a direct consequence of the presence of 21 naval shipyards in 16 different countries. The standardisation of weapon and other systems in Europe still has a long way to go. The process starts with the joint identification of needs and an accompanying package of requirements by a group of like-minded countries. A precondition for such cooperation is that the military requirements and not the interests of national defence industries are the decisive factor. It is also necessary to ensure that the addition of national requirements does not cause the costs of weapon systems to escalate, as has now happened in the case of the NH-90 helicopter. Joint procurement has often proved expensive owing to unnecessary differences in national configurations.

When drawing up its investment plan, the Ministry of Defence must determine first of all what materiel is in short supply at European level. Standardisation of military materiel forms the best basis for lasting international cooperation in the areas of logistics, maintenance, education and training. The attractiveness of this form of cooperation stems in part from the fact that sovereignty and dependence are less of an issue here than in the case of more far-reaching forms of cooperation. Use of the same materiel is essential for the joint education and training of personnel. This applies, for example, to the armoured howitzer and YPR tracked armoured vehicle training courses (with Germany and Belgium respectively), the paratrooper training courses (with Belgium) and, in the future, the tactical UAV training courses (with Belgium). An obvious step would also to be to arrange joint training courses in specific skills (parachute jumping, diving and mountaineering). Finally, the cooperation between defence academies could be strengthened, for example by a gradual expansion of the European Security and Defence College.

However, international materiel cooperation should not become an instrument by which the different services of the armed forces attempt to secure their interests within the Ministry of Defence's investment plan. Subject to this reservation, cooperation with countries that intend to replace their F-16 fighter aircraft in due course with the JSF (Norway, Denmark and Belgium) would seem a logical choice.[81]

II.4 The obstructive power of industrial and economic interests

National industrial and economic interests often prove a stubborn obstacle to efforts to achieve greater international materiel cooperation. In Europe some 80% of defence contracts are still awarded to national companies. In consequence, European armed forces now have not only over 20 different types of combat vehicles but also seven types of combat helicopter, four types of tank, three types of fighter aircraft and a wide range of frigates and other vessels. The navy and army sectors of Europe's defence industries in particular are still strongly nationally oriented. One positive development,

81 Margriet Drent et al., 'Internationale Militaire Samenwerking: Knelpunten en Kansen' (International Military Cooperation: Problems and Opportunities), Clingendael Policy Brief no. 6, September 2011, pp. 6-8; Dick Zandee, 'Europa *moet*, ook voor defensie!' (Europe is a must, for defence too!), *Atlantisch perspectief* nr. 6, 2010, pp. 6-7; interview with CDR F. Sijtsma, The Hague, 30 August 2011; interview with Thomas Valasek, The Hague, 30 September 2011.

however, is that the British and French defence industries are looking for ways of cooperating more closely as a consequence of the Franco-British defence and security cooperation treaty.

To date, the EDA's efforts to rein in the protection afforded to national defence industries have met with only very limited success. Within Europe the Dutch defence industry is a modest player described by a former EDA official as an industry with an 'SME-like structure'. There would not therefore appear to be a leading role for the Netherlands in limiting the protection given to national defence industries in Europe. Moreover, the Dutch aviation cluster has a strong bias to transatlantic cooperation, in particular in the development of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF). Nonetheless, the Netherlands must press within the EU for further liberalisation of the European defence market.[82]

II.5 No savings without investment

A common misconception is that more international defence cooperation would be a quick way of reducing expenditure on the armed forces. This fails to take account of the initial costs of such cooperation: staff capacity to build the cooperation from the ground up and investments in new or existing joint facilities. For example, the Netherlands has spent some €10 million on new facilities for the European Air Transport Command (EATC) at Eindhoven Airbase.[83] Cost awareness is therefore an important factor in the choice of future international cooperation projects.

Effective operational cooperation also requires years of joint training and exercise. For example, the effective partnership with the German army can be attributed to the years of cooperation on the North German Plain during the Cold War. This aspect cannot be sufficiently emphasised.

II.6 Greater emphasis on civil-military cooperation in the EU

The entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon on 1 December 2009 has presented new opportunities for elevating civil-military cooperation in the EU to a higher plane. The solidarity clause and mutual assistance obligation provide a basis for improved coordination and closer cooperation between the civil and military capabilities of the member states in order to avert the threat of terrorism on European territory and provide assistance in the event of a natural or man-made disaster. In addition, the EU can more often request the deployment of the European Gendarmerie Force (EGF) for out-of-area police training and mentoring missions. In this way, the EGF can create significant added value for the CFSP. As noted previously, it would be worth considering transferring this niche capacity in due course to the PSC mechanism, provided that this leaves scope for different lead groups.

There are also ways in which greater synergy could be achieved in the development of civil and military technologies. In various research areas, such as satellite communication, data transmission and sensors, the civil sector has an important lead

82 Margriet Drent and Dick Zandee, 'Breaking Pillars. Towards a Civil-Military Security Approach of the European Union', Netherlands Institute of International Relations, January 2010, p. 60; interview with Dick Zandee, Brussels, 9 September 2011.

83 Interview with Colonel T. Rikken, former EATC project leader, The Hague, 14 October 2011.

over the defence industry. This is why it would be desirable to create a joint research budget for internal and external security under the European Commission's European Security Research Programme. However, the European Commission and the EDA would then have to reach agreement on funding for this joint research programme.[84]

II.7 Cooperation creates obligations

It is important to recognise that, besides advantages, European defence cooperation also entails obligations. The transfer of national defence capabilities to a multinational pool, for example the airlift capability pool in the EATC, also creates obligations for the partners in respect of the upkeep and maintenance of these assets. The Future Policy Survey Final Report – 'A New Foundation for the Netherlands Armed Forces' – pointed to the risk that cuts in European defence budgets are often at the expense of international partnerships and cooperation projects.[85] For example, the Dutch government decided in a previous round of spending cuts that it would terminate a binational project with Germany (the Patriot Air Defence Agreement) and, following a change of government, Norway did the same in 2003 in the case of a binational project with the Netherlands (the Norwegian deal). Also, the recent decision to reduce Dutch staff capacity in the high readiness forces headquarters of the German/Netherlands Corps is hardly likely to inspire confidence from the German perspective. Being able to rely implicitly on a partner's loyalty is essential for successful defence cooperation. To take a hypothetical example, if the Netherlands had decided to dispose of the multipurpose frigates as part of the recent substantial package of spending cuts within the armed forces, this would have been a major setback to the navy cooperation with Belgium. Procurement decisions for the Royal Netherlands Navy will have to continue to be made in close cooperation with Belgium in the future. Naturally, the converse may also be expected.[86]

II.8 EU-NATO cooperation

In the past decade the EU and NATO have worked equally hard to improve the military capabilities of the member states for out-of-area operations. Despite many imposing-sounding initiatives launched by the EU and NATO, they have been of only limited help in strengthening capabilities. Duplication of effort by the EU and NATO is often blamed for the limited progress in this respect. However, it is worth repeating that it is the member states themselves that are responsible for their national defence planning and the procurement of military assets. Deficient materiel cooperation between the member states and not duplication between the EU and NATO is the main reason why European military shortfalls for out-of-area operations continue to exist.

Informal contacts between the staffs of the EU and NATO, in particular the EDA and the Allied Command Transformation (ACT), provide a sufficient basis for coordinating priorities, including agreements about the division of military capability projects. As the great majority of the capability projects developed by the EDA or within NATO are initiated by a limited number of countries, consultations on these projects can

84 Interview with Dick Zandee, Brussels, 9 September 2011.

85 Interdepartemental Project, 'Future Policy Survey Final Report: A New Foundation for the Netherlands Armed Forces', The Hague, 2010.

86 Commander F. Sijtsma, The Hague, 30 August 2011; Professor Sven Biscop, Brussels, 8 September 2011.

be conducted without restrictions at staff level. For example, the EDA is working on protection against biological weapons and NATO on protection against chemical threats. However, coordination of projects that meet a collective need of NATO or the EU is not possible as long as EU-NATO cooperation continues to be blocked politically by Cyprus and Turkey.[87]

II.9 Rapid reaction forces of the EU and NATO

International defence cooperation is not solely about strengthening military capabilities; it also concerns the effective deployment of these capabilities during missions. To this end, sound operational concepts and joint training are essential. The NATO Response Force (NRF) and EU Battlegroups are playing an important role in transforming the armed forces to enable them to take on a more expeditionary role and in increasing interoperability between military units of participating countries, thereby preparing them for effective multinational deployment during future missions. Hitherto, the operational deployment of the NRF and EU Battlegroups has not been politically feasible, with the exception of the provision of humanitarian relief by the NRF in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina and the earthquake in Pakistan. A major stumbling block remains the issue of who is to bear the costs of deploying the NRF and EU Battlegroups. As only a limited part of these costs is eligible for common funding, this is – hardly surprisingly – a disincentive to the troop-contributing countries to agree to the deployment of a response force.

After a period of joint training and exercises, followed by a six-month standby period, the NRF and EU Battlegroup formations are once again disbanded. Poland has suggested that the one-off operational cooperation between countries in the NRF and the EU Battlegroups should be converted into a form of semi-permanent cooperation in which the same countries or combinations of countries participate periodically in the NRF or EU Battlegroup in accordance with a rotational plan.[88] The AIV considers that this idea is worthy of support. The transformation of the NRF and EU Battlegroups into semi-permanent forms of cooperation would provide a welcome stimulus to deepening the operational cooperation between the participating countries. It would seem logical for the Netherlands to participate in this. Those European countries which, unlike the Netherlands, do not have a fully expeditionary armed force, could be encouraged to specialise by contributing niche capacity to the NRF or EU Battlegroups, along the lines of the Czech Republic's specialisation in NBC detection and protection. The AIV believes that this proposal should be further developed in the context of NATO's Smart Defence initiative and the EU's Ghent Initiative.

87 Dick Zandee, 'EU-NAVO: minder politiek, meer pragmatisme' (EU-NATO: less politics, more pragmatism), *Internationale Spectator* no. 12, December 2011, pp. 637-641; AIV advisory report no. 67, 'NATO's New Strategic Concept', The Hague, January 2010.

88 Interview with Tomas Valasek, The Hague, 30 September 2011.

III Deepening European defence cooperation

Promoting international defence cooperation has been a constant theme of Dutch foreign policy since the Second World War. The Netherlands regards close cooperation as the best insurance for its own security and sovereignty. This is why it has been an advocate within NATO and the EU of greater security cooperation and has shown itself to be a constructive partner in the various defence capability initiatives of both organisations. The security architecture of NATO and the CSDP (formerly the ESDP) is the result of a top-down approach to international cooperation which has its roots in the North Atlantic Treaty (1949) and the EU decision to establish the ESDP (1999).

The Netherlands also recognised early on the importance of bottom-up defence cooperation with a few strategic partners as a way of augmenting the top-down cooperation through NATO and the EU. Three bilateral partnerships (Benesam, the German/Netherlands Corps and the UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force) and various multinational airlift capability initiatives (EATC, MCCE, SAC/C-17 and SALIS) have hitherto been the chief products of this bottom-up cooperation. These have helped to improve the deployability and interoperability of the Dutch armed forces. The AIV considers that this has by no means exhausted the scope for bottom-up cooperation.

In this chapter the AIV outlines a twin-track approach consisting of a top-down strategy for European security cooperation and a bottom-up approach for deepening bilateral defence cooperation with existing and potential partners.

III.1 Top-down strategy for European security cooperation

Among the EU member states, views differ on the Union's role on the world stage and the accompanying security policy objectives and priorities. This became most apparent last year during the Libya crisis and the intervention by the international community under NATO's command. Owing to the division between France and the United Kingdom on the one hand and Germany on the other, the EU remained largely sidelined. If the EU wishes to be a significant power in Europe and the surrounding region it needs a consistent CSDP and clear military profile. Like NATO it should therefore set to work on formulating a Strategic Concept or revised Security Strategy.[89] A basic document of this kind should also provide scope for improved coordination of responsibilities between the EU and NATO in the security field. The following questions should in any event be addressed:

- What role does the military play within the CSDP and what military capabilities are necessary for this purpose?
- Is it possible, by analogy with the Stability and Growth Pact for the euro, to make agreements about the size of each member state's defence expenditure, primarily with a view to combating European military deficits?
- Is there any way of establishing PSC in order to circumvent the absence of consensus about the expansion and deepening of European defence cooperation?
- What can be done to ensure that the imperfect cooperation between the EU and NATO at political level does not paralyse both organisations in their efforts to act together effectively in crisis management operations?

89 See also AIV advisory report no. 67, 'NATO's New Strategic Concept', The Hague, January 2010, p. 41.

The AIV considers that the Netherlands, together with like-minded countries, should argue in favour of drawing up a new European Security Strategy (ESS) which takes account of the operational shortfalls of the 2003 ESS and also answers the above questions. The most important challenge facing this new security strategy is to translate specific security objectives into a European needs identification process that is the main point of reference for the defence expenditure plans of the individual member states. The present situation in which European armed forces undertake operations jointly but individual countries decide on the expenditure on their own armed forces without international consultation must be ended as quickly as possible. The success of this new security strategy is dependent on the political willingness of European countries to accept mutual military dependence and give priority to expenditure designed to strengthen joint military capability. If it proves impossible to unite all EU member states behind a top-down strategy of this kind, agreement must be reached with as many member states as possible under the PSC mechanism. The EDA can be instructed to arrange for the implementation of the European needs identification process and supervise compliance with the resulting agreements. This top-down approach complements the pooling and sharing approach under the Ghent Initiative.

It should be remembered here that every effort must be made to continue the measures taken within both the EU and NATO in recent decades to strengthen expeditionary capabilities. As far as NATO is concerned, particular consideration should be given to the agreements made under the Lisbon Capability Initiative in respect of:

- missile defence;
- special forces;
- common logistical support through NAMSA;
- common procurement and maintenance of ammunition and spare parts;
- air-ground surveillance;
- air-to-air refuelling;
- counter-IED capabilities;
- civil-military cooperation;
- cyber security.

International cooperation, particularly military cooperation, is essential in order to improve cyber security and develop operational cyber capabilities. This cooperation is discussed in the AIV's recently published advisory report 'Cyber Warfare'.[90]

III.2 Bottom-up approach to bilateral cooperation

The first question to ask when choosing bilateral partners is what are the aims of the cooperation. In the case of less far-reaching reforms of defence cooperation such as pooling and sharing, the aim is for two or more countries to make the best possible use of their scarce military capabilities by organising them in a single structure. The navy cooperation with Belgium shows that the standardisation of military materiel and the division of responsibilities for the maintenance of materiel and for the education and training of crews can cut costs. In this way it is possible to sustain navy capabilities that would be beyond the means of each country individually. The AIV considers that this model of bilateral cooperation (referred to as the Benesam model) should also be followed by the other two services. The choice of bilateral partners should therefore

90 See AIV advisory report no. 77, 'Cyber Warfare', The Hague, December 2011.

be based on whether countries are amenable to pooling and to the present or future standardisation of military materiel, joint maintenance of military materiel and joint education and training of personnel.

Another aim of bilateral cooperation is the joint deployment of military units during operations. The German/Netherlands Corps was established for this purpose in 1995. When choosing bilateral partners for this form of integrated operational cooperation the Netherlands should take careful stock of the similarities and dissimilarities in terms of political decision-making and strategic culture. The military advantages of integrated action can be achieved only if the countries concerned hold similar political views on the nature of the military action and the willingness to take risks. The AIV considers that the Dutch government should carefully examine the scope for integrated operational cooperation with other countries, by analogy with the German/Netherlands Corps, on condition that broad political support exists in the countries concerned. The added value of this form of enhanced cooperation is that by participating in a binational or multinational operational partnership the Netherlands can acquire not only extra military capability but also greater political prestige and influence over international decisions. A treaty would seem necessary in order to impart due weight to the agreements made about the mutual obligations of the partners in a binational or multinational operational partnership.

III.3 Bilateral cooperation: with whom?

The Netherlands' main strategic partners in recent decades have been Belgium, Germany, the United Kingdom and, in the special capacity of protector, the United States. As the experience gained of cooperation with these partners is predominantly positive, the scope for deepening cooperation with them should obviously be studied. It would also be desirable to survey the possibilities for cooperation with France and the Scandinavian countries, in particular Norway and Denmark.

As regards the prospects for close cooperation with *the United Kingdom*, it is important to note that the British have emphatically chosen to continue their cooperation with the United States and to enter into new forms of far-reaching cooperation with France. These countries have a permanent seat on the UN Security Council, which is bound to be an important factor in their security policy. They are also countries that are capable of rapid political decision-making and have a robust approach to military deployment, as in the case of the NATO operation in Libya. One of the components of the British partnership with France is the creation of a Joint Expeditionary Task Force (JEF). A question that arises here is whether there is scope for other European countries to participate in the JEF and, if so, on what terms. If participation is possible, the next question is whether the Netherlands would be willing and able to join this Franco-British task force, which will consist of some 5,000 military personnel from all three services. The task force must be able to carry out demanding crisis management operations and will hold joint training courses and exercises for this purpose from 2011 onwards. If a Dutch military contribution can be integrated into the JEF, the question remains whether the Netherlands would be prepared to give the requisite political commitment to make a robust contribution to high-risk missions. This is, after all, what participation in the JEF implies.

The AIV considers that the government should first ensure that there is broad political support for Dutch participation in the JEF. Thereafter it could conduct negotiations with the United Kingdom and France about the specific nature of the Dutch contribution and mutual obligations. The AIV points out that participation in the JEF could enhance the

political influence and reputation of the Netherlands with its European and other allies. This influence is a reflection of the willingness to share responsibility for high-risk crisis management operations resulting from decisions of international organisations, in particular the UN Security Council.

Dutch defence cooperation with *the United States* has three main goals: cooperation between the countries' air forces (under which the Netherlands can make use of US training facilities for fighter and helicopter crew), cooperation between the coastguard services in combating drug trafficking in the Caribbean, and ad hoc operational cooperation within NATO. The AIV considers that the opportunities for the Netherlands to work more closely with the United States on a bilateral basis are limited since the size of the armed forces is not comparable and the security priorities of the two countries often diverge. The greater emphasis placed by US foreign and security policy on Asia and the Pacific, sometimes at the expense of transatlantic relations, may also be a limiting factor for the Netherlands, Europe and NATO in future security and defence cooperation.

For a variety of reasons *Germany* is an important partner with which the Netherlands should seek to deepen its defence cooperation. First of all, Germany plays a leading role in European politics, particularly as regards monetary policy. It is also our most important trading partner by far. The Dutch contribution to the global economy is channelled to a large extent through trade with Germany. Moreover, the Netherlands and Germany hold similar views on many foreign policy issues, including security policy. Decision-making on military deployment is also organised in much the same way as in the Netherlands and takes place at a similar tempo.[91] As military conscription is to be suspended, Germany too will shortly have professional armed forces. In addition, the two armies have much the same equipment and purchase ammunition jointly. Finally, the joint deployment of military units, for example in Kosovo, and the deployment of the high readiness forces headquarters in Afghanistan (Kabul) have borne fruit. This holds out good prospects for more far-reaching cooperation with Germany and not only between the two armies. An example is the intention to merge the Patriot air defence capacity of the two armed forces in keeping with the Benesam model, also allowing other countries to join in.[92] Another example is the Comprehensive Approach exercise involving the German/Netherlands high readiness forces headquarters in cooperation with the countries' foreign ministries and German and Dutch governmental and non-governmental organisations in October 2011. The further development of the Comprehensive Approach concept and the cooperation with civil organisations is a cornerstone of the transformation of NATO, in which the high readiness forces headquarters is playing a pioneering role.

The *Benelux* ministers of defence signed a declaration of intent on 10 March 2011 to identify the opportunities for military cooperation and integration, in accordance with the Benesam model. Besides the existing navy cooperation they agreed to study the scope for air force and army cooperation, for example in the fields of materiel logistics and maintenance, training and readiness, air policing and air transport, and

91 AIV advisory report no. 56, 'Deployment of the Armed Forces: Interaction between National and International Decision-Making', The Hague, May 2007, p. 18.

92 See: <http://www.defensie.nl/actueel/nieuws/2011/05/10/46182412/Nederland_en_Duitsland_verdiepen_samenwerking>. Consulted on 5 December 2011.

materiel procurement.[93] If such cooperation is to be successful, the security policy of the participating countries must be fairly similar. In this sense Belgium, with its strong emphasis on multilateralism, is closer to the Netherlands than are the United Kingdom or the United States, which are more inclined to act unilaterally. Another consideration of a more politico-strategic nature is that the position of the smaller EU member states has come under pressure as a result of various factors. Closer coordination among the Benelux countries would be a logical response to the increased dominance of the large countries.

Defence cooperation with *France* can best be described as difficult, but besides the failures there have also been a few modest successes. The project to develop a binational UAV capacity between 2001 and 2006 ended in failure, but it did teach the Netherlands some useful lessons for future defence cooperation. Effective cooperation arises from cultivating mutual trust over many years and from the joint identification of needs and joint drafting of investment plans. These lessons were successfully applied when the EATC (in which France and the Netherlands participate together with Germany and Belgium) was established in 2010. The French and Dutch participation in the EGF is also a good example of defence cooperation with France and multinational cooperation. Finally, the Netherlands works on a limited scale with France to train African military personnel in the context of security sector reform (SSR). The AIV notes that Franco-Dutch defence cooperation tends to prosper better in multinational contexts such as the EATC and EGF than under bilateral arrangements. This is why the AIV considers that preference should be given to deepening defence cooperation with France within these multinational settings rather than in a bilateral context.

Besides cooperation within NORDEFCO *Norway* has investigated other possible alliances. Since 2008 the Norwegian defence ministry has been examining the scope for close cooperation with countries bordering the North Sea, in particular Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The Netherlands has emerged as a potential bilateral partner for the Norwegian army. In the words of a Norwegian defence specialist: ‘Only the Netherlands stands out as both a willing and able partner and then primarily for the Norwegian army.’[94] In 2002 the Netherlands and Norway signed a declaration of intent setting out agreements in principle about far-reaching military cooperation between the armies, air forces and navies of the two countries. As a consequence of a change of government in Norway and cuts in defence expenditure, Norway largely shelved the plans for closer bilateral cooperation with the Netherlands in 2003.[95] However, Norway is an important NATO partner within the German/Netherlands high readiness forces headquarters. Although not a member of the EU, it has concluded a cooperation agreement with the EDA and is part of the Nordic Battlegroup with Sweden, Finland, Ireland and Estonia. Norway and the Netherlands also have much in common in terms of their outlook on foreign and security policy and their politico-strategic culture. Opportunities for cooperation exist, for example, in relation to fighter aircraft and in the field of research and technology development.

93 Minister of Defence, policy letter on ‘Defence after the credit crisis: smaller armed forces in an unsettled world’, The Hague, 8 April 2011.

94 Hakon Lunde Saxi, ‘Nordic Defence Cooperation after the Cold War’, *Oslo Files on Defence and Security,* March 2011, p. 28.

95 However, the operational cooperation between the Norwegian and Dutch armies remained intact.

Like Norway, *Denmark* is a country that has traits in common with the Netherlands. Although Denmark is admittedly the only EU member state to have negotiated an opt-out for the CSDP, the new Danish government has announced that it will work for the abolition of this opt-out arrangement by holding a referendum, possibly as early as 2012.[96] Denmark will also reduce the number of its fighter aircraft and helicopters. A decision on a successor to the current F-16 fighter aircraft will be taken in 2018 at the latest. Like the Netherlands, Denmark is considering purchasing the JSF.

On the basis of this analysis, the AIV considers that deeper cooperation with Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, Norway and Denmark offers the best prospect of enabling the Dutch armed forces, while maintaining essential military capabilities, to continue taking part in crisis management operations that require more robust military action than peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations. The possibility of deeper cooperation with the United Kingdom and France in the context of the JEF should be examined, but would be worthwhile only if the Netherlands is prepared to make a political commitment to make an even more robust contribution to high-risk missions.

III.4 New possibilities for bilateral cooperation

The government's request for advice asks for specific ideas for defence cooperation with partner countries, bilaterally or in a broader context. At the same time the AIV takes account of the provisional choices advocated by the Minister of Defence in respect of bilateral defence cooperation in the policy letter 'Defence after the credit crisis' of April 2011. The AIV believes that new cooperation possibilities must be assessed by reference to the following criteria:

- whether they strengthen European military capability;
- whether they improve interoperability;
- whether cost savings can be made through economies of scale.

Belgium and Luxembourg

Cooperation with Belgium and Luxembourg is receiving greater emphasis in foreign policy under this government and can count upon a sympathetic response from the Benelux partners. The AIV considers that the Dutch government should work with the new Belgian government to reach an agreement among the Benelux partners to facilitate structured cooperation among the armed forces. However, a separate treaty similar to the Army Corps Treaty with Germany is required in order to deepen the operational cooperation under Benesam. The AIV has identified the following cooperation possibilities:

- Air force: materiel and logistical cooperation in preparation for the joint procurement, maintenance and stationing of transport and fighter aircraft and the joint education and training of pilots. One possibility would be for Norway and Denmark to join this air force cooperation.
  Aim: retention of a versatile air force with adequate airlift and combat capacity; to be achieved through economies of scale obtained through the joint purchase and

96 See: <http://www.securitydefenceagenda.org/Contentnavigation/Library/Libraryoverview/tabid/1299/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/2929/European-Commission-welcomes-end-of-Danish-border-controls.aspx>. Consulted on 11 November 2011.

maintenance of aircraft and the redistribution of Dutch and Belgian transport and fighter aircraft over a limited number of airfields.
Implications for sovereignty: this far-reaching cooperation would not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch and Belgian air forces independently of one another (by analogy with Benesam).
Preconditions: (1) cooperation in respect of fighter aircraft presupposes that the Netherlands and Belgium choose the same successor to the current F-16s; (2) the costs and benefits of concentrating the stationing and maintenance of aircraft and the joint training of pilots must be apportioned fairly.

- Navy: coordination of current investment plans and, in due course, the establishment of a joint investment plan for the Dutch and Belgian navies. One possibility would be for Germany to join this navy cooperation.
Aim: standardisation of the new generation of navy platforms, including joint maintenance and joint crew training, preferably with Germany, would save costs and at the same time strengthen the European military capability for mounting navy operations.
Implications for sovereignty: this far-reaching cooperation would not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch and Belgian navies independently of one another.
Preconditions: (1) unnecessary national configuration differences must be avoided when purchasing materiel; (2) the costs and benefits of concentrating maintenance and training must be apportioned fairly.

- Navy: deepening of operational cooperation under Benesam through the joint deployment of Dutch and Belgian navy units, for example for coastguard duties, mine countermeasures and antipiracy operations.
Aim: integration and joint deployment of Dutch and Belgian navy units for navy duties entailing limited operational risks.
Implications for sovereignty: integrated operational cooperation of this kind would to some extent make the Netherlands more dependent on Belgium in carrying out the specified navy duties. However, the increased capacity to act would more than make up for the reduction in freedom of action.
Preconditions: (1) joint formulation of doctrine is required; (2) conclusion of a separate treaty to record the political aims, scope and conditionalities of this operational cooperation.

Germany

For many decades Germany has been an important strategic partner with which the Netherlands has collaborated intensively, for example in the German/Netherlands Corps headquarters and in the procurement of materiel for the army. The AIV has identified the following possible ways of deepening cooperation:

- Army: materiel and logistical cooperation in relation to joint materiel such as the Boxer armoured vehicle and the armoured howitzer as well as the joint purchase and management of ammunition.
Aim: improvement of interoperability and achievement of cost savings through economies of scale.
Implications for sovereignty: this cooperation would not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch and German armies independently of one another.
Precondition: the costs and benefits of concentrating maintenance of materiel and ammunition management must be apportioned fairly.

- Army: leasing mechanised capability. By disbanding its tank battalions, reducing the number of armoured howitzers and halving its anti-tank capacity, the Netherlands has given up much of its combat strength. The capacity of the Dutch army to act with sufficient escalation dominance in the event of conflicts has thus been considerably reduced. However, the Netherlands can make up for these gaps in its defences by concluding agreements with Germany for the leasing of mechanised capability which the Netherlands is no longer able to maintain independently owing to the high costs involved. One specific example would be the leasing of combat tanks. By concluding a package deal, Germany could in turn make use of Dutch materiel or training facilities. For example, it could lease Patriot air defence systems from the Netherlands.
  Aim: retention of an army that has sufficient escalation dominance in the event of conflicts helps to strengthen European military capability.
  Implications for sovereignty: by leasing mechanised capability the Dutch army would retain the possibility of acting independently with sufficient escalation dominance in the event of conflicts. The army's potency would thus be largely maintained.
  Precondition: the scope and conditionalities of a lease arrangement for military capability must be recorded in an agreement.

- Army: coordination of current investment plans and, in due course, the formulation of a joint investment plan for the Dutch and German armies.
  Aim: standardisation of the new generation of army assets would achieve cost savings and also help to strengthen European military capability for land operations.
  Implications for sovereignty:this cooperationwould not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch and German armies independently of one another.
  Preconditions: (1) unnecessary national configuration differences must be avoided when purchasing materiel; (2) the costs and benefits of concentrating maintenance and training must be apportioned fairly.

- EU Battlegroup: conversion of the German-Dutch-Finnish Battlegroup, which was available for deployment in 2007 and 2011, into a semi-permanent partnership that can be periodically offered to the EU.
  Implications for sovereignty: this operational cooperation would make the Netherlands dependent on Germany and Finland in relation to both the political decision-making process for deployment of the Battlegroup and its actual deployment.[97] During the preparations for the Battlegroup rotations in 2007 and 2011 the countries concerned cooperated closely and held joint exercises, thereby gaining experience of dealing with cultural differences.
  Preconditions: (1) broad political support is required for the conversion of the German-Dutch-Finnish Battlegroup into a semi-permanent partnership; (2) joint formulation of doctrine is required; (3) the scope and conditionalities of this partnership must be recorded in an agreement.

- Air force: the procurement of a MALE UAV system will be one of the priorities for increased spending for the Dutch armed forces in the next ten years. Joint purchase, maintenance and stationing of a UAV and joint education and training of the operators would give substantial economies of scale. Cooperation with Germany would be the most obvious course of action.

97 AIV advisory report no. 56, 'Deployment of the Armed Forces: Interaction between National and International Decision-Making', The Hague, May 2007.

Aim: the joint purchase and maintenance of a MALE UAV system would yield cost savings and also help to strengthen European military intelligence capability.
Implications for sovereignty:this cooperationwould not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch and German armed forces independently of one another.
Precondition: the costs and benefits of concentrating maintenance and training should be apportioned fairly.

- Navy: coordination of current investment plans and, in due course, the formulation of a joint investment plan for the Dutch and German navies. Belgium's participation in this navy cooperation would be desirable.
  Aim: standardisation of the new generation of navy platforms, including joint maintenance and joint training of crews, together with Belgium, would bring cost savings and help to strengthen European military capability for navy operations.
  Implications for sovereignty: this far-reaching cooperationwould not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch and German navies independently of one another.
  Preconditions: (1) unnecessary national configuration differences must be avoided when procuring materiel; (2) the costs and benefits of concentrating maintenance and training must be apportioned fairly.

- Navy: a study of possible cost savings that could be achieved by setting up a joint command for the four Dutch and eight German submarines, including joint maintenance and joint training, by analogy with the example of the Admiral Benelux operational headquarters in Den Helder. Denmark could possibly participate in submarine cooperation of this kind.
  Aim: improvement of the interoperability of Dutch and German submarines and cost savings through economies of scale.
  Implications for sovereignty: this far-reaching cooperation would not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch and German submarines independently of one another.
  Precondition: the costs and benefits of concentrating maintenance and training should be apportioned fairly.

- Navy: the Netherlands and Germany are leading the way in Europe in developing a Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence system for the navy. Operational cooperation between the two navies in the area of missile defence would therefore be logical.
  Aims: strengthening European military capability and improving the interoperability of the missile defence systems of the two navies.
  Implications for sovereignty: this operational cooperation would make the Netherlands dependent on Germany. However, the increased capacity to act would easily outweigh the reduction in freedom of action.
  Preconditions: (1) joint formulation of doctrine would be necessary; (2) the political aims, scope and conditionalities of this operational cooperation should be recorded in a separate treaty.

The United Kingdom

For many decades the United Kingdom has been an important strategic partner with which the Netherlands has collaborated in crisis management operations and the UK/ Netherlands Amphibious Force. A decision to deepen defence cooperation with the United Kingdom would be logical if the Netherlands is willing and able to participate with the United Kingdom and France in high-risk military missions. The AIV has identified the following specific cooperation possibility:

- A yet-to-be-determined Dutch contribution to the Joint Expeditionary Task Force (JEF), if the United Kingdom and France allow participation by other European countries.
  Aim: increase Dutch military deployability on high-risk missions and thus help to strengthen European military capability.
  Implications for sovereignty: this operational cooperation would make the Netherlands dependent on the United Kingdom and France. However, the increased capacity to act would easily outweigh the reduction in freedom of action.
  Preconditions: (1) broad political support would be required for Dutch participation in the JEF; (2) joint formulation of doctrine would be necessary; (3) the political aims, scope and conditionalities of this operational cooperation should be recorded in a separate treaty.

Norway

In the recent past Norway was considered as a potential strategic cooperation partner for the Netherlands. The present military cooperation is mainly confined to ad hoc cooperation in the context of the EPAF Expeditionary Air Wing and joint exercises conducted by the Norwegian and Dutch armies and navies. Norway is also an active partner in the high-readiness forces headquarters of the German/Netherlands Corps. The AIV has identified the following cooperation possibilities:

- Air force: materiel and logistical cooperation in preparation for the joint procurement and maintenance of fighter aircraft and for the joint training of pilots. Belgian and Danish participation in this cooperation would be desirable.
  Aim: retention of a versatile air force with adequate combat capacity; to be achieved through economies of scale obtained through the joint purchase and maintenance of fighter aircraft.
  Implications for sovereignty: this cooperation would not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch and Norwegian air forces independently of one another.
  Preconditions: (1) cooperation in respect of fighter aircraft presupposes that the Netherlands and Norway choose the same successor to the current F-16s; (2) the costs and benefits of concentrating the maintenance of aircraft and the joint training of pilots must be apportioned fairly.

- Intensification of cooperation in the area of research and technology development, with a possible division of labour being agreed with Norway in some areas. Closer cooperation is desirable in anticipation of the gradual rise in the cost of acquiring modern defence technology. The participation of other like-minded countries would be possible.
  Aim: cost savings through specialisation and close cooperation between like-minded countries.
  Implications for sovereignty: cooperation in the area of research and technology development would not influence the freedom of action of the Dutch and Norwegian armed forces.
  Precondition: the scope and conditionalities of this cooperation should be recorded in an agreement.

Denmark

Military cooperation with Denmark is confined for the time being to ad hoc cooperation in the context of the EPAF Expeditionary Air Wing. The AIV has identified the following cooperation possibilities:

- Air force: materiel and logistical cooperation in preparation for the joint procurement and maintenance of fighter aircraft and for the joint training of pilots. Belgian and Norwegian participation in this cooperation would be desirable.
  Aim: retention of a versatile air force with adequate combat capacity; to be achieved through economies of scale obtained through the joint purchase and maintenance of fighter aircraft.
  Implications for sovereignty: this cooperation would not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch and Danish air forces independently of one another.
  Preconditions: (1) cooperation in respect of fighter aircraft presupposes that the Netherlands and Denmark choose the same successor to the current F-16s; (2) the costs and benefits of concentrating the maintenance of aircraft and the joint training of pilots must be apportioned fairly.

- Navy: a study of possible cost savings that could be achieved by setting up a joint command for Dutch, Danish and German submarines, including joint maintenance and joint training, by analogy with the example of the Admiral Benelux operational headquarters in Den Helder.
  Implications for sovereignty: this far-reaching cooperation would not affect the possibility of deploying the Dutch, Danish and German submarines independently of one another.
  Precondition: the costs and benefits of concentrating the maintenance and training must be apportioned fairly.

III.5 Coordination of bilateral and multilateral cooperation

In the past decades the Netherlands has made gradual progress in the field of bilateral defence cooperation. This has definitely enhanced the professionalism of the armed forces. As noted in this chapter, the possibilities for far-reaching forms of bilateral cooperation have by no means been exhausted. The AIV therefore recommends that the government make the best possible use of the above-mentioned ways of deepening bilateral cooperation. At the same time, it notes that close bilateral cooperation can be a basis for new multilateral initiatives. When France and Germany, as bilateral partners, decided in 2006 to establish the EATC, it was relatively easy for the Netherlands and Belgium to join in. The good bilateral relations between the Netherlands and Germany and between Belgium and France formed the foundation for the establishment of a joint air transport command for these four countries.

The AIV points out that some of the possibilities for cooperation listed above have been formulated in both a bilateral and a multilateral context. For example, in the opinion of the AIV, Belgian-Dutch navy cooperation provides a basis for both deepening the bilateral relationship and expanding the navy cooperation with Germany. Similarly, air force cooperation with Belgium could be expanded in a slightly modified form to include Norway and Denmark. Finally, the AIV considers that bilateral cooperation with the United Kingdom in the UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force could possibly be expanded into a form of multilateral cooperation with France in the JEF. In short, bilateral defence cooperation can in favourable circumstances act as a springboard for multilateral defence cooperation.

IV Conclusions and recommendations

The AIV emphasises that the need for European defence cooperation is greater than ever. The latest round of severe cuts in defence expenditure in numerous European countries means that there is once again a real possibility that substantial military capability will be lost. At the same time, the NATO operation in Libya has demonstrated that there are still essential military shortfalls in Europe. These shortfalls concern, among other things, the capacity to identify enemy targets and eliminate them with great accuracy and to carry out in-flight refuelling of fighter aircraft. The Libya operation has in this respect shown how dependent Europe still is on the United States. The AIV views this dependence as a problem since the United States appears to be focusing more and more on Asia and is assuming that Europe will be increasingly capable of standing on its own two feet. It can no longer be taken for granted that the United States will provide military assistance to European countries in future crisis situations which are not covered by article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and in which its interests are affected only indirectly, if at all. This is why the European countries must set about in earnest enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of their military capabilities. There is also every reason for this because their joint defence output is lacking in terms of their capacity to deploy a substantial force in conflict areas outside Europe.

The AIV believes that the military output per euro spent on defence is too low when viewed in the light of total European defence expenditure. European armed forces have insufficient combat troops capable of rapid deployment and overhead costs are relatively high. A comparative survey by McKinsey & Company of the so-called tooth-to-tail ratio of 33 armed forces shows that the Dutch armed forces perform better in terms of effectiveness than most of their European allies.[98] As a substantial increase in defence budgets is unlikely in the near future, there is only one alternative: eliminate military surpluses within Europe wherever possible, arrange for joint procurement and maintenance of materiel, establish joint training courses, pool and share existing military capabilities with other countries to maximise use, and also exchange and allocate capabilities in the context of operational cooperation (specialisation). Only in this way can the harmful effects of the current spending cuts be limited and resources made available to fill critical gaps in European defence capability. If this does not happen, the credibility of Dutch and European ambitions to play a significant role in Europe and the surrounding region will be impaired still further. It should be noted that the AIV recognises that as long as the responsibility for defence remains a primarily national matter there will be red lines regarding the extent to which European defence can be rationalised and enhanced. A common European defence will remain a distant speck on the horizon as long as European countries demonstrate insufficient unity in terms of their foreign policies. Without a common foreign policy there can be no common defence.

Turning to the Netherlands in particular, the AIV notes that, in view of the present size of its armed forces the practical significance of and hence the social justification for its defence effort are now dependent more than ever on capitalising on opportunities for international cooperation, especially with its European partners. In other words, the position of the Dutch armed forces as an independent organisation is largely

98 S. Gebicke and S. Magid, ‘Lessons from around the World: Benchmarking performance in defence’, *McKinsey on Government*, Spring 2010; see also Nick Witney, ‘Re-energising Europe’s Security and Defence Policy’, *European Council on Foreign Relations*, London, July 2008.

determined by their value in partnerships with other countries. This idea forms the basis for the following policy recommendations for a coherent approach to the expansion and further deepening of European defence cooperation.

Defence cooperation framework: implications for national sovereignty
The government is interested first of all in the question of how various forms of defence cooperation relate to the national sovereignty of the countries involved. The AIV notes that contemporary thinking on the concept of sovereignty places much less emphasis on a strictly legal approach to the preservation of the state's exclusive power of decision – freedom of action – and much more on the capacity of the state to act by cooperating effectively in international forums and to participate with authority in international contexts. For the Netherlands this means that only through participation in bilateral and multilateral configurations and through structured European cooperation can international influence and military effectiveness be maintained. From this perspective the importance of shared European sovereignty is in reality greater than that of (unshared) national sovereignty. The AIV concludes that the freedom to act (i.e. sovereignty in a traditional sense) is limited only in the case of certain forms of operational cooperation and in role and task specialisation. A careful consideration of the choice of countries with which and the conditions under which close operational cooperation or a form of specialisation is entered into is required in such cases.

Besides having major advantages, bilateral and multilateral defence cooperation also entails obligations and dependences. For example, the placing of national defence capabilities in a multinational pool creates obligations towards partners for the upkeep and maintenance of the capability. Furthermore, there are limitations on the extent to which a country can have free access to its own capability in a multinational pool. The problem of these limitations can be overcome by means of an agreement about the principle of a 'red card holder', which gives a country the possibility of demanding its own capability for national operations in exceptional situations. Such an arrangement was agreed, for example, when the EATC was established.

By taking part in the pooling of scarce airlift capability in the EATC and participating in the SAC/C-17 initiative, the Netherlands has reduced its dependence on external providers of airlift capability for the movement of military materiel to and from theatres of operations. Pooling and sharing capabilities enables a country to strengthen combined military capability while maintaining the autonomous control over the deployment of its own armed forces, and thus makes it easier for countries to participate in a military operation if they desire.

In the case of integrated operational cooperation, the mutual dependence of the partners greatly increases because successful cooperation is dependent on reaching agreement on the political desirability and military feasibility of joint deployment in a given situation. At the same time, this form of cooperation also has major advantages, particularly if the partners have similar materiel. Although an ultimate escape clause can be included when a treaty on integrated operational cooperation is concluded, the freedom of choice of the participating partners will be limited in practice. The following factors should be considered when deciding whether to enter into integrated operational cooperation with a particular country:

- the political decision-making process and the role of parliament;
- the strategic culture in the sense of the prevailing views on the deployment of the military in order to achieve security aims;

- the political willingness to share risks;
- the risk profile in the event of deployment, determined not just by the nature of the mission but above all by the type of deployment (ground, air or maritime operations) and the level at which the deployment takes place. Deployment of ground forces at a low tactical level has the highest risk profile.

The most far-reaching form of dependence between partners occurs in the case of role and task specialisation. Although the AIV considers that this option should not be taboo, it also believes that, before the Netherlands agrees to any such specialisation by the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral agreements, two conditions must be met: a similar strategic culture and ample operational experience with the partner or partners. Careful consideration should also be given to the advantages of specialisation and the division of tasks and the possible disadvantage of curtailing national autonomy or freedom of action. The AIV refers in this connection to the possibility of making further agreements with Belgium about a division of coastguard duties, mine countermeasure operations and protection of the airspace between the two countries. In the AIV's opinion, this would not cause any unacceptable loss of sovereignty.

The AIV points out that in the past, during the Cold War, the security of the Netherlands was highly dependent on decisions taken by the American government. The United States was, after all, the strategic guarantor of security in Europe. The fear in our part of the world was not of being entrapped against our will in an armed conflict but of being abandoned by the Americans.[99] To defend Europe the United States risked the destruction – by nuclear or other means – of its own people. The Netherlands, like the other allies, had little influence over American decisions, particularly as regards the possible use of nuclear weapons. Although the Dutch troops assigned to NATO were under national control in peacetime, the decision to put them fully under NATO command in the event of application of article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty following a surprise enemy attack would be dictated entirely by circumstances. From the moment that the Netherlands started participating in the integrated defence of the Alliance, it was foreseeable that Dutch sovereignty would be considerably curtailed, if not formally in any event in practice, by its dependence on the United States.

However, the security context in which the issue of sovereignty should now be placed has changed radically. The semi-automatic obligation to provide assistance under article 5 is now overshadowed by the voluntary participation in non-article 5, out-of-area crisis management operations and the fear of abandonment has been replaced by the fear of entrapment. Another change is the assertiveness displayed by the House of Representatives in respect of all matters connected with the deployment of Dutch military personnel. This has resulted, for example, in the formulation of a Frame of Reference for the participation of Dutch military units in international crisis management operations.[100] In many other European countries too, there is growing parliamentary involvement in the matter of the deployment of troops. This new reality has resulted in a provisional definition of the boundaries of international defence cooperation: most European countries wish to retain the possibility of deploying units involved

99 A classic account of the twin concepts of abandonment and entrapment can be found in Glenn H. Snyder, 'The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics', *World Politics* 36 (4), 1984.

100 The Frame of Reference for decision-making on the deployment of Dutch military units in international crisis management operations was adopted in 1995 and last amended in 2009.

in cooperation arrangements as independent modules in international operations, irrespective of whether the countries with which they closely cooperate are taking part in such operations. A good example is the navy cooperation between the Netherlands and Belgium in the Admiral Benelux operational headquarters, which enables both countries to participate entirely separately in international military operations.

In the future, however, partners may conceivably become so dependent on one another's military capabilities that they cannot participate effectively in military operations without the active cooperation of the partners. The AIV believes that in such a situation the danger of paralysis where certain countries decide not to become involved in a proposed mission outweighs the danger of loss of national sovereignty in the sense of autonomous control. In the intergovernmental decision-making process characteristic of both NATO and the EU, member states cannot, after all, be compelled to cooperate in implementing majority decisions. Moreover, it is hard to imagine that critical and vigilant national parliaments such as the Dutch parliament would endorse participation in military operations simply because other countries have become dependent on their country's military capabilities and exert political pressure to make these available; especially with regard to high risk military action involving ground forces at a low tactical level. In such circumstances, troops face the greatest dangers. Often the decisive factor for national parliaments in determining whether or not to agree to a mission is the risks that military personnel run in the event of a joint deployment with troops of another country.

Lessons from international programmes and processes
After the Cold War, NATO and the EU embarked on a process of transformation that would shift the focus to expeditionary operations. Hitherto, however, the capability programmes established by NATO and the EU have produced only limited results. Accordingly, the potential for further cooperation has by no means been exhausted. Entrenched national interests, primarily in national defence industries, and differences in politico-strategic culture have proved to be major obstacles to the full utilisation of this potential. In the case of NATO, the capabilities initiatives have concentrated mainly on the joint leasing and pooling of strategic airlift and sealift capability and logistical support for out-of-area operations. The NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA) has helped to make substantial savings by coordinating as far as possible the logistic support provided for expeditionary operations for participating countries. Within the framework of the EU, the European Defence Agency (EDA) acts as the driving force behind joint programmes and projects. A series of smaller projects have been carried out within the EDA. The most tangible result has been a joint training programme for helicopter pilots, which was in fact established in consultation with NATO. Owing in part to its modest budget, however, the Agency has not yet been able to achieve any real breakthroughs in military capability cooperation. Unfortunately, EU member states take different views on the appropriate level of control to be exercised by the Agency.

In practice, another way of deepening defence cooperation has been found to be through regional partnerships or clusters of like-minded countries. This applies, for example, both to cooperation between the Scandinavian countries (in NORDEFCO) and to the cooperation of the Netherlands with Belgium/Luxembourg and Germany. However, the cluster approach also has limitations and drawbacks. An obvious limitation is that the desired deepening of cooperation in the area of strategic intelligence, communication and command falls outside the remit of the clusters. Deepening of this kind can be achieved only within the framework of NATO and the EU. A disadvantage of the cluster approach is the risk that these cooperation programmes may become disconnected from the real

capability needs of all European countries together. After all, European surpluses exist in some fields, but large shortfalls in others.

The AIV considers it is essential for European capability shortfalls to be identified with a view to jointly setting defence expenditure priorities for NATO and EU member states in order to redress the existing imbalanced configuration of military capabilities. The failure to set joint priorities has also been apparent in the case of the plans for defence spending cuts recently drawn up by European governments, including the Dutch government. Moreover, the varied timing of these national plans is an extra complication. No top-down coordination mechanism exists for monitoring the total expeditionary capabilities of the European armed forces. Extraordinary ministerial conferences within the EU, as already proposed by the Netherlands, could remedy this deficiency. It would be logical for the EDA to play a supporting role in implementing this coordination.

An important lesson is that the most effective strategy for military cooperation starts with joint procurement and maintenance of materiel, combined with joint training of personnel. However, a certain amount of resistance to such cooperation must still be overcome, for example within national defence industries and among those responsible for military defence planning. Materiel cooperation places few if any constraints on the independent deployment of military units. Once the parties concerned have gained positive experience of such cooperation and become convinced of the desirability of making further progress, steps can be taken to achieve more far-reaching operational cooperation, resulting ultimately in the exchange and division of military capabilities. This is somewhat analogous to the process of European integration as a whole: the result of a strategy of taking successive small steps to expand and deepen cooperation.

The aim of international defence cooperation is not only to increase the output of the joint defence budgets in terms of capabilities but also to maximise the effectiveness of action taken during missions. The development of operational concepts and joint training are indispensable in this connection. In future hybrid military conflicts, the success of the action taken by multinational units will be determined above all by their ability to operate in a complex civil-military environment. Also important is their ability to adapt and the speed of their response to new security risks. This adaptability will have to extend over a broad area including joint materiel procurement procedures, education and training concepts, and the defence industries.

Cooperation possibilities in the future
The Netherlands is regarded in Europe as a pioneer of defence cooperation with other countries. The Benesam model can serve as a shining example to other countries. Nonetheless, the AIV is convinced that numerous possibilities still remain unused even by the Netherlands. The emphasis of Dutch defence cooperation is on relations with the Benelux partners and Germany. Although a deepening of military cooperation with these countries is desirable, it should be accompanied by an intensification of security policy cooperation. In addition, the AIV sees opportunities for the Royal Netherlands Air Force to broaden its cooperation with its counterparts in Norway and Denmark. The Netherlands shares with these two countries a similar political and strategic culture and a similar vision of foreign and security policy. Finally, the AIV advises that the Netherlands continue its operational cooperation with the United Kingdom by seeking to join the Joint Expeditionary Task Force (JEF), provided that the government can generate broad political support and that the United Kingdom and France are receptive to the idea. In this way, the Netherlands could acquire more political prestige and exercise influence over decisions on international action, including military action, in crisis situations.

The AIV presents ten specific recommendations to the government that relate directly to the Dutch armed forces or individual services:

1. To guarantee that the existing level of cooperation between the Dutch and Belgian navies is maintained in the future, the governments of the two countries should coordinate their current investment plans and draw up a joint set of requirements, leading in due course to a joint investment plan. An important aim of this plan should be to help to strengthen European navy capabilities. If possible, Germany too should be involved in this.
2. To enhance still further the level of cooperation between the Dutch and Belgian navies, the operational cooperation within the framework of Benesam can be deepened by means of the joint deployment of navy units, for example for coastguard duties, mine countermeasures and antipiracy operations.
3. To achieve cost savings in materiel and logistical cooperation between the Dutch and Belgian air forces, arrangements should be made for the joint procurement, maintenance and stationing of transport and fighter aircraft and the joint education and training of pilots. It would also be desirable for the two governments to reach the same decision on the replacement for the F-16. If the decision is in favour of the JSF, expansion of materiel and logistical cooperation with Norway and Denmark would be possible and desirable (assuming that these countries too come down in favour of the JSF).
4. To achieve cost savings in materiel and logistical cooperation between the Dutch and German armies, arrangements should be made for the joint maintenance of the Boxer armoured vehicle and the armoured howitzer and for the joint purchase and management of ammunition. The governments of the two countries should also coordinate their current investment plans and draw up a joint set of requirements, leading in due course to a joint investment plan. An important aim of this plan should be to strengthen European military capability for land operations.
5. To enable the Royal Netherlands Army to continue operating in the future with sufficient escalation dominance in the event of conflicts, a study should be made of whether the loss of mobility, firepower and protection as a consequence of the recent spending cuts can be offset by leasing combat tanks from the Bundeswehr, preferably by concluding a package deal with Germany. In exchange Germany could make use of Dutch equipment, or training or other facilities.
6. The Netherlands should aim for the joint procurement, maintenance and stationing of an unmanned aerial vehicle (MALE UAV) in order to limit costs. Close cooperation with Germany would produce considerable economies of scale, including through joint training.
7. To maximise the effectiveness of maritime Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence, operational cooperation with Germany would be the obvious course of action since the two countries lead the way in Europe in this field.
8. To reduce the costs of operating its four submarines, the Netherlands could study whether it would be possible to place these vessels under a joint command with the eight German submarines, by analogy with the example of the Admiral Benelux operational headquarters. It is also possible that Denmark might join in any submarine cooperation. Here too, possible savings could be achieved through joint maintenance and joint crew training.
9. To enable the armed forces to participate in high-risk missions, the possibility of operational cooperation with the United Kingdom and France in the JEF merits serious study.
10. To strengthen the European Gendarmerie Force (EGF) as a unique niche capability in the range of police services, consideration could be given to extending it to

qualify as Permanent Structured Cooperation (PSC) or establishing it as a form of enhanced cooperation as referred to in the Treaty of Lisbon.

The AIV considers it desirable for the government to work not only to embed the Dutch armed forces further in bilateral and multilateral cooperation arrangements but also to engage in active diplomacy in order to deepen international defence cooperation within NATO and the EU. The transformation towards expeditionary operations which both security organisations have undergone since the Cold War must be vigorously continued. The desired efforts should focus above all on converting the rapid reaction forces of NATO and the EU into semi-permanent cooperation arrangements, making more intensive use of NAMSA for logistical support for NATO and EU operations, denationalising the procurement of defence materiel, shifting from national to multinational education and training programmes and establishing a single research budget for internal and external security. To this end the AIV makes six additional recommendations:

11. To deepen operational cooperation between the countries participating in the NRF and the EU Battlegroups, it would be advisable to convert the rapid reaction forces into a form of semi-permanent cooperation in which the same countries or combinations of countries participate periodically in the NRF or EU Battlegroup in accordance with a rotational plan. Those European countries which, unlike the Netherlands, do not have a fully expeditionary armed force could be encouraged to specialise by contributing a niche capability to the NRF or EU Battlegroups.
12. To limit the high costs of making available and deploying the NRF and the EU Battlegroups it would be advisable for countries that lead one or more of these rapid reaction forces to make arrangements directly with NAMSA for their logistical support. In this way, it would be possible to ensure that agreements with NAMSA about the support of EU-led military forces do not founder due to the political blockade regarding EU-NATO cooperation.
13. To achieve greater efficiency in expenditure on defence materiel procurement, EU member states should gradually increase the percentage of expenditure on the purchase of materiel on a bilateral or multilateral basis. Systematic research into ways of embedding international cooperation in the defence planning process of the separate member states would be necessary for this purpose. Only in this way can greater standardisation of defence materiel be achieved. The EDA should be given the job of advising member states on the necessary adjustments to the defence planning process by reference to established best practices in a number of countries and monitoring progress.
14. To establish lasting international materiel cooperation in the areas of logistics, maintenance and training, better use should be made of the possibilities for joint courses. In addition, cooperation on defence education could be strengthened, for example by gradually expanding the European Security and Defence College.
15. To achieve greater efficiency in the investments required in cross-border research and development, efforts must also be made to shift from national to multinational research programmes and introduce closer cooperation with the private sector. NATO's Smart Defence and the EU's joint investment programmes for research and technology must combine their efforts in this field in order to avoid duplication of research programmes.
16. To generate more synergy in the research into internal and external security it is proposed (in view of the close connection between these two aspects of security) that a single EU research budget should be created for them. For this purpose, agreements should be made between the European Commission and the EDA.

Final remarks
In this report the AIV advocates a coherent approach to the expansion and deepening of European defence cooperation. This requires a twin-track approach consisting of a top-down strategy for European security cooperation and a bottom-up approach for deepening bilateral defence cooperation. It is essential that a balance be achieved between the two tracks. Too much emphasis on the first track could unduly weaken national armed forces' sense of ownership. There is also a risk that plans forged within NATO and the EU may take the special ties that exist between countries and their armed forces insufficiently into account. Conversely, undue emphasis on the second track – the bottom-up approach – would entail the risk of a lack of coordination between (regional) clusters of partner countries, resulting in major imbalances in the military capabilities available to Europe as a whole. This is one reason why the AIV recommends the formulation of a new European security strategy. This exercise should have a dual character. First, the study should systematically assess what Europe needs in military terms in order to safeguard its security and play an important role on the world stage. Second, an evaluation should be made of national defence plans in the light of established European military needs. This evaluation should provide an answer to the question of the extent to which European countries set the right defence priorities and on what military capabilities the partnerships should preferably focus. The AIV considers that if this new European security strategy is to be a success, it should be put on the agenda at the highest political level (i.e. the European Council).

Finally, the AIV emphasises that cost savings as a result of bilateral and multilateral cooperation should not be seen as paving the way for further cuts in the Dutch defence budget. Achieving savings is a process where we have to make investments now so that we can reap the benefits later, and confidence between the cooperating partners is essential. Cost savings will be absolutely essential in order to overcome the existing operational shortfalls and maintain versatile and innovative armed forces. This is all the more important since Europe will in future increasingly be expected to stand on its own two feet militarily, and the Netherlands too will be expected to make a proportional contribution to European defence.

Annexe I

Request for advice

Mr F. Korthals Altes
Chairman of the Advisory Council
on International Affairs
P.O. Box 20061
2500 EB The Hague

Date: 20 June 2011

Re: Request for advice on deepening international defence cooperation by Dutch armed forces

Dear Mr Korthals Altes,

Cuts in European defence spending in response to government budget deficits have refuelled the debate on European defence cooperation. Defence cooperation is sought as a means of keeping military capabilities up to scratch and sharing costs wherever possible. Against the background of the shifting balance of power in the world, deepening European defence cooperation also has great political and strategic significance for European security and burden sharing in the transatlantic partnership.

The Netherlands is seeking to further deepen its international cooperation programme. It is already involved in a number of successful multinational projects such as the European Air Transport Command (EATC) and the Strategic Airlift Capability (SAC) using C-17s, and wishes to deepen bilateral cooperation, especially with Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg and the United Kingdom. This does not rule out further cooperation with other partner countries, including the United States. The efforts are an integral part of the present government's vision for the future Dutch armed forces, in which innovation, quality and international embedding are important benchmarks.

The government acknowledges that this also raises fundamental questions about national sovereignty. Cooperation and sovereignty should not be seen as opposites, not least because deepening international cooperation by the armed forces is designed to strengthen joint military effectiveness and thereby enhance our security and sovereignty. Since we are currently striving for an ambitious, multi-annual cooperation agenda, it is appropriate to also take account of the greater or lesser sovereignty dilemmas that may arise as new initiatives are developed. As promised by the Minister of Defence to the House of Representatives, the AIV is requested to devote particular attention to this issue.

Against this backdrop the government requests the AIV, following on from its report 'Military Cooperation in Europe: Possibilities and Limitations', published in April 2003, to make recommendations on the further international embedding of the Dutch armed forces. As promised by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Senate, the AIV is requested to investigate in particular what scope this could offer for improving cooperation between the EU and NATO. The AIV's advice could contribute to the development of the Ministry of Defence's international cooperation agenda over the next several years.

The key questions are as follows:

Defence cooperation framework

What sovereignty issues are implicit in the various forms of defence cooperation? How are these issues expressed and how can the government and parliament deal with them? How are they viewed by the EU? Are there certain fields where cooperation seems to be an obvious option, and are there capabilities that will need to be specifically maintained at national level? What added value can the Dutch armed forces contribute internationally and can this be viewed as a form of 'role specialisation'?

Lessons from international programmes and processes

What lessons can be learned from past multinational programmes such as the NH90, and how can we ban divergent national configurations? How great is the willingness to work together internationally, and does this vary from larger to smaller countries? What lessons can be learned from the capabilities development process within the EU (including the European Defence Agency, EDA) and NATO and what would be the best way for us to enhance the effectiveness of these processes? Should we move towards a more binding international framework, as envisaged by the Permanent Structured Cooperation mechanism? What part do the NATO Response Force (NRF) and EU Battlegroups play in promoting defence cooperation and how could this role be strengthened?

Cooperation possibilities

Are there any specific ideas for defence cooperation with partner countries, bilaterally or in a broader context, for instance along similar lines to the EATC? What opportunities exist in terms of technology and research? Are there any links with civilian capability development, especially within the EU, where the Ministry of Defence could benefit from economies of scale and interoperability?

EU-NATO cooperation
In the AIV's opinion, what are the options for improving EU-NATO cooperation, despite the persistence of underlying political problems? We also request the AIV to outline its vision on cooperation between the EU and NATO, whether recently initiated or currently under consideration, for instance in the following fields:

- consultations between the two organisations at official and political levels (including informal talks between all NATO and EU countries, and contacts between EU High Representative Catherine Ashton and the Secretary-General of NATO);
- coordination and consultation at staff level;
- capability cooperation, notably in the light of the debate about pooling and sharing, the EU-NATO Capability Group and the contacts between the EDA and the NATO Allied Command Transformation;
- training and exercises;
- unfreezing cooperation on the basis of the organisation-to-organisation principle.

Yours sincerely,

Uri Rosenthal
Minister of Foreign Affairs

Hans Hillen
Minister of Defence

Definitions of terms

Admiral Benelux	Joint operational headquarters of the Dutch and Belgian navies in Den Helder.
Benesam	Bilateral navy partnership between Belgium and the Netherlands.
Caveat	Operational reservation made by a state in the event of a crisis management operation.
Comprehensive Approach	Approach employing political, civil and military means in crisis management.
Cyber warfare	Military and other operations designed to disrupt, mislead, change or destroy an enemy's computer systems or networks by digital means.
Globalisation	Worldwide process of mutual economic, political and sociocultural influences.
Hybrid military conflict	Conflicts characterised by a broad spectrum of conventional and non-conventional forms of combat in which both state and non-state actors are involved.
Opt-out	Negotiated provision allowing a member state an exceptional position in relation to specific areas of EU policy.
Out-of-area operation	Crisis management operations outside the territory of NATO and the EU.
Patriot air defence systems	Guided missile systems for air defence.
Pooling	Combining of similar military capabilities of two or more countries in order to optimise their use.
Red card holder	System enabling pool members to demand in exceptional circumstances that their own military capabilities be made available to them for national operations.
Role specialisation	Agreements between two or more countries about the use of each other's capabilities for military tasks.
Sharing	Joint procurement and use of military capabilities by two or more countries.
Smart Defence	Maximising security with limited means and investing sufficiently in future security (NATO concept).
Sovereignty	Independence in the exercise of power, particularly of a state.
Standardisation	Coordinating the requirements for military capabilities in order to arrange for the joint procurement of weapons systems, while eliminating national configurations.
Task specialisation	Exchange of military tasks and capabilities between two or more countries which specialise by mutual agreement and can completely rely on one another's specialisations.
Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence	System for defence against ballistic missiles fired from sea or land.
Transatlantic partnership	Relations between Europe and the United States in the security field.
UK/Netherlands Amphibious Force	A Dutch infantry battalion has been assigned to the British 3 Commando brigade. The Dutch 1 Boat Company of the Amphibious Support Battalion has been incorporated into the British 539 Assault Squadron.

List of abbreviations

A400M	Military transport aircraft (built by EADS)
ACT	Allied Command Transformation
AIV	Advisory Council on International Affairs
AWACS	Airborne Warning and Control Systems
Benesam	Belgian-Dutch Navy Cooperation
C-130	Hercules military transport aircraft (Lockheed Martin)
C-17	Military transport aircraft (Boeing)
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CIMIC	Civil-Military Cooperation
CIMIN	EGF High-Level Interdepartmental Committee
DCI	Defence Capabilities Initiative
EAC	European Airlift Centre
EADS	European Aeronautic Defence and Space Company
EATC	European Air Transport Command
ECAP	European Capabilities Action Plan
EDA	European Defence Agency
EEC	European Economic Community
EGF	European Gendarmerie Force
EPAF	European Participating Air Forces
ESS	European Security Strategy
EU	European Union
EuroMALE	European Medium-Altitude Long-Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
F-16	Fighter aircraft (Lockheed Martin)
HRFHQ	High Readiness Forces Headquarters
IEDs	Improvised Explosive Devices
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
JEF	Joint Expeditionary Task Force
JSF	Joint Strike Fighter F-35 (Lockheed Martin)
KFOR	Kosovo Force
MALE UAV	Medium-Altitude Long-Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
MARSUR	Maritime Surveillance Networking project (van EDA)
MCCE	Movement Coordination Centre Europe
NAMSA	NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NBC	Nuclear, Biological and Chemical protection
NORDEFCO	Nordic Defence Co-operation
NRF	NATO Response Force
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PCC	Prague Capabilities Commitment
PSC	Permanent Structured Cooperation
SAC	Strategic Airlift Capability
SALIS	Strategic Airlift Interim Solution
SME	Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
SSR	Security Sector Reform
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicles
UMS	Unmanned Maritime Systems
UN	United Nations

List of persons consulted

NAME	POSITION
Ms C.F. Arnould	Chief Executive, EDA
J.P. van Aubel	Representative of the Netherlands to the Politico-Military Group of the Council of the EU
Lt. Gen. P. Auroy	Assistant Secretary-General, NATO Defence Investment Division
Professor S. Biscop	Director of the Security & Global Governance Programme, EGMONT – The Royal Institute for International Relations, Brussels
T.S. Koster	Adviser to the Permanent Delegation of the Netherlands to NATO
Ambassador M. de Kwaasteniet	Representative of the Netherlands on the Political and Security Committee of the EU, Permanent Representative to the WEU
Ambassador F.A.M. Majoor	Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to NATO
Lt. Gen. F. Meulman	Permanent Military Representative of the Netherlands to NATO and the EU
J. Mullin	Capabilities Director, EDA
Lt. Gen. A.G.D van Osch	Director-General of the EU Military Staff at the Council Secretariat of the EU
Major General S.L. Porter CBE	Supreme Allied Commander Transformation Representative in Europe
Col. T. Rikken	Military adviser to the Permanent Military Delegation of the Netherlands to NATO
Commander F. Sijtsma	Deputy Head, International Military Cooperation, Ministry of Defence
T. Valasek	Director, Foreign Policy and Defence, Centre for European Reform, London
P. Valin	Commander, EU Military Staff
D. Zandee	Former Director of Planning & Policy, EDA

Previous reports published by the Advisory Council on International Affairs

1. AN INCLUSIVE EUROPE, *October 1997*
2. CONVENTIONAL ARMS CONTROL: urgent need, limited opportunities, *April 1998*
3. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS: recent developments, *April 1998*
4. UNIVERSALITY OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY, *June 1998*
5. AN INCLUSIVE EUROPE II, *November 1998*
6. HUMANITARIAN AID: redefining the limits, *November 1998*
7. COMMENTS ON THE CRITERIA FOR STRUCTURAL BILATERAL AID, *November 1998*
8. ASYLUM INFORMATION AND THE EUROPEAN UNION*, July 1999*
9. TOWARDS CALMER WATERS: a report on relations between Turkey and the European Union*, July 1999*
10. DEVELOPMENTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY SITUATION IN THE 1990s: from unsafe security to unsecured safety, *September 1999*
11. THE FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, *September 1999*
12. THE IGC AND BEYOND: towards a European Union of thirty Member States, *January 2000*
13. HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION, *April 2000**
14. KEY LESSONS FROM THE FINANCIAL CRISES OF 1997 AND 1998, *April 2000*
15. A EUROPEAN CHARTER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS?, *May 2000*
16. DEFENCE RESEARCH AND PARLIAMENTARY SCRUTINY, *December 2000*
17. AFRICA'S STRUGGLE: security, stability and development, *January 2001*
18. VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN: legal developments, *February 2001*
19. A MULTI-TIERED EUROPE: the relationship between the European Union and subnational authorities, *May 2001*
20. EUROPEAN MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION, *May 2001*
21. REGISTRATION OF COMMUNITIES BASED ON RELIGION OR BELIEF, *June 2001*
22. THE WORLD CONFERENCE AGAINST RACISM AND THE RIGHT TO REPARATION, *June 2001*
23. COMMENTARY ON THE 2001 MEMORANDUM ON HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY, *September 2001*
24. A CONVENTION, OR CONVENTIONAL PREPARATIONS? The European Union and the ICG 2004, *November 2001*
25. INTEGRATION OF GENDER EQUALITY: a matter of responsibility, commitment and quality, *January 2002*
26. THE NETHERLANDS AND THE ORGANISATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE IN 2003: role and direction, *May 2002*
27. BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN CITIZENS AND BRUSSELS: towards greater legitimacy and effectiveness for the European Union, *May 2002*
28. AN ANALYSIS OF THE US MISSILE DEFENCE PLANS: pros and cons of striving for invulnerability, *August 2002*
29. PRO-POOR GROWTH IN THE BILATERAL PARTNER COUNTRIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA: an analysis of poverty reduction strategies, *January 2003*
30. A HUMAN RIGHTS BASED APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION, *April 2003*
31. MILITARY COOPERATION IN EUROPE: possibilities and limitations, *April 2003*
32. BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN CITIZENS AND BRUSSELS: towards greater legitimacy and effectiveness for the European Union, *April 2003*
33. THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE: less can be more, *October 2003*
34. THE NETHERLANDS AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT: three issues of current interest, *March 2004*
35. FAILING STATES: a global responsibility, *May 2004**

36 PRE-EMPTIVE ACTION, *July 2004**
37 TURKEY: towards membership of the European Union, *July 2004*
38 THE UNITED NATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS, *September 2004*
39 SERVICES LIBERALISATION AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: does liberalisation produce deprivation?, *September 2004*
40 THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE, *February 2005*
41 REFORMING THE UNITED NATIONS: A closer look at the Annan report, *May 2005*
42 THE INFLUENCE OF CULTURE AND RELIGION ON DEVELOPMENT: Stimulus or stagnation?, *June 2005*
43 MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION: coherence between two policy areas, *June 2005*
44 THE EUROPEAN UNION'S NEW EASTERN NEIGHBOURS: *July 2005*
45 THE NETHERLANDS IN A CHANGING EU, NATO AND UN, *July 2005*
46 ENERGISED FOREIGN POLICY: security of energy supply as a new key objective, *December 2005***
47 THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION REGIME: The importance of an integrated and multilateral approach, *January 2006*
48 SOCIETY AND THE ARMED FORCES, *April 2006*
49 COUNTERTERRORISM FROM AN INTERNATIONAL AND EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE, *September 2006*
50 PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY REDUCTION, *October 2006*
51 THE ROLE OF NGOS AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, *October 2006*
52 EUROPE A PRIORITY!, *November 2006*
53 THE BENELUX: the benefits and necessity of enchanced cooperation, *February 2007*
54 THE OECD OF THE FUTURE, *March 2007*
55 CHINA IN THE BALANCE: towards a mature relationship, *April 2007*
56 DEPLOYMENT OF THE ARMED FORCES: interaction between national and international decision-making, *May 2007*
57 THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS TREATY SYSTEM: strengthening the system step by step in a politically charged context, *July 2007*
58 THE FINANCES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, *December 2007*
59 EMPLOYING PRIVATE MILITARY COMPANIES: a question of responsibility, *December 2007*
60 THE NETHERLANDS AND EUROPEAN DEVELOPMENT POLICY, *May 2008*
61 COOPERATION BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN UNION AND RUSSIA: a matter of mutual interest, *July 2008*
62 CLIMATE, ENERGY AND POVERTY REDUCTION, *November 2008*
63 UNIVERSALITY OF HUMAN RIGHTS: principles, practice and prospects, *November 2008*
64 CRISIS MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS IN FRAGILE STATES: the need for a coherent approach, *March 2009*
65 TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE: justice and peace in situations of transition, *April 2009**
66 DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION, *July 2009*
67 NATO'S NEW STRATEGIC CONCEPT, *January 2010*
68 THE EU AND THE CRISIS: lessons learned, *January 2010*
69 COHESION IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION: Response to the WRR (Advisory Council on Government Policy) Report '*Less Pretension, More Ambition', May 2010*
70 THE NETHERLANDS AND THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT: the responsibility to protect people from mass atrocities, *June 2010*
71 THE EU'S CAPACITY FOR FURTHER ENLARGEMENT, *July 2010*
72 COMBATING PIRACY AT SEA: a reassessment of public and private responsibilities, *December 2010*
73 THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE DUTCH GOVERNMENT: identifying constants in a changing world, *February 2011*
74 THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA: the millennium development goals in perspective, *April 2011*

75 REFORMS IN THE ARAB REGION: prospects for democracy and the rule of law?, *May 2011*
76 THE HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION: between ambition and ambivalence, *July 2011*
77 CYBER WARFARE*, December 2011**

Advisory letters issued by the Advisory Council on International Affairs

1 Advisory letter THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, *December 1997*
2 Advisory letter THE UN COMMITTEE AGAINST TORTURE, *July 1999*
3 Advisory letter THE CHARTER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, *November 2000*
4 Advisory letter ON THE FUTURE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, *November 2001*
5 Advisory letter THE DUTCH PRESIDENCY OF THE EU IN 2004, *May 2003****
6 Advisory letter THE RESULTS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE FUTURE OF EUROPE, *August 2003*
7 Advisory letter FROM INTERNAL TO EXTERNAL BORDERS. Recommendations for developing a common European asylum and immigration policy by 2009, *March 2004*
8 Advisory letter THE DRAFT DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES: from Deadlock to Breakthrough?, *September 2004*
9 Advisory letter OBSERVATIONS ON THE SACHS REPORT: How do we attain the Millennium Development Goals?, *April 2005*
10 Advisory letter THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS RELATIONS WITH THE DUTCH CITIZENS, *December 2005*
11 Advisory letter COUNTERTERRORISM IN A EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE: interim report on the prohibition of torture, *December 2005*
12 Advisory letter RESPONSE TO THE 2007 HUMAN RIGHTS STRATEGY, *November 2007*
13 Advisory letter AN OMBUDSMAN FOR DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION, *December 2007*
14 Advisory letter CLIMATE CHANGE AND SECURITY, *January 2009*
15 Advisory letter THE EASTERN PARTNERSHIP, *February 2009*
16 Advisory letter DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION, The benefit of and need for public support, *May 2009*
17 Advisory letter OPEN LETTER TO A NEW DUTCH GOVERNMENT, *June 2010*
18 Advisory letter THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS: protector of civil rights and liberties, *November 2011*

* Issued jointly by the Advisory Council on International Affairs (AIV) and the Advisory Committee on Issues of Public International Law (CAVV).

** Joint report by the Advisory Council on International Affairs (AIV) and the General Energy Council.

*** Joint report by the Advisory Council on International Affairs (AIV) and the Advisory Committee on Aliens Affairs (ACVZ).