

EU Centers of Excellence: getting concrete about threat reduction programs

21 October, 2011

Bruno Dupré
Security Policy Division
EEAS
European Union

EU Centers of Excellence: one possible model
for the future G8 Global Partnership

Getting “effective” on multilateralism

Towards a CBRN Policy at national/regional level

Current assistance model needs to be adjusted

Developing an EU model

International and regional support: a prerequisite

EU Member States essential role



Getting effective about EU Multilateralism

- Getting effective on Multilateralism (2003 WMD Strategy)

- . NPT, CD, Export Control Regimes (NSG), CTBT, WMDFZ: when can we expect a real success ?

- . Compliance: severe limits (AP, BTWC and OPCW)

- . Sanctions: efficient but to what extent ?

- Diplomacy needs to address not only universalization, compliance and sanctions but also capacity building against CBRN risks and threats (criminal, accidental, natural). Legal and illegal transfer of Know How is at the heart of a rationale CBRN policy. For a new G8GP.

New risks and threats require new CBRN

Policy (I)

- New needs are emerging everywhere: energy (Nuclear), health (Bio-sciences), use of chemical for the industry;
- Those sensitive technologies give birth to new types of threats and risks: criminal threats (proliferation, terrorism, organized crime, illicit trafficking) but also natural and accidental risks (pandemics, nuclear and chemical waste);
- Scientists engagement is essential but still a low political priority;
- One reason: lack of interministerial approach on CBRN. There is still a need to raise awareness on smuggling, bio security, nuclear security, waste management, CBRN emergency planning, CBRN crisis preparedness. Low priority;
- CBRN Policy (Action Plans) not yet in place or not yet implemented, including inside the EU;
- CBRN Policy particularly needed in regions at risks (Mediterranean basin, CA, South Caucasus, SEA, Sub Sahara, South Africa).

New risks and threats require new CBRN

Policy (2)

- CBRN policy demanded by UNSC 1540 resolution
- 1540 contributed to the creation of national action plans with clear reference to the responsibility of state towards non state actors (including raising awareness for scientific community)
- But 1540 Committee still lacks credibility vis a vis vertical CBRN institutions (IAEA, WHO, OPCW, BTWC, Interpol)
- Security approach is not the right approach to scientists engagement
- Need for a better integration between Security and Health, Safety, Environment, Development
- The EU approach can here make a difference

Current EU Assistance needs to be adjusted

- Most of EU Assistance, up to now, was towards Russia, through redirection of scientists and TACIS management (nuclear safety G8 channel)
- Very much Cold War model not adapted to global challenge: intangible transfer of know how;
- Funds transfer directly to International Organizations (Council decisions): mixed result on scientist engagement (i.e. WHO on bio security)
- Scientist engagement should be a national and regional priority through CBRN action plans.

Creating an EU/UN cooperation system: CoEs

(1)

Promoting a new methodology: a decentralized model

- Regional ownership, accountability, sustainability, partnership
- CBRN national good governance: planning, communication, standardized process, platforms, public private collaboration

Reinventing Nunn Lugar Threat Reduction Programs

- . From Cold War legacy to responsible development
- . Notion of financial vigilance, technology vigilance, academics vigilance
- . Multiform Partnership becomes key

CoE paradigm: partnership (2)

- Encouraging partnership at regional level with the support of EU/UN and international donors ;
- Incorporating existing EU assistance programs under the same and unique CoE framework: a difficult but necessary task;
- Relying on local and international experts to develop a culture of safety and security;
- Coordinating with international donors (G8, UN, US, Japan, OSCE, NATO): filling the regional gaps and using existing channels. Not reinventing the wheel.

International and regional Support needed

Support from international donors

- . G8 – 1540 – US – Japan – UN – G20
- . CoEs recognized as a possible valid new methodology

Support from regional organizations

- . Arab League – ASEAN – ECOWAS – GCC – African Union
- . No direct intervention but political support

Support from a regional coordinator: A regional Secretariat

- . Willingness to cooperate
- . Capacity to do so
- . Strategic Partner
- . Regional Outreach

Choice of countries: EU/UN choice

Choice of regions and countries made after selection by EU MS experts in coordination with Commission (DEVCO/JRC), Council and UNICRI ;

Choice validated by a launch event in the region and agreement by all countries of the region (including Regional Organizations);

Choice of Regional Secretariat by EU/UN in close consultation with EU MS and countries of the region

7 centers: five will start before end of December 2011;

Algeria for Maghreb, Morocco for West Africa, Jordan for Middle East, Georgia for South Caucasus, Philippines for SEA, possibly soon Uzbekistan for Central Asia, UAE for GCC.

Africa in 2012



Interest for the EU MS

- Supporting 1540 requirement to assist 1/3 countries;
- Developing our own EU cooperative and integrated assistance system;
- Better coordination and synergies
- Promoting, locally, EU norms and industry on CBRN issues;
- Benefiting from early warning systems in key sensitive regions;
- Engaging embassies and delegations on concrete security issues;
- Mirroring projection between CBRN policies.



EU MS possible concrete involvement

EU MS continue exploratory missions in different regions (Africa) with Commission (DEVCO/JRC) and UNICRI;

EU MS will support the establishment of CoEs secretariats together with JRC and UNICRI;

EU MS will implement most of the projects;

EU Embassies and delegations should support the establishment of CoEs and regional secretariats;

EU MS should envisage with EEAS and Commission options for contracting (ICM, MS Consortium...);



Results and Future

- MS question: what has the EU achieved these last two years ?
- With the support of the UN, the EU (EEAS/DEVCO/JRC) has:
 - Started to implement the projects;
 - Created the concept;
 - Validated the concept inside the EU and outside the EU;
 - Involved around 40 countries in this framework (more to come);
 - Created five regional Secretariats (eight to come before the end of 2012);
 - Dedicating euro 100 million for 2009-2013

EEAS question to MS: what role are you ready to play for the next two years ?

