

**On occasion of the third conference marking the International Day of United Nations
Peacekeepers
United Nations Association –Westminster, London, 31 May 2006:
„Keeping today’s international peace: a job more than for the military“**

Intervention by

**Stefan Feller, Head of the Police Unit, General Secretariat of the Council of the
European Union, Directorate for Civilian Crisis Managementⁱ**

to

„European Union’s plans for Independent Police Units and other formations“

„European Union’s plans for **Independent** Police Units and other formations“, that is the topic you have given to me.

As I started my preparation just two days ago, there was no time left indicating to the organizers that it is not about „Independent Police Units“ the EU is talking about, but „**Integrated** Police Units (IPU)“. However, this opens an opportunity to elaborate a bit on the diversity of policing concepts within the international police community and the subsequent „proliferation of terms and their acronyms“.

But, let me begin with a short look on the Police and the Military and their relationship in international environments.

This is the third conference organised to mark the International Day of United Nations Peacekeepers. I have been a UN peacekeeper, serving for the United Nations Interim Mission in Kosovo, for one year as a Deputy Police Commissioner, then for 2 ½ years as a Police Commissioner. I was commissioned to discharge executive policing whilst building a local police capacity. In the same theatre, NATO is continuing to deploy a strong military force, KFOR. This military force clearly acknowledged that peacekeeping was more than a military task only, likewise UNMIK would have never denied that peacekeeping in Kosovo was more than a civilian task only. We used to say „We do it jointly or both of us will fail“.

Now, being a staff member of the EU, I am not using the term „peacekeeping“, we use the word „crisis management“.

Within the framework of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), the Council of the European Union is providing both military and civilian means of crisis management.

Looking at the diversity of policing concepts and police organisation all over the world and in Europe as well, I find it worth mentioning (and not taking it for granted) that, as the Head of the Police Unit, within the General Secretariat of the Council, I am part of the Directorate for **Civilian** Crisis Management within a Directorate General for external and politico-military affairs. We have, within the same Directorate General as well as through a DGEUMS, also the entire military setup for EU crisis management, under civilian lead under the SG/HR, Dr. Javier Solana.

As a Police Officer I enjoyed professional education in Germany. I grew up with the fact that Police in my country is a civilian instrument by constitutional nature. As a member of a post-WWII-generation, my education includes the specific and fundamental reasons which led to the constitutional separation of military and police roles in my country. Still, more 60 years later, we find it important to emphasize this need.

From that perspective you will easily understand that, becoming a United Nations peacekeeper, I appreciated the importance the UN gave to the term „CivPol“ or, Civilian Police. Recently, the UN gave up this term, replacing it by „Police“ only. Their argument is: „Police is civilian by nature“, therefore there is no need to use a tautology.

However, if I use this argumentation, it would sometimes happen that my counterparts are telling me, that this, although convincing, might be disputed by others. For example, France's Gendarmes and Italy's Carabinieri would at least refer to themselves, although understanding their role as civilian, as Police Officers with military status. Romanian Gendarmes (which I happened to have the pleasure of working with and within UNMIK Police) would refer to themselves as soldiers with police tasks. Within a regional organisation like the African Union, a general fundamental understanding of Police as a civilian instrument is only slowly emerging. Just some examples, we could find more.

Babylon, or: the diversity of terms of policing in international environments

UN: SPU

Within UNMIK, I was, aside for up to 3300 international individual and up to 6000 Kosovan police, in charge for up to ten „Special Police Units (SPU)“, all of company strength.

UN: FPU

The United Nations recently have changed the term „Special Police Unit“ into „Formed Police Unit (FPU)“ and since some years, significantly increased the use of such capacity, not only in executive police environments. An FPU would come in company structure and strength.

G8: SPU

Within an initiative created by the G8 states in order to strengthen Africa's own peacekeeping capabilities, a Center of Excellence for „Stability Police Units“ has been created and headquartered in Vicenza, Italy. Stability Police Units happen to carry the abbreviation „SPU“. A unified structure and strength of such SPU is not known (to me, currently).

EGF: ready to contribute to EU's IPU

If one would visit the CoESPU, one would discover that the same beautiful compound is housing the Headquarters of the „European Gendarmerie Force (EGF). The EGF is founded by five European States, currently enjoying ties with the European Union, but not formally attached to it. The EGF is aiming at having a capacity of rapidly deployable Gendarmerie type Police at hand. EGF Forces are comprised of „police officers with military status“. The EGF is aiming at offering this capacity to the European Union (preferred), but to other International Organisations such as the United Nations, as well.

Now, having talked about „others“, I should finally introduce where I am coming from:

EU: IPU and FPU

Because, within the European Union, we use the term „Integrated Police Unit (IPU)“. And, we do the opposite of an independent or compartmentalised approach. We do, in the EU,

emphasize that only coherent, integrated approaches, using all appropriate civilian and military means of intervention, have a better chance of effectively and sustainably changing a crisis into peace, democracy, the Rule of Law and economic development, with a fundamental view on upholding human rights.

However, again, just to complicate matters a little more, within an integrated approach, we have established terminology both for „Integrated Police Units“ and „Formed Police Units“.

So, how can I shed some light into that thicket of acronyms?

Let me begin with stating that I have started with mentioning the terms and abbreviations of several different organisations, amongst them the UN and the EU. It is from there that I regret that babylonian situation. But I do take ownership only for what we have been developing within the EU.

What the EU wants to achieve

Let me mention first what we want to achieve.

1. We want to achieve a comprehensive response, including, where appropriate, the use of military and civilian tools. One of the guiding principles therefore is integration. EU action in crisis management requires a strong synergy between different components (military, civilian like Police, Rule of Law, Civilian Administration, Civil Protection). As a consequence, the military and police components must, where necessary, be part of an integrated planning process and have to be discharged in a closely coordinated manner. I have mentioned that the EU knows IPU's and FPU's. And earlier I mentioned the different history in Police development within Member States of the EU. It is for the reason that some Member States do allow Police to be under overall military command and others do not that we had to create different terms, allowing to give due consideration to different national caveats within a larger conceptual framework giving space for each Member States contribution.
2. We want to achieve a response to an emerging crisis which is timely and effective from the outset on. It is from there that we aim, in case of a necessity of an intervention (for example, on request of the UN) which would call for a robust military start-up, for having also a policing capability at the earliest stages possible.

We say that the police boots have to follow the military boots as close as possible. This calls for a robust policing capability at the beginning, rapidly deployable, self-sufficient, trained and experienced, able to work in non-stabilised environments where, during the initial stages¹, the military component has to have an overall authority, including, possibly, a temporary command&control over Integrated Police Units. This is, why the EU's conceptual work started with defining doctrine for Integrated Police Units (IPU).

3. We want to achieve a response to an existing crisis which, from the earliest stages possible, takes over civilian responsibility for policing. So, in preparation for those scenarios which would require an international substitution of broken down local capacities, we defined different stages within a gradual stabilisation which would allow for earliest overall civilian control over policing and the additional use of policing assets which would be limited by Member States to civilian Command and Control. It is from there that we defined Formed Police Units (FPU) in addition to IPU.
4. We want to achieve a response to an existing crisis which, as early as possible, not only overcomes the security gap but also what we call the enforcement gap. That is a gap created by the absence of specialised police capabilities like, for example, criminal intelligence, investigative and capacity building expertise during the early stages of police deployment. Kosovo is a prominent example for how the difficulties of UNMIK-Police providing specialised expertise from the outset on led to the criminal side filling that gap immediately and therefore to a drastically increased amount of problems dealing e.g. with Organised Crime years later.

The general police scenarios the EU is planning for: strengthening and substitution

-
- ¹ **THE INITIAL STAGE.** THIS STAGE SHOULD BE KEPT AS SHORT AS POSSIBLE, TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE SITUATION ON THE GROUND. IT WILL INVOLVE THE DEPLOYMENT, SIMULTANEOUSLY OR ALMOST SIMULTANEOUSLY WHEN POSSIBLE, OF A POLICE SUBSTITUTION MISSION WITH THE MILITARY OPERATION IN ORDER TO REDUCE AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE THE GAP IN WHICH THE MILITARY CONTINGENT MIGHT ASSUME, ON ITS OWN, PUBLIC SECURITY TASKS,
 - **THE STABILISATION STAGE:** FOCUSING ON RESTORING THE FULL RANGE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS AS A PRIME CONDITION FOR A RETURN TO NORMALITY, THE EU POLICE SUBSTITUTION MISSION MUST ENSURE THAT ORDINARY POLICING FUNCTIONS, INVOLVING LOCAL POLICE WILL BE GRADUALLY RESTORED.
 - **A FINAL STAGE:** TRANSITION TOWARDS A FULLY FLEDGED STRENGTHENING OF LOCAL POLICE MISSION WITH A PROGRESSIVE PHASING OUT OF THE SUBSTITUTION FUNCTIONS, AND PARALLEL ENHANCEMENT OF THE STRENGTHENING OF LOCAL POLICE COMPONENTS

Since 2001 the EU has been, through military and civilian planners working in the same building under the same chief, establishing common crisis management procedures, common tools for early warning in a joint Situation Centre, consisting of civilian and military staff and the groundwork for crisis management concepts ensuring the coherence and comprehensiveness of possible EU actions by taking account of the range and scale of the different instruments available. In December 2004, we established, within the EU Military Staff, the Civilian/Military Cell.

For the deployment of Police within EU Missions, we do identify two different general types of scenarios, strengthening and substitution scenarios. As a matter of fact, whilst ultimately all support of an international police capacity should lead to strengthen local Police, substitution in addition takes into account the fact that a local police structure may be partially or entirely broken down, requiring the temporary substitution of such missing capacity through international means.

Important experiences gained in previous and current missions, fundamental planning assumptions:

The EU, since 2003, has achieved quite some practical experience in military and civilian crisis management, as you can see on the following summarizing slide. None of the Police Missions, yet, have been mandated to substitute a missing local capacity. As a matter of fact, we do not rule out that this might, for the first time, be part of our future engagement in Kosovo. However, all of our police missions have experienced the need of integrated Rule of Law approaches. And we gained significant experience in cooperation between the military and police components like in BiH or in joint deployment scenarios like in our support to AU's AMIS in Darfur. On another note, the EU's activities in DRC, both in terms of military and civilian means, are an example of an experience leading to the recognition how important coherent SSR strategies are.

Within our preparation for substitution scenarios, we have been doing planning in order to ensure rapid deployment. This is based on previous experiences, like for example in Kosovo, as regards the key influencing factors leading to peacekeeping or crisis management. If an intervention and stabilisation is not immediately being accompanied by a policing capacity, the gaps in public order, self-announced policing, the soil for

organised crime etc. become endemic. This calls for rapid deployment of robust policing expertise, it calls for deployment of specialised policing means as early as possible and it calls for the recognition that, ultimately, this goes beyond the Police, addressing the same shortfalls within the whole chain of the Rule of Law. As I am asked only to reflect on the Police, I will not cover other areas of our preparation here. But I would like to assure you that, within a process we name „Civilian Headline Goal 2008“, we are identifying all necessary civilian means which have to, many of them most expeditiously, be deployed into such a situation.

The European Union policing approach: Integrated Police Units, Formed Police Units, Expert Teams and individual Police officers.

So, how does your working title „The EU’s IPU and other units“ now translate into details? Because, as I never fail mentioning, IPU’s are an important part of the whole concept, however, the concept includes, on the same level of importance, FPU and Expert Teams and individual police officers.

Integrated Police Units

IPU’s are robust, rapidly deployable, flexible and interoperable, able to perform a wide range of police executive tasks. They can, preferably, be deployed into non stabilised situations, and, within an EU operation, be placed temporarily under the responsibility of the military authority.

IPU’s, in the EU context, can have a company- or battalion-type structure. The EU has identified capabilities which, according to commitments Member States have already made, are, in principle, already deployable.

Formed Police Units

FPU can not be deployed under military command but can play a role in non stabilised situations under a civilian command&control structure. Whilst the concept of IPU’s foresees that such units would assume immediate overall area policing coverage immediately after a military deployment, the FPU concept foresees more functional specialised assignments from the outset on. In such a step-by-step deployment of more police capabilities then, gradually the IPU would be assigned to functional duties rather than having them covering whole territorial segments like in the very early beginning of a robust intervention. And from there,

the differences between IPU and FPU, in later stages of Eu missions, would, in many ways, melt like ice in the sun.

FPU's, in the EU context, will have a company-type structure. We are currently identifying commitments by Member States and hope to see some clear facts in the nearer future. Unlike IPU, which by nature are standing Police Units to be deployed on decision, FPU will be composed on the principle of individual volunteering. However, the concept foresees rapid composition and deployment of these units within 30 days as well.

Expert Team (ET)

This is a group, pre-established for the mission within an MS, which is trained and equipped to undertake a specific specialised task or a set of tasks.

Expert teams will be able to perform a large variety of functions, either specialized policing or provide immediate specialized experience in the setup of headquartered tasks of strategic importance. Our concept basically foresees that many Expert Teams will fill the immediate gaps of specialized requirements until the more permanent taking care of such tasks by units established from individual police officers has been facilitated.

Whilst this conceptual segment has been identified in preparation of substitution scenarios, I am convinced such teams will add significant value to existing and future strengthening missions as well. We are, quite often, faced with request to deliver guidance and advise in highly specialized policing areas and do constantly struggle with filling that gap with experts Member States are already to lend to our missions.

From an operational point of view the intervention in a police function with a national expert team would be most appropriate when:

- (1) Special training requirements, rapid deployment or working methodology needs would be more easily met with the participation of teams from one Member State rather than a mixture of individual police officers from several Member States.
- (2) Special risks, a dangerous environment, or the use of special equipment would be better dealt with by a practised team who are used to working together, rather than by a recently formed group.
- (3) Member States have in their Police structure Units that do not usually work individually but are integrated at a certain level within their chain of command and operational procedures (e.g. antiterrorist/ SWAT).

The EU currently is in the process of identifying national contributions by Member States to such teams.

Individual Police Officers

I should, by no means, forget them. They are, in all their diversity, flexibility, professional and cultural background, the heart of every Police mission. And as, mainly, the three categories above have been identified in order to bring a fully prepared policing capacity into crisis management from the earliest possible stages on, sooner or later at the heart the structure been set up is to be overtaken by individual officers. One of the reasons is, that the advantage of rapid deployment of IPU's, FPU's and ET's comes with a disadvantage: they are scarce resources, deployable with certain duration constraints.

But to remind you, in an integrated approach, we intend to find conceptual solutions overcoming the security and enforcement gaps, whilst establishing a sustainable mission structure.

Thank you for your attention.

¹ The author has delivered the content in free speech. This printed version differs in details, however, not in general content. As regards the conference documentation, according to the Conference Rules, quotation or citation requires the authors' authorization. The author can be reached under stefan.feller@consilium.europa.eu.