Thank you Daniel.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

One of the worst nightmares of any military planner at the strategic level is to have to cope with a “too little-too late” situation. This is the situation that NATO faced in 2015, as displayed by a series of table-top war games. Their scenario: a surprise invasion of the Baltic States. The alarming conclusion was that attacking forces would threaten the Baltic capitals within a short time. Reinforcements would arrive too late to make a difference.

Part of this problem, the "too little" part, was addressed through the US European Reassurance Initiative (ERI), under which, additional military capabilities were deployed in the region. But there still was the risk that reinforcements would arrive "too late", facing a multitude of problems of various natures.

The problem I described is not exclusive to NATO, undermining its "collective defence" core task. It also affects the European Union's ability to mobilise forces within and beyond its external borders, to react effectively and timely to crisis situations in the context of Common Security and Defence Policy missions and operations, of EU mutual assistance and security clauses, as well as of national and multinational activities. Thus, this problem could have a serious impact on the Union's credibility as a relevant security provider. These challenges made Military Mobility a flagship project for the European Union.

From an EU perspective, the envisaged unhampered flow of forces, equipment and material should be achieved not only on the West-East axis but
equally so, on the North-South one. As the problems hampering this swift flow are multifaceted, including physical, procedural and regulatory ones, it takes an equally multifaceted organisation to deal with them. This organisation is the European Union.

Among all these diverse problems, I see the physical ones as the most challenging to tackle. To remove all the other barriers all is needed is some meetings, obviously intense consultations and the necessary streamlining of the existing laws or regulations.

But when it comes down to removing the physical obstacles, things get more complicated. To modify and upgrade existing infrastructure or to build new one, it requires a great deal of effort, a lot of time and huge amounts of money. Therefore, the highest quality achieved on the definition of the "military mobility requirements" the most positively it will affect the other work strands.

This task has been assigned to the military element of the European Union, the EU Military Committee and the EU Military Staff, as they are the custodians of the military expertise and they represent the customer of the whole effort, which ultimately are the Member-States.

Some clarification is needed here. Under the generic term "military mobility requirements", we examine not only technical requirements for land, air or maritime transport infrastructures, but also for military assets in these three domains. Furthermore, this term encompasses procedures and regulations in many fields (cross-border activities, customs, transport of dangerous goods…) and management of the military mobility in all spaces (land, air, maritime). The collection of all this information requires the cooperation of a number of relevant Ministries or Agencies of the Member-States in a "whole-of-government" effort. It provides a perfect example of deepened and productive civil-military cooperation. It includes preparation and in-depth examination of the military requirements for these dual-use, civilian and military infrastructures, with a view to the future and to anticipated developments.

While developing the military requirements, no less than eight key areas were identified as relevant to military mobility, areas that are very diverse in
nature. This fact highlights the complexity of the task. These areas are namely **Military planning and conduct support; Transport infrastructure; Legal and regulatory needs; Access to transport resources and support; Coordination and Common information exchange; Security; Environmental considerations** and **Training**. I will offer some more insight on each of them.

1. The first area examined, **Military Planning and Conduct Support**, can also be regarded as the chapeau-area that also covers most if not all the rest areas of examination. It includes developing EU strategic movement and transport reaction plans in **advance** for crisis response, making use of the Requirements Catalogue 2017 **illustrative scenarios**, and in particular in preparation of **EU Battle Groups**, and other national or multinational needs. As a reminder, the five illustrative scenarios are: Peace Enforcement (PE); Conflict Prevention (CP); Support to Stabilisation and Capacity Building (SSCB); Support to Humanitarian Assistance (SHA) and Rescue/Evacuation (RE). Information management, security, environmental considerations and training are also examined in this area.

2. What forms the foundations of mobility is the required **infrastructure**. This includes all fixed, permanent and temporary installations, fabrications or facilities for the support and control of military forces such as bridges, handling points, routes and parking zones, especially for dangerous goods, airports and seaports capabilities, roads and railways networks and inland waterways. The requirements identified here are the **minimum** to meet the **maximum EU need** and will support up to **Corps-level** deployment of EU Member States military. A specific dual-use transport network infrastructure has to be identified, providing suitable transport hubs that should be assured for the deployment of EU MS forces within and beyond the EU.

3. The **legal and regulatory** aspect of military mobility has also been taken into consideration. What has been identified, among others, is the need for alignment of the rules applicable to transport of dangerous goods by military forces within the EU as well as **clarity and commonality** on customs procedures and documentation and cross-border regulations.

4. When examining the **access to transport resources and support** there were some very interesting findings. I will offer only a couple of
them. First is the need to have at least two different navigation systems, including the EU Galileo system for enhanced navigation autonomy. The second is the need of common standards to enable interoperability for all transport assets and equipment to facilitate their mobility.

5. To perform such a complex task as swiftly moving military forces through a number of countries coordination is paramount. The coordination requirements set the need for civilian and military interaction to enable the smooth movement of military forces across borders and throughout MS and host nations' territories in full respect of the nations' sovereignty. This is to be addressed via a dedicated EU military movement coordination capability. Efficient coordination also requires a great amount of information being timely and effectively exchanged between two or more end users who may be civilian or military.

6. Under security, the protection of military personnel, equipment, classified data, transport system were examined but also cyber and hybrid threat protection. What is noteworthy is the identification of the risk posed by foreign investments in critical infrastructure and essential services. Commission suggests taking further measures by establishing a framework to screen foreign direct investments in the EU.

7. Another aspect taken into consideration is environmental protection. In the military requirements, the use of energy-efficient technologies that will offer significant operational benefit has been highlighted among others.

8. And last but not least, there is the training aspect. Whatever is included in all the previous chapters needs to be tested through exercises. Civilian and commercial actors should participate in these training activities as appropriate to ensure interoperability between civil and military actors. The necessary cooperation with NATO and other actors will be enhanced through the implementation of military mobility in EU-NATO, or EU-UN, Parallel and Coordinated Exercises, as well as in other major crisis management exercises planned by the Commission and EU decentralised agencies. Exercising the military mobility through the integrated approach will allow the validation and testing of the concepts, doctrine and standards.
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To make things even more complicated, one should not expect that the European Union will turn into a construction site of gigantic proportions in its entirety overnight. This is neither needed nor feasible. Therefore, careful prioritisation has to be made on the basis of criticality and anticipated effect.

At this point, I want also to highlight a different aspect of the military mobility project. This is the impact of this project to national and local economies. The Commission will invest €6,5 billions for the creation or modification of transport infrastructure for dual-use purposes, creating jobs, directly or indirectly supporting commercial activity and upgrading the living standards of the societies.

Acknowledging the fact that the final product and its materialisation will also impact NATO's mobility capabilities, consultation with NATO was also taken forward. This consultation is taken forward in full openness and transparency, respect of the decision-making autonomy and procedures of both organisations, inclusiveness and reciprocity without prejudice to the specific character of the security and defence policy of any EU Member-State. We should always have in mind that Military Mobility is both a PESCO project and one of the most important concrete strands to enhance EU-NATO cooperation. Through my military lenses, at the end of the PESCO tunnel I clearly see just one label that reads, "Collective Defence". Therefore, the intention of the cooperation on the military requirements is to ensure a coherent approach and synergies between the EU and NATO.

The process of developing the military requirements is still ongoing and therefore I will not go into details or give any hints about the requirements themselves. It will suffice for me to say that we are on good track, good progress has been made and that we are confident that we will deliver a comprehensive product. The timeline agreed identifies three phases:

- Firstly, the EUMC will agree on an overarching high level document to be submitted to the Council in June;
- Secondly, detailed technical specifications will be validated separately by early July;
Finally, geographical identification of the infrastructure needed and other annexes deemed ready will be validated by the EUMC not later than the third quarter 2018.

I shall stop here and I am open to your questions.

Thank you.
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