

Brussels, 29 April 2016 (OR. en)

8347/16 ADD 1

LIMITE

COCON 8 CFSP/PESC 345

NOTE

| From: | Presidency |
|----------|-----------------------------------|
| To: | Working Party on Consular Affairs |
| Subject: | Consular Cooperation Initiatives |
| | - Final report |

Delegations will find attached the addendum 1 to the document ST 8347/16 on the above subject.

LRV/yt 8347/16 ADD 1 EN

LIMITE DG C 2C

Joint EU Consular Crisis Preparedness Framework

Background

Experience in crisis management and prevention shows that it is desirable to produce contingency plans in advance of a crisis. In addition to the national contingency plans of Member States, there is an added value in joint crisis preparedness in thirds countries, which - in order to be effective - would require the participation of the diplomatic and consular service of all Member States, as well as of the local EU Delegation. A clear division of responsibilities between present and non-present Member States and the EU Delegation will assist adequate crisis preparedness and crisis management.

The Council Directive 2015/637 provides guidance for crisis preparedness and cooperation (Art.13) in order to ensure that unrepresented citizens are taken into account in contingency planning and can be provided with the necessary assistance in the event of a consular crisis.

This framework is designed to enhance coordination and effectiveness in the event of a crisis, while taking into account the national responsibility of Member States in consular matters. It neither replaces the existing national crisis plans of Member States nor their responsibility to provide consular assistance to their own nationals. It should be tailored to local circumstances.

This framework refers to procedures to be put in place and to activities to be carried out at local level. Member States' capitals and the EEAS HQ have also roles and responsibilities in preparing and responding to a consular crisis.

Objectives

The aim of this crisis planning document is to establish a framework for cooperation between EU Member States and the EU Delegation, thereby making cooperation and coordination more efficient and effective in the event of a consular crisis.

The objective of the cooperation is to better exploit the resources of the Member States and the EU Delegation in support of the consular protection provided by MS to their nationals and to unrepresented EU citizens.

| | Baseline Actions | | | | |
|----|---|---------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | Action | Who | When | Additional comments | |
| 1. | Local EU-MS meetings on consular protection | > EU DEL & MS | On a regular basis | Preferably held at the EUDEL. | |
| 2. | Designation of an EU Point of Contact (PoC) in every MS Embassy and EU DEL (Key local non-EU nations (US/Can/Australia etc.) could be invited to participate where appropriate) | | | | |

| 1. Situation analysis and risk assessment | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|---|--|--|
| Action | Who | When | Additional comments | | |
| Establish number and location of EU citizens (incl. unrepresented citizens). | MS and EUDEL via EEAS HQ (for unrepresented citizens) | On a regular basis | Numbers and locations to be mapped. For unrepresented citizens: MS on the basis of existing agreements / arrangements. The EEAS Consular Division provides EUDEL with information on unrepresented citizens collected from MS capitals. | | |
| Country map with locations and number of EU citizens | ➤ EEAS HQ | | | | |
| Risk assessment and identification of the most plausible scenarios | > MS & EUDEL | On a regular basis | A risk assessment should be conducted by MS and EUDEL in consultation with capitals and the EEAS HQ. Include discussion on travel advice. | | |

Example of Risk assessment table (Dominican Republic)

The most likely crisis scenarios include, but are not limited to:

- political/confessional violent conflict
- broader regional outburst of violence/war
- natural disasters
- major industrial incidents
- pandemic
- a crisis in the region.

Determining the most likely scenario will enable better identification of resource requirements and of plans and procedures to be developed.

The risk assessment compares the possible threat(s) to the vulnerability and (EU) interests. It forms the basis for a decision on whether the drafting of a joint EU Crisis Plan is opportune.

| Low | Medium | Medium High | | |
|---|---|---|--------|--------------|
| | | Earthquake or Hurricane | High | ABILITY - |
| | Transport accident affecting Eligible Persons. Drought and floods Social unrest, riots and strikes | | Medium | VULNERABILII |
| Risk of airline strike or tour company going bust Energy shortages | Dating scams Local bureaucracy | Widespread outbreak of viral disease, e.g. cholera, chigunguya Criminality | Low | |

| 2. Crisis Preparedness | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|--|--|
| Action | Who | When | Additional comments | |
| 1. Division of tasks | ➤ MS + EU DEL | | Look at existing arrangements for cooperation and for assistance to unrepresented citizens | |
| | | | To be adjusted in time of crisis i.e. additional means often sent from | |
| | | | capitals, including | |
| | | | from MS which are not | |
| | | | presented. | |
| 2. Share and update | EUDEL (locally) EEAS HQ (capital | To check and update | Re. a) | |
| operational contact list regarding: a) MS diplomatic and | level and regularly coaccredited MS Embassy) | regularly | MS: consular officer + duty number. Also a contact in the capital. | |
| consular representations. b) Points of Contact for unrepresented | | | Re. b) PoC at accredited MS Embassy or in MS capital (whatever is | |
| EU citizens | | | applicable) | |
| c) Third countries d) International | | | Re. e) e.g. immigration, | |
| Organizations | | | customs, airport/port, | |
| e) Local authorities | | | hospitals, morgues, etc. | |
| 3. Mapping of MS presence in the country (wardens, | ➤ EEAS | To check regularly | | |
| honorary consuls, etc.) | | | | |
| 4. Exchanging information | ➤ MS + EUDEL | To check and update | e.g. establishment of a | |
| on and/or sharing crisis communication means | | regularly | local EU radio network, satellite phones numbers, | |
| | | | etc. Test on a regular | |

| | | | basis |
|---|---------------|--------------------|---|
| 5. Exchange of information on: assembly points, crisis staff, emergency stocks, evacuation means, safe haven locations and planning assumptions | ➤ MS + EU DEL | To check regularly | Identification of possible conflicts and gaps (notably regarding the assistance to be provided to unrepresented citizens) |

| 6. Carry out crisis exercises to test the system | A | MS Capitals & EEAS HQ | Depending on risk exposure | - In association with local authorities and other key non-EU partners where appropriate |
|--|----------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---|
| | | | | - Templates could be provided by the EEAS HQ |
| | | | | -Participate in crisis |
| | | | | exercise of local |
| | | | | authorities |

| 3. Crisis Response | | | |
|--|---|-------------|---|
| Action | Who | When | Additional comments |
| Convene a meeting The following points should be on the agenda: | > EUDEL | Immediately | Preferably at EUDEL If relevant include third countries and UN |
| 1. Assessment | MS & EUDEL MS Capitals & EEAS HQ | | (Analysis, impact, action points) |
| 2. Coordination of contact with third parties | MS & EUDEL (local level)EEAS HQ and/orMS Capitals | | |
| 3. Validation of information | ➤ MS & EUDEL | | |
| 4. Coordination of means and potential evacuation | ➤ MS &EUDEL | | |
| 5. Reporting | > MS & EUDEL | | Re. 5.Use list of participants of LCCgroup as mailing list. MS can decide themselves if or how they use the report to inform their capital. |

| 6. Monitoring of the | > MS & EUDEL | Continuously | Re. 6 |
|---|------------------------|---|--|
| situation | | | > What is the extent of the crisis? |
| | | | > How many people affected? |
| | | | > What measures have |
| | | | been taken? |
| | | | > What is the impact? |
| | | | > Action points? (e.g. |
| | | | demarches with local |
| | | | authorities, overflight |
| | | | clearances, etc.) |
| 7. Exchange on MS | ➤ MS & EUDEL | | Re. 7 |
| actions and tools to locate and assist their nationals | | | Consider designating a single Point of Contact for liaising with local authorities on behalf of LCC-group. |
| | | | Acquire assessment |
| | | | made by non-EU |
| | | | countries / organizations |
| 8. Activation of the EU sharing information system (CoOL) | Capital and/or EEAS HQ | ASAP | For timely exchange information between MS and EEAS (e.g. decisions to evacuate, assets for evacuation) |
| 9. Checking of crisis response means (including reinforcements by capitals) | ➤ MS & EUDEL | From the beginning of the crisis + continuously | Examples: - Rescue teams - RDT teams - Evacuation assets - Sheltering facilities |

| 10. Apply and adjust the procedures and division of tasks as defined in the preparation phase In case of an evacuation | > MS & EUDEL | When necessary | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 11.Exchange information on decision to evacuate | EEAS HQ in close relation with capitals (including the MS not present in the country) | Immediately | A channel to exchange information has to be activated (inter alia CoOL at HQ level) + local channels depending on availability of communication means in order to optimize coordination, while recognizing that the decision to evacuate rests with each MS and that information on available options/seats etc. is continuously exchanged. |
| 12.Exchange information on assets | | ASAP (after the decision of evacuation | This could be aimed at the pooling of assets. |
| 13.Deploy support staffs to the assembly / exit points | | In a timely manner | |

| 5. Post Crisis Actions | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Action | Who | When | Additional comments | |
| 1. Lessons learnt meeting | MS & EUDEL in cooperation with MS capitals and EEAS HQ | Shortly after the crisis | Share reports containing recommendations with capitals + EEAS (HQ) | |
| 2. Adaptation of the EU crisis Framework (at local level) and of the national plans taking into account lessons learnt | > MS & EUDEL | | | |
| 3. Consider holding follow-up exercise to test implementation of any lessons learnt | MS & EUDEL with assistance from MS Capitals & EEAS HQ | After adapted joint EU Consular Crisis Plan has been approved. | | |

Possible phases and triggers

Depending on the situation's analysis and on the nature of the possible crisis, MS and EU DEL should discuss and aim for the sequencing of actions and the obvious triggers for such actions.