



Council of the  
European Union

Brussels, 29 June 2022  
(OR. en)

12252/22

LIMITE

COPS 398  
POLMIL 191  
EUMC 276  
CFSP/PESC 1125  
CSDP/PSDC 537  
PESCO 2

**COVER NOTE**

---

From: European External Action Service (EEAS)  
To: Delegations  
Subject: PESCO PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORTS

---

**DOCUMENT PARTIALLY ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC 20.09.2022**

Delegations will find attached document PESCO20220060/ARO.

---

Encl.: PESCO20220060/ARO

To: PSC Ambassadors

Copy: EUMC, PMG Delegates

## PESCO PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORTS TO THE COUNCIL

**References:** A - Council Decision (CFSP) 2017/2315 of 11 December 2017

B - Council Decision (CFSP) 2018/909 of 25 June 2018

**Annex:** 1 - PESCO Projects Progress Report

Please find in the Annex, the reports on the progress made towards the implementation of 60 PESCO projects which has been made having regard to the Article 5(3) of Council Decision (CFSP) 2017/2315 of 11 December 2017 establishing the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) and determining the list of participating Member States (ref. A) and in accordance with the Article 2 and Article 3(c) of the Council Decision (CFSP) 2018/909 of 25 June 2018 establishing a common set of governance rules for PESCO projects (ref. B).

Director General

EU Military Staff

VADM Hervé Bléjean

Deputy Secretary-General for CSDP  
and Crisis Response

European External Action Service

Charles Fries

Chief Executive

European Defence Agency

Jiří Šedivý



ANNEX

# PESCO PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORTS

PESCO Secretariat documentation for Government use only

June 2022

## Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Main trends of PESCO Projects.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1) Projects in Training, Facilities domain.....</b>	<b>21</b>
(IT) European Training Certification Centre for European Armies (ETCCEA).....	22
(EL) Helicopter Hot and High Training (H3 Training) .....	24
(EL) Joint EU Intelligence School (JEIS).....	26
(FR, SE) EU Test and Evaluation Centers (EUTEC) .....	29
(HU) Integrated European Joint Training and Simulation Centre (EUROSIM) .....	31
(PT) EU Cyber Academia and Innovation Hub (EU CAIH).....	33
(PL) SOF Medical Training Centre (SMTC).....	36
(RO) CBRN Defence Training Range (CBRNTR) .....	38
(RO) European Union Network of Diving Centres (EUNDC).....	41
<b>2) Projects in Land, Formations, Systems domain.....</b>	<b>45</b>
(DE) EUFOR Crisis Response Operation Core (EUFOR CROC) .....	46
(IT) Deployable Military Disaster Relief Capability Package (DM-DRCP) .....	50
(IT) Armoured Infantry Fighting Vehicle / Amphibious Assault Vehicle / Light Armoured Vehicle (AIFV/AAV/LAV) .....	52
(SK) Indirect Fire Support Capability (EuroArtillery) .....	55
(EE) Integrated Unmanned Ground System (iUGS) .....	59
(FR) EU Beyond Line Of Sight (BLOS) Land Battlefield Missile Systems (EU BLOS).....	62
(EL) Main Battle Tank Simulation and Testing Center (MBT-SIMTEC) .....	65
FR) EU Military Partnership (EU MP) .....	68
<b>3) Projects in Maritime domain .....</b>	<b>71</b>
(BE) Maritime (semi) Autonomous Systems for Mine Countermeasures (MAS-MCM) .....	72
(IT) Harbour and Maritime Surveillance and Protection (HARMSPRO).....	75
(EL) Upgrade of Maritime Surveillance (UMS).....	78
(BG) Deployable Modular Underwater Intervention Capability Package (DIVEPACK) .....	81
(PT) Maritime Unmanned Anti-Submarine System (MUSAS) .....	84
(IT) European Patrol Corvette (EPC) .....	87

(ES) Essential Elements of European Escort (4E) .....	90
(EE) Medium size Semi-Autonomous Surface Vehicle (M-SASV) .....	93
<b>4) Projects in Air domain .....</b>	<b>96</b>
(DE) European MALE RPAS .....	97
(FR) TIGER Mark III .....	100
(IT) Counter Unmanned Aerial System (C-UAS).....	102
(ES) Airborne Electronic Attack (AEA).....	104
(DE) Strategic Air Transport for Outsized Cargo (SATOC) .....	107
(ES) Next Generation Small RPAS (NGSR) .....	110
(IT) Rotorcraft Docking Station for Drones (RDSD) .....	112
(IT) Small Scalable Weapons (SSW) .....	114
(FR) Future Medium-size Tactical Cargo (FMTC) .....	116
(FR) Air Power .....	118
<b>5) Projects in Cyber C4ISR domain .....</b>	<b>121</b>
(EL) Cyber Threats and Incident Response Information Sharing Platform (CTISP).....	122
(LT) Cyber Rapid Response Teams and Mutual Assistance in Cyber Security (CRRT).....	125
(ES) Strategic C2 System for CSDP Missions and Operations (EUMILCOM) .....	129
(FR) European Secure Software defined Radio (ESSOR).....	132
(IT) European High Atmosphere Airship Platform – Persistent ISR Capability (EHAAP).....	135
(EL) One Deployable SOF Tactical C2 Command Post (CP) – (SOCC) for SJO.....	137
(CZ) Electronic Warfare Capability and Interoperability Programme for Future JISR Cooperation .....	140
(DE) Cyber and Information Domain Coordination Center (CIDCC) .....	142
(EE) Cyber Ranges Federations (CRF) .....	144
(PT) Automated Modelling, Identification and Damage Assessment of Urbain Terrain (AMIDA-UT).....	147
<b>6) Projects in Joint, Enabling domain .....</b>	<b>151</b>
(NL) Military Mobility (MM).....	152
(DE) European Medical Command (EMC).....	155
(DE) Network of Logistic Hubs in Europe and Support to Operations (NetLogHubs).....	158
(FR) Energy Operational Function (EOF).....	161

(AT) CBRN Surveillance as a Service (CBRN SaaS) .....	164
(FR) Co-basing.....	167
(DE) Geo-meteorological and Oceanographic (GeoMETOC) Support Coordination Element (GMSCE)	169
(FR) Timely Warning and Interception with Space-based TheatER surveillance (TWISTER) .....	173
(FR) Materials and components for technological EU competitiveness (MAC-EU).....	176
(FR) EU Collaborative Warfare Capabilities (ECoWAR).....	178
(IT) European Global RPAS Insertion Architecture System (GLORIA) .....	181
<b>7) Projects in Space domain.....</b>	<b>184</b>
(FR) EU Radionavigation Solution (EURAS) .....	185
(IT) European Military Space Surveillance Awareness Network (EU-SSA-N).....	188
(DE) Common Hub for Governmental Imagery (CoHGI) .....	191
(FR) Defence of Space Assets (DoSA).....	193

## Introduction

This PESCO Projects Progress Report is prepared in accordance with Article 5 (3) of the Council Decision (CFSP) 2017/2315 of 11 December 2017, establishing Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO), which defines that the Council shall be regularly informed on the developments of the projects. The Council Decision (CFSP) 2018/909 of 25 June 2018 establishing a common set of governance rules for PESCO projects also specifies the need for the Council to be duly informed about the development of the PESCO projects once a year. In addition, as laid down in Article 2 (2) of the Council Decision (CFSP) 2018/909 of 25 June, these reports shall contain consolidated information on progress made towards the implementation of the project, its roadmap, objectives and milestones, and its contribution to the fulfilment of the relevant more binding commitments.

Following the High Representative (HR) in his Annual Report on the Status of the PESCO Implementation (HR(2020)54) of 14 April 2020 along with the Council Recommendation (2020/C 204/01) of 15 June 2020, recalling for a more transparent criteria and parameters in order to reinforce the reviewing process of the progress of PESCO Projects, the PESCO secretariat developed the document “PESCO projects definitions and their meaning”(PESCO20200045) agreed by the participating Member States (pMS). This document offers a common terminology developed together with the pMS and aims at improving the identification of risks, standardising progress indicators, as well as clarifying and reinforcing the reviewing process of the progress of PESCO projects.

To further enhance the reporting system, the Annual Report on the Status of the PESCO Implementation (HR(2021)108) of July 2021 reinforced by the Council Recommendations (2021/C 464/02) of 16 November, also recommended the pMS to indicate whether the project delivers on time, on target and on impact along with the indication of involvement of third States. Against this background, the reporting system was adapted accordingly to contribute to a better identification of the PESCO projects encountering difficulties in delivering results in order to support their revision or closure, and additionally, to set the basis for recommendations to maintain a steady pace towards concrete the deliverables. Alongside this enhanced reviewing process, “the successful implementation of all ongoing PESCO projects and the timely delivery of tangible results and required capabilities will determine the visibility and credibility of PESCO”<sup>1</sup>.

The necessary information to deliver an overview on the progress of PESCO projects was provided and updated by the project coordinators using the EU collaboration in Defence platform - EUCLID PESCO (CWS) available at <https://euclid.eda.europa.eu/>. On that basis, 60 individual project factsheets were developed by the PESCO secretariat taking into account a further clarification obtained during bilateral meetings as well on the workshop on the progress of PESCO Projects and finally validated by the project coordinators.

## Content of the report

This Projects Progress Report takes into account the agreed definitions from the referred document “PESCO Projects Definitions and their Meaning” which are presented as a preamble: the four project phases (ideation, incubation, execution, closing) are explained as well the progress and risk indicators

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Recommendations (2021/C 464/02) of 16 November 2021

used to present the overview of the projects. For the 2022 iteration of the Projects Progress Report, an augmented presentation of the “Main trends of PESCO projects” was included in order to facilitate a better overview of the progress of the projects. This new input is composed by the following elements:

- A) *General information on the current status of PESCO projects*, focusing on general and factual overview of the projects;
- B) *Trends showing Progress in PESCO Projects*, highlighting the overall projects evolution trends;
- C) *Significant elements unbalancing the progress of PESCO Projects*, underlining the overall delays at the moment;
- D) *Main risks identified*, focusing on the identified risks as the basis for the different trajectories and development of the projects;
- E) *Elements requiring particular attention*, which emphasizes the elements that may affect the progress of the projects, including their outcomes.

The second part of the Report is composed by the projects’ factsheets per grouping/operational domain, with a summary per domain. The layout of the individual project factsheet has been amended to better reflect the Council Conclusions on the PESCO Strategic Review 2020<sup>1</sup> and the new elements agreed with the document “PESCO Projects definitions and their meaning”. Moreover, the “N/A” reference in the projects’ factsheets is related with non-applicability of information.

## Definitions

### A. Indicators of Progress

The indicators of progress are quantitative or qualitative variables indicating changes or progress made towards the implementation of PESCO projects, as follows:

a. **Project Completion Year (PCY):** The year by which the project objectives will have been met and the outcome has been delivered. Key activities related to the project completion and closing of the project are agreed by the project members. (*Note: This indicator replaces FOC – Full Operational Capability – which was used until November 2020*).

b. **Project Execution Year (PEY):** Project execution year (or implementation) is the year by which the plan designed in the prior phases of the project life is put into action. The purpose of project execution is to deliver the project expected results (deliverables and other direct outputs) by the foreseen completion date (*Note: This indicator replaces IOC – Initial Operational Capability – which was used until November 2020*).

c. **Roadmap:** Overview of the project’s objectives, milestones, deliverables, and planned resources.

d. **Phase of Project’s Lifecycle:** The phase in which the project is: Ideation, Incubation, Execution or Closing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Conclusions on the PESCO Strategic Review 2020 (13188/20), 20 November 2020.



## B. Risk Indicators

The risk indicators allow to evaluate the likelihood that a PESCO project will (fully or partially) fail to deliver its objectives. The following agreed risk indicators are included in this reporting system and in each PESCO Project Factsheet:

- Delay in the implementation of the agreed project milestones and timelines<sup>1</sup>.
- Decrease in the level of participation (*which leads to an amendment of the CD on the list of PESCO projects*)<sup>2</sup>.
- Change in the objectives, the scope or the deliverables.
- Lack of notably financial resources (national or EU).

## C. Criteria for Success

Description in a qualitative and quantitative terms of the level of success of the project, which forms the basis for evaluation at the end of a project and beyond and facilitates the evaluation whether the project meets the expectations content wise.

## D. Projects Phases Definitions

### 1. IDEATION

The **Ideation Phase** of a project is a conceptual phase. An outcome of this phase is likely to be a statement by project members on what the project is intended to deliver (in the form of a project initiating document), including: an estimate how long it will take to achieve the desired output; resources required (including any Through-Life Management Costs); the potential return on investment (if appropriate); likely stakeholders; how the end product or service will be used by operating authorities; and what are the risks involved. High-level staff requirements will be considered in this phase. A feasibility study to assess the project viability may be undertaken, as a precursor for the Incubation Phase.

### 2. INCUBATION

---

<sup>1</sup> The delay in PCY is measured against the first report either in the project proposal template or in the previous Progress Report(s).

<sup>2</sup> The decrease in the level of participation is measured against the number of pMS on the day the project was established.

The **Incubation Phase** of a project is where more detailed assessment and planning are undertaken by project members and concludes with a decision as a key milestone. In this phase, the scope of a project is to be defined, which includes: a detailed assessment of the activities to be undertaken within the project; derivation of a project plan, encompassing activity scheduled, resources (financial and human), communication, stakeholder engagement, and how the solution will be obtained; the methodology for detailing possible risks/ issues. All these elements will be included in the Business Case with a view to monitor the progress of a project. There may be a need for a Memorandum of Understanding to cover facilities, doctrine or resources of the project. Critically, planning will need to be undertaken to ensure that the perceived benefits of the project will be realized by the end-user in the form of a Benefits Management Plan. The Project Board will review the outcomes of this phase leading to Project Authorization.

### 3. EXECUTION

Within the **Execution Phase** of a project, the work is executed according to the approved project management plan. If the solution is derived under contract, then a kick-off meeting is held with the contracting authority. Changes might be introduced to the implementation plan of the project, if necessary. Periodic reports are to be made available to the stakeholders on the progress of the project and performance of the project members, including the use of the resources. In the event of risks or issues being realised, contingency plans are activated. Within this phase, solutions could be tested as a 'pilot activity' to assess where expected deliverables meet desired specifications. Feedback is solicited, project outputs as 'quick-wins' are accepted and lessons identified and shared as 'project knowledge'. The outcome of this Phase should be accepted deliverables against those planned.

### 4. CLOSING

In the **Closing Phase** of a project, an assessment as to whether the work done meets the requirements / specifications (this may result in an Acceptance Certificate) is undertaken. Critically, the output is handed over to the end-user with a subsequent assessment of impact made according to the Benefits Management Plan. Procurement processes are closed, records archived, and lessons updated for the organizational knowledge base.

## 2. Main Trends of PESCO Projects

DELETED FROM THIS POINT UNTIL THE END OF THE DOCUMENT (page 195)