

Members of the Advisory Council on International Affairs

Chair	Professor R.F.M. Lubbers
Members	Professor F.H.J.J. Andriessen A.L. ter Beek Professor C.E. von Benda-Beckmann-Droogleever Fortuijn Professor G. van Benthem van den Bergh Dr O.B.R.C. van Cranenburgh Professor C. Flinterman Professor E.J. de Kadt Dr B. Knapen
Official advisors	F.A.M. Majoor (<i>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</i>) B.W. Bargerbos (<i>Ministry of Defence</i>)
Secretary	F. van Beuningen

P.O. Box 20061
2500 EB The Hague
The Netherlands

Telephone + 31-70-348 5108/6060
Fax + 31-70-348 6256
E-mail AIV@minbuza.nl
Internet www.AIV-Advice.nl

Table of contents

Foreword

I Background to the request for an advice on defence research capacity 7

II Defence research 9

II.1 The situation in the Netherlands 9

II.2 International 10

III The parallel debate: strengthening Parliament's scrutinising role 14

IV Defence research capacity: a proposal 15

IV.1 Proposal 15

IV.2 Concluding remarks 17

Annexe I Request for advice

Annexe II Fact-finding study on defence research capacity

Foreword

On 11 July 2000 the Advisory Council on International Affairs (AIV) was asked to produce an advisory report on the scope for granting a wish expressed by the House of Representatives. The House wanted to create a capacity for conducting research into defence issues in the broadest sense of the word, as set out in a motion tabled by Mr M. Zijlstra and Ms N.G. van 't Riet. (The request for advice is enclosed as Annexe I.) This motion was tabled during the debate that took place in the House of Representatives on 14 February 2000 on the 2000 Defence White Paper (the Zijlstra and van 't Riet motion is reproduced immediately after the request for advice).

In preparing the report, the AIV first obtained information on the support provided to parliament, notably in relation to defence issues, in a number of countries with which the Netherlands maintains close or relatively close relations. (This information is included as Annexe II.) The research institutes cited in the request for an advisory report (i.e. the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research and the Society and Armed Forces Institute) were then asked a number of questions about their relations with parliament and the research which they perform on its behalf. Interviews were also conducted with the members of the House of Representatives who submitted the motion in question, i.e. Mr Zijlstra (for the Labour Party (PvdA)) and Ms van 't Riet (for Democrats '66 (D66)), and with the president (Ms J. van Nieuwenhoven) and secretary general (Mr W.H. de Beaufort) of the House of Representatives. The AIV also interviewed, at his own request, the chair of the PvdA's Defence Committee, Mr H.J. van den Bergh, under whose chairmanship the latter committee published a discussion paper entitled 'Een plan voor de krijgsmacht' ('A plan for the armed forces'). One of the recommendations made in this paper was that more research should be conducted into defence issues. The information which the AIV gleaned from both the written documents and the personal interviews proved to be of great value, and the AIV is extremely grateful to all those concerned for their readiness to share their knowledge and experience with the Council.

The AIV finalised this report on 27 November 2000. The report was prepared by the Defence Research Capacity Committee, which was made up of Professor R.F.M. Lubbers (chair of the AIV), Mr A.L. ter Beek (chair of the Peace and Security Committee) and Professor G. van Benthem van den Bergh (vice-chair of the Peace and Security Committee). In the light of the subject matter of the report, the latter two members acted as an interface between the Defence Research Capacity Committee and the Peace and Security Committee, which discussed the matter of defence research capacity at two meetings held on 3 October and 14 November 2000. The head of staff of the AIV, Mr F. van Beuningen, acted as secretary of the Defence Research Capacity Committee.

I **Background to the request for an advice on defence research capacity**

In preparing the ground for the public and political debate on the 2000 Defence White Paper (which had not yet been published at that point), the PvdA presented a discussion paper on the future of defence policy entitled 'Een plan voor de krijgsmacht' ('A plan for the armed forces'). The authors of the discussion paper claimed that the amount of research conducted into defence issues in the Netherlands was inadequate: "It is unfortunately the case that little or no independent research is conducted into the many aspects of the military side of international politics."¹ Although the paper did not go into this claim in any further detail, it nevertheless formed the background to a plea made by the PvdA in favour of establishing a Dutch institute for defence research. In the PvdA's view, this institute should be given the task of conducting either independent research or research commissioned by the House of Representatives, the Ministry of Defence or the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Research topics could include:

- "The modern armed forces in the light of new political challenges;
- management issues against the background of political objectives;
- the value and desirability of certain weapon systems and proposed purchases of defence equipment;
- optimising the contribution made by the Dutch armed forces to NATO and European alliances;
- cooperation between the armed services;
- improving the quality of Dutch military personnel;
- Dutch society and the military ethos."²

During the debate in the House of Representatives on the Defence White Paper of the Netherlands government in February 2000, two MPs, viz. Mr M. Zijlstra for the PvdA and Ms N.G. van 't Riet for D66, tabled a motion in which (on the assumption that there were no institutes in the Netherlands that could undertake research into defence issues in the broadest sense of the word) the government was asked to examine ways and means of remedying the situation.³ Mr Zijlstra did not know exactly how such a research capacity should be created: "There are all sorts of ways of doing it. One would be to create a special branch of the Clingendael institute which would occupy itself exclusively with military issues. Such a research institute would not simply look at strategies, but would also examine very specific issues like the replacement of weapon systems."⁴

Other commentators have explained the need for a defence research institute in no uncertain terms. A report on a fact-finding mission undertaken by the House of Representatives's permanent defence committee in connection with the replacement of the

1 'Een plan voor de krijgsmacht' ('A plan for the armed forces'), p. 42.

2 Idem.

3 House of Representatives, 1999-2000 session, 26 900, No. 7.

4 House of Representatives, 1999-2000 session, 26 900, No. 22, p. 9.

Dutch F16-airplanes makes it clear that Members of the House of Representatives do not wish to rely on the Ministry of Defence as their sole source of information. "The relevant members of the defence committee no longer have any faith in the information supplied by the Ministry. In any event, they do not wish to depend on the information given to them by Minister Frank de Grave and State Secretary Henk van Hoof (both of whom are members of the VVD (People's Party for Freedom and Democracy))."⁵ Members of the House of Representatives are concerned that they may suddenly find, during the course of a procedure for awarding a defence contract, that they have already passed the point of no return without actually realising it. When asked about this point, Mr Zijlstra explained his standpoint as follows: "The information provided by the government [...] should be assessed in the light of all the various interests that are at stake. There are all sorts of subsidiary interests within the defence organisation. The question is whether the aim at all times is to secure the best possible result or to protect the maximum number of interests."⁶ The other originator of the motion, Ms N.G. van 't Riet, saw the possibility of seeking a second opinion as the paramount consideration in this respect. She claimed that the House of Representatives needed to be able to ask independent, outside experts to examine certain defence issues.⁷ Mr van den Bergh, the Chair of the PvdA committee that was responsible for producing the discussion paper entitled 'Een plan voor de krijgsmacht' ('A plan for the armed forces'), felt that the absence of a defence research capacity undermined the opportunities for democratic debate: "As far as defence issues are concerned, there is no countervailing power to offset the government's influence."⁸ Against this background, it should come as no surprise that the House of Representatives has decided to ask the UK Royal United Services Institute to undertake a research study in connection with the replacement of the fleet of F16s, a project worth between NLG 10 and 12 billion.

5 *Elsevier*, 26 August 2000, p. 14.

6 Interview with Mr M. Zijlstra, 4 October 2000.

7 Interview with Ms N.G. van 't Riet, 10 October 2000.

8 Interview with Mr H.J. van den Bergh, 16 October 2000.

II Defence research

II.1 The situation in the Netherlands

The Dutch government and parliament would appear to hold differing opinions about the present state of defence research. In its letter requesting this report, the government claims that there is a wide range of research institutes and advisory bodies. This assertion is at odds with the claims discussed in the previous section. The government cites the following bodies in addition to the Advisory Council on International Affairs: the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', the Society and Armed Forces Institute and the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research.⁹ What is more, Dutch universities accommodate a great deal of expertise in all manner of disciplines and degree courses, most notably in departments dealing with international relations. There are three university institutes that could also be mentioned in this context, viz. the Study Centre for Peace Issues at the University of Nijmegen, the Institute for International Studies and the Programme for Interdisciplinary Research into the Causes of Human Rights Violations (the latter two are based at Leiden University). Moreover, various bodies (such as the Netherlands Atlantic Commission and the Society and Armed Forces Institute) have funded endowed chairs for conducting research into aspects of security and defence policy, teaching undergraduate students, etc. The Netherlands Defence College, the Royal Military Academy and the Royal Naval College also play a role in building up the expertise that is available in the Netherlands in relation to defence issues, although it should be said that these are all primarily training colleges operated by the Ministry of Defence and the armed services. In more general terms, the Netherlands Agency for Aerospace Programmes and the Maritime Research Institute Netherlands carry out research on behalf of the Dutch government and industrial clients. (The National Defence Research Council is responsible for harmonising technical research studies commissioned by central government.) In principle, there is nothing to prevent parliament from seeking the advice of these institutes, although most of them only undertake research projects on a fee-paying basis. Most of the training colleges and research institutes listed above publish regularly on matters relating to security and defence policy. The defence experts on their staff also regularly attend seminars, conferences, etc. at which they exchange knowledge and information.

In response to questions from the AIV, the institutes referred to in the letter requesting a report (i.e. the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', the Society and Armed Forces Institute and the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research) confirmed that they were in regular contact with members of the House of Representatives, in most cases because the latter had asked for information about topical issues.¹⁰ The contacts are mostly of a sporadic nature, and the information

9 See page 2 of the request for advice (No. D 2000002239 of 11 July 2000), pursuant to the motion tabled by Mr Zijlstra and Ms van 't Riet.

10 The institutes concerned were asked to provide the AIV with written information for the purposes of this report (see the letter of 13 September 2000 from the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', the letter of 25 September 2000 from the Society and Armed Forces Institute, and the letter of 2 October 2000 from the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research).

requested covers a very wide range of topics. Members of the House of Representatives may ask for information on decisions to send Dutch military units to crisis areas, on European security and defence policy, on aspects of personnel policy, on defence procurement (such as orders for new aircraft to replace the Dutch F16s), etc. Experts and members of the House of Representatives also often exchange views at seminars and conferences. These institutes regard informing or advising parliament and individual members of the House of Representatives as part of their job, whether on their own initiative or upon request. Whether they are able to meet requests for information or recommendations depends in part on the nature of the research conducted at the institute in question.

II.2 International

Where necessary, the research institutes referred to in the request for advice are also free to make use of the services of research institutes and other bodies outside the Netherlands. There are regular contacts with a large number of foreign institutes, some of which are of a systematic nature. There now follows a list, in random order, of just some of the institutes with which the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', the Society and Armed Forces Institute and the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research are in contact: Rand Europe (a US institute whose European offices are located in the Netherlands), the Centre for European Policy Studies (Brussels), the Center for Defence Analysis, the Centre for European Reform, the Defence Evaluation and Research Agency, the International Institute for Security Studies, the Royal Institute for International Affairs (UK), the WEU Institute for Security Studies, the IFRI (France), the IAI (Italy), the Industrieranlagen-Betriebsgesellschaft, the Deutsches Institut für Auswärtige Politik, the Fraunhofer Gesellschaft für Trendanalysen, the Zentrum für Europäische Studien (Germany), the Försavets Forskninganstalt, the Swedish National Defence College (Sweden) and the US Army Research Institute (USA).

To obtain a picture of the opportunities for conducting research on defence issues on behalf of parliament and of the general research facilities available to members of the House of Representatives in countries with which the Netherlands maintains close relations, we asked the Dutch embassies in the countries concerned to provide us with the relevant information. This information is set out in the following table, together with the names of the countries to which it relates. (A dash in a box [-] indicates that no information was received from the embassy on that topic.) A more detailed description of the information provided, as well as the questions asked, is given in Annexe II.

Country	Is there a parliamentary defence committee?	Is there a general research bureau for parliament?	Is there a defence research bureau for parliament?	Are independent studies performed for major government contracts?	Are there any independent research institutes?	Additional information
USA	Yes	Yes, the Library of Congress (Congressional Research Service). The Congressional Budget Office is responsible for monitoring expenditure.	No	Yes, generally applies to industrial R&D spending.	Yes, numerous (no formal relationship with Congress).	No examples of 'independent' studies initiated by Congress.

Country	Is there a parliamentary defence committee?	Is there a general research bureau for parliament?	Is there a defence research bureau for parliament?	Are independent studies performed for major government contracts?	Are there any independent research institutes?	Additional information
Canada	Yes	Yes, the Library of Parliament (with a staff of 280) has a 'parliamentary research branch' and an 'information and documentation branch'.	No	No specific facilities. Parliament is, however, given extensive and detailed information.	Yes, but there is also a lot of government-controlled academic research.	–
Germany	Yes	Yes, the Wissenschaftliche Dienst (Scientific Agency), which is a relatively small bureau and generally works with public sources. It has a staff of three working on security and defence matters.	No	No	Yes, but there is no formal relationship with the Bundestag.	Germany has a system of 'Politische Stiftungen'. These are non-profit-making foundations that make recommendations to political parties with which they are associated; they only have limited expertise in defence issue.
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes, extensive library with 200 specialist staff.	No, but the Select Committee has its own staff of specialists and the House library has an International Affairs and Defence Section.	–	Yes, the House makes frequent use of external expertise.	–
France	Yes	Yes, the Service des Etudes et de la Documentation (with a staff of 36).	No, but the parliamentary committee does have its own seven-person support staff.	–	Yes, but there is no close relationship with the Assemblée.	Independent, external bodies are seldom used in connection with decisions taken by the Assemblée.
Belgium	Yes	No	No	No. An ad-hoc parliamentary committee on army procurement does supervise major procurements, however.	Yes. There is also a defence study centre, that works mainly on behalf of the government.	–

Country	Is there a parliamentary defence committee?	Is there a general research bureau for parliament?	Is there a defence research bureau for parliament?	Are independent studies performed for major government contracts?	Are there any independent research institutes?	Additional information
Norway	Yes	No	No. There is a Council for Defence Research that advises the government.	No. Research studies (second opinions) are performed for contracts worth over NOK 500 million, but this is on behalf of the government only.	Yes. There is also an Institute for Defence Studies, that performs technical analyses on behalf of the government.	Broadly speaking, the Storting does not have any means for conducting research into defence issues independently of the government.
Denmark	Yes	No. Although the Folketing is formally able to request universities to perform research on its behalf (and has a budget for this purpose), it rarely does so in practice.	No	–	Yes	As a result of the tradition of minority government, the government and the Folketing regularly get together to map out policy
Sweden	Yes	The Riksdag has a 'research service' (with a staff of about 30) that selects information from public sources at the request of Riksdag members.	No. Although the Riksdag could theoretically instruct government-funded research institutes to carry out studies on its behalf, this has never happened in practice.	No	Yes. The SIPRI is the best-known example.	The Riksdag does not engage any external consultants.
Spain	Yes	No. There is a legal service that is responsible for conducting research into legislation.	No	No	Yes. There is no direct link with parliament.	–
Portugal	Yes	No	No	No	Yes, although a great deal of research is also performed by government-funded institutes.	–

Country	Is there a parliamentary defence committee?	Is there a general research bureau for parliament?	Is there a defence research bureau for parliament?	Are independent studies performed for major government contracts?	Are there any independent research institutes?	Additional information
Italy	Yes	The House of Representatives of parliament (i.e. the Camera Deputati) has its own research department with a staff of about 40 (known as the Servizio Studi).	No	–	Parliament makes regular use of research institutes many of which receive at least one third of their funding in the form of government grants.	–
Austria	Yes	–	There are government research centres that the parliament is also entitled to use.	Yes. Although this is technically feasible, it has not actually been done for some considerable time.	–	–
Switzerland	Yes	–	No	No	–	–

It is clear from the information we have received that none of the countries in question has an institute that is capable of carrying out defence research on behalf of parliament, as is described in the motion tabled by Mr Zijlstra and Ms van 't Riet. In this sense, the Netherlands is no different from other countries. At the same time, in some countries support staff have been attached to a parliamentary defence committee. There are seven countries that have some sort of general support service for the members of the House of Representatives. Such support varies tremendously in scale, ranging from the US Library of Congress, which does much more than simply support Congress (and the Congressional Research Service, that provides Congress with information services) to the relatively small-scale Wissenschaftliche Dienst of the German Bundestag or the Service des Etudes et de la Documentation of the French Assemblée. The type of support provided also varies, ranging from research studies, whether independent or not, to the extraction of data from public sources. Finally, not all parliaments have a tradition of seeking advice from external consultants in order to form an opinion on certain issues.

III The parallel debate: strengthening Parliament's scrutinising role

It would appear that the increasingly complex social and political issues facing parliament have led members of the House of Representatives to demand more support in their scrutinising role. The chairs of the parliamentary parties in the Netherlands Senate, for example, have decided to set up a 'European Bureau' with the aim of improving the quality of information on European law.¹¹ In the Dutch House of Representatives, the debate on how to strengthen its scrutinising role has centred on plans for creating an evaluation or research unit. Here too, members of the House of Representatives are reluctant to rely solely on the information provided by the government.¹² In other words, this is not only a concern in relation to defence issues.

The desire to strengthen the scrutinising role played by the House of Representatives is something that emerges not just in press publications, but also in debates in the House itself. Writing in the general notes to the expenditure estimates for 2001, the president and secretary general of the House say that they are considering instituting a parliamentary evaluation unit. "The task of this agency would be to assess the reliability both of existing research studies that the government presents to the House and of research studies commissioned by the House itself. Clearly, such an agency would need to meet very strict requirements in terms of impartiality. Any budgetary consequences will be implemented once a decision has been taken."¹³ The president and secretary general support the establishment of an independent evaluation unit that has no links with any existing institutions. Their own preference is for "a unit staffed by just a few people with expertise in research methods, particularly in terms of assessing the practical value of research findings."¹⁴ During the debate on spending estimates on 21 June 2000, the president of the House of Representatives announced that she would be sending the House a memorandum with more detailed information.¹⁵ This should be ready by the end of 2000. In response to our questions, the president of the House of Representatives, Ms J. van Nieuwenhoven, said that there was no reason why the House should not decide to commission a research study on the basis of an examination and verification of data and other information from public sources. In other words, Parliament would appear to have a broad preference at the moment for a body that is something between an evaluation agency and a research unit.¹⁶

11 *Algemeen Dagblad*, 3 November 2000.

12 *Onmacht en kippendrift – De Tweede Kamer wil strenger controleren maar weet niet hoe* ('Powerless frenzy: the House of Representatives wants to get tough but doesn't know how'); *NRC Handelsblad*, 10 June 2000.

13 Estimate of expenditure required for the House of Representatives in 2001, and designation and estimate of income, House of Representatives, 1999-2000 session, 27 082, No. 6, p. 1.

14 *Idem*, No. 12, pp. 1 and 5.

15 Debate on the estimate of expenditure required for the House of Representatives in 2001, and designation and estimate of income (21 June 2000), House of Representatives 89, 89-5743.

16 Interview with the president and secretary general of the House of Representatives, Ms J. van Nieuwenhoven and Mr W.H. de Beaufort respectively, on 6 November 2000.

IV Defence research capacity: a proposal

IV.1 Proposal

In its letter requesting a report, the government asks whether there might be any gaps in the current network of research institutes and advisory bodies. We have already indicated, in Section II of this report, that a large number of highly disparate research institutes are active in the Netherlands, the services of most of which the House of Representatives is probably free to use. Moreover, Dutch institutes have all sorts of contacts with foreign research institutes. In short, more research is evidently undertaken into security and defence issues than either 'A plan for the armed forces' or the Zijlstra and van 't Riet motion would appear to admit. In addition, a great deal of information is already available, some of which is based on academic or other research.

This raises the question of why the House of Representatives should apparently feel so uneasy about the matter. After all, the Zijlstra and van 't Riet motion was passed unanimously. Given that the members of the House do not wish to rely solely on information provided by the Ministry of Defence, the research studies currently available and the data based on these studies do not apparently constitute an adequate alternative for them. Presumably, these studies take insufficient account of the nature of the decisions that they are required to take and of the arguments on which these decisions are based. Leaving aside the question of whether sufficient research is conducted (as was suggested by the MPs who tabled the motion) or whether there are gaps in the current network of research institutes and advisory bodies (which the government seems to refute in its request for a report), the AIV wishes to point out that the House of Representatives as a whole could make greater and more effective use of existing defence research capacity than it has done to date. The question to be addressed is not so much how to conduct more research, but how to make use of the defence expertise already available in the Netherlands and abroad in such a way that it adds value to the debate and decision-making on Dutch defence policy. Evidently, the path currently followed by information, starting with study and research and ending with debate and decision-making in the House of Representatives, is so tortuous that it seldom reaches its final destination.

The request for advice asks the Council to suggest ways and means of granting the wish expressed in the Zijlstra and van 't Riet motion for the creation of a defence research institute, primarily to support members of the House of Representatives. In the light of the above, the AIV concludes that what is needed is not so much *more* defence research as *more effectively targeted* research which both adequately meets the need expressed by members of the House of Representatives and takes full account of the parliamentary decision-making process and the time limits inherent to this process. It is not clear whether a full-blown defence research institute would be capable of meeting this need. The creation of a new or additional independent institute would not necessarily bridge the gap between the current research capacity and the need expressed by members of the House of Representatives. This is without even

considering the practical issues involved, such as funding, the availability of expert staff and the anticipated cost in proportion to the expected results.¹⁷

The AIV believes that a more practical solution – and one that could be implemented in the short term – would be to create some sort of body that could match supply with demand instead of an independent institute undertaking academic research. This body would be relatively small and its prime task would be to commission existing research institutes and universities (both in the Netherlands and abroad) to perform studies, or to use other means in order to give the House of Representatives access to the expertise it needs. The body should have a staff of between three and five specialists, recruited from universities, research institutes and/or centres of military expertise, who would only need to devote a limited part of their time to their work for this body. They should be sufficiently qualified to act as knowledge brokers between the House of Representatives and the defence research infrastructure in both the Netherlands and abroad. It is therefore vital to recruit authoritative experts who are familiar with security and defence issues (i.e. policy, international and European cooperation, organisational issues, funding, staffing, procurement, etc.). Legislative and other measures should be taken to guarantee the independence of these experts.

This could meet the need expressed by the House of Representatives for a system that is capable of dealing with defence research issues that the House wishes to address. The House of Representatives must, however, be prepared to assume responsibility for formulating research briefs: these should explain what it wishes to know, why this is important in the light of future decisions and by which date it needs to have the data in question. It is important to realise that it takes time to complete a research project and to generate the relevant data. In other words, the House of Representatives must look ahead when formulating its research requests. This can only be achieved if the experts in question are in regular contact with members of the House (for example, the permanent defence committee). Moreover, this type of consultation – between the House of Representatives and external experts – may also encourage the House to take a proactive attitude in commissioning research studies so as to take account of defence issues that it may well need to debate in the future.

17 The following table is intended to give the reader an impression of the size of existing research institutes and their budgets (the figures in question are based on emails received from the institutes concerned):

Name of institute	Number of staff (approximate figure)	Annual budget (approximate figure)
Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'	60	NLG 10.9 million
Rand Corporation	1,100 (including 700 researchers)	USD 140 million
Stiftung für Wissenschaft und Politik	110 (including 35 researchers)	DEM 16 million
Bonn International Centre for Conversion (BICC)	35 (including 15 researchers)	DEM 4.5 million
International Institute for Strategic Studies	43	GBP 2 million

Recommendation:

Given that the House of Representatives has called on the government to examine the options for creating a defence research capacity, the AIV urges the government to concentrate not on establishing an institute to conduct independent research, but on finding a way of matching the demand from the House of Representatives with the supply of defence expertise in the Netherlands and abroad. The AIV recommends that the government recruit a select group of experts to act as knowledge brokers between the House of Representatives and the defence research infrastructure in the Netherlands and abroad.

IV.2 Concluding remarks

The AIV believes that it is basically up to the House of Representatives to decide on the nature of the defence research capacity that is to be created. We have already explained in Section III of this report that there is a body of opinion in the House of Representatives in favour of the establishment of an evaluation or research unit. It is not yet clear whether such a unit will also encompass defence research, and if so, when, and whether the mission of such an *evaluation* agency or *general* research unit will be compatible with the need for a *defence research* capacity as set out in the Zijlstra and van 't Riet motion. A case could be made, however, for incorporating a defence research capacity into the evaluation or research unit which the House of Representatives itself wishes to set up.

As long as the picture remains unclear, the AIV is prepared to place its own expertise at parliament's disposal and thus, where required, help to bridge the gap between the House of Representatives and the defence knowledge infrastructure as described in Section V.1. The AIV does not regard this as anything more than a stopgap solution, the details of which could be discussed once the House of Representatives concludes that it does indeed wish to use the AIV's services as a knowledge broker. This arrangement can only be temporary because it would otherwise pose a threat to the AIV's ability to perform its primary role, i.e. making strategic policy recommendations on a broad range of foreign policy and defence issues.

Against this background, the AIV would like to take this opportunity to remind the House of Representatives that it enjoys the same right as the government to ask the AIV for its opinion on matters relating to government policy. These include both defence issues and other international issues. Indeed, all the research topics listed in Section I would form suitable subject matter for AIV advisory reports on government policy. With the exception of the technical aspects of defence procurement in a narrow sense, the topics in question have a sufficiently strong link with government policy for the AIV to be able to produce a report on each of them should this be required.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

P.O. Box 20701
2500 ES The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel.: 070-3188188

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

P.O. Box 20061
2500 EB The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel.: 070-3486486

Professor R.F.M. Lubbers
Chair, Advisory Council on International Affairs
P.O. Box 20061
2500 EB The Hague

Your letter	Your ref.	Our ref.	Date
		D 2000002239	11 July 2000

Subject
Request for advisory report pursuant to motion tabled by Mr Zijlstra and Ms van 't Riet

Dear Professor Lubbers,

During the debate on 14 February on the Defence White Paper, two members of the House of Representatives (Mr Zijlstra for the Labour Party and Ms van 't Riet for Democrats '66) tabled a motion asking the government to investigate the opportunities for creating a capacity for conducting research into defence issues in the broadest sense of the word, and to report to the House on the results of its investigation (see enclosure). The motion was passed unanimously on 22 February.

In a discussion paper published last year in connection with the Defence White Paper, the Labour Party argued in favour of the creation of a 'Dutch Institute for Defence Research' whose mission would be to 'undertake research, independently and on behalf of bodies such as the House of Representatives, the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, into aspects of defence policy, both individually and in conjunction with other policy areas'. The paper listed the following potential research topics:

- the modern armed forces in the light of new political challenges;
- management issues against the background of political objectives;
- the value and desirability of certain weapon systems and proposed purchases of defence equipment;
- optimising the contribution made by the Dutch armed forces to NATO and European alliances;
- cooperation between the armed services;
- improving the quality of Dutch military personnel;
- Dutch society and the military ethos.

There is already a wide range of research institutes and advisory bodies for defence issues. Not only can the government make use of the knowledge and experience of the civil servants employed by the relevant ministries, it also has access to the expertise of advisory bodies and research institutes such as the Advisory Council on International Affairs, the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', the Society and Armed Forces Institute and the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research. In addition, the government has gained considerable experience with the employment of external consultants on an ad-hoc basis. Engaging the services of external advisors has a number of obvious advantages, the main ones being their flexibility and the absence of any facilities that need to be staffed and funded on a permanent basis.

In the light of the above, we are interested in establishing whether there are any gaps in the present system of research institutes and advisory bodies, and if so, what sort of gaps these might be. There is also the question of the positioning of these bodies and of an independent research institute (for example, in relation to the ministries concerned and parliament) and, in connection with this, their funding. Another point of concern is whether it would be possible to recruit a sufficient number of impartial, properly qualified people to staff a genuinely authoritative institute that would be capable of commanding the respect of the ministries concerned. A comparison with the situation abroad could generate interesting information in this respect.

We have decided to ask the AIV to publish an interim report on the motion tabled by Mr Zijlstra and Ms van 't Riet. The impartiality and expertise of the Council are guarantees of an authoritative opinion on this issue that could provide a basis for putting the motion into effect. As far as the government is concerned, consultations with the House of Representatives on this point could be resumed shortly after the summer recess. We would therefore be grateful if the Council would report to us as soon as possible, and in any event by 1 October at the latest.

Against this background, we should like to ask the Council to assess the opportunities available for granting the wish expressed by the House of Representatives, as set out in the motion tabled by Mr Zijlstra and Ms van 't Riet. We request the Council in any event to discuss the relationship between the proposed new institute and existing research institutes and advisory bodies, and also to examine the question of the resources (in terms of staff, funding and other aspects) that a decision to create such an institute would require.

Yours sincerely,

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE
(signed)
F.H.G. de Grave

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
(signed)
J.J. van Aartsen

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATES-GENERAL

1999-2000 session

26 900

2000 Defence White Paper

No. 7

MOTION TABLED BY MEMBERS ZIJLSTRA AND VAN 'T RIET
Presented during the debate on the White Paper on
14 February 2000

The House,

having heard the deliberations,

whereas there is no capacity in the Netherlands for
conducting research into defence issues in the broadest
sense of the word,

requests the government to examine how to create such a
apacity and to report to the House accordingly,

and proceeds to the order of the day.

Zijlstra
Van 't Riet

**Fact-finding study conducted in the framework
of the report on defence research capacity**

1 Introduction

2 Country-by-country survey

- 2.1 USA 3
- 2.2 Canada 4
- 2.3 Germany 5
- 2.4 UK 7
- 2.5 France 8
- 2.6 Belgium 10
- 2.7 Norway 10
- 2.8 Denmark 11
- 2.9 Sweden 13
- 2.10 Spain 14
- 2.11 Portugal 15
- 2.12 Italy 16
- 2.13 Austria 17
- 2.14 Switzerland 17

1 Introduction

The motion tabled by MPs Zijlstra and Van 't Riet and the request for advice on the creation of an independent defence research capacity made pursuant to this motion, may be seen against the background of parliament's broader desire to strengthen its own scrutinising role. It would appear that parliament needs more support in order to address the increasingly complex social and political issues facing it. This study contains information on the support provided to national parliaments in a number of countries: the USA, Canada, Germany, the UK, France, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Austria and Switzerland. This information was obtained from the Dutch embassies in the countries concerned, which were asked to answer the following list of questions:

- 1 Does the parliament in the country where the embassy is located have its own research bureaus that help it to scrutinise government policy? The AIV is interested specifically in research that is conducted prior to political or parliamentary decision-making. If such bureaus exist, how are they organised (i.e. in terms of number of staffing, budget and funding)? (See sections x.x.2 below.)
- 2 Is there a research bureau geared specifically towards defence policy in the country where the mission is located? If so, does it concern itself solely with technical issues or does its remit extend to general policy matters? How is it organised? (See sections x.x.3 below.)
- 3 Does the parliament in the country where the embassy is located commission independent research when decisions have to be taken on major spending items (such as the purchase of large weapon systems)? If so, who undertakes this research? (See sections x.x.4 below.)
- 4 Are there any independent defence research institutes in the country where the embassy is located? If so, do they concern themselves primarily with technical issues (as in the case of the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research) or are they geared more towards policy matters (as in the case of the Clingendael institute in the Netherlands)? What is the relationship between such institutes as a group and between the institutes and parliament? (See sections x.x.5 below.)

The answers to the above questions are set out below on a country-by-country basis. We have tried to stick as closely as possible to the wording used by the embassies. We should point out that not all questions were answered in all cases.

2 Country-by-country survey

2.1 USA

2.1.1 Parliamentary committee

The Committee on the Armed Services is the House of Representatives committee that deals with defence-related issues. It consists of the following sub-committees: the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, the Subcommittee on Military Readiness and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

2.1.2 Research bureau

The Library of Congress plays a pivotal role in relation to information services and policy research. Its main priority is to give the members of the US Congress access to knowledge and creativity. It is widely recognised that the size and scope of the collections held by the Library of Congress are way in excess of that which is needed simply to perform an information and research role for the US parliament. Facilities for the general public and academic users are unparalleled. Members of Congress can use the Library's Congressional Research Service, which specialises in giving others access to information.

The parliamentary committees of the US Congress can use the services of the Committee on the Budget for research into budgetary aspects. The Committee on the Budget is responsible for monitoring all research into the effects of expenditure that is related to existing or proposed legislation and for initiating and evaluating research into tax spending. Finally, there is also a Congressional Budget Office that actually does the practical work involved.

2.1.3 Defence research bureau

The US Congress does not have a research bureau that concerns itself exclusively with defence issues.

N.B. Our respondent at the embassy said that there were no examples of 'independent' studies initiated by Congress. On the other hand, both the House of Representatives and the Senate obtain information by holding hearings at which experts and research institutes are invited to express their views on certain subjects.

2.1.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

The Department of Defence has a wide range of technical testing and evaluation facilities that are comparable to those available to the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research.

The Americans spend much more than the Europeans on R&D. There are competitive tendering procedures for defence contracts and products supplied by the defence industry are regularly subjected to comparative surveys.

2.1.5 Independent research institutes

There are a large number of independent institutes in the USA that conduct research into defence and related fields. Many of them work in conjunction with interest groups and channel their output through parliamentary lobbies. The latter are sometimes founded for the sole purpose of attaining a specified object and lead relatively short lives.

The Brookings Institution in Washington D.C. is one of the better known independent research institutes¹ and seeks to act as a bridge between the academic world and policy-makers. Although often branded a government think-tank, it is independent of government² and is in theory also at the disposal of parliamentary committees.

Other well-known independent research institutes are:

- the Rand Corporation;
- the Centre for Strategic and International Studies;
- the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace;
- the Institute for Defence Analysis.

2.2 Canada

2.2.1 Parliamentary committee

There are three committees in Canada that are active in the domain of security and defence: the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs, the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

2.2.2 Research bureau

The Library of Parliament (LP) acts as a parliamentary research bureau. It consists of two principal branches:

- the Parliamentary Research Branch, that performs research and analyses, and makes policy recommendations to members of the House of Representatives and parliamentary committees;
- the Information and Documentation Branch.

The LP has a staff of about 280 and had a spending budget of CAD 20.5 million in 1999. The Canadian parliament's website contains extensive information on the services provided by the LP, its mandate, etc. Please see www.parl.gc.ca for further information. (See also the LP Performance Report for 1998-1999.)

2.2.3 Defence research bureau

Canada does not have a parliamentary research bureau that concentrates exclusively on defence issues. From time to time, parliament sets up a Special Committee (consisting either of a number of members of the House of Commons or a mixture of members of both Houses) to study a particular issue. In February 1994, for example, a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons was formed to examine Canadian defence policy. The Committee spent a period of six months collecting information both in Canada and in other countries. In response to the resultant report, the government published its 1994 Defence White Paper, substantial parts of which were in line with the recommendations made by the Committee.

1 It is involved in both research and teaching.

2 The Brookings Institution is in fact funded by philanthropic foundations, private-sector firms and private individuals.

2.2.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

See above under 2.2.1. As far as the respondent was aware, no independent research studies are commissioned.

2.2.5 Independent research institutes

The federal government operates a policy-oriented Security and Defence Forum. This programme, managed by the Ministry of Defence, has three basic aims:

- (a) developing and supporting Canadian expertise in security and defence matters;
- (b) stimulating informed public debate;
- (c) fostering communication between the Ministry of Defence, the armed forces and the academic community.

Two key components of this Forum are the Centres of Expertise and the Chair of Defence Management Studies. Although they are subsidised by the government, they enjoy full academic freedom in setting their research agendas. There are currently 12 Centres of Expertise; these are based in various Canadian universities and receive government grants worth between CAD 45,000 and CAD 100,000 per annum. In many cases, these grants form the core of a Centre's funding and are supplemented by funds from other sources. Each Centre develops its own expertise in one or more aspects of defence or security studies. The idea is that their work should ultimately lead to a greater degree of affinity with defence and security issues in academic circles and in general terms help to further knowledge and understanding of the defence and security challenges facing Canada.

The Chair of Defence Management Studies was created to develop the knowledge and skills that are required to manage current defence policy. Key issues in this respect are decision-making on defence issues, financial management and budgeting, capital expenditure and defence procurement, the defence industry and civil-military relations.

The Security and Defence Forum also funds a number of study grants and traineeships for undergraduate and postgraduate courses relating to Canadian defence and security. It also awards modest grants in support of projects initiated by individuals or institutions, such as conferences, seminars, individual research studies and papers.

The Ministry of Defence also funds a number of other institutions that are active in this particular field, such as the Centre for Conflict Studies, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, the Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies and the Conference of Defence Associations.

Finally, there is a technical bureau known as the Defence Research and Development Branch. This is based on Ottawa and is comparable to the Physics and Electronics Laboratory of the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research.

2.3 Germany

2.3.1 Parliamentary committee

In Germany, the Defence Committee is the parliamentary committee that is responsible for dealing with matters relating to defence legislation and also for scrutinising the activities of the armed forces.

In addition to the personal assistants of the members of the Bundestag, each parliamentary party has specialist researchers of its own working in its party office (there are generally one or two researchers in each parliamentary party covering security policy and defence).

2.3.2 Research bureau

The Bundestag has its own Wissenschaftliche Dienst, or Scientific Agency, which provides 'comprehensive information and expert advice' in response to requests made by individual members of the Bundestag. It is a relatively small unit, with three members of staff being responsible for handling matters relating to defence and security. Acting on requests from Bundestag members, they compile 'Kurzberichte' that are frequently based on external sources of information.

2.3.3 Defence research bureau

There is no defence research bureau that works solely on behalf of the German parliament.

2.3.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

None. There are two prime sources of information that parliament often uses in relation to decisions on major defence contracts: the government and competitors.

2.3.5 Independent research institutes

There are a large number of independent research institutes in Germany, dealing with both technical aspects and security policy. Most of these are more or less fully government-funded (either by the federal government or by the relevant state government), with subsidies taking the form of either direct budgetary support or a shareholding. A small number of institutes have a formal link with the government. In no case, however, is there a formal relationship with parliament.

The Fraunhofer Gesellschaft, which is subsidised by the German Ministry of Defence, is a well-known umbrella organisation for technical research. It has 47 specialist institutes under its wing that obtain their funding partly in the form of subsidies, but also – and to an increasing degree – from commercial work. Some of the more familiar names are the Hydroakustisch Institut, the Deutsche Institut für Luft- und Raumfahrt (DLR) and the Institut für die Chemie der Treib- und Explosivstoffe (ICT).

There is also the IABG in Ottobeuren, near Munich. This is owned by the Bayerische Landesbank, which is in turn a state corporation. The IABG has a sizeable defence branch, including the Zentrum für Europäische Strategieforschung, and has close links with the Bavarian defence industry (notably DASA and Kraus Maffei Wegmann).

As far as security policy is concerned, one of the leading research institutes is the Bundesakademie für Sicherheitspolitik, which is formally part of the German Ministry of Defence. The staff of the Bundesakademie are all officially civil servants.

Other important bodies are the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP, which was also involved in the Ebenhausen seminar, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik (DGAP) and the Hessische Stiftung für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung. Although all three have civil-law status, they are nevertheless dependent on the government for most of their resources. They are not allied with any specific political party or movement. Distantly related to these institutes is the Bonn International Centre for Conversion (BICC), which is active in a highly specialised field and from time to time publishes studies on its own initiative to stimulate public debate, for example, when the Bundestag was debating the Eurofighter.

Finally, there are the Politische Stiftungen. These are typically German institutions, and perform a broader role than the research institutes operating under the aegis of the Dutch political parties. Most of them have a staff running into hundreds of people; together, they have an aggregate budget (which is allocated by the central government) of approximately DEM 200 million. Although they are formally independent, their recommendations generally tend to be in fairly close keeping with the philosophy espoused by the political party with which they are associated:

- Friedrich Ebert Stiftung: SPD;
- Konrad Adenauer Stiftung: CDU;
- Heinrich Böll Stiftung: Greens;
- Friedrich Naumann Stiftung: FDP;
- Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung: PDS.

It should be stressed that these 'stiftungen' have only limited expertise in defence issues in a strict sense, and that relatively little practical use is made of their research capacity in this particular area. They tend to play a more prominent role in analysing security policy.

2.4 United Kingdom

2.4.1 Parliamentary committee

When parliament decides to examine the government's policy on defence issues (e.g. the Strategic Defence Review, policy on Kosovo and policy on weapons of mass destruction), this is generally done by the relevant House Select Committee, in which all parties are represented in proportion to their status in the House of Commons. These Select Committees have far-reaching powers to take written or oral evidence from experts both from within government (e.g. civil servants and military personnel) and from outside (e.g. external experts and academics). The Defence Select Committee of the House of Commons is the parliamentary committee that is concerned specifically with defence policy.

2.4.2 Research bureau

Although the British parliament does not have a research bureau of its own, it does have a very extensive library that is staffed by expert librarians (comparable with the Library of Congress in the US). This library has a total staff of about 200 and a special International Affairs and Defence Section (IADS) with five researchers and eight supporting staff. Although only the equivalent of 1.5 full-time staff actually specialise in defence in the strict sense, extra manpower may be drafted in as and when the need arises, as in the case of the crisis in Kosovo, when four of the five researchers were working more or less constantly on Kosovo. The library's research departments are predominantly demand-driven. At the same time, existing documentation is regularly updated and researchers also seek to anticipate future developments (for example, they are currently preparing a report on NMD).

The library has a total spending budget of GBP 8 million per annum. Although the library does not make clear exactly how much of this is spent on research into security issues, it is possible to make a rough estimate of the amount in question by working on the assumption that '1.5' people out of a total staff of 200 are employed full-time on defence research.

MPs often cite the library as a source in statements and questions, and its staff are regarded as being authoritative in terms of their knowledge and expertise.

2.4.3 Defence research bureau

The British parliament does not have a research bureau specifically for defence issues.

It is important to note that the Select Committees have their own expert staff. The Select Committee for Defence employs five people on a full-time basis, including support staff. These cost approximately GBP 150,000 per annum in salaries, plus expenses (for travel, etc.). The amount of expenditure incurred by the entire Committee in 1998-1999 was approximately GBP 126,000. Our respondent estimated that total expenditure averaged in the order of GBP 300,000 per annum. Temporary staff may also be used for reporting purposes.

2.4.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

None.

2.4.5 Independent research institutes

There are a number of good research institutes operating outside parliament that specialise in security and defence matters. They vary in terms of their degree of independence, but are all used with great regularity by parliament. The leading institutes are listed below, beginning with the least independent:

- the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), that has links with the Ministry of Defence and undertakes research studies exclusively in the domain of defence and security;
- the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA, also known as Chatham House), which specialises in international relations, including security issues;
- the fairly recently founded Centre for European Reform, that focuses on European issues, including (but not primarily) security and defence issues;
- the authoritative International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), which is fully independent and examines defence and security in a broad sense.

There are also a number of universities where research is undertaken into defence and security issues.

2.5 France

2.5.1 Parliamentary committee

In France, parliamentary scrutiny of government policy is the joint preserve of the Assemblée Nationale and the Senate. There are currently 577 representatives in the Assemblée and 321 Senators. Parliamentary scrutiny of defence policy is exercised by the permanent defence committee of the Assemblée and the Senate.

Both chambers have six permanent committees each covering a specific area, including foreign affairs and defence. These committees have a permanent staff who are responsible for performing preparatory and supporting work. The committees also undertake research prior to political decision-making.

2.5.2 Research bureau

The permanent defence committee has a staff of seven. These are all officials with expertise in the field of defence, and each of them has his or her own specialist field. They compile files and perform research in support of the committee's work. They can also perform a number of practical jobs that would otherwise be performed by MPs, i.e. they can act on behalf of the defence committee. Our respondent was unable to provide any information on

the size of the committee's spending budget, but did say that the committee was paid for by the Assemblée itself.

The Assemblée also has a research bureau of its own, although this is not geared specifically towards defence. This institute is known as the 'Service des Etudes et de la Documentation' and acts as the Assemblée's information desk. It is divided into four divisions, each of which covers a particular field and is headed by a Secretary. Under the Assemblée's constitution, the 'Service' is responsible for supplying representatives with the information they need in order to carry out their mandate. This information is supplied in the form of studies, files and answers to questions on specific issues.

The 'Service' has a staff of 36, all of whom are accountable to the Assemblée's speaker and clerk. The four thematic divisions are as follows:

- culture, work and public health;
- social security;
- economic and financial affairs;
- legal and administrative affairs.

The cost of the Service des Etudes is borne by the Assemblée. We were not able to obtain any information on the size of the Service's annual spending budget.

2.5.3 Defence research bureau

The French parliament does not have a research bureau working specifically on defence issues.

2.5.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

None.

2.5.5 Independent research institutes

There are a number of institutes operating outside parliament that undertake research into defence issues:

- The Centre de la Documentation de l'Armement (CEDOCAR) is part of the Ministry of Defence. Its prime concern is arms issues, and it deals with technical, political and strategic aspects. Its main clients are the Ministry of Defence itself and the French defence industry. Although it is not customary for the Assemblée to ask the Centre to answer questions in relation to policy matters, the members of the Assemblée do have access to its well-equipped library.
- In addition, the Ministry of Defence funds a number of technical schools and colleges, such as the prestigious École Polytechnique in Paris.
- The Institut Français des Relations Internationales (IFRI) is the counterpart of the Clingendael institute in the Netherlands. The main difference between the two is the close links that exist between the IFRI and the French private sector, which provides part of its funding. The IFRI's activities include organising seminars, performing research on international relations and publishing on subjects in these fields.

These institutes do not enjoy particularly close links with the French parliament. Obviously, the members of the Assemblée do have access to the information they gather, but we were told by the Assemblée that it seldom makes use of recommendations from independent, external organisations when taking decisions.

2.6 Belgium

2.6.1 Parliamentary committee

In Belgium, parliamentary scrutiny of defence policy is a matter for the National Defence Committee.

2.6.2 Research bureau

The Belgian parliament does not have its own research bureau to help it to scrutinise government policy.

2.6.3 Defence research bureau

As far as the embassy is aware, there is also no research institute in Belgium that is geared specifically towards defence issues.

Despite the absence of a research bureau that is capable of supporting parliament with regard to defence policy, the government, and more specifically the Minister of National Defence, does have a centre that debates and conducts research into security issues. The Defence Study Centre is part of the Royal Higher Defence Institute (established by Royal Decree of 8 October 1998). However, undertaking the type of in-depth research described in the letter requesting the AIV to produce a report is not its principal object.

2.6.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

As far as major public contracts are concerned, the House of Representatives, and more specifically the Ad-Hoc Committee on Army Procurement, exercises its own supervisory powers. This is not simply a matter of performing *post-factum* checks, as the committee is also entitled to advise the minister.

2.6.5 Independent research institutes

Although the Royal Institute for International Relations (KIIB) is an independent research institute, its activities are by no means policy-related or intended as preparatory work for government policy, as is the case with the Clingendael institute in the Netherlands. The staff of the KIIB do, however, contribute to a journal called *Internationale Spectator*.

2.7 Norway

Broadly speaking, the Storting, the Norwegian lower chamber, does not have any resources at its disposal that it can use to fund independent research (i.e. other than through government channels) on defence issues. Apparently, this has never been a topic of debate. Moreover, the members of the Norwegian parliament do not have the backing of enough staff to be able to properly interpret any additional information generated by such independent research. The government, too, does not really have any advisory bodies that could be regarded as genuinely independent. Nonetheless, it was recently decided that, where the price tendered for a particular government contract was in excess of NOK 500 million, the tender should be assessed by an ad-hoc committee of independent experts. However, this applies specifically to the price, and not to the underlying policy.

2.7.1 Parliamentary committee

The Standing Committee on Defence is the committee in the Norwegian parliament that deals specifically with defence policy.

2.7.2 Research bureau

The Storting does not have any research bureaus of its own. Parliamentary scrutiny relates primarily to matters of a financial, administrative and managerial nature, and is exercised after rather than before decision-making. Obviously, all decisions on defence matters are prepared by the Standing Committee on Defence, which is entitled to ask the Minister of Defence for additional information or research data. The minister may in turn seek expert advice before presenting such information.

2.7.3 Defence research bureau

None. The Norwegian defence structure does include a Council for Defence Research, however. This consists of five members, with a former Chief of Defence Staff in the chair and the four other members being civil servants of good repute. The Council is responsible for scrutinising the consistency of the government's funding, policy-making and programmes in broad terms and is entitled to present alternatives. In practice, the Council's services are at the disposal of the Norwegian government in general and the Minister of Defence in particular, as well as the military establishment in general and the Chief of Defence Staff in particular, but not the Storting. Our respondents were unable to say whether the latter was a result of custom or regulation.

Norway also has an Institute for Defence Studies, the Norwegian equivalent of the Dutch Clingendael institute, but geared exclusively towards defence issues. Although it labels itself as an independent institute, it is in fact assisted and supervised by a number of bodies including the Ministry of Defence and the University of Oslo. The Institute's main task is conducting research into defence and security issues, although it is mainly active after rather than before decision-making. All research is undertaken on a fee-paying basis.

2.7.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

As we have already mentioned, the Storting does not seek advice from research bureaus, not even in the case of major government contracts. Nonetheless, it was decided this year that, where the value of a purchase is over NOK 500 million (approximately NLG 125 million), a risk assessment must be performed by an independent consultant. This does not apply, however, to the policy underlying the decision to purchase the equipment in question. The government is the client, so that, in principle, the research findings are presented only to the government. The minister recently decided, in connection with the purchase of five naval frigates, to give the Standing Committee on Defence a copy of the research findings.

2.7.5 Independent research institutes

We have already referred to the relatively independent Institute for Defence Studies as being a bureau that conducts research into defence issues without being under the umbrella of parliament. The Institute is, however, only equipped for dealing with policy. Where studies of a technical nature are required (i.e. aspects for which the Dutch would use the services of the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research), the Norwegians make ad-hoc arrangements with independent consultants (both Norwegian and foreign). The resultant information is passed on either to the minister or to the directly responsible Division for Materiel Management. The Storting does not ask to be given such information.

2.8 Denmark

Denmark has gradually built up a tradition of minority government. This has led more or less automatically to parliament and government regularly getting together to find solutions for problems relating to policy implementation, policy plans and legislation. As a natural

consequence of this type of consultation, government and parliament have a tendency to produce compromise solutions. According to our respondent, the Danish political parties and members of the House of Representatives 'are more focused on their political responsibilities', which means that there is not so much need for mountains of technical data. This applies both to the process of preparing decisions and to after-the-event scrutiny.³

As a result, the relationship between government and parliament is characterised by a high degree of trust and openness, and members of the House of Representatives have no hesitation in basing their views on information provided by the government (or individual ministers).

2.8.1 Parliamentary committee

The Danish parliament has a permanent security and defence committee for dealing with defence issues.

2.8.2 Research bureau

The Folketinget, the Danish parliament, does not have any research bureaus of its own (with the exception of the customary secretariats and policy bureaus) that it can use to scrutinise government policy. There is a secretariat within the parliamentary organisation that writes very brief analyses and reports for members of the House of Representatives on a limited range of subjects. The vast majority of these analyses and reports are connected with Denmark's policy on the EU.

In addition, every political party (and a party must win at least four seats in order to be represented in parliament) employs at least four academically qualified researchers. The bigger the party, the larger the number of researchers.

2.8.3 Defence research bureau

None.

2.8.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

None.

2.8.5 Independent research institutes

Parliament, including the permanent security and defence committee, is free to seek expert advice from outside parliament in order to facilitate policymaking.

- The Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut (DUPI) was founded in 1995. The DUPI undertakes research studies and compiles analyses on topical issues relating to foreign policy, including defence issues. Its recommendations are geared towards policymakers. The DUPI is somewhat similar to the Clingendael institute in the Netherlands: although it is formally independent, it is accountable to the Minister of Foreign Affairs on account of the funding it receives from the foreign ministry (DKK 11 million per annum). The Danish Minister of Foreign Affairs appoints (in a personal capacity) the nine members of the Management Council. There is also a Council that supports the DUPI's policy and which is made up of 30 members from a variety of backgrounds (i.e. the Folketing, civil servants and a range of interest groups). The DUPI's clients may be either ministers or

³ It should be pointed out that Denmark has a fairly radical law on open government (although this is not always the viewpoint taken by officials working for parliament, given the large number of exemptions included in the law).

- members of the House of Representatives. One of its more recent reports for the Danish parliament was entitled 'Developments in the EU since 1992 in the policy areas covered by the Danish opt-outs' (including the defence opt-out).
- Parliament may also ask universities to perform research studies on its behalf, although it has to pay for this type of work. To date, parliament has not commissioned any university analyses.
 - Apart from the DUPI, which is more concerned with general policy issues and produces reports both upon request and on its own initiative, there is also the Forsvarets Forskningstjeneste (Danish Defence Research Establishment). This is a small organ within the Ministry of Defence that reports to the defence staff, which is in turn responsible for advising the Minister of Defence on technical matters. The institute also participates in the technical debates in specialist committees in Brussels. It does not, however, actually advise the Folketinget directly.
 - When major decisions need to be taken, parliament forms special committees consisting of representatives of parliament, the defence organisation and relevant social groups who either can offer specialist expertise in certain areas or are interested in specific issues. An interesting example of this type of special committee is the 1997 Defence Commission, which was formed to make recommendations on the further development of the Danish defence organisation (in terms of orientation, policy, procurement and the reshaping of its organisational structure). Incidentally, this was a non-parliamentary body. Its recommendations played a decisive role in shaping the final version of the Defence Agreement 2000-2005, a contract between parliament and government on future defence policy.
 - The Dansk Maritim Institut is a non-parliamentary body which insiders claim is similar to the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research (although operating on a more limited scale). The institute is responsible for making technical recommendations on maritime matters and is required to find its own funding. The private sector is the institute's chief locomotive.

2.9 Sweden

Officially, the Swedish parliament, the Riksdag, has no resources at its disposal that it could use for commissioning independent research. Our respondent at the embassy was also under the impression that there had never actually been any need for such research. Any research that is considered necessary can be performed by existing defence research institutes.

2.9.1 Parliamentary committee

There is a defence committee that is constantly preparing proposals on defence matters. The committee is composed of about 17 members of the House of Representatives, discusses plans announced by the government and is entitled to ask ministries and other authorities for additional information.

There is also the defence commission, a forum for consultation between government representatives and political parties on strategic defence and security issues. The commission is made up primarily of members of the House of Representatives and plays an advisory role vis-à-vis the government, i.e. it makes proposals for long-term defence and security policy.

2.9.2 Research bureau

The Riksdag does not have any research bureaus of its own. It does have a Research Service with a staff of around 30, but this does not perform any research of its own. The Research Service is more in the nature of a service facility, collecting facts and figures from existing files and publications for members of the House of Representatives.

2.9.3 Defence research bureau

The Riksdag does not have any defence research bureaus of its own. There are certain research institutes that the Swedish parliament can use, however, the main ones being the Defence Research Establishment (FOA) and the National Defence College (FHS). There is also the Aeronautical Research Institute (FFA), which is due to merge with the FOA in 2001, but which does not perform the type of research described in the questions listed in the introduction. All three institutes fall under the authority of the Ministry of Defence.

The research performed by the FHS is designed to form part of an academic process, to provide a basis for teaching at the College. Research projects must be beneficial to teaching and may not overlap with studies being performed at other Swedish teaching establishments. The College has a staff of eleven professors and assistant professors, with about 25 postgraduate students working on their doctoral theses. Security policy and strategy forms one of its main focal areas.

The FOA has a staff of 1,000 (of whom 700 are scientists with university degrees). It performs research and publishes reports. It is geared largely towards technical research and concerns itself only to a limited degree with policy issues. The FOA's services may be commissioned on a fee-paying basis. The armed forces are its biggest customer (accounting for 62% of its revenue). The Riksdag does not appear on its list of customers, although the Ministry of Defence does (accounting for 19% of revenue). It has an annual budget of NLG 155 million.

2.9.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

The Riksdag does not seek advice from independent research institutes.

2.9.5 Independent research institutes

The best known Swedish research institute is, of course, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Its research work centres on issues of peace and conflict in the broadest sense of the word. The SIPRI was founded in 1966 in commemoration of the fact that Sweden had then been free from war for a period of 150 years. The SIPRI gets most of its funding from the Swedish parliament.

Universities also perform research into security and defence issues.

Whilst there are no direct links between the Riksdag and the FOA, the FFA and the FHS, the former is free to use the services of the latter institutes.

2.10 Spain

2.10.1 Parliamentary committee

The Spanish parliament has a permanent defence committee that deals with defence issues.

2.10.2 Research bureau

The Spanish parliament does not have any research bureaus of its own that can help it to scrutinise government policy. Parliament can only be advised by its own lawyers, whose recommendations relate more or less exclusively to the technical aspects of legislation. The lawyers are not associated with particular political parties.

2.10.3 Defence research bureau

None.

2.10.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

Generally speaking, the Spanish parliament does not seek any independent advice. The only occasions on which outside experts are heard are when special committees are in session. One example is the committee that looked into the professionalisation of the armed forces. Formal responsibility for any parliamentary inquiry continues to be vested in parliament itself.

2.10.5 Independent research institutes

As in other countries, there is a range of independent centres that perform research into policy issues, although only a small number of them are geared exclusively towards security and defence. One example is the Centro Superior de Estudios de la Defensa Nacional (CESEDEN). Most of these centres undertake research on policy and political matters. The organisations that are active in the field of security and defence have virtually no direct relationship with parliament. At the request of the Ministry of Defence, a list is currently being prepared of strategic defence studies that have been published in Spain by both centres and individuals. It is not clear when this list will be ready.

2.11 Portugal

2.11.1 Parliamentary committee

The Portuguese parliament has a permanent national defence committee that deals with defence issues.

2.11.2 Research bureau

The Portuguese parliament, the Assembleia da República (AR), does not have any research bureaus of its own.

2.11.3 Defence research bureau

None.

2.11.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

Given that the AR does not have any research capacity of its own, it is obliged to base its decisions on information supplied by the government. Although parliament is free to seek advice on an ad-hoc basis, this does not happen much in practice. As a result, it is difficult for the AR properly to assess government plans (such as for major procurements).

2.11.5 Independent research institutes

The Instituto da Defesa Nacional is an independent defence institute, whose main task consists of giving courses and organising seminars and conferences. Although it also performs research, it does not have any capacity of its own for making technical recommendations in connection with defence procurement.

There are no other institutes in Portugal that specialise in defence. At the same time, there are certain organisations that are part either of the Ministry of Economic Affairs or of the Ministry of Science and Technology and which perform studies (including studies of a relatively technical nature) on an ad-hoc basis.

Apart from the Instituto da Defesa Nacional, there are a number of other institutions that undertake political studies:

- the Instituto Diplomático (comes under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs);
- the Instituto de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais. This is a private organisation funded by the European Commission, the Ministry of Defence, the TEPSA organisation and various foundations such as the Fundação Luso-Americana;
- the Centro de Estudos Internacionais (part of Lisbon's Lusiada University);
- the Instituto Superior de Ciências e Políticas.

2.12 Italy

2.12.1 Parliamentary committee

Yes, there is a permanent defence committee.

2.12.2 Research bureau

The lower chamber of the Italian parliament (the Camera dei Deputati) has its own research department, the Servizio Studi, which has a staff of about 40 and receives all its funding from parliament. The department helps members of the House of Representatives and their staff to prepare files, compare Italian laws with foreign legislation, etc.

2.12.3 Defence research bureau

None. The question of whether or not parliament should have its own defence research bureau is not a topic of debate in Rome.

2.12.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

None.

2.12.5 Independent research institutes

The Italian parliament seeks advice from independent institutes on matters relating to more specific, political issues or issues for which some form of technical expertise is required. Most of these institutes are funded – at least in part – by the government.

The official secretary of the permanent defence committee told us that parliament occasionally requested the following independent institutes to undertake studies on policy or technical matters:

- The Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) and the Centro Studi di Politica Internazionale (CESPI) are both research institutes specialising in international policy, and are roughly comparable with the Clingendael institute in the Netherlands. The IAI and the CESPI are planning to merge in the future.
- The Centro Alti Studi di Defesa (CASD) is an institute that is comparable with the Netherlands Defence College, although the CASD does have its own research institute (the CEMISS).
- The Centro Militare Italiano di Studi Strategici (CEMISS) conducts research into topics relating to political and military strategy. It is part of the CASD.

- The Istituto Studi Ricerche Informazioni di Defesa (ISTRID) specialises in academic-level, technical military research.

2.13 Austria

2.13.1 Parliamentary committee

The Austrian parliament has a number of committees (Ausschüsse), which include MPs among their members.

2.13.2 Research bureau

None.

2.13.3 Defence research bureau

The Austrian Ministry of Defence has two research centres, viz. the Militärwissenschaftliche Büro and the research department of the Landesverteidigungsakademie. Both of them concentrate on policy-related research. Parliament can commission research studies from these centres.

2.13.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

When decisions need to be taken on major items of government expenditure, parliament can organise an informative meeting for all members, at which independent experts are invited to speak. Every parliamentary party is entitled to designate a number of experts to be invited. According to a parliamentary spokesperson, it has been a long time since the last such meeting was held.

2.13.5 Independent research institutes

None.

2.14 Switzerland

2.14.1 Parliamentary committee

Both houses of the Swiss parliament have national security committees that are responsible for preparing political and parliamentary decision-making. The committee for the Nationalrat (lower chamber) consists of 25 members, while that operated by the Ständerat (upper chamber) consists of 13 members. The two committees share a small secretariat with a staff of three.

2.14.2 Research bureau

None.

2.14.3 Defence research bureau

There is no defence research bureau in Switzerland.

2.14.4 Independent research studies in connection with major government contracts

The parliamentary committees are entitled to seek expert advice when decisions need to be taken on major items of government spending. It is not unusual for leading retired soldiers and politicians to be heard as experts.

2.14.5 Independent research institutes

None.

Previous reports published by the Advisory Council on International Affairs
(available in English)

- 1 AN INCLUSIVE EUROPE, *October 1997*
- 2 CONVENTIONAL ARMS CONTROL: urgent need, limited opportunities,
April 1998
- 3 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS: recent developments,
April 1998
- 4 UNIVERSALITY OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY,
June 1998
- 5 AN INCLUSIVE EUROPE II, *November 1998*
- 6 HUMANITARIAN AID: redefining the limits, *November 1998*
- 7 COMMENTS ON THE CRITERIA FOR STRUCTURAL BILATERAL AID,
November 1998
- 8 ASYLUM INFORMATION AND THE EUROPEAN UNION, *July 1999*
- 9 TOWARDS CALMER WATERS: a report on relations between Turkey
and the European Union, *July 1999*
- 10 DEVELOPMENTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY SITUATION IN THE 1990s:
from unsafe security to unsecured safety, *September 1999*
- 11 THE FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS,
September 1999
- 12 THE IGC AND BEYOND: TOWARDS A EUROPEAN UNION OF THIRTY MEMBER
STATES, *January 2000*
- 13 HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION, *April 2000**
- 14 KEY LESSONS FROM THE FINANCIAL CRISES OF 1997 AND 1998, *April 2000*
- 15 A EUROPEAN CHARTER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS?, *May 2000*

* Issued jointly by the Advisory Council on International Affairs (AIV) and the
Advisory Committee on Issues of Public International Law (CAVV)