



**2016/2052(INI)**

13.10.2016

# **OPINION**

of the Committee on Budgets

for the Committee on Foreign Affairs

on the European Defence Union  
(2016/2052(INI))

Rapporteur: Esteban González Pons

PA\_NonLeg

## SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions into its motion for a resolution:

1. Notes that, with around EUR 200 billion of annual military spending, European countries are unable to avert the deterioration of their security environment and to weigh on global affairs because of fragmented defence policies that create inefficiencies and hinder their force projection; believes that a more integrated framework for defence could result in significant savings, additional capabilities and more sustained investment; recalls that, according to 'cost of non-Europe' estimates, annual efficiency gains in this area could range between EUR 26 billion in the less optimistic scenarios and EUR 130 billion; calls for the identification of sustainable means to finance new initiatives relating to the common security and defence policy and underlines the need to clarify long-term funding for common defence research;
2. Underlines that, at a time when public support for the EU is being called into question in some Member States, defence and security is an area where the individual and collective benefits of more Europe can be easily demonstrated, especially regarding the likely challenges to EU's standing as a strategic actor following Brexit;
3. Believes that common funding has a key role to play in incentivising the use of mechanisms whose potential remains largely untapped, such as permanent structured cooperation and EU Battlegroups; calls, therefore, for the Athena mechanism to be expanded and for consideration to be given to alternative funding for military expenditure in order to modify the 'costs lie where they fall' principle; stresses that, in this context, the EU budget should be able to fund the administrative costs of establishing and operating strategic structures, such as joint operational headquarters, and to prepare, organise and deliver defence research, technology and development activities;
4. Calls also for more ambitious civilian missions that are better integrated in the policy cycle and in the range of available instruments; recalls that civilian missions must be consistent with the overall objectives of EU external policies and, in the same way as military missions, promote EU values such as peace, security, sustainable development, solidarity and mutual respect among people, the eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights, in compliance with international law, including the United Nations Charter;
5. Recalls that, in line with its resolution of 6 July 2016 on the preparation of the post-electoral revision of the MFF 2014-2020: Parliament's input ahead of the Commission's proposal, 'new political initiatives should not be financed to the detriment of existing EU programmes and policies';
6. Urges the Commission to be ambitious in its forthcoming European Defence Action Plan (EDAP), which should be a strategic tool to foster EU-level defence cooperation with a view to the development of defence capability programmes by Member States;
7. Urges the Member States to engage more actively in cooperative projects, e.g. research programmes or pooling and sharing of assets; supports, in this framework, the proposed preparatory action on defence research which should pave the way for a dedicated

programme;

8. Believes that the time is ripe for unfreezing the budget of the European Defence Agency, and is convinced that more should be done to close the investment gap in defence capabilities, including via EU innovative financing; endorses, finally, the proposal for a 'European Semester' on defence, whereby Member States would coordinate their defence spending and investment plans in an open process involving the European Parliament and the national parliaments.

## RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE ASKED FOR OPINION

<b>Date adopted</b>	11.10.2016
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 26 -: 9 0: 1
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Nedzhmi Ali, Jonathan Arnott, Jean Arthuis, Richard Ashworth, Reimer Böge, Lefteris Christoforou, Jean-Paul Denanot, Gérard Deprez, José Manuel Fernandes, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Jens Geier, Esteban González Pons, Ingeborg Gräßle, Iris Hoffmann, Monika Hohlmeier, Bernd Kölmel, Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, Vladimír Maňka, Ernest Maragall, Siegfried Mureşan, Victor Negrescu, Jan Olbrycht, Urmas Paet, Paul Rübig, Petri Sarvamaa, Patricija Šulin, Eleftherios Synadinos, Indrek Tarand, Isabelle Thomas, Inese Vaidere, Daniele Viotti, Auke Zijlstra
<b>Substitutes present for the final vote</b>	Derek Vaughan
<b>Substitutes under Rule 200(2) present for the final vote</b>	Daniela Aiuto, Edouard Ferrand, Afzal Khan