



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on Foreign Affairs

2014/2220(INI)

16.12.2014

DRAFT REPORT

on the implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy)
(0000/2014 – C8-0000/2014 – 2014/2220(INI))

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Rapporteur: Arnaud Danjean

CONTENTS

	Page
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION	3

MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

on the implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy)

(0000/2014 – C8-0000/2014 – 2014/2220(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (based on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy) (0000/2014 – C8-0000/2014),
- having regard to the Annual Report from the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (VP/HR) to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy, in particular the parts concerning the European Security and Defence Policy (12094/14)),
- having regard to Articles 2 and 3 and to Title V of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), and notably to Articles 21, 24 and 36 thereof,
- having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU),
- having regard to the European Council conclusions of 18 December 2013,
- having regard to the conclusions of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Common Security and Defence Policy of 4 April 2014 and 7 November 2014,
- having regard to the European Security Strategy entitled ‘A Secure Europe in a Better World’, adopted by the European Council on 12 December 2003, and to the report on its implementation entitled ‘Providing Security in a Changing World’, endorsed by the European Council on 11-12 December 2008,
- having regard to the Council conclusions on the Common Security and Defence Policy of 25 November 2013 and 18 November 2014,
- having regard to the progress report of 7 July 2014 by the VP/HR and the Head of the European Defence Agency on the implementation of the European Council conclusions of December 2013,
- having regard to the Joint Communication by the VP/HR and the Commission on ‘The EU’s Comprehensive Approach to External Conflicts and Crises’, and the related Council conclusions of 12 May 2014,
- having regard to the Joint Communication on a Cybersecurity Strategy of the European Union: An Open, Safe and Secure Cyberspace, and to the related Council conclusions of 25 June 2013, as well as to the EU Cyber Defence Policy Framework adopted on 18 November 2014,

- having regard to the EU maritime security strategy of 24 June 2014,
- having regard to the Council Decision of 24 June 2014 on the arrangements for the implementation by the Union of the solidarity clause,
- having regard to the Policy Framework for Systematic and Long-Term Defence Cooperation adopted on 18 November 2014,
- having regard to the Commission Communication of 24 July 2013 entitled ‘Towards a more competitive and efficient defence and security sector’ (COM(2013)0542) and to the implementation roadmap of 24 June 2014 (COM(2014)0387),
- having regard to Directive 2009/43/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 May 2009 simplifying terms and conditions of transfers of defence-related products within the Community¹,
- having regard to Directive 2009/81/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 on the coordination of procedures for the award of certain works contracts, supply contracts and service contracts by contracting authorities or entities in the fields of defence and security, and amending Directives 2004/17/EC and 2004/18/EC²,
- having regard to its resolutions on the Common Security and Defence Policy, in particular to those of 21 November 2013 on the implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy³ and on the European Defence Technological and Industrial Base⁴, and of 12 September 2013 on the maritime dimension of the Common Security and Defence Policy⁵ and on the EU’s military structures: state of play and future prospects⁶,
- having regard to its resolution of 3 April 2014 on the EU comprehensive approach and its implications for the coherence of EU external action⁷,
- having regard to its recommendation to the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the European Commission, to the Council and to the Commission of 13 June 2013 on the 2013 review of the organisation and the functioning of the EEAS⁸ and to the Council conclusions on the EEAS Review 2013 of 17 December 2013⁹,

1 OJ L 146, 10.6.2009, p. 1.

2 OJ L 216, 20.8.2009, p. 76.

3 Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013)0513.

4 Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013)0514.

5 Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013)0380.

6 Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013)0381.

7 Texts adopted, P7_TA(2014)0286.

8 Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013)0278.

9 http://eeas.europa.eu/library/publications/2013/3/2013_eeas_review_en.pdf

- having regard to the Charter of the United Nations,
- having regard to Rule 132(1) of its Rules of Procedure,
- having regard to the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (A8-0000/2014),

Overall security context

1. Considers the European Union and neighbourhood security environment to be increasingly unstable and volatile; regards the war in Ukraine, the conflicts in Syria and Iraq, with the rise of the terrorist organisation ISIS, the Libyan crisis and the terrorist threat in the Sahel as direct threats to the Union's security; considers, too, that the US 'pivot to Asia' and the impact of the financial crisis on Member States' budgets and capabilities only highlight how necessary it is for the Union to shoulder more responsibility for its own security and defence;
2. Considers that the current level of instability on the borders of the EU and in its immediate neighbourhood is unprecedented in the period since the late 1990s when the ESDP/CSDP was established; is concerned that the Union may not be able to be key player in addressing each of these threats and that it may too often be reduced to relying on initiatives by one or a few Member States, or on ad hoc alliances in which it has only a peripheral or reserve role to play;
3. Considers that the Union and its Member States must, as a matter of the utmost urgency, adapt to the new security challenges, in particular by making effective use of the existing CSDP tools, by coordinating national action more closely and, where appropriate, by introducing in a pragmatic and flexible way new arrangements for the expression of European solidarity;
4. Emphasises that the Union's strength and relevance lie in its ability to bring into play a wide range of instruments simultaneously and in full compliance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter; underscores the fact that the CSDP military and civil instruments are integral components of this overall approach;

From the December 2013 Council to June 2015: is the CSDP a real priority?

5. Welcomes the European Council conclusions of December 2013 recognising the need to increase the effectiveness, visibility and impact of the CSDP, enhance the development of capabilities and strengthen Europe's defence industry;
6. Considers, however, that the injection of political stimulus in 2013 did not lead to the implementation of practical measures commensurate with the declared levels of ambition; considers that the Union today does not yet possess the requisite resources, operationally, industrially or in terms of capabilities, to contribute in a determining way to the management of international crises and to assert its own strategic autonomy;
7. Welcomes the appointment of the new Vice-President of the Commission and High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (VP/HR), Federica Mogherini; welcomes her first statements and her decision to chair the Foreign Affairs

and Defence Council meetings, an indication of her interest in the CSDP; hopes that the stances she has taken will be reflected in a boost to the development of the CSDP;

8. Hopes that by the time of the June 2015 European Council, which will once again deal with defence issues, the Member States and the EU institutions will be in a position to propose specific measures in line with the undertakings given in December 2013;

CSDP missions and operations

9. Takes note that the most recent civilian and military operations under the CSDP have continued to be dogged by structural shortcomings evident now for several years: lengthy and inflexible decision-making processes, mission mandates unsuited to the operational environment, the problem of 'force generation' and logistical and financial inertia;
10. Considers the issue of financing for CSDP missions and operations to be crucial if the policy is to have a future; finds it regrettable that specific proposals have not yet emerged from the discussion initiated on this subject by the December 2013 Council; calls for the Athena mechanism to be used as a matter of course for the financing of expenditure on CSDP operational and mission deployment and for the same mechanism to manage financing received from Member States on a bilateral basis as well as from third countries and other international organisations, so that they can participate in the financing of a given operation;
11. Notes that too many of the civilian missions launched by the EU since 2009 have been about raising the Union's crisis response profile rather than taking strategic measures on the basis of in-depth analysis and planning; believes that these missions should be not merely for show, but rather should be genuine, effective and responsibly used policy tools forming part of an overall action strategy;
12. Questions, for example, the relevance of deploying and maintaining a mission on the Libyan border (EUBAM Libya) in an institutional and security context where it has never been able to address the basic aims identified there;
13. Likewise finds it regrettable, given the situation in the Gaza Strip, that the Council discussions about the EU Border Assistance Mission at the Rafah Crossing Point (EUBAM Rafah) have so far yielded no results; calls for that mission to be reactivated and for its remit, staffing and resources to be reviewed so that it can play a part in monitoring the borders between the Gaza Strip and Egypt and Israel;
14. Notes that the institutional and operational environment of the ambitious mission to strengthen regional maritime capabilities in the Horn of Africa (EUCAP Nestor) is a crowded one in which it is hard to identify or pinpoint specific aims for Nestor and thus to achieve real results amid the host of international operators, multinational and bilateral, including some implementing other EU measures;
15. Notes that since June 2013 a warehouse facility has existed for the rapid deployment of resources for CSDP civilian missions; considers that if this facility is to be used effectively it should be placed at the service of the relevant heads of mission to meet the

needs they identify, rather than operating on the basis of Commission decisions; calls for annual activity reports to be prepared in respect of this warehouse so that the added value it offers in terms of speeding the deployment of civilian missions can be properly assessed;

16. Welcomes the research being conducted with a view to the establishment of a shared services centre to pool resources for CSDP civilian missions; considers that the most effective solution would be to have a single institutional structure inside the EEAS centralising and rationalising services for civilian missions (human resources, IT, logistics etc.), which are currently dispersed within the respective missions;
17. Notes that CSDP military operations increasingly tend to be armed forces training missions (e.g. EUTM Mali and EUTM Somalia); while hailing the success of such operations, finds it regrettable that missions with an executive remit are rarely envisaged nowadays; considers that, given the persistent threats in our neighbourhood, the EU cannot allow itself to focus exclusively on instruments for a post-crisis context or for supporting exit from crisis, but rather must be capable of intervention across the full spectrum of crisis management;
18. Is dismayed by the problems of force generation encountered when military missions are being launched; notes that, with the exception of EUTM Mali to which 23 Member States are making an effective contribution, current EU military operations involve, in each case, no more than half a dozen Member States; considers that while the contribution of third countries reflects the vitality of partnerships under the CSDP, what it demonstrates most clearly is a certain disaffection on the part of Member States;
19. Given that Union missions both civilian (EUCAP) and military (EUTM) are focusing on training, asks whether a structural policy for putting such missions on a long-term footing, with the provision of financial and equipment assistance, ought not to be introduced; considers that such a new policy, as part of the Union's cooperation and development efforts, would be a means of furthering the work being done under the 'Train and Equip' and 'E2I' initiatives which aim to build the capabilities of third countries (in terms of equipment, materiel, infrastructure and salaries) so that their armed forces are properly operational;
20. Welcomes the intention of the November 2013 Council to enhance the modularity and flexibility of the EU battlegroups so that they can be deployed for crisis-management tasks of all types; notes, however, that the only progress here to date has been the very limited step of proposing that the Athena mechanism should cover the strategic transport of battlegroups into theatres of operations; insists that all the Member States should demonstrate a constructive attitude and overcome, once and for all, the political and operational impediments to battlegroup deployment;
21. Welcomes the positive message sent out by the last informal Council of Defence Ministers about exploring the potential of Article 44 of the Treaty on European Union; finds it regrettable, however, that, due to divisions on the subject, no progress has been made in determining how the provisions of the article could be applied; believes that the implementation of Article 44 would enable the Union to act considerably more flexibly and faster, thus enhancing its ability to address the threats around it; urges those

Member States which are not interested in participating in CSDP operations or which lack the means to do so to take a constructive line by allowing others to act if they so wish;

22. Calls on the VP/HR to explore, in addition, the potential of other relevant articles of the Lisbon Treaty;
23. Calls for serious consideration to be given to the possible use – with arrangements ensuring the necessary modularity – of multilateral HQ structures which are established and have proved their effectiveness on the ground, such as Eurocorps in Strasbourg;
24. Stresses the importance of EU security and defence cooperation with other international institutions, particularly the UN, NATO, the African Union and the OSCE; welcomes the statement from the NATO summit in Wales in September 2014 reasserting support for the development of the CSDP;

Capabilities

25. Considers that national defence budgets have been reduced due to the effects of the 2008 economic and financial crisis and that the reductions have taken place without coordination among the Member States, thus jeopardising the Union's strategic autonomy and the ability of its Member States to meet the capacity requirements of their armed forces;
26. Welcomes the adoption by the Council of 18 November 2014 of a policy framework for systematic, long-term defence cooperation based on the convergence of capability planning processes and on information exchange;
27. Welcomes the adoption by the November 2014 Council of the European Defence Agency (EDA) Capability Development Plan (CDP) setting out the 16 priorities for capability development; welcomes, too, the EDA's work through the collaborative database (Codaba) identifying the scope for cooperation among Member States and thus paving the way for various forms of cooperation to be instituted; urges the Member States, in developing their military capabilities, to have regard to these tools;
28. Is surprised that there are as yet no European-level tax incentives to cooperation and pooling; takes note of the call by the December 2013 Council for such arrangements to be explored, and finds it regrettable that, a year on, discussions have not yet produced any tangible measures in this regard; notes that the Belgian Government already grants VAT exemptions, on an ad hoc basis, to the preparatory phases of certain EDA projects, e.g. for satellite communications; believes that such exemptions should be applied as a matter of course and should be extended to infrastructure and to specific capability-related programmes;
29. Welcomes the existence of cooperation models such as European Airlift Transport Command (EATC) and applauds the fact that this system continues to expand to include new Member States; finds it regrettable that although such a model has existed for several years it has not yet been adapted for use with other types of defence capability; calls for the EATC model to be applied to other spheres of operational support as a

means of addressing serious capability shortfalls;

30. Notes that minimal progress has been made on projects for pooling and sharing; welcomes the advances that have been made on air-to-air refuelling with the acquisition of a fleet of multirole tanker transport aircraft; finds it regrettable that only a very few Member States have so far participated in the project, and calls on those Member States which lack this type of capability to become involved;
31. Welcomes the Council's intention to develop projects for pooling critical technologies, e.g. remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS) and Governmental Satcom; notes that a regulatory framework is needed for the initial integration of RPAS into Europe's air traffic system by 2016, taking due account of civilian and military requirements;
32. Welcomes the progress made on EU satellite services (Galileo, Copernicus, EGNOS); considers that such space services, particularly Copernicus, ought to be put on an operational footing to help meet the high-resolution satellite imaging needs of CSDP missions and operations; welcomes the launch of the Ariane 6 project; finds it regrettable that, for technical and commercial reasons, the Union still buys Russian launch equipment despite its aim of achieving a certain level of strategic autonomy;
33. Considers that the Union could adopt the same capacity targets as NATO, requiring a minimum level of defence spending of 2% of GDP and a minimum 20% share of the defence budget for major equipment needs, including for research and development;

The defence industry

34. Regards the defence markets as highly specific ones for various reasons: public purchasing is virtually the sole source of demand; the number of companies in the marketplace is limited; products spend a long time in development and then in service; and certain technologies are of a strategic nature;
35. Takes note of the Commission communication of July 2013 entitled 'Towards a more competitive and efficient defence and security sector' and of the roadmap of June 2014 on its implementation with its proposals, in particular, for improved implementation of the single market directives 2009/81/EC and 2009/43/EC;
36. Believes that all the measures in question are contingent on the prior joint determination of what falls within the European Defence Technological and Industrial Base (EDTIB) so that potential beneficiary companies or strategic activities can be targeted;
37. Notes the Council's intention to implement European supply security arrangements under which the Member States would engage in mutual assistance, responding rapidly to their respective defence requirements; is awaiting a Commission roadmap setting out the relevant implementation options;
38. Believes that no government can embark alone on genuinely large-scale research and technology (R&T) programmes; welcomes, therefore, the Commission's proposals for developing synergies between civilian and defence research; also welcomes the initiation of 'Preparatory Actions' and hopes that, in the realm of the CSDP, the next

step will be funding, under the forthcoming multiannual financial framework, for a relevant research strand;

39. Calls, at the same time, for the utmost vigilance to be exercised, be it in relation to governance issues, intellectual property rights or the co-financing of, and rules for participation in, the defence Preparatory Action; calls for the Member States to be fully involved in the decision-making process with a view to avoiding bureaucratic excesses and for it to be ensured that the programmes included address the strategic needs of the CSDP and the Member States;
40. Notes the Commission's proposals for promoting the introduction of common standards and certification procedures for defence equipment; awaits the EDA and Commission roadmap for the development of industrial standards for the defence sector, as well as the EDA and EASA options for improving mutual recognition of military certification in the EU;
41. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the President of the European Council, the VP/HR, the Council, the Commission, the governments and parliaments of the Member States, the Secretary-General of NATO, the President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the Chair of the Assembly of the African Union and the Secretary-General of ASEAN.