



2015/2343(INI)

16.12.2016

AMENDMENTS

1 - 58

Draft opinion

Jean Arthuis

(PE594.135v01-00)

on constitutional, legal and institutional implications of a common security and defence policy: possibilities offered by the Lisbon Treaty
(2015/2343(INI))

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that *recent political developments affecting both the EU and NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of shaping a genuine European Defence Union;*

Amendment

deleted

Or. el

Amendment 2
Monika Vana
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that *recent political developments affecting both the EU and NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of shaping a genuine European Defence Union;*

Amendment

1. Notes that *the EU's current security environment calls for a more effective implementation of the Lisbon Treaty provisions on the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and in particular cooperation and coordination among Member States including on financial and budgetary aspects;*

Or. en

Amendment 3
Alfred Sant

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that recent political developments affecting **both** the EU **and** NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of **shaping** a genuine European Defence Union;

Amendment

1. Notes that recent political developments affecting the EU further highlight the utmost urgency of **opening a discussion on the options for** a genuine European Defence Union **giving prominence to the Member States which are bound to neutrality by their respective national constitutions**;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that recent political developments affecting both the EU and NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of shaping a genuine European Defence Union;

Amendment

1. Notes that recent political developments affecting both **Member States within** the EU and NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of shaping a genuine European **Security and Defence Union and of strengthening the strategic autonomy of the European** Union;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that recent political developments affecting both the EU and NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of shaping a genuine European Defence Union;

Amendment

1. Notes that recent political developments **and the numerous threats** affecting both the EU and NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of shaping a genuine European Defence Union;

Amendment 6
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that recent political developments affecting **both** the EU **and** NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of **shaping a genuine European Defence Union**;

Amendment

1. Notes that recent political developments affecting the EU, **particularly the terrorist threat**, further highlight the utmost urgency of **adequate defence spending by every State**;

Or. fr

Amendment 7
Daniele Viotti

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that recent political developments affecting both the EU and NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of shaping a genuine European Defence Union;

Amendment

1. Notes that recent political developments affecting both the EU and NATO further highlight the utmost urgency of **considering** shaping a genuine European Defence Union;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Notes that recent political developments affecting the EU are of a wide variety and have many reasons, only very few of which are military in nature

and can thus be dealt with by military means;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that *pooling financial resources is a key factor in incentivising the EU and its Member States to act proportionally to the current challenges in the area of security and defence; points out that the EU's failure to make full use of the possibilities offered by the Lisbon Treaty means that its action is hindered by complex and unattractive cost-sharing mechanisms;*

Amendment

2. Considers that *defence policy is clearly a field reserved for the nation state, and that it is inconceivable that a State might surrender its sovereignty in this field to any organisation whatsoever;*

Or. fr

Amendment 10
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that pooling financial resources is a key factor in incentivising the EU and its Member States to act proportionally to the current challenges in the area of security and defence; points out that the EU's failure to make full use of the possibilities offered by the Lisbon Treaty means that its action is hindered by complex and unattractive cost-sharing mechanisms;

Amendment

2. Considers that pooling financial resources is a key factor in incentivising the EU and its Member States to act proportionally to the current challenges in the area of security and defence; *strongly believes that it is of utmost importance that the instruments provided by the Treaty of Lisbon be finally implemented;* points out that the EU's failure to make full use of the possibilities offered by the Lisbon Treaty means that its action is

hindered by complex and unattractive cost-sharing mechanisms;

Or. en

Amendment 11

Alfred Sant

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that pooling financial resources is a key factor in incentivising the EU and its Member States to act proportionally to the current challenges in the area of security ***and defence; points out that*** the EU's ***failure*** to make full use of the possibilities offered by the Lisbon Treaty ***means that its action is hindered by complex and unattractive cost-sharing mechanisms;***

Amendment

2. Considers that pooling financial resources is a key factor in incentivising the EU and its Member States to act proportionally to the current challenges, ***especially*** in the area of security, ***and possibly at a level of enhanced cooperation in the area of defence; notes*** the EU's ***choice not*** to make full use of the possibilities offered by the Lisbon Treaty;

Or. en

Amendment 12

Notis Marias

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Recalls that the 'cost of non-Europe' in security and defence is estimated to be at least EUR 26 billion annually as a result of duplication, overcapacity and barriers to procurement;***

Amendment

deleted

Or. el

Amendment 13
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Recalls that the ‘cost of non-Europe’ in security and defence *is estimated to be at least EUR 26 billion annually as a result of duplication, overcapacity and barriers to procurement;*

Amendment

3. Recalls that the ‘cost of non-Europe’ in security and defence ***cannot seriously be measured;***

Or. fr

Amendment 14
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Recalls ***that the ‘cost of non-Europe’ in security and defence is estimated to be at least EUR 26 billion annually as a result of duplication, overcapacity and barriers to procurement;***

Amendment

3. Recalls ***the importance of better spending in defence through more common planning and procurement in order to avoid duplication, fragmentation and lack of operability;***

Or. en

Amendment 15
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Recalls that the ‘cost of non-Europe’ in security and defence is estimated to be at least EUR 26 billion annually as a result of duplication, overcapacity and barriers to procurement;

Amendment

3. Recalls that the ‘cost of non-Europe’ in security and defence is estimated to be at least EUR 26 billion annually as a result of duplication, overcapacity and barriers to procurement;

recalls that the European Commission has stated that the lack of cooperation between Member States in the field of defence and security is estimated to cost annually between EUR 25 billion and EUR 100 billion;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Recalls that the ‘cost of non-Europe’ in security and defence is estimated to be at least EUR 26 billion annually as a result of duplication, overcapacity and barriers to procurement;

Amendment

3. Recalls that the ‘cost of non-Europe’ in security and defence is estimated to be at least EUR 26 billion annually as a result of duplication, overcapacity and barriers to procurement; *considers that the European arms industry can meet the full range of defence needs without relying on imports from outside Europe;*

Or. fr

Amendment 17
Esteban González Pons

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Recalls that the ‘cost of non-Europe’ in security and defence is estimated to be at least EUR 26 billion annually as a result of duplication, overcapacity and barriers to procurement;

Amendment

3. Recalls that the ‘cost of non-Europe’ in security and defence is estimated to be at least EUR 26 billion annually as a result of duplication, overcapacity and barriers to procurement; *also notes that according to these calculations efficiency gains could reach EUR 130 billion for what Member States*

commitment is needed;

Or. en

Amendment 18

Monika Vana

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Warns that any attempt at putting a price tag on the 'cost of non-Europe' in security and defence is notoriously tricky, as 'Europe' has never existed in the area of arms procurement;

Or. en

Amendment 19

Sophie Montel

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Considers that the concept of the 'cost of non-Europe' in security and defence is based on the purest ideology and fanaticism;

Or. fr

Amendment 20

Monika Vana

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Strongly *believes* that the use of Union funds through the EU budget would be a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding;

Amendment

4. Strongly *rejects the idea* that the use of Union funds through the EU budget would be a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity *with regard to military and defence-related projects* and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding; *believes that with an annual defence spending level of EUR 200 Billion the 28 Member States have a sufficient level of spending and Europe is still the world's second largest military spender; supports the Commission's opinion that Member States need to increase the efficiency of defence spending also by deepening cooperation and coordination and overcome the many structural problems of the defence markets in Europe;*

Or. en

Amendment 21
Daniele Viotti
Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Strongly believes that* the use of Union funds *through the EU budget would be* a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding;

Amendment

4. *Considers necessary to explore ways in which* the use of Union funds *could help in achieving* a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding; *Highlights that any possible expenditure related to the activities of military/defence nature, including defence research, shall be counted over and above the commitment and payment ceilings laid down in the MFF Regulation;*

Or. en

Amendment 22

Jens Geier

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Strongly believes that the use of Union funds through the EU budget would be a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding;

Amendment

4. Strongly believes that the use of Union funds through the EU budget would be a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding; ***is convinced that this makes an increase of the EU budget necessary, which could be achieved by additional own resources or a higher GNI own resource;***

Or. en

Amendment 23

Alfred Sant

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Strongly believes that the use of Union funds through the EU budget would be a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding;

Amendment

4. Strongly believes that the use of Union funds through the EU budget ***on humanitarian missions and security related operations*** would be a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding;

Or. en

Amendment 24

Sophie Montel

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Strongly believes that the use of Union funds through the EU budget would *be a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding;*

Amendment

4. Strongly believes that the use of Union funds through the EU budget would *convey a strong message to peoples that they were increasingly rapidly being stripped of the instruments for the assertion of their sovereignty;*

Or. fr

Amendment 25
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Strongly believes that the use of Union funds through the EU budget would be a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity *and would allow for better and more transparent control of funding;*

Amendment

4. Strongly believes that the use of Union funds through the EU budget would be a strong expression of cohesion and solidarity;

Or. en

Amendment 26
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

4a. Strongly rejects recent proposals made by the Commission in the context of the European Defence Action plan which promote to use a number of existing civilian funds and divert financial resources to the defence industry; opposes in particular the idea to misuse the European Investment Bank, the European Fund for Strategic Investments

Amendment

(EFSI), the Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized enterprises (COSME), European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF), and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF);

Or. en

Amendment 27
Esteban González Pons

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. *It's convinced that, in order to ensure that the EU maintains its position as a strategic security provider in the years to come, the Commission shall ensure that the mobilisation of EU instruments and policies are not a substitute for Member States cuts in defence investments;*

Or. en

Amendment 28
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. *Strongly rejects the ideas presented by the Commission in the context of the European Defence Fund on the so called capability window which promotes the idea that national capital contributions would be treated as "one-offs" under the Stability and Growth Pact which will incentivise and increase public debt and potentially weaken the EURO;*

Amendment 29
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Draft opinion

5. *Considers that*, in the short term, the following *steps are needed*:

Amendment

5. *Urges to take*, in the short term, the following *concrete steps*:

Or. en

Amendment 30
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Draft opinion

5. Considers that, in the short term, the following steps *are needed*:

Amendment

5. Considers that, in the short term, the following steps *would be useful*:

Or. fr

Amendment 31
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 1

Draft opinion

- *Revision and broadening of the Athena mechanism to ensure more collective funding of the EU missions;*

Amendment

- *Encouragement to States to spend 2% of their GDP on defence policy;*

Or. fr

Amendment 32
Alfred Sant

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 1

Draft opinion

- Revision and broadening of the Athena mechanism to ensure more collective funding of *the* EU missions;

Amendment

- Revision and broadening of the Athena mechanism to ensure more collective funding of EU *civilian and humanitarian* missions;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 1

Draft opinion

- Revision and broadening of the Athena mechanism to ensure more collective funding of the EU missions;

Amendment

- *Substantial* revision and broadening of the Athena mechanism to ensure more collective funding of the EU missions;

Or. en

Amendment 34
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 2

Draft opinion

- *Setting-up of the permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) and the start-up fund provided for in Article 41(3) TEU;*

Amendment

- *Encouragement of a policy of détente with Russia, which is not an enemy;*

Or. fr

Amendment 35
Alfred Sant

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 2

Draft opinion

- *Setting-up of the permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) and the start-up fund provided for in Article 41(3) TEU;*

Amendment

- *If a group of like-minded Member States is established, consider the setting-up of the permanent structured cooperation (PESCO);*

Or. en

Amendment 36
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 2

Draft opinion

- *Setting-up of the permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) and the start-up fund provided for in Article 41(3) TEU;*

Amendment

- *Setting-up of the permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) and the start-up fund provided for in Article 41(3) TEU **which would help launch military CSDP operations much faster;***

Or. en

Amendment 37
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

- *The consequent lifting of economic sanctions against Russia;*

Amendment

Or. fr

Amendment 38
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Greater cooperation with Russia in Syria in order, in so far as possible, to tackle the Islamist threat, which is the prime threat to the nations of the EU;*

Or. fr

Amendment 39
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Unfreezing of the budget of the European Defence Agency;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 40
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Unfreezing of the budget of the European Defence Agency;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 41
Alfred Sant

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 3

Draft opinion

- *Unfreezing of the budget of the European Defence Agency;*

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 42
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 3

Draft opinion

- *Unfreezing* of the budget of the European Defence Agency;

Amendment

- *Abolition* of the budget of the European Defence Agency;

Or. fr

Amendment 43
Daniele Viotti

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 3

Draft opinion

- *Unfreezing* of the budget of the European Defence Agency;

Amendment

- *Exploring options for optimal financing of the* of the budget of the European Defence Agency;

Or. en

Amendment 44
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Full implementation of the preparatory action on CSDP research;*

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 45
Alfred Sant

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Full implementation of the preparatory action on CSDP research;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 46
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Full implementation of the preparatory action on CSDP research;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 47
Daniele Viotti
Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Full implementation of the preparatory action on CSDP research;*

- *Recognizing that the preparatory action on CSDP research is a new political*

initiative with a significant impact on the EU budget which by its very nature should be endowed with fresh resources; considers that this action can only be prolonged if this principle is reflected in the upcoming EU budget;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 4

Draft opinion

- Full implementation of the preparatory action on CSDP research;

Amendment

- Full implementation of the preparatory action on CSDP research; *strongly encourages the creation of a specific consultation forum of all relevant stakeholders to best align the supply and the demand sides for the preparation of the proposed defence research programme under the next MFF;*

Or. en

Amendment 49
Esteban González Pons

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

- *Begin laying the ground for the creation of a 'Coordinated Annual Review 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;*

Or. en

Amendment 50
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – indent 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Exemption of the military expenditure of Member States from application of the convergence criteria, as it is of benefit to Europe;*

Or. fr

Amendment 51
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Believes that, in the long term, the EU should aim at a common budget, financing inter alia the core of the EU integrated military forces, including the command structure, joint operations and equipment, as well as a proper EU programme for CSDP research; looks forward to the presentation of the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund, and stresses that it should be financed by new additional appropriations.

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 52
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. ***Believes that, in the long term, the EU should aim at a common budget, financing inter alia the core of the EU integrated military forces, including the command structure, joint operations and equipment, as well as a proper EU programme for CSDP research;*** looks forward to the presentation of the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund, and stresses that it should be financed by new additional appropriations.

Amendment

6. Looks forward to the presentation of the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund, and stresses that it should be financed by new additional appropriations.

Or. el

Amendment 53
Sophie Montel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that, in the long term, the EU *should* aim at ***a common budget, financing inter alia the core of the EU integrated military forces, including the command structure, joint operations and equipment, as well as a proper EU programme for CSDP research;*** looks forward to the presentation of the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund, and stresses that it should be financed by new additional appropriations.

Amendment

6. Believes that, in the long term, the EU *could* aim at ***greater defence cooperation between Member States, to the extent that they are willing to engage in it; considers, however, that such cooperation could equally be considered between Member States and non-Member States, one example being military cooperation between France and Britain.***

Or. fr

Amendment 54
Alfred Sant

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that, in the long term, the EU should aim at a common budget, financing *inter alia the core of the EU integrated military forces, including the command structure, joint operations and equipment*, as well as *a proper EU programme for CSDP research*; looks forward to the presentation of the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund, *and stresses that it should be financed by new additional appropriations*.

Amendment

6. Believes that, in the long term, the EU should aim at a common budget, financing *a command structure for humanitarian and civilian missions* as well as *security related joint operations and equipment*; looks forward to the presentation of the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund.

Or. en

Amendment 55
Daniele Viotti
Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that, in the long term, the EU *should aim* at a common budget, financing *inter alia the core of the EU integrated military forces, including the command structure, joint operations and equipment*, as well as a proper EU programme for CSDP research; *looks forward to the presentation of the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund*, and stresses that it should be financed by new additional appropriations.

Amendment

6. Believes that, in the long term, the EU *could explore the possibilities of* at a common budget, financing *inter alia the core of the EU integrated military forces, including the command structure, joint operations and equipment*, as well as a proper EU programme for CSDP research; *respecting the principle that new political initiatives should be financed with additional funds counted over and above the ceilings set by the MFF Regulation; intends to study* the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund, and stresses that it should be financed by new additional appropriations.

Or. en

Amendment 56
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that, in the long term, the EU should aim at a common budget, ***financing inter alia the core of the EU integrated military forces***, including the command structure, joint operations and equipment, as well as a proper EU programme for CSDP research; looks forward to the presentation of the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund, and stresses that it should be financed by new additional appropriations.

Amendment

6. Believes that, in the long term, the EU should aim at a common budget, including the command structure, joint operations and equipment, as well as a proper EU programme for CSDP research, ***taken into account the specificities in the defence sector***; looks forward to the presentation of the Commission's proposal for a European Defence Fund, and stresses that it should be financed by new additional appropriations.

Or. en

Amendment 57
Arnaud Danjean

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Strongly encourages the European Commission, EDA and Member States to actively participate in the implementation process of the European Action Plan; invites the Commission to clarify in the first quarter of 2017 the legal structure and budget sourcing of the European Defence Fund;

Or. en

Amendment 58
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Calls on the Members States not to deviate ESI funds from their primary objective of reducing regional disparities in order to subsidize the ailing arms industry.

Or. en