



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Plenary sitting

A7-0332/2010

19.11.2010

REPORT

with a proposal for a European Parliament recommendation to the Council on setting up an EU rapid response capability (2010/2096(INI))

Committee on Development

Rapporteur: Iva Zanicchi

CONTENTS

	Page
PROPOSAL FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL.....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	3
PROPOSAL FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL B7-0228/2010.....	3
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.....	3
RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE.....	3

PROPOSAL FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL

on setting up an EU rapid response capability (2010/2096(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Article 196 of the Lisbon Treaty which states that ‘the Union shall encourage cooperation between Member States in order to improve the effectiveness of systems for preventing and protecting against natural or man-made disasters’ and that ‘Union action shall aim to promote consistency in international civil-protection work’,
- having regard to Article 214 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union which states that the Union’s operations in the field of humanitarian aid are intended to provide ‘assistance and relief and protection for people in third countries who are victims of natural or man-made disasters’ and that its operations shall be ‘conducted in compliance with the principles of international law and with the principles of impartiality, neutrality and non-discrimination’,
- having regard to the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid jointly signed in December 2007 by the Presidents of the Council of the European Union, the European Parliament and the European Commission, and the Action Plan presented by the Commission in May 2008 for the implementation of the consensus,
- having regard to the Council conclusions of December 2007 inviting the Commission to make the best use of the Community Civil Protection mechanism and to further strengthen cooperation between Member States,
- having regard to the guidelines on the use of military and civil defence assets in the event of disaster (Oslo Guidelines), as revised on 27 November 2006,
- having regard to the Communication from the Commission to the Council and to the European Parliament of 23 February 2009 on an ‘EU strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries’,
- having regard to the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council of March 2008 on ‘Reinforcing the Union's Disaster Response Capacity’ (COM(2008) 0130) and the European Parliament resolution of 19 June 2008 on stepping up the Union's disaster response capacity¹,
- having regard to the report of 9 May 2006 by Michel Barnier entitled ‘For a European civil protection force: europe aid’,
- having regard to the European Parliament resolution of 10 February 2010 on the recent

¹ P6_TA (2008)0304

earthquake in Haiti¹,

- having regard to its resolution of 21 September 2010 on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters,
 - having regard to the proposal for a recommendation to the Council of 23 March 2010 on setting up an EU rapid response capability, presented by Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Charles Goerens, Louis Michel, Marielle De Sarnez and Frédérique Ries on behalf of the ALDE Group pursuant to Rule 121(1) of the Rules of Procedure (B7-0228/2010),
 - having regard to Rule 121(3) of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Development and the opinion of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (A7-0332/2010),
- A. whereas disasters causing significant human, economic and environmental damage are on the increase worldwide; whereas such crises are happening with greater impact, frequency and scope in more parts of the world, mainly due to the effects of climate change; and whereas the European Union is making considerable efforts to respond to these crises,
- B. whereas the multiplication and greater frequency of interventions inside and outside the European Union are compounded by the global financial situation and budgetary constraints which underline the need for more cost effective operations,
- C. whereas sharing of resources among the 31 states that are members of the Community civil protection mechanism (EU-27, Norway, Lichtenstein, Croatia, Iceland), or in the context of enhanced cooperation between Member States, can represent an operational and financial asset,
- D. whereas the Commission's budget for humanitarian disasters, and specifically that of DG ECHO , has not merely been frozen but has fallen slightly in real terms over the last five years,
- E. whereas progress has been made in recent years towards a more coherent EU disaster response, notably through progressive strengthening of the civil protection mechanism, better interaction/coordination between civil protection and humanitarian aid, and the recognition that an integrated approach to disaster management involves not only response but also prevention and preparedness,
- F. whereas the European Union's response to the earthquake in Haiti triggered not only a rapid, significant and large scale humanitarian aid intervention but also the activation of the civil protection mechanism which was able to deploy immediately and for the first time two modules (a water purification unit and an advanced medical post) financed through a 2008 Preparatory Action for an EU rapid response capability,
- G. whereas lessons learned from recent crises continue to demonstrate the need to improve the EU's disaster response in terms of efficiency, coordination and visibility, and whereas

¹ P7_TA (2010)0015

these disasters have once again highlighted the need for an EU rapid response capability (European civil protection force),

H. whereas the EU's capacity to protect citizens' lives and property is a decisive factor for its credibility,

1. Addresses the following recommendations to the Council:

- (a) acknowledges that the inclusion of civil protection and humanitarian aid within the portfolio of a single Commissioner responsible for Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Response creates better synergies within the Commission and helps enhance the coherence of the overall EU disaster response;
- (b) calls for greater integration between civil protection and humanitarian working methodologies within DG ECHO, while preserving their specific features by maintaining a clear distinction and demarcation of roles between them, in order to maximize synergies and complementarities and to enhance efficiency; calls also for military and civilian personnel and humanitarian workers involved in disaster response or humanitarian operations to act in accordance with the principles of neutrality, independence and impartiality;
- (c) reiterates that the use of civil protection resources, where deployed in any humanitarian crisis, should be needs driven and complementary to, and coherent with, humanitarian aid, in accordance with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid and the United Nations guidelines (Oslo guidelines), with a view to ensuring compliance with the humanitarian principles of neutrality, humanity, impartiality and independence;
- (d) insists that EU assistance in the event of natural or man-made disasters should aim, wherever possible, at helping the local economy, for example by purchasing locally or regionally produced foodstuffs as well as providing the necessary materials for farmers in order to relaunch the rural economy;
- (e) asks the Council and the Commission to clarify the arrangements for cooperation and coordination between the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the Commission for the management of a large-scale disaster response outside the territory of the European Union;
- (f) suggests localised coordination efforts, in cooperation with the national government of the affected state, using EU and Member States' representatives on the ground to ensure a targeted and competent response to affected localities;
- (g) urges the Council to strengthen the EU's disaster response capacity as a high priority, especially in view of the discussions on setting up an EU Civil Protection Force, and to follow up the European Parliament's repeated requests that the proposals put forward in the Barnier report in 2006 should be implemented;
- (h) calls for the immediate establishment of an EU Civil Protection Force which must be adequately equipped with the necessary technological and technical resources;

- (i) calls also, in the context of operations following a natural disaster, for better coordination between the humanitarian agencies and the civil protection mechanisms of the Member States and DG ECHO, and any future European civil protection force;
- (j) urges the Commission to develop programs with national governments, local authorities and civil society organisations in beneficiary countries with regard to community-based disaster prevention and response management capacity;
- (k) encourages the Council to adopt, under the ordinary legislative procedure, measures (to be proposed by the Commission) for improving the predictability and the forward-planning capacity of the current EU civil protection mechanism, which is currently based on ad-hoc and voluntary contributions from Member States; suggests that these measures may include arrangements tested under the EU Preparatory Action including EU-level assets, voluntary pooling of resources, mapping of existing capacities, identification of scenarios and the development of further training activities;
- (l) calls also for realistic budgets in which appropriations for natural disasters or humanitarian action are allocated on the basis of previous years' spending;
- (m) considers that the EU civil protection force should build on the EU Civil Protection mechanism, should optimise the tools available, which would gain in efficiency and visibility, should involve the voluntary pooling of existing logistical and human resources with regard both to disaster-response training and disaster management by developing initiatives taken during preparatory actions, and it should be capable of providing initial aid within 24 hours of the occurrence of a disaster;
- (n) recommends that the EU civil protection force be based on the principles that it should:
 - be based on an assessment of needs, with the participation of all humanitarian actors,
 - be civilian
 - operate under the banner of the EU
 - observe international humanitarian law
 - respect the voluntary nature of the Member States' participation in the intended arrangements
 - be based on the principle of burden-sharing
 - be open to contributions from non-EU countries
 - recognise the UN's overall role in coordinating international relief outside the territory of the European Union;
 - be organised on a preventive basis, according to specific scenarios;
- (o) considers that, with particular reference to humanitarian aid operations, and based on the lessons learned from intervention in Haiti and Pakistan, the EU should, as far as possible, operate under the coordinating umbrella of the UN, concentrating on those fields where its intervention can contribute greater added value;
- (p) considers that the European civil protection force could be based on a commitment by some Member States to voluntarily make available pre-determined civil protection modules that are ready to intervene immediately in EU operations coordinated by the MIC, that most of these modules, which are already available nationally and thus would

not entail significant additional costs, would remain under their control, and that the deployment of these modules placed on standby would form the nucleus of the EU's civil protection system for responding to disasters inside and outside the EU;

- (q) considers that additional civil protection modules could be financed by the EU for certain specific requirements where gaps have been identified and where the European level would add value, and stresses the importance of increasing funding for transport and developing standby transport modules;
- (r) underlines the need to develop a comprehensive and proactive approach in response to disasters, coordinating the various means of action available to the Union and its Member States, such as crisis management (civil and military), financial assistance and development or social and environmental policies; believes in this context that the transition between disaster response and post-disaster reconstruction should be managed more efficiently; recalls the proposal to set up a European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty (Article 214(5)), and with a view to the European Year of Volunteering 2011 encourages the European Commission and the Council to work, together with the European Parliament, on the rules and procedures for the operation of the Corps as soon as possible, especially in the light of similar initiatives taken by some Member States;
- (s) reminds the Council that the use of military assets and capabilities in disaster response, particularly for logistics, transport and infrastructure support for humanitarian aid operations, should be exceptional, used as a 'last resort' and always in compliance with existing agreements such as the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid and the Oslo guidelines on the use of military and civil defence assets in international disaster relief;
- (t) acknowledges that military and civil defence assets in disaster relief should be used as a last resort, in compliance with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid and the Oslo guidelines; recalls that military means often constitute an important contribution to disaster response, along with civil protection and humanitarian aid, and notes that military assets can be necessary for filling critical capacity gaps (particularly strategic lift, specialised assets, heavy engineering and transport); therefore stresses the need to develop a comprehensive approach and to improve synergies between civil and military capabilities, and to identify areas in which Member States can pool their efforts and capabilities at EU level to contribute to EU disaster response, which is particularly important in a difficult economic climate;
- (u) emphasises the need to build up permanently available civilian capabilities in the EU which operate independently from military structures and to identify areas in which Member States can pool their efforts and capabilities at EU level in this respect;
- (v) urges the Council and the Commission to cooperate on the implementation of a visibility action plan that should include concrete measures to enhance the visibility of the EU's disaster response;
- (w) encourages the utilisation of the Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (GMES) system to keep potential crisis areas under surveillance, allowing for better preparedness in sending humanitarian support, and stresses the critical importance of

establishing a follow-up mechanism on EU efforts and assessment of deployed assistance;

- (x) encourages the development of research budgets and industrial capacity (for example satellite imagery in the GMES programme) to improve disaster management phases;
 - (y) invites the Council to take the above recommendations into consideration when examining and reaching conclusions on the forthcoming Commission Communication on reinforcing the European Union's Disaster Response Capacity, announced by the European Commission;
2. Instructs its President to forward this recommendation to the Council and, for information, to the Commission.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Introduction:

The multiplication of major disasters (natural/ man made) outside the European Union in recent years has led to increased calls to improve the effectiveness of the existing EU disaster response capacity. If the EU disaster response capacity has constantly evolved since the establishment of the community civil protection mechanism in 2001, the Rapporteur believes that much more needs to be done to ensure a coordinated, coherent and visible EU response.

This need for a more coherent response was also highlighted in the latest Communication from the Commission on "reinforcing the Union's disaster response capacity", which dates back from March 2008. This communication was supposed to be a first step on the road to a comprehensive and integrated EU response. It included an Action Plan with a number of concrete actions to gradually build up a more integrated coordination between the various instruments for disaster response.

Since then, one of the greatest steps towards a more integrated response has been the inclusion of civil protection and humanitarian aid under the portfolio of a single Commissioner. While it is too early to assess results, there is no doubt that this portfolio rearrangement creates opportunities for enhanced coherence and coordination of the EU disaster response. However, two years after the publication of 2008 Commission Communication, many actions from the Action Plan still remain to be implemented while the EU response to recent crises have revealed the limitations of the existing system.

The Rapporteur believes that it is high time to recognise the political importance of reinforcing the EU disaster response capacity and that all means should be mobilised to achieve this objective. In this regard, the Rapporteur regrets that many concrete proposals included in the 2006 Barnier report on setting-up a European Civil Protection Force have been largely ignored or have only seen limited progress.

As the decision to draft an own-initiative report was originally triggered by the situation in Haiti, this report limits its scope to the external dimension of the EU disaster response capacity.

Lessons from recent crises with a special focus on Haiti

The EU's response to the earthquake in Haiti, combining notably the activation of the EU civil protection mechanism, the use of military assets and the deployment of a significant and large scale humanitarian assistance response, clearly showed the complexity of existing tools and procedures.

While the Rapporteur acknowledges that the response by the Member States and the EU institutions was swift and large scale, the management of the crisis also raised a number of challenges in terms of efficiency, coordination and visibility.

- **The efficiency challenge**

In terms of *humanitarian aid*, it has to be acknowledged that the response was extremely fast and effective with the quick deployment of ECHO experts on the field and the allocation of fast track humanitarian funds (3 million EUR) within 24 hours. This initial response was later on complemented by additional resources for a total amount of 120 million EUR.

The *EU civil protection mechanism* was activated on the very day the earthquake struck and the assistance provided through the Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC) was quite significant - with urban search and rescue teams, medical teams and the provision of supplies, shelter and water sanitation.

Although in the case of Haiti the system worked relatively well, the deployment of the EU civil protection assistance is inevitably delayed by the mechanics of the current system which is based on voluntary and ad-hoc contributions subject to different national decision-making processes. One of the major weaknesses of the system is that it is impossible to guarantee in advance that key assets will be available and that major gaps will be avoided.

Among the positive lessons to be drawn from Haiti is the fact that, for the first time, the European Commission was able to directly deploy a water purification unit (run by France) and an advanced medical post with surgery (run by Italy), that were kept on stand-by under arrangements financed through a Preparatory Action for an EU rapid response capability (2008 budget).

The Rapporteur believes that the encouraging results of the 2008 Preparatory Action should be further assessed and that the idea of a voluntary pool of Member States assets on stand-by for immediate deployment in EU operations should be further developed. In this context, the Rapporteur would like to remind Council and Commission of the following recommendation from the Barnier report: "Only preventive organisation and a pooling of existing resources can bring about the emergence of a European civil protection force".

The Haiti crisis has also shown that the *deployment of military assets* can be extremely useful to complement the provision of relief assistance. It will be important to explore how the correct use of military assets in disaster response can be made more effective.

In this respect, the Rapporteur believes that the use of military assets and capabilities as part of a civilian-led response to a natural disaster should under all circumstances continue to be governed by existing guidelines such as the European Consensus on humanitarian aid and the Oslo Guidelines on the use of military and civil defence assets in disaster relief (updated in November 2006).

- **The coordination challenge**

Given the magnitude of the crisis and the number of actors involved, the coordination process in the aftermath of the earthquake proved quite challenging, both at the operational and at the strategic/political level.

As mentioned above, the coordination process through the Monitoring and Information Centre

(MIC) has been quite effective in Haiti but there were (and still are) instances of national assistance being provided without any prior coordination.

In the context of Haiti, ECHO and the MIC quickly conducted joint needs assessments, but it proved difficult to exchange information and to organize joint needs assessments with EU Member States during the immediate relief phase. This situation resulted in various and overlapping flows of reports, complicating the adequate mobilization of available relief assets. As already mentioned above, at the Commission level, the coordination process was facilitated by the recent inclusion of civil protection and humanitarian aid under a single DG. This new distribution of portfolios led to greater in-service consultation and created opportunities for joint assessments and better information sharing.

In this context, it is important to recall that the "use of civil protection – where deployed in any humanitarian crisis- should be needs-driven and complementary to and coherent with humanitarian aid" as stipulated in the European humanitarian consensus.

The crisis in Haiti also occurred at a time of *institutional transition* with the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty and discussions on the establishment of the European External Action Service (EEAS). For the management of the Haiti crisis, it has been reported that efforts have been made to put the Lisbon Treaty spirit into practice through increased interaction between the Commission services and the Council.

However, the earthquake was immediately followed by a period of confusion over who should take the lead for the coordination of the EU's overall action. Given the magnitude of the crisis, the coordination of the EU assistance was finally ensured by High Representative/Vice President Ashton in close coordination with Commissioner Georgieva in charge of humanitarian aid, civil protection and international cooperation.

In the future, it is expected that the EEAS will create a single crisis response, which will require a rationalisation of the existing crisis platforms. Clear mechanisms for coordination between the Commission services and the Council secretariat will have to be clarified also in relation to the coordination and the use of EU military assets in a disaster response.

- **The visibility challenge**

The lack of visibility of the EU response has also been highlighted as one of the main shortcomings of EU interventions in Haiti. The same criticism has been made in relation to the EU response to the floods in Pakistan in July/August 2010.

The Rapporteur believes that clear agreements and procedures should be established to ensure a dual visibility (for both the member states and the European Union) for civil protection assets deployed by Member States through the EU civil protection mechanism. A first and essential precondition for such dual visibility will however be the political willingness from Member States to pool information and assets under a unified EU flag rather than under their national banner.

In relation to the visibility issue, the Rapporteur also believes that more attention should be paid to improve the monitoring as well as the overall communication around the EU disaster

response. A continued flow of information should be provided with data that should continue to be updated even after the emergency phase.

Control over the use of budgets and information on results should be made available to provide evidence to the European public opinion that aid has been real, concrete and properly managed.

Conclusions

The brief analysis of lessons learned from Haiti clearly shows the need for further reforms of the EU disaster response capacity. In this context, it also needs to be underlined that a more efficient and rapid response to emergencies will require a strong political will from the different parties in presence.

If efforts have recently been made to reinforce the coherence and coordination between the civil protection and humanitarian aid dimensions of the EU response, steps towards the creation of a European civil protection force have remained minimal. The Rapporteur argues that it is high time to make further progress in this field, notably by putting into practice a number of concrete proposals that were included in the 2006 Barnier report (Towards a European Civil Protection Force).

23.3.2010

PROPOSAL FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL B7-0228/2010

pursuant to Rule 121(1) of the Rules of Procedure

on setting up an EU rapid response capability

Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Charles Goerens, Louis Michel, Marielle De Sarnez, Frédérique Ries

on behalf of the ALDE Group

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the European Union’s global responsibility to provide rapid humanitarian aid and assistance and to the considerable efforts the EU deploys worldwide,
- having regard to the need for better coordination and pooling of existing humanitarian assistance, within 24 hours of a disaster,
- having regard to the fact that, following the recent earthquake in Haiti, the Commission for the first time successfully deployed there two modules made available through a preparatory action on an EU rapid response capability, established with Parliament’s support,
- having regard to the proposals contained in the report ‘For a European civil protection force: europe aid’, drawn up by Michel Barnier in 2006,
- having regard to Rule 121(1) of its Rules of Procedure,

1. Addresses the following recommendation to the Council:

that it call on the Commission to bring proposals before Parliament as soon as possible for establishing an EU civil protection force based on the EU Civil Protection Mechanism and enabling the Union to bring together the resources necessary for providing initial emergency humanitarian aid within 24 hours of a disaster;

that a European rapid response mechanism should

- be civilian and/or humanitarian
- be capable of being mobilised at any time and as rapidly as possible
- operate under the banner of the EU
- observe international humanitarian law
- be open to cooperation with other bodies involved in humanitarian action
- be prepared to cooperate with the UN system

- be open to contributions from third countries
- respect the voluntary nature of the Member States' participation in the intended arrangements
- endeavour on an ongoing basis to keep up the standard of the human and material resources available for mobilisation at any time
- be based on the principle of burden sharing;

that it call on the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the Commissioner for International Cooperation, Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Response to play a leading role in coordinating the Union's crisis response, using the responsibilities created under the Lisbon Treaty to coordinate the Union's response to future crises more effectively, while building on what has already been achieved.

2. Instructs its President to forward this recommendation to the Council and, for information, to the Commission.

28.10.2010

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

for the Committee on Development

on setting up an EU rapid response capability
(2010/2096(INI))

Rapporteur: Renate Weber

SUGGESTIONS

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

1. Recalls the pivotal role of the High Representative/Vice-President in coordinating EU operations in third countries and regions; underlines that the structure and working methods of the European External Action Service (EEAS) should aim at ensuring the coherence and consistency of EU action in crisis situations; calls therefore on the Council to grant the HR/VP a permanent mandate allowing her to activate a crisis cell, gathering representatives from all the appropriate services of the Commission and the Council and from all EU planning capabilities (MIC, CMPD, EUMS, CPCC) to coordinate the EU response in the event of disaster, in order to be able to start work quickly without having to systematically go to the Council; suggests that this cell could be supported by a team, deployable within the first hours of the crisis, could be composed of civilian (CRT, MIC), military and civ-mil (EUMS, CPCC) experts and could also benefit from SITCEN and SATCEN intelligence;
2. Emphasises the need for optimal coordination between an EU disaster response and other EU instruments - particularly Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) civil or military missions and instruments (i.e. Battlegroups) – which are already on the ground or which could be set up in the aftermath of a disaster; also underlines that EU response could rely as well on available multinational forces, such as the European Air Transport Command in Eindhoven which could for example play a role in coordinating Member States' strategic transport capabilities;
3. Acknowledges that military and civil defence assets in disaster relief should be used as a last resort, in compliance with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid and the Oslo

Guidelines; recalls that military means often constitute an important contribution to disaster response, along with civil protection and humanitarian aid, and notes that military assets can be necessary for filling critical capacity gaps (particularly strategic lift, specialised assets, heavy engineering and transport); therefore stresses the need to develop a comprehensive approach and to improve synergies between civil and military capabilities, and to identify areas in which Member States can pool their efforts and capabilities at EU level to contribute to EU disaster response, which is particularly important in a difficult economic climate;

4. Calls therefore on the High Representative/Vice-President and Member States to make substantial efforts to explore synergies in dual civil-military use of strategic airlift capacities; welcomes the cooperation between the Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC) and the European Union Movement Planning Cell (EUMPC) in the EU disaster response effort in Pakistan in this regard; calls on Member States to substantially increase air transport capabilities pooled in the European Air Transport Command (EATC) while ensuring dual civil-military use of these capabilities; welcomes in this regard the proposal by the Belgian Presidency to establish a multinational helicopter corps in the framework of the EATC to be used for both civilian and military tasks;
5. Encourages the Council to continue on-going discussions about improving the predictability of the EU Civil Protection Mechanism and calls for the immediate establishment of an EU Civil Protection Force, as suggested by the Barnier report as long ago as 2006;
6. Underlines the need to develop a comprehensive and proactive approach in response to disasters, coordinating the various means of action available to the Union and its Member States, such as crisis management (civil and military), financial assistance and development or social and environmental policies; believes in this context that the transition between disaster response and post-disaster reconstruction should be managed more efficiently; recalls the proposal to set up a European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty (Article 214(5)), and with a view to the European Year of Volunteering 2011 encourages the European Commission and the Council to work, together with the European Parliament, on the rules and procedures for the operation of the Corps as soon as possible, especially in the light of similar initiatives taken by some Member States;
7. Recalls the existing structures, capabilities and instruments developed under the CSDP since the Helsinki and Feira European Councils, and stresses that civilian crisis management (including civilian response teams) can be financed from the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) budget; therefore supports the development of a rapid response capability that does not duplicate, but is complementary to, the existing structures and capabilities within the CFSP framework;
8. Recalls the need to respect the coordinating role of the United Nations and to recognise the contribution of other international actors.

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	28.10.2010
Result of final vote	+: 39 -: 8 0: 2
Members present for the final vote	Gabriele Albertini, Pino Arlacchi, Franziska Katharina Brantner, Frieda Brepoels, Elmar Brok, Arnaud Danjean, Mário David, Marietta Giannakou, Ana Gomes, Andrzej Grzyb, Takis Hadjigeorgiou, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Tunne Kelam, Andrey Kovatchev, Eduard Kukan, Vytautas Landsbergis, Sabine Lösing, Ulrike Lunacek, Kyriakos Mavronikolas, Alexander Mirsky, Annemie Neyts-Uyttebroeck, Raimon Obiols, Kristiina Ojuland, Ria Oomen-Ruijten, Pier Antonio Panzeri, Vincent Peillon, Alojz Peterle, Hans-Gert Pöttering, José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra, Nikolaos Salavrakos, Jacek Saryusz-Wolski, Werner Schulz, Adrian Severin, Charles Tannock, Zoran Thaler, Geoffrey Van Orden, Kristian Vigenin, Graham Watson
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Christian Ehler, Kinga Gál, Georgios Koumoutsakos, Barbara Lochbihler, Norbert Neuser, Vittorio Prodi, Potito Salatto, Judith Sargentini, Marietje Schaake, Traian Ungureanu, Renate Weber

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	9.11.2010
Result of final vote	+: 20 -: 0 0: 0
Members present for the final vote	Thijs Berman, Corina Crețu, Nirj Deva, Charles Goerens, Catherine Grèze, András Gyürk, Eva Joly, Filip Kaczmarek, Gay Mitchell, Norbert Neuser, Bill Newton Dunn, Maurice Ponga, Birgit Schnieber-Jastram, Michèle Striffler, Alf Svensson, Eleni Theoharous, Ivo Vajgl, Anna Záborská, Iva Zanicchi
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Judith Sargentini