

2006 annual report on the CFSP

2007/2219(INI) - 06/05/2008

The Committee on Foreign Affairs adopted the own initiative report by Jacek **SARYUSZ-WOLSKI** (EPP-ED, PL) on the 2006 report on the CFSP (Common Foreign and Security Policy), noting that, from its inception, the CFSP, including the ESDP (European Security and Defence Policy), has helped to strengthen the European identity and the EU's role as a global player. Nevertheless, the parliamentary committee takes the view that the EU's role in the world is not commensurate with its potential and that it should establish clear objectives and effective measures, while speaking with one voice. The CFSP must also gain greater democratic legitimacy by allowing the Parliament to scrutinise this policy while also speaking with one voice.

The 2006 Annual Report on the CFSP: while welcoming the Council's 2006 report, MEPs expect the next annual report to take into account the relevant resolutions and/or recommendations adopted by the Parliament. The Parliament should more systematically adopt positions on each successive stage of CFSP and ESDP decision-making and common positions and joint actions should better take into account those positions adopted by Parliament.

It is in this context that MEPs define their **priorities** on certain aspects of CFSP for 2008, which can be summarised as follows:

1. **Horizontal priorities:** according to MEPs, priority should be given to a limited number of subjects, particularly: (a) issues of current concern for Europe (such as terrorism and organised crime); (b) energy security, climate change and sustainable development; (c) improvement of stability in the neighbouring regions; (d) crisis management and conflict prevention and resolution; (e) the non-dissemination of weapons of mass destruction; (f) migration management; (g) the promotion of human rights and civil liberties. They call for the creation of appropriate structures and procedures aimed at improving crisis management through, for example, the development of a legal framework which defines the right to intervene and the obligation to protect in crisis situations. In particular, MEPs consider that the Union's dependence on energy from unstable or undemocratic countries and regions poses a serious problem. That is why they recommend wide-ranging diversification of energy sources and energy transport routes as well as increased solidarity in energy security policy among EU Member States. They deplore, in particular, the uncoordinated signing of bilateral energy agreements by Member States (which call into question the strategic projects of the Union as a whole). Furthermore, they call for the creation of the post of High Official for Foreign Energy Policy under the authority of the future High Representative.
2. **Priorities in the geographical areas:** MEPs are of the view that the Union's enlargement and integration process remains a key foreign policy priority. However, **stability in the Western Balkans** should remain the top priority. In this context, dialogue with Serbia should be intensified through concrete steps, including through the visa liberalisation road-map and measures to ensure that the country does not become isolated. Furthermore, links with Kosovo must be strengthened through, for example, the EULEX mission in Kosovo, and efforts must be made to improve the situation of minorities in all the countries of the Western Balkans. The other main priority is the strengthening of the European Neighbourhood Policy (**ENP**), given that the persistence of unresolved conflicts in the ENP countries represents a serious challenge to the security of the EU's external borders. Other areas must also be tackled such as developing economic cooperation, political stability and democracy in the three key regional cooperation areas, namely **the Mediterranean, the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea**. MEPs consider, in this respect, that equal attention between these regions would be best assured by devising new organisational structures for regional cooperation (particularly in Black Sea and Baltic Sea regions). In addition, MEPs underline

the need to strengthen the transatlantic alliance by focusing discussions with the United States on civil conflict prevention, the international legal order, peace and disarmament, sustainable development and combating poverty. Lastly, the two main areas that also merit the full attention of CFSP are the EU's relations with **Russia** (focusing on the issue of energy) and **negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians**.

MEPs then review the other main areas that the CFSP should tackle. These include nuclear non-proliferation and the promotion of international solidarity, stability, peace and democratic development (for example, in Afghanistan or in African or South American countries). Particular attention should also be paid to China, which remains a topic of great concern following the events in Tibet.

Treaty of Lisbon: MEPs welcome the improvements brought about by the Treaty of Lisbon regarding external action, the CFSP and the ESDP, which is to become the CSDP (Common Security and Defence Policy). They hope that this Treaty will be promptly ratified in all Member States, as it will have a considerable impact on Council-Parliament-Commission relations in the area of foreign policy. Once again they urge parliamentary scrutiny of this policy and call on the Council to respond in a substantive manner to the concerns expressed in formal communications from Parliament on cases of breaches of human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

Other wishes are expressed such as the review of Council-Parliament relations to take account of the major reforms of the future CSDP. An interinstitutional agreement between Parliament and the Council should therefore be established, in order to define their working relations in this area as well as Parliament's request for transparency on all of these issues (MEPs call, in particular, for confidential information in this area to be shared with designated members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs). At the same time, MEPs **request that the future High Representative/Vice-President of the Commission take office together with the new Commission on 1 November 2009**. While the Treaty of Lisbon is yet to enter into force, they suggest that a temporary solution be found. In any case, an ad hoc hearing procedure needs to be established within the Parliament for the nomination of the High Representative/Vice-President of the Commission since, according to MEPs, this highly symbolic role **will draw its legitimacy directly from the European Parliament**.

MEPs also review the thorny issue of financing of the CFSP/CSDP in the light of the Treaty of Lisbon. Aware of the strengthening of Parliament's budgetary powers once the new Treaty enters into force, MEPs regret the unnecessary complexity of the arrangements for the rapid financing of CSDP activities (outside the EU budget). They request that, in the spirit of the Interinstitutional Agreement of 17 May 2006, which provides for a structured dialogue between the Council and Parliament, the Council should inform Parliament prior to the adoption of any decision entailing CFSP expenditure. Furthermore, they regard the total amount of EUR 1 740 million allocated to the CFSP for the period from 2007 to 2013 as insufficient to achieve the ambitions and specific goals of the EU as a global player, while recognising that the CFSP funding agreed for 2008, amounting to EUR 285 million, represents an important step forward compared to previous allocations of funds. However, they urge better control over this expenditure.

Lastly, MEPs note that they will make specific proposals about the financing and budgetary control of the **European External Action Service (EEAS)** as it will have a significant impact on the Union's external relations. MEPs therefore recall their right to be consulted on the establishment of the

EEAS, in accordance with Article 13a(3) of the EU Treaty, and hope that the establishment of the EEAS will provide greater clarity with regard to the criteria for EU Special Representatives, including their appointment and the definition of their tasks and mandate.