



Basic information	
2010/2299(INI) INI - Own-initiative procedure Development of the common security and defence policy following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty Subject 6.10.02 Common security and defence policy (CSDP); WEU, NATO	Procedure completed

Key players				
European Parliament	Committee responsible		Rapporteur	Appointed
	AFET Foreign Affairs		GUALTIERI Roberto (S&D)	28/10/2010
			Shadow rapporteur LISEK Krzysztof (PPE) DUFF Andrew (ALDE) BÜTIKOFER Reinhard (Verts /ALE) LÖSING Sabine (GUE/NGL)	
European Commission	Commission DG		Commissioner	
	External Relations		ASHTON Catherine	

Key events			
Date	Event	Reference	Summary
16/12/2010	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
13/04/2011	Vote in committee		Summary
29/04/2011	Committee report tabled for plenary	A7-0166/2011	
11/05/2011	Decision by Parliament	T7-0228/2011	Summary
11/05/2011	Results of vote in Parliament		
11/05/2011	Debate in Parliament		
11/05/2011	End of procedure in Parliament		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2010/2299(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Initiative
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 55
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	AFET/7/04797

Documentation gateway				
European Parliament				
Document type	Committee	Reference	Date	Summary
Committee draft report		PE458.483	02/03/2011	
Amendments tabled in committee		PE460.912	22/03/2011	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A7-0166/2011	29/04/2011	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T7-0228/2011	11/05/2011	Summary

Development of the common security and defence policy following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty

2010/2299(INI) - 11/05/2011 - Text adopted by Parliament, single reading

The European Parliament adopted a resolution on the development of the common security and defence policy following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. It emphasises that the new provisions on Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) introduced by the Lisbon Treaty provide a firm political statement of the Union's intention to act as a force for stability in the world.

Security and foreign policy: Members underline that the duty of consistency as defined by the Treaty and recent ECJ case law protect both the primacy of the Community method and the distinguishing features of the CFSP, while encouraging the convergence of different policies and instruments in a comprehensive approach. They note that military assets can be also deployed in the event of natural and man-made disasters, as shown in practice by the EU Military Staff coordination of military capabilities in support of civilian-led humanitarian relief operations during the Pakistan floods in 2010. Parliament expresses concern, therefore, that, more than one year after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, there are not yet clear signs of a post-Lisbon EU comprehensive approach enabling traditional procedural and institutional barriers to be overcome, while preserving respective legal prerogatives when European citizens' security is at stake.

Members regret the unwillingness of the EU Member States to define a common position on the Libya crisis, and express deep concern about the risk of considering ad hoc coalitions of the willing or bilateral cooperation as viable substitutes for CSDP, as no European State has the capacity to be a significant security and defence actor in the 21st century world. They reiterate that the mandate given in UN Security Council Resolution 1973(2011) to protect Libyan civilians should not be exceeded through the disproportionate use of force. Parliament considers it crucial to work closely with the Interim Transitional National Council, the African Union and the Arab League in order to channel the current military conflict towards political and diplomatic solutions, including the objective of securing the resignation of the Gaddafi regime. The elaboration of a strategy for the Sahel region and the Horn of Africa is yet another concrete opportunity to demonstrate the ability of the EU to act both on security and development challenges.

Parliament goes on to appeal to the Council to provide immediate humanitarian support to Misrata and other population centres, specifically by naval means. It is profoundly concerned about the increasing number of victims of the conflict in Libya and the Gaddafi regime's reported use of cluster munitions and other arms against the civilian population. Members deeply regret that the mandate of EUFOR was limited to humanitarian aspects when there was a clear case for the EU to take the lead in maritime surveillance and in humanitarian assistance and protection of civilians in Libya. They also regret the decision of some Member States to veto a broader mandate for EUFOR Libya while at the same time conducting such operations on their own, and want a start to be made on planning a potential CSDP operation in the medium to long term in Libya in the areas of security sector reform, institution-building and border management.

The European Council is urged to carry out its task of identifying the strategic interests and political objectives of the EU by drawing up a **European foreign policy strategy** which should be based on real convergence of the different dimensions of EU external action and subject to regular review. Members call on the European Council and its President to set about this task by engaging in **political dialogue with the European Parliament** and to

discuss Parliament's recommendations, maintaining that such a dialogue is required in the light of the new Treaty provisions. They also call on the Vice-President/High Representative (VP/HR) to interpret her role as a proactive one and to pursue a constructive dialogue with Parliament in the framework of the twofold effort to foster a political consensus among the Member States on the strategic directions and policy options for the CFSP and the CSDP, and to exploit the potential for the CFSP-CSDP to act synergistically with the other sectors of EU external action.

Parliament regrets the fact that the provisional organisation chart of the EEAS does not include all existing units dealing with crisis response planning and programming, conflict prevention and peace building with the CSDP structures. It calls for the following:

(i) the organisation of regular meetings of a crisis management board to be composed of the CMPD, the CCPC, the EUMS, the EU SITCEN, the peace-building, conflict prevention, mediation and security policy units, the Chair of the PSC, the geographical desks and other policy departments concerned, placed under the authority of the VP/HR and the executive Secretary-General and with the participation of the Commission humanitarian aid, civil protection and internal security structures according to the circumstances. These meetings would be coordinated by the Managing Director for Crisis Response. The VP/HR and the Commission are asked to equip the board with an alert and emergency system and a large unified operations room, located within the EEAS, so as to enable surveillance to be carried out 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, hence avoiding the present operational overlapping, which hardly squares with the need for a proper surveillance and rapid reaction system to deal with crises. Regular coordination and exchange should be ensured between this system and the European emergency response centre currently being developed by the Commission;

(ii) a permanent working structure involving the above-mentioned actors going beyond acute crisis management in order to develop common approaches, in areas such as the rule of law and security sector reform;

(iii) a midterm review of the current arrangements with a view to establishing truly integrated strategic planning and conceptual development in the field of crisis management and peace building for the EEAS.

The Crisis Management Board should **provide the EEAS with unified contingency planning in relation to potential theatres and crisis scenarios** and also coordinate the use of the various financial instruments and deployment of capabilities available to the EU.

Security and defence: Members reaffirm that credible military capabilities are a sine qua non for an autonomous CSDP and that Member States need to provide them. They further stress that those military capabilities can be applied for diverse purposes, not least for civilian ones. Parliament regrets the **sharp contrast** between the EUR 200 billion per year spent by the Member States on defence, the lack of means at the EU's disposal and the painfully protracted force generation conferences for EU military operations at a time when there are redundant capabilities and personnel. It deplores the fact that over more than twelve years the method of the force generation process has not yielded any de facto improvements regarding the quantity and quality of military capabilities available for CSDP missions. Members stress the need to evaluate the improvements of military capabilities on a regular basis, pointing out that there is an **increasing mismatch between growing demand from abroad and the resources that Member States make available to the Union**. They also call on Member States to develop greater transparency regarding their respective defence budgets. The committee also stresses the following:

- the CFSP and CSDP, should also lead to disarmament and non-proliferations of weapons ranging from small and light weapons (SALW) to nuclear warheads and ballistic missiles and the VP/HR should give this policy priority;
- economies of scale are not being achieved since there are widespread overlapping of defence programmes in the EU, such as the more than 20 armoured vehicle programmes, the 6 different attack submarine programmes, the 5 ground-to-air missile programmes and the 3 combat aircraft programmes – this means limited economic resources are wasted, hampers the competitiveness of the whole security-related industrial sector in Europe.

Parliament calls for an extraordinary European Council meeting to be given over to European security and defence, and renews its call for the drafting of a **White Paper** on European security and defence.

Members recognise the soundness of the **Battlegroups**, but calls for the concept and the structure of the Battlegroups, which have so far never been deployed, to be carefully reviewed for an increased degree of flexibility and efficiency. They believe that consideration could be given to:

- specialising one of the two Battlegroups in niche capabilities and/or capabilities suited to low-intensity conflicts entailing mixed civilian-military tasks;
- the **operating costs should be charged to the ATHENA mechanism**, which is due to be reviewed under the Polish Presidency;

Parliament recommends that the **ATHENA mechanism be reformed with a view to rationalising and increasing the proportion of common costs** (at present estimated to be about 10%) so as to make for fairer burden-sharing in military operations, in which the participants in a mission, who already bear a heavy responsibility in terms of risks and costs, are obliged in the current situation to undertake a further economic responsibility. It calls for the **establishment of the start-up fund for preparatory activities in the lead-up to military operations** to speed up the disbursement of funds, and for this measure to be covered by the ATHENA mechanism review proposal.

Security in partnership: Members maintain that the trend towards multi-polarity in the international system and the establishment of strategic partnerships must be encompassed within an active commitment to promoting multilateralism. They call on those Member States which have seats on the UN Security Council to defend common positions and interests of the EU and to work towards a reform of the UN whereby the EU as such could have its own permanent seat. Parliament recognises that NATO constitutes the foundation of collective defence for those Member States which belong to it and reaches beyond its Member States. It looks forward to the proposals of the High Representative as tasked by the European Council conclusions of September 2010 referring to EU-NATO cooperation in crisis management.

Members recall that, in addition to partnerships with other international organisations such as the UN, NATO and the African Union, cooperation with individual third countries should be enhanced in the context of the CSDP. Experience shows that third countries can bring important assets, human resources and expertise to CSDP missions, such as in the context of EUFOR Chad/CAR, for which Russia provided much-needed helicopters. The

involvement of third countries can also enhance the legitimacy of CSDP operations and help set up a broader security dialogue with important partners while remaining committed to promoting respect for human rights and the rule of law.