

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

Committee on Foreign Affairs

2008/2202(INI)

5.11.2008

DRAFT REPORT

on the European Security Strategy and ESDP
(2008/2202(INI))

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Rapporteur: Karl von Wogau

CONTENTS

	Page
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION	3

MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

on the European Security Strategy and ESDP (2008/2202(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the European Security Strategy entitled ‘A secure Europe in a better world’, adopted by the European Council on 12 December 2003,
- having regard to the EU Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, adopted by the European Council on 12 December 2003,
- having regard to the paper from the High Representative and the European Commission to the European Council entitled ‘Climate change and international security’,
- having regard to its resolution of 14 April 2005 on the European Security Strategy¹,
- having regard to its resolution of 5 June 2008 on the implementation of the European Security Strategy and ESDP (P6_TA-PROV(2008)0255),
- having regard to its resolution of 16 November 2006 on the implementation of the European Security Strategy in the context of the ESDP (P6_TA(2006)0495),
- having regard to its resolution of 10 July 2008 on space and security (P6_TA(2008)0365),
- having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,
- having regard to the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (A6-0000/2008) and the opinion of the Committee on Budgets,

General considerations

1. Points out that the European Union needs a strong and effective foreign, security and defence policy in order to defend its interests in the world, to protect the security of its citizens and to defend human rights;
2. Notes that this policy has to combine the use of both civil and military assets and capabilities and necessitates close and seamless cooperation between all stakeholders;
3. Stresses that transparency and cost-efficiency are crucial to ensure public support for European defence;
4. Considers that both the European Security Strategy and the NATO Strategic Concept are being reviewed at almost the same time, thus offering an opportunity to arrive at a coherent approach to the future security of Europe;

¹ OJ C 33 E, 9.2.2006, p. 580.

European security interests

5. Points out that until now, Member States have defined their security interests on a purely national basis while the notion of "European security interest", by contrast, is still politically taboo; considers this approach no longer acceptable;
6. Considers it therefore necessary to define the Union's common security interests; stresses that only with a clear idea of its common interests can the European Union make its common policy more coherent and effective;
7. Is of the opinion that the security interests of the Union include the security of its neighbourhood, the protection of its external borders and critical infrastructure, the security of energy supply and sea lanes, and the protection of its space assets;

European security ambitions

8. Considers that the European Union has to define more clearly its ambitions concerning its role in the world; is of the opinion that the European Union should not try to become a superpower like the United States, but that it should instead guarantee its security and security in its neighbourhood and contribute to a multilateral global system of security;

Developing Europe's security strategy

9. Takes note that the 2003 European Security Strategy highlights the main threats faced by the European Union (terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, state failure and organised crime) and identifies strategic objectives, which have become the basis for substrategies;
10. Is of the opinion that, although many elements of the strategy are still valid, others should be adapted; states this is the case in particular for the relationship between the European Union and Russia, EU engagement in Africa, but also its energy supply, climate change and cyber warfare;
11. Suggests that the security strategy should be reviewed every five years at the beginning of a new legislative period for the European Union;
12. Demands the drawing up of a White Paper on European Security and Defence as a tool to ensure that the security strategy is implemented in an efficient way;

Relationship with Russia

13. Regrets that Russia's disproportionate response to the outbreak of violence in the Caucasus and the recognition of South Ossetia and Abkhazia as independent states have plunged the West's relationship with Russia into a crisis; notes with concern that this violation of international law has severely damaged the Euro-Atlantic partnership with Russia;
14. Notes that the European Union took concerted action on the Russian challenge; points out that the rapid reaction of the European Union, which led to the signing of a ceasefire agreement, has demonstrated its capacity for crisis management and common action;
15. Notes the concerns expressed by the Baltic states and requests that NATO draw up specific plans for their defence;
16. Expresses its opinion that existing channels of communication should be used and that the NATO-Russia Council should be reactivated;
17. Considers that a dialogue should be re-established with Russia on energy, missile defence, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, limitation of armed forces and space policy;
18. Points out that, due to its geopolitical position, its military power and political weight, its energy wealth and its economic potential, Russia is of strategic importance for Europe;

Building Europe's capabilities

19. Stresses that the European Union needs the means to implement its policies and hence it needs both civil and military capabilities to strengthen the European Security and Defence Policy and to fulfil its responsibilities in the world;
20. Is of the opinion that the European Union should continue to build its capabilities on the basis of the Helsinki Headline Goal; notes that it should endeavour to make 60 000 soldiers permanently available; reaffirms its proposal that the Eurocorps should be the core of such a force, if necessary reinforced by additional maritime and air capacities;
21. Points out that the EU Member States together spend more than EUR 200 billion per year on defence, which is more than half the defence expenditure of the United States; remains deeply concerned about the lack of efficiency and coordination in using those funds; urges therefore stronger efforts in eliminating unnecessary duplication between Member States;
22. Stresses that capability needs are often technologically very similar or even identical for armed forces operations, border surveillance, protection of critical infrastructure and disaster management; stresses that this creates new opportunities to exploit synergies and enhance interoperability between armed forces and security forces;
23. Strongly urges that the Union should focus its efforts on common capabilities which can be used for both defence and security purposes; considers, in this context, satellite-based

intelligence, observation, early warning, navigation and telecommunications, unmanned air vehicles, helicopters and telecommunications equipment, as well as air and sea transport to be crucial; demands a common technical standard for protected telecommunication;

24. Considers it necessary to allow the use of Galileo and GMES for security and defence purposes;
25. Advocates closer European cooperation in the area of training, maintenance and logistics as crucial prerequisites for more efficiency in defence spending;

The need for new structures

26. Is of the opinion that the capacity of the European Union for autonomous foreign and security policy action should be improved through goal-oriented enhancement of its analysis, planning, leadership and intelligence capacities;
27. Supports the idea of creating a Council of Ministers for Defence in order to make the various national defence policies more coherent, thus boosting the respective national contributions to European Security and Defence Policy;
28. Strongly supports the establishment of a European Defence and Security Market as projected in the Commission's legislative proposals for public procurement and intra-Community transfers and suggests further initiatives to achieve this objective, in particular in the areas of security of supply and security of information;
29. Demands an increase in Community funding for security research and the creation of joint research programmes involving the Commission and the EDA;
30. Considers that the United States' ballistic missile defence system has important implications for Europe, as the subsystems based in the Czech Republic and Poland could also be used to protect parts of Europe; points out that NATO decided in Bucharest to complement this protection by additional elements; is of the opinion that it is necessary to make sure that European interests are safeguarded as regards the force structure, command and control and participation in research and development;

The need for a new spirit

31. Considers it particularly important to strengthen the European Security and Defence College and give it a permanent structure which will contribute more to the development of a specifically European security culture among political and military elites;
32. Demands further initiatives concerning common training and common standards for personnel in civil and military operations, exchange programmes and the opening-up of armies to citizens of other Member States;

o
o o

33. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the parliaments of the Member States and the Secretaries-General of the United Nations, NATO, the OSCE and the Council of Europe.