



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 1 June 2012**

**10709/12**

**PE 236  
COSDP 444  
PESC 664**

**NOTE**

---

From: General Secretariat of the Council  
to: Delegations  
Subject: Summary record of the meeting of the **European Parliament Subcommittee on Security and Defence (SEDE)**, Brussels, 29 May 2012

---

The meeting was chaired by Mr Lisek (EPP, PL), Mr Mavronikolas (S&D, EL) and Mr Paleckis (ALDE, LT).

**I. Civilian missions under CSDP: state of play – Exchange of views with Hansjoerg Haber, Civilian Operations Commander and Director of CPCC**

Director Haber focused on staff issues as this had been requested by the SEDE Subcommittee at his last appearance. In his introduction, he expressed his and the High Representative's thanks to Member States for seconding staff. He elaborated on two concrete cases of staff issues: the recruitment of police forces (Member States having constraints due to the crisis or retaining forces in view of other interventions) and the difficulty in replacing Heads of Missions (only a few applications). He outlined the limited assets available compared to other international organisations (UN, NATO) and the reasons for understaffing in the EU missions (different staff regulations, non-coinciding leaving/recruitment periods, value of participating in mission for national career advancement, reluctance of Member States to send certain staff, decreasing attractiveness of missions over time etc.).

Members put a number of questions to Director Haber, which did not specifically focus on staff. On the Abkhaz authorities' decision to declare the EU Head of Mission (HoM) persona non grata in Georgia (Mr Lisek and Mr Zemke (S&D, PL)) he explained the practical consequences of this decision and reported that the EU had made clear to the Abkhazians and the Russians that this was unacceptable. He added that the EU was unambiguous and would make no concessions on the HoM. On the question regarding cooperation/coordination with other missions (Mr Kelam (EPP, EE), Mr Haber explained that usually UN missions were not located in the same place and that experience had shown that coordination of missions on the ground was essential because of overlaps which could lead to tensions. Mr Haber furthermore enumerated the three upcoming EU missions (Horn of Africa/security sector reform in countries in the region, airport security in South Sudan and Niger (part of the Sahel strategy)). On the future mission in the Horn of Africa, he added that it would focus only on piracy-related aspects. Replying to the question by Ms Gomes (S&D, PT) on the usefulness of establishing a European protection corps, he considered that the target of such a corps mostly did not correspond to those of EU missions. On the questions on the EU mission in Afghanistan (Mr Zemke and Ms Gomes), Director Haber said that the EU had decided to maintain a mission in Afghanistan until the end of the transition but it was likely that more time would be needed for establishment of the Afghan police force; this decision had however to be taken by Member States.

## **II. Exchange of views with Agostino Miozzo, Managing Director for Crisis Response and Operational Coordination (EEAS), on his recent visits to Syria and Yemen**

Mr Miozzo stated that he could not report on Yemen as he was not part of the mission to Yemen. On Syria, the situation was evolving since the tragedy of Houla and that the EU was in close contact with Kofi Annan. He recalled that the EU strongly supported the UN mission, providing logistical support in particular. As regards the observers, he indicated that 217 were currently in place and that soon there should be 300. In his view, it was likely that now was the last opportunity to resolve the situation. Mr Miozzo reported that several interlocutors he had met had criticised the sanctions against Syria as these primarily affected the people. He also stated that, with the remaining Member States delegations, he had focused on consular aspects. Mr Miozzo stressed the spill-over risk for Lebanon and Jordan from Syria (displaced persons), which could subsequently become a stability problem for these countries.

For Turkey he considered that it was managing the refugees well. He underlined that the issue of internally displaced persons could become a huge humanitarian issue if the international community were unable to keep supporting those persons.

Ms Gomes and Ms Flautre (Greens/EFA, FR) had strong words for Member States, considering that they had failed to address the brutality of the regime and to support the Syrian population.

Ms Gomes said that the problem was that there was no real plan B to the Annan plan though it was well known that the plan would fail. She felt that a proxy war was being conducted. Questions put forward by Members concerned the number of observers needed (Mr Kelam), humanitarian corridors (Ms Gomes) and discussions with opposition leaders (Mr Kelam).

Mr Miozzo replied that the Annan plan was not a failure, though the plan was not being respected, and the EU would continue supporting it. He stressed that there was no plan B. Mr Miozzo deplored the fact that the Member States were not acting in a coordinated manner on the Syrian issue, underscoring his statement by referring to the various travel recommendations issued by Member States. On the number of observers needed, he said that much more than the 300 were definitely needed. He reported that the Syrian opposition was divided, referring in particular to the different positions on the question of whether it should speak to the regime. He felt that internal consensus within the opposition was difficult to achieve. As regards humanitarian corridors, he said that this could not be the way forward because it would be an acceptance that there was a war. Mr Miozzo added that there were no more discussions on this idea any more.

### **III. Internal Security Fund - External borders and visas (AFET/7/07974)**

- Rapporteur for the opinion: H el ene Flautre (Verts/ALE)
- Responsible: LIBE – Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)
- Consideration of draft opinion

The rapporteur outlined the main objectives of the numerous amendments she had tabled, focused in particular on monitoring, recalling EU objectives, enhancing human rights, reintroducing asylum requests at borders, linking mobility and visas, and modifying some of the wording used in the proposal.

The Commission said that it had taken note of the amendments and to some extent shared the comments by the rapporteur (i.e. right to ask asylum), though it was opposed to Amendment 12 (as for Ms Gomes). The only Member taking the floor, Ms Gomes (speaking on behalf of Ms Koppa) welcomed the Commission proposal. She expressed doubts as to the legal basis suggested by the Commission and the rapporteur, and agreed that compliance with the EU's external action and human rights had to be ensured. Ms Flautre closed the debate by insisting on the need to take into account asylum requests at borders.

Provisional timetable:

<i>Deadline for tabling amendments:</i>	<i>12 June</i>
<i>Consideration of amendments:</i>	<i>21 June or 11 July</i>
<i>Adoption of the opinion in SEDE:</i>	<i>September</i>
<i>Adoption of the report by the leading committee:</i>	<i>October/November</i>

#### **IV. Public hearing "The proliferation of small arms and light weapons (SALW)"**

Experts provided an overview of the different aspects of SALW from industrial aspects (Professor Krause, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies), over legal instruments (Ms Ganslandt, EEAS) to control issues (Mr Bromely, Senior researcher, SIPRI) and diversion (Mr Poitevin, GRIP). Experts underlined the discrepancy between Member States concerning the controls and the implementation of EU embargos. Recommendations expressed included enhanced controls and regulations, transparency and assessments, evidence based policy, coordination of border controls etc.

Members welcomed the experts' presentations and showed particular interest in the issue of diversion. In reply, the experts explained that diversion happened primarily during the 'post-shipment' phase as the 'in-ship' phase was regulated and that diversion had to be seen as a chain with a number of possible diversion possibilities. Professor Krause said that the issue needed to be discussed further.

## **V. Negotiations on the UN Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) (AFET/7/09388)**

- Rapporteur: Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE)
- Consideration of draft motion for a resolution
- Consideration of amendments

The rapporteur considered that many of the 70 amendments tabled improved the text and she informed Members that she was working on compromise amendments. She was of the view that full transparency was needed as the implementation of the ATT would be done at national level. She also commented on some amendments which she did not support (e.g. repetitions, long list of conventions).

The shadow rapporteurs briefly commented: Ms Gomes and Ms Cronberg (Greens/EFA, FI) were opposed to the current wording on the benefits of the arms industry and asked for a redrafting. Ms Gomes was also of the view that SALW should be covered by the control provisions of the future ATT. On the same line, the EPP shadow rapporteur Ms Giannakou (EL) favoured the inclusion of conventional weapons into the scope of the ATT as well as a monitoring mechanism. She said that it was important for Parliament to give a clear message for the conference. Ms Cronberg commented on several compromise proposals which she welcomed in general. The EEAS representative noted that a reference to the relevant EU Common Position might not be in the EU's interest for the negotiations. The rapporteur concluded by referring to the future meeting with the shadow rapporteurs.

## **VI. Implementation and exploitation of European satellite navigation systems (AFET/7/08251)**

- Rapporteur for the opinion: Sampo Terho (EFD)
- Responsible: ITRE – Marian-Jean Marinescu (EPP)
- Consideration of draft opinion

The rapporteur reported on the meeting with shadow rapporteurs and stressed the need to enhance Europe's independence in this particular sector. He presented some of his amendments relating in particular to dual use technology, external threats, monitoring of the system etc.

Ms Koppa (S&D, EL) considered that the report reflected the SEDE Subcommittee's discussion, though she recommended placing more emphasis on international cooperation and interdependence as well as the protection of the system. The second speaker taking the floor, Mr Kelam, said it was a well-prepared opinion, yet he wondered whether the Subcommittee should not wait until the report was published. He considered that some amendments should be more specific and that Member States should start preparing for implementation of the Public Regulated Service. The rapporteur welcomed that the two speakers underlined the need for independence. He agreed that the ITRE Committee report should be seen by the SEDE Subcommittee and recalled that, though Galileo was a civilian system for civilian purposes, Member States could still decide if they wanted to use its defensive possibilities.

## **VII. Date and venue of the next meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for 20 June 2012 (p.m.) and 21 June 2012 (a.m.) in Brussels.

---