



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 22 June 2012

11807/12

**PE 294
COSDP 542
PESC 817**

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, 20 and 21 June 2012

The meeting was chaired by Mr Danjean (EPP, FR).

I. Workshop on Nagorno-Karabakh: security situation (with the participation of Philippe Lefort, EU Special Representative for the South Caucasus and the crisis in Georgia)

Experts had been invited to present their analysis of different aspects of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict: Ms German (King's College) focused on the security situation (overview of the conflict, danger of sniper war, recent escalation of violence, accusations/counter accusations, defence spending increases, relationship between the parties and their neighbours, spillover, etc.).

Mr Eberhardt (Centre for Eastern Studies) confirmed the pessimistic outlook (growing tensions, little chance of compromise, accidental war not to be ruled out, refugees issue used by Azerbaijan, Armenia's partial isolation / strong victim mentality, military spending increases, Azerbaijan growing status quo fatigue, power not accompanied by progress on Nagorno-Karabakh, etc.)

Mr Sammut (London Information Network on Conflicts and State-building) added that the nature and character of the conflict had evolved and a new war would have much more disastrous effects.

Therefore he called on the EU to engage in a long-term solution, though its support should be conditional and the parties should express more clearly their wish for more EU involvement. Mr Lefort completed the expert analysis by providing an overview of the peace process (historic/phases and Madrid principles), the relating EU policy (FAC conclusions, EP resolutions, EUSR to South Caucasus, confidence-building measures, principled policy excluding double standards) and the current situation and the outlook (risk of military conflict seems to be more or less under control but potentially major consequences, both sides consider alternatives to Madrid, status quo unacceptable, support respect of 1994 ceasefire, establishment of OSCE proposed investigation mechanism).

The numerous Members attending the workshop very much appreciated the presentations. There were some divergent views on the subject. Ms Nicolai (ALDE, RO) for instance considered that the solution to the conflict should take into account the interest of the EU, and that the principles and French approach should be left behind. She suggested a stability pact for the region. Mr Tannock (ECR, UK) felt that Euronest has been an impasse and Mr Gahler (EPP, DE) said that the European Parliament (EP) as well as the Minsk Group should adopt an objective attitude focusing on people. Mr Vajgl (ALDE, SI) added that the solution to the conflict should be the re-establishment of the previous situation in compliance with international law. Ms Ibrisagic (EPP, SE) was frustrated and worried as she had the impression of *déjà vu* (Balkans), and demanded an end to the occupation. A number of Members defended the view that the EU should be more involved. Members put a wide range of questions to the experts.

In their replies, the experts stressed the number of interested parties in the conflict and rejected the idea of re-organising the composition of the Minsk Group as this would only shift the focus to matters not relating to a solution, though the ambivalent role of Russia was admitted. It was also stressed that the interests and objectives of the political elite and the people did not necessarily converge. EU Special Representative Lefort concluded that no miracles should be expected from an enhanced EU involvement and that nobody could take the place of the parties and make peace for them. In his view, it was essential to focus on the future as the parties had not yet realised that a resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh issue was the only alternative.

II. Implementation and exploitation of European satellite navigation systems (AFET/7/08251)

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

The rapporteur thanked the shadow rapporteurs and concluded that there was a large consensus on the starting point. He felt that some amendments tabled would need more discussion (mutual ownership, regulated revenue scheme, etc.) though in general they were sound.

The Members concerned explained their amendments and the Commission also clarified some points. The rapporteur concluded that a very solid common ground had been found and he was sure that solutions were possible. He said that the main issue would be how to put a strong emphasis on the dual-use issue.

Provisional timetable:

Vote in AFET: 5 July

Vote in ITRE: 7 September

Vote in plenary: October

III. Implementation of the Single European Sky legislation (AFET/7/09125, 2012/2005(INI))

- Rapporteur for the opinion: Evgeni Kirilov (S&D)
- Responsible: TRAN – Jacqueline Foster (ECR)
- Further consideration of draft opinion
- Consideration of amendments

Prior to the vote, SEDE Members examined the amendments and the rapporteur for the opinion provided some explanations. He stressed the need to ensure that the SEDE's opinion was duly taken into account.

The opinion was adopted as amended by 34 votes in favour and two abstentions.

IV. Establishment of Horizon 2020 - The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) (AFET/7/09117)

- Rapporteur for the opinion: Kyriakos Mavronikolas (S&D)
- Responsible: ITRE – Teresa Riera Madurell (S&D)
- First exchange of views
- Deadline for tabling amendments: 12 July 2012

(dealt with under item VI.)

V. Rules for participation in and dissemination of Horizon 2020 – the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) (AFET/7/09118)

- Rapporteur for the opinion: Kyriakos Mavronikolas (S&D)
- Responsible: ITRE – Christian Ehler (PPE)
- First exchange of views
- Deadline for tabling amendments: 12 July 2012

(dealt with under item VI.)

VI. Specific Programme Implementing Horizon 2020 - The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) (AFET/7/09121)

- Rapporteur for the opinion: Kyriakos Mavronikolas (S&D)
- Responsible: ITRE – Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)
- First exchange of views
- Deadline for tabling amendments: 12 July 2012

The rapporteur emphasised the issue of dual-use technology, which should in his view be taken into consideration by the Horizon 2020 programme. He also believed that the role of the European Defence Agency should be fully recognized and that it could be invited to present concrete proposals for pooling and sharing. Mr Mavronikolas was of the view that research and innovation could also contribute to protection from and the prevention of threats.

Except for Ms Cronberg (Greens/EFA, FI), who argued that the military used civilian technology and not the other way around, all Members who took the floor supported the rapporteur's approach. Mr Gahler and Mr Zemke (S&D, PL) furthermore recalled related positions already adopted by the Parliament in previous reports.

The rapporteur for the opinion concluded that the debate was only an initial exchange and that he would take account of the comments. He also stressed that the rapporteur needed to be convinced to take into account the SEDE's opinion.

The Commission clarified that the current programme was already restricted to exclusively civilian use purposes, which however did not exclude include dual-use research, and voiced its concerns about opening up the programme to purely defence-orientated research.

VII. The role of the Common Security and Defence Policy in case of climate driven crises and natural disasters (AFET/7/09319, 2012/2095(INI))

- Rapporteur: Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE) PR – PE489.485v01-00
- Responsible: AFET
- Opinions: ENVI – Decision: no opinion
- Consideration of draft report
- Deadline for tabling amendments: 4 July 2012

The rapporteur gave a detailed presentation of his draft report and said that now was the right time to act in this area and called on the High Representative Ashton to stick to the promises made.

The EPP and ALDE shadow rapporteurs (Ms Neynsky (EPP, BG) and Ms Nicolai, supported by Mr Gahler), considered that the report should be pragmatic and realistic and disapproved of the ideological and political character of the draft report. Mr Mavronikolas (S&D, speaking on behalf of shadow S&D rapporteur Paleckis) said that it was a significant report which identified proposals for EU responses to natural disasters. He defended the view that Member States should further invest in quick and reactive forces and that cooperation between the EU and neighbouring countries should be enhanced.

The rapporteur concluded by admitting that the report might have to be less ideological/political.

VIII. The EU's mutual defence and solidarity clauses: political and operational dimensions (AFET/7/09829)

- Rapporteur: Ioan Mircea Paşcu (S&D)
- First exchange of views

The rapporteur presented the work undertaken so far and announced that the draft report would be available in July. He already outlined the structure of the forthcoming report (scope, capacities, structures and procedures). Mr Paşcu underlined the need for concrete practical implementation arrangements for the mutual defence and solidarity clauses, though a realistic and streamlined approach had to be followed and fragmentation and duplication avoided.

The Members who took the floor stressed the importance of the two clauses. Ms Giannakou (EPP, EL) stressed the importance of clearly defining the procedures (actors, command chain, definition of acts of aggression, etc.) and Mr Duff (ALDE, UK) pointed out that the Treaty stipulated three kinds of enhanced security and defence cooperation. Both Speakers underlined NATO involvement in this regard, and Mr Gahler added that the issue of cyber attacks also had to be dealt with.

The rapporteur answered that the Commission might adopt its proposals in this area by the end of the year and that the Parliament should therefore adopt its position before then in order to make sure that it was taken into account. He agreed with Ms Giannakou on the need to define the procedures. The rapporteur also shared the view expressed by Mr Duff that possible reservations of some Member States regarding mutual assistance should be taken into consideration and that there was a need to look at these cases. The rapporteur agreed that there should also be legal debates on cyber attacks.

IX. Date and venue of the next meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for 11 July 2012 (a.m. and p.m.) in Brussels.