



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 2 December 2013**

**17189/13**

**PE 567  
COSDP 1119  
PESC 1457**

**NOTE**

---

from :	General Secretariat of the Council
to :	Delegations
Subject:	Summary record of the meeting of the European Parliament <b>Subcommittee on Security and Defence (SEDE)</b> , Brussels, 27 November 2013

---

The meeting was chaired by Mr Lisek (EPP, PL).

**I. Combating piracy in the Gulf of Guinea - Exchange of views with representatives of the EEAS and DG Development and Cooperation - EuropeAid**

The Commission outlined the components of the Instrument for Stability (IfS) which was used inter alia to fight against security threats and protect critical infrastructures. The Commission pointed out that the intention was to link the political process to critical routes protection in the Gulf of Guinea, which required close involvement of the partner countries. The EEAS pointed out that it was in the vanguard of the political initiatives. Nigeria was identified as being the "hot spot", although piracy was continuously spreading geographically, together with other activities (e.g. organised crime, drugs and arms trafficking). A comprehensive approach was therefore needed, inter alia in order to ensure enhanced cooperation between the countries concerned and take preventive action. The EEAS also intended to involve as many European players and institutions as possible in this undertaking.

The Chair and Ms Koppa (S&D, EL) welcomed the presentations and showed particular interest in lessons learnt, notably from operation ATALANTA.

The Commission replied that the preventive approach had proved to be the most effective and therefore the fact that the states concerned realised that they needed to cooperate was a step forward; however, the lack of tools for sharing information was an issue, together with major legal gaps. The EEAS agreed with the Commission's assessment and added that it also saw the need to involve third countries and to establish a similar strategy to the Sahel strategy.

## **II. Missile defence: state of play - Exchange of views with:**

**- Roberto Zadra, Head of the Ballistic Missile Defence Section, NATO**

**- Nikolay Korchunov, Acting Permanent Representative of Russia to NATO**

Mr Zadra provided a historic overview of the ballistic missile defence (BMD) project, starting with the 2010 Lisbon summit and its follow-up, and stressed that there had been a significant slowdown in the project lately due to the issue of cooperation with Russia and the fact that political decisions on implementation were on hold. He pointed out that the aim was to ensure BMD using only NATO means, and at the same time cooperating with Russia. He regretted that, since the Lisbon summit, Russia had still not accepted NATO's offer to cooperate. Ambassador Korchunov recalled the existing fundamental divergence of views on the subject (the Russians supported joint MD as opposed to separate but coordinated MD). He also underlined the consequences of a purely NATO MD for Russia's strategic deterrence and strategic defence. He repeated that Russia was looking for firm guarantees fully responding to the Russian concerns.

In reaction to the statements, Ms Koppa expressed doubts about Russia's assessment that the Iranian threat no longer existed and that the BMD project was therefore no longer accurate. Ms Cronberg (Greens/EFA, FI) wondered if the real issue was not the transfer of technology, while Mr Terho (EFD, FI) did not understand the reasons behind the deadlock in the negotiations and wanted to know which guarantees were being sought by Russia. Mr Zemke (S&D, PL) said that, as a starting point, there needed to be a clear assessment of threats and he did not see why BMD would affect Russia's strategic deterrence.

Ambassador Korchunov admitted that the Iranian threat assessment was somewhat premature, but said that there was no threat from North Korea. Regarding the technology transfer issue, he said that the US did not want to transfer technology to Europe, therefore a common BMD would have the advantage of being independent of such transfers. On guarantees, he said that these were important but changeable. Russia wanted an agreement on paper on guarantees relating to issues such as capabilities and the architecture of the system, but NATO was not willing to go down this road. On the threat assessment, he agreed that it was very important but pointed out that even among the NATO members there was disagreement on the subject. Mr Zadra recalled that NATO had issued a high-level political declaration stating that the MD system would not jeopardise Russia's missile deterrence. In his opinion, the key issue was the lack of trust and, as a consequence, documents on which significant work had been carried out so far were now blocked.

### **III. An anti-missile shield for Europe and its political and strategic implications**

(AFET/7/13425, 2013/2170(INI) )

- Rapporteur: Sampo Terho (EFD)
- Responsible: AFET
- Consideration of draft report
- Deadline for tabling amendments: 7 January 2014

The rapporteur explained that the report took stock of the anti-missile situation, saying that there was a small risk which nevertheless had to be looked at seriously. A cost/benefit analysis needed to be drawn up for this purpose, which meant that more data was required.

Reactions from all speakers were fairly negative. The EPP shadow rapporteur (Mr Lisek) announced a number of amendments on a variety of topics. Ms Koppa (speaking on behalf of shadow rapporteur Pascu) said that the report was more a working document and a starting point for discussions and that it would need significant changes. Ms Netyts-Uyttebroeck (ALDE, BE) said that her group had strong reservations about the draft report and would table a number of amendments. Mr Tannock (ECR, UK) said that missile defence should under no circumstances fall

within EU competence and indicated that his group was unlikely to support the report. Ms Cronberg took the view that missile defence systems actually created more conflicts and were not in line with the classic EU preventive approach. Mr Angourakis (GUE/NGL, EL) said that his group was opposed to the report, in particular for ideological reasons.

The rapporteur concluded that there was a lot of work ahead, given the strong views that had been expressed. He said that he was open to discussing how to develop the report and debate the issues, including on the basis of the tabled amendments.

**IV. After the FAC Defence and before the European Council on Defence and Security – A Diplomatic and Military Stocktake -Exchange of views with:**

- **Walter Stevens, Chair of the Political and Security Committee**
- **Lieutenant General Wolfgang Wosolsobe, Director General of the EU Military Staff**

Both speakers explicitly welcomed the EP's input to the debate on the future of CSDP. Mr Stevens said that, by adding CSDP to the European Council (EC) agenda, the EC President had created a tremendous pull-effect. He described the process leading to the adoption by the Council of its conclusions on CSDP, which he said were substantive, ambitious and realistic and which would form the basis for the EC discussions/conclusions. He outlined how the Council conclusions addressed the three clusters and reported that main final issues were linked to industry aspects. Mr Stevens took the view that the Council conclusions expressed a clear political commitment to European security and the concept of the EU being a security provider and laid down how to get there. In this connection he pointed to the rendez-vous clause for December 2015. He then gave an overview of the state of play of EU missions/operations, on which the General provided more details, in particular on the EUTM Mali. The General regretted that there was no operational HQ and considered that the military dimension should be better integrated into the comprehensive approach. As regards the forthcoming EC, he said that what was needed was more transparency for the EU-NATO relationship, more strategic guidance, more predictability, enhanced partnerships and projects for capabilities development.

Ms Koppa reiterated her well-known position (high EP expectation, strong message from the EC, not a one-off event, establishment of a roadmap and benchmarks, public communication strategy in order to increase CSDP visibility) and admitted that the Council conclusions were better than expected. Mr Duff (ALDE, UK) said that he remained sceptical that the EC had everything on its agenda and that it would devote sufficient time and attention to CSDP (this concern was shared by Ms Cronberg). He invited the EC to take account of the EP's innovative arguments. Regarding the Council conclusions, he had expected more emphasis on cost-efficiency and greater trust in EDA. He also suggested that the report from the President of the EC to the Parliament on the outcome of the December EC should be dealt with in such a way as to ensure that CSDP would get the attention it deserved. Mr Tannock said that people were terrified by the idea of an European army. Mr Angourakis recalled that his group was against EU foreign policy and its increasing militarisation. Ms Cronberg asked whether the use of battle groups had been discussed.

In reply, the General said that, even if a more flexible use of battle groups was discussed, the final decision lay with Member States and one could only try to facilitate such decisions. As with the pooling and sharing issue, the Member States' willingness was the determining factor. Mr Stevens added that, given the budget constraints, Member States had to cooperate more and therefore a change of mentality would be needed.

## **V. Date and venue of next meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for 2 December 2013 (p.m.) in Brussels.

---