



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 5 December 2013

16455/13

**PE 576
COPS 512
PESC 1486
POLARM 7**

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, 2 December 2013 |

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

Space and CSDP

Exchange of views with:

**Philippe Brunet, Director, Aerospace, Maritime, Security and Defence Industries,
DG ENTR, European Commission**

Tomaž Lovrenčič, Director of the EU Satellite Centre (EU SATCEN)

Philippe Brunet outlined how Aerospace fitted in to the context of the CSDP. He pointed out that without the space dimension, it would not be possible to react to crises. A space strategy was quite recent, and communications had been set up in 2011. He pointed out the strategic importance of a space strategy with regard to humanitarian aid and security. Furthermore, it gave a boost to research and innovation, and created jobs. For the Copernicus and Galileo projects the infrastructure was

important. He stressed that civil projects could also be used for the military. Mr Brunet underlined that GPS systems were immune to interference. He said that Member States should put in place minimum standards. They were also the beneficiaries of such a system. With regards to Copernicus, Member States had to participate actively. Member States contributed to the system and collaboration took place between Copernicus and national systems. Member States provided significant contributions to Galileo in order to get precise data. The final product was a combination of different sources. Collaboration also took place with the EEAS. Mr Brunet called for a clear budgetary framework in a set time period. With regard to the December European Council, he pointed out that it could not survive without third party information and that it was dependent solely on third countries and non-EU countries. He proposed a European initiative in order to achieve a greater degree of European autonomy. He said that the fragmentation of demand had a negative effect.

Mr Lovrenčić presented the EU Satellite Centre to the committee. He stressed that it was still a Council agency and that the structure and supervision lay in the hands of the Member States. The services were used by commercial and governmental entities that would provide full flexibility and rapidity to the agency's services. He pointed out that more than 60% of its data were provided by European sources. However, he called for greater European autonomy.

Answering questions from the chair Mr Danjean (EPP, FR), Mr Brunet said that it was essential to receive technical information about who in the institutions should handle what data and how it should be handled. He pointed out that the 7-year budget cycle was incompatible with the technical advancements. No long-term investment was feasible without a long-term budgetary plan. Mr Lovrenčić stressed that all elements of the satellite system needed to be implemented. He clarified that the Satellite Centre did not take political decisions, it only executed them.

Mr Danjean (EPP, FR) said that the budget needed to be secured for these projects in order to ensure long-term investments.

4. Ratification of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT)

AFET/7/14550

2013/2955(RSP)

Rapporteur: Arnaud Danjean (PPE)

Responsible: AFET –

Consideration of draft motion for a resolution

Mr Danjean (EPP, FR) was happy with the outcome of the ATT Treaty. He welcomed the fact that 154 States had signed the treaty. Nevertheless, the EP wanted a stronger treaty. The chair pointed to weak definitions, the limited scope of arms covered by the treaty, and weak vocabulary. Therefore, the EP wanted to go further in order to improve the treaty.

Ms Jäätteenmäki (ALDE, FI) said that the treaty was a good start. She welcomed the fact that the ATT had a comprehensive report section which ensured greater transparency. She said that the treaty would have been more comprehensive if regional blocs such as the EU had been included in the treaty.

The EEAS welcomed the treaty. It would promote greater transparency in the arms trade. The EU should cooperate closely in order to support the treaty. Moreover, the EU should set an example in the ratification process. Therefore, Member States should not delay in ratifying the treaty. It introduced common and clear international standards. The EEAS stated that it also presented challenges. Firstly, that of ensuring swift entry into force. Secondly, that of effective implementation of its provisions, i.e. the control of arms flows, as well as administrative challenges in some countries. Thirdly, that of achieving universal application of the treaty. The EU should play an active role in meeting these challenges.

The Group for Research and Information on Peace and Security (GRIP) said that the treaty was only a first step. GRIP stated that the treaty had several weaknesses, among them weak vocabulary and a lot of room for interpretation by States. However, it was a compromise between a large number of States. According to GRIP, the scope of the treaty was too broad and was also incomplete. On the other hand, the treaty had the potential to increase global security. It was important for the EU to adopt a common position in order to enhance cooperation. Due to the broad definitions it was essential to establish similar interpretation of the provisions.