



CORTES GENERALES

INFORME SOBRE LA III CONFERENCIA INTERPARLAMENTARIA PARA LA POLÍTICA EXTERIOR Y DE SEGURIDAD COMÚN Y LA POLÍTICA COMÚN DE SEGURIDAD Y DEFENSA, VILNIUS, DEL 4 AL 6 DE SEPTIEMBRE DE 2013

Del 4 al 6 de septiembre, en el marco de la presidencia lituana del Consejo de la Unión Europea, se celebró la III Conferencia interparlamentaria para la Política Exterior y de Seguridad Común (PESC) y la Política Común de Seguridad y Defensa (PCSD) en la sede del Parlamento lituano en Vilnius.

En representación de las Cortes Generales, se desplazó a Vilnius para asistir a esta Conferencia la delegación designada por las Mesas conjuntas para el conjunto de la Legislatura compuesta por los siguientes miembros titulares:

- **Excmo. Sr. D. Vicente FERRER ROSELLÓ**, Presidente de la delegación, Diputado, G.P. Popular
- **Excmo. Sr. D. José María CHIQUILLO BARBER**, Senador, G.P. Popular
- **Excmo. Sr. D. Àlex SÁEZ JUBERO**, Diputado, G.P. Socialista
- **Excmo. Sr. D. Dimas Antonio SAÑUDO AJA**, Senador, G.P. Socialista
- **Excmo. Sr. D. Feliu-Joan GUILLAUMES I RÀFOLS**, Diputado, G.P. CiU, suplente.

La delegación fue asistida por la Ilma. Sra. D^a Carmen Sánchez-Abarca Gornals, letrada, y por la Sra. D^a Carmen Domínguez Poza, secretaria administrativa.

El programa y la lista de participantes en la reunión se adjuntan al presente informe como anexos 1 y 2.

Miércoles 4 de septiembre de 2013

El programa de la reunión comenzó con la reunión de la troika, compuesta por las delegaciones de los Parlamentos de Lituania, Irlanda y Grecia, y el Parlamento Europeo.

Tras su llegada a Vilnius, la delegación española acudió a la visita y cena ofrecida por la Presidencia lituana en el Palacio de los Grandes Duques de Lituania.

Jueves, 5 de septiembre de 2013

A las 9 horas, en la sala *Brazauskas* del *Seimas* Lituano, se reunió el grupo de trabajo de la Comisión Ad Hoc de Reforma del Reglamento de la Conferencia, a la que asistieron los jefes de las delegaciones de los países de la troika, Italia, Chipre y el Parlamento Europeo.

A continuación, a las 10 horas tuvo lugar la reunión de la Comisión Ad Hoc de Reforma del Reglamento de la Conferencia (CAHR), a la que acudieron los jefes de las delegaciones de todos los Parlamentos miembros de la Conferencia. El representante de las Cortes Generales en esta reunión fue el **Sr. FERRER**.

El **Sr. JUODKA**, Presidente de la Comisión de Asuntos Exteriores del *Seimas* lituano, expuso el acuerdo alcanzado por la troika y el grupo de trabajo en relación con el proceso de reforma del Reglamento de la Conferencia, por el que se pospuso el debate sobre el fondo de las enmiendas al Reglamento hasta la reunión de la CAHR que se celebrará en Atenas en abril de 2014. Dicha reunión podría consistir en un seminario previo a la Conferencia PESC/PCSD de Atenas, de un día de duración. Dicho acuerdo fue reflejado en unas recomendaciones iniciales, un calendario y una clasificación de las enmiendas presentadas, documentos que se adjuntan al presente informe como anexo 3.

El **Sr. FERRER** manifestó la conveniencia de que la CAHR debatiera el contenido de las enmiendas al Reglamento, dando la oportunidad a los Parlamentos nacionales de pronunciarse al respecto, de acuerdo con el formato que acuerde la Presidencia griega. El **Sr. BREEN** (Irlanda) y el **Sr. KOVACS** (Hungría) coincidieron con la opinión del **Sr. FERRER**.

El **Sr. JUODKA**, tras tomar nota de las opiniones de los jefes de delegación, sometió a votación las conclusiones del grupo de trabajo, considerándolas aprobadas por asentimiento. La propuesta de la Presidencia lituana, en los términos citados, se trasladará a la Presidencia griega que continuará el proceso de reforma del Reglamento.

Sesión de apertura.

Tras las reuniones previas, comenzó la Conferencia PESC/PCSD reunida en pleno en la Sala del 11 de marzo del *Seimas*, con la intervención inaugural de la **Sra. GRYBAUSKAITE**, Presidenta de la República de Lituania. Tras señalar que las políticas de seguridad y relaciones exteriores no reciben suficiente atención, insistió en la necesidad de alcanzar un acuerdo sobre los nuevos

riesgos que suponen las armas de destrucción masiva. El texto completo de su intervención se adjunta como anexo 4.

El **Sr. JUODKA** resumió a continuación el debate del grupo de trabajo y de la Comisión Ad Hoc de Reforma del Reglamento. Tras dar la bienvenida a Croacia, como nuevo miembro de la UE desde el 1 de julio de 2013, ya en relación con su país, recordó como, el 3 de noviembre de 1990, la independencia de Lituania fue declarada en el hemiciclo del *Seimas*. A continuación, se proyectó un vídeo sobre la historia de Lituania.

El **Sr. GEDVILAS**, Presidente del Parlamento lituano, presentó los eventos previstos en la dimensión parlamentaria de la Presidencia lituana del Consejo de la UE. El texto completo de su intervención se adjunta como anexo 5.

El **Sr. PAULASKAS**, Presidente de la Comisión de Defensa del Parlamento lituano, señaló las nuevas amenazas a la seguridad, que en su opinión obligan a reconsiderar la reducción que ha sufrido el presupuesto de defensa de la UE.

El **Sr. BROK** (Parlamento Europeo), señaló en su intervención, en relación con la situación en Siria, que la comunidad internacional no puede permitir el uso de armas de destrucción masiva en ningún conflicto, y su uso debe ser sancionado. Mostró su esperanza que la Conferencia fuera de una importancia histórica para Europa, así como una oportunidad para que los Parlamentos nacionales contribuyeran al Consejo Europeo de Defensa de diciembre de 2013.

El **Sr. JUODKA** sometió a continuación a consideración del pleno el orden del día de la Conferencia, que fue aprobado por asentimiento. Comunicó así mismo el plazo de enmiendas a las conclusiones, que se extendió hasta las 12 horas del viernes 6 de septiembre.

Sesión 1. Promoción de la democracia en una Europa ampliada: ideas e instrumentos.

El **Sr. LINKEVICIUS**, Ministro de Asuntos Exteriores de Lituania, solicitó a los miembros de la Conferencia una actitud más positiva y activa hacia los futuros miembros de la UE o países vecinos, en un amplio marco de carácter geopolítico y no meramente económico. En concreto, se refirió a los casos de Ucrania, Moldovia, Azerbayán y Bielorrusia.

El **Sr. OLEKAS**, Ministro de Defensa de Lituania, señaló que el Consejo europeo de defensa debería formar parte de una discusión más regular sobre temas de defensa, y en él sería necesario abordar el concepto de Europa como un garante de la seguridad, fijando las prioridades en una nueva estrategia europea de seguridad. El texto completo de la intervención del **Sr. OLEKAS** se adjunta como anexo 6.

El debate subsiguiente se centró en el conflicto sirio, en concreto en el uso de armas de destrucción masiva y el posible ataque de EEUU a Siria. Se insistió en el necesario respeto a la legislación internacional sobre armas químicas, e incluso se mencionó una futura Convención internacional para la destrucción de armas nucleares. Las consecuencias de un ataque a Siria para la Unión Europea, así como la relación con Rusia, fueron así mismo debatidas. Entre otras cuestiones, se propuso el nombramiento de un Comisario europeo de defensa, al igual que un

mayor papel de coordinación para la Agencia Europea de Defensa (AED), para lo cual sería necesaria una mayor inversión en el gasto destinado a la política europea de defensa.

Sesión in camera. Prioridades y estrategias de la PESC y la PCSD.

La **Baronesa ASHTON**, Alta Representante de la UE para la PESC/PCSD y Vicepresidenta de la Comisión europea, comenzó destacando la importancia del papel de los parlamentarios en la defensa de los valores que la UE defiende, en concreto el mantenimiento de la paz y la seguridad internacionales, que guían las acciones exteriores de la UE. La ola de inestabilidad actual nos obliga a replantear el nivel de coordinación dentro de la UE. En relación con Siria, y dadas las diferentes posturas de los Estados miembros al respecto, la Alta Representante afirmó la necesidad de dar prioridad al diálogo político, la cooperación con la ONU y el apoyo a las negociaciones que ya están en marcha en Oriente medio. Señaló que los 2.4 millones de euros que se destinan al año en Europa en defensa podrían emplearse de un modo más eficiente, a través del uso compartido de recursos, si bien para ello debe existir un mandato de los Estados miembros. Los comentarios de la **Sra. ASHTON** se adjuntan como anexo 7.

En el debate subsiguiente, los parlamentarios propusieron, entre otras, sugerencias como la aplicación de un "plan Marshall" en Oriente Medio y el Norte de África, que afronte de manera global la complicada situación de estos países.

El **Sr. SÁEZ JUBERO** mencionó en su intervención la decepción que ha supuesto la falta de acción de la UE en el conflicto sirio, desde su comienzo en 2011, al mismo tiempo que afirmó que una intervención militar sin el apoyo de la ONU no sería comprensible. En relación con el uso de armas químicas en Siria, recordó que ya en marzo de 2013 el Secretario General de la ONU activó el mecanismo de investigación en Siria, a petición del Gobierno de Al-Assad, si bien dicha investigación no pudo llevarse a cabo. En todo caso, concluyó afirmando la necesidad de sanciones a los culpables del uso de armas químicas y de mayores ayudas, por otra parte, a los desplazados sirios en la UE.

La **Sra. ASHTON** coincidió en considerar, en su intervención final, como fundamental en el conflicto sirio el papel de la ONU, así como de otros foros internacionales como el G-20, ya que es necesario que los Estados soberanos decidan cuál será la actuación de la comunidad internacional y de la UE en este caso. Se disculpó por no poder contestar a todas las preguntas, excusándose para asistir a la apertura de la sesión con los Ministros de Defensa de la UE y los EEUU que comenzaba en ese momento en Vilnius.

Viernes 6 de septiembre

Sesión 2. Futuro de la cooperación UE-OTAN

El **Sr. RASMUSSEN**, Secretario General de la OTAN, comenzó su intervención denunciando el uso de armas químicas en Siria. Tras destacar la importancia de la financiación del sector de la defensa, para mantener el papel de la UE en el mundo, insistió en la necesidad de que los recursos sean empleados de manera más eficiente. Por ello, en su opinión el Consejo europeo de Defensa de diciembre debería concentrarse en los recursos, como el transporte pesado aéreo, o la iniciativa “defensa inteligente”; la defensa de la competitividad de la industria europea y la mayor cooperación y la no duplicación de tareas entre la UE y la OTAN.

El **Sr. CHIQUILLO**, tras mostrar su preocupación por lo ocurrido en Siria, centró su intervención en el nuevo escenario de guerra que representa el ciberespacio. Tras la experiencia sufrida por Estonia en 2007, y pese al magnífico trabajo que la OTAN hizo en ese caso con la aprobación del manual de Tallin, la ciber guerra se presenta como una amenaza para los principios básicos OTAN y de la UE. Por ello, se interesó por los planes de la OTAN para defender el nuevo escenario de guerra que representa el ciberespacio.

En su respuesta, el **Sr. RASMUSSEN** coincidió en señalar el lugar prioritario que la ciber seguridad ocupa en la agenda de la OTAN. El primer paso en su estrategia fue, por ello, asegurar una protección efectiva de los sistemas de comunicaciones e informaciones de la OTAN, que en un año sufren alrededor de 2.500 ataques informáticos. El siguiente paso será explorar cómo puede ayudarse a los aliados cuando sufren un ciber ataque, y para ello esperan aprobar una política reforzada de ciber seguridad en la OTAN.

El **Sr. FERRER**, tras citar a Clausewitz, “la guerra es la continuación de la política por otros medios”, preguntó al **Sr. RASMUSSEN** por los argumentos que justificaron sus declaraciones tras el ataque el 21 agosto en Siria, en las que afirmó que dicho ataque no podía ser ignorado, y que la comunidad internacional debía dar una respuesta firme, para a continuación añadir sin embargo que la OTAN limitará su actuación a defender a Turquía y a servir de foro de conversación. Preguntó por los argumentos que justificaron esta afirmación, ya que una respuesta de la OTAN sería preferible a respuestas individuales de los Estados.

Entre las cuestiones planteadas en este debate se encontraron la seguridad de las fronteras, la situación de la industria europea de la defensa, la actuación de la OTAN en el conflicto sirio y la coordinación UE-OTAN.

En relación con el mercado europeo de defensa, el **Sr. RASMUSSEN** destacó la competitividad de las empresas de EEUU, reconociendo al mismo tiempo el potencial de las empresas europeas, pese a su excesiva fragmentación. Si la UE reduce las inversiones en defensa, los mercados europeos de defensa verán su competitividad perjudicada frente a los americanos.

En relación con Siria, el **Sr. RASMUSSEN** afirmó que debe diferenciarse entre el ataque con gases del 21 agosto de 2013, y la solución a largo plazo al conflicto sirio. Hay acuerdo en todo el mundo en que no puede darse una solución militar a largo plazo, la solución debe ser

política. También no hay duda de que hubo un ataque con gases químicos, y personalmente él no duda de que el régimen sirio es responsable, dadas las evidencias, quién podría esperar que la oposición organizara un ataque en áreas que ya estaban bajo su control, y con esa extensión. La comunidad internacional, pero no la OTAN sino las naciones soberanas que la componen, deberían actuar en defensa de las Convenciones que prohíben el uso de armas químicas.

Al **Sr. FERRER**, le contestó que nadie espera una larga intervención militar como respuesta a lo ocurrido en Siria, sino una operación militar breve, por eso no sería una función de la OTAN, que tiene estructuras para operaciones militares de amplio espectro.

Taller 1. El Partenariado del Este y su importancia estratégica para la Unión Europea.

En representación de la delegación de las Cortes Generales, asistieron a este taller el **Sr. SÁEZ** y el **Sr. GUILLAMES**.

Taller 2. Superando la distancia que separa a los recursos y las ambiciones de la UE: hacia el Consejo Europeo de Diciembre.

Este taller, al que asistieron el **Sr. FERRER**, **Sr. SAÑUDO** y **Sr. CHIQUILLO**, estuvo moderado por el **Sr. AUSTREVICIUS**, Vicepresidente del Parlamento lituano.

El **Sr. DANJEAN** (Parlamento Europeo) señaló que la UE es, en términos absolutos, la primera potencia del mundo en cuestión de defensa, y junto con otros ejemplos, destacó el trabajo del jefe español de la misión de la UE en Níger. Pese a ello, se mostró cauto en relación con los posibles resultados del Consejo Europeo de Diciembre, y denunció la falta de ciertos recursos en la UE, como el retraso en el reavituallamiento en vuelo. Es necesario que a través de la AED, los 28 Estados miembros puedan tener un enfoque común de su planificación presupuestaria y de recursos. No se trata de vincular a los Estados, sino de integrar la dimensión europea en las decisiones de cada Estado miembro, siguiendo la PCSD tal y como prevé el Tratado de Lisboa.

El **Sr. ZILMER-JOHNS**, Consejero especial de Seguridad y Defensa del Secretario General Adjunto del Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior, insistió así mismo en la necesidad de una mayor cooperación entre los Estados miembros en materia de defensa.

La **Sra. ARNOULD**, Directora ejecutiva de la Agencia Europea de Defensa, señala la necesidad urgente de que se aumente el apoyo al sector de la defensa, ya que con un presupuesto en reducción, las empresas europeas ya han anunciado que deberán abandonar ciertos sectores.

En el debate subsiguiente, se insistió en la falta de cooperación, a nivel regional y europeo, en un tema tan sensible como la defensa, que se encuentra en el núcleo de la soberanía de los Estados miembros. Se destacaron como obstáculos para esta cooperación, entre otros, las regulaciones nacionales, la falta de voluntad política y la división de costes y beneficios. La idea de una Europa de la Defensa fue defendida como un valor que merece el apoyo de todos los Estados miembros. Otros temas objeto de debate fueron el uso de los aviones no tripulados,

conocidos como drones, dados los problemas éticos y legales que plantean pese a no ser una tecnología que se emplee en la UE.

Sesión de clausura.

El Sr. JUODKA, expuso el trabajo del grupo de trabajo de la CAHR, en el que las 35 enmiendas presentadas por 16 delegaciones al borrador de Reglamento, fueron divididas en 4 categorías. Se señaló el carácter subjetivo de dicha clasificación¹. La decisión final sobre el Reglamento, de acuerdo con el calendario acordado en la CAHR, será propuesta por la Conferencia PESC de Atenas en abril de 2014 y finalmente aprobada en la Conferencia de Presidentes de Parlamentos de la UE de Roma en el primer semestre de 2015. Así mismo, la Presidencia lituana invitó a las delegaciones a continuar presentando propuestas y enmiendas al reglamento.

El **Sr. FERRER**, mostró su apoyo al trabajo de la Presidencia lituana, si bien mostró su desacuerdo con la clasificación de las enmiendas.

El **Sr. JUODKA** señaló que la clasificación fue discutida en la CAHR, y no es una verdad absoluta, sino una mera categorización preliminar. Las discusiones continuarán, y por ello solicitó que la delegación española no se oponga. El **Sr. FERRER** insistió en el apoyo al trabajo y el calendario propuestos por la Presidencia lituana, pese a no estar de acuerdo con la clasificación.

Hechas estas observaciones, se consideraron aprobadas por asentimiento las conclusiones de la CAHR.

Tras la presentación de las conclusiones de los talleres por parte del **Sr. BREEN** (Irlanda), en relación con el primer taller sobre el partenariado del Este, y el **Sr. KEFALOGIANNIS** (Grecia), sobre el segundo taller sobre el Consejo Europeo de Diciembre, se abrió el debate sobre las conclusiones de la Conferencia PESC/PCSD.

¹ Las cuatro categorías de dicha clasificación son: 1. propuestas acordes con las conclusiones de Varsovia, 2. propuestas contrarias al Tratado, 3. propuestas contrarias a las conclusiones de Varsovia, y 4. propuestas que requieren ulterior debate. Las enmiendas presentadas por la delegación española fueron incluidas en la categoría 2.

Debate sobre las conclusiones de la III Conferencia PESC/PCSD

El **Sr. JUODKA** comenzó sometiendo a votación cada punto de las conclusiones. El texto de las conclusiones, con las enmiendas presentadas, se adjunta como anexo 9.

En relación con el párrafo segundo relativo al conflicto en Siria, el **Sr. FERRER** agradeció los trabajos de la Presidencia lituana, si bien quiso dejar constancia de la reserva de la delegación española al respecto de las aportaciones de la delegación danesa y finlandesa, así como el apoyo a la enmienda de la delegación alemana. En todo caso, mostró su preferencia por la versión original del párrafo 2.

En relación con el párrafo 15 relativo a la política europea de vecindad, el **Sr. FERRER** quiso dejar constancia de que el lenguaje empleado en dicho párrafo (referencia al chantaje de Rusia) se alejaba más de lo razonable de un lenguaje diplomático. Finalmente, la versión consensuada del párrafo 15 fue la siguiente: ***Subraya la necesidad de una respuesta de la UE ante la presión económica a los países de la asociación oriental que están en contra de los acuerdos de Helsinki, para que puedan ejercer sus decisiones soberanas.***

Tras no presentarse ninguna otra objeción al resto de párrafos, las conclusiones fueron aprobadas por asentimiento. El texto final de las conclusiones, junto con el acta de la reunión elaborada por la Presidencia lituana, se adjunta como anexo 10.

La última intervención corrió a cargo del **Sr. TSIARAS** (Grecia), quien tras agradecer la hospitalidad lituana, y en calidad de próximo anfitrión de la Conferencia PESC/PCSD, invitó a todos los miembros de la Conferencia PESC PCSD a la IV edición de este foro que se celebrará en Atenas en abril de 2014.

El **Sr. JUODKA** dio por finalizada la III Conferencia PESC/PCSD a las 14 horas y 10 minutos.

Madrid, a 25 de septiembre de 2013

Carmen Sánchez-Abarca Gornals

Letrada de la delegación

ANEXOS

Anexo 1. Programa de la III Conferencia para la PESC/PCSD (lengua inglesa).

Anexo 2. Lista de participantes en la III Conferencia para la PESC/PCSD (lengua lituana, inglesa y francesa).

Anexo 3. Documentación elaborada por la Presidencia lituana en relación con el proceso de reforma del Reglamento de la Conferencia PESC/PCSD (lengua inglesa).

3.1. Sinopsis de las enmiendas

3.2. Calendario del proceso de reforma del Reglamento

3.3. Recomendaciones de la Presidencia lituana

Anexo 4. Texto de la intervención de la Presidenta de la República de Lituania (lengua inglesa).

Anexo 5. Texto de la intervención del Presidente del *Seimas* lituano (lengua inglesa).

Anexo 6. Texto de la intervención del Ministro de Defensa de Lituania (lengua inglesa).

Anexo 7. Comentarios de la Alta Representante de la UE para la PESC y la PCSD (lengua inglesa).

Anexo 8. Texto de la intervención del Secretario General de la OTAN (lengua inglesa).

Anexo 9. Conclusiones de la III Conferencia PESC/PCSD propuestas por la Presidencia lituana con enmiendas de compromiso (lengua inglesa).

Anexo 10. Conclusiones aprobadas en la III Conferencia PESC/PCSD (lengua inglesa).

Anexo 1. Programa de la III Conferencia para la PESC/PCSD (lengua inglesa).



Lietuvos Respublikos pirmininkavimas
Europos Sąjungos Tarybai
2013 m. liepos 1 d. – gruodžio 31 d.
PARLAMENTINIS MATMUO

Lithuanian Presidency of
the Council of the European Union
1 July – 31 December 2013
PARLIAMENTARY DIMENSION

Présidence lituanienne
du Conseil de l'Union européenne
du 1er juillet au 31 décembre 2013
DIMENSION PARLEMENTAIRE

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE FOR THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY AND THE COMMON SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY

4–6 September 2013

Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania

Vilnius

DRAFT AGENDA

Wednesday, 4 September

Arrival of the participants

15.00–19.00 Registration at the hotels

Meeting of the representatives of the Presidency Trio and of the European Parliament

17.30 Departure by bus from the hotels for the Seimas

18.00–19.00 Meeting of the representatives of the Presidency Trio (Ireland / Lithuania / Greece) and of the European Parliament

Venue: Algirdas Mykolas Brazauskas Hall, Building I of the Seimas

Departure by bus from the Seimas for the Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania

18.30–18.50 Departure by bus from the hotels for the Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania

20.00 Dinner hosted by Mr Artūras PAULASKAS, Chair of the Committee on National Security and Defence of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania

Venue: Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, Katedros a. 4, Vilnius

22.30 Return to the hotels

Thursday, 5 September

8.30–12.00 Registration (for those who have not registered yet)

Venue: Lobby, Building II of the Seimas

8.30 Departure by bus of the participants of the Working Group of the Ad Hoc Review Committee from the hotels for the Seimas

9.00–10.00 Meeting of the Working Group of the Ad Hoc Review Committee

Venue: Algirdas Mykolas Brazauskas Hall, Building I of the Seimas

9.30 Departure by bus of the participants of the meeting of the Ad Hoc Review Committee from the hotels for the Seimas

10.00–11.00 Meeting of the Ad Hoc Review Committee

Venue: Constitution Hall, Building I of the Seimas

Meetings of political groups

10.30 Departure by bus from the hotels for the Seimas

11.00–12.00 Meetings of the political groups:

EPP Venue: Meeting room 218b, Building III of the Seimas

S&D Venue: Press Conference Hall, Building II of the Seimas

ALDE Venue: Meeting room of the Committee on European Affairs, Building I of the Seimas

11.00 Departure by bus of other participants from the hotels for the Seimas

OPENING SESSION

Venue: Hall of the Act of 11 March, Building I of the Seimas

12.00–12.15 Opening remarks by Prof Benediktas JUODKA, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania

Opening remarks by Mr Artūras PAULAUSKAS, Chair of the Committee on National Security and Defence of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania

12.15–12.25 Welcome address by H.E. Ms Dalia GRYBAUSKAITĖ, President of the Republic of Lithuania

12.25–12.35 Welcome address by Dr Vydas GEDVILAS, Speaker of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania

12.35–12.45 Welcome address by Mr Elmar BROK, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the European Parliament

Adoption of the agenda

SESSION 1

Venue: Hall of the Act of 11 March, Building I of the Seimas

12.50–14.30 Promoting democracy in a wider Europe: ideas and instruments

Mr Linas LINKEVIČIUS, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania

Towards December European Council: Lithuanian priorities Mr Juozas OLEKAS, Minister of Defence of the Republic of Lithuania

Debate

14.30–15.50 Lunch

Venue: Stained Glass Gallery, Building I of the Seimas

14.30 Press conference

Venue: Press Conference Hall, Building II of the Seimas

16.00–17.20 EU Priorities and Strategies of the CFSP and CSDP

Baroness Catherine ASHTON, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Vice-President of the European Commission

Debate

End of the session

17.20–17.30 Family photo

Venue: Hall of the Act of 11 March, Building I of the Seimas

17.30 Departure by bus from the Seimas for Vilnius University Botanical Garden

19.00 Dinner hosted by Prof Benediktas JUODKA, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania

Venue: Vilnius University Botanical Garden, Kairėnų g. 43, Vilnius

22.00 Departure by bus for the hotels

Friday, 6 September

SESSION 2

Venue: Hall of the Act of 11 March, Building I of the Seimas

8.30 Departure by bus from the hotels for the Seimas

9.00–10.20 Future of EU-NATO Cooperation

Mr Anders Fogh RASMUSSEN, NATO Secretary General

Debate

10.30–12.30 Workshops

Workshop 1 Eastern Partnership and its strategic importance to the European Union

Venue: Hall of the Act of 11 March, Building I of the Seimas

Moderator: Mr Audronius AŽUBALIS, Deputy Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania

Rapporteur: Mr Pat BREEN, Chair of the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Irish Houses of the Oireachtas

Speakers:

Mr Gunnar WIEGAND, Director for Russia, Eastern Partnership, Central Asia, Regional Cooperation and OSCE, European External Action Service

Ms Sofia ARKELSTEN, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Swedish Riksdagen

Dr Laurynas KASČIŪNAS, expert, Eastern Europe Studies Centre

Debate

Workshop 2 Bridging the gap between EU capabilities and ambitions: towards the December European Council

Venue: Plenary Hall, Building II of the Seimas

Moderator: Mr Petras AUŠTREVICIUS, Deputy Speaker of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania

Rapporteur: Mr Ioannis KEFALOGIANNIS, Member of the Standing

Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Parliament

Speakers:

Mr Arnaud DANJEAN, Chair of the Security and Defence Sub-Committee, Committee on Foreign Affairs of the European Parliament

Ms Claude-France ARNOULD, Chief Executive of the European Defence Agency

General (ret.) Yves de KERMABON, Special Advisor to the Executive Secretary General of the European External Action Service

Dr Christian MÖLLING, expert, German Institute for International and Security Affairs

Debate

12.30–12.50 Coffee break

Venue: Stained Glass Gallery, Building I of the Seimas

12.50–13.15 Presentation of the proposals by the Ad Hoc Review Committee

Venue: Hall of the Act of 11 March, Building 1 of the Seimas

13.15–14.00 Presentation of the results of the workshops and adoption of the conclusions of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference

End of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference

14.00–15.00 Lunch

Venue: Stained Glass Gallery, Building I of the Seimas

14.00 Final press conference

Venue: Press Conference Hall, Building II of the Seimas

15.00 Guided tour of the buildings of the Seimas (in English and French) optional

Departure of the participants.

Anexo 2. Lista de participantes en la III Conferencia para la PESC/PCSD (lengua lituana, inglesa y francesa).



Lietuvos Respublikos pirmininkavimas
Europos Sąjungos Tarybai
2013 m. liepos 1 d. – gruodžio 31 d.
PARLAMENTINIS MATMUO

Lithuanian Presidency of
the Council of the European Union
1 July – 31 December 2013
PARLIAMENTARY DIMENSION

Présidence lituanienne
du Conseil de l'Union européenne
du 1er juillet au 31 décembre 2013
DIMENSION PARLEMENTAIRE

Draft 03/09/2013

DALYVIŲ SĄRAŠAS

**Tarpparlamentinė bendros užsienio ir saugumo politikos bei bendros
saugumo ir gynybos politikos konferencija
2013 m. rugsėjo 4–6 d.**

Vilnius

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and
Security Policy and the Common Security and Defence Policy
4-6 September 2013**

Vilnius

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

**Conférence interparlementaire pour la politique étrangère et de
sécurité commune et la politique de sécurité et de défense commune
4-6 septembre 2013**

Vilnius

MEMBER STATES – ETATS MEMBRES – VALSTYBĖS NARĖS

AUSTRIA - AUTRICHE - AUSTRIJA

National Council / Conseil national / Nationalrat / Nacionalratas

Ms Christine MUTTONEN Head of Delegation, Member of the National Council

Mr Werner AMON Member of the National Council

Mr Alois GRADAUER Member of the National Council

Mr Herbert SCHEIBNER Member of the National Council

Mr Joseph WIRNSPERGER Clerk of the Committee, EU and International Services

Federal Council / Conseil fédéral / Bundesrat / Bundesratas

Mr Günther KÖBERL Member of the Federal Council

BELGIUM – BELGIQUE – BELGIJA

Chamber of Representatives / Chambre des Représentants / Kamer van volksvertegenwoordigers /

Atstovų Rūmai

Mr André FLAHAUT Président de la Chambre des représentants

Mr Denis DUCARME Vice-Président de la Commission de la Défense nationale

Mr Steven VANACKERE Membre de la Commission des Relations extérieures

Mr Luc PEETERMANS Secrétaire de la commission de la Défense Nationale

Senate / Sénat / Senaat / Senatas

Mr Armand DE DECKER Deputy Speaker of the Senate, Vice Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and Defence

Mr Karl VANLOUWE Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and Defence

Ms Marie-Aline STACANOV Secretary of the Delegation

BULGARIA – BULGARIE - BULGARIJA

National Assembly / Assemblée nationale / Narodno Sabranie / Nacionalinis Susirinkimas

Mr Georgi ANDREEV Member of Parliament

Mr Roumen IONTCHEV Member of Parliament

Mr Tchetin KAZAK Member of Parliament

Mr Vladimir BERON Staff

Ms Zhulieta STOYANOVA Staff

Mr Krum ZARKOV Staff

CROATIA – CROATIE – KROATIJA

Sabor / Sabor / Hrvatski Sabor / Susirinkimas

Mr Milorad PUPOVAC Chairman of the Foreign Policy Committee

Mr Tomislav IVIĆ Chairman of the Defence Committee

Ms Dunja ŃPOLJAR Deputy Chairman of the Defence Committee

Mr Jozo RADONŃ Deputy Chairman of the European Affairs Committee

Mr Davor BOŃINOVIĆ Member of the Foreign Policy Committee

Ms Andrea HALAMBEK Secretary of the Foreign Policy Committee

Ms Ankica UDOVIĆIĆ Advisor at the Office for International and European Affairs, Interpreter

CYPRUS – CHYPRE – KIPRAS

House of Representatives / Cambre des Représentants / Vouli ton Antiprosopon / Atstovų Taryba

Mr George VARNAVA Chairman of the House Standing Committee on Defence Affairs

Mr Prodromos PRODROMOU Deputy Chairman of the House Standing Committee on Foreign and European Affairs

Mr Sotiris SAMPSON Member of the House Standing Committee on Foreign and European Affairs

Mr Demetris SYLLOURIS Member of the House Standing Committee on Foreign and European Affairs

Mr Aristos DAMIANOU Member of Parliament

Mr Angelos VOTSIS Member of Parliament

Ms Hara PARLA Senior International Relations Officer

Ms Sophie TSOURIS International Relations Officer

CZECH REPUBLIC – RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE – ČEKIJOS RESPUBLIKA

Chamber of Deputies / Chambre des Députés / Poslanecka Sněmovna / Atstovų Rūmai

No representation

Senate / Sénat / Senát / Senat

Mr Jozef REGEC Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Security

Ms Alena DOLEŃALOVÁ Secretary of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Security

DENMARK – DANEMARK – DANIJA

Folketing / Folketing / Folketinget / Folketingas

Mr Jeppe KOFOD Member of Parliament

Mr Peter RIIS Special Advisor

ESTONIA – ESTONIE – ESTIJA

Riigikogu / Riigikogu / Riigikogu / Rygikogas

Mr Marko MIHKELSON Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Mati RAIDMA Chairman of the National Defence Committee

Ms Elin PÄRNAMÄE Adviser to the National Defence Committee

FINLAND – FINLANDE – SUOMIJA

Eduskunta / Eduskunta / Eduskunta / Eduskunta

Mr Timo SOINI Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Johannes KOSKINEN Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Ms Raili LAHNALAMPI Counsel, Foreign Affairs Committee

FRANCE – FRANCE – PRANCŪZIJA

National Assembly / Assemblée nationale / Nacionalinė Asamblėja

Ms Elisabeth GUIGOU Présidente de la commission des Affaires étrangères

Mr Joaquim PUEYO Député

Mr Stanislas BREZET Chef du secrétariat de la commission des Affaires étrangères

Senate/ Sénat / Senatas

No representation

GERMANY – ALLEMAGNE – VOKIETIJA

Bundestag / Bundestag allemand / Bundestag / Bundestagas

Mr Johannes PFLUG Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Member of the SPD Parliamentary Group / Head of Delegation

Mr Ernst-Reinhard BECK Member of the Defence Committee, Defence Policy Spokesman of the CDU/CSU Parliamentary Group

Mr Harald BERWANGER Head of the Brussels Liaison Office of the SPD Parliamentary Group in the German Bundestag

Mr Rudolf RENTSCHLER Advisor to the Liberal Group

Mr Michael HILGER Delegation Secretary

Ms Ellinor TALMEIER Delegation Secretariat

Bundesrat / Bundesrat / Bundesrat / Bundesratas

No representation

GREECE – GRÈCE – GRAIKIJA

Hellenic Parliament / Parlement hellénique / Vouli ton Ellinon / Parlamentas

Mr Konstantinos TSIARAS Chairman of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs

Mr Ioannis KEFALOGIANNIS Member of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs

Mr Terens QUICK Member of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs

Mr George VAREMENOS Member of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs

Ms Despina FOLA Hellenic Parliament Representative to the European Parliament

Mr Nikolaos KARAPAPAS Head of the Department of Protocol and Ceremonies

Ms Panagiota SMYRNIOTI Official, European Affairs Directorate

HUNGARY – HONGRIE – VENGRIJA

National Assembly / Assemblée nationale / Országgyűlés / Nacionalinė Asamblėja

Mr László KOVÁCS Vice Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Mr Imre IVÁNCSEK Vice Chairman of the Defence and Internal Security Committee

Ms Noémi KORÁNYI Counsellor of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Ms Adrienn VARGA Adviser, EU Department, Directorate for Foreign Relations

IRELAND - IRLANDE – AIRIJA

Houses of the Oireachtas / Oireachtas / Houses of the Oireachtas / Irachtas

Mr Pat BREEN, T.D. Chairman of the Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs and Trade

Mr Eric BYRNE, T.D. Member of the Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs and Trade

Mr John Paul PHELAN, T.D. Vice Chairman of the Oireachtas Committee on Justice, Defence and Equality

Mr Brian HICKEY Secretary to the delegation

ITALY – ITALIE – ITALIJA

Chamber of Deputies / Chambre des Députés / Camera dei Deputati / Deputatų Rūmai

Mr Elio VITO Chairman of the Defence Committee

Mr Giovanni Claudio FAVA Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Ms Federica MOGHERINI Member of the Defence Committee

Ms Francesca PIAZZA Counsellor of the Defence Committee

Senate / Sénat / Senato della Repubblica / Senatas

Mr Nicola LATORRE Chair of the Defence Committee

Mr Luis Alberto ORELLANA Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Luigi COMPAGNA Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Ms Roberta D'ADDIO Head of the Office for Relations with the EU

LATVIA – LETTONIE – LATVIJA

Saeima / Saeima / Saeima / Saeima

Mr Ojārs Ēriks KALNIŅŠ Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Ainars LATKOVSKIS Chairman of the Defence, Internal Affairs and Corruption Prevention Committee

Mr Rihards VIKMANS Senior Adviser of the Defence, Internal Affairs and Corruption Prevention Committee

Ms Ieva BARVIKA Adviser of the Defence, Internal Affairs and Corruption Prevention Committee

Mr Āris VĪGANTS Foreign Affairs Adviser to the Presidium

Mr Artūrs JEFIMOVŠ Adviser of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Ms Linda KALNIŅA EU Presidency Coordinator

LITHUANIA – LITUANIE – LIETUVA

Seimas / Seimas / Seimas / Seimas

Mr Benediktas JUODKA Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Mr Artūras PAULAUSKAS Chair of the Committee on National Security and Defence

Mr Petras AUNTRIEVIČIUS Deputy Speaker, Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Mr Audronius ANUBALIS Deputy Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Mr Arvydas ANUŠAUSKAS Member of the Committee on National Security and Defence

Mr Eduardas NABLINSKAS Member of the Committee on National Security and Defence

Mr Evaldas ZELENKA Head of the Office of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Mr Vitalij DMITRIJEV Head of the Office of the Committee on National Security and Defence

Ms Milda PETROKAITĖ Adviser to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Ms Vilma KAMINSKIENĖ Adviser to the Committee on National Security and Defence

LUXEMBOURG – LUXEMBOURG – LIUKSEMBURGAS**Chamber of Deputies / Chambre des Députés / Deputatų Rūmai**

Mr Eugène BERGER Député

Mr Fernand BODEN Député

Mr Félix BRAZ Député

Mr Yves CARL Député

Mr Gast GIBÉRYEN Député

MALTA – MALTE – MALTA**House of Representatives / Chambre des Députés / Il-Kamra Tad-Deputati / Atstovų Rūmai**

Mr Michael FALZON Member of the Standing Committee on Economic and Financial Affairs

Mr Robert CUTAJAR Member of the Standing Committee on Social Affairs

NETHERLANDS – PAYS-BAS – NYDERLANDAI**House of Representatives / Chambre des Représentants / Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal / Antrieji Rūmai**

Ms Angelien EIJSINK Chair of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs / Head of Delegation

Mr Han TEN BROEKE Chair of the Standing Committee on Defence

Ms Wassila HACHCHI Member of the Standing Committee on Defence

Mr Ronald VUIJK Member of the Standing Committee on Defence

Mr Jeffrey VAN HAASTER Clerk / CFSP-CSDP Advisor

Senate / Sénat / Eerste Kamer der Staten-Generaal / Pirmieji Rūmai

Mr Frank VAN KAPPEN Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Development Cooperation

Mr Fred DE GRAAF Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Development Cooperation

Mr Christward GRADENWITZ Clerk, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Development Cooperation

Ms Saskia Maria VAN GENUGTEN Assistant clerk, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Development Cooperation

POLAND – POLOGNE – LENKIJA

Sejm / Sejm / Sejm / Seimas

Mr Andrzej GAŁAŻEWSKI Deputy Chairman of the European Union Affairs Committee

Mr Mariusz Antoni KAMIŃSKI Deputy Chairman of the National Defence Committee

Mr Jarosław Jacek GÓRCZYŃSKI Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Ms Kaja KRAWCZYK Head of the EU Division

Mr Łukasz ANDRZEJCZYK Secretary of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Senate / Sénat / Senat / Senatas

Mr Włodzimierz CIMOSZEWICZ Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Edmund WITTBRODT Chairman of the European Affairs Committee

Mr Andrzej OWCZAREK Deputy Chairman of the National Defence Committee

Mr Melchior SZCZEPANIK Secretary to the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Wojciech KUŹMA Secretary of the Senate Delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the CFSP/CSDP

PORTUGAL – PORTUGAL – PORTUGALIJA

Assembly of the Republic / Assemblée de la République / Assembleia da Republica / Respublikos

Asamblėja

Mr Sérgio AZEVEDO Member of the European Affairs Committee

Mr Alberto COSTA Member of the European Affairs Committee

Mr Marcos PERESTRELLO Member of the National Defence Committee

Mr António PRÔA Member of the National Defence Committee

Mr António RODRIGUES Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Portuguese Communities

Mr Paulo PISCO Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Portuguese Communities

Mr Bruno PINHEIRO Permanent Representative of the Portuguese Parliament to the European Union

ROMANIA – ROUMANIE – RUMUNIJA

Chamber of Deputies / Chambre des Députés / Camera Deputatilor / Deputatų Rūmai

Mr Laszlo BORBELY Chair of the Committee on Foreign Policy

Mr Adrian George SCUTARU Vice-Chair of the Committee on Defence, Public Order, and National Security

Mr Mihai WEBER Member of the Committee on Defence, Public Order, and National Security

Ms Ozana Steliana RADULESCU Parliamentary Counsellor, Committee on Foreign Policy

Senate / Sénat / Senatul / Senatas

Mr Petru FILIP Chair of the Committee on Foreign Policy

Mr Marius-Lucian OBREJA Member of the Committee on Defence, Public Order and National Security

Mr Marian POPA Counsellor, EU Division

SLOVAKIA – SLOVAQUIE – SLOVAKIJA

National Council / Conseil national / Narodna rada / Nacionalinė Rada

No representation

SLOVENIA – SLOVÉNIE – SLOVĖNIJA

National Assembly / Assemblée nationale/ Državni Zbor / Valstybės Susirinkimas

Mr Jožef KUNIČ Deputy Chair of the Committee on Foreign Policy

Mr Jožef JEROVŃEK Deputy Chair of the Committee on Foreign Policy

Ms Saša KOS Member of the Committee on Defence

Ms Katja JERMAN Undersecretary of the Committee on Foreign Policy

National Council / Conseil national/ Državni Svet / Valstybės Taryba

Mr Bojan KEKEC Deputy Chair of the Commission for International Relations and European Affairs

Mr Dušan NTRUS Head of the Legal Department

SPAIN – ESPAGNE – ISPAIJA

Congress of Deputies / Congrès des Députés / Congreso de los Diputados / Deputatų Rūmai

Mr Vicente FERRER Head of Delegation

Mr Àlex SÁEZ Member of Parliament

Mr Feliu-Joan GUILLAUMES Member of Parliament

Senate / Sénat / Senado / Senatas

Mr José María CHIQUILLO Senator

Mr Dimas SAÑUDO Senator

Ms Carmen SÁNCHEZ-ABARCA Legal Advisor

Ms Carmen DOMÍNGUEZ Administrative staff

SWEDEN – SUÈDE – ŠVEDIJA

Riksdag / Riksdag / Riksdagen / Riksdagas

Ms Sofia ARKELSTEN Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Ms Bodil CEBALLOS Member of Parliament, Committee on Foreign Affairs

Ms Carina HÄGG Member of Parliament, Committee on Foreign Affairs

Mr Ismail KAMIL Member of Parliament, Committee on Foreign Affairs

Mr Johan JOHANSSON Member of Parliament, Committee on Defence

Ms Anna-Lena SÖRENSON Member of Parliament, Committee on Defence

Mr Martin BROTHÉN Head of Secretariat

Ms Ingrid SVENSSON Committee Officer

UNITED KINGDOM – ROYAUME-UNI – DIDŲIOJI BRITANIJA

House of Commons / Chambre des Communes / Bendruomenių Rūmai

Ms Brigid FOWLER Foreign Affairs Committee Specialist

House of Lords / Chambre des Lords / Lordų Rūmai

Lord Christopher TUGENDHAT Chairman of the EU Sub-Committee on External Affairs

Ms Roshani PALAMAKUMBURA Policy Analyst of the EU Sub-Committee on External Affairs

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT – PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN – EUROPOS PARLAMENTAS

Mr Othmar KARAS Vice-President of the European Parliament

Mr Miguel Angel MARTÍNEZ Vice-President of the European Parliament
MARTÍNEZ

Ms Laima Liucija ANDRIKIENĖ Member of the European Parliament

Mr Elmar BROK Member of the European Parliament, Chair, AFET

Ms Tarja CRONBERG Member of the European Parliament

Mr Arnaud DANJEAN Member of the European Parliament. Chair, SEDE

Mr Michael GAHLER Member of the European Parliament

Ms Ana GOMES Member of the European Parliament

Ms Maria Eleni KOPPA Member of the European Parliament

Mr Willy MEYER Member of the European Parliament, Vice-Chair, AFET

Ms Kristiina OJULAND Member of the European Parliament

Mr Justas Vincas PALECKIS Member of the European Parliament, Vice-Chair, SEDE

Mr Ioan Mircea PASCU Member of the European Parliament, Vice-Chair, AFET

Mr José Ignacio SALAFRANCA Member of the European Parliament, President
SÁNCHEZ-NEYRA of EUROLAT

Mr Enrico Francesco SPERONI Member of the European Parliament

Mr Paolo BERGAMASCHI Political Advisor (Green/EFA)

Ms Armelle Douaud Head of Unit, AFET

Mr Edoardo FERRARA Policy Advisor (ALDE)

Mr Robert GOLĄŃSKI Group Advisor (EPP)

Ms Maria Soledad GUIRAO GALDON Political Advisor (S&D)

Mr Ciprian MATEI Political Advisor (S&D)

Ms Vera POLYCARPOU Political Advisor (GUE/NGL)

Ms Agnieszka WALTER-DROP Director, Directorate A, DG EXPO

Mr Silvio GONZATO Head of Unit, AFET

Mr Luis BALSELLS TRAVER Administrator, DG PRES

Mr Gerrard QUILLE Administrator, AFET

NATO MEMBER COUNTRIES – PAYS MEMBRES DE L'OTAN – NATO VALSTYBĖS NARĖS**NORWAY - NORVÈGE – NORVEGIJA****Storting / Storting / Stortinget / Stortingas**

Mr Bengt HOLMEN Permanent Secretary of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence

CANDIDATE COUNTRIES – PAYS CANDIDATS – ŠALYS KANDIDATĖS

FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA/FYROM – ANCIENNE RÉPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACÉDOINE/ARYM / BUVUSIOJI JUGOSLAVIJOS RESPUBLIKA MAKEDONIJA

Assembly / Assemblée / Sobranie / Susirinkimas

Mr Antonijo MILOŃOSKI Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Policy

Ms Sonja AVRAMOSKA Secretary of the Committee on Foreign Policy

ICELAND – ISLANDE – ISLANDIJA

Althingi / Althingi / Althingi / Altingas

Mr Birgir ÁRMANNSSON Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Asmundur Einar DADASON Member of Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Óttarr PROPPÉ Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Árni Thor SIGURÐSSON Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Stígur STEFÁNSSON Secretary of the Foreign Affairs Committee

MONTENEGRO – MONTÉNÉGRO – JUODKALNIJA

Skupstina / Skupstina / Skupština / Skupština

Mr Miodrag VUKOVIĆ Chairman of the Committee on International Relations and Emigrants

Mr Milan KNEŽEVIĆ Member of the Committee on International Relations and Emigrants

Mr Obrad STANIĆ Member of the Security and Defence Committee

Mr Vasilije LALOŃEVIĆ Member of the Security and Defence Committee

Ms Vera DAMJANOVIĆ Adviser to the Security and Defence Committee

Ms Vesna RADULOVIĆ Secretary of the Committee on International Relations and Emigrants

SERBIA – SERBIE – SERBIJA

National Assembly / Assemblée nationale / Narodna Skupština / Tautos Skupština

Mr Igor BEĆIĆ Head of the Delegation

Mr LjubiŃa STOJMIROVIĆ Member of the Delegation

Mr Konstantin SAMOFALOV Member of the Delegation

Mr Nikola MILIĆEVIĆ Secretary of the Delegation

TURKEY – TURQUIE – TURKIJA

Grand National Assembly / Grande Assemblée nationale / Büyük Millet Meclisi / Didysis

Nacionalinis MedŃlisas

Mr Volkan BOZKIR Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Mr Fevai ARSLAN Member of Parliament

Mr İzzet Anıl TURPÇU Chief of Cabinet, Foreign Affairs Committee

OTHER PARTICIPANTS – AUTRES PARTICIPANTS – KITI DALYVIAI

EUROPEAN DEFENCE AGENCY - AGENCE EUROPÉENNE DE DÉFENSE – EUROPOS GYNYBOS AGENTŪRA

Ms Claude-France ARNOULD Chief Executive

Mr Graham MUIR Head of the Policy and Planning Unit

EUROPEAN EXTERNAL ACTION SERVICE - SERVICE EUROPÉEN POUR L'ACTION EXTÉRIEURE – EUROPOS IŠORĖS VEIKSMŲ TARNYBA

Mr Gunnar WIEGAND Director for Russia, Eastern Partnership, Central Asia, Regional Cooperation and OSCE

Mr Pelayo CASTRO ZUZUARREGUI Head of Division

Ms Gabriele VISENTIN Deputy Head of Division

Mr Michael ZILMER-JOHNS Special Advisor on Security and Defence to the Deputy Secretary General of the European External Action Service

ARENA CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES – CENTRE D'ÉTUDES EUROPÉENNES ARENA – EUROPOS STUDIJŲ CENTRAS „ARENA“

Mr Ian COOPER Senior Researcher

SPEAKERS – ORATEURS – PRANEŠĖJAI

Mr Linas LINKEVIČIUS Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania

Mr Juozas OLEKAS Minister of National Defence of the Republic of Lithuania

Baroness Catherine ASHTON High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Vice-President of the European Commission

Mr Anders Fogh RASMUSSEN NATO Secretary General

Mr Gunnar WIEGAND Director for Russia, Eastern Partnership, Central Asia, Regional Cooperation and OSCE, European External Action Service

Ms Sofia ARKELSTEN Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Swedish Riksdag

Mr Laurynas KASČIŪNAS Expert, Eastern Europe Studies Centre

Mr Arnaud DANJEAN Chair of the Security and Defence Sub-Committee, Committee on Foreign Affairs of the European Parliament

Mr Michael ZILMER-JOHNS Special Advisor on Security and Defence to the Deputy Secretary General of the European External Action Service

Ms Claude-France ARNOULD Chief Executive of the European Defence Agency

Anexo 3. Documentación elaborada por la Presidencia lituana en relación con el proceso de reforma del Reglamento de la Conferencia PESC/PCSD (lengua inglesa).

3.1. Sinopsis de las enmiendas



Lietuvos Respublikos pirmininkavimas
Europos Sąjungos Tarybai
2013 m. liepos 1 d. – gruodžio 31 d.
PARLAMENTINIS MATMUO

Lithuanian Presidency of
the Council of the European Union
1 July – 31 December 2013
PARLIAMENTARY DIMENSION

Présidence lituanienne
du Conseil de l'Union européenne
du 1er juillet au 31 décembre 2013
DIMENSION PARLEMENTAIRE

THE AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP

**SYNOPSIS
OF THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL PARLIAMENTS
TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE
FOR THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY AND THE COMMON
SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY**

5 September 2013

Vilnius

The Working Group of the Ad Hoc Review Committee, convened in the framework of the Inter-parliamentary Conference on 4-6 September 2013 in Vilnius, has examined the proposals to the Rules of Procedure of the Inter-parliamentary Conference for the CFSP and CSDP, submitted by the national parliaments and categorized them according to their compliance with the Treaty on European Union (hereinafter referred to as "Treaty") and the Presidency Conclusions of the Conference of Speakers of the European Union Parliaments, adopted in Warsaw on 20-21 April 2012 (hereinafter referred to as "Warsaw Conclusions") into the following categories:

Category 1 – proposals, compatible with the Treaty and the Warsaw Conclusions.

Category 2 – proposals in contradiction with the Treaty.

Category 3 – proposals in contradiction with the Warsaw Conclusions.

Category 4 – proposals to be further examined.

Further consideration of the proposals shall be held under the Greek Presidency in the first half of 2014.

Category 1 – proposals compatible with the Treaty and the Warsaw Conclusions

Croatia <i>(The Croatian Parliament)</i>	Amendments to the Preamble - Paragraph 1: The Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), hereinafter referred to as the "Inter-Parliamentary Conference" "COFDAC" Reasoning of proposal:
--	---

Gedimino pr. 53, LT-01109 Vilnius, LITHUANIA
Tel. + 370 5 239 6762 E-mail presidency@lrs.lt



EU2013.LT

	<i>The Croatian delegation proposes the replacement of the abbreviation “Inter-Parliamentary Conference” with the abbreviation “COFDAC” throughout the entire text.</i>
Latvia (Saeima)	<p>Supplementing the Preamble with a new Paragraph 6 (thus deleting Article 1.3.) to read as follows:</p> <p>The Inter-Parliamentary Conference replaces the Conference of Foreign Affairs Committee Chairpersons (COFACC) and the Conference of Defence Affairs Committee Chairpersons (CODACC).</p>
The United Kingdom (The House of Lords and The House of Commons)	<p>Amendments to the Article 1, reasoning and aim of proposal:</p> <p><i>More generally, we would like to emphasise our belief that the purpose of the AHRC and its recommendations should be to provide suggestion on how the effective functioning of the Conference should be improved.</i></p> <p><i>In particular, consideration may be given to how the size of the Conference impacts upon debate and the general efficiency of the Conference, and the process by which the formal Conclusion of the conference are formulated and agreed. On the latter point, some of the UK delegates to the Dublin meeting were concerned they were not given sufficient opportunity to consider the draft Conclusion. Finally, the AHRC should not look to expand the remit or role of the Conference beyond the principles and framework agreed by Speakers, which were reached after some difficulty at the EU Speakers' Conferences in Warsaw on 20-21 April 2012 and Brussels in 4-5 April 2011.</i></p>
The Netherlands (The House of Representatives and The Senate)	<p>Amendments to the Article 2 – 2.1., reasoning and aim of proposal:</p> <p><i>For budgetary and practical reasons, the delegations should be restricted to six delegates of each national parliament and to sixteen delegates of the European Parliament (at maximum).</i></p>
Lithuania (Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania)	<p>Proposal to supplement the Rules of Procedure:</p> <p>New proposal 2013-09-04</p> <p><i>To define the composition and the role of the Presidential Troika of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, which could consist of the delegations of the national Parliaments of the Presidency, the preceding Presidency, the following Presidency, and the European Parliament.</i></p>
Latvia (Saeima)	<p>Amendments to the Article 3.1.:</p> <p><i>Changes in the order of sentences</i></p> <p>3.1. The Inter-Parliamentary Conference shall convene once every six months in the country of the Presidency Parliament or in the European Parliament in Brussels. <u>Extraordinary meetings shall be held when deemed necessary or urgent.</u> The Presidency <u>Parliament</u> shall decide on the matters. Extraordinary</p>

	meetings shall be held when deemed necessary or urgent.
The Netherlands <i>(The House of Representatives and The Senate)</i>	Amendments to the Article 3, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>On a practical level, the communication and cooperation between conference delegations can be improved by setting up an e-mail group list for delegates (i.e. Heads of Delegation) and their clerks, in addition to the network of parliaments' permanent representatives in Brussels.</i>
The Netherlands <i>(The House of Representatives and The Senate)</i>	Amendments to the Article 3, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>The effectiveness of the conference and the interaction between the delegates can be improved by organising a number of (small group) topical debates, working groups, breakout sessions, presentations, side events et cetera instead of or next to the plenary meeting.</i>
The United Kingdom <i>(The House of Lords and The House of Commons)</i>	Amendments to the Article 3, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>One change which we would suggest is the use of concurrent "break-out" session, in addition to the plenary sessions, where interested groups could assemble in smaller numbers to address specific issues of a more strategic nature. We know from our informal discussion with you and your colleagues in Paphos that this is something you were already considering and we would certainly like to encourage it.</i>
The United Kingdom <i>(The House of Lords and The House of Commons)</i>	Amendments to the Article 3, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>Another improvement would be to shift the balance from lengthy presentation by the speakers to more time for questions and answers, which is the fundamental purpose of the meetings. It is also important to ensure that each chamber present is able to contribute during each debate should they wish.</i>
The Netherlands <i>(The House of Representatives and The Senate)</i>	Amendments, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>The Dutch parliament considers the CFSP/CSDP conference to be a formal platform consisting of delegations of the national parliaments in the EU and of the European Parliament. Political groups cannot have an official status or formal rights in the CFSP/CSDP conference (contrary to the practices in the European Parliament and in certain parliamentary assemblies).</i>
Latvia <i>(Saeima)</i>	Amendments to the Article 4.1., b): (b) A draft agenda shall be communicated to all Parliaments in good time before no later than eight (8) weeks prior to each meeting. The agenda must be approved by a majority prior to the start of the meeting.

The Netherlands <i>(The House of Representatives and The Senate)</i>	Amendments to the Article 4 - 4.2, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>The continuity of the CFSP/CSDP conference is better served by a good transfer between the consecutive presidencies. It is suggested to publish a (public) transfer report prior to the conference, elaborating on the efforts that have been made by the preceding presidency and on the priorities of the succeeding one.</i>
--	--

The Netherlands <i>(The House of Representatives and The Senate)</i>	Amendments to the Article 4 - 4.2, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>The impact of the contributions delivered by the CFSP/CSDP conference towards the European institutions and the High Representative can be increased by better monitoring of the implementation of the conference conclusions and the follow up on the statements and commitments by the High Representative to the conference. These matters can be addressed in the suggested bi-annual 'transfer report'.</i>
--	---

The Netherlands <i>(The House of Representatives and The Senate)</i>	Amendments to the Article 6, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>In order to guarantee cost effectiveness and the involvement of all delegations to the conference, no permanent presidency or permanent secretariat or other form of institutionalisation should be established.</i>
--	---

Lithuania <i>(Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania)</i>	Amendments to the Article 7 – 7.2.: 7.2. Draft conclusions of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference shall be drawn up by the Presidency Parliament in English and French and communicated to the delegations of national Parliaments and the European Parliament during the meeting in a reasonable time before their adoption in good time before the relevant meeting of Inter-Parliamentary Conference for any amendments to be submitted and considered.
--	---

Category 2 – proposals in contradiction with the Treaty

Spain <i>(The Cortes Generales)</i>	Amendments to the Article 2 – 2.3., a): a) The High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy of the European Union shall discuss and set out, in the framework of the Inter-Parliamentary conference, be invited to the meetings of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference to set out the priorities and strategies of the EU in the area of CFSP and CSDP.
---	--

Germany <i>(The German Bundestag)</i>	Amendments to the Article 2 – 2.3., a): 2.3. The High Representative, special guests and specialists a) The High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy of the European Union shall be invited to the meetings of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference to set out the priorities and strategies of the EU in the area of CFSP
---	--

	and CSDP. A written statement should be communicated in advance by the High Representative.
Croatia (The Croatian Parliament)	Amendments to the Article 2 - 2.3.,a): 2.3. The High Representative, special guests and specialists a) The High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy of the European Union shall be invited to the meetings of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference to set out the priorities and strategies of the EU in the area of CFSP and CSDP. A written statement or report should be communicated in advance by the High Representative.
Spain (The Cortes Generales)	Supplementing the text with Article 2 - 2.3., b): b) To that effect, the High Representative shall submit to the conference in advance a statement for review. On an annual basis, the High Representative shall prepare a report related to the conclusions and recommendations agreed by the Inter-Parliamentary conference. That report may be reviewed every six months.
Germany (The German Bundestag)	Supplementing the text with the new Article 4. POLITICAL GROUPS: 4. At least six (6) members from at least five (5) different delegations have the right to create a political group.
Germany (The German Bundestag)	Amendments to the Article 7 – 7.3.: 7.3. Once the conclusions have been adopted, the Presidency Parliament shall communicate the final texts in English and French, each of these texts being equally authentic, to all delegations, to the Presidents of national Parliaments and the European Parliament, to the Presidents of the European Council and the Commission and the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, for their information. The Presidency Parliament shall also communicate the final texts to the High Representative and to the Presidents of the Council and the Commission and ask them to deliver an opinion.

Category 3 – proposals in contradiction with the Warsaw Conclusions

Germany (The German Bundestag)	Amendments to the Article 2 - 2.1., a), reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>The German delegation proposes that the number of members from each parliament could be based, perhaps proportionally, on the distribution formula used for the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. See Annex (page 12).</i>
Germany (The German Bundestag)	Amendments to the Article 4 - 4.1., b): (b) A draft agenda shall be communicated to all Parliaments no later than eight

	(8) weeks prior to each meeting. The agenda must be approved by a majority prior to the start of the meeting. Motions to amend the agenda must be submitted by at least three (3) members from at least two (2) different delegations and substantiated prior to the adoption of the agenda; decisions on such amendments shall be made by majority.
--	---

Germany (The German Bundestag)	Amendments to the Article 4 – 4.2: 4.2. Other documents Prior to each meeting, delegations may send any documents relating to items of the agenda to the Secretariat of the Presidency Parliament. The Presidency Parliament may also draw up discussion documents for the Inter-Parliamentary Conference. Discussion papers may be added at the request of three (3) members, subject to a decision adopted by a simple majority.
--	--

Germany (The German Bundestag)	Amendments to the Article 5, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>The German delegation proposes that German is given a status in line with the fact that the IPC is a EU interparliamentary body</i> <i>(Oral Amendment presented 9/11/2012 by the Head of the German delegation)</i>
--	--

Latvia (Saeima)	Amendments to the Article 7.1, reasoning and aim of proposal: <i>Bearing in mind the best practice used within the framework of COSAC (see the respective Rules of Procedure Article 7.5.), Paragraph 1 of Article 7. "Conclusions" in the current wording of the draft Rules of Procedure shall read as follows:</i> 7.1. The Inter-Parliamentary Conference may by consensus shall seek to adopt by broad consensus non-binding conclusions on CFSP and CSDP matters related to the agenda of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference. If this is not possible, contributions shall be adopted with a qualified majority of at least 3/4 of the votes cast. The majority of 3/4 of the votes cast must at the same time constitute at least half of all votes.
---------------------------	---

Germany (The German Bundestag)	Amendments to the Article 7 – 7.1.: 7.1. The Inter-Parliamentary Conference, acting by a three-quarters majority of votes cast , may by consensus adopt non-binding conclusions on CFSP and CSDP matters related to the agenda of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference.
--	---

Germany (The German Bundestag)	Supplementing the text with the new Article 7 - 7.3.: 7.3. Voting rights shall be exercised individually.
--	--

Latvia (Saeima)	<p>Supplementing the Article 7.4, reasoning and aim of proposal:</p> <p><i>With reference to principles set by the Article 7 of the Second Protocol of the Lisbon Treaty, insert a NEW Paragraph (7.4) to read as follows:</i></p> <p>7.4. Each delegation shall have two votes. In the case of a bicameral Parliamentary system, each of the two chambers shall have one vote.</p>
---------------------------	---

Germany (The German Bundestag)	<p>Amendments to the Article 8 – 8.2.: (2013-08-28 correction of the proposal)</p> <p>8.2. Any amendments, which the delegations of national Parliaments, political groups and the European Parliament may propose to the Rules of Procedure, are subject to a decision by consensus and must be in accordance with the framework set by the Conference of Speakers of the EU Parliaments taken by a three-quarters majority. The quorum for these votes is two-thirds of all members.</p>
--	---

Category 4 – proposals to be further examined

Croatia (The Croatian Parliament)	<p>Supplementing the text with Article 2 - 2.3., b):</p> <p>b) The Presidency Parliament may invite, in close cooperation with the national Parliaments and the European Parliament, special guests and specialists to address the meetings on matters relating to the agenda of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference</p>
---	---

The Netherlands (The House of Representatives and The Senate)	<p>Amendments to the Article 4 - 4.1., reasoning and aim of proposal:</p> <p><i>It is recommended that all delegations are consulted about the programme of the next conference before the draft is conveyed. This practice will give all delegations the opportunity to actively suggest agenda topics. It will strengthen the commitment to the conference and will facilitate the preparations as well.</i></p>
---	---

Latvia (Saeima)	<p>Supplementing the Rules of Procedure with the new Article 10:</p> <p>10. ENTRY INTO FORCE</p> <p>10.1. These Rules of Procedure are drawn up in a single original in English and French, each of these texts being equally authentic, and shall be published in the official languages of the European Union. They shall enter into force on the adoption date.</p>
---------------------------	---

Cyprus (The House of Representatives)	<p>Amendments, reasoning and aim of proposal:</p> <p><i>Paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 of the Conclusions of the inaugural Meeting of the Interparliamentary Conference on the CFSP and CSDP held in Paphos, on 9-</i></p>
---	--

	<p>10 September 2012, stipulate that:</p> <p>"7. [The Inter-Parliamentary Conference] is convinced that Parliaments have a crucial role in promoting democratic values and accountable systems of good governance and emphasizes, therefore, the need for an enhanced role of parliaments, particularly in supporting the democratic transitions in its Southern and Eastern Neighbourhood;</p> <p>8. Takes the view that this requires, inter alia, enhanced monitoring of the democratic processes in the Union's Southern and Eastern Neighbourhood and coordination, through joint initiatives and improved exchange of information, as well as parliamentary activities in support to these countries;</p> <p>9. Requests the Presidency to develop proposals to this effect before the next Inter-Parliamentary Conference Meeting;"</p> <p><i>In accordance with paragraph 9, the Cyprus House of Representatives suggests that a fact-finding mission be set up by the Inter-Parliamentary Conference to monitor the democratic processes in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean Neighbourhood. For this purpose, the mission will pay visits to Arab Spring countries and report its findings to the Conference.</i></p> <p><i>The mission can be composed of up to eight members to be decided upon by the Conference, through an open call. A coordinator can be decided from within the group. The composition can be renewed for each mission.</i></p> <p><i>The duration of the mission's mandate can extend until the next Conference and can be renewed.</i></p> <p><i>The Secretariat can be ensured by the Parliament of which the Coordinator is a Member, acting in cooperation with the Presidency Troika and the European Parliament.</i></p> <p><i>The cost of missions can be covered by participating Parliaments.</i></p>
--	--

Annex referring to the amendments of Germany on Article 2 - 2.1.

	CoE PA votes	multiplied by 2/3	rounded up; minimum 4
Austria	6	4,00	4,00
Belgium	7	4,67	5,00
Bulgaria	6	4,00	4,00
Croatia	5	3,33	4,00
Cyprus	3	2,00	4,00
Czech Republic	7	4,67	5,00
Denmark	5	3,33	4,00
Estonia	3	2,00	4,00
Finland	5	3,33	4,00
France	18	12,00	12,00
Germany	18	12,00	12,00
Greece	7	4,67	5,00
Hungary	7	4,67	5,00
Ireland	4	2,67	4,00
Italy	18	12,00	12,00
Latvia	3	2,00	4,00
Lithuania	4	2,67	4,00
Luxembourg	3	2,00	4,00
Malta	3	2,00	4,00
Netherlands	7	4,67	5,00
Poland	12	8,00	8,00
Portugal	7	4,67	5,00
Romania	10	6,67	7,00
Slovakia	5	3,33	4,00
Slovenia	3	2,00	4,00
Spain	12	8,00	8,00
Sweden	6	4,00	4,00
United Kingdom	18	12,00	12,00
	212	141,33	161,00
European Parliament	18	12,00	16,00
Total:	230	153,33	177,00

3.2. Calendario del proceso de reforma del Reglamento



LIETUVOS RESPUBLIKOS
SEIMAS

Lietuvos Respublikos pirmininkavimas
Europos Sąjungos Tarybai
2013 m. liepos 1 d. – gruodžio 31 d.
PARLAMENTINIS MATMUO

Lithuanian Presidency of
the Council of the European Union
1 July – 31 December 2013
PARLIAMENTARY DIMENSION

Présidence lituanienne
du Conseil de l'Union européenne
du 1er juillet au 31 décembre 2013
DIMENSION PARLEMENTAIRE

THE AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE

FINAL TIMETABLE FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE FOR THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY AND THE COMMON SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY

5 September 2013
Vilnius

The Ad Hoc Review Committee, convened in the framework of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on 4-6 September 2013 in Vilnius, has agreed on the final timetable for the review process of the Rules of Procedure of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Common Security and Defence Policy.

Lithuanian Presidency

1. Ad Hoc Review Committee Working group submits proposals from national Parliaments to amend the Rules of Procedure for categorization.
2. Ad Hoc Review Committee examines the proposals and makes remarks at the Concluding session of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference.
3. Ad Hoc Review Committee takes note of the Initial Recommendations by the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania as the Presidency Parliament and passes them to the Greek Presidency for further consideration.

Greek Presidency

4. (February 2014) Seminar of the Working Group submits a package proposal.
5. Ad Hoc Review Committee considers the package proposal prepared by the Working Group (before the Athens Inter-Parliamentary Conference).
6. Athens Inter-Parliamentary Conference considers the proposals.

Italian Presidency

7. Ad Hoc Review Committee considers the proposals at the Rome Inter-Parliamentary Conference and submits them for final adoption.
8. The recommendations are adopted by consensus by the Rome Inter-Parliamentary Conference.

Gedimino pr. 53, LT-01109 Vilnius, LITHUANIA
Tel. + 370 5 239 6762 E-mail: presidency@lrs.lt



EU2013.LT

3.3. Recomendaciones de la Presidencia lituana



Lietuvos Respublikos pirmininkavimas
Europos Sąjungos Tarybai
2013 m. liepos 1 d. – gruodžio 31 d.
PARLAMENTINIS MATMUO

Lithuanian Presidency of
the Council of the European Union
1 July – 31 December 2013
PARLIAMENTARY DIMENSION

Présidence lituanienne
du Conseil de l'Union européenne
du 1er juillet au 31 décembre 2013
DIMENSION PARLEMENTAIRE

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SEIMAS OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA AS THE PRESIDENCY PARLIAMENT

ON THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE FOR THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY AND THE COMMON SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY TO THE AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP

5 September 2013

Vilnius

In accordance with the decision made by the Conference of Speakers of the European Union Parliaments, hereinafter referred to as the Conference of Speakers, on 20-21 April 2012 in Warsaw that a review of the arrangements for the Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), hereinafter referred to as the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, should be conducted after two years from its first meeting and that conclusions from such review should be submitted to the relevant meeting of the Conference of Speakers;

In accordance with Article 9 of the Rules of Procedure of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, adopted on 9-10 September 2012 in Pafos, which states that the "Inter-Parliamentary Conference may appoint an ad hoc review committee which would, eighteen (18) months from the first meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, evaluate the workings of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference and make recommendations thereon to be deliberated upon by the Conference of EU Speakers";

Pursuant to the decision made by the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on 24-25 March 2013 in Dublin to appoint the Ad Hoc Review Committee, hereinafter referred to as the AHRC, to conduct a review of arrangements for the Inter-Parliamentary Conference as well as to establish a Working Group of the AHRC to conduct a preliminary review of arrangements for the Inter-Parliamentary Conference;

Gedimino pr. 53, LT-01109 Vilnius, LITHUANIA
Tel. + 370 5 239 6762 E-mail: presidency@lrs.lt



The Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania as the Presidency Parliament, after careful consideration of the proposals on the Rules of Procedure submitted by the delegations of the national Parliaments, proposes the following initial recommendations:

1. To replace the current abbreviation of the “Inter-Parliamentary Conference” with an acronym in order to distinguish this conference from other inter-parliamentary conferences, such as COSAC and the Interparliamentary Conference on Economic and Financial Governance of the European Union. One proposed acronym is COFDAC.
2. Apart from the plenary meetings, side events, such as topical debates in smaller groups, working groups or concurrent break-out sessions, could be organised in the framework of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference.
3. Draft Conclusions of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference should be communicated by the Presidency Parliament to all delegations before the relevant meeting in a reasonable time for any amendments to be considered and submitted.
4. To define the composition and the role of the Presidential Troika of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, which could consist of the delegations of the national Parliaments of the Presidency, the preceding Presidency, the following Presidency, and the European Parliament.
5. The Presidency Parliament, when setting up the draft agenda, should foresee more time for debate in order to ensure that each parliamentary chamber present is able to contribute during each debate should they wish.
6. To foresee the possibility for political groups, organised along the lines of the European political parties, to convene informal meetings prior to meetings of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference.
7. These Rules of Procedure are drawn up in a single original in English and French, each of these texts being equally authentic. They shall enter into force on the adoption date.

Anexo 4. Texto de la intervención de la Presidenta de la República de Lituania (lengua inglesa).

**Welcome address by H.E. Dalia Grybauskaitė, President of the Republic of Lithuania, at the
Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the
Common Security and Defence Policy**

Distinguished Guests,

Two months ago, Lithuania took over the Presidency of the Council of the European Union. I am delighted that the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania is actively engaged in implementing the Presidency agenda.

This conference is dedicated to Europe's foreign policy, security and defence. I believe that it is held at the right time because foreign policy, security and defence issues are often unduly overlooked. But security and well-being are indivisible. More security and stability in our neighborhood means more security and prosperity in Europe.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The European Union is a unique project. No other international organization possesses such a comprehensive set of political, economic and social instruments to promote democracy and ensure political stability. Many describe the European Union as a „soft power", but its "soft power" drive is often underestimated. And that is why I firmly believe that the signing of the Association Agreement between the European Union and Ukraine as well as the initialing of agreements with Moldova and Georgia at the Vilnius Summit this coming November would not only advance closer trade and economic relations, but would contribute to building a European continent that is secure, stable and prosperous.

It would also reaffirm the credibility of Europe, its ability to make key decisions. This is what Europe and its eastern partners need today.

Distinguished Guests,

Eastern Partnership and stability in the neighborhood is just one of the many themes of this conference on security and defence. I would like to underline that in the 21st century we can no longer discuss only conventional threats. The conflicts that are taking place in the world today have many sides to them - with information, environmental, energy, humanitarian, and religious aspects among many others. If we want peace, stability and prosperity, we cannot ignore any of these aspects. We must stand ready to deal with crises caused by the use of chemical weapons, water shortage and cyber attacks. The European Union, which is complex and diverse, should be better prepared than any other actor to confront new challenges.

This is very important for us in the European Union. This is very important as we talk to our Eastern and Southern neighbors. This is very important for the entire world. Therefore, we must find common agreement to address the highly complicated causes of modern conflicts.

We need it within the European Union. We need it within NATO framework. We need it as we search for common solutions together with the global security community.

Dear Participants of the Conference,

In 2012 the European Union was awarded the Nobel Prize for having contributed for over six decades to the advancement of peace and reconciliation, democracy and human rights.

It is important that we continue on this path. And this conference provides a perfect and timely platform to discuss the pressing challenges that Europe faces today and ways of dealing with them.

Thank you for your attention. I wish you a fruitful discussion.

Dalia Grybauskaitė, President of the Republic of Lithuania

Anexo 5. Texto de la intervención del Presidente del *Seimas* lituano (lengua inglesa).

Welcome address by Dr Vydas Gedvilas, Speaker of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, at the Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Common Security and Defence Policy

“Dear guests, Members of Parliaments, Dear colleagues, Ladies and gentlemen,

I am happy and privileged to have an opportunity to welcome you all at the third Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Common Security and Defence Policy held in the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania. In particular, I would like to congratulate the delegation of the Croatian Parliament taking part in this conference for the first time as a full-fledged national Parliament of the EU. Welcome to the circle of colleagues and friends!

This Inter-Parliamentary Conference is the third parliamentary dimension event of the Lithuanian Presidency of the Council of the European Union. We will hold a total of nine parliamentary dimension events during this half of the year. We have been eagerly waiting and making responsible preparations for them. Therefore, I am particularly delighted to welcome so many of you here in Vilnius.

Dear Members of Parliaments, Ladies and gentlemen,

Today you have gathered to discuss the common foreign and security policy and the common security and defence policy. It is one of the most essential and relevant EU policies. We cannot but be happy about the changes in this field that have taken place over the last decade, especially after the Lisbon Treaty came into effect, strengthening the common foreign and security policy and establishing new measures for a more effective implementation of the policy. I am delighted to note that Baroness Catherine Ashton, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, will take part in the Conference. I appreciate the opportunity to thank her in person for her crucial contribution to strengthening the EU's positions globally and for her difficult diplomatic job not only beyond the European Union but also inside the Union when it comes to finding a common position of the EU Member States on the common foreign and security policy matters.

Mr Anders Fogh Rasmussen, NATO Secretary General, is also going to take part in the Conference as well as in the opening of the NATO Energy Security Centre of Excellence in Vilnius.

Dear participants of the Conference,

Even though peace has been dominating the greater part of Europe for nearly seven decades while relations between countries have been based on law and mutual trust, other regions of the world, unfortunately, face quite a different reality. Recent developments in North Africa and the Middle East serve once again as a reminder to us of how important it is to have an effective common foreign and security policy, seeking to contribute to peace, stability, democracy, human rights and the spread of common social and economic progress in this region that is of crucial strategic importance for us.

Our Eastern partners also need effective engagement of the European Union. They are still stuck in geopolitical crossroads and they could make use of the EU strategic support in making key historical choices. Although more than 20 years have passed since our Eastern neighbours liberated themselves from the communist grip, democracy and human rights still find it difficult to get rooted there; there is still a lack of the rule of law. In the meantime, there are still some countries which project their relations with their neighbours through power and pressure.

This is the reality and the circumstances we have to act in. Therefore, I am certain that only a strong, integrated and effective EU external policy can contribute to positive changes in North Africa or the Middle East at this historically crucial and difficult period of time. I also hope that we will manage to reach a common position on key issues related to the Eastern neighbours while our efforts will be crowned with success at the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius this November.

Dear participants of the Conference, Ladies and gentlemen,

Taking this opportunity, I kindly invite you to visit the documentation and photography exhibition titled „Lithuania’s Return to the World Community of Free Countries“, which was opened this morning in the Exhibition Gallery, Building 1 of the Seimas. This exhibition features key documents which consolidated the foundations of Lithuania’s statehood, including the original of the Act of 11 March 1990 of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania on the Reestablishment of the State of Lithuania as well as the letters of credence presented by the ambassadors of the EU Member States, candidate countries and Eastern Partnership countries, which were signed by the heads of state, prominent politicians of the time. These are the documents that both record our historical developments and attest to the diplomatic and cultural traditions of the countries. I invite you to take this wonderful opportunity to visit this exhibition.

In conclusion, I would like to wish you productive work, i.e. successful exchange of opinions and insights on key subjects of foreign, security and defence policy.

I wish you a pleasant stay in Vilnius and we will be looking forward to your return to Lithuania some time in future again!

Thank you.”

Anexo 6. Texto de la intervención del Ministro de Defensa de Lituania (lengua inglesa).

Key note

Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP)

5 September 2013, Vilnius

Towards December European Council on Defence

Juozas Olekas, Minister of National Defence of the Republic of Lithuania

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my great honour to be here today, and to speak to such a distinguished audience. It is a particular privilege for me to address the inter-Parliamentary conference, which is becoming an important platform to debate EU foreign, security and defence issues.

Lithuania is committed to further development of the Common security and defence policy (CSDP).

Our practical engagement within the CSDP framework has recently become very intense. Our troops are currently on stand-by in the UK-led Battle group. In our first ever engagements in Africa, we are contributing to the EU training mission in Mali and anti-piracy operations off the coast of Somalia.

It is no coincidence that the second half of 2013 will be the most active period in terms of Lithuania's participation in EU operations. Security and defence issues are among our Presidency priorities.

Lithuania is an active Presidency. We have circulated number of Food for Thought papers and hosted number of meetings. Through events like this one Lithuania is ready to create opportunities for in-depth discussions and facilitate debate leading to the December European Council.

The December European Council on Defence is a rare opportunity to have a strategic and forward looking discussion on the CSDP and European defence integration.

Such a discussion is very timely and much needed.

If the EU wants to become a real security provider it has to not shy away from strategic debates and to take defence issues seriously.

Over the last ten years EU security and defence policy has matured. Progress has been fast - we have deployed 29 missions and operations. However, if you put that into the context of global politics, the EU is still a very modest crisis management actor.

With the decreasing level of defence spending, Europe's role could become smaller still. I hope that the European Council in December will be ready to address this challenge in a comprehensive manner.

Many say that European leaders have not discussed defence and security issues for five years. But I would argue that they do it regularly - both nationally and in NATO. What we are lacking is a political vision on further European defence integration. We look to Heads of State and Government in December to provide the leadership and guidelines we all need in our daily work.

Last year's European Council conclusions on the CSDP provided a comprehensive set of questions related to further CSDP development.

But what big ideas and concrete deliverables should we all expect from the Heads of State and Government in December?

The recent interim report on CSDP from the High Representative gives some ideas on the possible way forward. I would like to pick up on some of the emerging elements.

First, the European Council should address the issue of CSDP visibility as well as the importance of security and defence issues in general.

There is no better way to ensure visibility than troops on the ground. However, we should use the December Council meeting to communicate to the wider public that "defence matters". It matters for the sake of our security and economic prosperity.

Let me mention a few things which could support our goal of promoting defence issues. First of all, Heads of State and Government could commit to discussing security and defence issues regularly. In addition, we should once again consider the idea of setting up a Defence formation of the Council of the EU.

Second, the European Council should have a strategic debate on the state of defence in Europe as well as the EU's role as a security provider.

This debate includes such questions as defence spending, further defence cooperation in Europe, and defining what the main EU security interests are. The debate should lead to the setting of strategic priorities and possibly mandating the update of the European Security Strategy.

The 10-year old Strategy and its 5-year old implementation report provide a list of security challenges and threats that EU is facing. However, the Strategy does not provide the best guidance in a rapidly changing environment.

As I often say, it is like going somewhere in a car which has a GPS which has not been updated. It takes longer to navigate with an old map.

I know that for some it is a question of timing and the ability of the EU to produce an ambitious document. But for me, it is a question of the EU's ability to reflect on the shifting strategic environment and our ability to find a common position. The process of preparing such an important document is as valuable as the outcome itself.

Third, the European Council should have a debate on how to make the best use of partnership instruments, including relations with neighbourhood countries, strategic partners and international organisations.

I believe that Heads of State and Government should express a clear political commitment that the EU will undertake responsibility as a security provider in its neighbourhood. Through regular security dialogue and defence cooperation the EU will enable our partners to provide for their own security and to contribute to regional stability. Development of security partnerships is particularly urgent issue following the recent developments in the Southern neighbourhood.

Furthermore, strengthening of CSDP Partnerships is a sound investment in times of austerity. A number of partners are keen to support us in our operations, thereby reducing the burden of the EU member states. I would like to highlight the enthusiasm of the Eastern partners in this regard. Ukraine is already taking part in ATALANTA operation, while Georgia and Moldova have recently pledged their contributions. The EU should actively encourage such contributions from the partners and provide their military with a possibility to serve under the EU flag be it in operations or battle groups.

The more active role could be also played by Member states. For example, Lithuania and Poland engaged Ukraine in creating trilateral brigade LITPOLUKRBRIG, which could be used as a part of EU battle group or NATO NRF force.

Attention should also be given to the issue of EU cooperation with the US and NATO. Strong transatlantic partnership remains essential for Europe in terms of security and defence. The need for closer cooperation between EU and NATO has been articulated a number of times. We need to make it happen, by ensuring active security dialogue as well as further strengthening coordination in capability building and operational activities.

Fourth, the European Council should discuss the EU's response to emerging threats in order to further enhance our ability to respond to cyber, energy and maritime security challenges.

Energy security is one of Lithuania's Presidency priorities. Within defence, we put a particular emphasis on military energy efficiency.

Our armed forces are among the largest energy consumers in Europe. The combined electricity demand of the armed forces of Member States is equal to that of a medium sized EU country. In addition, energy supply is an Achilles heel of military operations.

Therefore, we should look at the impact of energy consumption on defence budgets and military effectiveness and develop a comprehensive energy efficiency strategy for our armed forces.

We need solid political guidance which is consistent with and complementary to both the EU energy objectives and the ongoing discussion of the role of foreign policy in supporting EU energy policy.

Fifth, the European Council should have a debate on the EU's ability to deploy rapidly. At the heart of this discussion I see the question of how to increase usability and efficiency of the EU Battle groups.

We need a strong political message in December, recalling the current level of ambition and committing to use Battle groups. This should be supported by some practical decisions to further develop the modular approach, improve advance planning, and enhance training and certification. Discussion on more equal burden sharing is also a part of that complex issue.

Where the EU can add greatest value is in its ability to take comprehensive action. However, being not willing or ready to rapidly project military capabilities, the EU will be missing a very important element for a truly comprehensive response.

Sixth, the December European Council is an opportunity for us to really commit to the development of European defence capabilities. By committing to a number of European Flagship projects, such as Air-to-Air refueling, Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems, satellite communications and cyber defence. As well as by giving a political impetus to further develop defence cooperation within the EU.

Heads of the State should encourage further work on identifying the incentives for closer European defence cooperation in the long run, including the fiscal stimulus.

Last but not least, the overview on the preparation for December European Council would not be complete without specifically mentioning the growing role of the European Commission in the defence field.

With its recent communication on the defence industry, the European Commission is consolidating its role in creating a competitive and efficient European defence market. In addition it is also becoming a very important player in ensuring comprehensive EU action in such domains as energy, cyber and space, and by possibly facilitating multilateral defence cooperation. This is a shift which could have major implications for European defence. We very much welcome the added value the European Commission brings to the defence sector.

This is not an exhaustive list of issues to be discussed in December, and we continue to work on defining the key deliverables for the December European Council.

I hope that informal discussions in Vilnius will help to shape the common understanding what is achievable by the end of the year. December deliverables are very much in our hands.

I wish all of us very fruitful discussions today and in the coming months.

Anexo 7. Comentarios de la Alta Representante de la UE para la PESC y la PCSD (lengua inglesa).

Vilnius, 06 September 2013

130906/2

R E M A R K S

by EU High Representative Catherine Ashton to the

Interparliamentary Conference (IPC), Vilnius, 5 September 2013

"It is always a great privilege to have an opportunity to be in this wonderful city and this is my first opportunity to stand in these walls which have their own important history for Lithuania, the whole region and for the European Union. I'm always delighted to have an opportunity to meet with parliamentarians, not just from the European Parliament but also from national Parliaments. Many of us met last time in Dublin and we'll continue our journey here today.

Each time we meet there is some subject that remains the same, and there are new issues that I know are uppermost in your minds. I hope in our question and answer session we will have a chance to discuss those issues that are most important to you, in the course of this afternoon.

It's also a pleasure because I believe parliamentarians play a very special role. Not only are you closest to the citizens that you represent, but you play a particular role in representing and defending the values that we hold dear at home and abroad and you can speak up in ways that frankly diplomats cannot. You work hard to observe elections and are taken extremely seriously across the world for the things that you say.

You share the knowledge and experience as well of the countries that you come from and the history which you have. And as we work so much more now with countries that we describe as being in transition, the contribution that you can make to supporting them from your own experience is absolutely invaluable.

I want to talk about some of the aspects of that, when we think about the relationships we have in the Eastern Partnership. I remember the television pictures from when we saw two million people linked Vilnius to Tallinn to Riga in a human chain, and what that represented not just for the people here but for people across the world. I still believe that's what they look to the European Union for today too: to strengthen the relationship that they have with the European Union and to have an opportunity in some cases to be part of the European Union and its future. Those who are closest to us want to join us, those who are further away want to imitate us. With the African Union, with Asian countries, many conversations I have across the world are about trying to create something new in an economic sense to begin with, but more and more often in a political sense. Look at how the Asian nations have tried now to develop a human rights strategy. Look at the developments in the African Union where they model themselves largely on us. What we know when we travel across the world, all of us, is how much people look for the same things. People want to live in dignity and freedom, they want to have a good job, they want their children to go to school, they want to be safe and they want a future. I've met people in so many places and they said the same things to me. They said we want what you have, you have democracy as a way of life. That's what a young woman said to me in Benghazi at the height of the war in Libya. That's been reflected in

conversations, from Burma-Myanmar through to Egypt, through to Serbia-Kosovo, through to every country that is currently going through any kind of dramatic change. I've spoken to this gathering before about what I call the importance of deep democracy. The countries going through transitions will find themselves on a bumpy and sometimes long road. Again we have in this room so much experience of transition and change, of the search for democracy, of the difficulties and of knowing that it is not something ever to take for granted. That's a strong and important message. Many countries look to us to show them how democracy can be developed. You have to dig the roots in deep and you have to continue to nurture them. You have to build the institutions of democracy because an election is not enough. It's a guarantee of the future of elections, of transparency, of administration, of all the elements that we recognize that make democracy work. The Lisbon Treaty says "the European Union's actions on the international scene shall be guided by the principles which have inspired its own creation and which it seeks to advance in the wider world - democracy, the rule of law, the universality and indivisibility of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity". It also says that the European Union's External Action should seek to preserve peace, to prevent conflict and to strengthen international security. I want to focus a little bit on how we bring together all of the different ways in which Europe can act.

We're better able to make sure that we are supporting political, economic and crisis management, fostering democracy, helping to stabilize countries and preventing lasting conflicts. I don't have to tell anyone here but when you look across the world there is no question that we need to do this more and the challenge is even bigger than we thought.

Right now we are faced with what I describe as an arc of instability that is evolving across our own neighbourhood from Libya to Egypt, from the tragedy of Syria to Iraq; August in Iraq was the deadliest month in 5 years. And we've just witnessed the brutal incidents in Camp Ashraf which I condemned in the strongest terms. I spoke to the new UN representative who asked to come see me to talk about how he can support those people.

All of the tools that we have and we can use have value. The basic truth should guide us. Whatever amount of political energy, time and money we spend on conflict prevention we will have saved several times the amount spent on dealing with the consequences of conflict. Not to mention the human suffering that can be averted through conflict prevention.

And, you know, I realized particularly in our modern media world, that sometimes trying to prevent wars doesn't get as much publicity as you would hope. The ever on-going work of diplomats, every minute of every day to try both to help people and prevent conflict is extremely valuable and often under rated. We also need to continue to engage directly where we can make a difference. We know that we can help people to solve differences because we provide the environment where they can come together and we can provide support to them.

It has been especially true for the people working with Serbia and Kosovo. We will meet on Sunday for the 16th occasion. We can see the transformation that is on-going in the relationship between the people and the leaders and the capacity to now find the way forward; that means that there won't be a return to conflict and the lives of the people on both sides will be improved. They show great courage. They continue to show great courage. And last night we saw the registration which was necessary for the elections that will take place in Kosovo and we saw the support that is coming from Belgrade for those elections. Our role is to facilitate and support, but they would tell you if they were here that they could not have done it without us.

I also think about the work that we are doing in Egypt. Some of you may have seen the visits

that I have made. I have been eleven times in Egypt since the revolution took place two years ago. But we went and continued to talk with Egyptians because we are trusted interlocutors within the country, within the region. They know that we talk to all and that our agenda is an agenda of support for the Egyptian people. And in the pursuit of democracy and freedom I will talk to everybody to try to help them come up with the political road map they need. We still talk to Egypt. Egyptians were in Brussels last week and we will be going back to discuss with them how they can still continue to do that in circumstances that have become more and more difficult.

We are trying to do it as well across our Neighbourhood, finding innovative ways to bring partnerships together, to put resources on the ground, to support the people, women's groups, civil society, helping to make sure that the electricity works, helping to support infrastructure that will give people better transport, helping to ensure the economic recovery which will be led, as it always is, in large part by small businesses starting all over these nations. From Libya to Jordan, to Egypt, billions of euros mobilised for the purpose of supporting people.

And we will take the model that we developed there, the task force, to Burma-Myanmar in November, to use this mechanism to take leaders of industries and political leaders with us, all committed under an EU umbrella of working in the best possible way for social responsibility and support of the people of that country. And take parliamentarians who are close to Aung San Suu Kyi, with her team, with President Thein Sein, with parliamentarians, with our desire to see economic and political security for that country.

I also should mention the vital role - in terms of our intervention and dialogue - we play in the talks with Iran. I have already spoken to the new Foreign Minister twice. I am determined to ensure that if there is a prospect of a diplomatic solution we will find it and we will do all we can to ensure that the collaboration is effective. We work closely with Russia, with China, with the United States and with all European colleagues, but it is EU leadership in the work that we do.

I am also very much aware of the tragedy in Syria and although there are differences in some of the ways that we want to go forward, we are all united in some common things. The first and most obvious is that there has to be a political dialogue and solution and we will have to sit together. And anyone who says "that's the easy part" does not understand how important negotiations will be to end the war. It will be incredibly difficult but it will be necessary to do so. And when it starts it's the best solution for people whose lives have been destroyed by what has happened, by death, by injuries. There are 2 million children directly affected by what has happened in Syria. All of them lacking the basics like school, a house, friends. All of these things are denied to children because they are either internally displaced in Syria or living in a country outside like Lebanon and Jordan. We work with the United Nations, we believe in the work by Lakhdar Brahimi and his efforts, we've supported the initiative by Secretary Kerry and Minister Lavrov to try and get talks moving and we continue more than anything to be the biggest humanitarian donor in the world for the people in Syria and we will continue to do that. And we also know that there are difficult times ahead as nations decide how best to try to tackle this problem and how to deal with the problem of the terrible chemical attack that took place on the 21st of August. We also know that it is important to follow the negotiations that are going on in the Middle East, and again I pay tribute to John Kerry for his work. He will be joining us at the Gymnich meeting on Saturday in order to brief us on that and other issues. And we will continue to support those talks.

I want to focus as well on the work we're doing to support women all over the world. Because we believe that where women prosper, societies prosper and where they do not, societies do not. It makes no economic, political or moral sense to have half the population not able to contribute to the world. I should, while in Vilnius, pay tribute to the work of the European Gender Equality

Institute which is based here, and remind colleagues that we work closely with women in Egypt, in Jordan, across our neighbourhood and across the world and bring them together so their voice is heard, as we did with the women leaders of the Sahel region recently at a meeting in Brussels.

I want to spend a couple of minutes on the Common Security and Defence Policy. Quite often, our missions are about building the rule of law, community policing and capacity building. What characterizes them is that they are hands-on operations, direct in the approach that they take. Since the EEAS was established we've launched five new missions and we're constantly reviewing and adapting the ones we have. We have 16 missions and operations with 7000 men and women deployed in places like Afghanistan where we have 350 people who are training Afghan police officers, like in the monitoring mission in Georgia which monitors the situation on the ground and so on. We do this in order to make sure that we are able to support the people and help them to deal with the issues that they are confronted with. And I am very glad that the European Council in December is going to pick up this question on what more we should do on Common Security and Defence Policy based on the report that I will give them by the end of this month. Defence Ministers, as you know, will join me later today to discuss this issue and it will also be part of the Foreign Ministers' discussions at the Gymnich. This is about how we become an effective security provider and it's about looking at how we use our resources in Europe. We spend 200 billion Euros a year on defence and I think we can spend it better than we spend it now. We need to look at pooling and sharing, we need to build a strong industrial base to provide the capabilities, we need to make sure that it is also a source of jobs and growth and a driver of innovation.

And working with the European Defence Agency, we are able to do much to develop a working collaboration across the European Union in Research and Development, opportunities to pool knowledge to be used by all in a much more cost-effective way than it's currently the case. Because you know that we face rising challenges, the financial crisis has affected budgets in every area, and that includes security and defence. We see the interdependence of member states when it comes to security and defence and now it's time for heads of state and government to help us drive this agenda further, including explaining to our public why defence matters as much as it does and to enable us to cooperate better among ourselves and with others. To work directly with the UN, with NATO, the African Union; with others who want us to help them and to make sure that part of what we are doing is in our capacity of building missions like in Libya, Niger, Somalia or Mali where we're helping partners to become more effective.

Colleagues, there is no unique recipe because every situation is different, but it is absolutely right that the European Union should look to see what it can uniquely do. We have a wide array of tools that we can use: diplomatic, security, defence, financial, trade, development, humanitarian. My ambition is to make sure that they join up in a coherent way: To unite everyone on the EU side behind a coherent approach so we can work in a coordinated way using all our resources and our instruments, but using them truly effectively.

My final word is on the next time that I will be in Vilnius when we will be hosting the Eastern Partnership Summit here. It's very dear to our hosts in Lithuania but it really is extremely important for the EU. We know that the lead-up to Vilnius is going to be difficult. We have to ensure that our partners – perhaps particularly Ukraine – show that they can deliver on their commitments to reform. But we also have to recognize that they face immense external pressure. If we succeed, the Association Agreements, with the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas, will give our partners a framework they need for sustained transformation, in the rule of law, democracy, human rights and much better access to the biggest market in the world and the best standards that they can possibly have to modernize their countries. I am convinced that we can open a new chapter in our

long quest to promote stability and prosperity in the Eastern neighbourhood and draw them closer to us. And it will be a tribute to the work that we have all done if we are able to be successful with this.

Colleagues, I will stop there. It's a privilege, as I said, to have been able to come to speak to you. There are many topics and many issues and countries I would like to speak about. But it will be for me much more important to speak about the issues that you would particularly like to focus on.

Thank you so much."

FOR FURTHER DETAILS:

Michael Mann +32 498 999 780 - +32 2 584 9780- Michael.Mann@eeas.europa.eu
@EUHighRepSpox

Maja Kocijancic +32 498 984 425 - +32 2 298 65 70 - Maja.Kocijancic@ec.europa.eu
@AshtonSpox_Maja

Sebastien Brabant +32 460 75 09 98 - Sebastien.Brabant@ec.europa.eu

Follow us on Twitter @eu_eeas

www.facebook.com/EuropeanExternalActionService

www.eeas.europa.eu

Anexo 8. Texto de la intervención del Secretario General de la OTAN (lengua inglesa).

06 Sep. 2013

Fulfilling Europe's Potential
Speech by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the Inter-parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Common Security and Defence Policy, Vilnius

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is a privilege and a pleasure to stand before you today. I see many familiar faces in the audience, including representatives from the European Parliament and national parliaments whom I have known for many years.

Let me start with the situation in Syria, which is of concern to the whole world. We have all seen the terrible images of what happened in the suburbs of Damascus on August 21st. A massive chemical weapons attack. Civilians gassed by their own regime.

A variety of sources point to the responsibility of the Syrian regime. NATO Allies have condemned this attack in the strongest possible terms. And it cannot go unanswered.

NATO continues to play its part as a forum of consultations where North America and Europe consult every day.

Our Patriot deployment continues to keep watch over Turkey. And we continue to protect and defend the Alliance's south-eastern border.

But as the situation in Syria demonstrates, we continue to face significant security challenges. And it is vital that we are prepared to meet them together.

Ladies and gentlemen,

In this hall, over two decades ago, Lithuania regained its sovereignty and began its journey towards Euro-Atlantic and European integration.

That journey has led to remarkable success. Nearly a decade ago, Lithuania became a valued NATO Ally, and a respected member of the European Union. This country has become safer. And Lithuania's security has helped make the entire Euro-Atlantic region safer.

As an Ally, Lithuania has shown commitment to our shared security. This country has helped to strengthen our political solidarity. And it has made important contributions to our operations, including to our ongoing mission in Afghanistan.

Lithuania has also been a leader on the issue of energy security. I am pleased to attend the opening of the NATO Centre of Excellence on Energy Security here later today. This institution will prove indispensable as we explore ways to address an important concern.

And as the holder of the European Union presidency for the first time, Lithuania has vowed to push for strengthened cooperation between the European Union and NATO.

For all this, I extend my thanks to Lithuania's government and to the people of Lithuania.

Today I speak to you as NATO's Secretary General. But I also speak to you as a proud European who believes in Europe -- and who cares greatly about the future of our continent. And because I care for Europe's future, let me be very clear from the start. If we in Europe do not invest more - financially and politically - in our own defence and security, then in the future, we will not speak of our influence in the world, but of the influence of others over our world.

Let me give you a few figures. Over the last four years, most European NATO Allies have reduced their defence spending. Some by more than 20%.

By contrast, defence spending in the emerging world is increasing quickly. In 2012, Asian defence spending overtook Europe's for the first time. By 2015, it is forecast that defence

spending in China alone will be equal to that of the 8 largest European NATO Allies combined.

While our defence spending is falling, global security challenges are rising. Nation-state instability. Missile proliferation. Terrorism. Cyber-attacks.

To tackle these challenges, Europe needs soft power instruments. But it also needs to back them up with hard military capabilities.

Our continent has half a million more soldiers under arms than the United States. But we continue to fail to get the most out of those impressive resources.

For example, basic and technical training is largely the same for all our forces, particularly where nations use the same equipment. But there are too few examples where our forces train efficiently together.

And the problem is compounded by our industrial practices. For example, we operate close to forty different types of infantry fighting vehicles – many in small numbers, but protecting national industries. The result is poor economies of scale, excessive running costs, and inefficient training.

So – in essence – if we Europeans want to tackle the challenges we will face in the future, then, we must raise the level of our ambition.

We must let go of the lingering national rivalries of the past.

And we must pool and share more of what we have and use it more effectively.

Our security isn't optional. It is vital. And to preserve it, we Europeans need to invest in a strong Europe. We need to invest in a strong NATO. And we need to invest in a strong partnership between NATO and the European Union.

as you know next December the European Union will hold an important Summit on security and defence.

In the run-up to the Summit, I believe the countries of Europe should focus on three key areas.

First, capabilities. European countries have made real progress in developing new capabilities such as heavy transport aircraft. But we are all aware of the shortfalls. These shortfalls include drones for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

While we have already made progress on addressing these shortfalls, more has to be done.

That will take significant time and investment. Such investment may cost money. But sending out troops into battle without the support they need may cost lives – the lives of our troops and of those we are meant to protect.

At NATO, we are working hard to provide critical capabilities. Our Smart Defence initiative, for example, has 29 multinational capability projects in the pipeline. The first – a helicopter maintenance project in Afghanistan – was recently completed.

And for its part, the European Union is working to provide capabilities through pooling and sharing. For example, the European Union is leading a multinational programme on acquiring more air-to-air refuelling planes.

I strongly welcome this. It will enhance the European Union's ability to act, and NATO's as well. I encourage the European Union to use the December Council to make further progress on this important initiative.

Second, industry. To develop effective and modern capabilities, Europe needs effective and modern industries. National borders should not be barriers to competition. Instead, we need a truly European defence market that leads to innovation, better and cheaper equipment, and a better return on every euro spent.

Making the defence industry in Europe stronger, more sustainable, and more streamlined is a vital part of Europe's ability to ensure its future security.

Finally, forces. European countries should take a long hard look at the forces they will need in the future. No single European country on its own can produce the forces of the size, scale and skills that we have deployed during the past 20 years. But together, we can.

So if European countries are to have access to the full spectrum of capabilities and forces they require, they must cooperate more closely.

NATO and the European Union share the same values. We share the same strategic analysis of the challenges we face. And we have the same vision. Our two organisations are on the same road and travelling towards the same destination – a Europe where our nations share responsibility for our security and remain a force for good in the world.

As we travel, we must ensure that we don't push each other off the road by pursuing similar projects. We don't have the money for it, and our taxpayers don't have the patience for it. Cooperation, not duplication, is the way to success. And you, as parliamentarians, are critical in making it happen.

Ladies and gentlemen,

As a believer in both Europe and NATO, I am convinced that Europeans should not be content with playing the role of a global spectator. We can be and must be global actors.

At the European Council in December, we Europeans have to make a strategic choice. We should put our money where our mouth is, and our resources where the need is. We should build capabilities, not bureaucracies. And we should build them together -- as Europeans cooperating with each other and with our North American Allies.

Thank you.

Anexo 9. Conclusiones de la III Conferencia PESD/PCSD propuestas por la Presidencia lituana con enmiendas de compromiso (lengua inglesa).



Lietuvos Respublikos pirmininkavimas
Europos Sąjungos Tarybai
2013 m. liepos 1 d. – gruodžio 31 d.
PARLAMENTINIS MATMUO

Lithuanian Presidency of
the Council of the European Union
1 July – 31 December 2013
PARLIAMENTARY DIMENSION

Présidence lituanienne
du Conseil de l'Union européenne
du 1er juillet au 31 décembre 2013
DIMENSION PARLEMENTAIRE

Draft with compromise amendments

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE FOR THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY AND THE COMMON SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY

CONCLUSIONS

4–6 September 2013, Vilnius

The Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Having regard to the decision of the Conference of Speakers of EU Parliaments taken in April 2012 in Warsaw regarding the establishment and mandate of this Conference;

Having regard to Title II of Protocol I of the Treaty of Lisbon regarding the promotion of effective and regular interparliamentary cooperation within the Union;

*Cognisant of the new powers and instruments foreseen by the Treaty of Lisbon for the EU institutions in the area of foreign, security and defence policy; being aware that the new instruments create better opportunities for the Union to wield international influence commensurate with its **political and (tabled by the Italian delegation) economic weight;***

Conscious of the multi-layered decision-making process in the areas of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP); being aware that effective implementation of these policies must involve numerous policy actors at both the EU and national levels; conscious of the responsibility to engage in parliamentary scrutiny and advance interparliamentary cooperation in the areas of CFSP and CSDP;

Taking into account the fast-changing geopolitical environment and the increasing importance of new foreign and security policy challenges such as climate change, transnational crime and terrorism, maritime piracy, security of energy supply, cyber-attacks, pandemics, as well as fragile and failing states and the proliferation of WMDs and conventional weapons;

Aware that the evolution of the international geopolitical scenario has brought about an unavoidable strengthening of the role of Parliaments which are at the core of global decision making with respect to crises and conflicts; (tabled by the Italian delegation)

*[Compromise proposed by the Trio and the EP: Aware that the evolution of the international geopolitical scenario has ~~brought about an unavoidable strengthening~~ **highlighted the central role** of the role of Parliaments which are at the core of global decision making with respect to crises and conflicts]*

Gedimino pr. 53, LT-01109 Vilnius, LITHUANIA
Tel. + 370 5 239 6762 E-mail: presidency@lrs.lt



EU2013.LT

CFSP: Conflict in Syria

1. Expresses its deepest concern about the ongoing conflict in Syria that has already caused over 100,000 deaths, of which most are civilian; draws attention to the massive humanitarian crisis that has unfolded as a result of the conflict and that is affecting the whole region; notes with alarm that, according to estimates of the United Nations (UN) High Commissioner for Refugees, more than 2 million Syrians have fled their country and sought refuge in neighbouring countries;
2. Expresses extreme concern over the use of chemical weapons in Syria, in particular the chemical attack that took place in the Damascus suburbs on 21 August 2013 and which reportedly killed more than 1400 people, including at least 400 children; looks forward to the conclusions of the investigation carried out by the mission of UN experts on the incident, yet regrets that the mission was not allowed to start the investigation immediately after the attack; considers that the use of weapons of mass destruction, banned by the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention, is a crime against humanity that must be condemned in strongest terms *and a strong international reaction is required (tabled by the Danish delegation); and requires strongest international action; (tabled by the Finnish delegation); the situation in Syria should be referred to the International Criminal Court (tabled by the German delegation);*

[Compromise proposed by the Trio and the EP: and requires a strong international reaction, including a possible referral to the International Criminal Court]

3. Stresses the responsibility of the international community, and in particular the UN Security Council, to hold accountable the perpetrators of such crimes and to take appropriate measures, *in the framework of the UN Charter (tabled by the European Parliament),* to ensure that such crimes are not repeated in the future; calls on ~~Russia and China~~ *all as (tabled by the Cypriot delegation)* permanent members of the UN Security Council, to face their responsibility and unblock the UN Security Council and facilitate the achievement of a common position and a political solution to the Syrian conflict; believes that the EU together with its international partners should persist in promoting a political solution, which is critical in order to achieve a peaceful, inclusive and democratic transition in Syria *in line with the UN Charter (tabled by the Cypriot delegation);* supports the convening of the Geneva II peace conference as a follow-up to the conference on the Syrian conflict held in June 2012;

[Compromise proposed by the Trio and the EP: Stresses the responsibility of the international community, and in particular the UN Security Council, to hold accountable the perpetrators of such crimes and to take appropriate measures, ~~in the framework of~~ accordance with the principles of the UN Charter, to ensure that such crimes are not repeated in the future; calls on Russia and China, as permanent members of the UN Security Council, to face their responsibility and unblock the UN Security Council and facilitate the achievement of a common position and a political solution to the Syrian

conflict; believes that the EU together with its international partners should persist in promoting a political solution, which is critical in order to achieve a peaceful, inclusive and democratic transition in Syria ~~in line with the UN Charter~~; supports the convening of the Geneva II peace conference as a follow-up to the conference on the Syrian conflict held in June 2012;

4a (new) – Calls on the EU Member States to show solidarity to Syrian refugees and provide all the necessary assistance and aid to them, including by invoking an EU-wide protection temporary regime; (tabled by the European Parliament)

4b (new) – Is of the view that the dramatic events in Syria make it necessary for the EU to embrace the idea of a humanitarian intervention which should be as direct and immediate as those already made on the ground; believes that an extensive plan should be promoted in Europe to help those who have run or will run away from the Syrian conflict; stresses that to this end it is necessary to allocate resources and define working methods and goals for a new Euro-Mediterranean framework; (tabled by the Italian Senate)

[Compromise proposed by the Trio and the EP: Calls on the EU Member States to show solidarity to Syrian refugees and provide all the necessary assistance and aid to them, including by invoking an EU-wide protection temporary regime; (tabled by the European Parliament); is of the view that the dramatic events in Syria make it necessary for the EU to embrace the idea of a humanitarian ~~intervention~~ response which should be as direct and immediate as those already made on the ground; believes that an extensive plan should be promoted in Europe to help those who have run or will run away from the Syrian conflict; stresses that to this end it is necessary to allocate resources and define working methods and goals for a new Euro-Mediterranean framework;]

CFSP: developing a Comprehensive Approach

4. Believes that foreign and security policy objectives of the EU should be based on and further developed with the overall aim of contributing to peace, preventing conflict, promoting human rights, democracy and international law – principles that inspired the creation of the EU itself;
5. Considers that there should be more strategic foreign policy coordination at the Union level if the EU wants to increase its international influence as well as its effectiveness to implement its foreign policy objectives; is of the opinion that adequate resources should be provided for the EU to act effectively and consistently on the world stage;
6. Underlines that only by adopting a comprehensive approach to foreign and security policy, which includes not only the diplomatic and economic instruments but also development aid and, in the last resort and in compliance with the UN Charter, military means, can the EU expect to effectively counter global threats, promote its strategic interests and fundamental values; believes that the Treaty of Lisbon enables the EU to adopt such a comprehensive

approach and looks forward to the HR/VP setting this out in her report on the role of CSDP within the comprehensive approach;

7. Takes note of the review of the organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service (EEAS) published by the HR/VP in July 2013; notes that the EEAS was launched in the midst of the worst economic crisis in decades and in the context of unprecedented civic and political upheaval in its southern neighbourhood; recognises the efforts of the HR/VP to achieve greater coordination, synergies, economies of scale, complementarity and cohesion of the EU's various foreign policy instruments, including those of its Member States, and to forge a more united foreign and security policy in general; is of the view that the full potential of instruments foreseen in the Treaty of Lisbon, including the opportunities for structured cooperation, have yet to be fully realised;
8. Welcomes efforts by the HR/VP to promote and defend human rights in the world, in particular welcomes the adoption of the Strategic Framework and Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy in 2012; is of the view that the EU Special Representative for Human Rights has enhanced the effectiveness and visibility of the EU's human rights policy; supports a more active engagement of civil society in defending human rights abroad and in the EU's external relations more generally; *is looking forward to the accession of the EU to the European Convention on Human Rights and enhanced cooperation with the Council of Europe; (tabled by the German delegation)*
9. Highlights the importance of maintaining strengthened relationships with the EU's strategic partners; underlines that strategic partnerships must be based upon a common vision, not least a commitment to democracy and human rights, and should be reviewed regularly including through parliamentary cooperation; welcomes the start of negotiations between the EU and the US on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, which not only has the potential of boosting jobs and growth of the two biggest economies in the world but also of promoting internationally the values and interests that are the basis of the transatlantic partnership;

CFSP and the external dimension of the EU's energy policy

10. Underlines the importance of ensuring coherence between the EU's foreign and energy policies including by improving internal energy efficiency and by reducing energy dependency on third countries, especially those countries that do not share or respect fundamental EU values or where there is a risk that energy resources will be used as an instrument to undermine the EU's foreign policy objectives;
11. Recalls the request made by the Council to the Commission to present a report before the end of 2013 on the status of implementation of the EU's external energy policy and looks forward to the ensuing debate on the matter; is of the opinion that ensuring nuclear safety in EU neighbouring countries has to be an integral part of the EU's external energy policy and that the EU should promote the highest nuclear safety standards internationally; underlines that energy security is a key concern of the Union and as such be integrated

more strategically in CFSP including in dialogues with strategic partners and in relevant multilateral fora;

CFSP and the European Neighbourhood Policy

12. Emphasises the importance of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), which is a Community policy and stresses the need to establish a closer link between the CFSP and the ENP as part of the comprehensive approach; given the centrality of the principle of effective multilateralism in the EU's foreign policy strategy supports the strengthening of multilateral cooperation within the regional ENP formats, namely the Eastern Partnership and the Union for Mediterranean; recognises, however, that EU neighbours manifest different levels of aspiration in terms of cooperation with the EU and that as a results relationship with each of the partners are unique and ENP instruments should be tailored to serve each of those relationships individually; calls on the partner countries not to lower their ambition and commitment to reform and seek closer political and economic association with the EU;
13. Highlights the strategic importance to CFSP of the countries of the Eastern Partnership; calls therefore for the 3rd Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius to open the door to closer political association and deeper economic integration for those Eastern Partnership that meet their commitments and requirements; recognises the aspirations of the Eastern partners on the basis of their ambitions and commitments arising therefrom, including those enshrined in Article 49 of the Treaty of European Union, provided they meet the relevant criteria;
14. Welcomes, in line with the principle of more for more, the progress that has been achieved in the negotiations on the bilateral Association Agreements and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements with the Eastern partners, including the conclusion of visa facilitation agreements and progress on visa liberalisation, which strengthen people-to-people contacts and improve the general political relations with these countries; in this regard welcomes the conclusion of the visa facilitation agreements with Azerbaijan and Armenia and progress in negotiations with Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine on the Visa Liberalisation Action Plans;

15 (new) – Calls on the Russian Federation to renounce its policies of intimidation and various forms of blackmail towards the Eastern Partnership countries; underlines the need for a consistent, firm and unanimous EU response to the above mentioned policies of unprecedented pressure towards EU neighbours; urges the European Commission to reinforce its efforts in negotiations with the Eastern Partnership countries in order to ensure that decisions made in the Vilnius summit grant them irreversible progress towards ever closer partnership with the EU; (tabled by the Lithuanian delegation)

[Compromise proposed by the Trio and the EP: Underlines the need for a unanimous and consistent EU response to the ~~unprecedented~~ political, economic and trade pressure the Russian Federation is applying towards the Eastern Partnership countries which undermines the sovereign rights of these countries to freely pursue their political path

towards the EU and which is against the principles of the Helsinki Accords, the WTO commitments and international law; urges the European Commission to reinforce its efforts in negotiations with the Eastern Partnership countries in order to ensure that decisions made in the Vilnius summit grant them irreversible progress towards ever closer partnership with the EU;]

15. Calls for *structured intensified (tabled by the Finnish delegation)* cooperation with the countries of the Eastern Partnership in the framework of CSDP with the aim, inter alia, to further encourage their participation in EU crisis management operations and missions;
16. Welcomes the commitment of HR/VP in the Southern neighbourhood and her continuous efforts to promote peace, stability and democratic change in the region;
17. Expresses its deep concern about the situation in Egypt; condemns excessive violence by all parties, both state security forces and opposition forces, that has already caused hundreds of deaths of innocent civilians and security officers; urges all conflicting parties to resolve their differences through peaceful dialogue and calls for an inclusive political agreement for power to be transferred to democratically elected leaders in the nearest possible future; - *MOVE AFTER PARA 3 TO BE NEW PARA 4 (tabled by the Finnish delegation)*

[Compromise proposed by the Trio and the EP: Not to move the paragraph]

18. Welcomes the initiative of the US Secretary of State to give a fresh start to the Middle East Peace Process by relaunching direct final status negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority; encourages both parties of the conflict to take the negotiations seriously and to engage their respective societies in the discussion about the benefits and the necessity of achieving a lasting peace agreement; underlines that finding a solution to the conflict would serve the interests of both Israel and the Palestinian Authority, as well as the EU and the wider international community; calls upon all parties to refrain from initiatives which can either prejudice or undermine the successful conclusion of the talks *with regard, in particular, to the recent decision of the Israeli government to authorise the expansion of some settlements (tabled by the European Parliament); - MOVE AFTER PARA 3 TO BE NEW PARA 5 (tabled by the Finnish delegation)*

[Compromise proposed by the Trio and the EP: Not to move the paragraph]

19. Notes that EU parliaments have an important responsibility of supporting parliaments and civil society in countries undergoing transition and that such support could help lay the foundations for a robust and effective parliamentary democracy in those countries; takes the view that parliamentary diplomacy can play a significant role in contributing to the EU's foreign policy objectives of strengthening human rights and contributing to democratic reforms; in this regard stresses the importance of the full use of such platforms of parliamentary cooperation as EURONEST and EUROMED parliamentary assemblies;

Review of the European Security Strategy

20. Notes that the current European Security Strategy (ESS), which was adopted 10 years ago, does not fully meet the new global realities and that the time has come for the review of the strategy; points out that the revision process can by itself be a valuable process and provide an opportunity to reinvigorate the CSDP; considers that an appropriate time and place for the discussion on the review of the ESS could be the December European Council; expresses its position that national Parliaments and the European Parliament should be engaged in the review as much as possible to reach the maximum possible consensus on the new ESS;
21. Notes that while conventional security challenges and capabilities will continue to form the backbone of defence policy in general, emerging challenges in the field of cyber, space, maritime or energy security, need to have a special place in the EU's security and defence strategy and should be addressed at the Union level in a comprehensive manner; points out that the EU Cyber Security Strategy is a value adding effort, while further discussion on the evolution of the EU's role and level of engagement in space is desirable; notes that the armed forces are the largest public consumers of energy in Europe and that efforts should be made to increase their efficient use of energy, especially in operations; supports the European Defence Agency's (EDA's) Military Green effort; welcomes the Commission's initiative to identify possible objectives and focus areas of action at the EU level for a comprehensive energy concept for armed forces;

CFSP/CSDP: towards the December European Council

22. Reiterates its call for the European Council to give a much needed boost to address the serious decline in European defence and to make proposals for speeding up CSDP decision making and the financing of CSDP operations as well as on structured cooperation and on the future of the EU Battlegroups; further reiterates its call for the European Council to set out a roadmap with specific timelines for achieving progress on defence issues, including all existing provisions in the Lisbon Treaty, to ensure the Union's security during a period of significant defence cuts in all Member States;
23. Considers that the EU Battlegroups have the potential of being one of the key tools of the CSDP but stresses that steps should be taken to better define their usability, such as by adopting the modular approach, enhancing training, exercises and certification, improving advance planning, and ensuring more equal burden sharing; in this regard supports the proposal for the European Council to endorse a new approach on the EU's rapid response assets in the December meeting;
24. Underlines that EU-NATO cooperation is essential for reversing the decline in European defence and for strengthening the European pillar of the transatlantic alliance; is of the opinion that closer coordination in defence planning between the EU and NATO would help avoid duplication between the two partners and that in this regard synchronising and harmonising European Capability Development Plan with NATO's Defence Planning Process would be desirable; acknowledges the progress that has been achieved in terms of

practical cooperation between the EU and NATO in policy planning and the conduct of operations;

25. Considers that in efforts to streamline the capability development process clear geographical and engagement priorities should be set; believes that such priorities would better allow to determine the mix of soft and hard capabilities and provide guidance to procurement programmes; encourages to bridge the gap between the CSDP's ambitions and capabilities by adjusting both the former and the latter; calls for more efficient regional coordination between the different CSDP missions, especially between those taking place in the same geographical area, such as in the Horn of Africa for example;
26. Supports the pooling and the common use of EU military capabilities; notes that most of the Member States individually are not able to acquire modern state-of-the-art capabilities; emphasises the important role played by the EDA in streamlining defence procurement needs across the EU; underlines that more should be done to coordinate within the EU and with NATO the ongoing *de facto* specialisation in capabilities, to clearly identify the surplus capabilities that do not match operational needs and to agree upon their reduction targets; takes the view that defence standardisation and the common use of hybrid standards (military and civilian) would contribute to the EDA's Pooling and Sharing initiative and enhance cooperation and interoperability between the European armed forces; calls for effective implementation of the Code of Conduct on Pooling and Sharing; encourages more flexible use of EU funds to support dual-use technologies in defence-related activities;
27. Is of the opinion that a strong European industrial and technological base in the area of defence is essential in order to maintain sustainable European defence capabilities; stresses that European defence industry is not only important for Europe's security but that it also contributes to economic growth, provides jobs and fosters innovation; welcomes in this vein the Commission Communication towards a more competitive and efficient defence and security sector; hopes to see more progress on the implementation of such flagship European projects as the Air-to-Air Refuelling or the Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems;

The future work of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference

- 28 (new) – *Asks, in the context of the review of the effectiveness of CSDP missions, for an exchange of views on the parliamentary procedures and practices regarding the respective national decision-making processes regarding the deployment of armed forces in non article V operations, such as international Peace Support Operations (PSOs) and/or Crisis Response Operations (CROs), during the next meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary conference; (tabled by the Dutch delegation)*
- 29 (new) – *Encourages the next Presidency Parliament to consult the national delegations on their national procedures and practices as outlined under point 28 in advance of the next meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary conference; (tabled by the Dutch delegation)*

[Compromise proposed by the Trio and the EP: Encourages the next Presidency Parliament to consult the national delegations on their national procedures and practices as outlined under point 28 in advance of the next meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary conference; (tabled by the Dutch delegation) Asks, in the context of the review of the effectiveness of CSDP missions to organise for an exchange of views on the role of parliaments parliamentary procedures and practices regarding such missions; the respective national decision-making processes regarding the deployment of armed forces in non-article V operations, such as international Peace Support Operations (PSOs) and/or Crisis Response Operations (CROs), during the next meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary conference; (tabled by the Dutch delegation)]

The future work of the AHRC

28. Takes note of the initial work made by the Ad Hoc Review Committee regarding the practical arrangements of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference and the proposals made by the national Parliaments; takes note of the intention to convene a meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group during the Greek Presidency in the first half of 2014; recalls that the decision on the final recommendations of the AHRC will have to be taken by the Inter-Parliamentary Conference during the Italian Presidency in the second half of 2014;
29. Asks the Presidency Parliament to forward these Conclusions to all delegations, to the Presidents of national Parliaments and of the European Parliament, to the Presidents of the European Council and the European Commission and the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.

ANNEX 1 – PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Introductory remarks

The Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) took place on 4-6 September 2013 in the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania in Vilnius.

The Inter-Parliamentary Conference was opened by the hosts Prof. Benediktas JUODKA, Chair of the Seimas Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Mr Artūras PAULAUSKAS, Chair of the Seimas Committee on National Security and Defence. Participants were welcomed by H. E. Ms Dalia GRYBAUSKAITĖ, President of the Republic of Lithuania, Dr Vydas GEDVILAS, Speaker of the Seimas, and Mr Elmar BROK, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the European Parliament.

Debates were focused on the following items: *Promoting democracy in a wider Europe: ideas and instruments* (keynote speaker Mr Linas LINKEVIČIUS, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania), *Towards December European Council: Lithuania's priorities* (keynote speaker Mr Juozas OLEKAS, Minister of Defence of the Republic of Lithuania), *EU Priorities and Strategies of the CFSP and CSDP* (keynote speaker Baroness Catherine ASHTON, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Vice-President of the European Commission – HR/VP), and *Future of EU-NATO Cooperation* (keynote speaker Mr Anders Fogh RASMUSSEN, NATO Secretary General).

In addition, two thematic workshops were held: *Bridging the gap between EU capabilities and ambitions: towards December European Council and Eastern Partnership and its strategic importance to the European Union*.

Pursuant to the decision made by the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on 25 March 2013 in Dublin, the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Review Committee (AHRC) on the practical arrangements of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference was organised on 5 September.

Overview of the presentations and debates

<...>

Anexo 10. Conclusiones aprobadas en la III Conferencia PESC/PCSD (lengua inglesa).



Lietuvos Respublikos pirmininkavimas
Europos Sąjungos Tarybai
2013 m. liepos 1 d. – gruodžio 31 d.
PARLAMENTINIS MATMUO

Lithuanian Presidency of
the Council of the European Union
1 July – 31 December 2013
PARLIAMENTARY DIMENSION

Présidence lituanienne
du Conseil de l'Union européenne
du 1er juillet au 31 décembre 2013
DIMENSION PARLEMENTAIRE

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE FOR THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY AND THE COMMON SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY

CONCLUSIONS

4–6 September 2013, Vilnius

*The Inter-Parliamentary Conference,
Having regard to the decision of the Conference of Speakers of European Union
Parliaments taken in April 2012 in Warsaw regarding the establishment and mandate of
this Conference;*

*Having regard to Title II of Protocol I of the Treaty of Lisbon regarding the promotion of
effective and regular interparliamentary cooperation within the Union;*

*Cognisant of the new powers and instruments foreseen by the Treaty of Lisbon for the
European Union (EU) institutions in the area of foreign, security and defence policy; being
aware that the new instruments create better opportunities for the Union to wield
international influence commensurate with its political and economic weight;*

*Conscious of the multi-layered decision-making process in the areas of Common Foreign
and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP); being
aware that effective implementation of these policies must involve numerous policy actors
at both the EU and national levels; conscious of the responsibility to engage in
parliamentary scrutiny and advance interparliamentary cooperation in the areas of CFSP
and CSDP;*

*Taking into account the fast-changing geopolitical environment and the increasing
importance of new foreign and security policy challenges such as climate change,
transnational crime and terrorism, maritime piracy, security of energy supply, cyber-
attacks, pandemics, as well as fragile and failing states and the proliferation of WMDs and
conventional weapons;*

*Aware that the evolution of the international geopolitical scenario has highlighted the
central role of Parliaments which are at the core of global decision making with respect to
crises and conflicts;*

CFSP: Conflict in Syria

1. Expresses its deepest concern about the ongoing conflict in Syria that has already caused over 100,000 deaths, of which most are civilian; draws attention to the massive humanitarian crisis that has unfolded as a result of the conflict and that is affecting the whole region; notes with alarm that, according to estimates of the United Nations (UN) High Commissioner for Refugees, more than 2 million Syrians have fled their country and sought refuge in neighbouring countries;
2. Expresses extreme concern over the use of chemical weapons in Syria, in particular the chemical attack that took place in the Damascus suburbs on 21 August 2013 and which reportedly killed more than 1,400 people, including at least 400 children; looks forward to the conclusions of the investigation carried out by the mission of UN experts on the incident, yet regrets that the mission was not allowed to start the investigation immediately after the attack; considers that the use of weapons of mass destruction, banned by the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention, is a crime against humanity that must be condemned in strongest terms and requires a strong international reaction, including a possible referral to the International Criminal Court;
3. Stresses the responsibility of the international community, and in particular the UN Security Council, to hold accountable the perpetrators of such crimes and to take appropriate measures, in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter, to ensure that such crimes are not repeated in the future; calls on Russia and China, as permanent members of the UN Security Council, to face their responsibility and unblock the UN Security Council and facilitate the achievement of a common position and a political solution to the Syrian conflict; believes that the EU together with its international partners should persist in promoting a political solution, which is critical in order to achieve a peaceful, inclusive and democratic transition in Syria; supports the convening of the Geneva II peace conference as a follow-up to the conference on the Syrian conflict held in June 2012;
4. Calls on the EU Member States to show solidarity to Syrian refugees and provide all the necessary assistance and aid to them; is of the view that the dramatic events in Syria make it necessary for the EU to embrace the idea of a humanitarian response; stresses that to this end it is necessary to allocate resources and define working methods and goals for a new Euro-Mediterranean framework;

CFSP: developing a Comprehensive Approach

5. Believes that foreign and security policy objectives of the EU should be based on and further developed with the overall aim of contributing to peace, preventing conflict, promoting human rights, democracy and international law – principles that inspired the creation of the EU itself;
6. Considers that there should be more strategic foreign policy coordination at the Union level if the EU wants to increase its international influence as well as its effectiveness to implement its foreign policy objectives; is of the opinion that adequate resources should be provided for the EU to act effectively and consistently on the world stage;
7. Underlines that only by adopting a comprehensive approach to foreign and security policy, which includes not only the diplomatic and economic instruments but also development aid and, in the last resort and in compliance with the UN Charter, military means, can the EU expect to effectively counter global threats, promote its strategic interests and fundamental values; believes that the Treaty of Lisbon enables the EU to adopt such a comprehensive approach and looks forward to the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy/Vice-President of the European Commission (HR/VP) setting this out in her report on the role of CSDP within the comprehensive approach;

8. Takes note of the review of the organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service (EEAS) published by the HR/VP in July 2013; notes that the EEAS was launched in the midst of the worst economic crisis in decades and in the context of unprecedented civic and political upheaval in the EU's Southern neighbourhood; recognises the efforts of the HR/VP to achieve greater coordination, synergies, economies of scale, complementarity and cohesion of the EU's various foreign policy instruments, including those of its Member States, and to forge a more united foreign and security policy in general; is of the view that the full potential of instruments foreseen in the Treaty of Lisbon, including the opportunities for structured cooperation, have yet to be fully realised;
9. Welcomes efforts by the HR/VP to promote and defend human rights in the world, in particular welcomes the adoption of the Strategic Framework and Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy in 2012; is of the view that the EU Special Representative for Human Rights has enhanced the effectiveness and visibility of the EU's human rights policy; supports a more active engagement of civil society in defending human rights abroad and in the EU's external relations more generally; is looking forward to the accession of the EU to the European Convention on Human Rights and enhanced cooperation with the Council of Europe;
10. Highlights the importance of maintaining strengthened relationships with the EU's strategic partners; underlines that strategic partnerships must be based upon a common vision, not least a commitment to democracy and human rights, and should be reviewed regularly including through parliamentary cooperation; welcomes the start of negotiations between the EU and the US on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, which not only has the potential of boosting jobs and growth of the two biggest economies in the world but also of promoting internationally the values and interests that are the basis of the transatlantic partnership;

CFSP and the external dimension of the EU's energy policy

11. Underlines the importance of ensuring coherence between the EU's foreign and energy policies including by improving internal energy efficiency and by reducing energy dependency on third countries, especially those countries that do not share or respect fundamental EU values or where there is a risk that energy resources will be used as an instrument to undermine the EU's foreign policy objectives;
12. Recalls the request made by the Council to the Commission to present a report before the end of 2013 on the status of implementation of the EU's external energy policy and looks forward to the ensuing debate on the matter; is of the opinion that ensuring nuclear safety in EU neighbouring countries has to be an integral part of the EU's external energy policy and that the EU should promote the highest nuclear safety standards internationally; underlines that energy security is a key concern of the Union and as such be integrated more strategically in CFSP including in dialogues with strategic partners and in relevant multilateral fora;

CFSP and the European Neighbourhood Policy

13. Emphasises the importance of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), which is a Community policy and stresses the need to establish a closer link between the CFSP and the ENP as part of the comprehensive approach; given the centrality of the principle of effective multilateralism in the EU's foreign policy strategy supports the strengthening of multilateral cooperation within the regional ENP formats, namely the Eastern Partnership and the Union for Mediterranean; recognises, however, that EU neighbours manifest different levels of aspiration in terms of cooperation with the EU and that as a results relationship with each of the partners are unique and ENP instruments should be tailored to serve each of those relationships individually; calls on the partner countries not to lower

their ambition and commitment to reform and seek closer political and economic association with the EU;

14. Highlights the strategic importance to CFSP of the countries of the Eastern Partnership; calls therefore for the 3rd Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius to open the door to closer political association and deeper economic integration for those Eastern Partnership countries that meet their commitments and requirements; recognises the aspirations of the Eastern partners on the basis of their ambitions and commitments arising therefrom, including those enshrined in Article 49 of the Treaty of European Union, provided they meet the relevant criteria;

15. Welcomes, in line with the principle of more for more, the progress that has been achieved in the negotiations on the bilateral Association Agreements and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements with the Eastern partners, including the conclusion of visa facilitation agreements and progress on visa liberalisation, which strengthen people-to-people contacts and improve the general political relations with these countries; in this regard welcomes the conclusion of the visa facilitation agreements with Azerbaijan and Armenia and progress in negotiations with Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine on the Visa Liberalisation Action Plans;

16. Underlines the need for a unanimous and consistent EU response to the political, economic and trade pressure the Russian Federation is applying towards the Eastern Partnership countries, which is against the principles of the Helsinki Accords, the WTO commitments and international law, and calls for the respect of the sovereign rights of these countries to freely pursue their political path towards the EU; urges the European Commission to reinforce its efforts in negotiations with the Eastern Partnership countries in order to ensure that decisions made in the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius grant them irreversible progress towards ever closer partnership with the EU;

17. Calls for intensified cooperation with the countries of the Eastern Partnership in the framework of CSDP with the aim, inter alia, to further encourage their participation in EU crisis management operations and missions;

18. Welcomes the commitment of HR/VP in the Southern neighbourhood and her continuous efforts to promote peace, stability and democratic change in the region;

19. Expresses its deep concern about the situation in Egypt; condemns excessive violence by all parties, both state security forces and opposition forces, that has already caused hundreds of deaths of innocent civilians and security officers; urges all conflicting parties to resolve their differences through peaceful dialogue and calls for an inclusive political agreement for power to be transferred to democratically elected leaders in the nearest possible future;

20. Welcomes the initiative of the US Secretary of State to give a fresh start to the Middle East Peace Process by relaunching direct final status negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority; encourages both parties of the conflict to take the negotiations seriously and to engage their respective societies in the discussion about the benefits and the necessity of achieving a lasting peace agreement; underlines that finding a solution to the conflict would serve the interests of both Israel and the Palestinian Authority, as well as the EU and the wider international community; calls upon all parties to refrain from initiatives which can either prejudice or undermine the successful conclusion of the talks with regard, in particular, to the recent decision of the Israeli government to authorise the expansion of some settlements;

21. Notes that EU parliaments have an important responsibility of supporting parliaments and civil society in countries undergoing transition and that such support could help lay the foundations for a robust and effective parliamentary democracy in those countries; takes the view that parliamentary diplomacy can play a significant role in contributing to the EU's foreign policy objectives of strengthening human rights and contributing to democratic

reforms; in this regard stresses the importance of the full use of such platforms of parliamentary cooperation as EURONEST and EUROMED parliamentary assemblies;

Review of the European Security Strategy

22. Notes that the current European Security Strategy (ESS), which was adopted 10 years ago, does not fully meet the new global realities and that the time has come for the review of the strategy; points out that the revision process can by itself be a valuable process and provide an opportunity to reinvigorate the CSDP; considers that an appropriate time and place for the discussion on the review of the ESS could be the December European Council; expresses its position that national Parliaments and the European Parliament should be engaged in the review as much as possible to reach the maximum possible consensus on the new ESS;

23. Notes that while conventional security challenges and capabilities will continue to form the backbone of defence policy in general, emerging challenges in the field of cyber, space, maritime or energy security, need to have a special place in the EU's security and defence strategy and should be addressed at the Union level in a comprehensive manner; points out that the EU Cyber Security Strategy is a value adding effort, while further discussion on the evolution of the EU's role and level of engagement in space is desirable; notes that the armed forces are the largest public consumers of energy in Europe and that efforts should be made to increase their efficient use of energy, especially in operations; supports the European Defence Agency's (EDA's) Military Green effort; welcomes the Commission's initiative to identify possible objectives and focus areas of action at the EU level for a comprehensive energy concept for armed forces;

CFSP/CSDP: towards the December European Council

24. Reiterates its call for the European Council to give a much needed boost to address the serious decline in European defence and to make proposals for speeding up CSDP decision making and the financing of CSDP operations as well as on structured cooperation and on the future of the EU Battlegroups; further reiterates its call for the European Council to set out a roadmap with specific timelines for achieving progress on defence issues, including all existing provisions in the Lisbon Treaty, to ensure the Union's security during a period of significant defence cuts in all Member States;

25. Considers that the EU Battlegroups have the potential of being one of the key tools of the CSDP but stresses that steps should be taken to better define their usability, such as by adopting the modular approach, enhancing training, exercises and certification, improving advance planning, and ensuring more equal burden sharing; in this regard supports the proposal for the European Council to endorse a new approach on the EU's rapid response assets in the December meeting;

26. Underlines that EU-NATO cooperation is essential for reversing the decline in European defence and for strengthening the European pillar of the transatlantic alliance; is of the opinion that closer coordination in defence planning between the EU and NATO would help avoid duplication between the two partners and that in this regard synchronising and harmonising European Capability Development Plan with NATO's Defence Planning Process would be desirable; acknowledges the progress that has been achieved in terms of practical cooperation between the EU and NATO in policy planning and the conduct of operations;

27. Considers that in efforts to streamline the capability development process clear geographical and engagement priorities should be set; believes that such priorities would better allow to determine the mix of soft and hard capabilities and provide guidance to procurement programmes; encourages to bridge the gap between the CSDP's ambitions and capabilities by adjusting both the former and the latter; calls for more efficient regional

coordination between the different CSDP missions, especially between those taking place in the same geographical area, such as in the Horn of Africa for example;

28. Supports the pooling and the common use of EU military capabilities; notes that most of the Member States individually are not able to acquire modern state-of-the-art capabilities; emphasises the important role played by the EDA in streamlining defence procurement needs across the EU; underlines that more should be done to coordinate within the EU and with NATO the ongoing *de facto* specialisation in capabilities, to clearly identify the surplus capabilities that do not match operational needs and to agree upon their reduction targets; takes the view that defence standardisation and the common use of hybrid standards (military and civilian) would contribute to the EDA's Pooling and Sharing initiative and enhance cooperation and interoperability between the European armed forces; calls for effective implementation of the Code of Conduct on Pooling and Sharing; encourages more flexible use of EU funds to support dual-use technologies in defence-related activities;

29. Is of the opinion that a strong European industrial and technological base in the area of defence is essential in order to maintain sustainable European defence capabilities; stresses that European defence industry is not only important for Europe's security but that it also contributes to economic growth, provides jobs and fosters innovation; welcomes in this vein the Commission Communication towards a more competitive and efficient defence and security sector; hopes to see more progress on the implementation of such flagship European projects as the Air-to-Air Refuelling or the Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems;

The future work of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference

30. Encourages the next Presidency Parliament in the context of the review of the effectiveness of CSDP missions to organise an exchange of views on the parliamentary procedures and practices regarding such missions;

The future work of the AHRC

31. Takes note of the initial work made by the Ad Hoc Review Committee regarding the practical arrangements of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference and the proposals made by the national Parliaments; takes note of the intention to convene a meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group during the Greek Presidency in the first half of 2014; recalls that the decision on the final recommendations of the AHRC will have to be taken by the Inter-Parliamentary Conference during the Italian Presidency in the second half of 2014;

32. Asks the Presidency Parliament to forward these Conclusions to all delegations, to the Presidents of national Parliaments and of the European Parliament, to the Presidents of the European Council and the European Commission and the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. 8

ANNEX 1 – PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Introductory remarks

The Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) took place on 4-6 September 2013 in the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania in Vilnius.

The Inter-Parliamentary Conference was opened by the hosts Prof. Benediktas JUODKA, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Mr Artūras PAULAUSKAS, Chair of the Committee on National Security and Defence of the Republic of Lithuania. Participants were welcomed by H.E. Dalia GRYBAUSKAITĖ, President of the Republic of Lithuania, Dr Vydas GEDVILAS, Speaker of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, and Mr Elmar BROK, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the European Parliament.

Debates focused on the following items: *Promoting democracy in a wider Europe: ideas and instruments* (keynote speaker Mr Linas LINKEVIČIUS, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania), *Towards December European Council: Lithuania's priorities* (keynote speaker Mr Juozas OLEKAS, Minister of Defence of the Republic of Lithuania), *EU Priorities and Strategies of the CFSP and CSDP* (keynote speaker Baroness Catherine ASHTON, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Vice-President of the European Commission (HR/VP)), and *Future of EU-NATO Cooperation* (keynote speaker Mr Anders Fogh RASMUSSEN, NATO Secretary General).

In addition, two thematic workshops were held on: *Bridging the gap between EU capabilities and ambitions: towards December European Council and Eastern Partnership and its strategic importance to the European Union*. Results of the two workshops were presented to all participants of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference by rapporteurs Mr Pat BREEN, Chair of the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Irish Houses of the Oireachtas, and Mr Ioannis KEFALOGIANNIS, Member of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Parliament.

Pursuant to the decision made by the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on 25 March 2013 in Dublin, the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Review Committee (AHRC) on the practical arrangements of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference was held on 5 September 2013 in Vilnius. The AHRC approved the final timetable for the review process, the synopsis of the amendments proposed by the national Parliaments, and took note of the initial recommendations proposed by the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania as the Presidency Parliament.

Overview of the presentations and debates

SESSION I

In his presentation Minister Linas LINKEVIČIUS presented the priorities of the Lithuanian Presidency of the EU Council, which are credible Europe, growing Europe, and open Europe. In the context of the latter priority, an important dimension is closer cooperation with the EU neighbours, particularly the Eastern Partnership countries. Mr LINKEVIČIUS stressed that the process of political and economic engagement of the Eastern neighbours can be a value adding effort in itself. He particularly emphasised the importance of Ukraine calling it a “litmus test” of the success of the Eastern Partnership. The Minister stressed that countries should have the right to freely choose their foreign policy objectives, while economic threats and political pressure from outside was not acceptable. While there were problems in Ukraine, such as instances of selective justice, the Minister emphasised that relations with Ukraine should always be seen in a broader geopolitical context. Therefore the EU should be proactive and encourage Ukraine to continue on the path of reform. The Minister also encouraged Armenia not to waste the effort that had been invested with regard to the Association Agreement and called for the engagement of Belarus albeit not at the

expense of European values. He also called for the development of a clearer strategy for the future of the Eastern Partnership.

Minister of Defence Mr Juozas OLEKAS stressed the importance of the December European Council – the first such specialised Council in 5 years – to advance the debate on the future of European defence policy. According to the Minister, the EU was still a modest crisis management actor and now with decreasing defence budgets this role could further diminish. An important aspect of the EU defence policy should be to increase its visibility. He therefore raised the idea of having a defence formation of the EU Council and noted the importance of reviewing the 10 year old European Security Strategy, which failed to provide adequate strategic guidance. The Minister also stressed other important priorities of the EU defence policy: increasing the role of the EU as a security provider in the EU neighbourhood by engaging in security partnerships, such as with the Eastern Partnership countries; maintaining a strong transatlantic partnership essential for Europe's security; focusing on the new security challenges such as cyber, energy and maritime security; increasing the efficient use of energy in the military; improving rapid deployment capabilities; and strengthening the defence dimension in the comprehensive foreign policy approach.

During the debate many speakers stressed their concern about the situation in Syria, and noted the importance of finding a political solution to the crisis. Members of Parliament also called for a truly common security and defence policy, especially in the current geopolitical context, but drew attention to the threat of declining defence budgets. Others stressed that if the EU aimed for a strong CSDP, it should also have a strong CFSP in order to establish the role of the EU as a legitimate international actor and a security provider. It was emphasised that there had been a lack of unity in the foreign and security policy and that this represented Europe's weakness. Inefficiencies in the procurement market were emphasised, a greater role for the EDA was called for, and the idea of a possible defence commissioner in the European Commission was raised. Another important dimension of the discussion was EU relations with the Eastern partners and specifically the increasing pressure from Russia towards these countries. Concern was expressed about Armenia's commitment to further its relations with the EU. Some delegates urged the EU to increase efforts to secure closer partnerships with countries like Moldova or Ukraine, without which the Russian-sponsored Eurasian Union would be a paper tiger.

SESSION II

HR/VP Baroness Catherine ASHTON stressed that an arch of instability had developed around the EU and that the EU should be more actively engaged in conflict prevention in the region because it cost cheaper to prevent conflicts than to deal with their consequences. HR/VP reminded of her active mediation efforts in Egypt, which considered the EU as a trusted interlocutor. The EU should continue to engage Iran in the EU3+3 framework and should put all efforts to achieve a lasting political solution to the crisis in Syria, including convening the Geneva II peace conference. HR/VP also spoke about the external pressure the Eastern Partnership countries are facing in light of the upcoming 3rd Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius in November 2013. She also drew attention to the progress that had taken place in Serbia-Kosovo relations, which was a direct consequence of active EU engagement.

During the debate Members raised many questions related to Syria, Egypt and the wider region. Some proposed to step up financial support to countries in the region calling for the EU's own Marshall Plan for the Middle East. Members also addressed questions to the HR/VP regarding the upcoming Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius and increasing pressure from Russia on the Eastern Partners.

Responding to questions, HR/VP stressed the importance of synchronising defence procurement standards across the EU and pointed to the success of the ATALANTA

mission, due to which piracy has dropped by 93% in the mission's operational area. She also spoke about the instability spill-over in the Middle East and reminded that the EU was already the biggest provider of aid in the region. With regard to European neighbours, she singled out progress in Serbia-Kosovo relations as one of the biggest successes of EU diplomacy and stressed that the EU should continue with the enlargement policy in Western Balkans.

SESSION III

NATO's Secretary General Anders Fogh RASMUSSEN condemned the chemical attack that had taken place in Syria in the strongest possible terms. He stressed that NATO was a forum for consultations between the members on all matters and that NATO was committed to protecting its South-Eastern border. He drew attention to the worrying tendency of shrinking defence budgets in the context of rising security challenges. He said that in 2015 defence spending in China would supersede the spending of the 8 largest European NATO allies combined. There was also too much duplication in capabilities as well as divergence in standards among NATO members – this led to poor economies of scale and inefficient training. Secretary General underlined the importance of maintaining a strong NATO and developing a strong European pillar of defence. In this context we should focus on three priorities: developing capabilities, developing strong forces and developing a robust defence industry. He also emphasised that the EU and NATO shared the same values and vision; they were on the same road heading towards the same destination. He therefore called for cooperation, not duplication, and the strong need to build capabilities, not bureaucracies.

During the debate several speakers emphasised the growing threat of cyber-attacks and the need to treat them similarly to conventional attacks. It was acknowledged that Europe could take the lead in crisis management but it lacked capabilities, which was clearly visible during the operation in Libya. A lively exchange of views regarding NATO's possible role in Syria also took place. Mr RASMUSSEN explained that NATO C2 was not necessary for the short and tailored operation in Syria planned by some of the Allies. Practical proposals on more effective EU-NATO cooperation included a wide range of ideas such as EU-NATO defence standardization, joint NATO NRF and EU Battlegroups training. Secretary General welcomed LTU-NED-POL non-paper on EU-NATO strategic partnership including all its elements. Delegates and the keynote speaker agreed that reacting to the chemical attack and finding a long-term solution to the Syrian conflict required two very different approaches, noting that the latter required a political solution.

Workshop 1 – Eastern Partnership and its strategic importance to the European Union

The workshop was moderated by Mr Audronius AŲUBALIS, Deputy Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania. Presentations by Mr Gunnar WIEGAND, Director for Russia, Eastern Partnership, Central Asia, Regional Cooperation and OSCE of the European External Action Service, Ms Sofia ARKELSTEN, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Swedish Riksdagen and Dr Laurynas KaŲčiūnas, expert of the Eastern Europe Studies Centre were made. The rapporteur was Mr Pat BREEN, Chair of the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Irish Houses of the Oireachtas.

In the opening remarks the moderator of the workshop, Mr Audronius AŲUBALIS, emphasised the strategic importance of the region covering the Eastern Partnership countries to the EU. He stressed the responsibility of the EU in promoting the political, economic and social stability in the Eastern Partnership countries. The need to evaluate Russia's pressure towards them and to give a clear response from the EU side was emphasised.

Mr Gunnar WIEGAND emphasised that Eastern Partnership was a strategic policy of the EU designed to respond to the legitimate aspirations of the partner countries and the prime example of the comprehensive approach. He pointed out that the support from the EU to the Eastern Partnership countries is based on the principle of “more for more” reflecting the ambitions of each partner country. Mr WIEGAND presented briefly the *status quo* in the Eastern Partnership countries regarding the Association Agreements and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements and outlined the expectations for the 3rd Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius. In this context concern over pressure from Russia towards these countries was expressed. It was emphasised that each country’s sovereign rights to freely pursue their political path towards EU should be respected. The speaker stressed the significant work that has been done during the process of negotiations. He mentioned the need of further efforts in the process of dealing with unresolved conflicts in the Eastern Partnership countries. According to Mr WIEGAND, the Vilnius Summit is expected to be an important milestone on the way of the Eastern Partnership countries towards the EU. He highlighted the important role of national Parliaments and the European Parliament working together towards closer cooperation with the Eastern Partnership countries, particularly with regard to the engagement of the civil society.

Ms Sofia ARKELSTEN recalled that Sweden had always been an advocate for a strengthened and deepened relationship between the EU and its Eastern European neighbours. She emphasised that the Eastern Partnership was an expression of the EU’s solidarity and long-term commitment towards Eastern Europe and demonstrated the EU’s interest in the region. It was also a response to the aspirations of the partner countries for closer cooperation with the EU. Ms ARKELSTEN shared her firm belief that the Eastern Partnership should be further developed as a priority of EU foreign policy. She emphasised as well that the universal values such as democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights should be at the core of the Eastern Partnership. In this context she urged to promote the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people. The speaker stressed the need to increase support and involve civil society by enhancing people-to-people contacts. Ms ARKELSTEN underlined the special role of parliamentarians as their involvement was crucial in order to continue the dialogue and to promote democratic reforms in the Eastern Partnership countries. Finally, it was emphasised, that Europe did not end with what were the external borders of the EU and that the Eastern Partnership countries had a perspective to accede to the EU according to Article 49 of the Treaty on European Union.

Dr Laurynas KAŠČIŪNAS presented a comprehensive geopolitical overview of the Eastern Partnership countries and their strategic importance to the EU. He emphasised that the strategic environment in the region was very complex because the EU and its Eastern Partnership programme was not the only “player in town”. The Eurasian Union initiated by Russia was qualitatively different from all the previous initiatives in CIS countries. The speaker outlined that there was clear evidence that the EU and the Eurasian Union were based on essentially different rules and standards. In contrast to the EU, the Eurasian Union was marked by authoritarian politics, oligarch-dominated business and an unhealthy link between economy and politics. According to Mr KAŠČIŪNAS, further development of the Eastern Partnership would depend on the results of the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius. In addition, he emphasised that the EU should understand that the construction of a safe Europe was not over and in order to complete the process the EU should learn to play by the *realpolitik* rules. The speaker stressed the need to start thinking about the incentives the Eastern Partnership could offer to partner countries following the Vilnius Summit. Some possible ideas were presented – the possible new concept of Privileged Eastern Partnership modelled on relations between the European Economic Area and Switzerland, or offering the Eastern Partnership countries the right to participate in the initial stages of EU policy-shaping.

A number of key issues emerged in the course of the debate among delegates and speakers. The concern over Russia's political, economic and trade pressure on the Eastern Partnership countries and the need for a consistent EU response, issues regarding the respect for human rights, differences and challenges with regard to the internal situation in each of the six partner countries, the ongoing preparations for the Vilnius Summit and its strategic importance, EU action towards Belarus, the "frozen" conflicts in South Caucasus and Moldova were the main issues touched upon during the debate.

Workshop 2 – Bridging the gap between EU capabilities and ambitions: towards the December European Council

The workshop was moderated by Mr Petras AUŠTREVČIUS, Deputy Speaker of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania. The rapporteur was Ioannis KEFALOGIANNIS, Member of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Parliament.

In the introductory remarks Mr Petras AUŠTREVČIUS emphasised that EU ambitions in the area of defence are high as they have been set during the economic upturn when defence funding was steadily increasing. Therefore there was a growing gap between the ambitions and the capabilities at hand. The moderator stressed that it was not only greater funding that could pave the way for the development of priority capabilities; reducing or scrapping some surplus capabilities altogether could serve the purpose just as well.

Mr Arnaud DANJEAN, Chair of the Security and Defence Sub-Committee of the European Parliament, stressed that expectations must be reasonable with regard to the December European Council. According to him, the main reason the ambitions of the EU in the area of defence had not been met was the lack by the Member States of the key capabilities and the political will to efficiently allocate the capabilities in possession. The speaker also noted that the EU needed to work collectively and to play a more proactive role.

Ambassador Michael ZILMER-JOHNS, Senior Military Advisor on Security and Defence to the Deputy Secretary General of the European External Action Service, stressed that ambitions were absolutely necessary in order to protect European citizens and businesses. According to him, the EU should do much better with the current budget. The speaker also noted the need to invest in technology and develop further civilian capabilities. In this regard, the support of Parliaments was much appreciated.

Ms Claude-France ARNOULD, Chief Executive of the European Defence Agency, stressed that the EU had to have reasonable expectations. Ms ARNOULD underlined the necessity to focus on doing more with the same level of funding and the need for clear programmes, common standards, and common requirements. If the EU had the right programmes and efforts, it could save small and medium size enterprises in the defence sector. The speaker stressed that the EU could not rely operationally solely on the United States. For this reason it was important to have a defence roadmap in order to achieve a positive outcome during the December Summit.

A number of key topics emerged in the course of the debate among the delegates. The participants mainly spoke about the upcoming December European Council. The need for a new defence roadmap was emphasised in order to effectively manage defence issues in the next decade. Members of Parliament noted the need to persuade the heads of states to allocate more funding for defence and that defence matters should be a priority. Some emphasized that EU structural funds could be used for defence as well.

In her reply, Ms ARNOULD stressed that the efficient use of energy resources in the military sector would allow saving resources and said that the European Commission was ready to work in this area in the future. She noted the importance of having strong European companies in the defence sector that would be international players and stressed that industrial solutions could deliver the capabilities the EU needed.