


# Procedure file

Basic information		
INI - Own-initiative procedure	<a href="#">2000/2005(INI)</a>	Procedure completed
Developing a common European security and defence policy CFSP after Cologne and Helsinki		
Subject 6.10.02 Common security and defence policy (CSDP); WEU, NATO		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	<b>AFET</b> Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security, Defense		23/09/1999
		PSE <a href="#">LALUMIÈRE Catherine</a>	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
	<b>AFCO</b> Constitutional Affairs		12/07/2000
		PPE-DE <a href="#">STOCKTON The Earl Of</a>	

Key events			
17/11/1999	Non-legislative basic document published	<a href="#">B5-0361/1999</a>	
21/01/2000	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
14/11/2000	Vote in committee		Summary
14/11/2000	Committee report tabled for plenary	<a href="#">A5-0339/2000</a>	
20/11/2000	Additional information		Summary
29/11/2000	Debate in Parliament		
30/11/2000	Decision by Parliament	<a href="#">T5-0537/2000</a>	Summary
30/11/2000	End of procedure in Parliament		
13/08/2001	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2000/2005(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Initiative

Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 54
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	AFET/5/12344

### Documentation gateway

Non-legislative basic document	<a href="#">B5-0361/1999</a>	17/11/1999	EP	
Document attached to the procedure	<a href="#">B5-0114/2000</a>	17/02/2000	EP	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading	<a href="#">A5-0339/2000</a> <a href="#">OJ C 228 13.08.2001, p. 0004</a>	14/11/2000	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading	<a href="#">T5-0537/2000</a> <a href="#">OJ C 228 13.08.2001, p. 0020-0173</a>	30/11/2000	EP	Summary

## Developing a common European security and defence policy CFSP after Cologne and Helsinki

The committee adopted the own-initiative report by Catherine LALUMI-RE (PES, F) stressing that a common European security and defence policy (CESDP) was not an end in itself but an instrument of the EU's foreign policy. The European Council was urged to take the necessary steps to make the CESDP fully operational by 2003. The report said that crises should be resolved if possible by civilian means and any military action should be authorised by an appropriate mandate from the United Nations. In the absence of a mandate as a result of deadlock in the Security Council, the international community should intervene only at the express request of the UN Secretary-General. The report added that the EU should draw up the principles and legal bases for it to act by civilian or military means in non-Community countries where a crisis was occurring. The committee expressed support for the guidelines contained in the Feira Summit report for strengthening the EU's capabilities in the civilian aspects of crisis management and the objective of a 5000-strong European police force for conflict prevention or crisis management. The EU's intelligence-gathering and analysis capacities should also be strengthened so as to detect the earliest signs of any crisis, and an annual report should be produced on EU conflict prevention. The report noted that the Kosovo conflict had revealed the European countries' weakness in crisis intervention and supported the 'headline goal' of establishing by 2003 a Rapid Reaction Force that could be mobilised within 60 days and deployable for a year. However, it warned that this would raise the question of the professionalisation of the Member States' armed forces, which was a matter for each country to decide on in the light of its political and social traditions. Substantial joint long-range planning was also needed for the military equipment procurement process, and a common defence research policy should be established. The committee expressed concern over the effectiveness of the interim bodies set up on 1 March 2000 to manage the CESDP and over the coherence between the civilian and military operations upon which the EU might decide. It reiterated Parliament's call for the posts of High Representative for the CFSP and Commissioner for External Relations to be merged into a specially appointed Vice-President of the Commission. The costs of Petersburg tasks should be apportioned among Member States according to their GNP, and any states not wishing to take part in an operation should be required to make a financial contribution. Eventually, the committee felt, those tasks should be funded from the Community's general budget. It stressed that further development of the military tasks should in no way lead to a reduction of Community spending in non-military areas, such as development assistance and humanitarian aid. The report underlined the importance of effective parliamentary supervision of the CESDP and called for the establishment of a European parliamentary body for security and defence. The Council was criticised for its decision on restricting access to documents in this field. Lastly, the committee stressed the need to ensure that the CESDP was compatible with NATO obligations and that it would establish genuine partnership between the EU and the USA and Canada.?

## Developing a common European security and defence policy CFSP after Cologne and Helsinki

In a declaration from the General Affairs Council on 20 November 2000, the Union highlighted its determination to develop an autonomous capability to decide on and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises. For that purpose, Member States have decided to develop more effective military capabilities. This process, without unnecessary duplication, does not involve the establishment of a European army but rather it is an integral part of strengthening the CFSP. The Union will thus be able to make a greater contribution to international security in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter, the OSCE Charter and the Helsinki Final Act. In this framework, the Union recognises the primary responsibility of the United Nations Security Council with regard to international peace-keeping and security. With regard to the military capabilities, which will complement the other instruments available to the Union, at the Helsinki European Council the Member States set themselves the headline goal of being able, by 2003, to deploy within 60 days and sustain for at least one year forces up to corps level (60,000 persons). Concerning the forces, the Council believes that in quantitative terms, the voluntary contributions announced by Member States make it possible to achieve in full the headline goal established in Helsinki. As regards command, control and communications, the Member States offered a satisfactory number of national or multinational headquarters at strategic, operational, force and component levels. These offers will have to be evaluated further in qualitative terms so that the EU can, in addition to possible recourse to NATO capabilities, have the best possible command and control resources at its disposal. The Union pointed out the importance it attaches to the speedy conclusion of ongoing talks on access to NATO capabilities and assets. The European Union Military Staff, which will acquire an initial operating capability in the course of 2001, will bolster the European Union's collective early warning capability and will provide it with a predecisional situation assessment and strategic planning capability. The Member States also committed themselves to medium and long-term efforts in order to improve both their operational and their strategic capabilities still further and also to continue taking steps to strengthen their own capabilities and carrying out existing or planned projects implementing multinational solutions, including in the field of pooling resources. These projects as a whole relate to: 1) improving the performance of European forces in respect of the availability, deployability, sustainability and interoperability of those forces; 2) developing

"strategic" capabilities: strategic mobility to deliver the forces rapidly to the field of operations; headquarters to command and control the forces and the associated information and communication system; means of providing them with information; 3) strengthening essential operational capabilities in the framework of a crisis-management operation; areas which were identified in this context were: resources for search and rescue in operational conditions, means of defence against ground-to-ground missiles, precision weapons, logistic support, simulation tools. The restructuring of the European defence industries taking place in certain Member States was a positive factor in this. It encouraged the development of European capabilities. Member States also agreed on the importance of defining down an evaluation mechanism enabling follow-up to be made and progress to be facilitated toward the realisation of the commitments made with a view to achieving the headline goal, in both quantitative and qualitative terms.?

## Developing a common European security and defence policy CFSP after Cologne and Helsinki

---

The European Parliament adopted, by 326 votes to 119 with 49 abstentions, the report by Mrs Catherine LALUMIERE (PES, F) on a Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP) after Cologne and Helsinki. The report adopted reflects the amendments laid down by the committee responsible. (Please refer to the previous document). Furthermore, an amendment was included which calls for restrictions on arms exports and for the EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports to be made mandatory. Further amendments express concern that there should be no cutting back on EU's social and economic priorities as a result of an increase in defence expenditure and express the hope that the pooling of resources will lead to a rationalisation of military spending.