


Procedure file

Basic information	
INI - Own-initiative procedure	2001/2254(INI) Procedure completed
Arms: code of conduct on exports, point 8. 3rd annual report	
Subject 3.40.09 Defence and arms industry	

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	AFET Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security, Defense	PSE TITLEY Gary	25/02/2002

Key events			
17/01/2002	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
10/09/2002	Vote in committee		Summary
10/09/2002	Committee report tabled for plenary	A5-0286/2002	
25/09/2002	Debate in Parliament		
26/09/2002	Decision by Parliament	T5-0452/2002	Summary
26/09/2002	End of procedure in Parliament		
14/11/2003	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2001/2254(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Annual report
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 142-p2; Rules of Procedure EP 54
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	AFET/5/15641

Documentation gateway					
Document attached to the procedure		13657/2001 OJ C 351 11.12.2001, p. 0001-0009	07/11/2001	CSL	Summary

Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading	A5-0286/2002	10/09/2002	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading	T5-0452/2002 OJ C 273 14.11.2003, p. 0202-0302 E	26/09/2002	EP	Summary

Arms: code of conduct on exports, point 8. 3rd annual report

The European Code of Conduct on Arms Exports was adopted on 8 June 1998. It builds on the common criteria for arms exports adopted by the Luxembourg and Lisbon European Councils in 1991 and 1992 and establishes a mechanism for information exchange and consultation among the Member States. The Code sets high minimum standards for the management of, and restraint in, conventional arms transfers by all Member States. The European Union embarked on a process of convergence of national arms export control policies. Operative Provision 8 provides for an annual review of the implementation of the Code, progress achieved and issues outstanding. This document constitutes the third annual report and reviews the third year of implementation of the Code of Conduct. (Please refer to the two previous reports COS/2000/2012 and COS/2001/2050). The third year was marked by the achievement of most of the priority objectives identified in the first and second reports and the identification of new issues for consideration and action. At the same time, the number of notified denials and consultations has continued to increase, demonstrating not only an intensification of the dialogue on interpretation of the Code of Conduct at national level but also the Member States' growing confidence in this instrument, which contributes to convergence of the policies and procedures on arms exports applicable in the Member States of the European Union. Discussions have also been held on certain aspects of national policies with a view to being able to bring them closer together. Dialogue with non-member countries which have aligned themselves with the Code's principles, particularly the associated countries of Central and Eastern Europe, as well as Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, was stepped up during the third year as a result of new initiatives aimed at improving the application of the Code in these countries both at legislative level and in actual implementation by the operators concerned. Progress made in the remaining areas during the third year of implementation is as follows: - Essentially identical transactions : Member States have continued their discussion on this matter within the Working Party on Conventional Arms Exports (COARM), with a view to developing an understanding agreed by all the Member States, of the concept of an essentially identical transaction. Discussion has led to a common approach. - Common list of non-military security and police equipment : The COARM Working Party undertook to draw up a common list of non-military security and police equipment, the export of which should be monitored in accordance with Criterion No 2 of the Code "Respect for human rights in the country of the final destination". The Commission has now announced a proposal for a Community mechanism for controlling exports of non-military equipment which may be used for internal repression. Other work has been carried out regarding the development of exchanges of information on national control of arms to certain countries or regions regarded as requiring special vigilance, harmonisation of the procedures implemented in the framework of the operative provisions of the code and harmonisation of national annual report on the application of the Code of Conduct. It should also be noted that efforts have been made as regards the coordination of the Member State's national positions in multilateral bodies dealing with arms export control issues (coordination within the EU was exemplary at the UN Conference on illicit trade in small arms and light weapons held in New York from 9-20 July 2001 and was the only group of States to submit an overall plan of action). Progress has been made on other issues such as the export of equipment for humanitarian purposes, Control of arms brokering activities (Member States have reached an agreement on a set of guidelines for controlling brokering that could be a basis for national legislation). Lastly, the report proposes a series of priority guidelines for the near future. Member States have thus identified the following guidelines: - Continue efforts to increase harmonisation of national reports and, consequently, to produce clearer, more transparent summary tables; - Agree on the definitive adoption of a system for controlling exports of non-military security and police equipment. - Continue proceedings in the area of arms brokering on the basis of the guidelines already approved. - Continue the proceedings on standardising the information to appear on the certificates of final destination. - Study the problem of manufacture under licence in non-member countries. - Begin proceedings on effective control by the authorities of each Member State of electronic transfers of the software and technology associated with the equipment on the common list. The system for the control of exports of dual-use goods could serve as a model in this respect. - Continue efforts to promote the principles and criteria of the Code among non-member countries and international organisations, on the basis inter alia of the Declaration of the European Union and the United States on the responsibilities of States and on transparency regarding arms exports. - Work towards greater involvement by the candidate States in the implementation of the Code of Conduct.?

Arms: code of conduct on exports, point 8. 3rd annual report

The committee adopted the own-initiative report by Gary TITLEY (PES, UK) on the Council's Third Annual Report on the EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports. The committee welcomed the progress made (in terms of transparency of information provided, the agreement on guidelines for controlling arms brokering and efforts to lay down common rules) and added that it was crucial to involve the candidate countries closely in consultations under the Code of Conduct. However, MEPs above all wanted the code of conduct to be legally binding and called for the EU Member States to adopt as a matter of urgency legislation similar to the recently adopted Belgian law on arms brokering (which establishes a register of licensed arms brokers, strict conditions for individuals to be included in the register and firm sanctions against those who violate the rules). They urged other exporting countries to take similar measures. ?

Arms: code of conduct on exports, point 8. 3rd annual report

The European Parliament adopted its own-initiative report drafted by Gary Titley (PES, United Kingdom) on the Third annual report on Arms Exports. (Please refer to the document dated 10/09/02.) Parliament recalled that the Code of Conduct states that Member States must not allow exports which would provoke or prolong armed conflicts. Member States need to review their defence industry relations, particularly in the Middle East. Parliament went on to point out that the different national systems of data collection and reporting are an obstacle to proper scrutiny. All Member States need to publish national annual reports based on agreed standards and best practice. Such reports should provide details on individual licences granted or denied including a description of the goods and details regarding the value, quantity and end-user of

the equipment, as well as details of the supplier country and the recipient state. A comprehensive system of end-user controls should incorporate pre-export checks, an effective system of end-user certification and post-export monitoring and follow-up procedures. Finally, Parliament urged the incorporation into the Code of Conduct of a provision whereby a Member State which has refused authorisation but has subsequently changed its mind within a period of one year is obliged to notify the other Member States of that decision during a common consultation procedure.?