

Procedure file

Basic information		
INI - Own-initiative procedure	2002/2165(INI)	Procedure completed
The new European architecture for security and defence, priorities and lacks		
Subject 6.10.02 Common security and defence policy (CSDP); WEU, NATO		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	AFET Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security, Defense	PPE-DE MORILLON Philippe	11/09/2002
Council of the European Union	Council configuration	Meeting	Date
	General Affairs	2509	19/05/2003
	General Affairs	2464	19/11/2002

Key events			
10/10/2002	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
19/11/2002	Resolution/conclusions adopted by Council		
25/03/2003	Vote in committee		Summary
25/03/2003	Committee report tabled for plenary	A5-0111/2003	
09/04/2003	Debate in Parliament		
10/04/2003	Decision by Parliament	T5-0188/2003	Summary
10/04/2003	End of procedure in Parliament		
19/05/2003	Resolution/conclusions adopted by Council		
12/03/2004	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2002/2165(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/5/16639

Documentation gateway					
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A5-0111/2003	25/03/2003	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T5-0188/2003 OJ C 064 12.03.2004, p. 0393-0599 E	10/04/2003	EP	Summary

The new European architecture for security and defence, priorities and lacks

Following a lively debate, the committee adopted the own-initiative report by Philippe MORILLON (EPP-ED, F) on the new European security and defence architecture. The central message of the report was that the EU's military capability must be strengthened if Europe wished to become a credible actor on the international stage and a free partner of the United States, prepared to share the burden of defence. Faced with a world characterised by new threats and growing insecurity, MEPs proposed the construction of a new European defence architecture, and expressed deep regret at the current split between the Member States on key foreign policy issues. As regards military operations, the committee wanted the EU to have, with effect from 2004, a 5000-strong force kept in a state of permanent readiness for humanitarian and rescue operations. By 2009 this force should be capable of carrying out operations autonomously. The committee also expressed support for the EU's decision to take over NATO's "Allied Harmony" operation in Macedonia and its intention to take on the SFOR command in Bosnia-Herzegovina. However, it stressed that the Council should inform Parliament about such missions "after each General Affairs Council meeting, especially with regard to the mandate, the capabilities needed (including possible access to NATO structures) and the financial implications". The report suggested a collective defence clause similar to that of NATO, which would apply to all Member States wishing to take part. The committee emphasised that NATO remained the indispensable bond between the US and Europe and highlighted the importance of clarifying relations between the two military structures. A "solidarity clause" should, it said, be introduced into the Treaty to enable Member States to mobilise all the necessary military and civilian instruments to combat terrorism. On the financial front, MEPs proposed that the common costs of military operations under the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) be covered through the Community budget. This would require an amendment to Article 28 of the Treaty on European Union. With the European Convention's deliberations in mind, the report included a reference to the EU's institutional set-up. MEPs supported an enhanced role for the High Representative, who should have the right of initiative in crisis management matters. Elsewhere the committee suggested that an Armaments and Research Agency and also a European Institute of Advanced Defence Studies be set up, the aim of the latter being "to sow the requisite seeds within both the armed forces and the civilian population to ensure the emergence of a common defence culture".?

The new European architecture for security and defence, priorities and lacks

In adopting by 275 votes for, 96 against and 11 abstentions the resolution by Mr Philippe MORILLON (EPP-ED, F) on the new European security and defence architecture, the Parliament agreed with the position agreed by the committee responsible (please refer to the previous text). The resolution's main message is that the EU's military capability should be strengthened if Europe wishes to become a credible actor on the international stage and a free partner of the United States. As regards the new international security environment, the Parliament proposes - as a response to the US National Security Strategy - the development of a Security Strategy of the European Union which would define the Union's values and interests in the field of promoting worldwide stability, conflict prevention and crisis management, and would describe the Union's approach to making the world a safer place. The House considers that this strategy could help to build better EU-US cooperation based on common interests and reduce current differences. The Parliament also considers that the Petersberg tasks should be revised and expanded to include other tasks involving the use of military resources, such as conflict prevention, joint disarmament operations, military advice and assistance, post-conflict stabilisation and combating terrorism, which should lead the European Union to make provision for various types of interventions of varying intensity. Civilian crisis management should be placed on an equal footing to the military aspects of the Petersberg tasks and should be recognised as a core part of the common security and defence policy; points out that the Union should be able to meet civilian crisis management needs by coherent and concerted deployment of Member States' capabilities and Community instruments, for the purpose of conflict prevention and preservation of peace and stability through police missions, as well as through measures aiming at strengthening democracy, public administration and the rule of law. In addition, Parliament confirms its position that common costs of military operations within the ESDP framework should be covered by the Community budget (CFSP) and, in this connection, calls for Article 28 of the TEU to be modified. It equally expresses its interest in the initiative launched by Belgium, France, Germany and Luxembourg to discuss in Brussels on 29 April 2003 EU defence policy perspectives and hopes that other Member States will be willing to subscribe to it and that the proposals resulting from this meeting will be presented to the Council and the European Convention.?