

**Il-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005**

nevertheless the exemption granted to nationals from states that are not party to the Rome Statute from the jurisdiction of the ICC and calls on the Council to continue its firm support for the ICC;

***Parliament's view on the financing of CFSP for 2005***

45. Reiterates that responding to the five main threats to European security, as set out in the European Security Strategy (terrorism, WMD proliferation, regional conflicts, State failure, organised crime), will require long-term external commitment using all available instruments, including a serious investment in security research and conflict prevention, involving the identification of concrete, sustained budgetary compromises to be explicitly made in the future Financial Perspectives for 2007-2013;

46. Insists it is no longer possible to distinguish between the financing of civil or military expenses in the context, in particular, of ESDP operations, and more specifically those undertaken solely by the Union and planned and conducted through its Civil/Military Cell;

47. Stresses once again, therefore, that joint costs for military operations within the framework of ESDP should be funded from the Community budget (as already occurs in the civil sphere in the case of police operations) and not from a subsidiary budget or a start-up fund of the Member States, as currently provided for;

48. To that end, recalls the new possibilities offered by the financing of future interventions by the planned "Humanitarian Battle Groups" in cases of natural disasters in which a mixture of military and civil means of assistance are necessary, as was recently the case with the tsunami disaster in South Asia; calls, in this regard, on the Council and the Commission to draw up a new proposal which also takes into account the proposal of the European Parliament for a European Civil Peace Corps and the setting-up of a European Voluntary Aid Corps as provided for in Article III-321 of the Constitution;

49. Asks the Council to consider, in the event of any future ESDP operation in the fight against terrorism, and in opposition to existing rules such as the principle that "costs lie where they fall" or any other ad hoc arrangements such as the so-called "Athena mechanism", the possibility of funding the joint cost of such operations from the Community budget;

\*  
\*   \*

50. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the parliaments of the Member States, the Secretary-General of the UN, the Secretary General of NATO and the Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

---

**P6\_TA(2005)0133**

**European Security Strategy****European Parliament resolution on the European Security Strategy (2004/2167(INI))**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, signed in Rome on 29 October 2004,
- having regard to the European Security Strategy adopted by the European Council on 12 December 2003, following an initiative in this connection by the Greek Presidency, the informal Council of Foreign Ministers (Kastellorizon, May 2003) and the conclusions of the Thessaloniki European Council (19-20 June 2003),

II-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005

- having regard to its resolution of 30 November 2000 on the establishment of a common European security and defence policy after Cologne and Helsinki <sup>(1)</sup>,
  - having regard to its resolution of 10 April 2003 on the new European security and defence architecture — priorities and deficiencies <sup>(2)</sup>,
  - having regard to its resolution of 10 March 2005 on the Non-Proliferation Treaty 2005 Review Conference — Nuclear arms in North Korea and Iran <sup>(3)</sup>,
  - having regard to the Proposal for a White Paper on European defence as presented by the EU Institute for Security Studies in May 2004,
  - having regard to the report on a Human Security Doctrine for Europe as presented to the EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy on 15 September 2004 <sup>(4)</sup>,
  - having regard to the various programmes on conflict prevention as made public by all the European Institutions,
  - having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (A6-0072/2005),
- A. considering the milestone reached in the evolutionary development of European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) as set out in the Franco-British St Malo Declaration of 3-4 December 1998,
- B. considering the subsequent ESDP development agenda as expressed during the European Council Summits in Cologne (3-4 June 1999), Helsinki (10-11 December 1999) and Göteborg (15-16 June 2001),
- C. considering the need to strengthen arms exports control in and from the EU and at global level,
- D. recognising the important role played by various EU assistance programmes and the indispensable contribution they make to economic development, to supporting the growth of democratic institutions, to the implementation of reconstruction measures, to drawing up macro-economic programmes and to promoting human rights,
- E. acknowledging that the comprehensive approach advocated in the European Security Strategy is already being actively pursued in the Balkans, as demonstrated by the scale of EU instruments currently being applied to bring stability to the region: the CARDS assistance programme; the civilian missions Proxima and EUPM; and the military mission Althea,
- F. recognising the consistent support levels established over a ten-year period of public opinion surveys, which have shown that more than 60 % of EU citizens are in favour of a common EU foreign policy and more than 70 % in favour of a common defence policy; noting, however, other opinion surveys which do not show support for increased military spending,
- G. noting and regretting that the level to which the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) is subject to scrutiny by the European Parliament in accordance with Article III-304 of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe has not significantly been increased and that Parliament is not and has never been consulted on numerous Council decisions and actions; recognising nevertheless the goodwill demonstrated by the High Representative and his services in keeping Parliament informed and engaging in dialogue with Parliament; urging the High Representative and his services to continue to strengthen this transparent dialogue with Parliament,
- H. observing, without prejudice to the previous point, the continued accountability of actions undertaken within the Union's CFSP framework to the national parliaments, particularly with regard to those Member States where parliamentary approval is required in order to undertake any military action,

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 228, 13.8.2001, p. 173.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ C 64 E, 12.3.2004, p. 599.

<sup>(3)</sup> Texts adopted, P6\_TA(2005)0075.

<sup>(4)</sup> The Barcelona Report of the Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities.

**Il-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005**

- I. acknowledging that all actions and measures undertaken within the framework of the Union's CFSP are to be exercised in strict adherence to international law and with respect for the principles of the UN Charter, as stated clearly in Articles I-3 and III-292 of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe,
- J. whereas many EU Member States (including the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, Italy and Greece) have had, and in some cases are still having, their own experiences with various forms of terrorism and the philosophies which underlie them,
- K. whereas, for the foreseeable future, Islamist terrorism represents the greatest challenge to the EU, as to other regions, particularly in the event that terrorists succeed in gaining control of weapons of mass destruction,
- L. whereas the European Security Strategy forms part of the comprehensive CFSP and ESDP, in which the whole spectrum of political activities available to the EU, including those of a diplomatic, economic or development nature, may come into play,

***The European security environment***

1. Emphasises that only a comprehensive understanding of the concept of "security" can properly take into account both the influence of issues of political democratic concern (e.g. violation of human rights, wilful discrimination against particular groups of citizens, the existence of repressive regimes) and the wide range of social, economic and environmental factors (e.g. poverty, famine, disease, illiteracy, scarcity of natural resources, environmental degradation, inequitable trade relations, etc.) in contributing to existing regional conflicts, the failure of states and the emergence of criminal and terrorist networks, though the actions of the latter may not be seen as being justified in any way, shape or form by the above-mentioned factors;
2. Welcomes, therefore, the comprehensive understanding of the concept of "security" as expressed in the European Security Strategy (ESS); shares the view expressed within the ESS that key threats to our global security presently include terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), unresolved regional conflicts, failed and failing states and organised crime; emphasises that these threats can neither be primarily addressed nor exclusively resolved by military means;
3. Draws, therefore, the same conclusion as that expressed within the ESS that a combination of the various assistance programmes and instruments, including those of development policy, at both EU and Member State level, in conjunction with diplomatic, civilian and military capabilities and expertise can best serve to contribute to a more secure world;
4. Consequently stresses the urgent need for the practical transposition of this concept of the security environment within the existing structures of the Union, so as to enable the Union to detect crises sufficiently far in advance to act in a pro-active manner; in that connection, recommends greater efforts to establish an early-warning system for threats using innovative technologies from the civilian IT sector to carry out news analysis and assessment; expresses its view in this regard that the establishment of "tension detection centres" in regions particularly susceptible to crises, centres which may be set up under the auspices both of the future European External Action Service and of services outside the European Union, such as those of the African Union, would be one of many sensible ways of identifying, reporting on and helping to eradicate the roots of conflicts and thus preventing any violent escalations; stresses further in this regard the importance which it attaches to the integration of conflict prevention and the fight against terrorism as components within all EU policy areas;

***Strategic objectives for the EU***

5. Agrees fully with the strategic objectives for the Union as expressed in the ESS: addressing the threats; building security in the Union's neighbourhood; and strengthening the international order via effective action through effective multilateral structures; emphasises that the objectives of the ESS go well beyond the military aspects of the European Security and Defence Policy;

II-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005

6. Notes that, in addressing the threats, it will be necessary to determine those of a regional and/or those of a global nature, so that the Union can effectively mobilise its available instruments and resources in order to address the problem; notes that the establishment of security in the Union's neighbourhood will serve in large measure to counter threats of a regional nature, whereas those of a global nature must be tackled through effective multilateral international structures in which the EU is a driving force; notes, however, that multilateral organisations and structures may also be called upon to address regional threats;
7. Shares fully the view expressed in the Union's New Neighbourhood Policy and the ESS that the Union's neighbourhood should be understood in more far-reaching terms, covering not only those eastern European countries sharing borders with the EU but also regions further east and south, such as the Caucasus, the Middle East and northern Africa; notes the congruency of this policy with the continuing activities of the Union in seeking a resolution of the Arab-Israel conflict also through the Barcelona process; stresses that democracy and the rule of law are the most important preconditions for the peaceful coexistence of peoples;
8. Emphasises the primacy of the UN within the multilateral institutional framework and the need for the EU to play a leading role in re-invigorating the structures and capabilities of this indispensable institution; takes note in this connection of the report presented by the Secretary-General of the UN entitled "In larger freedom: towards development, security, and human rights for all" on 21 March 2005; welcomes this report — without prejudice to any future detailed assessment by the Parliament — as the starting point for an open discussion on reforming the UN so that it may face the challenges of the 21st century; urges the EU and the Member States to coordinate their position within the framework of these discussions in full awareness of the consistent support demonstrated by public opinion surveys for a stronger representation of CFSP/ESDP through the EU than that which currently exists;
9. Underlines, further, the need for the Union to play a leading role in cooperating with other international and regional organisations that foster peace and security in the world; emphasises in particular the need for full cooperation with the OSCE;
10. Stresses that it is important for the EU to pursue a firm and fair development policy in order to contribute efficiently to the universally agreed Millennium Development Goals;

#### **Recent ESDP milestones**

11. Notes the valuable experience gained in civilian and police missions over the course of the last two years, including: the assumption of control by the International Police Task Force (now EUPM) in Bosnia-Herzegovina since 2003; Proxima in The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) and Eujust Themis in Georgia; welcomes also the forthcoming deployment of a European Union police force in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (EUPOL Kinshasa);
12. Recognises the significant progress made in expanding the military capabilities of the Union; at the same time notes the importance of the Berlin Plus Framework agreed with NATO, which made the first EU military mission Concordia in FYROM and the Althea mission to Bosnia-Herzegovina possible; acknowledges the advantageous flexibility of the Union's ESDP framework in further allowing the execution of Operation Artemis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;
13. Emphasises the positive contributions already made by the EU Situation Centre (Sitcen) in combining all available civil, military and diplomatic intelligence to produce cogent background analyses of any given situation; urges the Member States to further intensify their information-sharing with the Sitcen, so as not to unduly hinder the fulfilment of ambitions expressed in the ESS;
14. Emphasises that the defining characteristic and the additional value of the ESDP lie in the combination of civilian and military components and notes, in observance of the aforementioned accomplishments, that the EU will in future be increasingly faced with the challenge of striking a good and proper balance between military and civilian components in order to fulfil the objectives and the spirit of the ESS; takes the view that the Althea mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina will provide valuable experience in this regard, in so far as the Union will be able to coordinate its military efforts with the civilian operations and programmes currently under way;

Il-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005

***Progress towards Headline Goal 2010 and towards a Civilian Headline Goal 2008***

15. Agrees with the targets set out in the Headline Goal 2010 as formally adopted by the General Affairs and External Relations Council (GAERC) on 17 May 2004 and the agreement to work out a Civilian Headline Goal 2008 as approved by the GAERC on 13 December 2004 as a means of concentrating efforts to empower the EU with the necessary capabilities to pursue the ESS strategic objectives; considers that these substantive and time-related targets should be given concrete form in a White Paper;

16. Recognises in this connection the progress made at the GAERC meeting on 22 November 2004 concerning the further development of the rapid deployment "Battle Groups" concept for high-intensity military operations; notes that these Battle Groups are to be primarily derived from the bi-national and multinational forces already existing within the EU; also notes the agreement to work out a Civilian Headline Goal 2008, as approved by the GAERC, and welcomes the intention expressed therein of making the existing civilian instruments more comprehensive and effective, so that the combination of various integrated contingents can take place on the basis of specific needs on the ground; recognises, therefore, that future civilian crisis management within the framework of the ESDP will in effect go beyond the four priority areas set out in Feira (police, rule of law, civil administration and civil protection);

17. Underscores, in particular with respect to achieving the full operational mobility of the Battle Groups by 2007, the importance of the Global Approach on Deployability and, in this context, welcomes the contributions made by the coordinating centres of Athens and Eindhoven in the military transport sector;

18. Welcomes further in this regard the formal adoption by the European Council of the proposal for a Civilian/Military Cell (Civ/Mil) within the European Union Military Staff; notes that Civ/Mil will play a particularly crucial role in the strategic planning of all operations (i.e. civil, military and joint civil/military) and — as of 2006 — in setting up an operations centre for autonomous EU missions in cases where no national HQ has been designated; emphasises further the importance of Civ/Mil in developing principles and models for the management of the civilian/military interface; acknowledges, however, that many of these principles and models will be derived as a result of ongoing and future operations;

19. Draws attention, as regards the planning for future EU mixed civil/military missions, to the proposals and ideas contained in the report entitled "A Human Security Doctrine for Europe"; welcomes in this regard not only the current developments in the field of ESDP, such as the establishment of Civ/Mil, which are in congruence with the general direction of this report, but also the future creation of a European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps as provided for in Article III-321(5) of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe; notes, however, that the European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps is primarily envisaged, in that article, as "a framework for joint contributions from young Europeans"; demands therefore that the framework of this be either expanded or complemented by the setting-up of a complementary "Corps" drawing upon the experience and expertise of mid- and post-career professionals, so as to create a functional corps more along the lines of the European Civil Peace Corps — as proposed on several occasions by the Parliament;

20. Notes that on 7 January 2005 the GEARC also — partly on the basis of provisional proposals put forward by the Foreign Affairs Commissioner — called on its competent subsidiary bodies and on the Commission to assess the scope for boosting the EU's crisis reaction capabilities as regards disaster aid;

21. Urges the Council and the Commission to guarantee the complementarity and cohesion of existing instruments and capabilities as well as those of new proposals, particularly regarding the close link between conflict protection and crisis management; considers that measurable success in this as yet uncompleted task may be regarded as progress with a view to the future establishment of the European Foreign Service;

22. Welcomes the initiative by certain Member States to establish a European Gendarmerie Force and their readiness to make it available for ESDP purposes; highlights the particular usefulness of this force in ensuring the transition from an essentially purely military phase of operations to a mixed or purely civilian phase;

II-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005

23. Emphasises the need to develop a European security culture through an effective implementation of the EU Training Concept in ESDP which increases interoperability among all actors involved in EU crisis management; stresses in this context the need for the establishment of a European Security and Defence College (ESDC) which will provide EU bodies and Member States with knowledgeable personnel able to work efficiently on all ESDP matters; considers that this College must be based on sound organisational and financial modalities;

24. Notes with satisfaction the rapid action taken in creating the European Defence Agency (EDA) in advance of the formal adoption of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe; notes that the activities of the EDA should benefit the Union, not only in further developing defence capabilities in crisis management, but also in bringing about a rationalisation of research and development costs within the Member States and, in the long run, helping to contribute to the creation of a European armaments market; considers that the Armaments Agency should pay particular attention to the arming and equipping of Battle Groups and should ensure their compatibility; calls for the Battle Groups to be supplied as a first priority with new, common equipment; cautions, however, that any future achievements of the EDA will, in large measure, be dependent on the (political) goodwill of the Member States; calls for the availability of sufficient budgetary means to permit the realisation of EDA-led armaments initiatives; notes further in this connection that the EDA must not be hindered from pursuing longer term capability goals — goals beyond the Headline Goal 2010 — in order that the Union may benefit from pursuing the ESS objectives;

25. Regards a European Space Policy as one of the most important strategic challenges facing the EU in the 21st century; notes that, in the field of telecommunications and intelligence, many projects have been developed in parallel, reducing efficiency and increasing costs; calls for these projects, such as the French Helios satellite system and the German SAR-Lupe system, to be merged within the framework of European security research;

26. Welcomes the Commission's efforts to promote security research within the EU in the near future; advocates, therefore, the establishment within the next framework programme for research of an independent European security research programme endowed with instruments, rules and funding models tailored to the work of researching security issues, in keeping with the recommendations of the Group of Eminent Persons; points out, however, the risk of duplication with research initiatives of the EDA; calls, therefore, on the Commission, the Council and the Member States to maintain close working relations with a view to avoiding this risk; recommends, in this connection — parallel to technology-driven research — that the emphasis should be placed on the development of joint modelling and simulation capabilities and the ability to analyse threats and security concepts, exploiting the respective comparative benefits they offer;

### *Capability deficiencies*

27. Takes note of the following three categories of material deficiencies, which could seriously affect the Union's ability to conduct both civilian crisis management operations and humanitarian intervention operations of high-intensity dimensions using mainly military means, such as halting humanitarian catastrophes of similar dimensions to that in Rwanda:

- (a) lack of deployable forces required for maintaining the rotation needed (1/3 on deployment, 1/3 on training, 1/3 resting) in such long-term/high-intensity operations;
- (b) lack of permanent large-scale airlift capabilities for transporting forces abroad;
- (c) lack of sufficient deployable command, control and communications capabilities as well as intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance resources within the collective framework of ESDP;

28. Notes that the continuing development of the Battle Groups will address the first deficiency in large measure; notes that the planned construction of the A400 M transport aircraft will not resolve the second deficiency completely and urges that measures be taken to address the deficiency further; urges, nonetheless, that consideration be given to establishing a rotation scheme for the deployment of forces; demands, in view of a rotation scheme of this kind, common standards in training, for instance as regards helicopters; considers that operational capability could be increased and costs reduced by a joint training system; urges

**Il-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005**

strongly, as regards the final deficiency, that measures be taken to enable the EU to conduct missions requiring the assistance of military forces without recourse to NATO or to any single Member State's resources; points out that such measures could realistically entail the pooling of existing resources and capabilities within the Member States with the goal of establishing a dual-use communications base or network at the service of the ESDP;

29. Emphasises further that the goals and aims expressed in the Headline Goal 2010 would not be sufficient to allow missions of a more intense nature or of a duration of more than one year; therefore urges the Commission, in close cooperation with the Council, to submit a White Paper on the practical requirements for the development of the ESDP and the ESS, so that a debate concerning the development of a future European Defence Strategy can also be further promoted;

***Arms export control and non-proliferation of WMDs and light weapons***

30. Acknowledges, within the framework of the Union's CFSP, the overall coherence of the European Strategy against the proliferation of WMDs, as formally adopted by the European Council in December 2003, with the strategic objectives of the European Security Strategy; notes with satisfaction the work undertaken by the Personal Representative of the High Representative in pursuing the implementation of Chapter III of this Strategy, particularly as expressed in the priority list endorsed by the European Council in December 2004;

31. Agrees with the European Security Strategy that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is potentially the greatest threat to our security and urges, in accordance with the provisions of the European Security Strategy, that the EU use the full panoply of instruments at its disposal in defeating the WMD threat, noting in this regard that the possible combination of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction requires prompt and appropriate action;

32. Stresses the need for the European Union to take over the initiative of strengthening the international arms control regime, thereby contributing to the reinforcement given to effective multilateralism within the international order; notes further the congruence of efforts to integrate aspects of non-proliferation within the EU Neighbourhood Policy with the overall strategic objective of building security within the Union's neighbourhood;

33. Welcomes the intended inclusion of WMD non-proliferation clauses in all future partnership and cooperation agreements between the EU and third countries, as exemplified by the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with Tajikistan of 11 October 2004<sup>(1)</sup> as well as the draft Association Agreement with Syria now awaiting approval;

34. Welcomes the fact that the EU's negotiations with Iran as a regional power, aimed at preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, were carried out in connection with legitimate economic and regional security interests; notes that this policy is an expression of foreign and security policy based on the principles of international law and multilateralism in the best interests of the international community; welcomes the fact that the EU and US positions on Iran have come significantly closer;

35. Takes note of the Peer Review currently being undertaken of the EU export control system; notes that the main finding derived from the first stage of this review, conducted in Spring 2004, was the need for Member States to collectively (i.e. the EU) and individually adopt a more pro-active approach in controlling the export of dual-use items; urges the Member States to follow up without delay the recommendations based on this finding and to make more use of Sitcen in this regard, as well as in general, as a base for exchanging information; welcomes the efforts made by the EU to coordinate and organise as far as possible a common EU position within the various export control regimes and, further, the efforts made by the EU to include the new Member States in the various export control regimes;

36. Takes note of the current practical difficulties in implementing the strategy against the proliferation of WMDs, due in particular to the various sources and procedures through which budgetary means are to be mobilised; urges the Council and the Commission to engage, together with Parliament, in a dialogue on streamlining and simplifying these procedures with a view to adopting such changes within the framework of the relevant new financial instrument for the budgetary period 2007-2013;

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 340, 16.11.2004, p. 21.

II-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005

37. Stresses the need to further strengthen the EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports as well as to maximise the EU's contribution to countering the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, notably by the establishment of an international arms trade treaty;

38. Calls on the countries defined in the Non-Proliferation Treaty as nuclear-weapon states, in particular the USA, China and Russia, in view of the uncontrollably spreading danger of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to review their own nuclear policies in the spirit of the Non-Proliferation Treaty; regrets, therefore, the efforts made by the US administration over the last four years to promote research into, and the development of, new nuclear weapons and its refusal to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; expresses concern at Russia's inadequate efforts to protect its nuclear stocks; is alarmed at China's massive increase in military spending (12,6 %), its comprehensive modernisation of its nuclear armed forces and the increase in its imports of modern weapons technologies;

### ***Budgetary challenges***

39. Notes that the greatest threat to the coherence and success of the ESS remains the possible lack of sufficient budgetary resources made available across the entire spectrum of EU policies and instruments; notes in this connection the particular importance of EU assistance programmes and their substantial contribution to the pro-active comprehensive approach expressed within the ESS; demands that this point be borne in mind within the framework of the current negotiations concerning the Future Financial Perspective for 2007-2013;

40. Notes further that the effectiveness of the ESS, and in particular that of the ESDP, is dependent to a large extent on the expenditure of the Member States outside the framework of the EU; recommends in this connection, first, a more sensible and more effective use of national expenditure in the defence field, which might be achieved in certain Member States, for example by a speedier modernisation and restructuring of their armed forces, and, second, the establishment of a mechanism for assessing the proportion of a Member State's GDP spent on defence; urges the Member States, therefore, to cooperate with the EDA to that end;

41. Regrets that Article III-313 of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe has maintained the status quo of dual budgeting for CFSP operations; notes the Council's efforts to ensure greater transparency of the mechanism (Athena) by which common costs for operations of a military or defence nature are to be administered outside the Union's budget<sup>(1)</sup>; emphasises, none the less, its strongly held view that the continued separation of financing for common costs in civil operations through the budget of the Union from those with military or defence implications outside the Union's budget will prove increasingly untenable given that missions conducted within the framework of CFSP will be increasingly mixed in nature, as evidenced by the establishment of the Civil/Military Cell;

42. Points out in this connection the substantial problems that current tendering procedures create regarding organisation of rapid actions within the ESDP; therefore urges the Council and the Commission to conclude as soon as possible their thorough examination regarding special procedures or exemptions for future ESDP measures and operations within the Financial Regulation<sup>(2)</sup>;

### ***Transatlantic relations***

43. Takes note of the substantive congruity in the global threat assessments presented in both the ESS and the US National Security Strategy; takes the view that this congruity should be seen as a basis upon which both the EU and the United States can re-establish a dialogue of equal partners in attaining a common understanding for the resolution of particular issues of concern, such as the authorisation and use of military force in relation to the relevant provisions of the UN's Founding Charter and its legitimising role, and for the re-invigoration of Transatlantic security cooperation in general;

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Decision 2004/197/CFSP of 23 February 2004 establishing a mechanism to administer the common costs of European Union operations having military or defence implications (OJ L 63, 28.2.2004, p. 68).

<sup>(2)</sup> Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002 of 25 June 2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities (OJ L 248, 16.9.2002, p. 1).

**Il-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005**

44. Stresses that a major element of the Transatlantic security dialogue must be focused on empowering other international organisations such as the OSCE and, in particular, the African Union to make their own contribution to global security; emphasises in this regard the utility of informal multilateral formations such as the Quartet in achieving a lasting resolution of the Israel-Palestine conflict;

45. Expresses its wish for a stronger cooperation with the United States in the fields of non-proliferation and the fight against terrorism; urges the EU and the US none the less to continue with their positive dialogue in these areas and to fully pursue an action plan for further cooperation as reflected in the EU-US Declarations on combating terrorism and on the non-proliferation of WMDs adopted at the EU-US Summit on 26 June 2004; considers that these points should be addressed in the context of all EU-US meetings relevant to security policy;

**NATO**

46. Notes the continued recognition by many Member States of NATO as the cornerstone of their security in the event of an armed aggression; takes the view that cooperation and complementarity should be the key elements upon which EU/NATO relations are based; proposes in this vein discussions — taking into account the different character of each organisation — concerning improved coordination of national contributions to the NATO Response Force and those of the EU Headline Goals in order to avoid any duplication; urges Member States to continue to reform their armed forces with a view to making those forces more deployable, transportable and sustainable; notes in this regard that for the foreseeable future most Member States will continue to commit the same units to both NATO and the EU owing to the lack of units possessing the right skills and capabilities; urges Member States to continue to enlarge their pool of readily available forces so that in the future the operational needs of both the EU and NATO can be readily satisfied;

47. Notes that the current problems, which are regrettably hampering the necessary cooperation between the EU Military Committee and NATO, can be very speedily resolved given political goodwill on the part of the decision-makers involved;

48. Calls on Turkey, in the context of NATO, to create the conditions to promote better cooperation — which is urgently needed — between the EU Military Committee and the relevant NATO bodies;

49. Encourages the new European Defence Agency to examine the possibilities for cooperation with NATO in the area of armaments and to explicitly provide for the possibility of such co-operation within the framework of the Administrative Agreement to be signed in due course between the two as provided for in Article 25 of Council Joint Action 2004/551/CFSP on the establishment of the European Defence Agency<sup>(1)</sup>;

50. Takes note of the complementary nature of certain policies and programmes of NATO (Partnership for Peace and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative and Mediterranean Dialogue) and the EU (Neighbourhood Policy and the Barcelona Process); encourages both parties to examine how these programmes and policies can more effectively serve to mutually reinforce each other;

***Homeland security and combating terrorism***

51. Observes that the ESS draws significant attention to the blurring of previously static boundaries existing in the traditional conceptions of internal and external security; notes, however, the sparsity of content within the ESS on linking the two concepts so as to address threats coherently; is nevertheless aware, in spite of this conceptual omission, of the many and varied efforts made by the Council, the Commission and the Member States in the fields of home and foreign affairs;

52. Takes note, in the field of prevention of terrorism, consequence management and protection of critical infrastructures, of the proposals put forward by the Commission for the ARGUS system, which would be capable of circulating information and coordinating action responses, and its possible linkage both with a crisis centre and with an alarm network (CIWIN) for the protection of critical infrastructures within the EU;

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 245, 17.7.2004, p. 17.

II-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005

53. Notes in the same connection the European Council's call, in the "Hague Programme" of 4-5 November 2004, for the Council and the Commission to set up, while fully respecting national competences, integrated and coordinated EU crisis-management arrangements for crises with cross-border effects within the EU, to be implemented at the latest by 1 July 2006;

54. Welcomes the work accomplished or initiated so far on the basis of the above-mentioned proposals and calls, as well as a number of other measures and proposals which traditionally form part of national internal policy; also welcomes in this connection the special role which Sitcen will have in producing risk assessments and analyses in connection with potential terrorist targets; calls in this connection for unrestricted cooperation between all intelligence departments attached to national defence ministries so as to create a corresponding capability within Sitcen;

55. Welcomes in particular the objective of arranging for the cross-border exchange of intelligence and security service information in accordance with the principle of availability set out in the Hague Programme — where it relates to the future exchange of law-enforcement information — a principle whereby, taking into account the special nature of these services' methods (e.g. the need to protect the information-gathering procedure, information sources and the continued confidentiality of data after exchange), information available to a service in one Member State should be made available to the corresponding services in another Member State;

56. As regards internal security policy, is deeply concerned by the inadequate implementation by the Member States of all of the measures and instruments listed within the original anti-terrorism plan adopted in October 2001;

57. Takes note of the report submitted by the EU High Representative to the European Council on 16-17 December 2004 on integrating the fight against terrorism into EU External Relations Policy; notes the conclusion in that report that the capabilities in the context of the Headline Goal 2010 and the Civilian Headline Goal 2008 should be adapted to the requirements of the various possible terrorist threats and scenarios — including a possible intervention under the Solidarity Clause (Article I-43 of the Constitution);

58. Calls, within the framework of the New Neighbourhood Policy and in the context of EU foreign relations in general, for an enhanced political dialogue with third countries on terrorism, to cover not only the need for their unrestricted cooperation with international and regional organisations but also the strict application of the clause on combating terrorism contained in agreements with third countries where there is evidence of terrorist threats or specific terrorist activities;

59. Is however concerned — with all due respect for the work accomplished so far in seeking to draw a line between the two fields of home and foreign affairs — about the coherence and coordination of this work and, in particular, the degree to which democratic freedoms and the rule of law are taken into account; therefore urges its Committees on Foreign Affairs and on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs to find an appropriate procedure for the preparation of recommendations on the matter to be addressed to both the Council and the Commission, in order not only to check the coherence and coordination of such work but also to ensure that the civil and political rights of citizens and organisations are not compromised in any way and thus, where appropriate, to make recommendations to Parliament's relevant committees, for forwarding to both the Council and the Commission;

### **External Action Service**

60. Salutes the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe as an important basis for pursuing the ESS and its ongoing development; considers that the creation of the new External Action Service will be a vitally important instrument for external action under the CFSP and therefore for the ESS; emphasises that an effective ESS must fully utilise available diplomatic capabilities (i.e. the EU Minister for Foreign Affairs and the European External Action Service (Articles I-28 and III-296(3)) and, if necessary, military capabilities (i.e. permanent structured cooperation between Member States for the fulfilment of high-intensity missions demanding higher military capabilities (Articles I-41(6), III-312 and the Specific Protocol));

**Il-Hamis, 14 ta' April 2005**

61. Urges the Council and the Commission forthwith to take the necessary steps to integrate their activities in a spirit of cooperation prior to the final ratification of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe; emphasises that Parliament will seek to assess those steps in a positive and constructive manner and will judge all proposed actions and measures during the transitional period on the basis of their quality rather than their origin, with a view to setting up a functioning and effective European External Action Service; stresses that Parliament will also judge these efforts in the light of whether they respect the political will, expressed in the Constitution, to formulate a common policy so that Europe may speak with a single voice in the world;

\*  
\*   \*  
\*

62. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the Parliaments of the Member States and the Secretaries General of the United Nations, NATO, the OSCE and the Council of Europe.

**P6\_TA(2005)0134**

**Doping in sport****European Parliament resolution on combating doping in sport**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to Declaration No 29 on sport, annexed to the Amsterdam Treaty, and to Article III-282 of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe,
  - having regard to its resolution of 7 September 2000<sup>(1)</sup> on the Commission communication on a Community support plan to combat doping in sport,
  - having regard to the conclusions of the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, of 4 December 2000 on combating doping<sup>(2)</sup>,
  - having regard to its resolution of 7 September 2000 on the Commission report to the European Council with a view to safeguarding current sports structures and maintaining the social function of sport within the Community framework — the Helsinki Report on Sport<sup>(3)</sup>,
  - having regard to the World Anti-Doping Code adopted in Copenhagen on 5 March 2003,
  - having regard to the public hearing of its Committee on Culture and Education of 29 November 2004 on "Drug-taking in sport: obstacle to the ideal of athleticism",
  - having regard to Rule 108(5) of its Rules of Procedure,
- A. whereas the number of doping incidents during the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens again demonstrated that doping in sport is, unfortunately, still a reality which must be combated,
  - B. whereas public health and the protection of minors are priorities of the European Union,
  - C. whereas doping is a genuine public health problem and concerns everyone involved in sport, including young people and amateurs who obtain illegal substances in, for example, fitness centres and, increasingly, via the Internet,
  - D. whereas the success of the European Year of Education through Sport should be followed through by the European Union taking action to tackle all aspects of doping in sport,

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 135, 7.5.2001, p. 270.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ C 356, 12.12.2000, p. 1.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ C 135, 7.5.2001, p. 274.