



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 10 December 2008

17079/08

**POLGEN 138
CAB 65
PESC 1681**

NOTE

from :	General Secretariat of the Council
to :	Delegations
Subject :	Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy - Comments from Cyprus

Further to the discussions in the GAERC of 8 December, delegations will find in annex the comments made by the Cypriot delegation on the report of the Secretary General/High Representative on the implementation of the European Security Strategy.

**REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN SECURITY STRATEGY
PROVIDING SECURITY IN A CHANGING WORLD**

Comments by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Markos Kyprianou

I would like first of all to thank the SG/HR and of course the Council Secretariat, which has assisted him in this task, for this Report on the Implementation of the ESS. We clearly recognise the challenge involved in aiming to address the concerns of all MS.

Since its adoption five years ago, the European Security Strategy has successfully guided EU action on the international scene. During this period, the EU has gained both in terms of political weight and visibility around the world. So I would like, at the outset, to reaffirm Cyprus' view that the 2003 document on the European Security Strategy, remains valid in the threats and challenges it identifies. If anything, the approach that it espouses of a Security Strategy based on effective multilateralism seems even more valid now than in 2003. The philosophy underpinning the 2003 Security Strategy is one that my country can endorse and believe that it should continue to govern the new Report, whose stated aim is not to replace the previous one, but rather to reinforce it. In this framework I have briefly sketched above, Cyprus believes that the revised Security Strategy should be positive in its outlook. It should identify the challenges and means to rise up to those challenges, but should not seek to raise new divisions in Europe.

This Report is not a “living document” in the sense that it is not constantly updated and revised, but rather forms part of a *Strategy, a comprehensive approach* setting out the objectives that the Union wants to achieve and identifying means to achieve them. It should therefore not be a compilation of the current problems and strains in our relations with others, recording every glitch on the road. It should avoid the temptation of privileging the short term over the medium or longer term which is exactly the hallmark of strategic thinking. Privileging the short term could lead to a skewed vision and can have the result that our revised document can quickly become outdated. The description contained in the Report, of the Union’s relations with Russia should take this into account, and whilst acknowledging that our relations have been strained, the aim remains to engage Russia in a partnership. A European Strategy based on multilateralism should seek partnerships with global actors, through cooperation rather than confrontation. The Union’s answers to challenges should be based on strategic thinking and long term analysis and should not attempt to micromanage, based on political expediencies of the moment. **So in the third part of the Report, (“Europe in a changing world”) in the section entitled “Greater engagement with our neighbourhood”, we could reflect in a more accurate manner the state of our relations with Russia and avoid giving overly negative messages. A reference that “our relations with Russia have been strained” would better reflect the situation than “Our relations with Russia have deteriorated”.**

The Second Part of the Report, entitled “Building Stability in Europe and Beyond”, rightly mentions enlargement as a powerful driver for stability, peace and reform. Cyprus shares this assessment. However, enlargement is also based on conditionality and countries aspiring to join the Union must fulfill those conditions and respect European values. This should be explicitly stated and we should not shy away from mentioning conditionality, treating it in effect as a burden on candidate countries, when in fact this conditionality is a guide for them to continue on their reform process. We would be doing a disfavour, not only to the Union but especially to the candidate countries themselves, by sending wrong signals if we don’t clearly and unequivocally reaffirm conditionality which is not optional, but a precondition. So the reference to the potential of enlargement to act as a driver for stability, peace and reform, could be completed with the addition “For this process to be successful, it must be based on the fulfilment of the conditionality as set out in the relevant Council decisions.”

Another point I would like to raise and one that is very important for my country is our view that we have to frame in *European terms* the scope of our reflection on the development of the Security Strategy. This will allow the greatest possible convergence of Member states-our strength lies exactly in our unity.

For the European Union, 'security' is a wide term encompassing much more than just defence, including the notion of human security and in this respect we very much welcome the specific mention of development and security. The European Union does not have simply a defence policy but rather a European *Security and Defence Policy* which we want to reinforce and enhance. This consolidation of the ESDP can come about, among other means, also through cooperation with defensive alliances such as NATO, but the scope of our policy surely cannot be reduced to this. The ESDP is not simply about defence but also about conflict prevention and post-conflict stabilization, it is concerned with developing civilian capabilities and not only military ones. Cooperation with NATO is a means to an end, that of reinforcing the ESDP, not an end in itself and formulations of the EU's relationship with NATO should respect this as well as the sensitivities of all Member States, including those who are not NATO members. We should not forget that consolidating and enhancing ESDP, which is an integral part of CFSP, is an important component of the European integration process, leading to an ever closer Union. **This could be better reflected in the Executive Summary of the Report, which could include the following formulation on EU-NATO relations: "The EU and NATO must deepen their strategic partnership for better co-operation in crisis management, with the participation of all member states and with full respect to the institutional and decision-making autonomy of each organisation"**

Last, but not least, **I would like to revert to the Section entitled “Greater engagement with our Neighbourhood”** to offer some comments on the way that we, as a Union, are addressing the challenge of reaching out to the Muslim world. My country can wholeheartedly support any initiative do so but, our belief is that we should work with all countries that can help the EU in this. Our view is that the best way to achieve this is not to single out particular countries or initiatives, but rather to *reach out to all that can help us in this respect*. We welcome but should not be limited to a reference to the Alliance of Civilisations; surely the Union for the Mediterranean also deserves a mention. The emphasis on Turkey as a country the Union can work with, to the exclusion of countries like Egypt who is a co-Chair of the UfM, makes our text not balanced. What we propose is to widen the scope of our reference and to include all who can work with the EU in this effort. **It would be better therefore to state that “there is a particular opportunity for Europe to work with those countries that can serve as a bridge to the Muslim world, including through the Union for the Mediterranean and the Alliance of Civilisations”.**

This would make our text both more balanced and more inclusive, making it therefore stronger.

GAERC 8.12.08
