



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 10 November 2011

16739/11

**PE 472
COSDP 1061
PESC 1441**

NOTE

From :	General Secretariat of the Council
to :	Delegations
Subject:	Summary of the meeting of the Subcommittee on Security and Defence (SEDE) of the European Parliament , Brussels, 10 November 2011

The meeting was chaired by Ms Nicolai (ALDE, RO).

I. Operation "Unified protector" over Libya: lessons learned - Exchange of views with Rick Froh, Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Operations (NATO)

Mr Froh recalled the context of operation "Unified protector" and provided information about its conduct and the assets used. He emphasized the successful results of this complex operation, highlighting in particular the speed of reaction/decisions, which he qualified as unprecedented and historic. Mr Froh underlined the fact that there were no reported civil casualties. He stressed that there would need to be a reconstruction and reconciliation process, indicating that during the operation, this aspect had been taken into account. He was of the view that, with operation "Unified protector", NATO had proven its efficiency, the strong commitment of its allies and the strong European pillar in NATO. Mr Froh concluded by saying that NATO stood ready to provide assistance to the new leadership in Libya, but only if requested.

All three MEPs taking the floor raised the issue of reported supply shortages. Mr van Baalen (ALDE, NL) wondered if the mandate was not overstretched (troops on ground, national operations), while Mr Gualtieri (S&D, IT) and Mr Lisek (EPP, PL) showed interest in the chain of command (unified or national) and in the EU's capability for conducting the operation without the US. The chair asked for an evaluation of cooperation between intelligence services and on Libya's future.

In reply, Mr Froh said that it had been an intense operation, in which shortages had sometimes appeared, but solutions had been found in all cases (e.g. sharing of weapons). He stressed that the US had provided relevant intelligence services/assets and he recognised that Canadian and European capabilities did not have the same range of assets at their disposal. Despite the fact that the operation had been largely driven by Europeans/Canadians, he considered that in future Europeans had to improve their capabilities. Regarding the mandate, he explained that its terms were clear and that the shift had been operated in order to prevent attacks by Gaddafi troops on civilians. With regard to the chain of command, he replied that it was clearly within NATO, including also the centralised data analysis. He reported that intelligence cooperation had been slightly difficult at the beginning but had continuously improved and was excellent at the end. As far as Libya's future was concerned, he was of the opinion that the international community should help to set up institutions, an independent judiciary, and military forces.

II. The impact of the financial crisis on the defence sector in the EU Member States (AFET/7/06560, 2011/2177(INI))

- Rapporteur: Mr Lisek (EPP, PL)
- Responsible: AFET
- Opinions: ITRE - Evžen Tošenovský (ECR)
- Further consideration of draft report
- Consideration of amendments

The rapporteur noted that extensive discussions with the shadow rapporteurs had taken place and that compromise amendments were under negotiation, although the vast majority of amendments were acceptable to him.

In general, the four Members who took the floor supported the draft report. Ms Koppa (S&D, EL) suggested inserting additional wording, in particular on the role of the European Defence Agency and on support for research. Mr Bütikofer commented on some of the compromise amendments concerning the strategic autonomy of the CSDP (also raised by Mr Gualtieri) and suggested also referring to 'Weimar plus'. Members expressed different views on the issue of opening up the EU budget to defence research. The chair considered that there was a need for a strong European defence industry and, therefore, it needed to be supported in times of crisis. Mr Bütikofer argued that more competition was in fact needed and that pooling and sharing, as well as further EDA involvement, were therefore appropriate solutions. He was against any opening of the budget to defence research without additional funds. Mr Gualtieri also considered that the EU budgetary aspects in the report should be solved and he favoured new funds for the EU budget, new allocation mechanisms of those funds to industry, and a simultaneous decrease in national budgets. He did not share Ms Nicolai's view on granting exemptions for the defence industry.

The rapporteur concluded by stating that the issue of strategic autonomy was a political issue to be discussed within the political groups. He agreed to mentioning 'Weimar plus' in the report. Mr Lisek considered that national defence budget cuts could not be offset by the EU budget, though the question of whether to open the EU budget to defence research remained.

Provisional timetable:

Vote in AFET: 17 November 2011

Vote in plenary: December 2011

III. Date and place of the next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for 29 November 2011 (a.m. and p.m.) in Brussels.