

Courtesy Translation

Presidency of the IPC for the CFSP and CSDP

Mr Bendiktas Juodka

Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Mr Arturas Paulauskas

Chair of the Committee on National

Security and Defence

Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania

Vilnius

[Email: presidency@lrs.lt](mailto:presidency@lrs.lt)

1 October 2013

Dear Mr Juodka and Mr Paulauskas,

Please allow me to thank you very much for the excellent manner in which the Lithuanian Parliament hosted the third meeting of the IPC. All members of the German delegation were greatly impressed by the efficiency with which the conference was run, the high-ranking speakers, and the generous hospitality shown, all of which set standards for the future in many respects.

With regard to the approach which should be taken to questions relating to the Rules of Procedure, I suggest that sufficient time be allowed at future meetings for the members of the Ad Hoc Review Committee to discuss in detail the aims of the IPC and the parliamentary and procedural instruments required as a result. In our view, it is not sufficient for the Working Group alone to consider the proposals and amendments previously submitted by the delegations. My delegation is ready for a constructive debate about the Rules of Procedure and the amendments which would allow the necessary compromises to be explored and a consensus to be reached. The overview of all amendments drawn up and distributed in advance by the Lithuanian Presidency is very helpful, not least because it is objective. The assignment of categories by the Working Group, however, represents in itself a subjective assessment, and there is scope for divergent interpretations.

I would be grateful if you could lend your support to a discussion of the following points by the Ad Hoc Review Committee, as part of the debate I have proposed, in addition to the amendments which have been submitted:

- How can the existence of the political groups, and potentially also their role and rights, be reflected in the Rules of Procedure?
- What are the arrangements for dealing with situations in which the IPC must take decisions but the consensus required by the provisional Rules of Procedure does not exist?
- Can the language regime of the IPC, which is an EU parliamentary body, be brought into line with the practice in the Permanent Representatives Committee at EU intergovernmental level and the College of European Commissioners, with German becoming one of three conference languages?

Yours sincerely,

Sgd. Johannes Pflug
Head of the German Bundestag's Delegation
to the IPC for the CFSP and CSDP