

17 February 2014

Remarks on the rules of procedure of the Inter-parliamentary conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Common Security and Defence Policy

The Swedish delegation's general approach on the review of the rules of procedure of the Inter-parliamentary conference is summarized below. After the summary, the proposals found in the Ad-Hoc Review Committee Working Group's synopsis are listed in accordance with the Swedish approach.

The Swedish delegation considers the Inter-parliamentary conference an important forum for discussions but the delegation believes the number of parliamentarians participating in the conferences should be small and efficient, and that cost effectiveness should mainstream the rules of procedure. Furthermore, the delegation objects all proposals which directly or indirectly contribute to formalize or enlarge the Inter-parliamentary conference. Consequently, the delegation objects all proposals that concern the topics listed below. The Swedish delegation:

- objects all proposals of creating new institutions or establishing a permanent secretariat
- objects all proposals stating that the delegations should be consulted about documents prior to the Inter-parliamentary conference
- objects all proposals stating that the delegations could send in own suggestions/documents to the secretariate prior to the conference
- objects all proposals that give political groups an official status in the rules of procedure
- objects all proposals that enable extraordinary meetings to be held between the Inter-parliamentary conferences

What regards the meetings between the Inter-parliamentary conference and the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, the Swedish delegation considers these meetings a good opportunity for discussions. However, the delegation objects all proposals that in one way or another bind the High Representatives to the Inter-parliamentary conference. The delegation also believe that the High Representative should not have to send any material in advance to the delegations.

Based on the Swedish delegation's general approach that is specified above, the delegation has divided the proposals found in the Ad-Hoc Review Committee

Working Group's synopsis into three groups; proposals the delegation *obejts*, *approves*, or does not have an opinion about. The categorization is found below.

Category 1: proposals compatible with the Treaty and the Warsaw Conclusions

The Swedish delegation *opposes* following proposals:

- Latvia, Supplementing the Preamble with a new Paragraph 6 (thus deleting Article 1.3.) *Inter-parliamentary conference replaces COFACC and CODACC*
- Latvia, Amendments to the Article 3.1.: *Changes in the order of sentences. Extraordinary meetings*
- Latvia, Amendments to the Article 4.1., b) *Draft agenda communicated in good time and approved prior to the meeting*
- The Netherlands, Amendments to the Article 4 - 4.2 *Consecutive presidencies, transfer reports*
- The Netherlands, Amendments to the Article 4 - 4.2 *Impact of the contributions from the Inter-parliamentary conference on the High Representative and European institutions*
- Lithuania, Amendments to the Article 7 – 7.2 *Draft conclusions communicated in good time before the Inter-parliamentary conference*

The Swedish delegation *approves* following proposals:

- Croatia, Amendments to the Preamble - Paragraph 1 *New acronym*
- The United Kingdom, Amendments to the Article 1 *Size of the conference impact on debate and effectivity*
- The Netherlands, Amendments to the Article 3 *E-mail group list*
- The Netherlands Amendments to the Article 3 *Effectiveness of conference*
- The United Kingdom, Amendments to the Article 3 *Concurrent "break-out" sessions*
- The United Kingdom, Amendments to the Article 3 *More time for questions and answers, less time for lengthy presentations*
- The Netherlands, Amendments *Political groups cannot have an official status or formal rights in CFSP/CSDP Inter-parliamentary conference*
- The Netherlands, Amendments to the Article 6, *No permanent presidency or secretariate in order to guarantee cost effectiveness*

The Swedish delegation does not have any opinion about following proposals:

- The Netherlands, Amendments to the Article 2 – 2.1, *Restrict the size of the delegations due to budgetary and practical reasons*

- Lithuania, Proposal to supplement the Rules of Procedure: New proposal
2013-09-04 *Definition of the presidential Troika*

Category 2: proposals in contradiction with the Treaty

The Swedish delegation opposes following proposals (i.e. all proposals under category 2):

- Spain, Amendments to the Article 2 – 2.3., a) *The High Representative shall discuss and set out in the framework of the Inter-parliamentary conference, the priorities and strategies of EU*
- Germany, Amendments to the Article 2 – 2.3.a) *The High Representative should communicate a written statement in advance*
- Croatia, Amendments to the Article 2 - 2.3.,a) *The High Representative should communicate a written statement or report in advance*
- Spain (The Cortes Generales) Supplementing the text with Article 2 - 2.3., b) *The High Representative shall submit a written statement in advance, on annual basis prepare a report on conclusions and recommendations agreed by the Inter-parliamentary conference*
- Germany, Supplementing the text with the new Article 4. POLITICAL GROUPS *At least six members from at least five different delegations have the right to create a political group*
- Germany, Amendments to the Article 7 – 7.3 *The presidency parliament shall communicate a final text to the High Representative and to the Presidents of the Council and the Commission and ask them to deliver an opinion*

Category 3 – proposals in contradiction with the Warsaw Conclusions

The Swedish delegation opposes following proposals (i.e. all proposals under category 3):

- Germany, Amendments to the Article 2 - 2.1. a) *Base the number of members from each parliament proportionally*
- Germany, Amendments to the Article 4 - 4.1. b) *The agenda to be approved prior to the meetings (...)*
- Germany, Amendments to the Article 4 – 4.2 *Discussion papers to be added by members of the Inter-parliamentary conference*
- Germany, Amendments to the Article 5 *Give German an official status*
- Latvia, Amendments to the Article 7.1 *Introduce qualified majority voting on non-binding conclusions*

- Germany, Amendments to the Article 7 – 7.1 *Introduce qualified majority voting on non-binding conclusions*
- Germany, Supplementing the text with the new Article 7 - 7.3. *Voting rights exercised individually*
- Latvia, Supplementing the Article 7.4 *Each delegation to have two votes*
- Germany, Amendments to the Article 8 – 8.2.: (2013-08-28 correction of the proposal) *Giving political groups the right to propose amendments to the rules of procedure.*

Category 4 – proposals to be further examined.

The Swedish delegation opposes following proposals:

- The Netherlands, Amendments to the Article 4 - 4.1 *The delegations to be consulted about the programme of the next conference before the draft is conveyed*
- Latvia, Supplementing the Rules of Procedure with the new Article 10 *Publish the rules of procedure in the official languages of the EU.*
- Cyprus, Amendments *Introducing fact-finding missions to monitor the democratic processes in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean Neighbourhood.*

The Swedish delegation *approves* following proposals:

- Croatia, Supplementing the text with Article 2 - 2.3., b) *The Presidency Parliament and the European Parliament could invite special guests*



Ms Sofia Arkelsten
Head of Delegation