



SEJM
OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Warsaw, 11 February 2014

Dear Mr Chairman,

Please find enclosed our set of remarks to the synopsis of the proposals submitted by the national parliaments to the roles of procedure of the Inter-Parliamentary conference for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Common Security and Defence Policy.

The remarks are as follows:

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

1. We do not support replacing the abbreviation "Inter-Parliamentary Conference" with the abbreviation "COFDAC". The Inter-Parliamentary conference concerns European, foreign and defence affairs. Our delegation is perfectly aware of growing number of interparliamentary conferences, nevertheless this abbreviation do not reflect the right of each parliament to decide on the composition of its delegation. (*Croatia's and Latvia's amendments to the Preamble*).
2. We do believe that compromise on the size of the delegation is already reached and additional restrictions regarding composition of national parliaments and European Parliament delegation are not needed. (*The Netherlands's amendments to the Article 2-2.1*).
3. In our opinion the network of parliament's permanent representatives in Brussels should remain as a primarily network to avoid overlapping with any additional mailing lists. (*The Netherlands's amendments to the Article 3*).
4. We support the following version: "The effectiveness of the conference and interaction between the delegates can be improved by organising a number of (small group) topical

debates, working groups, breakout sessions, presentations, side events et cetera ~~instead of or~~ next to the plenary meeting" (*The Netherlands's amendments to the Article 3*).

5. We are all for the idea of publishing a transfer report prior the conference, elaborating on the efforts that have been made by the preceding presidency and on the priorities of the succeeding one, after clarifying its status and preparatory rules. (*The Netherlands's amendments to the Article 4-4.2*).

Category 2 - proposals in contradiction with the Treaty

1. We would appreciate having written statement or report in advance by the High Representative, however there are some doubts if this obligation could be set by Rules of Procedure of this conference. (*Germany's and Croatia's amendments to the Article 2-2.3., a*).
2. We think that the statement of the High Representative should refer to the conclusions that appear in discussion during the Inter-Parliamentary conference and not necessarily be submitting to the Inter-Parliamentary conference in advance for review. (*Spain's supplementing to the text with Article 2-2.3., b*).
3. We do not support the idea of the right to create a political group (*Germany's supplementing to the text with the new Article 4*).

Category 3 - proposals in contradiction with the Warsaw Conclusions

1. We think that compromise reached by Speakers in regard the size of the delegations should be supported. (*Germany's amendments to the Article 2-2.1*).
2. We do not support the idea that discussion papers may be added at the request of three members and a decision shall be adopted by a simple majority (*Germany's amendments to the Article 4-4.2*).
3. The official languages of the Inter-Parliamentary conference should remain English and French which is the best practice in the interparliamentary cooperation (*Germany's amendments to the Article 5*).
4. In our opinion non-binding conclusions of the Inter-Parliamentary conference should be adopted by consensus (*Latvia's and Germany's amendments to the Article 7.1*).
5. We do not support the voting rights to be exercised individually (*Germany's supplementing to the Article 7-7.3*).

6. We also do not support the right of political groups to propose amendments to the Rules of Procedure (*Germany's amendments to the Article 8-8.2*).

Category 4 - proposals to be further examined

1. In our opinion it is technically difficult to consult with all delegations the topics for the agenda of the next Inter-Parliamentary conference. This practice can hinder the preparation of the following meeting (*The Netherland's amendments to the Article 4-4.1*).
2. Taking into account that the official languages of the Inter-Parliamentary conference is English and French, there is no need to publish the Rule of Procedure in the official languages of the European Union (*Latvia's supplementing to the Article 10*).

Our delegation is of the opinion that functioning of the Interparliamentary Conference should be based on existing best practices among parliaments, we should avoid overregulation and refer to the experiences of Conference's meeting already hold. We are wishing you fruitful discussion during the Seminar on the Review of the Rules of Procedure of the Inter-Parliamentary conference of the CFSP/CSDP on 21 February 2014.

We are looking forward to seeing you in April during the Inter-Parliamentary conference.

Yours sincerely,




Andrzej Gałazewski

Vice-Chairman of the European
Union Affairs Committee
of the Sejm
of the Republic of Poland



Grzegorz Schetyna

Chairman of the Foreign Affairs
Committee
of the Sejm
of the Republic of Poland



Stefan Niesiołowski

Chairman of the National Defence
Committee
of the Sejm
of the Republic of Poland

Mr Tsiaras KONSTANTINOS

Chairman of the Committee
on National Defense and Foreign Affairs
Hellenic Parliament

GREECE