

October 2010

**Annex**  
**to the Fourteenth Bi-annual Report on**  
**Developments in European Union**  
**Procedures and Practices**  
**Relevant to Parliamentary Scrutiny:**  
**Replies**  
**of National Parliaments and**  
**the European Parliament**



Prepared by the COSAC Secretariat and presented to:

**XLVI Conference of Community and European Affairs**  
**Committees of Parliaments of the European Union**

25-26 October 2010  
Brussels

## Table of Contents

Questionnaire: 14th Bi-annual Report of COSAC .....	3
Questionnaire: 14 <sup>e</sup> Rapport Semestriel de la COSAC .....	10
Austria: <i>Nationalrat and Bundesrat</i> .....	18
Belgium: <i>Chambre des représentants et Sénat</i> .....	25
Bulgaria: <i>Narodno Sabranie</i> .....	32
Cyprus: <i>Vouli ton Antiprosopon</i> .....	39
Czech Republic: <i>Poslanecká sněmovna</i> .....	47
Czech Republic: <i>Senát</i> .....	52
Denmark: <i>Folketing</i> .....	60
Estonia: <i>Riigikogu</i> .....	66
Finland: <i>Eduskunta</i> .....	70
France: <i>Assemblée nationale</i> .....	77
France: <i>Sénat</i> .....	81
Germany: <i>Bundestag</i> .....	86
Germany: <i>Bundesrat</i> .....	92
Greece: <i>Vouli Ton Ellinon</i> .....	98
Hungary: <i>Országgyűlés</i> .....	105
Ireland: <i>Houses of the Oireachtas</i> .....	111
Italy: <i>Camera dei Deputati</i> .....	119
Italy: <i>Senato della Repubblica</i> .....	128
Latvia: <i>Saeima</i> .....	135
Lithuania: <i>Seimas</i> .....	141
Luxembourg: <i>Chambre des Députés</i> .....	149
Malta: <i>Kamra-tad-Deputati</i> .....	157
The Netherlands: <i>Tweede Kamer</i> .....	164
The Netherlands: <i>Eerste Kamer</i> .....	171
Poland: <i>Sejm</i> .....	177
Poland: <i>Senat</i> .....	183
Portugal: <i>Assembleia da República</i> .....	190
Romania: <i>Camera Deputaţilor and Senatul</i> .....	200
Slovakia: <i>Národná rada</i> .....	208
Slovenia: <i>Državni zbor</i> .....	217
Slovenia: <i>Državni svet</i> .....	224
Spain: <i>Cortes Generales</i> .....	230
Sweden: <i>Riksdag</i> .....	237
United Kingdom: <i>House of Commons</i> .....	244
United Kingdom: <i>House of Lords</i> .....	251
European Parliament .....	259

## **Questionnaire: 14th Bi-annual Report of COSAC**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy<sup>1</sup>**

This chapter accompanies a set of questions regarding the content as well as the procedures of the recently adopted Europe 2020 Strategy. These will enable to examine whether the concept of sustainable development was sufficiently integrated into this Strategy. In addition, the chapter will provide information on how the national Parliaments intend to hold their governments to account for their actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy.

This concept of sustainable development was described for the first time in the so-called “Brundtland Report” in 1987 as: “(...) *development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It contains within it two key concepts: the concept of ‘needs’, in particular the essential needs of the world’s poor, to which overriding priority should be given, and the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment’s ability to meet present and future needs*”<sup>2</sup>.

In 1992, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development<sup>3</sup> transferred the concept of sustainable development onto the action level and, subsequently, the Commission on Sustainable Development (henceforth “CSD”) was established<sup>4</sup>.

On 9 June 2006, the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development was published<sup>5</sup>.

Moreover, sustainable development is one of the first items of the Treaty of Lisbon as Article 3.3 of the Treaty on European Union stipulates: “*The Union shall establish an internal market. It shall work for the sustainable development of Europe based on balanced economic growth and price stability, a highly competitive social market economy, aiming at full employment and social progress, and a high level of protection and improvement of the quality of the environment. It shall promote scientific and technological advance*”.

After Rio de Janeiro and Johannesburg, a third important Summit on the level of the United Nations will take place in Rio de Janeiro in 2012 (“Rio + 20”). This Summit is currently being prepared by the CSD.

The new strategy “EUROPE 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth” was presented by the European Commission in its communication on 3 March 2010<sup>6</sup>. As suggested by the strategy’s title, one of its social and economic priorities is the concept of sustainable growth described as: “*promoting a more resource efficient, greener and more competitive*

---

<sup>1</sup> This questionnaire was established in collaboration with the Belgian Federal Council on Sustainable Development.

<sup>2</sup> Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future (UNO, 4 August 1987)-  
[http://www.un.org/french/documents/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/42/427&TYPE=&referer=http://www.un.org/fr/documents/&Lang=E](http://www.un.org/french/documents/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/42/427&TYPE=&referer=http://www.un.org/fr/documents/&Lang=E)-p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> Also known as the “Earth Summit” or the “Rio Summit”.

<sup>4</sup> The CSD is responsible for executing the international agreements on global sustainable development i.e. the Agenda 21, the Rio Declaration and the **Johannesburg Plan** of Implementation stemming from the 2002 Summit

<sup>5</sup> This Strategy mainly deals with the following issues (1) climate change and clean energy, (2) sustainable transport, (3) sustainable consumption and production, (4) conservation and management of natural resources, (5) public health, (6) social inclusion, demography and migration and (7) global poverty and sustainable development challenges-<http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/06/st10/st10117.en06.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:2020:FIN:EN:PDF>

*economy” and expressed as three climate and energy targets of (at least) 20% to meet, namely: “reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 20% compared to 1990 levels or by 30%, if the conditions are right; increase the share of renewable energy sources in our final energy consumption to 20%; and a 20% increase in energy efficiency”.*

The Belgian Presidency of the European Union has defined sustainable development, one of the present-day major global challenges, as one of its priorities. It will, therefore, endeavour to search for ways to integrate sustainable development into the framework of the new strategy “EUROPE 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth”, the Lisbon Strategy’s successor, and to put it into practice.

**Questions:**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy’s political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

On 31 March 2010, ten Member States<sup>7</sup> of the Western European Union (henceforth “WEU”) agreed to initiate procedures to terminate the modified Treaty of Brussels. Citing the mutual assistance clause enshrined in the Treaty of Lisbon (Article 42.7<sup>8</sup> of the Treaty on European Union), these Member States considered that a next phase in CSDP had begun, ending the historic role of the WEU.

However, the termination of the modified Treaty of Brussels also means the end of the activities of the Assembly of WEU, traditionally considered to be one of the interparliamentary bodies dealing with security and defence policy in Europe. The Assembly will cease its activities at the end of June 2011.

For many, the dissolution of the Assembly of WEU will leave the issue of parliamentary control in the field of European defence unsolved.

Moreover, the Treaty of Lisbon is not designed to introduce any modification on this matter. It, though, grants the European Parliament with a general right to be informed and consulted. In this respect, Article 9 of Protocol 1 on the role of national Parliaments in the European Union states that “*The European Parliament and national Parliaments shall together determine the organisation and promotion of effective and regular interparliamentary cooperation within the Union*”.

In that context, the implementation of Article 10 of Protocol 1 on the role of national Parliaments in the European Union also represents an opportunity for national Parliaments to get more involved in the CSDP.

---

<sup>7</sup> France, Germany, Belgium, Spain, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal and the United Kingdom.

<sup>8</sup> “*If a Member State is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other Member States shall have towards it an obligation of aid and assistance by all means in their power. This commitment will be consistent with commitments in NATO*”.

But how should this parliamentary control of CSDP look like? Is it really necessary to create an interparliamentary body, considering the fact that security and even more so defence remain to a large extent national policies? The discussion still has to take place.

Some consider Protocol 1 to the Treaty of Lisbon on the role of national Parliaments in the European Union as the basis for this discussion.

In March 2010, the European Affairs Committee of the French *Sénat* adopted a resolution in which it stated that a structure should be created bringing together Members of Parliament specialised in defence issues of the 27 Member States of the European Union. This structure could be designed following the model of COSAC<sup>9</sup>. The organisation and secretariat would be the responsibility of the national Parliaments on a rotational basis of one meeting every six months. Some Members of COSAC have expressed different opinions.

The President of the Assembly of WEU has proposed the creation of a permanent conference of representatives of national Parliaments. This new mechanism would have effective parliamentary control powers *vis-a-vis* the actors and activities of the European Union.

Another idea, presented at the XLIII COSAC meeting on 31 May - 1 June 2010, was to leave this scrutiny in the hands of COFACC and/or the Conference of chairs of parliamentary defence committees, sometimes referred to as "CODAC".

Both the Conference of Speakers of the Parliaments of the EU and COSAC have considered that:

- (Speakers): *"Given the special nature of the common security and defence policy (CSDP) and the role of national parliaments in the smooth functioning of the European Union, the Speakers stress the fundamental role of national Parliaments in the future parliamentary scrutiny of the common foreign and security policy including the CSDP"*<sup>10</sup>;
- (COSAC): *"Given the special nature of this policy area, COSAC underlines the fundamental role of national Parliaments in the parliamentary scrutiny of the common foreign and security policy as well as the common security and defence policy"*<sup>11</sup>.

For this reason, the Speakers have asked the incoming Presidency of their Conference to take the discussion forward, with a view to reaching an agreement at the next meeting of the Conference of Speakers of the EU Parliaments.

Article 10 of Protocol 1 clearly gives COSAC a role in this matter. At the same time, the European Parliament, the Assembly of WEU and national Parliaments are also encouraged to reflect on this matter, which will be on the agenda of the XLIV COSAC meeting on 25-26 October 2010 in Brussels.

Building on the information in the 13th Bi-annual Report of COSAC, this Chapter will examine a possible parliamentary scrutiny of the CSDP and its modalities.

### **Questions:**

---

<sup>9</sup> Six Members of Parliament for each Member State, six Members of the European Parliament, meeting once every six months.

<sup>10</sup> Presidency Conclusions of the EU Speakers' Conference, Part 6, Stockholm, 14 - 15 May 2010.

<sup>11</sup> Contribution of the XLIII COSAC, Para 5.3, Madrid, 31 May - 1 June 2010.

This chapter stems from the fact that the Treaty of Lisbon has extended the role of national Parliaments in EU matters. More specifically, it raises the question of the role of national Parliaments in the parliamentary scrutiny of common foreign and security policy (henceforth "CFSP") and common security and defence policy (henceforth "CSDP").

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?
2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?
3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,
  - Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.
4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
    - In what form?
    - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
    - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
    - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
    - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
    - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
    - What changes/reforms are needed?
  - 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
    - In what form?
    - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
    - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
    - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
    - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
    - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
    - What changes/reforms are needed?
  - 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
    - Which one?
    - In what form?

- Please specify other modalities.
5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?
  6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?
  7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

The replies of the national Parliaments to the questions on the future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon led to a number of fairly general conclusions and suggestions which were taken up in the 13th Bi-annual Report of COSAC<sup>12</sup>.

Furthermore, the XLIII COSAC spent a considerable part of its meeting in Madrid discussing this topic. This debate demonstrated that the issue of the future role of COSAC is far from being closed. Moreover, new suggestions were made which merit to be further explored.

Consequently, the Belgian Presidency has agreed to refine the quest for COSAC's post-Lisbon identity by means of a series of well-aimed questions in the context of Article 10 of Protocol 1 on the role of national Parliaments in the European Union which reads:

*"A conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs may submit any contribution it deems appropriate for the attention of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission. That conference shall in addition promote the exchange of information and best practice between national Parliaments and the European Parliament, including their special committees. It may also organise inter-parliamentary conferences on specific topics, in particular to debate matters of common foreign and security policy, including common security and defence policy. Contributions from the conference shall not bind national Parliaments and shall not prejudge their positions".*

Given this background, this chapter will present an overview of the opinions of national Parliaments and the European Parliament on practical aspects of holding COSAC debates on such issues as:

- the principle of subsidiarity;
- the European Commission's Work Programme;
- political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities;
- the European Union CFSP, including CSDP.

### **Questions:**

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.cosac.eu/en/meetings/Madrid2010/ordinary.doc/> - p. 32 – 61.



1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?
2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?
3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?
4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?
5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>13</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?
6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.
7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?
8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?
9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

## **Questionnaire: 14<sup>e</sup> Rapport Semestriel de la COSAC**

### **Chapitre 1<sup>er</sup>: Le développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020<sup>14</sup>**

Ce chapitre accompagne une série de questions concernant aussi bien le contenu que les procédures de la Stratégie Europe 2020, adoptée il y a peu. Ces questions permettront d'examiner si le concept de développement durable est suffisamment intégré dans cette Stratégie. Par ailleurs, le chapitre fournira des informations sur la façon dont les Parlements nationaux ont l'intention de demander justification à leurs gouvernements sur les actions qu'ils vont mener en vue des objectifs de la Stratégie.

Ce concept de développement durable a été défini pour la première fois dans le «Rapport Brundtland» en 1987 en ces termes: *«Le développement durable répond aux besoins du présent sans compromettre la capacité des générations futures de répondre aux leurs. Deux concepts sont inhérents à cette notion : celui de « besoins », et plus particulièrement des besoins essentiels des plus démunis, à qui il convient d'accorder la plus grande priorité, et l'idée des limitations que par l'état de nos techniques et de notre organisation sociale font peser sur la capacité de l'environnement à répondre aux besoins actuels et à venir»<sup>15</sup>.*

En 1992, la Conférence des Nations unies sur l'environnement et le développement<sup>16</sup> a fait passer le concept de développement durable au niveau de l'action et, suite à cette conférence, la Commission pour le Développement Durable (*Commission on Sustainable Development* – ci-après: «CSD») a été mise en place<sup>17</sup>.

Le 9 Juin 2006, la Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable a été publiée<sup>18</sup>.

De plus, le développement durable figure parmi les premières dispositions du Traité de Lisbonne étant donné que l'article 3.3 du Traité sur l'Union européenne dispose que: *«L'Union établit un marché intérieur. Elle œuvre pour le développement durable de l'Europe fondé sur une croissance économique équilibrée et sur la stabilité des prix, une économie sociale de marché hautement compétitive, qui tend au plein emploi et au progrès social, et un niveau élevé de protection et d'amélioration de la qualité de l'environnement. Elle promeut le progrès scientifique et technique».*

---

<sup>14</sup> Ce questionnaire a été établi en collaboration avec le Conseil fédéral du développement durable de Belgique.

<sup>15</sup> Rapport de la Commission mondiale sur l'Environnement et le Développement: Notre avenir à tous (ONU, 4 août 1987)-  
[http://www.un.org/french/documents/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A%2F42%2F427&Submit=Recherche&Lang=F-p](http://www.un.org/french/documents/view_doc.asp?symbol=A%2F42%2F427&Submit=Recherche&Lang=F-p). 65.

<sup>16</sup> Également connu sous le nom de « Sommet de la Terre » ou de « Sommet de Rio ».

<sup>17</sup> La CSD est responsable de l'exécution des accords internationaux sur le développement durable mondial, à savoir: l'Agenda 21, la Déclaration de Rio et le Plan d'action de Johannesburg issu du Sommet de 2002.

<sup>18</sup> Cette Stratégie porte essentiellement sur les matières suivantes: (1) changement climatique et énergie propre, (2) transports durables, (3) consommation et production durables, (4) préservation et gestion des ressources naturelles, (5) santé publique, (6) inclusion sociale, démographie et immigration et (7) pauvreté dans le monde et défis en matière de développement durable-<http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/fr/06/st10/st10117.fr06.pdf>

Après Rio de Janeiro et Johannesburg, un troisième Sommet important au niveau des Nations Unies aura lieu en 2012 à Rio de Janeiro («Rio + 20»). Ce Sommet est en phase de préparation au niveau de la CSD.

La nouvelle Stratégie «EUROPE 2020: Une Stratégie pour une croissance intelligente, durable et inclusive» a été présentée par la Commission européenne dans sa communication du 3 mars 2010<sup>19</sup>. Comme l'intitulé de la Stratégie l'indique, une des priorités socio-économiques mises en avant est la croissance durable ayant été décrite comme la promotion «*d'une économie plus efficace dans l'utilisation des ressources, plus verte et plus compétitive*» et exprimée en termes de trois résultats de 20% (au moins) à atteindre en matière de climat et d'énergie, à savoir: «*réduire les émissions de gaz à effet de serre d'au moins 20% par rapport aux niveaux de 1990 ou de 30% si les conditions sont favorables; faire passer la part des sources d'énergie renouvelable dans notre consommation finale d'énergie à 20%; et accroître de 20% notre efficacité énergétique*».

La présidence belge de l'Union européenne a fixé parmi ses priorités la thématique du développement durable, qui constitue un des enjeux majeurs à l'heure actuelle à l'échelle planétaire. De ce fait, elle s'attachera en particulier à rechercher comment le développement durable peut être intégré et mis en pratique dans le cadre de la nouvelle Stratégie «EUROPE 2020: Une Stratégie pour une croissance intelligente, durable et inclusive», laquelle fait suite à la Stratégie de Lisbonne.

### **Questions:**

#### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020*

1.1. Vu l'intention de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 d'établir une relation entre les différentes crises auxquelles nous sommes confrontés actuellement (économique, financière, sociale, écologique), est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que les points de vue politiques de cette Stratégie forment un ensemble bien intégré ?

1.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des développements économiques et scientifiques dans le reste du monde, comme par exemple aux États-Unis et en Chine ?

1.3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des conséquences sociales et environnementales et du respect des droits et l'homme (par exemple le droit à la nourriture) ?

#### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et la Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable*

2.1. La Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable identifie 7 défis, chacun accompagné d'un objectif général. Dans ce contexte, est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte de ces

---

<sup>19</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:2020:FIN:FR:PDF>

défis ? Veuillez spécifier votre réponse pour chaque défi avec un commentaire votre spécifications en faisant référence aux objectifs généraux susmentionnés.

	Oui	Non
1. changement climatique et énergie propre		
2. transports durables		
3. consommation et production durables		
4. préservation et gestion des ressources naturelles		
5. santé publique		
6. inclusion sociale, démographie et immigration		
7. pauvreté dans le monde et défis en matière de développement durable		

2.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 prévoit assez d'instruments pour (1) réaliser ces défis et (2) mesurer et (3) suivre leurs résultats (par exemple en introduisant des critères similaires aux critères de convergence de l'euro) ?

#### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et les Parlements nationaux*

3.1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que le processus décisionnel, lié à la Stratégie EUROPE 2020, est suffisamment contraignant pour les Etats membres et que le contrôle par les Parlements nationaux et, le cas échéant, régionaux est suffisamment assuré?

3.2. Quels sont les organes de votre Parlement/Chambre qui seront chargés du suivi de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et de quelle façon le gouvernement devra-t-il justifier ses actions tendant à la poursuite des objectifs de cette Stratégie ?

3.3. Décrivez brièvement les procédures parlementaires (au niveau national et, le cas échéant, au niveau régional).

3.4. Au cas où un tel organe ou une telle procédure parlementaire n'a pas encore été établi€, envisage-t-on de le(s) créer ?

3.5. Quelle serait la meilleure façon pour les Parlements/Chambres de contribuer au renforcement de l'aspect développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 ?

### **Chapitre 2. Contrôle parlementaire de la Politique de sécurité et de défense commune (ci-après: «PSDC»)**

Le 31 mars 2010, dix États membres<sup>20</sup> de l'Union de l'Europe occidentale (ci-après: «UEO») ont convenu d'engager les procédures qui doivent mettre fin au Traité de Bruxelles modifié.

<sup>20</sup> France, Allemagne, Belgique, Espagne, Grèce, Italie, Luxembourg, Pays-Bas, Portugal et le Royaume-Uni.

Évoquant la clause d'assistance mutuelle inscrite dans le Traité de Lisbonne (article 42.7<sup>21</sup> du Traité sur l'Union européenne), ces États membres considèrent qu'une nouvelle phase pour la PSDC a commencé, mettant ainsi fin au rôle historique de l'UEO.

Quoi qu'il en soit, la fin du Traité de Bruxelles modifié signifie également la fin des activités de l'Assemblée de l'UEO, considérée traditionnellement comme un des organes interparlementaires chargés de la politique de sécurité et de défense en Europe. L'Assemblée mettra un terme à ses activités à la fin du mois de juin 2011.

Pour beaucoup, la dissolution de l'Assemblée parlementaire de l'UEO laissera ouverte la question du contrôle parlementaire dans le domaine de la défense européenne.

Par ailleurs, le Traité de Lisbonne n'est pas conçu pour introduire une quelconque modification à ce sujet. Toutefois, le Traité accorde au Parlement européen un droit général d'être informé et d'être consulté. Dans ce contexte, l'article 9 du Protocole 1 sur le rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne stipule que *«Le Parlement européen et les parlements nationaux définissent ensemble l'organisation et la promotion d'une coopération interparlementaire efficace et régulière au sein de l'Union»*.

Dans ce contexte, l'implémentation de l'article 10 du Protocole 1 sur le rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne présente également une opportunité pour les Parlements nationaux de s'intéresser à la PSDC.

À quoi devrait ressembler ce contrôle parlementaire de la PSDC ? Est-il vraiment indispensable de créer une structure interparlementaire compte tenu du fait que la sécurité et encore plus la défense restent, en grande partie, des politiques nationales ? La discussion doit encore avoir lieu.

D'aucuns considèrent que le Protocole 1 au Traité de Lisbonne sur le rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne pourrait servir de base pour cette discussion.

En mars 2010, la Commission des affaires européennes du Sénat français a adopté une résolution où elle estime qu'il faudrait créer une structure qui réunirait des parlementaires spécialisés dans les questions de défense des 27 États membres de l'Union européenne. Cette structure pourrait être conçue sur le modèle de la COSAC<sup>22</sup>. L'organisation et le secrétariat de cette structure relèveraient des Parlements nationaux par rotation sur la base d'une réunion par semestre. Certains membres de la COSAC ont exprimé des opinions différentes.

Le Président de l'Assemblée de l'UEO a proposé d'instaurer une conférence permanente des représentants des Parlements nationaux. Ce nouveau mécanisme disposerait d'une compétence effective de contrôle parlementaire sur les acteurs et les activités de l'Union européenne.

Une autre idée, avancée lors de la XLIII Conférence de la COSAC des 31 mai et 1<sup>er</sup> juin 2010, est de confier ce contrôle à la COFACC et/ou à la Conférence des présidents des commissions parlementaires de défense, parfois appelée «CODAC».

---

<sup>21</sup> «Si un État membre est l'objet d'une agression armée sur son territoire, les autres États membres lui doivent aide et assistance par tous les moyens en leur pouvoir. Cet engagement demeure conforme aux engagements souscrits au sein de l'OTAN».

<sup>22</sup> Six parlementaires par État membre et six membres du Parlement européen se réunissant une fois par semestre.

La Conférence des Présidents des Parlements de l'UE et la COSAC ont tous deux estimé que :

- (Présidents): *«Étant donnée la nature spéciale de la PSDC et le rôle des parlements nationaux dans le fonctionnement sans heurts de l'Union européenne, les Présidents soulignent le rôle fondamental des parlements nationaux dans la surveillance parlementaire future de la PSDC aussi bien que dans celle de la politique étrangère et la politique de sécurité communes»<sup>23</sup>;*
- (COSAC): *«Eu égard au caractère particulier de ce domaine politique, la COSAC souligne le rôle fondamental des Parlements nationaux dans le cadre du contrôle parlementaire de la politique extérieure et de sécurité commune ainsi que de la politique de sécurité et de défense commune»<sup>24</sup>.*

C'est pourquoi, les Présidents ont demandé à la future présidence de leur Conférence de poursuivre la discussion en vue d'arriver à un accord lors de la prochaine Conférence des présidents des Parlements de l'UE.

Dans cette matière, l'article 10 du Protocole 1 accorde à la COSAC un rôle clair à jouer. En même temps, le Parlement européen, l'Assemblée de l'UEO et les Parlements nationaux sont également invités à réfléchir à cette matière qui sera à l'ordre du jour de la XLIV réunion de la COSAC les 25 et 26 octobre à Bruxelles.

En partant de l'information recueillie dans le 13ème rapport biennuel de la COSAC, ce chapitre examinera la possibilité du contrôle parlementaire de la PSDC ainsi que de ses modalités.

### **Questions:**

Ce chapitre découle du fait que le Traité de Lisbonne a élargi le rôle des Parlements nationaux dans le domaine des affaires européennes. Plus particulièrement, il pose la question du rôle des Parlements nationaux dans le cadre du contrôle parlementaire de la politique étrangère et de sécurité commune (ci-après: «PESC») et de la politique commune de sécurité et de défense (ci-après: «PCSD»).

1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime utile un échange interparlementaire sur la PESC et la PCSD en vue d'améliorer le contrôle parlementaire au niveau national et/ou européen?
2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère que le contrôle parlementaire au niveau de l'UE devrait inclure aussi bien la PESC que la PCSD ou rien que la PCSD ?
3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère souhaitable l'installation d'un mécanisme, d'une structure ou d'un forum particulier en vue de l'organisation d'une coopération et d'un contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?  
Le cas échéant,
  - Est-ce que celui-ci devrait prendre la forme d'une nouvelle commission/ conférence/ organisation/ institution interparlementaire ?

---

<sup>23</sup> Conclusions de la Conférence des Présidents de l'UE, Partie 6, Stockholm, 14 - 15 mai 2010

<sup>24</sup> Contribution de la XLIII COSAC, Para 5.3, Madrid, 31 mai - 1<sup>er</sup> juin 2010

- Est-ce que l'état membre de la Présidence tournante devrait y avoir un rôle spécial ?
  - Veuillez spécifier d'autres modalités.
4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre préfère un modèle ou un arrangement institutionnel existant pour organiser la coopération et le contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
- 4.1. Est-ce que la COSAC devrait jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ? Le cas échéant,
- Sous quelle forme ?
  - Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COSAC ?
  - Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COSAC devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
  - Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
  - Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
  - Est-ce que vous estimez que la COSAC doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
  - Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?
- 4.2. Est-ce que la COFACC et/ou la «CODAC» devrai(en)t jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ? Le cas échéant,
- Sous quelle forme ?
  - Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» ?
  - Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
  - Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
  - Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
  - Est-ce que vous estimez que la COFACC ou la «CODAC» doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
  - Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?
- 4.3. Est-ce qu'une autre conférence/organisation/institution devrait encore jouer un rôle dans ce contrôle ? Le cas échéant,
- Laquelle ?
  - Sous quelle forme ?
  - Veuillez spécifier d'autres modalités.
5. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est prêt à mettre à disposition des budgets pour ce contrôle ?
6. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est partisan d'un mécanisme/d'une structure/d'un forum composé(e) de membres des seuls Parlements nationaux ou d'un organe mixte avec des membres du Parlement européen ?
7. Est-ce que, au sujet de la coopération interparlementaire relative à la PESC et/ou à la PCSD, votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que le Parlement européen devrait être doté du statut de membre ou d'observateur ?

### **Chapitre 3. Le rôle futur de la COSAC après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Lisbonne – suite du débat de la XLIII COSAC**

Les réponses des Parlements nationaux aux questions relatives au rôle futur de la COSAC après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Lisbonne ont conduit à un certain nombre de conclusions et suggestions plutôt générales qui ont été reprises dans le 13ème rapport biennuel de la COSAC<sup>25</sup>.

En outre, la XLIII COSAC a consacré une partie considérable de sa réunion de Madrid à l'examen de ce sujet. Ce débat a démontré que la question du rôle futur de la COSAC est loin d'être close. Par ailleurs, de nouvelles suggestions ont été faites qui méritent d'être approfondies.

Par conséquent, la Présidence belge a accepté d'affiner la réflexion sur l'identité de la COSAC dans la période de l'après-Lisbonne par une série de questions bien ciblées dans le contexte de l'article 10 du Protocole 1 sur le rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne, qui dispose:

*«Une conférence des organes parlementaires spécialisés dans les affaires de l'Union peut soumettre toute contribution qu'elle juge appropriée à l'attention du Parlement européen, du Conseil et de la Commission. Cette conférence promeut, en outre, l'échange d'informations et de meilleures pratiques entre les parlements nationaux et le Parlement européen, y compris entre leurs commissions spécialisées. Elle peut également organiser des conférences interparlementaires sur des thèmes particuliers, notamment pour débattre des questions de politique étrangère et de sécurité commune, y compris la politique de sécurité et de défense commune. Les contributions de la conférence ne lient pas les parlements nationaux et ne préjugent pas de leur position».*

Dans ce contexte, ce chapitre permettra de se faire une idée globale des opinions des Parlements nationaux et du Parlement européen sur des moyens pratiques d'organiser, au sein de la COSAC, des débats portant notamment sur:

- le principe de subsidiarité ;
- le Programme de travail de la Commission européenne;
- le contrôle politique d'Europol et l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust;
- la PESC de l'Union européenne, la PCSD incluse.

#### **Questions:**

1. La Contribution de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 10.1) stipule que «Assurer le suivi du rôle des Parlements nationaux comme souligné en particulier dans l'Article 12 du Traité sur l'Union européenne et ses Protocoles respectifs restera l'une des priorités de la COSAC». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment et dans quelle mesure ce suivi peut-il mis en œuvre en pratique ?

2. La Contribution de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 10.2) stipule que «Le système appelé «Système d'alerte précoce » tel qu'établi dans le Protocole (n°2) et le mécanisme de coordination entre les Parlements nationaux devraient jouer un rôle approprié dans la COSAC». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment la COSAC devrait-elle assumer cette tâche en pratique ?

---

<sup>25</sup> <http://www.cosac.eu/fr/meetings/Madrid2010/ordinary.doc/> - pp. 37- 71



3. Quelle est l'opinion de votre Parlement/Chambre sur l'organisation pratique d'un débat, dans le cadre de la COSAC, relatif au Programme de travail de la Commission européenne ?
4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère acceptable l'invitation d'orateurs externes à l'Union européenne (par exemple le Secrétaire général de l'OTAN, l'Ambassadeur des États-Unis, etc.) pour informer la COSAC en ce qui concerne la PESC et/ou la PCSD ?
5. Des réponses au questionnaire ayant mené au 13ème rapport semestriel, il s'est avéré qu'une large majorité des Parlements/Chambres<sup>26</sup> soutenait l'idée d'ajouter le sujet du contrôle politique d'Europol et de l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust en tant que point régulier de l'ordre du jour de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, de quelle manière ces débats devraient-ils être tenus ? En particulier, les débats en COSAC devraient-ils être précédés d'auditions de représentants d'Europol et Eurojust ou cette évaluation introductive devrait-elle être présentée par, par exemple, des représentants du monde académique, judiciaire et/ou des services de police ?
6. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré d'inviter les commissions parlementaires spécialisées à participer aux activités de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre préférerait-il augmenter la coopération avec les commissions parlementaires spécialisées dans le cadre de la COSAC ou en dehors de celui-ci ? Au cas où préférence est donnée au cadre de la COSAC, veuillez spécifier les modalités possibles d'une telle coopération.
7. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré l'organisation d'une «Semaine européenne» dans les Parlements nationaux. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre soutient-il la suggestion d'organiser une telle «Semaine européenne» et, le cas échéant, de quelle manière en envisage-t-il l'organisation pratique ? La COSAC devrait-elle prendre une initiative à ce sujet ?
8. Les Conclusions de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 3.4) stipulent que «la COSAC devrait refléter comment les nouvelles technologies, telles que les vidéoconférences, et les forums, tels qu'IPEX, pourraient être employés et optimisés afin de donner effet à l'Article 10 du Protocole (n° 1) sur le Rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment, en pratique, de nouvelles technologies pourraient-elles être employées et optimisées par la COSAC ?
9. Les Conclusions de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 3.6) stipulent que «Le Règlement devrait limiter les temps de parole à 3 minutes, à moins que la Présidence n'en décide autrement, en tenant compte des circonstances spécifiques». Votre Parlement/Chambre est-il d'avis que le Règlement de la COSAC devrait être modifié sur d'autres points ?

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid. – p. 47

## **Austria: Nationalrat and Bundesrat**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

*In general the replies below reflect the broad spectrum of views that the different political parties have on this subject.*

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**In general YES (People's Party/government):**

**The EU 2020 Strategy constitutes a well integrated concept and the challenges, which the EU is currently facing, should be met. The EUROPE 2020 Strategy is one important element in the necessary transition process towards a more resource efficient, safe and sustainable low carbon and resilient economy.**

**BUT:**

**There are several crucial aspects of sustainable development missing in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy (e.g. global aspects; poverty reduction; biodiversity; transport). Therefore there is still the need for a strong EU Sustainable Development Strategy in addition to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy. The two strategies together should then form a well integrated concept for the transition towards sustainable development.**

**THEREFORE:**

**COSAC should ask the European Commission to present its Communication on the review of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy under the Belgian Presidency.**

**AND there could be improvements:**

- there should be two additional headline targets, one concerning the use of natural resources (absolute decoupling of economic growth from the use of natural resources) and the other regarding agriculture & environment.**
- the ongoing discussion "GDP and beyond" towards new measures for prosperity and quality of life should be included in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy-process.**
- the strategy for the reduction of poverty needs better and clearer measurement criteria that can be compared across Europe.**
- to focus solemnly on the "green economy" will only work if there is a functioning energy supply, an adequate infrastructure and a skilled workforce.**

**NO (Green Party/opposition):**

**There is a lack of vision and ambition in the Strategy and the absence of specific indicators for some of them open the door to a step backwards in major issues. There should be strategic and operational links with the overarching Sustainable Development Strategy and**

also with the Energy/Climate Package, the Social Agenda, the EU 2020 biodiversity strategy and the Common Agricultural Policy.

**NO (Freedom Party and Alliance for the Future of Austria/opposition)**

**Focussing on "green economy" is deemed insufficient to ensure the competitiveness of Europe. A functioning energy supply, infrastructure and skilled workers are necessary as well. The Strategy tries to measure Member States' performance with one set of criteria but for that they are to different one from another. Member States are in a better position to define the necessary reforms than the European Commission**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**YES(People's Party/government):**

**In the nearest future "A Digital Agenda for Europe" and innovation as well as energy policy will be discussed in depth in the context of the EU 2020 Strategy. In this regard, the developments in the rest of the world will be of course taken into account.**

**In general YES, BUT (Green Party/opposition):**

**Irrespective of the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, should be a 4% GDP objective for research and development and innovation (military and nuclear R&D excluded), as a cornerstone for future prosperity in Europe.**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**In general YES (People's Party/government):**

**The EU 2020 Strategy explicitly targets at achieving "sustainable and inclusive growth". Thus the Strategy is even more comprehensive and broader than by just "taking social and environmental consequences into account". At the level of concrete targets or measures the EUROPE 2020-Strategy might more intensively reflect the impact on e.g. global aspects of sustainable development or human rights questions.**

**NO (Green Party/opposition):**

**The overall goal of the EU 2020 strategy should shift away from the sole pursuit of GDP growth towards a broader political concept of the future of the EU as a social and sustainable Union that puts people and the protection of the environment at the centre of policy-making and aims at creating wellbeing and the best opportunities for all.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in

the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No <sup>27</sup>
1. climate change and clean energy	Yes and No	
2. sustainable transport	partly and No	
3. sustainable consumption and production	partly and No	
4. conservation and management of natural resources	partly and No	
5. public health	partly and No	
6. social inclusion, demography and migration	partly and No	
7. global poverty and sustainable development	partly and No	

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

**YES (People's Party/government):**

The **Integrated Guidelines** provide a good basis for the Member States for the implementation of measures in order to achieve the targets. (Note: The implementation of the majority of measures in the different policy areas lies in the hands of Member States.) The European Commission should follow a partnership approach. The measuring and monitoring of results (eg through the EC) should not lead to an additional administrative burden for Member States and their administrations.

It might be useful to include the experiences with instruments like the Open Method of Coordination in the context of the Lisbon Strategy and to expect the experiences with the new governance cycle of the EUROPE-2020-Strategy to answer this question more in detail.

**NO (Green Party/opposition):**

The 2020 Strategy does not foresee enough instruments. The experiences of the largely ineffective Lisbon Strategy should have led to the establishment of new instruments in order to meet the stated challenges. However the way that was chosen now will lead to interminable negotiations between the commission and the member states, the results will be hardly objectively measurable and the monitoring of the process very difficult. Nevertheless the problem arises not only from the chosen instruments, but also from non-existing treaty provisions.

**NO (Freedom Party and Alliance for the Future of Austria/opposition)**

After the failure of the Lisbon Strategy this political group together with the third opposition party BZÖ (Alliance for the Future of Austria) doubts that the new EUROPE 2020 Strategy will lead to a success.

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

<sup>27</sup> Yes and partly: governing parties; no: Green party

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

**3.1.-3.5 The EU-2020-Strategy and all its aspects are on the agenda of the parliamentary bodies (plenary, main and EU-committee, other committees) according to the provisions in the Austrian constitution and the rules of procedures of the respective chamber. We expect a preference to discuss the flagship initiatives on the occasion of preparing decisions at EU-level or of deciding on proposals (motions) directed to specific national measures.**

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?
2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?
3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,
  - Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.
4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
    - In what form?
    - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
    - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
    - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
    - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
    - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
    - What changes/reforms are needed?
  - 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?
6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?
7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

### **Answer to Chapter 2:**

**For the time being the Austrian delegation would like to refrain from presenting a position as the Belgian Presidency of EU-Speakers has been invited to elaborate possible ways of scrutiny on CSFP and CSDP until April 2011 in order not to prejudice discussions on the level of speakers.**

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

**The current tools like the bi-annual Report and questionnaires sent out before the COSAC plenaries seem to be appropriate. Looking back to its own history COSAC has monitored both the current competences of national parliaments (eg. scrutiny vis-à-vis the own government) and possible ways of enhancing their role (eg. the contribution of Dublin 1996 before the protocol of the Amsterdam Treaty). Discussions on best practises of existing**

**possibilities and reflecting space for improvement seems to be a feasible way in the future as well.**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

**Taking into consideration that there are only two COSAC meetings per rotating presidency, it is difficult to envisage to give COSAC some sort of a permanent role on specific EU draft legislation. After all, decisions or common positions within COSAC are only taken during its plenary meetings every 6 months. Therefore, on basis of the current rules of procedure rather an ex-post reflection on the functioning of the early warning mechanism than institutionalised common checks might be taken into consideration.**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

**From a timing perspective the debate would have to be carried out after national Parliaments have dealt with the Work Programme but at the same time not too late after its presentation. The Work Programme would have to be presented by the President of the European Commission or by a Vice-President followed by a discussion. As the Work Programme stretches across many topics, the question must be asked as to how thoroughly such a debate can be held without the participation of specialised committees.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

**This would be acceptable to the Austrian Parliament.**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>28</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**Views from outside the two organisations – in addition to hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust - would be most welcome in order to have a more balanced approach leading to a statement on the evaluation process. Depending on eventual future regular annual reports political and academic discussion could alternate between the biannual meetings of COSAC. Future activities of COSAC, however, can only supplement but not replace nor restrict competences of national parliaments in this field according to Art. 85 par. 1 and Art. 86. par. 2 TFEU.**

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

**It should be left within the discretion of parliaments to determine the composition of their delegation which might vary depending on agenda items.**

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

**This issue has already been dealt with on the level of EU Speakers ("Raising European Awareness"). A (more or less) simultaneous debate on the Commission's legislative and working programme might be a feasible way.**

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

**Videoconferences are a time- and probably also a cost-effective way of coordination and will become more and more common during the next couple of years. However the technical capacity and possibilities will have to be explored further. Other technologies such as online-discussion platforms or social networks seem to be quite trendy but have yet to prove their usefulness.**

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

**The current provisions (4 minutes) seem to be fine, but if the other delegations request a further limitation Austria would not oppose to it. However, COSAC should concentrate on more important issues than procedural ones.**



## **Belgium: Chambre des représentants et Sénat**

### **Chapitre 1<sup>er</sup>: Le développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020**

#### **Questions:**

##### ***La Stratégie EUROPE 2020***

1.1. Vu l'intention de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 d'établir une relation entre les différentes crises auxquelles nous sommes confrontés actuellement (économique, financière, sociale, écologique), est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que les points de vue politiques de cette Stratégie forment un ensemble bien intégré ?

*La Chambre des représentants et le Sénat de Belgique ne se sont pas formellement exprimés à l'égard de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020.*

*Toutefois, des débats se sont tenus au sein de chaque commission permanente sur les priorités de la présidence belge et au sein du Comité fédéral d'avis chargé des questions européennes à l'occasion des réunions du Conseil européen.*

1.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des développements économiques et scientifiques dans le reste du monde, comme par exemple aux États-Unis et en Chine ?

*Voir question 1.1.*

1.3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des conséquences sociales et environnementales et du respect des droits et l'homme (par exemple le droit à l'alimentation) ?

*Voir question 1.1.*

##### ***La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et la Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable***

2.1. La Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable identifie 7 défis, chacun accompagné d'un objectif général.

Dans ce contexte, est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte de ces défis ? Veuillez spécifier votre réponse pour chaque défi avec un commentaire votre spécifications en faisant référence aux objectifs généraux susmentionnés.

*Oui Non*

*1. changement climatique et énergie propre*

---

*2. transports durables*

---

*3. consommation et production durables*

---

*4. préservation et gestion des ressources naturelles*

---

*5. santé publique*

6. inclusion sociale, démographie et immigration

7. pauvreté dans le monde et défis en matière de développement durable

---

*Voir question 1.1.*

2.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 prévoit assez d'instruments pour (1) réaliser ces défis et (2) mesurer et (3) suivre leurs résultats (par exemple en introduisant des critères similaires aux critères de convergence de l'euro) ?

*Voir question 1.1.*

**La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et les Parlements nationaux**

3.1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que le processus décisionnel, lié à la Stratégie EUROPE 2020, est suffisamment contraignant pour les Etats membres et que le contrôle par les Parlements nationaux et, le cas échéant, régionaux est suffisamment assuré ?

*Voir question 1.1.*

3.2. Quels sont les organes de votre Parlement/Chambre qui seront chargés du suivi de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et de quelle façon le gouvernement devra-t-il justifier ses actions tendant à la poursuite des objectifs de cette Stratégie ?

*Voir question 1.1.*

3.3. Décrivez brièvement les procédures parlementaires (au niveau national et, le cas échéant, au niveau régional).

*Voir question 1.1.*

3.4. Au cas où un tel organe ou une telle procédure parlementaire n'a pas encore été établi, envisage-t-on de le(s) créer ?

*Voir question 1.1.*

3.5. Quelle serait la meilleure façon pour les Parlements/Chambres de contribuer au renforcement de l'aspect développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 ?

*Voir question 1.1.*

**Chapitre 2. Contrôle parlementaire de la Politique de sécurité et de défense commune (ci-après: «PSDC»)**

**Questions:**

1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime utile un échange interparlementaire sur la PESC et la PSDC en vue d'améliorer le contrôle parlementaire au niveau national et/ou européen ?

*Il est à souligner que, jusqu'à présent, ni le Sénat ni la Chambre des représentants n'ont abordé la problématique en question.*

*Sur la base du présent questionnaire relatif au contrôle parlementaire de la PESC et de la PSDC, une proposition de résolution sera déposée et soumise aux parlementaires fédéraux.*

*Par ailleurs, à la suite de la demande de la dernière Conférence des présidents de l'Union européenne, le Parlement belge, en sa qualité de prochain président de cette conférence, élaborera une proposition en vue de la conférence de 2011. Dans cette proposition, il sera tenu compte des positions prises par (1) la XLIV COSAC, par (2) la réunion interparlementaire de commissions « Politique européenne de sécurité commune et de défense » qui, ce 28 septembre, a eu lieu au sein du Parlement européen et par (3) la réunion des présidents des commissions des Affaires étrangères (COFACC) qui aura lieu ces 18 et 19 octobre.*

2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère que le contrôle parlementaire au niveau de l'UE devrait inclure aussi bien la PESC que la PSDC ou rien que la PSDC ?

*Voir question 1.*

3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère souhaitable l'installation d'un mécanisme, d'une structure ou d'un forum particulier en vue de l'organisation d'une coopération et d'un contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PSDC ?

*Voir question 1.*

Le cas échéant,

- Est-ce que celui-ci devrait prendre la forme d'une nouvelle commission/conférence/organisation/institution interparlementaire ?
- **Est-ce que l'État membre de la Présidence tournante devrait y avoir un rôle spécial ?**
- **Veillez spécifier d'autres modalités.**

4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre préfère un modèle ou un arrangement institutionnel existant pour organiser la coopération et le contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PSDC ?

*Voir question 1.*

- 4.1. Est-ce que la COSAC devrait jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ?

Le cas échéant,

- Sous quelle forme ?
- Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COSAC ?
- Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COSAC devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PSDC ?
- Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
- Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
- Est-ce que vous estimez que la COSAC doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
- Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?

4.2. Est-ce que la COFACC et/ou la «CODAC» devrai(en)t jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ?

Le cas échéant,

- Sous quelle forme ?
- Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» ?
- Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PSDC ?
- Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
- Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
- Est-ce que vous estimez que la COFACC ou la «CODAC» doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
- Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?

4.3. Est-ce qu'une autre conférence/organisation/institution devrait encore jouer un rôle dans ce contrôle ?

Le cas échéant,

- Laquelle ?
- Sous quelle forme ?
- Veuillez spécifier d'autres modalités.

5. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est prêt à mettre à disposition des budgets pour ce contrôle ?

*Voir question 1.*

6. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est partisan d'un mécanisme/d'une structure/d'un forum composé(e) de membres des seuls Parlements nationaux ou d'un organe mixte avec des membres du Parlement européen ?

*Voir question 1.*

7. Est-ce que, au sujet de la coopération interparlementaire relative à la PESC et/ou à la PSDC, votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que le Parlement européen devrait être doté du statut de membre ou d'observateur ?

*Voir question 1.*

### **Chapitre 3. Le rôle futur de la COSAC après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Lisbonne – suite du débat de la XLIII COSAC**

#### **Questions:**

1. La Contribution de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 10.1) stipule que «Assurer le suivi du rôle des Parlements nationaux comme souligné en particulier dans l'Article 12 du Traité sur l'Union européenne et ses Protocoles respectifs restera l'une des priorités de la COSAC». Selon votre

Parlement/Chambre, comment et dans quelle mesure ce suivi peut-il être mis en œuvre en pratique ?

*Dans le cadre actuel de ses tâches et compétences, la COSAC, en sa qualité de plate-forme d'échanges d'information entre les Parlements nationaux, d'une part, et entre ceux-ci et le Parlement européen, d'autre part, assure, d'ores et déjà, le suivi du rôle des Parlements nationaux sous forme de débats, au sein de ses réunions, en partant du rapport semestriel ainsi que de son annexe.*

*Par ailleurs, moyennant l'utilisation des nouvelles technologies, des dialogues ciblés pourraient être établis sur des sujets d'actualité ne pouvant pas être remis à une réunion «physique» ultérieure.*

*Enfin, dans le contexte de l'évolution d'IPEX comme unique plate-forme de contact, une rubrique «COSAC» pourrait y être créée reprenant les réponses officielles des Parlements/Chambres à des requêtes aussi bien internes (d'autres Parlements) qu'externes.*

2. La Contribution de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 10.2) stipule que «Le système appelé «Système d'alerte précoce» tel qu'établi dans le Protocole (n°2) et le mécanisme de coordination entre les Parlements nationaux devraient jouer un rôle approprié dans la COSAC». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment la COSAC devrait-elle assumer cette tâche en pratique ?

*Le «Système d'alerte précoce» pourrait être coordonné par l'application de nouvelles techniques au cas où, tenant compte de l'importance du sujet, une réaction rapide s'impose et/ou via la rubrique «COSAC» de la plate-forme IPEX.*

*Les contacts préalables concernant le contrôle de subsidiarité et le système d'alerte précoce doivent passer d'une manière efficace et rapide par le réseau des représentants nationaux auprès du Parlement européen.*

3. Quelle est l'opinion de votre Parlement/Chambre sur l'organisation pratique d'un débat, dans le cadre de la COSAC, relatif au Programme de travail de la Commission européenne ?

*Tenant compte du planning repris à l'Annexe 4 du projet d'accord-cadre entre le Parlement européen et la Commission européenne, la COSAC devrait prévoir un débat sur ce sujet de grande importance lors de sa réunion plénière d'automne.*

4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère acceptable l'invitation d'orateurs externes à l'Union européenne (par exemple le Secrétaire général de l'OTAN, l'Ambassadeur des États-Unis, etc.) pour informer la COSAC en ce qui concerne la PESC et/ou la PSDC ?

*L'invitation d'orateurs externes en tant qu'orateurs experts serait recommandable dans le contexte des débats au sein de la COSAC (voir chapitre 2). De toute façon, l'appréciation de cette option devrait être laissée à la présidence.*

5. Des réponses au questionnaire ayant mené au 13ème rapport semestriel, il s'est avéré qu'une large majorité des Parlements/Chambres soutenait l'idée d'ajouter le sujet du contrôle politique d'Europol et de l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust en tant que point régulier de l'ordre du jour de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, de quelle manière ces débats devraient-ils être tenus ? En particulier, les débats au sein de la COSAC devraient-ils être précédés d'auditions de représentants d'Europol et Eurojust ou cette évaluation introductive devrait-elle être présentée par, par exemple, des représentants du monde académique, judiciaire et/ou des services de police ?

*Les activités d'Europol et d'Eurojust se sont développées au niveau intergouvernemental sans qu'un contrôle parlementaire y soit de facto attaché. Ce retard normatif doit être rattrapé afin d'intégrer un contrôle soit via le Parlement européen, soit via les parlements nationaux. La COSAC n'est a priori pas le meilleur instrument pour un tel contrôle.*

*Par ailleurs, il est à souligner que la décision d'ajouter le sujet du contrôle politique d'Europol et de l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust en tant que point régulier à l'ordre du jour de la COSAC ne serait pas sans conséquences quant à sa durée.*

*Outre cet aspect pratique, des auditions systématiques ne semblent pas s'imposer. Le cas échéant, ce débat doit être introduit par les représentants d'Europol et Eurojust avec un rôle important à jouer par les personnalités externes qui peuvent être invités aux débats comme experts.*

*Enfin, le contrôle parlementaire d'Europol fait actuellement l'objet d'une réflexion au sein d'un groupe de travail informel présidé par la DG Affaires intérieures de la Commission. Cette dernière prépare également une Communication à ce sujet.*

6. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré d'inviter les commissions parlementaires spécialisées à participer aux activités de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre préférerait-il augmenter la coopération avec les commissions parlementaires spécialisées dans le cadre de la COSAC ou en dehors de celui-ci ? Au cas où préférence est donnée au cadre de la COSAC, veuillez spécifier les modalités possibles d'une telle coopération.

*L'article 10 du Protocole (n° 1) sur le rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne, qui est généralement considéré comme la base légale de la COSAC, la définit comme une «Conférence des organes parlementaires spécialisés dans les affaires de l'Union». Néanmoins, chaque Parlement/Chambre peut adapter sa délégation en fonction de l'ordre du jour de chaque réunion COSAC.*

7. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré l'organisation d'une «Semaine européenne» dans les Parlements nationaux. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre soutient-il la suggestion d'organiser une telle «Semaine européenne» et, le cas échéant, de quelle manière en envisage-t-il l'organisation pratique ? La COSAC devrait-elle prendre une initiative à ce sujet ?

*Dans le passé, le Parlement fédéral de Belgique a déjà organisé des initiatives semblables à propos de divers sujets. La COSAC pourrait mobiliser les Parlements nationaux autour d'une telle initiative annuelle qui aurait lieu dans chaque Parlement au même moment. Toutefois, il est à craindre que des contraintes pratiques puissent compliquer une telle initiative.*

*Plus général, si on veut intégrer la dimension européenne dans les activités des Parlements nationaux, il faut le faire de manière transversale.*

8. Les Conclusions de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 3.4) stipulent que «la COSAC devrait refléter comment les nouvelles technologies, telles que les vidéoconférences, et les forums, tels qu'IPEX, pourraient être employés et optimisés afin de donner effet à l'Article 10 du Protocole (n° 1) sur le rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment, en pratique, de nouvelles technologies pourraient-elles être employées et optimisées par la COSAC ?

*Voir les réponses aux questions 1 et 2. De toute façon, ces nouvelles technologies ne devraient pas remplacer les réunions plénières de la COSAC.*

9. Les Conclusions de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 3.6) stipulent que «Le Règlement devrait limiter le temps de parole à 3 minutes, à moins que la Présidence n'en décide autrement, en tenant compte des circonstances spécifiques». Votre Parlement/Chambre est-il d'avis que le Règlement de la COSAC devrait être modifié sur d'autres points ?

*Au lieu de faire chaque fois la distinction plutôt artificielle entre les Conclusions et la Contribution de la COSAC, il est proposé de produire un seul texte à l'issue de chaque réunion COSAC.*

*Le débat autour des langues à utiliser au sein de la COSAC n'est pas nouveau. En ce moment, le coût d'interprétation représente pratiquement la moitié du budget d'organisation. Il est utile d'étudier la possibilité d'utiliser le système d'interprétation de la Conférence des Présidents des Parlements nationaux de l'UE au sein de la COSAC.*

## **Bulgaria: Narodno Sabranie**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

Yes, the Europe 2020 Strategy sets out a well integrated concept, based on the 3 mutually reinforcing priorities – intelligent, sustainable and inclusive growth. The relevant standing committees of the Bulgarian Parliament have generally approved the Europe 2020 Strategy.

In the framework of translating the EU goals into national targets, the Bulgarian government has already elaborated measuring indicators, preserving the opportunity to adapt the headline target indicators to the specific national conditions if needed.

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

The Bulgarian parliament finds that the new Europe 2020 Strategy takes into account the conclusions from the Lisbon Strategy and sets out clear indicators which will help European economy to become more competitive on the world stage.

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

Yes, with the Europe 2020 Strategy the 27 democratic Member States are aimed at reaching the 3 types of growth – sustainable, intelligent and inclusive. The Strategy defines the overall vision by setting headline targets, while the Member States are responsible to identify national specific indicators and implementing measures in order to meet the Strategy's objectives.

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.



	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	x	
2. sustainable transport	x	
3. sustainable consumption and production	x	
4. conservation and management of natural resources	x	
5. public health	x	
6. social inclusion, demography and migration	x	
7. global poverty and sustainable development	x	

As a whole, the 7 key challenges identified in the EU Strategy for Sustainable Development are included directly or indirectly in the Europe 2020 Strategy taking into consideration different areas of competences on EU and respectively national level.

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

The Bulgarian parliament considers that the Europe 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments to measure and monitor the results of the Strategy's implementation. The Bulgarian government has taken into account the overall vision and headline indicators of the post-Lisbon Strategy, which allows it to apply a benchmark approach with the other Member States.

#### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the National Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

The oversight by the National Parliament will be exercised in two main manners: firstly through monitoring and parliamentary control over the implementation of the indicators in the relevant sectoral policies by hearings and parliamentary questions; and secondly by public diplomacy, aimed at informing the citizens by presenting the EUROPE 2020 Strategy in an understandable way and giving them the opportunity to exercise the so called citizens' control.

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

In relation to the public consultation on the overall vision for the Europe 2020 Strategy and in the context of the vision for "Bulgaria 2020" the initiative belongs to the Committee on European Affairs and Oversight of the European Funds. The Committee established a Council for Public Consultations, with the aim to involve the social-economic partners and the NGO sector into the debate on issues, concerning the Bulgaria's membership to the EU, incl. the Europe 2020 Strategy.

Concerning the concrete achievement of the Strategy's indicators, targeted at the 3 types of growth, the oversight will be exercised by the relevant parliamentary committees by holding hearings of the respective responsible Ministers

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

The follow-up of the Europe 2020 Strategy will be exercised by the means of:

- the procedure for parliamentary monitoring and control on EU affairs during the relevant committee meetings (e.g. Committee on European Affairs and Oversight of the European Funds; Economic Policy, Energy and Tourism Committee; Labour and Social Policy Committee; Education, Science, Children, Youths and Sports Committee);
- Regular Hearings of the responsible bodies and Ministers during the parliamentary committee meetings as well as in plenary.\*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

N/A

3.5. In which way National Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

Via regular parliamentary monitoring on the implementation of the Strategy. In addition, the direct contact of the parliamentarians with the civil society representatives will give them the opportunity to assume any potential ideas and observations of the NGO sector.

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

Yes, all kinds of interparliamentary exchange and cooperation, especially in the light of the new Lisbon Treaty and the New conception of NATO are considered quite useful.

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

Interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP, because they are interrelated on significant degree.

---

\* According to the Parliament Rules of Procedure the National Assembly shall hear a report by the Prime Minister at the beginning of every six-month period of the Presidency of the European Union on the participation of the Republic of Bulgaria in the European Union during the preceding Presidency and on the tasks of the Republic of Bulgaria during the current Presidency. In this regard, during the launch of the 4<sup>th</sup> session of the National Parliament (in the beginning of September 2010), the Prime Minister presented before the National Assembly such a report, stressing the importance of the implementation of the new priorities and objectives of Europe 2020 Strategy.

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,
- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.

Such a discussion within the National Parliament has not taken place yet.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

The existing model of interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP could be tolerated.

Preferably, COSAC shall be informed on the development of the CFSP and CSDP, while its expertise may be used on ad-hoc basis in order to respond to the new challenges of the EU in the context of the Lisbon Treaty.

Regarding the role of COFACC and CODAC, the forums may continue fulfilling their functions and activities with the possibility of reorganization in order to meet the new European challenges.

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?

- Please specify other modalities.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

Due to the global financial and economic crisis, it's preferable the new challenges to be met in the framework of the existing budgets.

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of National Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

N/A in the context of the answer to the above questions.

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

We approve the current framework of interparliamentary cooperation.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the National Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

The current practice of elaborating Bi-annual Reports which summarize the National Parliament's opinions on the topical EU issues shall be preserved.

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between National Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

The coordination mechanism may be employed by the means of constant and sufficient communication, sound coordination, exchange of ideas and best practices between the National Parliament of the EU Member States.

The "Early-Warning" system requires a well-functioning communication channel between the parliamentary bodies in order to ensure that all necessary information concerning potential shortcomings or emerging problems is timely provided to COSAC.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

The current practice is well perceived by the National Parliaments. The Annual Working Program could be presented during the COSAC ordinary meeting in the first semester,

followed by an assessment of the Commission's activities in the course of the year in the second semester.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

Yes, we welcome the opportunity to invite keynote speakers from outside the EU to address COSAC meetings on the issues of CFSP/CSDP. In the context of the changes, implemented after Lisbon treaty and the forthcoming new concept of NATO, such a possible initiative would contribute to the better mutual understanding and cooperation in responding to the new challenges of the security area and diplomacy.

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>29</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

COSAC may hold hearings of the responsible bodies on the activities of Europol and the evaluation of Eurojust, in the presence of MP's of specialised committees of the National Parliaments, as well as representatives of the different EU Institutions.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

The cooperation in the framework of COSAC provides enough opportunities for ad-hoc initiatives.

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in National Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

We welcome every initiative aimed at raising the awareness on issues, related to the European Union. The idea to organize "European Week" is quite interesting but we need more information and concrete details on it.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

In the future, COSAC may initiate videoconferences on different topics, for example in response to urgent situations and on ad-hoc basis.

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

No.

## Cyprus: Vouli ton Antiprosopon

### Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy

#### Questions:

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

The above mentioned issues were considered by the Standing Committee on European Affairs of the House of Representatives in the context of the ongoing debate on “Europe 2020 Strategy”. It must be noted that the Strategy has been brought before the said Parliamentary Committee, which invited both the executive as well as the Head of the Representation of the European Commission in Cyprus, to provide information concerning the said Strategy.

The main areas of concern during this debate were, among others, related to: the existence or the absence of sufficient mechanisms to ensure the successful implementation and enforcement of this strategy; the level of social and economic cohesion; the need to strengthen the social dimension; the particularities and different starting positions of the member states; the broad and too ambitious targets set by the Strategy.

However, since the debate is ongoing, no final position of the Parliament is available to date with regard to the questions posed.

No special parliamentary body was created or specific procedure determined for the scrutiny of the government in relation to the Europe 2020 Strategy. Therefore, the existing scrutiny procedure will be followed. In particular, the Parliamentary Committee on European Affairs will be responsible for the follow up of the Strategy, notwithstanding the involvement of the sectoral Committees on matters falling within their competence. With regard to the accountability of the government for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of the Strategy, it must be noted that, the Cyprus Parliament cannot mandate the government with respect to the position that it will take at the EU level or guarantee its influence on the decisions taken, due to the fact that Cyprus is a Presidential democracy with a clear separation of powers. However, the Parliament can exercise direct control over the executive through questions addressed to the competent Ministries and entering matters for debate before the Parliamentary Committees or the Plenary. Furthermore, the Parliament can exercise control over the executive through amendments on the government budget or bills of law or regulations submitted before it for approval.

National Parliaments may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the Europe 2020 Strategy through the exchange of best practises and information, thus enabling themselves to scrutinise their governments more effectively.



## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

Interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is considered both useful and helpful, mostly because a related debate at EU level, coupled with the qualitative and quantitative importance of useful information that can be received in this context, can add to the scrutiny work carried out in each National Parliament. This is especially true since, although National Parliaments do have a role in scrutinising Foreign Affairs and Defence matters, their work is only indirectly related to CFSP and CSDP and do not always conduct extensive debates on these matters.

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

This would be legitimate, as there is still no unified European Foreign Policy that could support and be supported by a Security and Defence Policy. It would also be justified by the fact that decision making still takes place at the national political level. This would be the ideal principle underpinning the European external action, as there can not be a CSDP without a CSFP.

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

Yes. A special mechanism should indeed be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation and scrutiny in this domain, particularly in view of the cessation of the ESDA/WEU Assembly's activity. The House of Representatives agrees that the dissolution of the Assembly of WEU will leave the issue of interparliamentary control in the field of European security and defence unresolved.

If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?

The form of this new body should contribute to the smooth functioning of CFSP/CSDP scrutiny, through regular meetings and substantial examination of related matters. This is the reason why it is considered that this cooperation and exchange should not remain at a conference level, but allow the adoption of regular reports on CFSP/CSDP related matters and actions.

- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?

This depends on the format chosen for the meetings. The involvement of the Presidency could range from liaising with the high level officials invited to participate in the meetings as speakers, should the said cooperation take the form of a new

organisation/body, to being in charge of organising the meetings, if the decision is to develop this cooperation in an interparliamentary committee/conference context.

- Please specify other modalities.

All Member States of the European Union should be represented in this cooperation mechanism. Participation should be made on a membership basis, in a way to ensure continuity and substantial contribution of the body as a whole to debates on and scrutiny of CFSP/CSDP. The number of members from each National Parliament could be debated at a later stage. In order to ensure the pertinence of scrutiny results, involving Members of Parliament specialised in foreign affairs and defence matters seems reasonable.

The House of Representatives agrees with the French Senate proposal, in that the work of the body should be carried out in a regular and organised way and be convened at least once every semester. The House also agrees that this mechanism should encourage joint discussions and allow the engagement in dialogue with the European executive.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

It is considered more appropriate to have Foreign Affairs and Defence Committees involved in such scrutiny, rather than European Affairs Committees, as the former deal with matters related to CFSP and CSDP at national level.

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

COFACC and "CODAC" should continue to meet in the same format as before. However, Chairpersons of Foreign Affairs and Defence committees should be encouraged and strongly advised to participate in the body dealing with scrutiny of

CSFP and/or CSDP, as well as members of those committees. Should it be decided that the engagement of these conferences be substantial, these Conferences could take up a coordinating role. A part of those Conferences could be allowed for planning the work of the new mechanism, in terms of setting the agenda and deciding on priorities and topics to be discussed.

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

No.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

Financial contribution could be foreseen. However, the budget should be kept to a minimum. The eventual contribution of each parliament should be discussed and jointly agreed upon.

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

The House of Representatives considers that, although those policies remain a competence of Member States, the European Parliament, which is well informed on the European perspective of these matters, could bring added value to joint debates carried out in the framework of to the mechanism/structure which will be put in place to scrutinise CSFP and/or CSDP.

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

Regardless of the status given to it, the European Parliament should be able to express its opinion and be consulted on matters discussed.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

The House of Representatives of Cyprus considers that COSAC should continue to monitor the role of national parliaments as outlined in article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective protocols. This role can best be exercised through

the timely scrutiny of (a) the Annual Strategy Policy (b) the Annual Work Programme of the Commission and the selection of topics for scrutiny or the conduct of subsidiarity checks therefrom and (c) the selection and discussion of broader EU matters of particular interest to the national parliaments of member states (e.g. the Europe 2020 Strategy). In the light of the valuable experience gained through the exchange of information and best practices emanating from the subsidiarity checks undertaken through COSAC, the House of Representatives of Cyprus considers that the monitoring role of COSAC can be further streamlined through the periodic conduct of debates on the experience gained by national parliaments and the difficulties encountered in carrying out the role vested in them by the Treaty.

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

COSAC should continue to operate as a forum where best practices and experiences are exchanged between national parliaments with the aim of enhancing the ability of national parliaments to individually decide whether subsidiarity is upheld or not. More specifically, COSAC could dedicate time in one of its plenary meetings to evaluate the operation of the early warning system, to discuss the problems encountered and to seek solutions to these problems. A report on the methods of carrying out subsidiarity checks and their results could be drawn at the end of each such discussion.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

The House of Representatives of Cyprus considers that a debate on the Annual Work Programme of the Commission is welcome. The said debate could be conducted by COSAC on the basis of the proposals chosen beforehand by each national parliament as being of general or specific importance to them. At the start of the debate, a concise briefing by Commission officials could take place, which should focus on the matters selected by national parliaments in order to stimulate the debate that will follow.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

This issue has not yet been discussed by the House of Representatives of Cyprus. In any case, the matter should be approached in relation to the possibility of having a separate Conference of Foreign Affairs and Defense Committees.

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>50</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

In the event that political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust activities is added as a recurrent item on the COSAC agenda, the House of Representatives of Cyprus believes that the debate should be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust as well as introductory evaluations presented by academics and possibly the judiciary and law enforcement services, in order to provide a spherical insight for the debate that will follow.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

The House of Representatives of Cyprus supports the view that the enhancement of the cooperation of specialised parliamentary committees should take place independently from COSAC, as suggested in the Presidency Conclusions of the EU Speakers' Conference of May 2010.

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

The organisation of a European Week in national parliaments constitutes a welcome suggestion. Concerning its practical organisation, COSAC could contribute in the selection of topics or themes to be presented and discussed. Furthermore, from time to time, COSAC could be the forum where an evaluation of the experience gained from the organisation of a "European Week" and the exchange of best practices and information among national parliaments could take place.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

Concerning the use of new technologies which could be employed by COSAC to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol 1 on the Role of National Parliaments in the EU, in our opinion, COSAC could assume a coordinating role in this matter. COSAC could contribute to this end through the creation of workgroups with the participation of experts from the national parliaments entrusted with the evaluation of each new technology and the compilation of a report on how the said technology could be employed in the exchange of information between national parliaments. COSAC could then discuss the said report in one of its plenary meetings to decide whether the technology in question can effectively be utilised by national parliaments for the exchange of information and best practices.

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

No.

## **Czech Republic: Poslanecká sněmovna**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

- 3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?
- 3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).
- 3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?
- 3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*Unfortunately, the Committee for the European Affairs of the Chamber of Deputies of the Czech Parliament, that is a competent body to deliberate on documents concerning European affairs, has not discussed the EUROPE 2020 Strategy due to the elections to the Chamber (in May 2010) with the following process of constituting the bodies of the Chamber for the new electoral term. Consequently, for the purpose of the questionnaire, we refer to the opinion on the EUROPE 2020 Strategy presented by the Czech Senate in its response to the Chapter 1 of the questionnaire.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

*The Chamber of Deputies of the Czech Parliament has not yet adopted an official position on this topic.*

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?
2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?
3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,
  - Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.
4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
    - In what form?
    - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
    - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?



- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?
- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?
- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.
5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?
6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?
7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?  
*In practice there should be an actual and timely debate on the proposals of the COM which elaborate on the role of national parliaments, either because they have to do so (e.g. art. 85-1, art. 88-2 of the Treaty of Lisbon) or should do so (reflecting the need of a new and enforced parliamentary dimension of the EU settled down by the Treaty of Lisbon).*
2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national

Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

*In our opinion it relates to the coordination role of COSAC for the subsidiarity checks. Such a role should be based on the experience of the previous subsubsidiarity tests within COSAC.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

*COSAC should debate on the Work Programme of the European Commission in order to determine the topics of its future and more detailed interest.No suggestion on the practical organization.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

*It always used to be the role of Presidency (in cooperation with the Troika and the COSAC Secretariat if needed) to prepare a draft program with the available speakers, reflecting the actual context of a topic, added value of the speakers etc. in order to open a debate on the proposal.*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>31</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

*See the answer to the previous question.*

*The focus of the actual debate should be focused on the eventual realization of art. 85(1) and art. 88 (2) of the Treaty of Lisbon so that the national parliaments have a common project (or criteria) to stand for.*

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

*COSAC could develop a framework of cooperation with the specialized committees meetings but should stick to the actual format of its own meetings.*

*COSAC conclusions, if any, could be more referred to during the other inter-parliamentary meetings, e.g. Join Parliamentary Meetings.*

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*This is a question for larger political debate that could be later based on such an initiative.*

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

*Not all of the national parliaments/chambers do have new technologies equipment available. Therefore, maybe, a list of all eventual technologies to be used could be elaborated and distributed among the national parliaments in order to find out more about the level of disposable communication.*

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*It was a practice that the time limit used to be modified in accordance with a number of registered demands for speech and the remaining time for each section. Based on our experience three minutes are quite enough to formulate a contribution for debate and that is why one could support a time limit for speaking time. On the other side, there can always be some specific circumstances and that is why we prefer that the Conclusions treating the time limitation become a part of best practices of the COSAC and not necessarily a part of the Rules of procedure.*

## **Czech Republic: Senát**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

*The Senate holds the view<sup>32</sup> that, in general, the strategy correctly identifies the main structural and global challenges such as a rapid build-up of public debt, insufficient labour market flexibility, problems arising from demographic change, fundamental shift in the global economy and relatively low productivity growth in the EU. The Senate supports the general focus of the strategy on increasing growth, competitiveness and employment as its main components. It takes note of the limited number of the headline targets. However, it does not think that the strategy should aspire to incorporate all the aspects, such as financial, social and environmental ones, into a single "silver bullet" strategy. Focusing on too many goals would only complicate the overall governance of the strategy and lead to overstretching of resources, which might result in a failure to meet the otherwise realistic goals.*

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

*As already mentioned, the Senate is of the opinion that the strategy correctly describes fundamental shift in global economy, i.e. emergence of new dominant players. It does, however, fail to draw any conclusions or suggest any recommendations as to what the European Union needs to do vis-à-vis rising of new economic powers, such as the BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China) countries. The most burning issue that the EU neglects to address sufficiently in its strategy is the issue of energy security in Europe. Given the expected surge in demand for energy resources resulting from the robust economic growth of the new emerging giants, the EU should work harder on developing a real common energy policy and take full advantage of being the largest trading block in the world when negotiating energy deals with its suppliers. The strategy also announces a new EU trade policy. In this respect, the Senate has expressed its full support to the ongoing liberalization of international trade as an important factor for boosting effectiveness of the EU economies.*

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

---

<sup>32</sup> See the resolution of the Czech Senate to the Europe 2020 Strategy on <http://www.senat.cz/xqw/webdav/pssnat/original/55625/47202>

*As regards the environmental aspects, the Senate has taken note of the environmental goal “20-20-20” and supports promoting energy efficiency and new technologies that help use renewable resources more efficiently. However, it holds the view that the flagship initiative “Resource efficient Europe” insufficiently addresses the importance of nuclear energy as a significant source of clean energy.*

*As far as the fight against the climate change is concerned, the EU has committed to meeting the 20-20-20 environmental goal and this pledge is incorporated into the EUROPE 2020 strategy. Nevertheless, further negotiations regarding a new global approach towards combating climate change after 2012 should not be viewed as falling within the strategy and should be addressed separately.*

*As for promoting social inclusion, in particular through the reduction of poverty, the Senate believes that the issue can be best addressed by a number of measures that are already, more or less implicitly, contained in the remaining headline targets. It is convinced that poverty reduction is best achieved through fostering favourable conditions for job creation together with corresponding work-related motivation measures (which should be addressed under the headline target no. 1).*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		<i>No; the Senate would like to see more emphasis being put on nuclear energy as a significant source of clean energy.</i>
2. sustainable transport	} <i>Yes; the Senate finds these areas sufficiently covered in the flagship initiatives, especially in the „Innovation Union“ and „Resource efficient Europe“.</i>	
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		<i>Yes; the issue of public health is prominent and features in a number of flagship initiatives, in particular in “Innovation Union” and “European platform against poverty.”</i>
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		<i>Yes; see answer 1.3</i>
7. global poverty and sustainable development		<i>As the EU2020 is not intended as a development and global poverty reduction</i>

*strategy, the Senate has no comment on this issue.*

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

*The Senate is of the opinion that the strategy is primarily intended to form an action plan with more or less clearly outlined agenda. It does not create new instruments. The current instruments in the Union will be used to deliver on the accepted targets.*

*The overall governance of the strategy shows certain improvements in comparison with the Lisbon strategy. The individual quantitative headline targets, as well as the integrated guidelines for economic and employment policies, have been endorsed by the prime ministers and the heads of states of the EU. The progress made at both EU and Member State level will be assessed annually by the European Council.*

*Whether the strategy can succeed in meeting its goals in the end depends, by and large, on the readiness of the member states and other stakeholders to commit themselves to the declared targets. Without determined political will to effect a change in the priority areas and without ownership of the strategy by the member states, the strategy risks failing. The same applies for the issue of sustainable development.*

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

*As of now, there is no specific procedure regarding the decision-making process linked to the strategy. In the case of the Lisbon strategy, the Senate dealt with the Government's report on implementation of the National reform programme (after a debate, the report was taken into account). New "EU 2020" National reform programme will probably be presented in the Senate. Nevertheless, detailed mechanisms of parliamentary involvement are not known yet.*

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

*The committees in charge of the EU 2020 follow-up initiatives are the Committee on EU Affairs, the Committee on Economy, Agriculture and Transport, the Committee on Education, Science, Culture, Human Rights and Petitions and possibly also the Committee on Health and Social Policy.*

*Regarding the implementation of the strategy, the Senate can hold the Government to account in a number of ways. Firstly, the Senate's Resolution on the Communication from the Commission Europe 2020 – A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth (see footnote 7 above), shall be taken into account by the Government.*

*The Senate has also requested the Government to provide it with information on further proceeding of negotiations regarding the EUROPE 2020 strategy. The Government keeps the Senate posted on the process of negotiating national targets. As of now, it is likely that the relevant committees will also be involved in the process of drawing up the national reform programme. The exact procedure regarding the approval of the national reform programme has not been agreed on yet.*

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

*As of now, no special procedure for EUROPE 2020-related issues is foreseen. The standard procedure for the scrutiny of European documents and for adoption of implementing statutory measures will apply.*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

*See answer 3.3*

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*NPs may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect through their consistent, continuous, cautious and thorough scrutiny of governments' proposals of EU 2020 implementing measures, scrutinising them from the perspective of their compliance with the principles of sustainable development.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

*The debate of future inter-parliamentary cooperation in CFSP and CSDP issues has not been conducted in the Senate yet. Therefore, there is no official position on the detailed features of such cooperation. The only position available is the one held by the Senate's representatives in the framework of the debate in the Parliamentary Assembly of the WEU. They have supported the proposal of the parliamentary cooperation (rather than interparliamentary scrutiny) being organized at the COFACC meetings.*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

*No official position. Because of the intergovernmental character of CFSP and different international obligations of member states concerning their defence policy, it seems to be appropriate not to predict or presume formalised general "interparliamentary scrutiny" of CSDP at EU level.*

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

*Such a mechanism should not take form of a new interparliamentary structure. As stated above, the Senate supports the idea of interparliamentary cooperation on CFSP and/or CSDP being covered by COFACC. If the idea of COFACC is not acceptable, the Senate could support the idea of CODAC, i.e. meetings of chairmen and presidents of committees on defence. Meetings should be organised by the member state holding the rotating presidency.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

*The Senate is of the opinion that the agenda of COSAC should not be extended to regular scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP issues.<sup>33</sup>*

4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form? **Meetings of COFACC**
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"? **Yes**
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP? **No**
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis? **Ad-hoc basis**
- If on a regular basis, at what interval? **See the previous answer**
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues? **No**
- What changes/reforms are needed? --

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

*No.*

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

*The debate on this issue has not been conducted in the Senate yet. Because of the financial restraints, the Senate would very probably express a reserved position.*

---

<sup>33</sup> The Committee on EU Affairs of the Senate does not deal with CFSP – this agenda belongs to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Security



6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

*The Senate prefers existing forms of cooperation covered by COFACC. Because of the intergovernmental character of CSDP, the body should be composed of members of national parliaments. Members of the European Parliament could be included with an observer status.*

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

*As stated above, the EP should have an observer status.*

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

*Exchange of best practices of individual NPs as regards fulfilling of their role described in Article 12 TEU should be the most important role of COSAC. On regular basis (especially now, in the first months after entering of the Lisbon Treaty into force), COSAC should discuss practical functioning of arrangements established for forwarding of Commission's documents to NPs and for sending reasoned opinions to Union institutions as well as the implementation of other Treaty provisions conferring new powers on national parliaments.*

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

*According to the Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2), COSAC should become a venue for the exchange of views on politically sensitive issues with relevant members of Union institutions. However useful such debates may be (in terms of contacts with direct participants of the legislative process, opportunity for obtaining explanation, etc.) they will not contribute to better coordination among the NPs. The Senate is of the opinion that the coordination, should it be effective, has to begin at much earlier stage, i.e. with issuance of the Commission's Work Programme (see the answer below). On the basis of this document, COSAC should agree on a limited number of politically sensitive legislative dossiers that could be discussed in future.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

*Since the Work Programme of the European Commission (CWP) is ordinarily issued in November, the instant exchange of views over this document at an autumn COSAC meeting is not possible. Still, the Senate is of the opinion that CWP should be a regular part of the meeting of chairpersons of COSAC at the beginning of the year. The Committee on EU affairs of the Senate*

*maintained the practice of scrutinizing the CWP and adopting of a resolution with indicative list of proposals potentially sensitive with regard to adherence to the principle of subsidiarity.<sup>34</sup> The Committee pays attention to similar shortlists issued by other chambers, be it focused on subsidiarity issues only (i.e. Denmark, the Netherlands) or selected for future scrutiny in general (Portugal). The Senate is convinced that such practice is worth disseminating.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

*The Senate is of the opinion that CFSP and/or CSDP should not be included in the regular agenda of COSAC (see answers in Chapter 2). However, should an ad hoc topic falling within this area be debated at a COSAC meeting, the presence of a speaker able to explain and provide information on broader context would be desirable.*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>35</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

*COSAC is an appropriate platform for exchange of information on experience acquired by the NPs while establishing their respective procedures for scrutiny of Europol's activities and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. Moreover, COSAC should be informed regularly on state of evaluations of Europol and Eurojust decisions and on preparatory works on new regulations. According to Annual report 2009 on relations between the European Commission and national Parliaments, the latter should be closely associated to these preparatory works. Therefore, not only representatives of Europol and Eurojust but also representatives of the Commission's services responsible for drafting of regulations should be invited. Representatives of the academic community, judiciary and/or law enforcement services shall be invited on ad hoc basis (i.e. not regularly).*

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

*The Senate is of the opinion that regular participation of specialised parliamentary committees at COSAC meetings should not be introduced. It should remain up to individual NPs whether the representatives of such committees will join the respective COSAC delegation. Besides, special committees have their own inter-parliamentary meetings (COFFAC, committees on economic and monetary affairs, budgets, consumer protection, agriculture, environment, home affairs, regional development, etc.).*

---

<sup>34</sup> See document [Resolution of the Committee on European Union Affairs of the Czech Senát](http://www.cosac.eu/en/meetings/Madrid2010/ordinary.doc/) on COSAC web pages <http://www.cosac.eu/en/meetings/Madrid2010/ordinary.doc/>

<sup>35</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*The Senate does not support this idea. Due to the budgetary restrictions many NPs have to cope with, existing platforms and meetings should be used to maximum extent possible. For instance, NPs should endeavour to involve representatives of civil society and other stakeholders to the scrutiny process or to organize meetings with their respective MEPs.*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

*The Senate is of the opinion that there is still a space for improvement of existing tools. IPEX database has a huge potential to be a user-friendly and instantly usable tool for acquiring information on scrutiny process in NPs. The necessary condition for this is reliability of data, regular up-dating, availability of translations to an EU working language and uniform interpretation of IPEX symbols.*

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*No (except for technical changes of references to Lisbon Treaty - instead of Amsterdam Treaty, or Conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs - instead of Conference of Community and European Affairs Committees of Parliaments of the EU).*

## **Denmark: Folketing**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

On 15 January 2010 the Folketing's Trade and Industry Committee, Science and Technology Committee, Labour Market Committee, Environment and Regional Planning Committee and European Affairs Committee adopted a joint opinion on the Europe 2020 Strategy, which was submitted to the European Commission. However the Folketing took no explicit stand on the question raised above.

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

The Folketing has taken no explicit stand on the question raised above.

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

The Folketing has taken no explicit stand on the question raised above.

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

The Folketing has taken no explicit stand on the question raised above.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

The Folketing has taken no explicit stand on the question raised above.

### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

The Folketing has not yet taken any explicit stand on the question raised above. However thus far the European Affairs Committee has acted as coordinating committee on the EU 2020 strategy. It has been a subject of discussion in the Committee how to oversee the decision-making process related to the implementation of the EU2020 strategy.

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

This has not yet been decided. It will depend on the type of action needed for the “follow-up”. To the extent new legislation is required for the implementation the competent sectoral committees will be involved.

However, thus far the European Affairs Committee has acted as coordinating committee on the EU 2020 strategy. Also the following sectoral committees were involved in the examination of the Commissions communication of the Europe 2020 strategy in January 2010, which was concluded with the adoption of a joint opinion on the matter: The Trade and Industry Committee, Science and Technology Committee, Labour Market Committee, Environment and Regional Planning Committee and European Affairs Committee (Se reply to question 1.1).

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

This is currently not being considered.

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

The Folketing has not yet explicitly addressed the question raised above.

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

YES it is important that national parliaments meet regularly to discuss common foreign and security policy issues in order to facilitate improved parliamentary scrutiny on CFSP and CSDP at the national level.

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only? It should cover both.

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- 
- The appropriate forum for interparliamentary cooperation on CFSP would be an interparliamentary Conference including up to six delegates per Member State Parliament. The delegations should be composed of the chairpersons of national parliaments' foreign policy committees, defence committees and European Affairs Committees.
- 
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- 
- Yes the parliament of the Member State holding the presidency should be in charge of preparing and chairing interparliamentary conferences on CFSP and CSDP. Planning and preparations should take place in close cooperation with the other parliaments of the trio and the COSAC Secretariat should assist the presidency in its preparations and organisation of the conferences.
- 
- Please specify other modalities.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so, COSAC should play the part, which is foreseen in Protocol 1 para. 10 of the Lisbon Treaty.

- In what form? See reply to question 4.2
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC? No
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP? No
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues? No
- What changes/reforms are needed?

4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so, Yes

In what form?

COFACC and CODAC should be replaced by an interparliamentary body on CFSP and CSDP which includes the chairpersons of foreign policy committees, defence committees and European Affairs Committees.

- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"? No
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP? No
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis? Yes
- If on a regular basis, at what interval? Biannually
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues? See reply above to question 4.2
- What changes/reforms are needed? See reply above to question 4.2

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so, No

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

This has not yet been decided

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

A mixed body including members of the European Parliament.

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

The European Parliament should participate on equal footing with national parliaments with up to six delegates and should therefore have member status.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

By organising an annual debate in COSAC on the role of national parliaments. The COSAC Secretariat's biannual reports could facilitate this debate by reporting on how

national parliaments carry out their new tasks and on any new developments in procedures and practises.

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

COSAC provides a good framework for MP's to discuss issues regarding subsidiarity with representatives of the European Commission and the European Parliament.

It could be considered to introduce a procedure whereby 1/4 of the parliaments could ask to have a subsidiarity check run on a particular EU legislative proposal. Or it could be considered to put a legislative proposal on the agenda of COSAC for discussion either at the request of 1/4 of national parliaments or if decided by the troika.

Finally it should be decided to carry out a review of any such arrangements after 2 or 3 years.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

If such a debate is organised it would ideally take place shortly after the Commission's Work Programme is published in the autumn. Therefore when fixing the date of future COSAC-meetings in the second half of the year, COSAC-Presidencies should take into account the time of publication of the Commission's work programme.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

Only if COSAC is going to play a role in discussing the EU's CFSP and CSDP – otherwise not.

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>36</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

Yes preferably debates on Europol and Eurojust in COSAC should be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.



committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

COSAC should not be an exclusive forum of members of European affairs committees, but should also be open to members of sectoral committees. Thus it should be left to each national parliament to decide on the composition of its own delegation allowing it to include members of sectoral committees dealing with European affairs.

However this would probably require an amendment of para. 4.1 of COSAC's rules of procedure, which states that "Each national parliament shall be represented by a maximum of six members of its community and European Affairs Committee". An amended article could read as follows: "Each national parliament shall be represented by a maximum of six members of its competent committees".

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

The idea of organising a European week is good.

It could be considered to revive the old idea of organising a European week presented by René van der Linden and Frans Timmermans and fifty other members and alternates of the European Convention. They proposed that Member State national parliaments should organise a (coinciding) parliamentary debate on a European issue in the same week in order to raise national European awareness.

The proposal was discussed both at the level of Speakers (Copenhagen 2006) and in COSAC. The Speakers in Copenhagen recommended that parliaments should organise a coinciding debate in the week following the Commission's presentation of its Work Programme.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

The Folketing has not yet taken any stand on the question raised above

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

As mentioned in the reply to question 6 also para. 4.1 of the rules of procedure on the composition of COSAC should be amended so as to allow members of sectoral committees to attend COSAC-meetings.

## **Estonia: Riigikogu**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

**1.1.** Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

- **Yes, all the political standpoints are covered.**

**1.2.** Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

- **We believe that it is complicated to predict precisely what the economic and scientific developments will be, but as much as one can presume Estonian Parliament consider that the Europe 2020 Strategy takes into account the economic and scientific developments.**

**1.3.** Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

- **European Affairs Committee of Estonian Parliament has not yet considered this issue.**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

**2.1.** In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	x	
2. sustainable transport	x	
3. sustainable consumption and production	x	
4. conservation and management of natural resources	x	
5. public health	x	
6. social inclusion, demography and migration	x	
7. global poverty and sustainable development	x	

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

**Yes. European Union Affairs Committee believes that the strategy foresees enough instruments.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

**Yes. We believe that the decision-making process is sufficiently stringent for the Member States.**

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

**In Estonian Parliament the European Union Affairs Committee will be in charge of follow-up of the Europe 2020 Strategy through giving the opinion on European Commissions initiatives/proposals. The Estonian Government (actually Strategy Unit, that supports planning the work of the Government of the Republic and coordinates the drawing up and carrying out of the Government's action plan, together with the representatives from ministries) has taken the EU 2020 Strategy process very seriously (Estonia 2020). We have set up our own targets and these targets will be included in national strategy plans. But we are in an opinion that in order to ensure successful implementation of the EUROPE 2020 strategy, a strong link between the strategy and the EU budget must be created.**

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

**If these targets are set in national strategy plans/development plans then every Committee (in the Parliament) will follow up these objectives that are established. All the reporting about accomplish the headline targets to the European Union will be done by the Government through the Ministries.**

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

-

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

**To strengthen the sustainable development aspect the EU 2020 strategy should regain scope for action and be able to mobilize the necessary resources to sustain growth-enhancing investments while ensuring the sustainability of public finances and social protection systems in order to maintain intergenerational solidarity and cohesion.**

**Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

**The Foreign affairs Committee and Defence Committee of the Riigikogu are in the process of discussing the issue, thus it is not possible to answer the questions at this point (September 15)**

**Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

**Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent? **By means of information exchange, best practices etc- via either bi-annual reports or COSAC agenda itself**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice? **By means of information exchange- IPEX and Permanent Representatives in the EP**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP? **Yes, if deemed necessary by the content of the Agenda**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>37</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services? **As an item of the agenda. Indeed, other important actors could be invited**

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation. **In our case, the Members of the EU Affairs Committee are Members in other standing Committees as well, so the specialized input would not be a problem. In more general terms, it depends on the will and readiness of National Parliaments and their respective Members and Committees, how their specific cooperation could be organised.**

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect? **We are rather cautious in organising such events as we try to communicate the EU issues taking into account our own specific situation. The proposal needs to be elaborated in a more detailed way in order to answer it more specifically.**

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects? **No**

## **Finland: Eduskunta**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**We do not think that a yes/no answer is appropriate.**

**The Eduskunta is of the opinion that the Europe 2020 strategy is first and foremost a political agreement between the Member States and the Institutions on the basis of which Member States shall undertake measures which mainly belong to national competencies. The Strategy itself does not sufficiently guarantee its effectiveness – without an effective enforcement at the national level the outcome of the Strategy will be as disappointing as the outcome of the Lisbon Strategy.**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**See above.**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**No. Especially the Eduskunta has stressed the need to integrate the Roma Question into the Strategy: discrimination against the Roma people is one of the main unresolved human rights issue within the EU.**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		

5. public health

---

6. social inclusion, demography and migration

---

7. global poverty and sustainable development

**We do not think yes/no answers are appropriate or unequivocal.**

**Generally speaking, the Eduskunta has emphasised that ambitious environmental policy and sustainable development must be seen as engines for economic growth. The Eduskunta considers that this viewpoint has not sufficiently been integrated into the Strategy. This structural flaw leads to a lack of concrete target setting at the EU level.**

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

**See above.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

**Decision-making process: The Strategy was adopted in great haste at the EU level. This may have impaired the ability of member states and national parliaments alike profoundly to evaluate and discuss the Strategy. This may have a negative effect on the overall commitment of the relevant actors within each member state to attain the objectives of the Strategy.**

**Oversight by the national parliaments: In Finland the oversight exercised by the Eduskunta directly flows from the Finnish Constitutional Provisions. As far as Finland's negotiating positions and the objectives of the strategy are concerned, the Government is politically obliged to take the Eduskunta's views into account. The Government is furthermore expected to resubmit the matter to the Parliament when any significant change concerning the strategy, its follow-up and or the Finnish position is foreseen.**

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

**Chambers in charge: The Grand Committee and the sector Committees.**

**Accountability: As stated above, the government is politically obliged to take the Eduskunta's views into account. The Government must consult with the Eduskunta and it must also explain and justify the policies it adopts.**

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

**The procedure is the same as in all other EU matters, i.e. the Government is required to communicate to the Eduskunta all EU proposals falling within the competence of Eduskunta according to the Constitution. The purpose of the scrutiny is to authorise the Government negotiating position with respect to the proposal.**

**The Finnish Constitution guarantees the rights of Eduskunta to participate in the national preparation of EU affairs. The Eduskunta primarily scrutinises documents describing the Government's negotiation position, with the documents of the EU institutions as**

**background material. In addition, national implementing measures are subject to scrutiny in the same way as any other government activity.**

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

-

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

**By actively participating in the decision making process within the realms of various national constitutional arrangements.**

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

**Yes. However, we would underline that interparliamentary exchange is useful only to the extent that it reflects active and effective scrutiny at the national level: Periodic conferences are useful for dialogue, for establishing best practices and benchmarks and for debating focal issues, but they can not replace actual scrutiny by each national parliament.**

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

**Both, as CSDP is an integral part of CSFP. (In the interest of precision, we would prefer not to call it "interparliamentary scrutiny"; it is more in the nature of interparliamentary cooperation on scrutiny.)**

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- **Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?**
- **Please specify other modalities.**

**No. The Eduskunta is of the opinion that cooperation of such a nature falls mainly within the competences of the COFACC and there is no need for further cooperation forums. In any case, scrutiny is the task of each parliament, vis-à-vis each national government. Any interparliamentary cooperation would/should be complementary to this scrutiny.**

**On CFSP - including CSDP - the COFACC is already a well-functioning platform for interparliamentary debate. There is no need to create a new forum which would only duplicate the existing system.**



4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

**Yes, as reasoned above.**

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

**No, as reasoned above. Also, in Finland and probably in other member states, CFSP and CSDP are in the remit of other committees than the EU Committee.**

**Although COSAC as such should not play a role in CFSP/CSDP, we do believe that there is a case for looking at COSAC's institutional structure. In our reply to the previous bi-annual report, we suggested that the various 'permanent' conferences – while retaining their independence – could be subsumed in the COSAC structure and utilise the COSAC secretariat. We still believe this option deserves to be examined.**

4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

**Yes, as reasoned above.**

**It is up to COFACC as a forum of political debate to decide on the desired level of scrutiny and its form. A different question is however whether COSAC Secretariat could also function as a COFACC Secretariat for the purpose of assisting the Presidency and the Troika in preparing COFACC meetings. Such an arrangement might help intensify the co-operation of national parliaments in COFACC matters.**

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

**No**

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

**No**

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

**We prefer a forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only. It should be noted that CFSP and CSDP are determined by the EU Council. Any EP involvement would be hard to reconcile with the Lisbon Treaty.**

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

**If any, observer status. In any case, the possible role given to the European Parliament cannot exceed its competences based on the EU Treaties. This would preclude any arrangement where the EP could, for example, influence the conclusions of the interparliamentary cooperation.**

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

**Exchange of information and views on pending EU legislative initiatives and other topical EU affairs is always beneficial to all parties. COSAC should enable dialogue at the early stages of handling EU draft legislative acts and other actions.**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

**One should concentrate on exchanging best practices. Also, maintaining effective communication tools, e.g. up-to-date e-mailing lists, is a vital, if unglamorous task.**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

**It is up to the chairperson to decide on the practical organisation of the debate.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

**Yes. COSAC must have the discretion to invite whoever it wants to hear. It is up to each presidency to decide what is opportune.**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>38</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**We would consider anything on an *ad hoc* or experimental basis as no one knows yet what the monitoring mentioned in the Treaty will mean concretely.**

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

**We would consider anything on an *ad hoc* or experimental basis. Whatever the form and organisation one should avoid unnecessary overlap. One should bear in mind that many specialist committees have developed successfully their own recurring conferences with distinct identities. If COSAC's institutional framework, especially its secretariat, could be made available to conferences of sector committees, this might well be beneficial for all concerned.**

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

**No. The Eduskunta handles EU affairs on a daily basis. Hence, we do not see that such a week would have added value to the daily work of the Eduskunta. Also, we would note that such coordinated thematic weeks/days have been tried in the past, with very poor results.**

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

**One should concentrate on encouraging national parliaments to increase the usage level of IPEX. As the usage level increases, the national position formation concerning EU documents can be comprehensively examined in real time.**

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

**We could – but we do not see it as a necessity - consider a modification in the Rules of procedure for the purpose of organising interparliamentary conferences on specific topics.**

## **France: Assemblée nationale**

Paris, le 21 septembre 2010

### **Eléments de réponse au questionnaire de la COSAC**

#### **Chapitre 1. La stratégie EUROPE 2020**

##### **Questions 1.1 à 2.2**

La commission des affaires européennes de l'Assemblée nationale a adopté le 25 mai 2010 des conclusions sur la stratégie « Europe 2020 » et sur le gouvernement économique européen.

Dans ces conclusions, elle « *considère que la stratégie « Europe 2020 » ne pourra être un succès que si trois conditions sont réunies : une série d'objectifs ciblés, une complémentarité entre les actions des Etats membres de l'UE et les politiques communautaires, et une gouvernance renforcée* » et qu' « *on ne peut que souscrire aux grands objectifs retenus, mais que leur déclinaison au niveau de chacun des Etats membres et au niveau de l'Union devra consister en une série de projets concrets, et que la responsabilité du pilotage doit incomber au Conseil européen* ».

##### **Questions 3.1 à 3.5**

La commission des affaires européennes examinera, dans le cadre de la procédure prévue à l'article 88-4 de la Constitution, les projets d'actes européens relevant de la stratégie « Europe 2020 ».

Les autres modalités du suivi de la stratégie « Europe 2020 » n'ont pas encore été définies. Une réflexion est en cours sur l'implication de l'Assemblée nationale dans la procédure du « semestre européen » qui s'appliquera à partir de 2011.

Dans le cadre de la stratégie de Lisbonne, la commission des affaires européennes et les commissions permanentes concernées (commission des finances et commission des affaires économiques) étaient intervenues (transmission du programme national de réforme et des rapports de suivi par le Gouvernement, audits du ministre de l'économie).

## **Chapitre 2. Contrôle parlementaire de la PSDC**

Des réflexions sont en cours sur les solutions permettant de sortir du paradoxe du traité de Lisbonne qui renforce la PSDC et favorise l'émergence d'une politique extérieure globale sans prévoir de contrôle parlementaire adéquat, la création d'une structure lourde étant exclue. La question est d'autant plus importante qu'intervient au même moment la dissolution de l'UEO, qui sera effective en 2010, et par conséquent la disparition de son assemblée parlementaire.

La Commission des affaires européennes de l'Assemblée nationale a en effet adopté, sur le rapport n° 2631 du 16 juin 2010 présenté par M. Yves Bur et Mme Elisabeth Guigou, députés, sur la réforme de la gouvernance de la politique extérieure de l'Union européenne, une proposition de résolution qui aborde aussi la question du contrôle de la politique extérieure et de la politique de défense par les parlements nationaux et le parlement européen.

Le point correspondant est ainsi rédigé :

« [L'Assemblée nationale] *Propose d'organiser un contrôle global et cohérent par les parlements nationaux et le Parlement européen de la politique extérieure européenne, à partir des considérations suivantes :*

– *la coopération interparlementaire permet de débattre et éventuellement d'adopter des positions communes indicatives, mais le Parlement européen et les parlements nationaux restent libres d'exercer leur contrôle respectif dans le cadre des compétences fixées par le traité et les constitutions nationales,*

– *la coopération interparlementaire doit à la fois respecter la délimitation des espaces respectifs de contrôle parlementaire par le traité et refléter la volonté du traité de dépasser la fragmentation des politiques pour assurer la cohérence d'une politique extérieure,*

– *l'organisation de la coopération interparlementaire doit donc être suffisamment souple pour que, selon les cas, le Parlement européen puisse débattre avec les parlements nationaux de la politique de défense qui relève en principe des seuls parlements nationaux, mais aussi que les parlements nationaux puissent débattre avec le Parlement européen de tous les aspects d'une politique extérieure globale et cohérente, y compris des relations extérieures de l'Union ou des volets extérieurs des politiques communes lorsqu'ils interagissent avec la politique étrangère et de sécurité commune. »*

Cette rédaction a été adoptée sans modification par la Commission des affaires étrangères de l'Assemblée nationale, dans sa réunion du 17 juin dernier, sur le rapport de Mme Nicole Ameline et M. Gaëtan Gorce, députés (rapport n° 2633 du 17 juin 2010).

Dans cette perspective, la résolution européenne du Sénat n° 86 du 11 avril 2010, intervenue sur une initiative de la commission des affaires européenne du Sénat de mars 2010, ensuite approuvée par la Commission des affaires étrangères, visant à créer une structure souple selon le modèle de la COSAC réunissant des parlementaires des 27 Etats membres compétents en matière de défense, ou à défaut, des seuls « *parlements nationaux les plus motivés sur une base volontaire* » représente une hypothèse de travail.

Si elle ne recueillait pas l'assentiment, la disposition de l'article 10 du protocole n° 1 annexé au traité de Lisbonne qui permet à la COSAC d'organiser des conférences interparlementaires « *sur des thèmes particuliers, notamment pour débattre des questions de politique étrangère et de sécurité* » offre la perspective d'une solution s'appuyant sur une structure éprouvée et associant déjà parlements nationaux et parlement européen.

### **Chapitre 3. Le futur de la COSAC**

1- Le suivi des nouvelles prérogatives dévolues aux parlements nationaux par le traité de Lisbonne **demeure l'une des priorités nécessaires de la COSAC**. En pratique, cela implique en particulier que la COSAC conserve son rôle moteur dans l'implication des parlements nationaux au regard du contrôle de la subsidiarité, en particulier en consacrant des débats aux textes ayant fait l'objet d'un avis dans un nombre significatif d'Etat membre.

2- Dans cet esprit, il apparaît utile que le Secrétariat de la COSAC assume une **mission de veille sur les contrôles de subsidiarité entrepris par les parlements nationaux**, par exemple en alertant rapidement les commissions des affaires européennes lorsqu'un même texte rencontre l'hostilité d'un nombre significatif (5 par exemple) de parlements. En parallèle, il apparaît opportun qu'un débat rapide soit consacré, au cours de la COSAC ordinaire, au bilan des contrôles effectués dans les parlements nationaux.

3- Le débat sur le programme de travail de la Commission pourrait utilement s'inspirer du débat traditionnellement organisé sur les priorités de la présidence semestrielle. La Commission des affaires européennes de l'Assemblée nationale a toutefois remarqué qu'il lui semblait plus utile encore de **programmer des débats sur des propositions d'actes législatifs concrets, choisis en commun** pour l'intérêt qu'il représente à l'égard des parlements nationaux.

4- L'audition d'orateurs extérieurs à l'Union ne pose **aucune difficulté**.

5- Il importe de **ne pas enfermer l'évaluation d'Europol et d'Eurojust dans une pratique figée et routinière**. Dans ce contexte, une audition systématique de leurs représentants au cours de chaque réunion de la COSAC ne paraît pas opportune. En revanche, il serait utile

que, par principe, **un thème de débats durant les réunions ordinaires soit consacré à l'évaluation de l'espace de liberté, de sécurité et de justice, sur un sujet précis** et selon une forme laissée à l'initiative de la présidence. Dans ce cadre, une attention particulière pourrait être consacrée à Europol et/ou Eurojust.

6- Il pourrait être utile d'inviter des représentants des commissions spécialisées à certains débats de la COSAC. Toutefois, **cette invitation ne saurait être systématique**, resterait soumise à l'appréciation de chacune des commissions des affaires européennes concernées et serait exclusivement liée à la nature du débat concerné (en particulier, par exemple, lorsque la COSAC débat d'une proposition législative particulière qui intéresse directement une commission spécialisée).

7- Cette question n'a pas encore fait l'objet d'une position de la Commission des affaires européennes. Toutefois, l'idée d'une « semaine européenne » dans les parlements nationaux mérite d'être explorée plus en avant. Dans un même esprit, il serait possible d'envisager **l'organisation d'un débat européen, tenu dans tous les parlements nationaux au même moment, par exemple à l'occasion de la journée européenne du 9 mai**.

8- La Commission des affaires européennes de l'Assemblée nationale est très attachée à l'utilisation des nouvelles technologies afin d'approfondir le dialogue entre les parlementaires nationaux et avec le parlement européen. Ainsi a-t-elle été la première en Europe à **organiser une réunion commune avec une commission spécialisée du Parlement européen (IMCO) en visioconférence**, le 26 janvier 2010, sur la proposition de directive relative au droit des consommateurs. La COSAC pourrait utilement recourir à cette méthode, par exemple en organisant un débat sur une proposition législative particulière choisie en commun avec une commission spécialisée du Parlement européen.

9- Aucune autre modification du règlement de la COSAC ne semble nécessaire.



## **France: Sénat**

### **Chapitre 1<sup>er</sup>: Le développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020**

#### **Questions:**

##### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020*

1.1. Vu l'intention de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 d'établir une relation entre les différentes crises auxquelles nous sommes confrontés actuellement (économique, financière, sociale, écologique), est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que les points de vue politiques de cette Stratégie forment un ensemble bien intégré ?

1.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des développements économiques et scientifiques dans le reste du monde, comme par exemple aux États-Unis et en Chine ?

1.3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des conséquences sociales et environnementales et du respect des droits et l'homme (par exemple le droit à la nourriture) ?

##### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et la Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable*

2.1. La Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable identifie 7 défis, chacun accompagné d'un objectif général. Dans ce contexte, est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte de ces défis ? Veuillez spécifier votre réponse pour chaque défi avec un commentaire votre spécifications en faisant référence aux objectifs généraux susmentionnés.

	Oui	Non
1. changement climatique et énergie propre		
2. transports durables		
3. consommation et production durables		
4. préservation et gestion des ressources naturelles		
5. santé publique		
6. inclusion sociale, démographie et immigration		
7. pauvreté dans le monde et défis en matière de développement durable		

2.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 prévoit assez d'instruments pour (1) réaliser ces défis et (2) mesurer et (3) suivre leurs résultats (par exemple en introduisant des critères similaires aux critères de convergence de l'euro) ?

##### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et les Parlements nationaux*

3.1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que le processus décisionnel, lié à la Stratégie EUROPE 2020, est suffisamment contraignant pour les Etats membres et que le contrôle par les Parlements nationaux et, le cas échéant, régionaux est suffisamment assuré?

3.2. Quels sont les organes de votre Parlement/Chambre qui seront chargés du suivi de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et de quelle façon le gouvernement devra-t-il justifier ses actions tendant à la poursuite des objectifs de cette Stratégie ?

3.3. Décrivez brièvement les procédures parlementaires (au niveau national et, le cas échéant, au niveau régional).

3.4. Au cas où un tel organe ou une telle procédure parlementaire n'a pas encore été établi€, envisage-t-on de le(s) créer ?

3.5. Quelle serait la meilleure façon pour les Parlements/Chambres de contribuer au renforcement de l'aspect développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 ?

***Le Sénat français ne s'est pas encore prononcé sur la stratégie Europe 2020. Il n'est donc pas possible de répondre aujourd'hui à ces questions.***

## **Chapitre 2. Contrôle parlementaire de la Politique de sécurité et de défense commune (ci-après: «PSDC»)**

### **Questions:**

1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime utile un échange interparlementaire sur la PESC et la PCSD en vue d'améliorer le contrôle parlementaire au niveau national et/ou européen?

***Oui***

2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère que le contrôle parlementaire au niveau de l'UE devrait inclure aussi bien la PESC que la PCSD ou rien que la PCSD ?

***Le Sénat s'est prononcé seulement sur la PCSD, qui a été considérée comme une question prioritaire compte tenu de la disparition de l'Assemblée de l'UEO.***

3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère souhaitable l'installation d'un mécanisme, d'une structure ou d'un forum particulier en vue de l'organisation d'une coopération et d'un contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?

***Oui. Dans la résolution qu'il a adoptée, le Sénat estime que « la disparition de l'assemblée de l'UEO doit être subordonnée à la mise en place d'une structure permettant de réunir des parlementaires spécialisés dans les questions de défense des vingt-sept États membres (c'est-à-dire émanant des commissions chargées des questions de défense), ou du moins de ceux des vingt sept États membres qui le souhaitent. Cette structure, souple, pourrait être conçue sur le modèle organique de la COSAC (au maximum six parlementaires par État membre ; une réunion par semestre ; présence de six membres du Parlement européen). L'organisation et le secrétariat de cette structure devraient relever des parlements nationaux, par rotation, sur la base d'une réunion par semestre. »***

Le cas échéant,

- Est-ce que celui-ci devrait prendre la forme d'une nouvelle commission/ conférence/ organisation/ institution interparlementaire ?
- **Est-ce que l'état membre de la Présidence tournante devrait y avoir un rôle spécial ?**
- **Veillez spécifier d'autres modalités.**

*A supposer que les parlements de tous les États membres participent, la présidence tournante devrait avoir le même rôle que dans le cas de la COSAC.*

*A supposer que certains parlements décident de ne pas participer, le Sénat estime, dans la résolution qu'il a adoptée, que le contrôle interparlementaire pourrait être mené « dans le cadre d'une coopération rassemblant les parlements nationaux les plus motivés sur une base volontaire. La réunion semestrielle serait alors organisée, par rotation, dans l'un des parlements nationaux participant à cette coopération. »*

4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre préfère un modèle ou un arrangement institutionnel existant pour organiser la coopération et le contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?

4.1. Est-ce que la COSAC devrait jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ? Le cas échéant,

- Sous quelle forme ?
- Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COSAC ?
- Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COSAC devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
- Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
- Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
- Est-ce que vous estimez que la COSAC doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
- Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?

***La COSAC pourrait jouer le rôle de caution juridique de la nouvelle structure, compte tenu de la rédaction du protocole n° 1. Mais l'initiative pourrait être également prise par les parlements nationaux les plus motivés.***

***Dans tous les cas, la nouvelle structure de coopération devrait être complètement distincte de la COSAC. En particulier, elle devrait avoir une composition appropriée, afin de s'appuyer sur les commissions compétentes en matière de défense.***

4.2. Est-ce que la COFACC et/ou la «CODAC» devrai(en)t jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ? Le cas échéant,

- Sous quelle forme ?
- Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» ?
- Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
- Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
- Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
- Est-ce que vous estimez que la COFACC ou la «CODAC» doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
- Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?

***La nouvelle structure de coopération devrait absorber la « CODAC ».***

4.3. Est-ce qu'une autre conférence/organisation/institution devrait encore jouer un rôle dans ce contrôle ? Le cas échéant,

- Laquelle ?
- Sous quelle forme ?
- Veuillez spécifier d'autres modalités.

*Non*

5. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est prêt à mettre à disposition des budgets pour ce contrôle ?

*Oui, d'autant que le coût sera notablement inférieur à celui du fonctionnement de l'Assemblée de l'UEO.*

6. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est partisan d'un mécanisme/d'une structure/d'un forum composé(e) de membres des seuls Parlements nationaux ou d'un organe mixte avec des membres du Parlement européen ?

*Le Parlement européen devrait être représenté, comme c'est le cas pour la COSAC.*

7. Est-ce que, au sujet de la coopération interparlementaire relative à la PESC et/ou à la PCSD, votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que le Parlement européen devrait être doté du statut de membre ou d'observateur ?

*Voir réponse à la question précédente.*

### **Chapitre 3. Le rôle futur de la COSAC après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Lisbonne – suite du débat de la XLIII COSAC**

#### **Questions:**

1. La Contribution de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 10.1) stipule que «Assurer le suivi du rôle des Parlements nationaux comme souligné en particulier dans l'Article 12 du Traité sur l'Union européenne et ses Protocoles respectifs restera l'une des priorités de la COSAC». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment et dans quelle mesure ce suivi peut-il mis en œuvre en pratique ?

*La COSAC devrait veiller à la pleine application de l'article 12 du TUE, notamment en utilisant ses contributions pour en demander une mise en œuvre effective.*

2. La Contribution de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 10.2) stipule que «Le système appelé «Système d'alerte précoce» tel qu'établi dans le Protocole (n°2) et le mécanisme de coordination entre les Parlements nationaux devraient jouer un rôle approprié dans la COSAC». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment la COSAC devrait-elle assumer cette tâche en pratique ?

*La COSAC devrait favoriser l'échange d'information entre parlements.*

3. Quelle est l'opinion de votre Parlement/Chambre sur l'organisation pratique d'un débat, dans le cadre de la COSAC, relatif au Programme de travail de la Commission européenne ?

*Le Sénat, sans être opposé au principe d'un tel débat, estime qu'il ne faut l'organiser que si la date de la réunion de la COSAC permet que ce débat soit utile.*

4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère acceptable l'invitation d'orateurs externes à l'Union européenne (par exemple le Secrétaire général de l'OTAN, l'Ambassadeur des États-Unis, etc.) pour informer la COSAC en ce qui concerne la PESC et/ou la PCSD ?

***Le Sénat estime que les questions relatives à la PCSD ne doivent pas relever de la COSAC, mais d'une structure de coopération spécifique.***

5. Des réponses au questionnaire ayant mené au 13<sup>ème</sup> rapport semestriel, il s'est avéré qu'une large majorité des Parlements/Chambres<sup>39</sup> soutenait l'idée d'ajouter le sujet du contrôle politique d'Europol et de l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust en tant que point régulier de l'ordre du jour de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, de quelle manière ces débats devraient-ils être tenus ? En particulier, les débats en COSAC devraient-ils être précédés d'auditions de représentants d'Europol et Eurojust ou cette évaluation introductive devrait-elle être présentée par, par exemple, des représentants du monde académique, judiciaire et/ou des services de police ?

***Les débats devraient être précédés d'auditions de représentants d'Europol et d'Eurojust.***

6. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré d'inviter les commissions parlementaires spécialisées à participer aux activités de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre préférerait-il augmenter la coopération avec les commissions parlementaires spécialisées dans le cadre de la COSAC ou en dehors de celui-ci ? Au cas où préférence est donnée au cadre de la COSAC, veuillez spécifier les modalités possibles d'une telle coopération.

***La COSAC doit rester une structure de coopération entre les commissions chargées des affaires européennes.***

7. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré l'organisation d'une «Semaine européenne» dans les Parlements nationaux. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre soutient-il la suggestion d'organiser une telle «Semaine européenne» et, le cas échéant, de quelle manière en envisage-t-il l'organisation pratique ? La COSAC devrait-elle prendre une initiative à ce sujet ?

***L'idée de la « semaine européenne » a été évoquée, mais la réflexion sur les modalités pratiques n'a pas été lancée.***

***Une telle initiative paraît être davantage de la compétence de la Conférence des présidents de parlements que de la COSAC. De plus, cette initiative devrait être précédée d'une réflexion sur le contenu et les modalités d'une éventuelle « semaine européenne ».***

8. Les Conclusions de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 3.4) stipulent que «la COSAC devrait refléter comment les nouvelles technologies, telles que les vidéoconférences, et les forums, tels qu'IPEX, pourraient être employés et optimisés afin de donner effet à l'Article 10 du Protocole (n° 1) sur le Rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment, en pratique, de nouvelles technologies pourraient-elles être employées et optimisées par la COSAC ?

***La COSAC devrait encourager le développement et l'amélioration d'IPEX.***

9. Les Conclusions de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 3.6) stipulent que «Le Règlement devrait limiter les temps de parole à 3 minutes, à moins que la Présidence n'en décide autrement, en tenant compte des circonstances spécifiques». Votre Parlement/Chambre est-il d'avis que le Règlement de la COSAC devrait être modifié sur d'autres points ?

***La Présidence devrait fixer un délai limite pour l'envoi des propositions d'ajout ou de modification au projet de contribution. Il ne devrait plus être possible ensuite que de présenter des amendements de compromis.***

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid. – p. 47

## **Germany: Bundestag**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

***Remark:** On June 10, 2010 the Bundestag has adopted a common motion of the CDU/CSU and the FDP parliamentary groups on the EUROPE 2020 Strategy (Bundestag, printed paper 17/1758). Two other motions on the same topic, one by the SPD parliamentary group, one by The Greens, were rejected. The following answers are based on the named adopted motion.*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

*A collective approach of the Member States as foreseen by Europe 2020 Strategy is the key to emerge stronger from the crisis. Moreover, through the strategy's implementation crystal clear targets have to be defined.*

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

*This question is not reflected in the motion but was part of the Bundestag's deliberations.*

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

*The fact that social aspects are taken into account by the new strategy, especially the objective to increase the employment rate, was appreciated by all parliamentary groups. In detail, especially concerning the indicators for poverty, unemployment etc., the discussion was controversial.*

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

*Following the complex parliamentary debate in the German Bundestag, a global answer to these questions cannot be given.*

Yes

No

1. climate change and clean energy
2. sustainable transport
3. sustainable consumption and production
4. conservation and management of natural resources
5. public health
6. social inclusion, demography and migration
7. global poverty and sustainable development

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

*All in all, the Strategy was estimated positively, especially in comparison to the predeceasing strategy. Concerning the possibilities to meet the challenges the implementation of the Strategy by the Member States was estimated crucial. In the debate, the general necessity to measure and monitor the results as well as to develop adequate mechanisms was assessed as crucial for the outcome of the strategy.*

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

*The implementation of the Strategy follows the regular scrutiny procedure. All relevant specialised committees were involved. National implementation and feasibility of the Strategy were crucial issues in the parliamentary discussion, receiving much attention.*

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

*The parliamentary control of government's work on the Europe 2020 Strategy follows the general parliamentary control mechanisms. Most importantly: The Bundestag must be given the opportunity to deliver an opinion and the Federal Government must report regularly and continuously to the responsible parliamentary bodies (EU Affairs and specialised committees).*

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

*The EU Committee was in the lead. Apart from various reports (oral and written) by the government, the Bundestag as a whole used its participation rights by delivering an opinion which was prepared by the EU Affairs committee as the leading committee and supported by five committees asked for an opinion (Budget, Economic Affairs, Labour and Social Issues, Environment, Education). Deliberations in the plenary completed the discussions.*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

--

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*By continuing to participate in the formulation, implementation and monitoring process, especially concerning the implementation in the Member States.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

***Remark:** Parliamentary scrutiny rights of the German Bundestag concerning CSFP and CSDP have been enhanced with the new accompanying laws as one result of the Federal Constitutional Courts decision in June 2009. The related deliberations contained the intention to evaluate the implementation of the new scrutiny rights after a certain practice period.*

*Concerning the interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level, so far there has been no official decision (opinion, motion) of the EU Affairs Committee or the German Bundestag as a whole on the parliamentary scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP. However, the stakeholders are aware of the new legal framework, esp. of Article 10 Protocol No 1, Treaty of Lisbon and of the phasing-out of WEU in July 2011. Organizational and political aspects are being discussed. Thus, a parliamentary decision making process can be expected still in 2010 or the beginning of 2011.*

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

*An interparliamentary exchange concentrating on an improved parliamentary control of CFSP and CSDP is welcomed.*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?



- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?
- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?
- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.
5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?
6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?
7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

*One of COSAC's most important tasks is the exchange of information and best practices. Concerning the new rights of national parliaments resulting from the Lisbon Treaty, especially Protocol No. 2, this function has become even more important. Monitoring the role of national parliaments under the new legal provisions will be carried out through a direct exchange during COSAC conferences and through the COSAC network. New monitoring mechanisms are not necessary.*

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national

Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

*Coordination between national parliaments on subsidiarity questions should continue on an informal level. Nevertheless, additional mechanisms to exchange information on subsidiarity actions respectively an early warning system are desirable in order to make effective use of the new parliamentary rights. In practice, for example, a regularly updated document/list based on the EU Commission's annual policy strategy/Working Programme containing suggestions of national parliaments for EU legislative proposals that could be part of a subsidiarity check could be useful. The document could be administered for example by COSAC or IPEX.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

*Discussing the EU Commission's Working Programme can be an important point on the COSAC agenda. Nevertheless, the timetabling problems mentioned by Senator Bizet in his report should be taken into account. Thus, generally only a discussion timely close to the publication of the Programme is useful.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

*Generally, the focus of COSAC's work should be European institutions. However, a discussion with specialists from a certain field or with a certain background can selectively be useful.*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>40</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

*A final answer to the parliamentary control or monitoring of Europol or Eurojust cannot be given until the regulation foreseen by Article 88 Treaty on the European Union does exist. If COSAC chooses discussions/hearings, the invited persons should generally represent Europol and Eurojust in order to proceed parliamentary rights and to avoid abstract academic discussions.*

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

*The question of the participation of specialised committees is highly related to future parliamentary control of GSPF and GSDP. Concerning that, please refer to the comment*

*under Chapter 2.*

*Generally, in order to enhance parliamentary cooperation on the EU level cooperation of specialised committees should be intensified in any framework. However, in order continue COSAC's concentrated approach, specialised committees should only participate on concrete agenda points/from time to time.*

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*There is a high awareness of European Union issues in the German Bundestag. The plenary often has EU related issues on its agenda. Moreover, the meetings of the EU Committee are open to the public. From that perspective a European Week does not seem necessary.*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

*Parliamentary rights offered by the Lisbon Treaty ask for quick action from time to time, esp. concerning subsidiarity control. The use of new technologies could be very helpful to distribute updated information. IPEX could be a useful tool. Videoconferences could be helpful to offer an interparliamentary exchange apart from the regular COSAC meetings, e.g. working groups/task-forces on certain issues and as a preparation for the COSAC plenary.*

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*The three-minute time limit should become part of the COSAC Rules of Procedure.*

## Germany: Bundesrat

### Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy

#### Questions:

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**The Bundesrat has commented on a number of occasions on the Commission Communication on the EUROPE 2020 Strategy. In this context the Bundesrat has expressed its support for the underlying focus on sustainable growth, innovation and employment, along with increased integration of social and ecological considerations. The Bundesrat has welcomed the comprehensive view of economics expressed in this strategy, which emphasises sustainability and increased social cohesion as pre-requisites for economic competitiveness. In the Bundesrat's view, closer links between economic, social and environment policy goals are essential if the strategy is to be a success.**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**The Bundesrat considers that sustainable growth and employment are – and will continue to be - the key challenges for Europe's future. The Bundesrat therefore takes the view that the "EUROPE 2020" strategy should continue to concentrate on these overarching goals. One proviso however is that this must not cause excessive costs for firms, as this would undermine their international competitiveness.**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**The Bundesrat has not commented explicitly on these aspects. However, the Bundesrat does welcome the Commission's efforts to provide enhanced opportunities for lifelong access to social and economic life for all Europe's citizens and its focus on reducing poverty and social exclusion by removing obstacles to participation in the world of work, in particular for women, older employees, young people, the disabled and legal migrants. Creating jobs is the best way to fight poverty.**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

**The Bundesrat has not explicitly addressed the question of whether the seven central challenges cited in the EU Strategy for Sustainable Development are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy.**

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

**Initially the Bundesrat was opposed to suggestions concerning quantifying such criteria. In the Bundesrat's view, the mechanism of binding national objectives and monitoring by the Commission should not impinge upon the clear division of competences between the EU and the Member States established by the Treaty of Lisbon. However the Bundesrat has nevertheless called upon the Commission to ensure that the method for selecting indicators and the corresponding criteria, particularly in the realm of education, is readily comprehensible.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

**The Bundesrat has not yet expressed an opinion on this issue.**

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

**The Federal Government will involve the federal states in the process of drawing up the National Reform Programme in the context of the "EUROPE 2020" strategy. The Federal Government will submit the National Reform Programme to the Bundesrat for examination by the Bundesrat.**

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

**C.f. answer to question 3.2.**

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

**C.f. answer to question 3.2.**

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

**The Bundesrat sees the regions as important players in implementation of the overarching EUROPE 2020 Strategy and believes that it also is crucial to secure acceptance at this tier of the political system for the content of the guidelines based on this strategy and for the measures comprised in these guidelines. The EU should therefore show rigorous respect for the subsidiarity principle and restrict its role to providing a general framework, in keeping with the competences allocated to it, in order to ensure that scope remains for policy to be determined at the national and regional level.**

**Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

**Questions:**

**On questions 1 - 7:**

**The Bundesrat has not yet addressed the question of a successor organisation to the Assembly of the WEU.**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?
2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?
3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,
  - Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.
4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
    - In what form?
    - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
    - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
    - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?

- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?
- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?
- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.
5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?
6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?
7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

**COSAC, in particular thanks to the COSAC Bi-Annual Reports, makes it easier to exchange substantive information about the political work, procedures and particularities of national parliaments and/or the chambers of those parliaments. This also constitutes specific COSAC added-value. This system should be maintained. That means it would, for example, be advisable, for a COSAC report to address the impact on national parliaments of the Lisbon Treaty's institutional innovations as soon as these have been fully implemented and initial experience with the new provisions has been gleaned.**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

**Coordination of subsidiarity scrutiny should be continued. In the context of joint scrutiny of subsidiarity, attempts could be made to ensure more intensive coordination of national parliaments' positions. In addition, the option of exchanging and evaluating experience with the procedure for implementing the Early Warning System should be maintained in the COSAC context. In the first instance, sufficient experience with the Early Warning System should be gathered. This would provide a sound basis to organise a debate addressing the efficacy of the Early Warning System, with preparatory work done through the Bi-Annual Report. Independently of this, there should be scope within COSAC for national parliaments and/or chambers to address their current experience with the scrutiny procedure.**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

**The debate on the Work Programme of the European Commission should be based on an oral report by a senior Commission representative, which should concentrate on the key political priorities of the Work Programme. With a view to preparing the debate, the COSAC Chair could enquire which topics members wish to address and these topics could be examined in the Bi-Annual Report.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

**Generally speaking, guests invited to speak at the meetings should come from within the European Union.**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>41</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**Forthcoming debates on Europol and Eurojust could be structured in a manner similar to the discussion at COSAC in Paris from 2nd to 4th November 2008. The format chosen on that occasion led to a concentrated and informative debate.**

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.



committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

**Members of specialised committees could in the future be invited to attend as special guests when topics pertinent to their area of expertise are to be discussed. Decisions pertaining to inviting an extended circle of participants to meetings should be taken by the Presidency in office on the basis of an agreement with the Troika.**

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

**A European Week is held every year in early May in Germany, with each of the 16 federal states organising their own independent activities. Numerous information events and workshops addressing European themes are run under the aegis of the European Week. The Federal Government and the EU institutions are involved in preparing and implementing these activities.**

**Each parliament and/or chamber should be free to decide whether (and how) to organise a European Week.**

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

**The Bundesrat considers that there is no need to amend the Rules of Procedure at present.**

## Greece: Vouli Ton Ellinon

### Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy

#### Questions:

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

- 1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

*Drawing up an integrated ten-year programme on EU's development strategy , is considered as an initial positive step. The Commission's text presents a holistic, yet generalized approach.*

- 1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

*The Commission's Communication on Strategy EUROPE 2020 contains important and apt references to the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the planet. Nevertheless, a broader presentation and data analysis would be useful in order to formulate a fuller picture; for instance, substantial issue folds such as a reference to the European industries being transferred to China, China's degree of penetration into the American economy, patent/copyright indices e.t.c.*

- 1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

*Similarly, useful references are made to these issues as well. The goals set are satisfactory in what concerns the human rights field. Moreover, the agenda on environmental issues is interesting and original , thus reaffirming EU's consistency exhibited in the aforementioned issues.*

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

- 2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	X	

*The Europe 2020 Strategy further promotes the existing EU 's pioneer policy on environmental issues.*

2. sustainable transport	
3. sustainable consumption and production	X
4. conservation and management of natural resources	
5. public health	
6. social inclusion, demography and migration	X
<i>At this point it would be advisable to take into consideration clandestine migration's impact .</i>	
7. global poverty and sustainable development	X

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

*The implementation, control and assessment process as provided in EUROPE 2020 Strategy is a credible procedure already tested , in a range of variations , thus guaranteeing for the production of results, as well as for the safe resulting data elaboration . Special emphasis, however, should be given on the conclusions reached through the failure of the previous Lisbon Strategy, which, to a large extent are due to different economic and social development paces. From this point of departure, it is advisable that the pursued goals and policies applied take into account each member-state's particularities, magnitudes and capabilities. Further to the frame of interparliamentary dialogue taking place in COSAC, these data should be discussed and taken into consideration at all levels of EUROPE 2020 Strategy's development.*

#### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

*The decision making process associated to EUROPE 2020 Strategy involves both EU institutional organs and national parliaments, a fact that strengthens its legitimacy. The national parliaments' more active involvement is always oriented towards the direction of covering the democratic deficit and, therefore it is a pursued goal. However, the degree of each parliament's involvement into the national goal setting and implementation process is up to it ( the parliament and its way of controlling the executive power).*

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

*The Standing Committee for European Affairs is competent for following/monitoring EUROPE 2020 Strategy, coming into either independent sessions or joint-competence sessions with other sectoral committees. The Committee exercises parliamentary control, by inviting members of the Government to give an account of their activities, debates upon issues related to its competence and delivers opinions.*

*Even though these opinions are not binding, the ministers are obliged to justify their actions, if there is differentiation.*

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

*National parliamentary procedures are mentioned above. In regional level they do not exist.*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

*Up to present time, the Committee for European Affairs of the Hellenic Parliament has realized one session concerning the European Commission's Communication and has scheduled for the near future a joint session with the Special Committee on Research and Technology, with subject "Digital Agenda for Europe". Similar sessions are expected to take place on other initiatives, falling within the Strategy's frame, along with the introduction of dialogue with the competent governmental authorities for drawing up the national action plan.*

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*They could introduce procedures of self evaluation in terms of the impact of passed legislation on sustainable development.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

*Since these policies are intergovernmental, it is indispensable for National Parliaments to scrutinize their Governments' decisions. In order to perform this task effectively, members of competent committees should meet regularly and exchange views, as well as with high officials of the institutions involved, and other experts.*

*Moreover, our Parliament acknowledges the important contribution of the WEU Parliamentary Assembly and deems necessary the establishment of a new mechanism of interparliamentary scrutiny, to fill the gap following WEU's dissolution, according to the Lisbon Treaty provisions.*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

*According to the Treaty of Lisbon, CSDP is considered an integral part of CFSP. Therefore, we believe that they should be examined in a holistic approach, and not separately.*

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

*As most suitable we envisage a new structure, in the form of an interparliamentary conference, of competent committees, meeting regularly every six months in the country holding the Presidency.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

*COSAC consists of EU Affairs Committees' members. As such, it is not the most competent body to discuss specific issues referring to CFSP or CSDP, as lacking specialization and expertise. Moreover, in our Parliament's view, we should neither attempt to change COSAC's role and orientation, as a forum of exchanging best practices and views on broader issues concerning the EU, nor its composition.*

*COSAC could serve as a model for the function of this new conference, and especially in terms of coordination, the role of Presidential Troika etc.*

4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

*These conferences should be replaced by the proposed structure, which will deal with both foreign policy and security and defence, which are interlinked and complementary. In our case, these issues fall under the jurisdiction of the Standing Committee for National Defence and Foreign Affairs. In that sense, the integration of COFACC and CODAC into one does not pose any problem, as may be the case with Parliaments that have two separate committees dealing with these matters.*

*Preserving these conferences along with a new larger structure dealing with the same issues, would hinder efforts towards rationalization of interparliamentary cooperation.*

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

*None of the other existing conferences is considered competent.*

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

*We are convinced that we can work out a viable low-cost solution, both for the participating as well as for the hosting Parliament, making the best out of existing modalities. For example, a considerable part of administrative support could be given by COSAC secretariat. (We could examine the appointment of a second permanent officer with experience and expertise in defence matters). Moreover, the interpretation costs could be reduced, by using the scheme applied at the Speakers Conference.*

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

*Even though the European Parliament does not play an active role in the decision making process regarding CFSP and CSDP, we see as positive its participating in the dialogue, as an equal member..*

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

*See above.*

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

*An evaluation of the way these Treaty provisions are implemented and how the relations between National Parliaments and the EU institutions are being developed (something which is already being done with the Commission) is the way the Hellenic Parliament interprets the above mentioned excerpt from the XLIII COSAC Contribution.*

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national

Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

*It would be advisable to proceed through the method of questionnaires and synthesis of answers in the biannual reports, in order to have a background document, and in order to save time to debate on other more substantial issues besides the procedure, concerning the implementation of the Early Warning System.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

*Such a discussion is indispensable, and it would be very helpful if the Programme was published before the second semester COSAC meeting, in order to be presented there.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

*As stated in the previous section of the questionnaire, the Hellenic Parliament is of the opinion that a more specialised interparliamentary body would be more suitable for these kind of debates. However, if there is a topical item of broader interest we can not exclude COSAC from discussing it.*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>42</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

*Also in this case, we deem indispensable the establishment of an interparliamentary body comprised by the competent committees, in order to focus on judicial and police cooperation.*

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

*It is up to each Parliament to decide upon the composition of its delegation.*

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*We think that there are more substantial means to bridge the gap between the citizens and the European institutions, than through one-off publicity events. Instead, National Parliaments can contribute to this end, through every day political and legislative action which empowers the*

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

*people of Europe and by improving the transparency and public accountability of the entire European political and administrative system.*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*We think that there is no need for amendment, as this provision is deemed sufficient.*



## **Hungary: Országgyűlés**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

The Hungarian National Assembly considers that the three priorities and five headline targets of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy represent a clear message for the Member States and third countries. The Hungarian National Assembly fully agrees with the need to create coherence between all EU policies and instruments "to pursue the strategy's objectives". Furthermore, the Hungarian National Assembly is convinced that the differences and inequalities of competitiveness among the Member States cannot be surmounted without a strong, consolidated cohesion policy and a more effective common agricultural policy.

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

Yes, the Strategy deals with the issue of EU's competitiveness comprehensively, however the role of international organisations and foreign countries are rather covered briefly, without deeper analysis.

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

The Hungarian National Assembly considers that the Strategy takes properly into account the social and environmental consequences as it is designed to turn Europe into a smart, sustainable and socially inclusive market economy.

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	X	
2. sustainable transport	X	

3. sustainable consumption and production	X	
4. conservation and management of natural resources	X	
5. public health		X
6. social inclusion, demography and migration	X	
7. global poverty and sustainable development	X	

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

Yes, the Hungarian National Assembly believes that under the current economic and financial circumstances, Member States should cooperate more closely with the European Commission and within the Council. A more focused country surveillance both regarding the programming and implementing seems to be inevitable.

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

The Hungarian National Assembly thinks that decision-making process linked to the Strategy represents one of the greatest shift compared to the Lisbon Strategy, since it constitutes clear-cut obligations for governments in numerous aspects, which due to fall under parliamentary oversight.

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

The Committee on European Affairs has dealt with the Strategy prior to its adoption, during the preparatory phase, on numerous occasions. In addition, there is a Committee on Sustainable Development, the successor of the former Committee on Environmental Protection, whose leader is one of the funding members of the so-called Hungarian Green Party (Politico can be different). Moreover, the National Council for Sustainable Development, a special body existing since October 2008, chaired by the Speaker of the Hungarian National Assembly, is also contributing to the follow-up of the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development.

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

See reply 3.2.

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

See reply 3.2.

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

The Hungarian National Assembly considers that the implementation of the Strategy and of the national reform programmes should be closely monitored by national parliaments.

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an inter-parliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

Yes, the Hungarian National Assembly believes that national parliaments can also contribute to the scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP.

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that inter-parliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CFSP and CSDP or CSDP only?

The Hungarian National Assembly considers that scrutiny should cover both CFSP and CSDP.

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise inter-parliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,

- Should it take the form of a new inter-parliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

There has been made no final decision on this specific issue yet. However, at the recent meeting of the Committees on European Affairs of the Visegrád Group countries in Prague, the participating countries have concluded that they do not support the initiative regarding the establishment of a new inter-parliamentary body responsible for Common Security and Defence Policy since the issue is sufficiently covered by the existing structures.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise inter-parliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?

- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

On the basis of the presidency programme, COSAC should play a part in the scrutiny of CFSP and /or CSDP issues.

4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

See reply 3. Ordinary meetings of COFACC and CODAC might provide floor for such scrutiny activities.

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

No.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

No.

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

No.

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in inter-parliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

See reply 6.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

The Hungarian National Assembly considers that following the entry force of the Lisbon Treaty there might be still open questions regarding the adequate application of some new mechanisms and provisions. COSAC might provide floor for inter parliamentary exchanges on specific issues related to Article 12 TEU or other provisions of the TEU or TFEU.

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

The Hungarian National Assembly considers that COSAC should discuss the experience of Early-Warning System yearly.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

The Hungarian National Assembly considers that the invitation of the President or of one of the Commissioners for a debate in the framework of COSAC on the annual Work Programme of the European Commission is a priority and should become a tradition. The practical arrangements for the COSAC debate on this issue should belong to the discretionary power of the Hosting Parliament.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

It is the troika who should decide regarding the invitation of keynote speakers from outside the European Union to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP.

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>43</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

Hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust could be placed from time to time on the agenda of COSAC meetings.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

The cooperation of specialised parliamentary committees should be enhanced but should not be linked to the framework of COSAC.

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

The Hungarian National Assembly suggests that this question should be further discussed by COSAC to able to present a well prepared initiative in the near future.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

Since the new IPEX website is already under planning and construction, the new site will fully contribute to the implementation of Article 10 of Protocol No. 1.

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

No.

## **Ireland: Houses of the Oireachtas**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**The Joint Committee does not consider a YES/No answer to be appropriate**

**While the Committee agrees that the focus of the new strategy should be on 'smart', knowledge based employment, the Committee also believes that its potential should not be over-estimated. While acknowledging the challenges presented by globalisation to the manufacturing sector, efforts must be made to sustain a functioning manufacturing and industrial base. In addition, more support needs to be given to traditional and indigenous industries, in particular tourism and food production which sustain huge numbers of jobs and have the potential to create more employment. They should not be ignored by an over-emphasis on the smart economy. The Joint Committee is also pleased to see an emphasis on the agriculture and food sector included as a specific action point in the Strategy. All these elements are required to ensure real sustainable development.**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**The Joint Committee has not agreed a specific position with regard to this question.**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**The Joint Committee does not consider a YES/No answer to be appropriate**

**The Joint Committee believes that there must be a greater policy emphasis on life-long learning as well as activation and training the unemployed. Measures should be explored which enable unemployed people receiving social security to use their skills and to contribute to society. In addition, the EU's evolving Immigration policy should be linked to the ongoing identification of the key 'skill-sets' required by labour markets across the Union in order to ensure that unpredicted shortages in labour supply do not occur in critical areas of the European economy.**

**More emphasis is required on societal values, placing responsibility to the citizen and the general public good first. The EU Treaties, as amended by the Lisbon Treaty, are now very strong in respect of the core values and objectives of full employment, education, sustainable development and climate change. Article 9 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU clearly states that in “defining and implementing its policies and activities, the Union shall take into account requirements linked to the promotion of a high level of employment, the guarantee of adequate social protection, the fight against social exclusion, and a high level of education, training and protection of human health”. Article 9 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU must guide the implementation of the Europe 2020 Strategy.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

**The Joint Committee on European Affairs has not specifically agreed a position with regard to this question.**

**In general the Committee believes that investment in green research and technology as well as a re-orientation of our industries towards more energy efficient and greener methods of production offers huge potential in terms of job creation and sustainable economic growth. In addition, the Joint Committee believes that the ‘EU2020’ strategy is not just be about developing a competitive economy. It is also about developing a fair and inclusive society.**

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

**The Joint Committee believes that monitoring mechanisms must be robust but not burdensome. Key to the successful implementation of the Europe 2020 Strategy must be regular and timely reviews that enable the Commission and the Member States to adjust the strategy’s headline goals and objectives in order to reflect changed circumstances. The national reform programmes coupled with the new ‘European Semester’ should offer a robust monitoring mechanism.**



*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

**The Joint Committee believes that establishing clear governance is key to making the new strategy effective and that one of the main reasons the Lisbon Strategy did not achieve many of its objectives was a lack of commitment on the part of individual Member States to reach agreed targets. The new strategy requires a simpler and more robust monitoring and reporting system which provides clear and measurable results. It should establish explicit and realistic targets and employ benchmarking. The performance of individual Member States and the EU as a whole should be constantly monitored and assessed, at least on an annual basis. A general review of the new Strategy should be undertaken by the Commission on an annual basis so that opportunities and weaknesses can be identified and the appropriate adjustments made. However the Committee underlines that Member States are ultimately responsible for delivering on the targets.**

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

**The Joint Committee on European Affairs**

**The Joint Committee on European Scrutiny and other Sectoral Committees of the Oireachtas as appropriate.**

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

**The Joint Committee on European Affairs has discussed the EU 2020 Strategy with a range of government Departments and as a next step will discuss Ireland's National Reform Programme. The Joint Committee will also engage in monitoring progress and key developments consulting with other Oireachtas Committees as appropriate.**

**The Joint Committee's regular meetings with the Minister for Foreign Affairs will also serve as an opportunity to scrutinize government on this matter.**

**Scrutiny of any resulting draft legislation will be undertaken by the Joint Committee on European Scrutiny**

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

**See 3.2**

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

**The Joint Committee believes that the ‘EU2020’ Strategy will need the active support of stakeholders such as the social partners and businesses and that its take up across all the regions of the EU will be crucial to its success. The Joint Committee believes that national parliaments should play an active role in monitoring and scrutinising the new strategy as it develops. The Joint Committee believes that national parliamentarians should meet more often and exchange views more regularly on important EU policies such as the ‘EU2020’ Strategy. The Joint Committee notes the importance of ensuring that the Strategy resonates with EU citizens in order for it to achieve success.**

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

**The Joint Committee strongly believes that active engagement with other national parliaments is an excellent vehicle for the exchange of best practice ideas, benchmarking and dialogue. Such discussions greatly benefit the Committees effectiveness in its core function of scrutiny at a National level. The JCEA would welcome an exchange of information and views between national Parliaments on CFSP/CSDP related issues in order to enhance the scrutiny of this area nationally.**

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

**Both are relevant and should be the subject of discussion among national parliaments. The JCEA views CSDP as an integral part of the CFSP.**

**As noted in question 1 above, actual “scrutiny” is undertaken at a national level.**

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,
  - Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.

**The Member State holding the rotating Presidency should organize twice yearly interparliamentary meetings to discuss CFSP and CSDP. The Joint Committee believes that no new structures are required. This cooperation falls mainly within the competence of COFACC and CODAC however flexibility should be shown as to attendance at such meetings since in some member states the policy area is scrutinized by the European Committee(s).**

**This approach will offer discretion to national parliaments as to the appropriate representation at such discussions. In the Oireachtas case the Joint Committee**

**on Foreign Affairs, the Joint Committee on Justice, Defence and Women's Rights, the Joint Committee on European Affairs and the Joint Committee on European Scrutiny would all have a policy interest in these exchanges**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

**The JCEA are not in favour of establishing new structures (see above)**

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
  - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

**COSAC should be kept informed of meetings and outcomes of various interparliamentary meetings such as COFACC. The Joint Committee recommends an examination as to whether the COSAC secretariat could provide some assistance to the Presidency as regards the organization of COFACC meetings.**

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

**See answer to question 3 above**

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

**No. See answer to question 3 above**

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

**The Oireachtas has not agreed a stance on this matter but would not foresee a requirement for funding given the view expressed above that no new structures are necessary.**

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

**N/A given the view expressed above that no new structures are necessary. Generally speaking the Joint Committee believes that CFSP/CSDP is an intergovernmental competency and involvement by the European Parliament should be as an observer.**

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

**See answer to question 6**

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

**Exchange of information on best practice and procedures is best carried out via the biannual report. It would always be open for the Presidency to seek actual debate on particular important issues should they arise.**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

**COSAC could supply a forum for exchange of information on planned (or early stage) subsidiarity checks mainly via the biannual report. COSAC should encourage the optimal use of IPEX and the National parliament representatives in Brussels.**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

**The Commission's President should present the Work Programme to COSAC allowing opportunity for debate**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

**COSAC should have the discretion as to speakers. The answer to this specific question depends on decisions taken as to the appropriate forum for discussion on CFSP and CSDP discussed in Chapter 2.**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>44</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**The Joint Committee believes that it is difficult to answer this question definitively given that the regulations are not published. However the primary function for COSAC should be an exchange of views with the Directors of Europol and Eurojust**

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

**The Joint Committee would prefer to consider this on a case by case basis depending on the proposed subject to be discussed. Enhanced cooperation between specialised committees should take place preferably but not exclusively within the framework of COSAC.**

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

**The Joint Committee considers that COSAC should not take the initiative here and that the organisation of such a week should be left to each national parliament to organise according to its own traditions and timetable. The Joint Sub-Committee on the review of the role of the Oireachtas in European Affairs in its final report recommended as follows;**

*It is also recommended that the week of 9 May, Europe Day, each year should be set aside by the Dáil as a week for debates and events on EU related topics. This could include discussions on Ireland’s priorities within the EU as well as debates with EU Commissioners and other leading practitioners from the EU institutions.*

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

**The Joint Committee considers that the option of the use of a live video link (for use by invited speakers) should be examined depending on the circumstances and the context.**

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

**NO**

## **Italy: Camera dei Deputati**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**On March 11th 2010 the Committee on Budget and the Committee on EU policies approved jointly a final document on the Strategy "EU 2020". The Committees, while expressing an overall positive opinion on the Strategy "EU 2020" as proposed by the European Commission (COM(2010)2020) and then approved by the European Council, criticized several aspect of the Strategy.**

**With reference to the issues raised in question 1.1. the final document emphasized that the Strategy does not ensure a real integration among the economic, financial, social and environmental actions and approaches. In the Committees view this would have required:**

- **the inclusion in a single programme of the Strategy for growth and employment, the Strategy for sustainable development and the Stability and growth Pact;**
- **the enhancement of economic governance by ensuring a stronger coordination in economic, budgetary, employment and social policies within the UE and, on a enhanced basis, in the Eurozone,**

**In addition the final document stressed that the Strategy contains too many priorities; this could affect the success of the new strategy;**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**This issues has not yet been addressed within the scrutiny of EUROPE 2020 at the Chamber.**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**The Final Document approved by the Committee on Budget and the EU Policies Committee on Europe 2020 (see above) stressed the need for the social and environmental dimension of the Strategy.**

**Firstly, by recalling the resolution on Europe 2020 approved by the European Parliament on 10 March 2010, the documents calls for the implementation of an ambitious social programme that will combat poverty and social exclusion, help workers reconcile their jobs with family responsibilities, favour lifelong learning, counter discrimination, promote gender inclusion and equal opportunities between men and women, promote workers'**

rights and good working conditions, while creating greater opportunities for apprenticeships and training for young people and protecting them from abusive labour practices.

Secondly, a) as regards the European commitments to poverty reduction, the Final Document gives priority to the development of an indicator of absolute poverty, which would be calculated with reference to the minimum income necessary for the purchase of a basket of certain goods and services;

Thirdly, as regards the flagship initiative “A resource-efficient Europe”, the Final document considers as a fundamental priority the launch of EU and other public investments in the environmental and energy sectors, both of which are closely tied to the prospects for the sustainable development of the European economy.

In addition, the Final Document emphasizes that the EU should build upon its leadership in the field of sustainable economic development and green transport technologies, while bearing in mind that sustainable production, the efficient use of resources and the further development of renewable energy sources will enable the national economies to preserve their strong manufacturing base.

Finally, the Final Document stressed that close attention needs to be paid to the EU's commitment to reducing its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by at least 20 per cent by 2020, though it also needs to be stressed that the EU willingness to reduce its output of greenhouse gases by 30 per cent needs to be matched by a commitment by other members of the international community to adopt adequate measures in this area;

### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

### See answer 1.3.

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?



The resolution approved on 13 July in plenary session on the LWP Commission and the Council trio Presidency programme 2010 calls for extending to employment and social policies objectives procedures and tools similar to those for implementing the Stability and Growth Pact. In particular the resolution asked to introduce - within the framework of the new EU economic governance - “reward and sanctions” mechanisms to ensure that Member States pursue and achieve the targets of the strategy envisaged.

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

The Final document approved by the Committee on Budget and the EU Policies Committee on Europe 2020 asked for a more binding mechanism for the implementation of the Strategy.

In particular the document called for:

- a more effective mechanism in place for the execution and validation of the Strategy and to make a sound assessment of factors that obstruct its application by selecting targeted measures that seek to overcome the most evident difficulties;

- the introduction of "reward" and "punishment" mechanisms to enforce respect for the new objectives of the Strategy by Member States, which may also include the formation of a special fund to support interventions aimed at implementing the Strategy and available to those Member States that have fulfilled set objectives;

- an incisive and systematic role of the Euro Group, acting in accordance with the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty, in coordinating the economic policies of eurozone countries in order to strengthen the principle of solidarity among Member States and respond adequately to asymmetric shocks and speculative attacks;

- an effective coordination of employment and social policies in order to ensure the enactment of the Europe 2020 objectives.

Those indications were reiterated and strengthened by the Resolution approved on 13 July by the plenary on the LWP Commission and the Council trio Presidency programme 2010. In addition the same issues are the object of a deeper and up-to-date consideration by the Budget and the EU Policies Committees in scrutinizing the Commission proposals on EU economic governance.

Concerning the role of the national parliaments, the Final document found appropriate the references in the Strategy, while urging the Italian Government to allow sufficient time for early consultation with the Houses of Parliament in all the significant stages of the procedure.

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

The Budget and the EU Policies Committees should have the main competence on the follow-up of Europe 2020. However the sectorial committees could be involved as regards specific flagship initiatives and objectives.

The Government is obliged – under art. 4-ter of Law 11/2005 to consult the Parliament before submitting to the Commission the National Reform Programme and all the Reports related to its implementation.

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

The competent parliamentary committees can hold hearings or debates with the Minister for EU Affairs (who is the national coordinator for the Europe 2020 Strategy) as well as with any other Minister competent by subject matter on any aspect concerning the implementation of Europe 2020-

The committees as well as the full House can also address to the Government resolutions or motions on such topics.

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

See answer 1.3.

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

Yes, the Italian Chamber of Deputies considers it very important to organise a wide-ranging and in-depth inter-parliamentary debate, for the purposes of ensuring parliamentary scrutiny of the CFSP and the CSDP. For this is one of the Union's policies which impinges deeply on the interests of individual Member States, and it is of crucial importance to the global role of the European Union and the effectiveness of many of its "internal" policies, over which it is essential to guarantee Parliamentary scrutiny.

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

The Chamber of Deputies favours parliamentary scrutiny over both CSFP and CSDP. On 15 September, the Chamber unanimously carried a motion on the initiatives to establish an Inter-Parliamentary Conference for European Foreign, Defence and Security Policy, where it is stated that it would be appropriate:

“a) to establish an “Inter-Parliamentary Conference for European Foreign, Defence and Security Policy” made up of delegations from the European Parliament, the Parliaments of the European Union States – both Members and Candidates. The Conference may invite parliamentary delegations from other interested countries;

b) that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the European Parliament and national parliamentary delegations form part of the Conference – limited in their size and ensuring the representation of both government and opposition – normally made up of members of the Foreign Affairs, Defence and European Affairs Committees;

*c) the Conference should ordinarily meet at least twice a year, co-chaired by the Chairperson of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the European Parliament and the Chairperson of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the country holding the revolving Presidency of the European Union. Whenever necessary it could also meet in extraordinary session and in emergencies, or when the Council has to take decisions on particularly sensitive matters;*

*d) the Conference shall establish its own Rules of Procedure;*

*e) the meetings of the Conference may be attended by the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, who, at least twice a year, shall report on Europe's foreign and defence policy guidelines and strategies;*

*f) the Conference, which would be headquartered in Brussels, shall have a streamlined operational structure, and organise its work with the logistical and operational co-operation of the European Parliament;*

*It is hoped that all the Parliaments interested will adopt a similar approach and that the Conference of Speakers of EU Parliaments in particular will support it and endorse it".*

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,
- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.

[See the reply to point 2.](#)

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

[See the reply to point 2.](#)

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
  - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

[See the reply to point 2.](#)

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?

- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

[See the reply to point 2.](#)

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

[See the reply to point 2.](#)

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

[This issue will have to be examined by the relevant bodies of the Chamber of Deputies.](#)

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

[See the reply to point 2.](#)

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

[See the reply to point 2.](#)

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

[The Chamber of Deputies attaches the greatest importance to ensuring that COSAC begin focusing its debates around the main priorities and political strategies of the institutions of the European Union, examining the main orientations of the EU at an early stage, also, to a greater extent than has been the case so far, in terms of their substance. This would make it possible for COSAC to play an effective role of the highest importance, for it cannot be](#)

considered – particularly in the light of the Treaties – as a body tasked with "monitoring" the role of the national parliaments as defined in the Treaties.

To achieve this, as was expressly stated in the conclusions of the Madrid COSAC meeting, the COSAC meeting in the first half of the year would have to focus on the European Commission's annual political strategy, and where possible, focus on the European Commission's work programme in the second half of the year (cf. reply 3)

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

The Chamber of Deputies reiterates its opposition to giving COSAC coordination role in the early warning mechanism. Subsidiarity checks conducted so far by COSAC have proven useful, mainly for the purposes of finding out how all the Parliaments have equipped themselves to oversee subsidiarity as provided by the Lisbon Treaty, which no longer gives COSAC the competence for monitoring subsidiarity it had in the past. On the contrary, the competence for subsidiarity checks, according to the Protocols annexed to the Treaty, is now vested in the individual Chambers of the national Parliaments. COSAC could, conversely, continue guaranteeing an exchange of information on the procedures, practices and methods used by each Chamber or Parliament to monitor subsidiarity, also by submitting six monthly reports.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

The Chamber of Deputies attaches the highest importance for COSAC to examine the Commission's annual political strategy, for this is a crucial EU legislative and political planning document. This would enable the Conference to give early and more substantive consideration to the main EU policies. It would also be useful if COSAC could examine the strategy in the first half of the year on a regular basis in order to identify the policies and sectors in the initial phase of EU planning to which COSAC and the individual Parliaments could turn their attention as a matter of priority. The legislative programme could also be considered by COSAC in the second semester as a corollary to the preceding examination of the annual political strategy. Both debates should be attended by the President of the European Commission, the permanent President of the European Council, and the President of the Council currently in office.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

To this regard, the Chamber notes that Rule 4.3 of the COSAC Rules of Procedure provides that "the Presidency shall invite observers from the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union and it may invite observers from the embassies of the Member States of the European Union and, after consulting the Presidential Troika, experts and special guests."

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>45</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**The Chamber attaches particular importance to the area of freedom, security and justice, and to monitoring Europol and Eurojust. Indeed, these are matters over which the Lisbon Treaty confers particular powers upon the national Parliaments, and it would therefore be appropriate for COSAC to discuss them before the Commission lays down the provisions for implementation. The European Commission ought to be reminded once again to forward to the European and all the national Parliaments the preparatory documents for proposals to apply the articles of the Treaty involving the national Parliaments in these sectors. Rather than envisaging a specific role for COSAC or any *ad hoc* fora, it would be far more preferable to activate the circuit of the half-yearly interparliamentary meetings of Justice and Home Affairs Committees. Through the regular attendance of representatives from the Commission, the Council and the agencies having competence in those fields, these meetings could offer our Parliaments the most appropriate framework for exchanging opinions and laying down commonly agreed policies.**

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

**The Chamber of Deputies is in favour of further developing cooperation among specialised committees outside the COSAC context, which the Chamber has always considered to be a useful forum for exchanging information and experiences and for improving direct familiarity between the members of the national Parliaments' EU Policies Committees and the relevant bodies of the European Parliament.**

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

**The idea of organising a "European week" in all the parliamentary Assemblies is certainly very attractive but it does not seem to be a practicable proposition in view of the difficulties of reconciling the sessions of 40 different Assemblies.**

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

This is a question that has been widely discussed at the Conference of Speakers of the European Union Parliaments. It might perhaps be useful for a specific debate to be held at COSAC. The Chamber of Deputies believes that it is important to ask how to ensure an ongoing and effective involvement of the parliamentary institutions and leading sectors of civil society. From this point of view a new development that has emerged in recent years has been the establishment of “cooperation-enabling technologies”, such as social networking tools (like Facebook). These tools could also be usefully adopted in such contexts as COSAC to improve interaction between Parliament and various external players.

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

The Chamber believes that any changes to the COSAC Rules of Procedure will require a thorough preparation once the role of COSAC becomes clearer as a consequence of the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty.

## Italy: Senato della Repubblica

### Chapitre 1<sup>er</sup>: Le développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020

#### Questions:

##### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020*

1.1. Vu l'intention de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 d'établir une relation entre les différentes crises auxquelles nous sommes confrontés actuellement (économique, financière, sociale, écologique), est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que les points de vue politiques de cette Stratégie forment un ensemble bien intégré ?

**Le Sénat de la République n'a pas encore examiné ce document de la Commission européenne.**

1.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des développements économiques et scientifiques dans le reste du monde, comme par exemple aux États-Unis et en Chine ?

**Voir réponse sous 1.1.**

1.3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des conséquences sociales et environnementales et du respect des droits et l'homme (par exemple le droit à la nourriture) ?

**Voir réponse sous 1.1.**

##### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et la Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable*

2.1. La Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable identifie 7 défis, chacun accompagné d'un objectif général. Dans ce contexte, est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte de ces défis ? Veuillez spécifier votre réponse pour chaque défi avec un commentaire votre spécifications en faisant référence aux objectifs généraux susmentionnés.

**Voir réponse sous 1.1.**

	Oui	Non
1. changement climatique et énergie propre		
2. transports durables		
3. consommation et production durables		
4. préservation et gestion des ressources naturelles		
5. santé publique		
6. inclusion sociale, démographie et immigration		
7. pauvreté dans le monde et défis en matière de développement durable		



2.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 prévoit assez d'instruments pour (1) réaliser ces défis et (2) mesurer et (3) suivre leurs résultats (par exemple en introduisant des critères similaires aux critères de convergence de l'euro) ?

**Voir réponse sous 1.1.**

### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et les Parlements nationaux*

3.1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que le processus décisionnel, lié à la Stratégie EUROPE 2020, est suffisamment contraignant pour les États membres et que le contrôle par les Parlements nationaux et, le cas échéant, régionaux est suffisamment assuré?

**Voir réponse sous 1.1.**

3.2. Quels sont les organes de votre Parlement/Chambre qui seront chargés du suivi de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et de quelle façon le gouvernement devra-t-il justifier ses actions tendant à la poursuite des objectifs de cette Stratégie ?

**Voir réponse sous 1.1.**

3.3. Décrivez brièvement les procédures parlementaires (au niveau national et, le cas échéant, au niveau régional).

**Voir réponse sous 1.1.**

3.4. Au cas où un tel organe ou une telle procédure parlementaire n'a pas encore été établi, envisage-t-on de le(s) créer ?

**Voir réponse sous 1.1.**

3.5. Quelle serait la meilleure façon pour les Parlements/Chambres de contribuer au renforcement de l'aspect développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 ?

**Voir réponse sous 1.1.**

## **Chapitre 2. Contrôle parlementaire de la Politique de sécurité et de défense commune (ci-après: «PSDC»)**

### **Questions:**

1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime utile un échange interparlementaire sur la PESC et la PCSD en vue d'améliorer le contrôle parlementaire au niveau national et/ou européen?

**Notre Chambre estime utile un échange interparlementaire au niveau européen sur la PESC et la PCSD.**

2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère que le contrôle parlementaire au niveau de l'UE devrait inclure aussi bien la PESC que la PCSD ou rien que la PCSD ?

**Le contrôle parlementaire doit inclure la PCSD ainsi que la PESC.**

3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère souhaitable l'installation d'un mécanisme, d'une structure ou d'un forum particulier en vue de l'organisation d'une coopération et d'un contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?

Le cas échéant,

- Est-ce que celui-ci devrait prendre la forme d'une nouvelle commission/ conférence/ organisation/ institution interparlementaire ?

- Est-ce que l'état membre de la Présidence tournante devrait y avoir un rôle spécial ?
- Veuillez spécifier d'autres modalités.

**Notre Parlement souhaite l'institution d'une Conférence interparlementaire pour la politique étrangère, de sécurité et de défense européenne. La Présidence tournante aura la co-Présidence de la Conférence interparlementaire avec la Présidence de la Commission des Affaires étrangères du Parlement européen.**

**En outre, le 16 septembre 2010, le Sénat a approuvé une motion qui estime opportun: *"l'institution d'une "Conférence interparlementaire pour la politique étrangère, de défense et sécurité européenne", formée de délégations du Parlement européen et des parlements des Pays - membres et candidats - de l'UE, Conférence qui doit pouvoir inviter des délégations parlementaires d'autres Pays concernés;***

***la participation à la Conférence de la Commission des Affaires étrangères du Parlement européen et de délégations parlementaires nationales - de dimension contenue et représentant la majorité ainsi que l'opposition - constituées normalement de membres des Commissions des Affaires étrangères, de la Défense et des Affaires européennes;***

***la réunion ordinaire de dite Conférence au moins deux fois par an; sa co-présidence de la part du Président de la Commission des Affaires étrangères du Parlement européen et du Président de la Commission des Affaires étrangères du Pays exerçant la présidence semestrielle de l'UE; sa réunion extraordinaire en cas de nécessité et d'urgence et à l'occasion de décisions particulièrement délicates du Conseil;***

***la détermination des modalités de fonctionnement de la Conférence par son propre règlement; la possibilité de participation aux réunions de la Conférence du Haut Représentant qui, deux fois par an au moins, relate personnellement sur les lignes et les stratégies de la politique étrangère et de défense;***

***la création de structures opérationnelles souples pour la Conférence, siégeant à Bruxelles, et l'organisation de ses activités en coopération logistique et opérationnelle avec le Parlement européen."***

**Le même texte a été approuvé par la Chambres des députés.**

4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre préfère un modèle ou un arrangement institutionnel existant pour organiser la coopération et le contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?

**Voir n. 3**

- 4.1. Est-ce que la COSAC devrait jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ? Le cas échéant,
- Sous quelle forme ?
  - Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COSAC ?
  - Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COSAC devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
  - Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
  - Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
  - Est-ce que vous estimez que la COSAC doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
  - Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?

- 4.2. Est-ce que la COFACC et/ou la «CODAC» devrai(en)t jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ? Le cas échéant,
- Sous quelle forme ?

- Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» ?
- Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
- Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
- Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
- Est-ce que vous estimez que la COFACC ou la «CODAC» doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
- Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?

4.3. Est-ce qu'une autre conférence/organisation/institution devrait encore jouer un rôle dans ce contrôle ? Le cas échéant,

- Laquelle ?
- Sous quelle forme ?
- Veuillez spécifier d'autres modalités.

5. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est prêt à mettre à disposition des budgets pour ce contrôle ?

**Voir n. 3.**

6. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est partisan d'un mécanisme/d'une structure/d'un forum composé(e) de membres des seuls Parlements nationaux ou d'un organe mixte avec des membres du Parlement européen ?

**Notre Parlement plaide une Conférence mixte avec des membres du Parlement européen.**

7. Est-ce que, au sujet de la coopération interparlementaire relative à la PESC et/ou à la PCSD, votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que le Parlement européen devrait être doté du statut de membre ou d'observateur ?

**Le Parlement européen devrait être doté du statut de membre.**

### **Chapitre 3. Rôle futur de la COSAC après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Lisbonne – suite du débat de la XLIII<sup>e</sup> COSAC**

#### **Questions:**

1. La Contribution de la XLIII<sup>e</sup> COSAC (Paragraphe 10.1) stipule que «Assurer le suivi du rôle des Parlements nationaux comme souligné en particulier dans l'Article 12 du Traité sur l'Union européenne et ses Protocoles respectifs restera l'une des priorités de la COSAC». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment et dans quelle mesure ce suivi peut-il mis en œuvre en pratique ?

**L'avis du Sénat de la République est qu'il faut continuer à discuter, pendant les réunions de la COSAC, sur la façon pratique dont chaque Chambre des Parlements nationaux réalise les dispositions du traité de Lisbonne qui la concernent. Dans cette perspective, un point de repère important est l'art. 12 du traité sur l'Union européenne.**

**En outre, le Sénat de la République souhaite que la COSAC concentre progressivement son attention sur les thèmes institutionnels européens, en jouant un rôle de contrôle aussi et d'évaluation des politiques de l'Union sur ce sujet. Par exemple, outre à la réalisation de l'art. 12 du traité sur l'Union européen, pourraient être pertinents les thèmes du *better law making*, du contrôle sur la qualité de la transposition de la législation européenne, des**

**procédures électorales, de l'initiative législative des citoyens, du contrôle sur les budgets. Ce sont tous des sujets qui demandent une connaissance transversale typique des Commissions des affaires européennes.**

2. La Contribution de la XLIII<sup>e</sup> COSAC (Paragraphe 10.2) stipule que «Le système appelé «Système d'alerte précoce» tel qu'établi dans le Protocole (n°2) et le mécanisme de coordination entre les Parlements nationaux devraient jouer un rôle approprié dans la COSAC». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment la COSAC devrait-elle assumer cette tâche en pratique?

**Pour le Sénat de la République il faut prendre en considération ce que l'on indique au point 3.3 des Conclusions adoptées par la XLIII<sup>e</sup> COSAC de Madrid, où l'on dit "l'agenda de la COSAC pourra inclure des débats sur des projets d'actes législatifs spécifiques de l'Union européenne pourvu que ces projets aient trait à des sujets particulièrement polémiques susceptibles de donner lieu à un débat politique sur des sujets spécifiquement européens". Toutefois, ces débats ne doivent pas réaliser une modalité de coordination entre les parlements nationaux.**

3. Quelle est l'opinion de votre Parlement/Chambre sur l'organisation pratique d'un débat, dans le cadre de la COSAC, relatif au Programme de travail de la Commission européenne ?

**Le Sénat est favorable à l'examen du Programme de travail de la Commission européenne dès qu'il est disponible dans toutes les langues officielles de l'Union. A ce propos, on rappelle que le point 10.3 de la Contribution de la XLIII<sup>e</sup> COSAC prévoit que "les réunions ordinaires de la COSAC pourraient inclure la présentation par le Président de la Commission européenne du Programme de travail annuel de son institution, lors du premier semestre, et du bilan d'action menée par la Commission au cours de l'année écoulée, lors du second semestre".**

4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère acceptable l'invitation d'orateurs externes à l'Union européenne (par exemple le Secrétaire général de l'OTAN, l'Ambassadeur des États-Unis, etc.) pour informer la COSAC en ce qui concerne la PESC et/ou la PCSD ?

**Le Sénat observe qu'il faut respecter ce qu'affirme l'art. 4.3 du Règlement, selon lequel "la présidence invite des observateurs du secrétariat général du Conseil de l'Union européenne et de la Commission européenne et peut également inviter des observateurs des ambassades des États membres de l'Union européenne et, après consultation de la troïka présidentielle, des experts et des invités spéciaux".**

5. Des réponses au questionnaire ayant mené au 13<sup>e</sup> rapport semestriel, il s'est avéré qu'une large majorité des Parlements/Chambres *ibid.* – p. 47 soutenait l'idée d'ajouter le sujet du contrôle politique d'Europol et de l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust en tant que point régulier de l'ordre du jour de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, de quelle manière ces débats devraient-ils être tenus ? En particulier, les débats en COSAC devraient-ils être précédés d'auditions de représentants d'Europol et Eurojust ou cette évaluation introductive devrait-elle être présentée par, par exemple, des représentants du monde académique, judiciaire et/ou des services de police?

**Sur cette question, il faudra vérifier comment seront définis les modèles d'"association" entre les parlements nationaux et le Parlement européen pour le contrôle politique d'Europol et l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust. Pour le moment, en rappelant le point 3 de la Contribution de la XLI<sup>e</sup> COSAC, les éventuels débats de la COSAC sur le sujet du contrôle politique d'Europol et sur l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust devraient être précédés d'auditions de représentants d'Europol et d'Eurojust, comme on l'a déjà fait lors de la XL<sup>e</sup> COSAC.**

6. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré d'inviter les commissions parlementaires spécialisées à participer aux activités de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre préférerait-il augmenter la coopération avec les commissions parlementaires spécialisées dans le cadre de la COSAC ou en dehors de celui-ci ? Au cas où préférence est donnée au cadre de la COSAC, veuillez spécifier les modalités possibles d'une telle coopération.

**Il faut souligner que l'art. 10 du Protocole n.1 joint au traité de Lisbonne prévoit que la conférence des organes parlementaires spécialisés dans les affaires de l'Union (COSAC) favorise "l'échange d'informations et de bonnes pratiques entre les parlements nationaux et le Parlement européen, et entre leurs Commissions spécialisées". Par rapport au texte du Protocole n. 9 joint au traité d'Amsterdam, il s'agit d'une nouvelle possibilité offerte à la COSAC.**

**La COSAC s'était déjà affirmée comme lieu de confrontation entre les organismes compétents pour les Affaires européennes des Assemblées nationales et le Parlement européen, par rapport à tous les thèmes concernant la vie de l'Union européenne. Cela surtout par rapport aux orientations et aux meilleures pratiques s'affirmant dans les Pays membres et, surtout dans la dernière décennie, pour ce qui concerne les systèmes de contrôle des projets d'actes législatifs de l'Union.**

**Avec la nouvelle disposition du traité de Lisbonne il faudra vérifier si ce rôle peut être rempli également par les autres Commissions permanentes des parlements nationaux. Cette dernière possibilité serait soutenue par le règlement même de la COSAC, selon lequel "il pourra être appliqué aux réunions d'autres commissions parlementaires convoquées par le Parlement de l'État membre qui exerce la Présidence de l'UE".**

**Maintenant il semble toutefois impossible d'exprimer une opinion. D'autres éléments d'évaluation pourront vraisemblablement surgir, d'un côté, par la cessation des activités de l'Assemblée parlementaire de l'UEO et les conséquences possibles pour la coopération interparlementaire au niveau de l'Union européenne et, de l'autre côté, par la définition concrète du modèle d'"association" entre les parlements nationaux et le Parlement européen pour le contrôle politique d'Europol et l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust.**

7. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré l'organisation d'une «Semaine européenne» dans les Parlements nationaux. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre soutient-il la suggestion d'organiser une telle «Semaine européenne» et, le cas échéant, de quelle manière en envisage-t-il l'organisation pratique ? La COSAC devrait-elle prendre une initiative à ce sujet ?

**Le Sénat de la République est en principe favorable à l'organisation d'une "Semaine européenne" dans les parlements nationaux, mais il souligne que sa réalisation pratique peut être influencée, et limitée, par les difficultés liées à l'intégration, nécessaire et contemporaine, dans les agendas des Chambres parlementaires de l'Union européenne des sujets liés à la "Semaine européenne". Au Sénat, par exemple, le programme des travaux d'Assemblée est déterminé par la Conférence des présidents des groupes parlementaires.**

**De plus grandes possibilités de succès de cette initiative pourraient venir par l'organisation de cette Semaine pour les travaux parlementaires des Commissions pour les affaires européennes.**

**Par ailleurs, le Sénat de la République croit que la forme la plus concrète et efficace pour faire pénétrer les thèmes européens dans les travaux des Assemblées parlementaires nationales est la coopération entre Commissions spécialisées sur des sujets spécifiques et de façon continue. Le limite de temps pour traiter les questions européennes empêcherait de**

**suivre de façon dynamique l'évolution des dossiers européens et ferait augmenter leur diversité par rapport à la matière nationale.**

8. Les Conclusions de la XLIII<sup>e</sup> COSAC (Paragraphe 3.4) stipulent que «la COSAC devrait refléter comment les nouvelles technologies, telles que les vidéoconférences, et les forums, tels qu'IPEX, pourraient être employés et optimisés afin de donner effet à l'Article 10 du Protocole (n° 1) sur le Rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment, en pratique, de nouvelles technologies pourraient-elles être employées et optimisées par la COSAC ?

**Le Sénat croit qu'il faut favoriser tout progrès dans l'utilisation des nouvelles technologies. L'utilisation des vidéoconférences, par exemple, pourrait permettre une confrontation avec un plus grand nombre d'interlocuteurs sans la nécessité de la présence physique dans les lieux de réunion. Tout cela permettrait aussi d'épargner de l'argent et du temps. À ce propos, le Sénat de la République signale qu'il a expérimenté avec succès le système des vidéoconférences dans les rapports avec l'Union européenne et qu'il veut continuer sur cette route.**

**L'engagement du Parlement italien dans la création du site IPEX montre en outre l'intérêt concret pour l'emploi de la technologie dans les rapports interparlementaires.**

9. Les Conclusions de la XLIII<sup>e</sup> COSAC (Paragraphe 3.6) stipulent que «Le Règlement devrait limiter les temps de parole à 3 minutes, à moins que la Présidence n'en décide autrement, en tenant compte des circonstances spécifiques». Votre Parlement/Chambre est-il d'avis que le Règlement de la COSAC devrait être modifié sur d'autres points?

**Le Sénat de la République croit que toute modification du Règlement doit être préparée quand on comprendra clairement ce que sera le rôle futur de la COSAC après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Lisbonne. Jusqu'alors toute modification, si ce n'est celles d'impact plus léger, devrait être retardée.**

## **Latvia: Saeima**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**The Strategy is a good starting point to unite EU in the common response for dealing with the crisis. Nevertheless, we do believe that the scope of major initiatives proposed by the European Commission is too broad, they should be fewer in number, more concentrated and focused on promoting growth and employment. EU Member states should be given the opportunity to choose initiatives which are appropriate for their specific situation rather than to act on all major initiatives.**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**The enhanced EU role as global player is one of the crucial priorities on the current EU agenda. Of course in revising and rebuilding the EU economics, the EU must observe the tendencies in the global economic and markets. However, EU 2020 strategy is primarily the strategy for the EU inner development, where also the global economic tendencies have been taken into account.**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**Saeima believes that the Strategy mainly is orientated for the solving of social and environmental consequences. Nevertheless we would like to emphasize that the social and environmental cohesion should go side by side with the economic cohesion.**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	<b>X</b>	
2. sustainable transport	X	

3. sustainable consumption and production	X	
4. conservation and management of natural resources	X	
5. public health		X
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		X
7. global poverty and sustainable development	X	

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

**The Saeima believes that the Strategy needs to strengthen economic cohesion, pay greater attention to the competitiveness, productiveness and modernisation of rural enterprises as well as to the need to address the issue of equal competition conditions for all EU farmers. As also we do think that the EU 2020 Strategy needs to strengthen the external dimension (foreign trade, trade liberalisation, access to markets of third countries).**

**We do believe that drafting of national reform programmes is an instrument, which will be used as main tool to meet the challenges, to measure and monitor the results of each EU Member State actions to reach the aims of the Europe 2020.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

**Yes, we do believe that the NPs can use all their capacities to express their views, ideas and concerns about the EU 2020, as also to scrutinise their governments during their work on EU 2020.**

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

**The European Affairs committee is the leading committee dealing with the EU 2020 Strategy. Saeima EAF takes part in different working groups and several discussion format organized by the Ministry of Economics. Latvian position on the EU 2020 is approved by the Parliament. Also the draft of national reform programme will be scrutinized by the EAF.**

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

**First there is wide range of discussions with the NGOs, social partners, ministry representatives, and then the Ministry of Economics drafts the initial draft of national reform programme, which is also widely discussed, and also viewed in the Saeima EAF. EU 2020 national reform programme supervisory board is also established, where the Saeima EAF and specialised committee chairs are full members. Saeima strongly follows all governmental actions in this respect and also organises discussions with society, reflecting the content of the discussion within the mass media.**



3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

**National parliaments must closely follow their government's performance in all areas, which constitute the key basis for the sustainable development. As legislator Parliament also has to, work on drafting of national legislation taking into account the need for sustainable development of the MS and EU as a whole.**

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

**Yes, we do believe that the interparliamentary exchange on the CFSP and CSDP is also useful. The information exchanged can be helpful both on national and European level.**

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

**The exchange of the information on the EU interparliamentary level should cover both CFSP and CSDP.**

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

**Saeima believes that there is no need for the establishing of special forum to organise the interparliamentary cooperation on both policy areas. The COFACC in collaboration with the CODAC can successfully deal with the interparliamentary cooperation on the CFSP and/or CSDP.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?

- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

**COSAC should not play part in the CFSP and CSDP scrutiny, unless there is special need or wish from the presidency to include the issues on the agenda, but this also must be negotiated within the trio.**

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

**The COFACC and CODAC should coordinate the interparliamentary scrutiny on both issues. We do believe that the discussions on the issues could be a part of the ordinary COFACC and CODAC meetings. Only in specific cases there could be a possibility envisaged to convene additional meeting to special discussions on issues of CFSP and/or CSDP.**

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

**NO**

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?
6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

**See the answer to the 4.2.**

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

**Saeima believes that no distinction should be draw between EU Members regarding any status provisions**

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

**COSAC is unique institutional organisation, where political discussions and debates on crucial EU agenda issues on the interparliamentary level can be held. Also the monitoring of the latest developments on the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols could be a part of those discussions within the COSAC. The bi-annual reports of the COSAC can serve as a basis for the monitoring purposes.**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

**IPEX and National Parliament representatives in Brussels must be used as the main tools to secure the effective functioning and coordination of the so-called Early Warning system.**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

**A distinction should be made between ex-ante and ex-post interparliamentary evaluation of the Commission work programme. This means that the National parliaments must have the possibility to involve also in the process, when EC is drafting the Work Programme (this could be debated with the representative from the Commission at the spring COSAC meeting) Secondly, after the Commission's work programme is published, the national parliaments might evaluate the programme and give their observations to the Commission during COSAC autumn meeting (if the Work Programme is already published, or early spring meeting of the Chairpersons of the COSAC).**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

**In Saeima opinion, the CFSP and CSDP issues should be dealt within the COFACC and CODAC, however, if this is the case where there is common understanding and willingness to put the issue on the COSAC agenda, we would support the keynote speakers from outside the EU.**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>46</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**We would support both the hearings of the representatives of the Europol and Eurojust, and also detailed input from the academic world.**

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

**Saeima believes that the European Affairs committee of the NP reserves their own right to form the delegation for the COSAC; this includes also the possibilities according to the agenda to include in the delegations representatives from specialised committees.**

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

**The idea of European week in the national Parliaments could be a great possibility to foster the EU issues within the National politics and make them closer to the citizens. COSAC and the presidency could take the initiative in organising of such event!**

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

**The new media tools and new technologies bring politics more closely to the public. In this respect, also the COSAC could benefit by using of new technologies, for instance, the COSAC meeting could be broadcasted on-line, and also provide the possibility for comments and questions from the public on the COSAC webpage.**

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

**NO**

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

## **Lithuania: Seimas**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**The opinion of the Seimas Committee on European Affairs on the Communication from the European Commission "EUROPE 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth" was adopted on 23 April 2010. This parliamentary document summarised and evaluated the conclusions and suggestions presented by the specialized committees of the Seimas: Information Society Development Committee, Committee on Economics, Committee on Education, Science and Culture, Committee on Social Affairs and Labour as well as individual MPs, public institutions and NGOs.**

**EUROPE 2020 Strategy gives its prime attention to the importance of economic growth by evaluating the current situation of the Member States and the present period. The Committee emphasizes that the Strategy should highlight the pursuit of the established common goals and the implementation of structural reforms. This, first and foremost, would ensure a long-term sustainability and quality of the EU Member States' public finances.**

**In addition, as one of the key elements in the Strategy implementation, the Committee on European Affairs distinguished the pursuit of the established common goals which should be related to the agreements and commitments on other financial prospects of the Members States involving the instruments of Common Agricultural and Cohesion Policies at the same time.**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**Despite the fact that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy highlights the EU's global competitiveness, notably its lagging behind the USA and Japan in scientific research and technological advancement areas, a lack of a deeper and comprehensive analysis of that challenge in the Strategy documents is to be acknowledged.**

**The opinion of the Committee on "EUROPE 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth" indicates that the main focus in the Strategy implementation in the area of safe growth should lie on:**

- strengthening of industry's potential;
- enhancement of business opportunities in the global trade.

**The Committee believes that a stronger focus on these areas and priority initiatives in implementing the established goals thereof would contribute more to steady and safe development of citizens (including the post-crisis period). It is no less important that the EU undertakes more active measures and steps to increase accessibility of third countries' markets to the businesses.**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**The EUROPE 2020 Strategy determines quantitative indicators encompassing the social area (including education). The measures of promoting social inclusion through reduction of poverty are acceptable. On the other hand, the qualitative indicator for education in this area and means to achieve it must not be considered less important than the quantitative indicators. In terms of environmental element of the Strategy, climate change softening measures including energy efficiency ones should make an adequate response to the current environmental challenges.**

**The economic growth have to be decoupled from the use of resources and effect on environmental challenges by implementing structural reforms, using market-based instruments, including fiscal (subsidies, soft loans, “green” procurement, etc.), promoting energy saving and eco-innovation.**

**The opinion of the Committee highlights that implementation of the Strategy in the smart growth area should be focussed on:**

- **development of scientific research and innovations;**
- **encouragement of cooperation among education, science and business areas.**

**The Committee on European Affairs believes that a focused and coordinated attention to these areas could help to develop the future infrastructure on a European level more efficiently and avail the potential of the digital economy.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	<b>Yes</b>	
2. sustainable transport	<b>Yes</b>	
3. sustainable consumption and production	<b>Yes</b>	
4. conservation and management of natural resources	<b>Yes</b>	
5. public health	<b>Yes</b>	
6. social inclusion, demography and migration	<b>Yes</b>	
7. global poverty and sustainable development	<b>Yes</b>	

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

**The objectives of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy are rather ambitious. However, it is important to ensure the necessary funding for the implementation of selected tools to achieve the objectives. It is equally important to strengthen the role of the Council in the implementation oversight mechanism. Thus, the role of the national parliaments could be fulfilled through the parliamentary scrutiny of the national governments representing their interests in various Councils. Another equally important aspect is cooperation between the governments and parliaments in the area of legislation in the framework of the implementation of the objectives of EUROPE 2020 Strategy on the national level.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

**Yes. As it has already been mentioned in 2.2 of this Questionnaire with regard to the monitoring of attainment and implementation of the objectives of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, the role of the Council needs to be strengthened. Consequently, the national parliaments will engage in the strategy implementation process through parliamentary scrutiny of the governments representing interests in various Councils. As it has already been pointed out, another aspect of no less importance is the co-operation of the governments and parliaments in the area of legislation while implementing the selected tools for the EU 2020 Strategy.**

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

**The Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania was actively engaged in the process of implementation of the EU Lisbon Strategy. The Parliament became a platform for the participation of the executive power and non-governmental organisations as well as other interested bodies in this process. A number of plenary discussions, committee debates, and public hearings were held to more clearly formulate the country's priorities and select priority implementation measures. Participation of the Seimas in the process of the EU Lisbon Strategy has received a positive evaluation and its activities have been assessed as activities of a diligent and constructively working parliament.**

**The Committee on European Affairs of the Seimas together with the Government is planning to debate the directions and priorities of the National Reform (the EU 2020 Strategy implementation) Programme in the near future (during the Autumn Session of the Seimas). After such programme is in place, the oversight of its implementation process is foreseen.**

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

**See the reply to Question 3.2.**

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

**As it has already been indicated in the reply 2.2 of this Questionnaire, both sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy implementation and other relevant aspects would be the issues of a regular parliamentary scrutiny agenda.**

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

**The joint decision of the Seimas Committee on European Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on National Security and Defence on parliamentary dimension of the Common Security and Defence Policy was adopted on 15 September 2010.**

**We are confident that a stronger cooperation between the national Parliaments on the Common Foreign and Security Policy, including the Common Security and Defence Policy is needed in order to coordinate and better exercise parliamentary oversight.**

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

**The Lithuanian Seimas considers that the most effective way to debate on the Common Security and Defence Policy is to see it as an integral part of the Common Foreign and Security Policy.**

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?

**The Lithuanian Seimas would like to propose to arrange inter-parliamentary debates in a forum which would unite two currently existing parliamentary meetings – Conference of the Foreign Affairs Committee Chairpersons (COFACC) and Conference of the Defence Affairs Committees (“CODAC”), into a common forum – Conference of the Foreign and Defence Affairs Committees (COFDAC). Such debates could be extended beyond parliamentary best practice exchange and deal with the substance of EU policy matters thus contributing to the transparency and efficiency of the European Union decision-making process. COFDAC inter-parliamentary meetings could be organised on a regular**



basis (e.g. once every six months), with the participation of delegates from parliamentary Foreign Affairs and Defence Committees.

**The High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, EU Presidency Defence Minister, and other representatives of the EU institutions could be invited in order to address these meetings. The participation from the non-EU Member States (e.g. NATO Parliamentary Assembly Secretary General, NATO Secretary General, other countries Defence Ministers, when appropriate) should be foreseen.**

- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?

**The national Parliaments of the EU Presidency Trio would be responsible for setting COFDAC political agenda and its implementation. The meetings of such forum could be organised by the cooperation of the COSAC secretariat, the representatives in the capitals of the national Parliaments of EU Presidency Trio and the Permanent Representatives of the national Parliaments to the EU.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

**Yes. As already mentioned in response to Question 3, the Lithuanian Seimas proposes uniting the two currently existing meeting formats, i.e. COFACC and CODAC, into the Conference of the Foreign Affairs and Defence Committees (COFDAC).**

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

**Yes. The outcomes of COFDAC debates on CSDP could be included into the final COSAC documents.**

**In addition, COSAC secretariat, the representatives in the capitals of the national Parliaments of EU Presidency Trio and the Permanent Representatives of the national Parliaments to the EU could take responsibility for organising COFDAC meetings.**

4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?

- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

**Yes. As previously mentioned, the Lithuanian Seimas proposes combining those two interparliamentary bodies into COFDAC. For more, please see the reply to Question 3.**

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

**The proposal of the Seimas on the establishment of COFDAC would demand minor additional expenditure from the national parliaments of member states of the EU Presidency Trio.**

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

**The interparliamentary COFDAC meetings would be the meeting place for representatives of the Foreign Affairs Committees and Defence Committees of the national parliaments. The European Parliament should also be represented in this forum and its representatives should be full-fledged members of COFDAC.**

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

See the reply to Question 6.

**Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

**Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

**COSAC should remain a parliamentary forum for the exchange of good practices of parliamentary control over the EU affairs. We consider the biannual reports approved by COSAC an important source of information on parliamentary work.**

**On the other hand, COSAC should increasingly focus on important political issues. The outcomes of this debate could be subsequently reflected in the final documents.**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

**In its replies in the 13th Bi-Annual Report, the Lithuanian Seimas underscored that there was no need to continue implementing pilot projects on subsidiarity checks. On the other hand, the implementation of the principle of subsidiarity in the national parliaments and the exchange of experience in the field should remain on the COSAC agenda.**

**COSAC could discuss subsidiarity issues of the EU legislative proposals. The selection of the topic could be based on the importance to the sufficient number of the national Parliaments (approximately 1/3 or 1/4 of the national Parliaments).**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

**The Lithuanian Parliament has always been of the opinion that the national parliaments would benefit from debates in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission. We suppose such debates could be held during spring plenary meetings of COSAC. In such a case the debate should be related to possible policy priorities of the European Commission for the next-coming year.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

**Yes. As it has been noted in the reply to Question 3 of this Questionnaire, the Lithuanian Parliament suggests inviting representatives from outside the European Union to COFDAC meetings (e.g. Secretary General of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Secretary General of NATO, Defence ministers of other countries, if applicable). It should be underlined that COSAC should not engage in a wide discussion on the provisions of the Common Security and Defence Policy and would confine itself solely to the presentation of the results of the COFDAC discussions and their inclusion into the final documents of COSAC.**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**The Lithuanian Parliament provides for the possibility to examine these issues on the national (information from our representatives) and the European (hearings on annual reports and other documents of the institutions) levels. On the national level we have decided to carry out a regular parliamentary scrutiny of these institutions by hearing**

**annual reports, examining recommendations provided in the reports, and presenting conclusions on them.**

**We believe that the European Commission should submit its proposal following its commitments with regard to the cooperation on the European level. This proposal could be used as the basis for discussions at other COSAC meetings.**

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

**The Lithuanian Parliament is of the opinion that each national parliament should compose the COSAC delegation at its own discretion.**

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

**The Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania holds a European Week debate every year. This is a long-standing tradition that was initiated by the Seimas Committee on European Affairs in 2004. The European Week debate is open to the public and is intended to commemorate Lithuania’s accession to the European Union and the Europe Day. Members of the Seimas, Members of the European Parliament from Lithuania, ministerial representatives, university teachers and students, as well as representatives of communities and interest groups take part in the debate. The participants of the European Week debate focus on various EU policy issues and aspects of Lithuania’s EU membership.**

**We believe that such events represent a great opportunity for the public to learn more about the European Union and the role of national parliaments in the process of European integration. Therefore, we invite all national parliaments to organise similar events.**

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

**In its responses given in the 13th Bi-Annual Report, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania underlined that first of all it was necessary to use the existing forms of cooperation. Nevertheless, we consider the initiatives on videoconferencing between the national parliaments and the EU institutions to be of importance for us.**

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

## Luxembourg: Chambre des Députés

### Chapitre 1<sup>er</sup>: Le développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020

#### Questions:

##### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020*

1.1. Vu l'intention de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 d'établir une relation entre les différentes crises auxquelles nous sommes confrontés actuellement (économique, financière, sociale, écologique), est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que les points de vue politiques de cette Stratégie forment un ensemble bien intégré ?

Réponse : Des progrès positifs sont notés en matière de coordination entre la politique économique et la politique financière. En revanche, le volet économique domine de manière trop marquée les volets social et environnemental.

1.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des développements économiques et scientifiques dans le reste du monde, comme par exemple aux États-Unis et en Chine ?

Réponse : La stratégie énumère les grands défis : l'intensification de la concurrence des économies développées et émergentes, dont notamment la Chine ou l'Inde qui investissent massivement dans la recherche et les technologies afin de pousser leurs industries vers le haut de la chaîne de valeur.

Les secteurs de notre économie doivent rester compétitifs. Il y a lieu d'améliorer notre compétitivité face à nos principaux partenaires commerciaux en renforçant notre productivité.

De même, il est important de maintenir l'objectif d'investir 3 % du PIB dans la R & D et de combler le retard par rapport aux Etats-Unis et au Japon. Par ailleurs, il est absolument nécessaire d'améliorer les conditions de la R & D privée au sein de l'Union européenne. La stratégie propose plusieurs mesures à cet effet.

1.3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte des conséquences sociales et environnementales et du respect des droits et l'homme (par exemple le droit à la nourriture) ?

Réponse : Voir question 1.1. Le volet économique domine trop les volets social et environnemental.

##### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et la Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable*

2.1. La Stratégie de l'Union européenne en faveur du développement durable identifie 7 défis, chacun accompagné d'un objectif général. Dans ce contexte, est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 tient suffisamment compte de ces défis ? Veuillez spécifier votre réponse pour chaque défi avec un commentaire votre spécifications en faisant référence aux objectifs généraux susmentionnés.

	Oui	Non
1. changement climatique et énergie propre	X	
2. transports durables	X	X
3. consommation et production durables	X	
4. préservation et gestion des ressources naturelles	X	
5. santé publique		X
6. inclusion sociale, démographie et immigration	X	
7. pauvreté dans le monde et défis en matière de développement durable	X	X

Ad 1) Oui : Les objectifs « 20/20/20 » en matière de climat et d'énergie font partie des cinq grands objectifs à atteindre (y compris le fait de porter à 30 % la réduction des émissions si les conditions adéquates sont remplies).

Ad 2) Oui et non : Certes, la stratégie propose quelques mesures (développer des infrastructures intelligentes, se concentrer sur la dimension urbaine des transports), mais ces mesures sont assez vagues.

Ad 3) Oui : Des mesures sont énumérées dans l'initiative phare « Une Europe efficace dans l'utilisation des ressources », comme p. ex. la promotion d'un programme substantiel en matière d'efficacité des ressources (aidant à la fois les PME et les ménages).

Ad 4) idem point 3.

Ad 5) Non : aucun chapitre n'est dédié à la santé publique. L'initiative phare « Une plateforme européenne contre la pauvreté » estime qu'il convient de rechercher des solutions pour améliorer l'accès aux systèmes de soins de santé.

Ad 6) Inclusion sociale : Oui – L'inclusion sociale et la réduction de 20 millions du nombre de personnes menacées par la pauvreté est parmi les grands objectifs. Des mesures sont proposées à cet effet dans l'initiative phare « Une plateforme européenne contre la pauvreté ».

Démographie et immigration : La stratégie dévoile une « faiblesse » structurelle de l'Union européenne, à savoir le vieillissement de la population. L'objectif est de s'employer à porter à 75 % le taux d'emploi des femmes et des hommes âgés de 20 à 64 ans, notamment grâce à une plus grande participation des jeunes, des travailleurs âgés et des travailleurs peu qualifiés, ainsi qu'à une meilleure intégration des migrants légaux.

Ad 7) Non : Pauvreté dans le monde  
Oui : défis en matière de développement durable

2.2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 prévoit assez d'instruments pour (1) réaliser ces défis et (2) mesurer et (3) suivre leurs résultats (par exemple en introduisant des critères similaires aux critères de convergence de l'euro) ?

Réponse : Tel est difficile à dire. La Stratégie contient en tout cas une panoplie de mesures et d'instruments. Il existe cinq grands objectifs clairement définis et chiffrés qu'il convient maintenant de traduire en objectifs nationaux dans le cadre d'un projet de programme national de réforme à soumettre pour le 12 novembre 2010 à la Commission européenne.

Par ailleurs, le Conseil européen a adopté une gouvernance renforcée au niveau de l'Union européenne par rapport à l'ancienne Stratégie de Lisbonne (le « semestre européen »).

### *La Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et les Parlements nationaux*

3.1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre croit que le processus décisionnel, lié à la Stratégie EUROPE 2020, est suffisamment contraignant pour les Etats membres et que le contrôle par les Parlements nationaux et, le cas échéant, régionaux est suffisamment assuré?

Réponse : Le contrôle des Parlements nationaux et la concertation avec d'autres acteurs, comme les syndicats et les associations patronales, ne sont assurés que de manière insuffisante. De plus, le document a de manière générale été élaboré après une trop courte période de consultation.

En date du 10 juin 2010, la Chambre des Députés a organisé un débat d'orientation sur la stratégie communautaire, avant l'adoption définitive de celle-ci lors du Conseil européen de juin 2010 (voir aussi question 3.3.)

3.2. Quels sont les organes de votre Parlement/Chambre qui seront chargés du suivi de la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 et de quelle façon le gouvernement devra-t-il justifier ses actions tendant à la poursuite des objectifs de cette Stratégie ?

Réponse : Le suivi de la Stratégie 2020 est dans la compétence de plusieurs commissions. Chacune des commissions suit les volets qui sont dans sa compétence : outre la Commission de l'Economie, du Commerce extérieur et de l'Economie solidaire, il s'agit de la Commission du Développement durable (créée en juillet 2009 et en charge des volets environnement, transports, travaux publics et aménagement du territoire), de la Commission du Travail et de l'Emploi, de la Commission de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche, des Media, des Communications et de l'Espace, de la Commission de l'Education nationale, de la Formation professionnelle et des Sports, de la Commission de la Famille, de la Jeunesse et de l'Egalité des Chances ainsi que de la Commission des Affaires étrangères et européennes, de la Défense, de la Coopération et de l'Immigration.

Le suivi de la Stratégie Europe 2020 est assuré de la même manière que pour les autres dossiers parlementaires. Ainsi, des échanges de vues peuvent p. ex. être organisés en commission avec les Ministres compétents ou des débats peuvent être mis à l'ordre du jour d'une séance publique.

3.3. Décrivez brièvement les procédures parlementaires (au niveau national et, le cas échéant, au niveau régional).

Réponse : Le Luxembourg ne connaît pas de régions et la procédure parlementaire est donc exclusivement nationale. Le suivi de la Stratégie Europe 2020 est assuré de la même manière que

pour les autres dossiers parlementaires, comme p. ex. les échanges de vues en commission avec les Ministres compétents.

A relever aussi qu'un débat d'orientation a été organisé lors de la séance publique du 10 juin 2010 sur la stratégie communautaire « Europe 2020 » sur demande de la Commission de l'Economie, du Commerce extérieur et de l'Economie solidaire.

3.4. Au cas où un tel organe ou une telle procédure parlementaire n'a pas encore été établi, envisage-t-on de le(s) créer ?

Réponse : ---

3.5. Quelle serait la meilleure façon pour les Parlements/Chambres de contribuer au renforcement de l'aspect développement durable dans la Stratégie EUROPE 2020 ?

Réponse : Il serait opportun de faire le suivi des recommandations (et des points à surveiller) adressées aux Etats membres par le Conseil européen dans le cadre des évaluations des programmes nationaux de réforme.

## **Chapitre 2. Contrôle parlementaire de la Politique de sécurité et de défense commune (ci-après: «PSDC»)**

### **Questions:**

1. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre estime utile un échange interparlementaire sur la PESC et la PCSD en vue d'améliorer le contrôle parlementaire au niveau national et/ou européen?

Réponse : Il est indispensable d'organiser un échange interparlementaire sur la PESC et la PCSD en vue d'améliorer le contrôle parlementaire au niveau européen. En ce qui concerne le contrôle parlementaire au niveau national, il serait intéressant d'organiser un échange des meilleures pratiques.

2. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère que le contrôle parlementaire au niveau de l'UE devrait inclure aussi bien la PESC que la PCSD ou rien que la PCSD ?

Réponse : Le contrôle devrait porter à la fois sur la PESC et sur la PCSD.

3. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère souhaitable l'installation d'un mécanisme, d'une structure ou d'un forum particulier en vue de l'organisation d'une coopération et d'un contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?

Le cas échéant,

- Est-ce que celui-ci devrait prendre la forme d'une nouvelle commission/ conférence/ organisation/ institution interparlementaire ?
- **Est-ce que l'état membre de la Présidence tournante devrait y avoir un rôle spécial ?**
- **Veillez spécifier d'autres modalités.**

Réponse : Le contrôle interparlementaire de la PESC et de la PCSD est indispensable, mais il est toutefois inopportun de créer de nouveaux mécanismes ou forums à cet effet. Une structure flexible et légère pourrait suffire. Cette structure devrait être encadrée d'une cellule d'experts



qui, ensemble avec des parlementaires préparent des documents sur les sujets à discuter. Une multiplication des réunions doit être évitée.

Au cas où une nouvelle structure telle que décrite ici est créée, le Parlement qui assure la présidence devrait en assurer la présidence.

4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre préfère un modèle ou un arrangement institutionnel existant pour organiser la coopération et le contrôle interparlementaires de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
- 4.1. Est-ce que la COSAC devrait jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ? Le cas échéant,
- Sous quelle forme ?
  - Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COSAC ?
  - Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COSAC devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
  - Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
  - Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
  - Est-ce que vous estimez que la COSAC doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
  - Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?

Réponse : La COSAC ne dispose pas des moyens et des experts requis pour jouer un rôle dans le contrôle interparlementaire de la PESC et de la PCSD.

- 4.2. Est-ce que la COFACC et/ou la «CODAC» devrai(en)t jouer un rôle dans un tel contrôle ? Le cas échéant,
- Sous quelle forme ?
  - Est-ce que ce contrôle devrait être fait lors des réunions ordinaires de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» ?
  - Est-ce que des réunions spéciales de la COFACC ou de la «CODAC» devraient être convoquées afin de discuter de la PESC et/ou de la PCSD ?
  - Est-ce que ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière ou ad hoc ?
  - Au cas où ces réunions devraient être convoquées sur une base régulière, quel devrait en être l'intervalle ?
  - Est-ce que vous estimez que la COFACC ou la «CODAC» doit être réformée afin de pouvoir traiter de ces sujets ?
  - Le cas échéant, quelles sont les modifications/réformes qui s'imposent ?

Réponse : La CODAC peut être une instance appropriée pour assurer ce contrôle, à condition d'être réformée. Des réunions semestrielles devraient être prévues pour discuter de sujets traitant la sécurité et la défense. La composition devrait assurer la participation de 3 à 6 parlementaires nationaux. Les discussions devraient se baser sur des documents préparés par des parlementaires assistés d'experts recrutés à cet effet. Des résolutions devraient clôturer les débats.

- 4.3. Est-ce qu'une autre conférence/organisation/institution devrait encore jouer un rôle dans ce contrôle ? Le cas échéant,
- Laquelle ?
  - Sous quelle forme ?
  - Veuillez spécifier d'autres modalités.

Réponse : Il faut absolument éviter de multiplier les interventions. Par contre, il faut assurer que les parlementaires disposent d'une cellule d'experts qui les assisteront dans la préparation et le suivi des réunions.

5. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est prêt à mettre à disposition des budgets pour ce contrôle ?

Réponse : Les décisions sur l'éventuelle mise à disposition de fonds budgétaires sont prises au cas par cas par le Bureau de la Chambre des Députés lorsque les données nécessaires pour pouvoir prendre une décision en pleine connaissance de cause sont connues.

6. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre est partisan d'un mécanisme/d'une structure/d'un forum composé(e) de membres des seuls Parlements nationaux ou d'un organe mixte avec des membres du Parlement européen ?

Réponse : Il serait opportun d'associer le Parlement européen aux travaux.

7. Est-ce que, au sujet de la coopération interparlementaire relative à la PESC et/ou à la PCSD, votre Parlement/Chambre est d'avis que le Parlement européen devrait être doté du statut de membre ou d'observateur ?

Réponse : Le Parlement pourrait être doté du statut de membre de cette structure. Elle devrait être composée de 3 à 6 parlementaires nationaux. Le Parlement Européen serait représenté de 6 membres. Dans les délégations nationales devraient figurer des parlementaires des partis de la majorité ainsi que de l'opposition.

Ne devrait-on pas accorder le statut d'observateur aux pays non membres de l'UE mais actuellement associés aux travaux de l'UEO ?

### **Chapitre 3. Le rôle futur de la COSAC après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Lisbonne – suite du débat de la XLIII COSAC**

#### **Questions:**

1. La Contribution de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 10.1) stipule que «Assurer le suivi du rôle des Parlements nationaux comme souligné en particulier dans l'Article 12 du Traité sur l'Union européenne et ses Protocoles respectifs restera l'une des priorités de la COSAC». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment et dans quelle mesure ce suivi peut-il mis en œuvre en pratique ?

Réponse : Le suivi du rôle des Parlements nationaux peut être assuré dans le cadre des travaux ordinaires de la COSAC, soit au niveau du rapport annuel, soit en cas de besoin au niveau d'une des réunions. Il peut être envisagé d'adresser une lettre à des institutions européennes s'il est constaté que le rôle des Parlements nationaux n'est pas respecté ou d'en faire le cas échéant mention dans la contribution de la COSAC. En tout état de cause, chaque Parlement national est libre de définir ses propres pratiques pour répondre aux objectifs des Protocoles 1 et 2.

2. La Contribution de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 10.2) stipule que «Le système appelé « Système d'alerte précoce » tel qu'établi dans le Protocole (n°2) et le mécanisme de coordination

entre les Parlements nationaux devraient jouer un rôle approprié dans la COSAC». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment la COSAC devrait-elle assumer cette tâche en pratique ?

Réponse : Le secrétariat de la COSAC devrait tenir informés les Parlements nationaux sur les informations fournies par les délégations auprès de la COSAC sur les éventuels avis motivés en matière de contrôle de la subsidiarité qui sont en cours d'élaboration. En cas de besoin, la question pourrait être introduite à l'ordre du jour d'une réunion.

3. Quelle est l'opinion de votre Parlement/Chambre sur l'organisation pratique d'un débat, dans le cadre de la COSAC, relatif au Programme de travail de la Commission européenne ?

Réponse : Il est utile d'inviter un représentant de la Commission européenne pour présenter le Programme et répondre aux questions des parlementaires.

4. Est-ce que votre Parlement/Chambre considère acceptable l'invitation d'orateurs externes à l'Union européenne (par exemple le Secrétaire général de l'OTAN, l'Ambassadeur des États-Unis, etc.) pour informer la COSAC en ce qui concerne la PESC et/ou la PCSD ?

Réponse : Il serait effectivement intéressant de connaître également la position d'orateurs externes à l'Union européenne, en particulier lorsqu'il est question de la PESC ou de la PCSD.

5. Des réponses au questionnaire ayant mené au 13<sup>ème</sup> rapport semestriel, il s'est avéré qu'une large majorité des Parlements/Chambres<sup>47</sup> soutenait l'idée d'ajouter le sujet du contrôle politique d'Europol et de l'évaluation des activités d'Eurojust en tant que point régulier de l'ordre du jour de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, de quelle manière ces débats devraient-ils être tenus ? En particulier, les débats en COSAC devraient-ils être précédés d'auditions de représentants d'Europol et Eurojust ou cette évaluation introductive devrait-elle être présentée par, par exemple, des représentants du monde académique, judiciaire et/ou des services de police ?

Réponse : Il serait opportun d'inviter régulièrement des représentants d'Europol et d'Eurojust devant la COSAC. Pour le reste, chaque Parlement national organise son information comme il l'entend.

6. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré d'inviter les commissions parlementaires spécialisées à participer aux activités de la COSAC. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre préférerait-il augmenter la coopération avec les commissions parlementaires spécialisées dans le cadre de la COSAC ou en dehors de celui-ci ? Au cas où préférence est donnée au cadre de la COSAC, veuillez spécifier les modalités possibles d'une telle coopération.

Réponse : La coopération entre les commissions parlementaires spécialisées devrait se faire en dehors de la COSAC.

7. Lors du débat sur le rôle futur de la COSAC à Madrid, un certain nombre d'orateurs ont suggéré l'organisation d'une «Semaine européenne» dans les Parlements nationaux. Dans ce contexte, votre Parlement/Chambre soutient-il la suggestion d'organiser une telle «Semaine européenne» et, le cas échéant, de quelle manière en envisage-t-il l'organisation pratique ? La COSAC devrait-elle prendre une initiative à ce sujet ?

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid. – p. 47

Réponse : La COSAC ne devrait pas prendre d'initiatives concrètes en vue de l'organisation d'une semaine européenne, mais en laisser l'initiative aux Parlements nationaux qui souhaitent y donner suite.

8. Les Conclusions de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 3.4) stipulent que «la COSAC devrait refléter comment les nouvelles technologies, telles que les vidéoconférences, et les forums, tels qu'IPEX, pourraient être employés et optimisés afin de donner effet à l'Article 10 du Protocole (n° 1) sur le Rôle des Parlements nationaux dans l'Union européenne». Selon votre Parlement/Chambre, comment, en pratique, de nouvelles technologies pourraient-elles être employées et optimisées par la COSAC ?

Réponse : Les nouvelles technologies pourraient être utilisées en particulier au cas où des groupes de travail ou des réunions extraordinaires sont organisés.

9. Les Conclusions de la XLIII COSAC (Paragraphe 3.6) stipulent que «Le Règlement devrait limiter les temps de parole à 3 minutes, à moins que la Présidence n'en décide autrement, en tenant compte des circonstances spécifiques». Votre Parlement/Chambre est-il d'avis que le Règlement de la COSAC devrait être modifié sur d'autres points ?

Réponse : Il n'est pas nécessaire de modifier le règlement de la COSAC.

## **Malta: Kamra-tad-Deputati**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

*In each and every sector: energy, transport, health etc. the economic, financial, social and ecological factor should be all taken into consideration, otherwise the targets that have been set in the strategy cannot be met. All four factors are interdependent and should be reflected in all sectors as outlined in the national reform programmes that all member states are developing. This is the correct way to achieve sustainable growth which is the greatest challenge for Europe but should remain its utmost priority.*

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

*Although the strategy does not make direct reference to the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, the targets that have been set by the strategy are earmarked to make Europe more sustainable and competitive in the rest of the world.*

*Nonetheless, it needs to be affirmed that for the EU economy to remain sustainable and competitive, a benchmarking exercise is required. The EU risks lagging behind if what is happening in third economies – such as India and Brazil – which have grown rapidly in spite of the crises that were being experienced in Europe and the United States, is ignored.*

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

*Two out of the seven flagship initiatives deal directly with the social, environmental and human rights issues. The Communication from the Commission entitled - Europe 2020 – A strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth states that:*

- 1. There should be a 'resource efficient Europe'. Targets have been set for the reduction of green house emissions by at least 20% compared to 1990 levels; increase of renewable energy sources in our final energy consumption by 20%; and a 20% increase in energy efficiency.*
- 2. There should also be a 'European platform against poverty' to ensure social and territorial cohesion such that the benefits of growth and jobs are widely shared and people experiencing poverty and social exclusion are enabled to live in dignity and take an active part in society. The target set by the EU is that the number of Europeans living*

*below the national poverty line should be reduced, lifting over 20 million people out of poverty.*

*However there should be more focus on the humanitarian issue. For instance the issue of illegal immigration in the Mediterranean is leading to humanitarian crises with social consequences on a number of member states in the South of Europe. Solidarity has been shown with Greece when faced with financial turmoil. The Maltese Parliament supported this initiative and voted for Malta's share to aid Greece. With the same reasoning it is expected that solidarity is shown with member states that are currently experiencing a disproportionate inflow of illegal immigrants.*

#### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

*Although the strategy does take the factors above into account the key to its success is to have the necessary benchmarks in place and that the necessary momentum be maintained in order to achieve them.*

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

*An ambitious Europe 2020 Strategy must be matched by an appropriate governance structure. It is believed that such a strategy should be based on shared analysis and agreed general principles as well as key targets to ensure consistent action by the Member States and the European Union.*

*In order to ensure increased ownership of the Strategy, all Member States must be involved in the monitoring and enforcement of the strategy. National Parliaments should play an important role in the monitoring the implementation of the EU 2020 Strategy.*

#### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

*The Maltese House of Representatives is in the process of discussing Europe 2020 Strategy and has not yet outlined its monitoring role on the implementation of the Strategy.*

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

*See answer 3.1*

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

*See answer 3.1*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

*The Maltese Parliament is still in the process of discussing the EU 2020 Strategy and what parliamentary procedures need to be established to follow up this Strategy.*

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*National parliaments have an important role of enriching the discussion on the EU 2020 Strategy and monitoring how this is being adopted at national level. Furthermore, national parliaments are in the most effective position in order to bring this debate closer to the citizens of the Member States of the European Union.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

*Interparliamentary exchanges are necessary to bring together different ideas and experiences on many issues, including CFSP/CSDP, as well as to improve scrutiny. Such exchanges are even more important for certain parliaments like the Maltese Parliament as this sharing of ideas promotes to establishment of best practice and could lead to a natural harmonisation of procedures.*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

*Interparliamentary scrutiny should cover both CFSP and CSDP, as long as no new costly structures are necessary.*

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,
- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.

*As per reply to previous question no new structures should be set up. Such scrutiny should be integrated in the regular work of COSAC.*

*New technologies should be used to support any new exchanges that might be necessary on an ad hoc basis.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

*Replies to questions 2 and 3 refer.*

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
  - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

*COSAC should be involved in this scrutiny with the possibility of holding ad hoc meetings (by way of videoconference) if necessary. CFSP/CSDP should feature as an agenda item on a regular basis, possibly every other meeting. No reforms to COSAC or its Rules would be necessary if the items are simply added to the agenda (other than those changes proposed in Q 3.9).*

*Such system could be evaluated say in 2 years, without the need of laborious revisions to the Rules of Procedure.*

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?



*Scrutiny of CFSP/CSDP primarily be within the remit of COSAC, however this should not preclude any other forum, such as COFACC or "CODAC", to independently scrutinise these aspects.*

*COSAC conclusions regarding CFSP/CSDP could be sent to COFACC or "CODAC".*

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

*No.*

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

*Only in a very limited manner and provided such scrutiny remains within the remit of COSAC.*

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

*Once it is being suggested that COSAC be the body entrusted with the scrutiny of CFSP/CSDP, MEPs would automatically be involved in the debate. It would be appropriate for MEPs from related EP Committees to be present during debates on CFSP/CSDP.*

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

*Reply to question 6 refers. They should have member status.*

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

*The national parliaments have a duty to make the most of the new impetus given to them by the Lisbon Treaty in contributing to the effective functioning of the EU. COSAC has over time asserted its position as the best suited forum to promote interparliamentary exchange of information and dialogue on EU matters.*

*COSAC should continue to pilot studies based on questionnaires and checklist procedures in order to disseminate as much information as possible to enable national parliaments to establish best practices.*

*Presentations from academics and professionals should also be taken on.*

*Monitoring should be limited to information collection and support to national parliaments and no initiatives by COSAC should be binding on parliaments.*

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

*COSAC should work to strengthen the IPEX system as this is considered to be a very powerful tool – if used to the full and properly – to support the efficient and effective inter-parliamentary cooperation on the early-warning system.*

*An important step that needs to be taken to strengthen IPEX is to include summaries of the positions of national parliaments on dossiers in English and/or French.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

*According to the 'Declaration on the role of national parliaments to raise national European awareness' of the European Convention dated 9 July 2003 as consequently adopted by COSAC<sup>48</sup> and the EU-Speakers Conference,<sup>49</sup> national parliaments have been called upon to hold a coinciding debate on the Commission Annual Legislative and Work Programme (ALWP).<sup>50</sup> COSAC should work to encourage all the Parliaments to hold such coinciding debate. The Work Programme is usually adopted towards the end of October, thus it would be appropriate to hold the coinciding debate towards the end of the year. Following that the Chairmen could report any issues of interest to the first Chairperson's meeting in February, and if necessary include such issues an item on the agenda of the Ordinary Meeting.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

*Addresses by keynote speakers from a wide-ranging selection of blocs or regional organisations would bring added value to debates in COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP.*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>51</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

---

48 XXXII COSAC – The Hague – 21-23 November 2004 – XXXIII COSAC – Luxembourg – 17-18 May 2005, and XXIV COSAC – London - 9-11 October.

49 EU-Speakers' Conference – Budapest – 6-7 May – Presidency Conclusions

50 COM (2005) 531 - Unlocking Europe's full potential - Commission Legislative and Work Programme 2006.

51 Ibid. – p. 41.

*On a yearly basis the heads of Europol and Eurojust could be invited to make a presentation to COSAC on the work being carried out by their respective organisation. COSAC members would then be able to participate in a debate with the heads of the organisations.*

*Presentations by other organisations/entities whose work is related to that of Europol/Eurojust would also be appropriate.*

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

*COSAC should retain its position as main forum for interparliamentary debate on EU affairs, however certain debates on specific issues could be enhanced by inviting chairpersons or members of specialised committees to participate in specific debates, especially – as suggested earlier – in ad hoc meetings.*

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*COSAC could take the lead in coordinating such events e.g. by choosing the theme for a particular year. National parliaments should then be allowed to organise the event according to their own traditions and resources.*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

*In view of the general drive by governments and also by national parliaments to reduce costs as much as possible, new technologies that offer considerable cost savings, such as videoconferences and video streaming, should be exploited.*

*Such means could be used in instances where national parliaments have limitations to physically participate in meetings and also to enable the convening of ad hoc meetings or working groups without giving rise to additional financial costs for national parliaments.*

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*The reduction of the speaking time to a maximum of 3 minutes is strongly supported in order to ensure that all the speakers wishing to participate in a debate have such opportunity and also contribute to a more focussed debate.*

*The Rules of Procedure should be amended to reflect the reality of the need to embrace new technologies, e.g. as suggested in 8 above.*

## **The Netherlands: Tweede Kamer**



Replies from the Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal  
(House of Representatives of the States General of The Netherlands)  
To the:

### **QUESTIONNAIRE: 14TH BI-ANNUAL REPORT OF COSAC**

Please find the replies in the boxes below.

#### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

##### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

Yes.

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

Yes

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

In 2008 and 2009, Parliamentary Resolutions have been adopted underlining that Lisbon post 2010 should focus more on sustainable growth, solidarity and quality of life within and outside the EU" (Motie-Wiegman – 21501 20 nr. 382) and calling on the Government to "promote that 'green innovation' is placed centre stage in the new Lisbon strategy" (Motie-Peters 32125 nr. 12). In the EU2020 headline targets and flagship initiatives, these elements are more visible than in the Lisbon Strategy. The national targets and the National Reform Programmes need to confirm this trend.

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	x	
2. sustainable transport	x	
3. sustainable consumption and production	x	
4. conservation and management of natural resources	x	
5. public health	x	
6. social inclusion, demography and migration	x	
7. global poverty and sustainable development	x	

Comment: in some cases, such 1 and 3, these issues have been taken on board in the headline targets and flagship initiatives. In other fields, such as 5 and 7, this is less clearly the case, but these areas are not seen by the House as major areas for EU2020.

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

In the run up to EU2020, the House pleaded for a new strategy with a smaller number of realistic, quantifiable and measurable targets and an improved follow-up mechanism. Allocation of Cohesion and Structural Funds should be made more supportive to these targets and conditional to Member States' performances vis-à-vis these targets.

EU2020 shows improvements in various areas, but some points still need to be delivered. A final judgment of EU2020 can only be made when the current debate on economic governance is concluded. The Van Rompuy Group should seek to implement a "European Seminar" about Member States' budgetary policies and introduce conditionality/sanctions in the allocation of Cohesion Fund, Structural Funds and CAP.

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

It is to a large extent up to National Parliaments to ensure that the process at national level is sufficiently stringent. The process of setting national targets is a key element. National Parliaments should be closely involved in this process and should commit themselves to the targets. These targets should be implemented in the national budgetary cycle. The House of Representatives intends to monitor this implementation process. National Reform Programmes

should be scrutinized in direct relation to the national budgets.

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

Standing committee on Economic Affairs  
Standing Committee on European Affairs  
Standing Committee on Finance

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

In November 2009, the Standing Committee on Economic Affairs held a special meeting with the Minister (Lisbon Coordinator) about the “new Lisbon Strategy”.  
In advance of every Council or European Council meeting, the relevant Standing Committee discusses the Dutch position. This also applies to “Lisbon related” Councils, such as Competitiveness, EPSCO and ECOFIN. European Council meetings, including the Spring European Council, are discussed afterwards in a plenary session.  
The draft national targets will be sent to Parliament before submitting them to the European Commission. National Reform Programmes and (updates of) Stability Programmes are sent to Parliament before handing them in to the European Commission.  
As of 2010, the national Budget, to be submitted to Parliament in September, will contain a letter explaining how the Budget relates to the EU2020 Strategy and its targets.

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

n.a.

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

By scrutinizing national targets, National Reform Programmes and the national budget. Draft bills or policy programmes at national level should be related to the Lisbon targets.

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

The Tweede Kamer is not in favour of interparliamentary scrutiny on CFSP and CSDP at the EU level. Interparliamentary exchange on these topics should concentrate on the exchange of

information, coordination of Parliamentary activities and preparatory meetings with key EU players.

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

The Tweede Kamer is not in favour of interparliamentary scrutiny on CFSP and CSDP at the EU level.

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

No. The Tweede Kamer believes that interparliamentary information exchange on CFSP and CSDP should take place in the existing structures: COFACC/ CODAC and COSAC.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

Yes. The Tweede Kamer believes that information exchange on these topics should take place in the existing structures: COFACC/ CODAC and COSAC.

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

The Tweede Kamer is not in favour of interparliamentary scrutiny on CFSP and CSDP. As far as the exchange of information is concerned, COSAC could play a role in facilitating the organisation of interparliamentary meetings, as stated in article 10 of Protocol I. .

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?

- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

The Tweede Kamer believes that the ordinary meetings of COFACC/ CODAC and COSAC suffice for the information exchange between national parliaments on these topics.

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

-

No.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

The Tweede Kamer does not believe that any additional funding is needed.

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

The Tweede Kamer is not in favour of mechanisms or structures other than the existing, i.e. COFACC/CODAC and COSAC.

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

The Tweede Kamer is not in favour of any modifications to the existing set-up of interparliamentary information exchange on these topics, i.e. through COFACC/CODAC and COSAC.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?



COSAC should play a role in the Early Warning System (Protocol 2/subsidiarity) and the coordination mechanism between national parliaments. The most obvious instrument for this is to coordinate a number of subsidiarity checks annually. In addition to this, National Parliaments should make better use of their Brussels representatives and IPEX. (Regular) COSAC meetings are not the most adequate instrument because of the narrow time frames.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

A debate in COSAC should concentrate on an exchange of views about the priorities selected by National Parliaments and their plans to scrutinize the respective Commission initiatives. In preparation, National Parliaments should compose and exchange priority lists and scrutiny plans. Concerning the 2010 LWP, only a handful of National Parliaments have uploaded scrutiny information on the LWP in IPEX. Only 3 have uploaded priority lists.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

No. Core business of COSAC should be to coordinate scrutiny by national parliaments of EU proposals, and to make the new competences given to national parliaments by the Lisbon Treaty work.

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>52</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

The House was not among those advocating a recurrent agenda item on Europol/Eurojust. The announced consultations of National Parliaments by the European Commission should be awaited before entering into further detail.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

Independently. Interparliamentary committee meetings should be held in accordance with the planning procedures agreed by the Speakers in Stockholm.

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

No. National Parliaments should integrate EU politics in their day to day business. Separating a “European Week” from the other weeks would not be supportive to this objective.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

In Stockholm, the EU Speakers asked the incoming EUSC Presidency to further explore the use of videoconferences as a means of communication between parliaments to be followed up at the next meeting of the Conference of Speakers of EU Parliaments. This could include an inventory of experiences made by National Parliaments and the European Parliament. COSAC should apply videoconferencing at appropriate occasions.  
On September 14th, the Dutch Parliament intends to liaise with the Dutch MEPs in a videoconference, to be opened by President Buzek, in the run up to the 16 September European Council.

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

No specific points.

## **The Netherlands: Eerste Kamer**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**The Senate has not taken an explicit stance on this question**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**The Senate has not taken an explicit stance on this question**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**The Senate has not taken an explicit stance on this question**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

**The Senate has not taken an explicit stance on these questions**

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

The Senate has not taken an explicit stance on this question

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

National Parliaments are responsible to exercise effective oversight of national action plans by scrutinising their governments' national targets. The Senate intends to monitor the government's progress towards its objectives and to take this into consideration when scrutinising relevant draft national legislation.

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

The standing Committee on European Cooperation Organisations  
The standing Committee on Economic Affairs  
The standing Committee on Finance

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

The draft national targets, National Reform Programmes, as well as (updates of) Stability Programmes are sent to Parliament.

Furthermore, the Senate can hold the government to account in relation to the draft national legislation as well as its position on draft European legislation.

The Senate can also debate government's initiatives and progress under the Strategy at the annual 'General European Reflection'. In April 2010, the Europe 2020 Strategy was debated with the government.

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

N/A

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

As with the other aspects of the Europe 2020 Strategy, the Senate can scrutinise both the government's objectives set out in the national targets and the National Reform Programmes, as well as the implementation of these goals through draft national legislation.

**Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

**Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

The Senate believes that interparliamentary exchange is useful and helpful to the extent that it furthers discussions in national parliaments about the CSDP and CFSP and promotes active participation of Members in the existing European fora that debate these issues, namely COFACC and CODAC. The Senate sees little added benefit in organising interparliamentary scrutiny of CSDP and CFSP at the European level.

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

The exchange of information (not scrutiny) should cover both CFSP and CSDP.

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,
  - Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - **Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?**
  - **Please specify other modalities.**

The Dutch Senate strongly holds the view that no additional structures or mechanisms should be created. Interparliamentary information exchange can and should take place within the appropriate existing structures, namely COFACC and/or CODAC. To a lesser degree COSAC could be involved.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

Yes. The Dutch Senate favours the existing practice where CFSP/ESDP matters are discussed in COFACC and CODAC.

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
  - In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
  - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

COSAC should aim to assist in the exchange of information between national parliaments insofar as COFACC and CODACC prove to be inadequate for this purpose.

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
  - In what form?

- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

Regular, bi-annual COFACC and CODAC meetings should suffice to facilitate the exchange of information between national parliaments.

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

The Dutch Senate is not in favour of this option.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

The Senate is of the opinion that no additional funding is needed nor appropriate.

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

No.

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

The Senate does not believe that any changes to the existing arrangements are necessary.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

As a forum for the exchange of best practices, (changes to) parliamentary procedures, and results of scrutiny procedures, COSAC plays, and can continue to play, an important role. It can help national parliaments to keep abreast of important developments within each others' parliaments.

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

The Senate believes that the added benefit of this mechanism lies predominantly in the possibility to share information on planned subsidiarity checks, or about checks in their early stages. It would be particularly useful if parliaments would upload their 'working programmes' for the next months/weeks to IPEX. This way, it would be transparent which priorities parliaments have in terms of European proposals for a given period, and thus which proposals may be likely to be subjected to a subsidiarity check.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

Such a debate should not only focus on a political exchange of views between representatives of national parliaments and the (vice-)President of the European Commission, but also on the priorities that national parliaments have set on the basis of the Commission's Legislative and Work Programme. This may facilitate the exchange information among parliaments on their respective political priorities, as well as enrich debates on draft European legislation 'at home'.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

The Senate believes that COFACC/ CODAC would be more appropriate venues to invite such speakers if they are to speak specifically on the CFSP/CSDP.

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>53</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

The Senate would be in favour of a discussion on the basis of expert reports, as opposed to hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust themselves. [check met Kim/Laurens]

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

The Senate believes that further coordination between the various interparliamentary committees can be achieved by independent cooperation, rather than direct involvement in COSAC's

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

activities. It is important to abide by the planning procedures that have been agreed by the Speakers in Stockholm

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

The Senate sees little added benefit in this initiative, as it strives to incorporate the ‘European dimension’ into its day-to-day activities, including draft national legislation. There is therefore no need for COSAC to take any initiatives in this regard.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

In the short term, COSAC could draw up an inventory of the facilities for, applications of, and experiences with videoconferencing in the different national parliaments. It may also help ensure that benchmarks are discussed for the use of audiovisual equipment and that trials are conducted, so that videoconferencing can become an integral part of interparliamentary contacts in the medium to long term.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

This may be a welcome amendment.



**Poland: Sejm**



Warsaw, 4 October 2010

SEJM  
OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND  
EUROPEAN UNION AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

CHARIMAN  
*Stanisław Rakoczy*

**SEJM, POLAND**

**QUESTIONNAIRE: 14TH BI-ANNUAL REPORT OF COSAC**

**Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

**Questions:**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

- 1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

*Yes. The EUROPE 2020 objectives are ambitious but possible to reach. The main condition is that the conclusions from failure of Lisbon Strategy will be drawn. The EU targets are interrelated, however it is important that each Member State define correctly its initial point and translate them into their national level.*

*On the other hand there are some doubts that high expenditures on innovations, climate, education or social projects do not go hand in hand with savings, which are essential after the crisis.*

- 1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

*Yes. EU 2020 Strategy is taking it into account, especially in context of R&D spending which is below 2% compared to 2.6% in US or 3.4% in Japan. It is also visible when speaking about the single market, where gaps still can be met and some rules are remains uneven while in China or US large home markets exists.*

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

*Yes. The inclusive growth as a key challenge is quite well defined in the EU 2020 Strategy, but the main role is here on the Member State side (including reforms and education of the society in those particular matters).*

*Speaking about food safety it has to be noticed that only Poland and France raise their voice about CAP which was not included in EU 2020.*

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	X	
2. sustainable transport		X
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		X
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

*To achieve these goals effective assessment is crucial, however there is a concern that the same mistakes as for Lisbon Strategy will be made. Although the Commission will assess the programmes and report on progress made by the Member States it still might be not enough.*

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

*It has not been discussed yet.*

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

*It has not been discussed yet.*

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*- efficient implementation of EU regulations and directives and co-operation at the interparliamentary level.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

*Yes. At a national as well as at European level.*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

*Yes. There is strict correlation between those two and both should be considered.*

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

*Unlikely, only in case if objects of the scrutiny can not be achieved using the present structures.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

*Existing model.*

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
  - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

*Yes. A permanent panel during the COSAC meetings could be created.*

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

*Chairpersons of those committees which are included in COFACC, CODAC and COSAC should be in permanent contact with each other while it is important not to repeat the same topics of discussion. This matter should be left to the scrutiny rules of each national parliament.*

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

*It has not been discussed yet.*

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

*Forum could include European Parliament as an equal member represented on the adequate level.*

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

*Observer or member status but in the second case only on the same rights as other member states.*

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

*By the network of Representatives of the national parliaments as well as by informing the COSAC secretariat.*

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

*See replay above. However COSAC's attention should be more focused on further step of the procedure - to hold a debate on the replays from the European Commission.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

*Work Programme of the European Commission is discussed on European Affairs Committee, that is why only the most essential issues should be included in the COSAC debate.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

*Yes.*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>54</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

*Both could be conducted. Representatives and chairmen of different interparliamentary assemblies could be invited as well.*

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC.

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

*The composition of the COSAC delegation and involvement of the branch committees into COSAC's activities should be left to the each national parliament.*

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*Yes, but it should be not only the EU institutions but also other European organizations (ex. Council of Europe).*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*No. There is no such need.*

Chairman of the Committee

/-/ Stanislaw Rakoczy

## **Poland: Senat**



SENATE OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND  
THE EUROPEAN UNION AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Warsaw, 14 September 2010

### **SENATE OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND** **REPLIES TO THE** **QUESTIONNAIRE: 14TH COSAC BI-ANNUAL REPORT**

#### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

##### **Questions:**

Answering to the question concerning the different aspects of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy it should be emphasized that since the very beginning the European Union initiatives for Sustainable Development of the EU and the member states have been of special interest to the Polish Senate. In June this year, the European Union Affairs Committee of the Senate organised a joint meeting with the National Economy Committee and the Budget and Public Finance Committee. The sitting was entirely dedicated to the Europe 2020 strategy. The special invitations were sent to and accepted by vice prime minister – Waldemar Pawlak and the MEPs. The sitting was a unique opportunity for the senators and other policymakers to learn the points of view of the Polish government and to evaluate the European Commission's approach to the sustainable development of Europe. It was agreed that in the near future the said topic would be discussed at the Senate sitting.

**Primary evaluation of the European 2020 strategy presented at the forum of the European Union Affairs Committee.**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**It is very important that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy is launched in a spirit of goodwill of all member states, however, taking into account the reasons of the ongoing crisis it seems that irrespectively of the political declarations the EU needs some guarantees, particularly a system of inevitable sanctions for these states which breach the adopted rules and obligations.**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**It seems that the Europe 2020 Strategy is focused mainly on the recovery of the EU economy after a slump. The principles of the Lisbon Strategy went out of date. The new program hasn't got much in common with former plans to gain an economic advantage over the United States or China.**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**No. (In the case of the right to food it is the consequence of playing down the CAP)**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		<b>No</b>
2. sustainable transport		<b>No</b>
3. sustainable consumption and production		<b>No</b>
4. conservation and management of natural resources		<b>No</b>
5. public health	<b>(This matter has not been discussed yet)</b>	
6. social inclusion, demography and migration	<b>(This matter has not been discussed yet)</b>	
7. global poverty and sustainable development	<b>(This matter has not been discussed yet)</b>	

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

**In the Europe 2020 Strategy quantitative goals should be determined more precisely in order to make their performance easier to monitor and evaluate.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

**There are some doubts because the proposed rules of decision-making process don't anticipate any legal or financial constraints in the case when the governments do not comply with their obligations.**

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?



**The European Union Affairs Committee and the National Economy Committee will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy. According to the Polish law and Senate's rules the EUAC has the right to monitor the Polish government's activity in EU matters. In case of doubt the EUAC may demand the explanations from the government.**

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

**Apart the Senate's rules and universally accepted norms, there are no specific parliamentary procedures.**

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

**No**

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

**By supervising the government being in charge of Strategy's implementation and monitoring of the progress against the targets. Particularly:**

- **on a regular basis, the European Union Affairs Committee summons the members of the Polish government and hold hearing on the EU issues;**
- **the EUAC will cooperate with government in the scope of the National Reforms Program.**

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

**Yes, in our view an interparliamentary exchange both on CFSP and CSDP is useful and necessary at European level.**

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

**An interparliamentary scrutiny should cover both areas, as they are strongly interdependent (art. 42 par. 1 of the Treaty on European Union).**

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

**Yes, but within a framework of COSAC**

If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?

**Interparliamentary conference**

- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?

**Yes**

- Please specify other modalities.

**According to the Article 10 of the Protocol no 1 COSAC is the only interparliamentary body mentioned in the treaties. According to the third sentence of the Article 10, COSAC “may organise interparliamentary conferences on specific topics, in particular to debate matters of common foreign and security policy, including security and defence policy”. That is why, in our view, COSAC is the only body which has a mandate to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP within a framework of the treaties.**

**In our view the scrutiny should be organised as conferences on CFSP and CSDP, as stated in the Article 10 third sentence of the Protocol. Besides chairmen of the EU Affairs Committees, chairmen of the Committees for Defence Affairs and Foreign affairs should also take part in such conferences.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

**Yes**

- In what form?

**COSAC should organise interparliamentary conferences dedicated especially to CFSP and CSDP.**

- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?

**No**

- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?

**Yes**

- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?

**On an ad-hoc basis**

- If on a regular basis, at what interval?

-

- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?

**No**

- What changes/reforms are needed?

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?

- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?

- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?

- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?

- If on a regular basis, at what interval?

- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?

- What changes/reforms are needed?

**In our view COSAC should not decide on a work of COFACC. COFACC can still play a role as a forum for discussion and interparliamentary exchange, but it does not have a treaties-based mandate for a scrutiny.**

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

**No**

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

**Not yet.**

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

**Members of the European Parliament should take part in conferences.**

Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

**Members of the European Parliament should have a member status.**

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent? **The mechanism of political dialogue between national parliaments and EU institutions is slowly becoming an established practice. Therefore, COSAC could be made a useful platform for exchange of information in this respect. Apart from inviting representatives of EU institutions to COSAC meetings and having face-to-face debates with them, it's worth considering for COSAC to request from the EU institutions information, lists and reports on the national parliaments' opinions, with a focus on a possible impact these opinions may have on decisions taken at the EU level.**

**As regards subsidiarity checks, the COSAC Secretariat might prepare a list of those legislative proposals from the Commission Work Programme which have been selected by national parliaments for subsidiarity check.**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national

Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

**Basing on the Commission Work Programme national parliaments could make up their lists of legislative proposals they intend to put to a subsidiarity test, while it would be for the COSAC Secretariat to compile and publish such lists.**

**As regards the early warning system, permanent representatives in Brussels should serve as a source of current information in this respect.**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

**With the Commission Work Programme (CWP) already published, it should be debated in national parliaments in the presence of the Commission's representatives (as it has been the case in the Polish Senate for the last 3 years). Having discussed the CWP, each national parliament might select those legislative proposals which are to be subjected to in-depth scrutiny. A compiled list of such selections could be prepared and published by the COSAC Secretariat before the year's first COSAC chairmen meeting takes place.**

**The year's first COSAC chairmen meeting should be attended by a Commission's representative to present the CWP.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

**YES**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>55</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**Such a debate should take place in the presence of Europol's and Eurojust's representatives, while debates with representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services might be carried out at national level.**

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

**COSAC membership specified in the rules of procedure should remain unchanged. Among the members of the Senate EU Affairs Committee are several chairmen of specialized committees and depending on the subject matter they often join Senate delegations to the COSAC. This is one of the ways how representatives/members of specialized committees might be involved in COSAC activities.**

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

**A “European Week” is a good idea and COSAC might work out a common framework for such meetings, including practical aspects like the most suitable timeframe (e.g. a week in May), the scope of issues to be discussed, a type/status of meetings and possible channels for information exchange among national parliaments. The more jointly agreed specifics, the better chance for a new practice to catch on and become a common routine.**

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

**Making use of new technologies requires advanced preparations, so a flexible transitional period is indispensable before they become a commonly used means of communication. Therefore, COSAC should be active in promoting new communication technologies and encouraging parliaments to invest in them in order to ensure that no stakeholder will be excluded from the debate for technical reasons.**

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

**An extension of the term of office of the permanent member of the COSAC Secretariat is worth considering (art. 11 bis Rules of Procedure of COSAC). E.g. a 4-year term would allow the staff to pursue an agreed agenda and to take a full responsibility for its effective implementation.**

Accepted by:

Edmund Wittbrodt  
Chairman  
EU Affairs Committee  
Senate of the Republic of Poland

## **Portugal: Assembleia da República**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

*(Note: response drawn up by the Committee on Economic Affairs, Innovation and Energy, Committee on Labour, Social Security and Public Administration and Committee on Environment, Territorial Planning and Local Government)*

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

*The report on the Communication from the European Commission COM(2010)2020 final that was drawn up by Member of the Assembly of the Republic Duarte Cordeiro (PS) and was unanimously approved by the Committee on Economic Affairs, Innovation and Energy (CAEIE) on 27 April 2010 recognised the communication's definition of "three mutually reinforcing priorities set to achieve these headline targets and to allow economic growth". It also calls attention to the launch of "seven flagship initiatives to catalyze progress under each priority theme". The Committee's report also mentions the fact that if an integrated approach is to be achieved, it is very important to draw up the reports on the Europe 2020 Strategy jointly with those on the Stability and Growth Pact.*

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

*This point has not been analysed by CAEIE so far.*

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

*To date, CAEIE has not looked at this point. We should also note that matters regarding the environment are usually analysed by the 12<sup>th</sup> Committee, while questions concerning food safety fall within the 7<sup>th</sup> Committee's area of competence.*

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	X	
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources	X	

5. public health

---

6. social inclusion, demography and migration

---

7. global poverty and sustainable development

*Note: with regard to the list of questions, inasmuch as there are no formal “deliberations” or positions on the matters in question, but given the overall positions taken in the 23 opinions on European initiatives that were sent to it by the European Affairs Committee (CAE) which the Committee on the Environment, Town and Country Planning and Local Government (CAOTPL) approved during the 1st Legislative Session of the 11th Legislature, it would seem appropriate to respond in the affirmative to questions 1 and 4, as per the above table.*

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

*This point has not been analysed so far.*

### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

*To date, apart from the Communication referred to above – COM(2010)2020 – CAEIE has not been sent any European initiative for scrutiny by the Parliament. CAEIE did debate the importance of a greater degree of monitoring by the National Parliaments of the construction and implementation of the Europe 2020 Strategy, both in terms of the scrutiny of European initiatives, and with regard to the monitoring and scrutiny of the actions of the Portuguese Government. Indeed, this debate resulted in a hearing of the Secretary of State with oversight of this matter on 16 June 2010.*

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

*At the Portuguese Parliament, the Europe 2020 Strategy is monitored by the Parliamentary Committees on European Affairs (CAE), Economic Affairs, Innovation and Energy (CAEIE) and Work, Social Security and Public Administration (CTSSAP), as well as by the Committee on Environment, Town and Country Planning and Local Government (CAOTPL) where the Strategy’s environmental dimension is concerned.*

*The Government’s actions in relation to this matter are scrutinised in various ways:*

*As the Parliamentary Committee that plays the pivotal role in the process of monitoring European affairs at the Assembly of the Republic (AR), CAE will coordinate the work of scrutinising the various initiatives – legislative and non-legislative – that are proposed within the scope of this EU2020 Strategy, and will distribute them to the different Committees with competence in relation to each subject. At the same time, as part of the regular process of consultations between the AR and the Portuguese Government, CAE holds a hearing both before and after each European Council, with the Spring European Council being of particular importance in this context.*

*CAEIE holds periodic hearings of the Strategy’s national coordinator, usually in October (following the submission of the annual reports on the execution of the national reform plans) and March (against the background of the Spring Council), as well as at other moments that may prove significant, and without prejudice to any other hearings/meetings which the Committee deems it opportune to hold – that referred to in 3.1, for example.*

The monitoring of the “Europe 2020 Strategy” by the 11th Committee (Work, Social Security and Public Administration, CTSSAP) focuses especially on guidelines 7 to 10 (increase participation in the labour market and reduce structural unemployment; develop a qualified workforce that is adapted to the needs of the labour market, and promote the quality of employment and of lifelong learning; improve the performance of education and training systems at every level, and increase participation in higher education; promote social integration and fight poverty), which fall within this Committee’s area of competence.

In this respect, monitoring the “Europe 2020 Strategy” formed part of the Committee’s activities throughout the first legislative session. At this point it is appropriate to note:

1. The organisation of a **seminar** on the topic “Work, Active Entrepreneurship Strategies and the EU 2020 Strategy” on 25 May last.

During the presentations and the subsequent debate, the participants identified the Strategy’s potentials, but also some of its constraints, in which respect the following questions were of particular import:

- ✓ The fact that the “Europe 2020 Strategy” can only really be successful if it is conceived in close articulation with the Community budget and the Stability and Growth Pact;
  - ✓ The fact that the conduct of the Strategy pertains to the Council and not the European Commission, which makes the necessary articulation of all the different Community and national vectors, which are absolutely fundamental to the Strategy’s success, more difficult.
2. The **Committee Chairman’s participation in the meeting of the Chairpersons of Work and Immigration Committees**, which the Spanish Parliament organised on 24 June last as part of the parliamentary aspect of the Spanish Presidency of the Council of the European Union, on the topic “Defining a post-Lisbon 2010 strategy for growth and employment inspired by innovation, education and sustainability”;
  3. **The scrutiny of two initiatives:** COM (2010) 193 final, Proposal for a COUNCIL DECISION on guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States, Part II of the Europe 2020 Integrated Guidelines; and SEC (2010) 488 final, Recommendation for a COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION of 27.4.2010 on broad guidelines for the economic policies of the Member States and of the Union – Part I of the Europe 2020 Integrated Guidelines {COM(2010) 193 final}

The Opinion on the scrutiny of the above initiatives, which was drawn up by Member of the Assembly of the Republic Miguel Laranjeiro (PS) and was approved by the Committee last July<sup>56</sup>, offers the following conclusions:

- ✓ Given the fact that the “Europe 2020 Strategy” is not limited to these initiatives, but is rather a medium/long-term plan, it is fundamentally important that the 11th Committee (CTSSAP) continue to receive information, particularly with regard to the National Reform Plan initiatives that are currently being drawn up by the Government.
- ✓ Notwithstanding the initiatives which the 11th Committee (CTSSAP) will be taking to monitor those of the integrated guidelines for the “Europe 2020 Strategy” that fall within its area of competence, the 11th Committee (CTSSAP) should ask the 4th Committee (CAE) to provide it with all the information it receives on the matter, and should assess the opportunity to take part in the

---

<sup>56</sup> The Opinion can be consulted on IPEX, at:  
[http://www.ipex.eu/ipex/cms/home/Documents/dossier\\_NLE20100115/pid/53725](http://www.ipex.eu/ipex/cms/home/Documents/dossier_NLE20100115/pid/53725)



*meetings which the 4th Committee (CAE) arranges before and after the European Councils, whenever the "Europe 2020 Strategy" is on the agenda for discussion.*

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

*The usual procedures apply to the scrutiny of European initiatives.*

*Hearings are organised at the initiative of Parliamentary Groups and/or on the basis of the CAEIE Activity Plan.*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

*In addition to the answer to 3.3., it should be noted that CAEIE can at any time decide to undertake any initiatives it considers opportune.*

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*Parliament has not formally considered this question, but it is an aspect that cuts right across the EU2020 Strategy, and one to which the AR attaches great importance. As such, this aspect is always likely to be considered as part of the work of scrutinising the various legislative and non-legislative initiatives that are presented within the ambit of the EU2020 Strategy.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

*(Note: response drawn up by the National Defence Committee)*

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

*Yes, on both levels.*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

*It is important for it to exist in both policies, although the specificity of the subjects warrants considering them separately.*

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

*Yes, we consider that it is necessary for there to be a mechanism to ensure that interparliamentary cooperation at this level effectively takes place in a constant and regular manner and in a way that guarantees an effective scrutiny of every aspect of the common defence and security policy.*

*We believe that it is possible to use the model employed at the Conference of Chairpersons of Defence Committees, which can be developed and institutionalised as described below.*

*Although the Treaty stipulates that in matters concerning CFSP and CSDP, the Council must be chaired by the High Representative, we believe that there are advantages to be gained from having these interparliamentary conferences chaired by the State that holds the rotating presidency, thereby making use of the existing model for conferences of chairpersons in this respect. We feel that adopting this solution would be a way of seeking an equitable participation by the Member States and of calling on all of them to be more involved.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

*Without prejudice to the provisions of Article 10 of the Protocol, on the role of National Parliaments in the EU, which allows COSAC to organise conferences on this matter, we feel that specialisation is essential to an effective scrutiny. This means that the members of the committees that scrutinise their Government's conduct of its defence policy at the national level are best qualified to make a substantive contribution to the scrutiny of these questions at the European level.*

*As such, interparliamentary cooperation in the scrutiny of CSDP-related questions must be undertaken in a forum that is closely linked to the committees that deal with defence issues in each National Parliament.*

4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

*As we said earlier, we consider that interparliamentary scrutiny of the CSDP must be designed in such a way as to ensure a direct link to the Committees that deal with defence issues at the national level. This means that a "CODAC" would appear to be a good solution. COFACC has its own competences, and we do not believe that adding consideration of foreign and security and defence issues would be the best option for achieving the objective of an effective scrutiny of the CSDP.*

*The definition of the outlines of "CODAC" could be inspired by the COSAC model, with regular meetings every six months to discuss and analyse concrete aspects of the CSDP.*

*Such a solution would naturally imply an in-depth reform of the existing interparliamentary cooperation with regard to this matter, to include institutionalising the regularity of “CODAC’s” meetings and finding ways to ensure the necessary coordination of its work.*

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

*We do not see the need for competition from other organisational bodies to this end. As we said above, it would seem preferable to concentrate the monitoring of these subjects in a single forum, failing which the resulting dispersion might lead to a less effective scrutiny.*

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

*The Defence Committee has not formally discussed this question.*

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

*We consider that the future mechanism must include Members of both the National Parliaments and the European Parliament. Although the CSDP maintains its intergovernmental nature, the European Parliament will also have an important contribution to make, complementing the role of the National Parliaments, particularly at the level of the control of common expenditure and the monitoring of some aspects of the process of defining and conducting the missions undertaken by Union bodies.*

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

*For the reasons given under point 6, it should have member status, like the National Parliaments.*

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

*With regard to the monitoring of the role of the National Parliaments, as referred to in Article 12 of the European Union Treaty and the Protocols thereto, COSAC could organise its debates in such a way as to always include a twice-yearly “state of the art” moment on the role that the various Chambers have been playing within the framework of the new possibilities provided for in the Treaty of Lisbon. This would mainly involve looking at how they have worked the fundamental part of this equation: the capacity to bring European topics closer to the national political debate with citizens.*

*Namely by continuing the “subsidiarity” tests and inviting the European Commission, the Council and the European Parliament to debate the results of those tests with the National Parliaments. Despite the fact that some National Parliaments are known to oppose carrying on with those exercises, the truth is that the practice of annually performing one or two subsidiarity tests, in which all the Parliaments were working on*

*the same proposals at the same time, made it possible to fine-tune procedures, share good practices, exchange information and identify vulnerabilities and potentials of both their own scrutiny systems and the early warning mechanism, as provided for in the Treaty.*

*In addition to this, the European institutions could be invited to draw up a balance sheet: on the one hand, of the initiatives that are sent to the National Parliaments within the framework of Protocol no. 2 (control of the principle of subsidiarity), thereby promoting the debate, for example, about the asymmetry that exists in the access to information, between the information that governments and the institutions possess over the course of the negotiating process and that which is made available to the Parliaments (e.g. first drafts of agreements, results of trilogues, etc.); and on the other hand, about the answers that are received from the various Chambers. This practice could give rise to an interesting debate anchored in concrete subject matters. In turn, this would provide the Chambers that had submitted "duly justified opinions" or "positive opinions" with an opportunity to put over their arguments, gather the support of other Chambers for the content of their opinion, and make the protagonists of the European decision-making process aware of the pertinence of the questions that opinion raises. Striving to make COSAC have a role other than just this one at the present time seems premature for now. We feel that the process of consolidating the implementation of the Treaty of Lisbon needs more time in order to understand whether or not we need to go beyond that which we propose above.*

*As to the National Parliaments' role within the framework of the area of freedom, security and justice, in the mechanisms for assessing the execution of the Union's policies in that area (association of the National Parliaments with the political control of Europol and the evaluation of Eurojust's activities), please see our response to Question 5.*

*With regard to the participation of the National Parliaments in the processes involved in revising the Treaties, one could place the topic on the agenda for debate whenever a Treaty revision process was inaugurated. One could both debate the various Chambers' positions on the subject, and study the forms of parliamentary monitoring of the revision process itself. At the moment, for example, it would be useful to know how the Member States that will have to accommodate another Member of the European Parliament are going about it, and how the process will take place in practice.*

*On the subject of applications for accession to the Union, it would be possible, for example, to dedicate part of the biannual COSAC report to a compilation of the positions taken by the various Chambers with regard to the accession applications that are formally made after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon. The conclusions of the body of responses from the various Chambers could be debated during a COSAC meeting.*

*Turning to interparliamentary cooperation between the National Parliaments and the European Parliament, COSAC could – as has been the case so far – be one of the forums for pursuing that cooperation in a constructive manner, above all via debates on the matters referred to above.*

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

*See the second paragraph of the response to Question no. 1.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

*The Portuguese Parliament has always pronounced itself in favour of this idea, although since 2003 it has already organised an annual debate on the European Commission's Work Programme, with the participation of the European Affairs Committee, other specialised committees, the Legislative Assemblies of the Azores and Madeira Autonomous Regions, the Portuguese Members of the European Parliament, the Government and a representative from the European Commission. Following this debate, and after the various specialised committees have issued opinions, the Assembly of the Republic selects the priority initiatives which it then submits to a heightened scrutiny.*

**4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?**

*Although it considers that debates with this profile should take place regularly, and should preferably be conducted within the ambit of the Conference of Foreign Affairs Committee Chairpersons (COFACC) and the Conference of Defence Committees, where the Members who specifically dedicate themselves to working on these matters have a seat, the European Affairs Committee of the Assembly of the Republic takes a positive view of the possibility of organising a general political debate of this kind within the ambit of COSAC.*

*In the position it has expressed in the Conference of Speakers of EU Parliaments, the Portuguese Parliament has also alerted its counterparts to the need for the Rules of Procedure to formally do away with the term "COSAC", inasmuch as the Treaty opted to replace this acronym with the expression "Conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs", with the ability to organise conferences on CFSP/CSDP (for example, we should note the fact that the Treaty of Lisbon provides for a mutual assistance clause, which did not exist before and could be the object of interesting debates under the EU aegis, following the abolition of the WEU) and AFSJ/Europol and Eurojust. It seems evident that this is an invitation to respond to the need to rationalise the previous practice, in which the spontaneity of each Presidency and of the European Parliament has been the rule.*

*The Portuguese Parliament is of the opinion that in the light of past experience, the content of the Treaty and the recent budgetary restrictions, it is time to evolve to a new COSAC. One that concentrates more on the evaluation of the European legislative process, with a special focus on subsidiarity, but also on the political debate about the substance of the European initiatives within the ambit of the political dialogue between the European Commission and the National Parliaments: with regard to the content of proposals, to their legal basis, or to compliance with the principle of proportionality (the capacity to influence the formulation of policies and decision-taking at the European level must also – and above all – take place via the direct dialogue with the European institutions on the substance of their proposals, and not just from the point of view of the veto in matters of subsidiarity). As in the debate within the ambit of COSAC about the revision of the Treaties, the expansion dossier and so on, whose interlocutor should always be the Vice-President of the European Commission with responsibility for promoting relations with the National Parliaments and the Presidency of the EU.*

*In addition to this "Conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs", the Conference of Foreign Affairs Committees and the Conference of Defence Committees should hold twice-yearly joint meetings together with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs.*

*There also should be a third six-monthly meeting, between the Committees for Justice and Internal Affairs and the Commissioner with responsibility for the field and a representative of the Presidency.*

*These three Conferences should be the permanent Conferences in which the National Parliaments and the European Parliament meet every six months, with the participation of four parliamentarians per delegation.*

*Besides these meetings, the decision to convene other ones should be taken on a case-by-case basis, depending on the options of the trio and the Presidency, and the delegations to such meetings should be made up of just the Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of the respective Committees.*

*As to the meetings organised by the European Parliament, it will be important for the EP itself: to pursue its self-evaluation processes in relation to the need for improved coordination with regard to this subject, both internally and with the National Parliaments, in order to avoid the proliferation of committee meetings; and to maintain the practice of organising, together with the National Parliament that holds the Presidency, at most one JPM and one JCM every six months. Within the context of the Treaty of Lisbon the relations between the National Parliaments and the European Parliament gain an unprecedented importance. As directly elected institutions, they possess added responsibilities in the challenge to ensure the EU's democraticity. However, although that source of legitimacy is the same, the focus of their actions is different, albeit necessarily complementary. With the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon, the relations between the National Parliaments and the European Parliament must be rationalised in a search for a balance between the qualitative and the quantitative, with emphasis on the former. In other words, first and foremost, the interparliamentary meetings that are organised in the future must concentrate more on concrete legislative proposals that are of mutual interest, and less on topics of a general nature whose concrete usefulness and relevance to scrutiny activities are hard to see. The criteria for a joint decision as to which topics should be debated in these meetings must be the real ability to influence the process. The National Parliaments' objective in this cooperation is not to be blocking forces, but rather to be able to participate in the decisions in areas in which they possess special competences and possibilities of influencing their governments. In this way the passage of European legislation will be imbued with a dual legitimacy.*

*In complementary fashion, it would be possible to develop permanent networks of homologous committees, in such a way as to establish communication channels that permit the exchange between the National Parliaments and the European Parliament, during the earliest possible phase, of information on given legislative proposals that they consider important. It would thus be possible to establish a political dialogue between the National Parliaments and the European Parliament, particularly with regard to subsidiarity.*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>57</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

*With regard to the monitoring of Europol and the evaluation of Eurojust's activities, COSAC could play an interesting role in promoting the debate between parliamentarians and representatives from Europol and Eurojust. In this case in particular, it might be considered useful to debate the way in which each European Affairs Committee forms its delegations to COSAC, in such a way as to ensure the participation of the interlocutors who are appropriate to this type of debate.*

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

*Once again, we consider that upstream, one should open the debate about the way in which each European Affairs Committee, in each Chamber, forms its delegations to COSAC, in such a way as to ensure that the interlocutors who are appropriate to this type of debate participate in it. It would only perhaps be possible to consider other types of proposal after that debate.*

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*We should recall that this proposal has been successively put forward since the debates that took place within the ambit of the Convention on the Future of Europe, where there was a proposal for an “annual debate on the state of the Union, at the National Parliaments”. The Portuguese Parliament supported that proposal at the time. However, we may also remember that the proposal was rejected. Each parliamentary Chamber organises its own debates on the Union, in accordance with its own rules, practices and political agendas: three realities which, in practical terms, it would be difficult to simultaneously bring together in a single week in forty parliamentary Chambers.*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

*The incentive to use the new information and communication technologies must be supported and promoted, particularly in the case of the need to create working groups on specific dossiers (thereby avoiding additional travel and expenses) and, for example, for the preparation of the meetings themselves.*

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*The European Affairs Committee of the Assembly of the Republic remembers how long the process of revising COSAC's Rules of Procedure took last time. As such, the Committee is of the opinion that the first step should be to undertake an assessment of the ongoing process of consolidating the implementation of the Treaty of Lisbon, so that it is then possible to present a list of questions that deserve to be debated within the framework of a possible amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the “Conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs”.*

## **Romania: Camera Deputatilor and Senatul**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

Yes.

The new Europe 2020 Strategy answers to the main challenges the EU will face in the next decade and defines the main actions to be taken for positioning European economy on sound basis and assuring the competitiveness growth.

The Romanian Parliament considers that the success of the Strategy also depends on a careful analysis of the constraints, especially those of fiscal – budgetary nature, and on taking in consideration the different development levels of the Member States.

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

Yes.

By setting the smart growth as first priority, the EUROPE 2020 Strategy maintains the focus on competitiveness for making the UE able to compete efficiently with the rest of the world.

The focus on competitiveness should be matched by an equal emphasize on cohesion. In this sense, the Romanian Parliament reiterates the importance of the principle of solidarity as an essential pillar of the European construction.

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

Yes.

By establishing as priorities sustainable growth and inclusive growth, the EUROPE 2020 Strategy provides proper attention to the environmental and social challenges. However, the concept of the sustainable growth should also refer to securing good living conditions in the human communities by proposing for instance the improvement of the environmental conditions within these communities.

The priority regarding the sustainable growth is well supported by flagship initiatives "Resource efficient Europe" and "An industrial policy for the globalization era". Along with these, the Commission could further identify initiatives concerning environmental infrastructure, encouraging eco-friendly and people-friendly urban developments, restoring the degraded lands,



interconnection of the modern and smart transport infrastructures and promoting the nonpolluting technologies.

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy	X	
2. sustainable transport	X	
3. sustainable consumption and production	X	
4. conservation and management of natural resources	X	
5. public health		X
6. social inclusion, demography and migration	X	
7. global poverty and sustainable development	X	

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

The consolidation of the monitoring and evaluation component is a clear element of progress against the previous strategic framework.

The partnership EU – Member States is crucial for the actions and the objectives of the Strategy to be accomplished. Measured adopted both at EU level and at the national or regional level should be consistent.

The Romanian Parliament agrees with simultaneous reporting of EUROPE 2020 and evaluation of the Stability and Growth Pact while keeping the instruments of the Strategy separate and maintaining for the ECOFIN Council the responsibility of the SGP.

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

The improvements provided by the EUROPE 2020 Strategy may bring more discipline in its implementation by the Member States. In this respect, the Romanian Parliament welcomes the coordinating role of the European Council which is fully justified taking in account the importance of political responsibility of the decisions on implementing the Strategy.

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

The European Affairs Committee, the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate in joint plenary meeting, Sectoral Committees in both Chambers relevant to the areas covered by the EUROPE 2020 Strategy.

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

The Joint European Affairs Committee (EAC) is placed in the centre of the parliamentary scrutiny system. With few exceptions, the Committee is empowered to represent the Parliament in EU matters, to participate in drafting Romania's position on EU proposals and to monitor and intervene in shaping the Government's actions in the EU decision making process, by way of a mandate on proposals selected for the parliamentary examination.

Sectoral Committees are required by the EAC to provide recommendations, and the EAC has to take them into consideration when adopting a decision.

The above described procedure is applicable for the EUROPE 2020 Strategy as well.

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

The current procedure will be amended through five pending drafts which will also include the necessary adaptations to the Lisbon Treaty: The Law on cooperation of the Parliament and Government in European Affairs, The Standing Orders of the Chamber of Deputies, The Standing Orders of the Senate, The Rules of Procedure of the European Affairs Committee, The Rules of Procedure of the Parliament for the Subsidiarity Control.

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

There are three main ways for the national Parliaments to contribute to strengthening the sustainable aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy:

- by consolidating the scrutiny of the national Governments concerning both drafting and implementing laws and policies concerning sustainable development
- by intensifying the political dialogue with the European institutions
- by being more active in sharing opinions with the civil society and by increasing awareness of the citizens concerning the matter of sustainable development

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

According to the Lisbon Treaty, Member States continue to exercise full decision power in both CFSP and CSDP. Therefore, national parliaments are better positioned than any organisation/body functioning at EU level, to influence decisions made in own countries, by means of the regular parliamentary scrutiny or other actions in their relation with the country's Government; they can persuade the national Government to support certain positions in the Council/European Council, or make use of the veto right. The general benefits of the international discussions forum and brainstorming methods are somewhat diminished by the very nature of CFSP and CSDP. Both are subject to strong opinions, many times based on historical experience, traditions and beliefs of the population, so that quests that a lowest common denominator be identified at EU level may be rare. The risk of clashes between partisan positions of parliamentary delegations, or at least frozen postures is high and could endanger the cooperation spirit in general.

Under these circumstances, we think the interparliamentary exchange in these fields has little capacity to clarify, define or re-define the political options of the delegations and parliaments they represent, and where it does, it will be only on specific topics. Even so, it is preferable to keep the forum open, in the name of parliamentary partnership, the entire EU construction and those specific matters open to discussions.

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

The interparliamentary scrutiny should cover both CSFP and CSDP. As a matter of fact, according to the Lisbon Treaty, the High Representative for CSFP can make proposals on CSDP (see art. 42, paragraph 4).

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,
  - Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - **Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?**
  - **Please specify other modalities.**

A special mechanism could be created in the frame of COSAC, but no new structure or forum.

The Assembly of WEU have been created on the basis of the Treaty of Brussels. Founding a replacing assembly would need another Treaty or Treaty revision, as the Lisbon Treaty does not mention such a structure.

On the other hand, the interinstitutional balance of the EU needs to be preserved. Setting up a special structure whose decisions would be compulsory, would make this structure more powerful than the European Parliament itself, diminish the role of the High Representative for CSFP and may result in superseding Council's decisions. Moreover, the arrangements inside the complexly organised CSFP could collide with the recommendations of an interparliamentary structure, making the last, useless.

A new structure having no decision power would be superfluous.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
    - In what form?
    - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
    - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
    - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
    - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
    - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
    - What changes/reforms are needed?
  - 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
    - In what form?
    - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
    - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
    - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
    - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
    - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
    - What changes/reforms are needed?
  - 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
    - Which one?
    - In what form?
    - Please specify other modalities.

The interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP could take place in dedicated COSAC meetings for both policies, merged for the occasion, with COFACC and CODAC meetings. COFACC and CODAC should continue to function as distinct organisations but should be obliged to join COSAC activities on COSAC's request. Such meetings should be convened on an ad-hoc basis. There should be operated the necessary changes in COSAC's Rules of Procedure and 2-4 posts added to the Secretariat.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

Yes, for the eligible expenses needed/made in excess of the normal costs of organizing the ordinary COSAC meetings.

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

Members of the European Parliament should participate according to the present COSAC Rules of Procedure.

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

Same as in COSAC.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

Drafting surveys/reports on national parliamentary scrutiny, using information from different sources (National Parliament and Government, European Parliament Offices, European Commission Representation, Media, EU member states' embassies, etc.), debating in ordinary meetings, the state of play of parliamentary scrutiny in less proficient member states, making recommendations to the national authorities of those states, employing the "peer pressure" method, including through sending "good will" missions composed of EAC parliamentarians from well performing countries, inviting delegations from less performing to well performing countries to witness the "good practice" at work.

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

By encouraging EAC Secretariats to informally provide timely information on any breach or even suspicion and making known as soon as possible the respective alert and the COSAC's Secretariat opinion on its own web page, on IPEX and by e-mail to all COSAC list of contacts; asking for opinions of other EACs and spreading information on the prevailing opinion / conclusion. In case reasoned opinions emerge, keep a record on the own web site, in a way to make clear if the "yellow card" threshold is reached.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

Presentation by European Commission's representative/s of the document, of the vision, purpose and specific motivations in the choice of measures, of the estimated / desired impact of the measures proposed, of possible / probable difficulties in negotiations / adoption. Debates. Adopt COSAC's Conclusions and recommendations to the Commission.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

Yes, but only in agreement with the High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy.

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>58</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

The hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust would be useful only if well targeted to issues of interest, to be established in the form of a questionnaire, drafted by COSAC's Secretariat on the basis of questions raised by national parliaments. The presidency should have discretion in inviting other key note speakers, but recourse to rigorous approaches, less descriptive and dealing mainly with already identified and foreseeable problems and possible solutions would be most welcome.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

Is already difficult to carry out COSAC ordinary meetings'agenda as it is. The question of limiting the speaking time is being raised in this very document. Often, the speaking time is limited to only one minute. The volume and diversity of information pertaining to EU policies and actions is exceptional. The only way to make the cooperation of specialised committees real and substantial is independently from COSAC, or together with COSAC, but in special thematic meetings.

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

Yes, in principle. The "European Week" though is likely to be abandoned / postponed for other pressing national affairs.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

Videoconferences do not add much the present communication instruments; they will never be able to replace the meetings and their contribution to communication, compared to telephones and e-mails is insignificant. IPEX instead is very useful and any upgrading is welcome.

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

Provisions concerning the organisation (decision to organize, organizer, agenda, participants, resources) of topical meetings / interparliamentary conferences, should be added.

## **Slovakia: Národná rada**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### **The EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

- 1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?
- 1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?
- 1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

*The National Council of the Slovak Republic – represented by the Committee on European Affairs – considers the Europe 2020 Strategy to be a key program document of the EU and therefore the Strategy is continuously on the Committee meetings' agenda. The Committee's negotiations are so far concentrated on the future implementation of the Strategy on the national level, while paying less attention to the political and global aspect of the Strategy.*

##### **The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development**

- 2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.
  1. climate change and clean energy
  2. sustainable transport
  3. sustainable consumption and production
  4. conservation and management of natural resources
  5. public health
  6. social inclusion, demography and migration
  7. global poverty and sustainable development
- 2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

*The Committee on European Affairs did not, so far, pay a specific attention to an analysis of the relation between the Strategy for Sustainable Development and the Europe 2020 Strategy. The Committee is of the opinion that both strategies are complementary to each other. The SSD deals principally with quality of life, equality between generations and the connection among all policies' areas and recognizes the task of the economic development while enabling a transition into a sustainable society. On the other hand, the Europe 2020 Strategy plays a role of a*



*contribution to the overall target of the SSD, while paying attention especially to activities and measures aiming to an economic growth and creation of work opportunities.  
To achieve the goals of the Europe 2020 Strategy, it is necessary to create a monitoring and control mechanism of the individual steps and tasks.*

### **The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments**

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

*The National Council of the Slovak Republic welcomes the involvement of the national parliaments into the Europe 2020 Strategy and sees their role as not substitutable in the process of the implementation of the Strategy on the national level. The NC SR would welcome a strengthened cooperation among national parliaments themselves and among national parliaments, the European Parliament and the Commission. An appropriate platform could be interparliamentary meetings on various levels (deputies, committees, expert stuff), that would contribute to their better awareness.*

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

*Europe 2020 Strategy will be discussed in the National Council of the Slovak Republic on various levels. The main responsible and coordination body is the Committee on European Affairs, which discusses the Strategy in the light of its EU aspect and coordinates the cooperation with other standing committees (the Committee on Finance and National Budget, the Committee on Education, Youth, Science and Sport, the Committee on Social Affairs, and the Committee on Economy, Construction and Transport). These committees together with the Committee on European Affairs discuss the implementation of the Strategy on national level in the form of the draft of the National Reform Program. At the end of the whole process the National Reform Program will be discussed on the highest level in the plenary meeting of the National Council of the Slovak Republic.*

*In the present, in the Slovak Republic an amendment of the Competence Act is in the process of being adopted, with a plan of coming into force on November 1, 2010. According to this amendment the minister of foreign affairs and the minister of finance are going to be the national coordinators for the Europe 2020 Strategy. They will present the draft of the National Reform Program, its Annual Progress Report and a statement to the Country-specific Opinions and Recommendations of the European Commission in the Committee on European Affairs and in the plenary meeting of the National Council.*

*In other committees this documents will be presented by the ministers responsible for the relevant ministries.*

*During the whole period the Committee on European Affairs will pay enhanced attention to the legislative proposals of the Commission which can contribute to fulfil the aims of the Europe 2020 Strategy.*

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

*Europe 2020 Strategy will be discussed repeatedly in various phases of its implementation. The National Council will focus mainly on the discussion of the National Reform Program.*

*1. Document Draft of the Four Key Elements of the National Reform Program (probably in October/November 2010) will be discussed:*

- in the Committee on European Affairs*
- in others relevant committees (the Committee on Finance and National Budget, the Committee on Education, Youth, Science and Sport, the Committee on Social Affairs, and the Committee on Economy, Construction and Transport) - in dependence on the contents*

*2. Document National Reform Program – Europe 2020 will be discussed (probably in March/April 2011):*

- in the Committee on European Affairs*
- in others relevant committees (the Committee on Finance and National Budget, the Committee on Education, Youth, Science and Sport, the Committee on Social Affairs, and the Committee on Economy, Construction and Transport)*
- consequently in the plenary meeting of the National Council of the Slovak Republic*

*3. The National Council will also discuss the document National Reform Program – evaluation of the third year of the Lisbon strategy period (probably in October/November 2010):*

- in the Committee on European Affairs*
- in others relevant committees (the Committee on Finance and National Budget, the Committee on Education, Youth, Science and Sport, the Committee on Social Affairs, and the Committee on Economy, Construction and Transport)*
- probably in the plenary meeting of the National Council of the Slovak Republic.*

*In 2008 at the start of the second Lisbon strategy period the draft of the National Reform Program was discussed on all these levels. That's why the National Council finds it useful to finish this period by evaluating it in the same way. It will be a continuous transition to the Europe 2020 Strategy which is regarded as the continuation/follow-up of the Lisbon strategy.*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

XXXXX

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*According to our opinion, national parliaments could have been involved into the preparation phase of the Europe 2020 Strategy to a greater extend. In the present phase, their activity will be limited to - more or less – only a control of their governments' activities, possibly activities on an interparliamentary level.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

- 1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?**

Before we tackle this question we would like to highlight that according to the Slovak Republic effective legal framework<sup>59</sup> the Committee on European Affairs of the National Council of the Slovak Republic (hereinafter as “NCSR CEA”) scrutinizes on behalf of the National Council of the Slovak Republic (“NCSR”) the whole range of EU policies (including the dossier of CFSP and that of CSDP), which is the process ending with imposing the legally-binding mandate to a member of the Government of the Slovak Republic and authorizing him/her to further present this mandate (i.e. official position of the Slovak Republic) at the sessions of a respective EU Council or at the European Council meeting. Having said this we wish to draw attention to the fact that **the Committee on European Affairs of the National Council of the Slovak Republic (NCSR CEA) – unlike some other EU Member States’ Committees on European Affairs (EUMS CEAs) – performs scrutiny across all EU policies, including Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).**

**As regards the process of interparliamentary exchange of information on CFSP and CSDP scrutiny, we perceive such a process positively and consider it to be very useful since through the process of interparliamentary exchange of information, experience and best practice on CFSP and CSDP scrutiny it is possible to more easily identify weak points in the scrutiny of a respective EU Member State concerning this.** Also by doing so, the process may provoke to bring in new insights and may assist subsequently in initiating new (additional) scrutiny procedures and finally contribute to improve the process of scrutiny and make it more effective. Therefore our opinion on this is that the process as such is desirable and beneficial for each stakeholder involved in it (including the active participation on the part of the Members of the European Parliament - MEPs). In the light of the above mentioned **the NCSR CEA welcomes and encourages any other way how to mutually share and exchange information concerning CFSP and CSDP scrutiny among EU Member States’ Committees on European Affairs (EUMS CEAs), or more precisely, among EUMS CEAs and those EUMS parliamentary committees that exercise scrutiny concerning CFSP and CSDP in their respective parliamentary remits** (which may in some EU Member States (EUMS) encompass Foreign Affairs Committees, Defence and Security Committees or Joint European Committees consisting of more parliamentary committees representing one or both parliamentary chambers.).

**2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?**

The CSDP is the integral and essential part of the CSFP, therefore we think that **it is important to involve the CSFP along with the CSDP in the process of interparliamentary scrutiny as well.** *(The argument for such an opinion on our side is for example the “case” of Serbia/Kosovo versus EULEX Kosovo /i.e. European Union Rule of Law Mission/, which confirms that there are “cases” that can not be separated from the view of CFSP and/or that of CSDP).*

**3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,**

- **Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/conference/organisation/ institution?**

---

<sup>59</sup> - Constitutional Law No. 397/2004 on cooperation between the National Council of the Slovak Republic and the Government of the Slovak Republic in the EU Affairs and Act of the National Council of the Slovak Republic No. 350/1996 on Rules of Procedure as amended

- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

**The NCSR CEA believes that it is not necessary to set up any special (new) mechanism/structure/forum in this regard. On the contrary. We believe that it is desirable to purposefully make use of those mechanisms that are in existence. Or let us put it more precisely, we believe that in the interest of more effective interparliamentary exchange of information on CFSP and CSDP scrutiny it is necessary to reform and rationalize the way how these mechanisms that are in place function.**

**4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?**

Yes.

**4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,**

- **In what form?**
- **Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?**
- **Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?**
- **Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?**
- **If on a regular basis, at what interval?**
- **Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?**
- **What changes/reforms are needed?**

Yes. In line with what we replied to the Question No. 3 we maintain that **in order to scrutinize the CFSP and CSDP on EU level it is necessary to make use of COSAC, however, it should be a COSAC that shall have its scrutiny competence slightly reformed and rationalized in terms of interparliamentary cooperation and scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP.** First of all it needs to be taken into consideration that not each EUMS Committee on European Affairs is (despite its general European scrutiny competence) authorized to exercise scrutiny even also as regards CFSP and CSDP. *(For example: The NCSR CEA model is based on a scrutiny competence that is exercised vis-à-vis the Government across all EU policies, including the CFSP and CSDP. However, there is another model which 'splits' EU scrutiny competence between 2 or more committees, e.g. on one hand between the Foreign Affairs Committee /FAC/ that enjoys such EU competence as regards the CFSP possibly along with the CSDP and on the other hand between the CEA that is competent in all remaining EU policies – except for the CFSP and CSDP. This second EU scrutiny model is represented e.g. by the CEA and the FAC of the Finnish Parliament. The Finnish Parliament /Eduskunta/, however, is not the only parliament to have such a model in existence. There are some more.)* Such irregularities or peculiarities typical of EU scrutiny in some EUMS Parliaments make us believe that it would be appropriate to make a slight reform in COSAC meetings regarding the interparliamentary scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP. **We find it very useful e.g. to start inviting to this sort of COSAC meetings besides 'authorized' EUMS CEAs (with scrutiny competence all over EU policies) also 'authorized' respective EUMS parliamentary committees dealing with EU scrutiny on the CFSP and CSDP (in most cases it would engage EUMS Foreign Affairs Committees and occasionally maybe also Defence and Security Committees).** If applied like this, the interparliamentary cooperation and scrutiny on CFSP and CSDP would manage to

involve in all the stakeholders who on a regular basis scrutinize in their parliaments these policies (obviously with different mandating degree for their government). **We are sure that making it possible to exchange particular pieces of information, experience, expertise, know-how and procedures taken onboard in particular matter among all 'authorized' stakeholders dealing with this shall shed light on weak aspects or points in respective EUMS parliamentary scrutiny on the CFSP and CSDP and shall at the same time contribute to conduct more 'matter-of-fact', transparent and effective interparliamentary scrutiny on these policies (which should always be at the forefront of any scrutiny).**

**4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,**

- **In what form?**
- **Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?**
- **Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?**
- **Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?**
- **If on a regular basis, at what interval?**
- **Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?**
- **What changes/reforms are needed?**

Yes, analogously applying our ideas concerning COSAC reform, **it would be very useful to reform and rationalize also COFACC (maybe also CODAC) meetings in order to allow to participate to all 'authorized' stakeholders dealing with EU scrutiny on the CFSP and CSDP in their respective parliamentary terms.** Our key argument for this (again – in line with our reply above) lies with the fact that **not each EUMS Foreign Affairs Committee (FAC) exercises EU scrutiny as regards the CFSP and CSDP;** moreover such a FAC does not need to feel motivated to make efforts to share information exchanged during these COFACC meetings with its 'competent' parliamentary partner – i.e. the Committee on European Affairs (CEA) that (paradoxically) does scrutinize the dossier of CFSP and CSDP within its remit. Therefore **in our opinion also COFACC should start inviting to its meetings (especially if it shall be dealing with the CFSP and CSDP issues) besides 'authorized' EUMS Foreign Affairs Committees (with EU scrutiny competence over CFSP and CSDP) also 'authorized' EUMS Committees on European Affairs (with EU scrutiny competence over CFSP and CSDP).** In some cases such a COFACC meeting should also count on an active participation by **EUMS Committees on Defence and Security**<sup>60</sup>. By doing so, we can step by step start to dismantle some irregularities and peculiarities persisting in EU parliamentary scrutiny on CFSP and CSDP. At the same time the process of interparliamentary cooperation and scrutiny on CFSP and CSDP can become more transparent and can provoke to have better cooperation and exchange of information not only on the EU level, but also on the domestic parliamentary level. Otherwise, COSAC or COFACC meetings will continue to have interesting interparliamentary discussions though comprising not all relevant and 'authorized' stakeholders (who could offer real and actual information concerning particular CFSP and CSDP parliamentary EU scrutiny).

---

<sup>60</sup> - In this context we would recommend to invite to a particular COFACC and COSAC meeting (dealing with an issue pertaining to the CFSP and CSDP dossier) experts coming from other structures than are those of EU. In practical terms it would involve in a participation on the part of NATO and/or OSCE specialists since their contribution would undoubtedly help to better understand and grasp particular problem. For example: while dealing with issues concerning EULEX Kosovo at a particular COFACC or COSAC session, NATO and/or OSCE specialists might provide with an update based on real activities and real development "on the spot".

**4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,**

- **Which one?**
- **In what form?**
- **Please specify other modalities.**

So-called “Joint Parliamentary Meetings” (JPMs) taking place between MEPs and MPs representing National Parliaments are in our view an excellent tool how to share information and knowledge between two parliamentary levels – national and European one. However, having in mind an effective interparliamentary scrutiny on CFSP and CSDP **we would like to present an idea to start to organize also JPM “sub-meetings” consisting of** (besides MEPs) **MPs representing indeed those National Parliaments Committees that do scrutinize CFSP and CSDP.** Such JPM “sub-meetings” would comprise MEPs (presumably Members of AFET and AFET sub-committees) and MPs representing EUMS Committees on European Affairs (dealing with CFSP and CSDP scrutiny) and Foreign Affairs Committees (dealing with CFSP and CSDP scrutiny), with possible participation also on the part of Defence and Security Committees (if dealing only with CSDP scrutiny). The added value of such JPM sub-meetings into the whole process of interparliamentary cooperation and scrutiny on CFSP and CSDP would be in expertise offered by and shared with the MEPs (AFET) who in their daily remit on the European Parliament level have great “leverage” vis-à-vis the European Commission (Enlargement, ENP) or even EEAS (soon to be born, the evidence of the great leverage successfully employed by MEPs could have been recently observed during EP sessions concerning EEAS matters). Such JPM “sub-meetings” could take place on a regular basis or even on an ad-hoc basis (if necessary).

**5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?**

With reference to our opinions and comments presented above we believe that following COSAC and COFACC (and perhaps also CODAC) “reforms” (as regards CFSP and CSDP scrutiny) it would be possible to achieve an open and effective interparliamentary scrutiny and costs optimization at the same time. However, if COSAC, COFACC and CODAC meetings devoted to CFSP and CSDP scrutiny would start to be organized jointly (instead of having 2 or 3 separate meetings – i.e. COSAC, COFACC and CODAC meeting each taking place once in 6 months), it would be possible even to lessen down general costs.

**6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?**

We have answered and commented this in our reply to the Question No. 4.3. (where we have offered a particular idea how to make the cooperation on CFSP and CSDP with MEPs better and more effective).

At all events, the NCSR CEA welcomes and encourages any cooperation with the European Parliament and its committees in this regard.

**7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?**

We find it difficult to answer this question. It depends on the possibility of taking forward our ideas and/or different ideas and proposals to be presented concerning this at the upcoming

COSAC (or COFACC) session. However, if the system of COSAC meetings remains unchanged, there is no point in considering the issue of status of the MEPs since it is probable to keep the same status. Therefore we recommend that the upcoming COSAC tackle this in greater details during its meeting.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent? *This monitoring could be implemented through the network of permanent representatives and IPEX network. Conclusion of this monitoring role can be then discussed in COSAC. There are still legislative changes to be made in the Slovak Republic.*

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice? *Here we also suggest to use IPEX network and permanent representatives who can exchange information about problematic issues (from their NPs on Monday meetings) and then inform them back.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission? *We support the initiative of COSAC to include the presentation of WP in the first semester and also an assessment of the Commissions activities in the course of the year in the second semester. We also welcome the involvement of Mr. Maroš Šefčovič and his presentation of the current topics (such as EU2020, etc.).*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP? *We welcome this opportunity.*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>61</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services? *There is no specific political monitoring of Europol/evaluation of Eurojust in Slovakia.*

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

*We support the involvement of specialised parliamentary committees in specific issues. The contacts between them should be developed and strengthened.*

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*Not yet decided.*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

*The Chancellery of the National Council has not so far implemented any standard videoconference system.*

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?





**REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA  
NATIONAL ASSEMBLY**

*Committee on EU Affairs*

**Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

**Questions:**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

*Until now, there has been no broader debate on the EUROPE 2020 Strategy in the National Assembly. It is expected that the strategy will be dealt with in the forthcoming months. By the end of the year, the Committee on EU Affairs plans to organise a general debate with the participation of Government representatives. The discussion format is still under debate.*

*However, this does not mean that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy has never been on the agenda of the National Assembly or its working bodies. This strategy has been discussed at several meetings of the Committee on EU Affairs, e. g. when the Commission's working programme or the Presidency programmes have been examined and whenever the issue has been put on the agenda of the GAC or the European Council meetings. The basis of discussion were the Government positions on the strategy which were approved by the Committee on EU Affairs. So far, the strategy has been on the agenda of the Committee on EU Affairs several times, but never as a separate item as such.*

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

*See above 1.1.*

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

*See above 1.1.*

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

***See above 1.1.***

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

***See above 2.1.***

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

***It is expected that the Government of Slovenia shall not have difficulties in the pursuit of the strategy objectives. However, all targets cannot be implemented in a short period of time.***

***The monitoring of the national parliaments depends on their internal mechanisms and political will to follow the EU, as well as the Member State's actions, including the adoption of legal acts.***

***The National Assembly will probably use the same monitoring criterion as it was established for the oversight of the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy.***

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

***So far, the political debate on the strategy has been conducted at the Committee on EU Affairs. In line with the established practice, also other Committees, e. g. the Committee on the Economy and the Committee on Labour, the Family, Social Policy and Disability, could monitor the implementation of the strategy.***

***However, the procedure as such has not yet been officially confirmed.***

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

*See above 3.2.*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

*See above 3.2.*

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*The best way to promote the sustainable development aspect is by organising public conferences.*

*For example, on 19 March 2010 the National Assembly hosted a conference on a long-term vision of sustainable development in Slovenia. By way of this conference, a group of experts sought to establish a topical discussion on a different, comprehensible and long-term vision of Slovenia's development. It called for a rethink of current development paradigms and a wholesale shift to sustainability. A number of experts and intellectuals outlined their proposals, whereas speeches were delivered by the Prime Minister, the President of the National Assembly and the Commissioner for the Environment.*

*Such public events may bring EU and its main challenges closer to its citizens. We should all be responsible and committed to sustainable development.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

*Yes. Interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP can be very useful and beneficial in improving parliamentary scrutiny at both the European and national levels.*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

*Interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP.*

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- **Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?**

- **Please specify other modalities.**

***Decision regarding the new forum or structure to be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP after the ending of the role the WEU, has not been taken yet. However, it is expected that a wider debate on this issue will take place in the near future and will focus on the new forms and ways in which to organize a successful and effective scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP in the future.***

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

***Decision has not yet been taken.***

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

***Decision has not yet been taken.***

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

***Decision has not yet been taken.***

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

*Decision has not yet been taken.*

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

*The monitoring of the role of national parliaments could be implemented in practice through the following:*

*1) the exchange of best practices and information between national parliaments (by holding debates at COSAC meetings or by written reports, e. g. in Bi-annual Reports of COSAC): written and oral information by national parliaments on the conducted subsidiarity tests, the procedures before the Court of Justice of the European Union on grounds of infringement of the subsidiarity principle by a legislative act, etc.;*

*2) by discussing other special topics of interest regarding the role of the national parliaments as outlined in Art. 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols at COSAC meetings.*

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

*In practice, COSAC could best perform this task by adding the Commission's Legislative and Work Programme to its agenda (with relevant members of the European Commission having presentation). Thus, national parliaments could identify which are the legislative proposals of interest for the conduct of subsidiarity tests (priorities of national parliaments or matters of concern). However, there could be difficulties with the timing of such debates.*

*Another possibility is the exchange of information (written and oral) between national parliaments as indicated above.*

*However, the National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia believes that the coordination between national parliaments could be best performed through the use of IPEX database and early exchange of information through permanent representatives of national parliaments in Brussels.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

***The Work Programme of the European Commission should be presented by the relevant members of the Commission in the first semester. Following the presentation, a debate should be held on the topics of interest and the legislative proposals of interest for the conduct of subsidiarity tests could be identified (national priorities or matters of concern).***

***However, regarding the fact that there is always a lack of time for a real debate, the right solution should be found. All members of delegations should have a possibility to participate in this debate.***

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

***If relevant, keynote speakers from outside the European Union should be invited to address COSAC.***

***However, we do not consider this to be an element of major importance for the good functioning of COSAC, since its priorities lie in other areas.***

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>62</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

***Although the National Assembly supports placing the topic of political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities as a recurrent issue on the COSAC agenda, we believe to be still too early to tell how such debates should be conducted. Namely, there are still important questions to be answered by the Eurojust and Europol Regulations.***

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

***The National Assembly prefers to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees independently from COSAC.***

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

***We think it depends on the interest of each national Parliament to organise such events as the European Week. In the National Assembly, we already have a practice of organising different***

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

*kind of events, e. g. debate on climate change, Working Programme of the Commission, the Lisbon Strategy, consequences of the membership of Slovenia in the EU etc. They are organised on or around 9 May and may last one or several days.*

*Taking different approaches of the national parliaments into account, we consider that there is not need for COSAC to take initiative in this respect.*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

*We support the introduction of new tools such as IPEX in the interparliamentary cooperation. At the same time, it is important to underline that national parliaments probably use different technical equipment and systems. And we doubt that the use of new technologies can bring the same quality of results as the personal exchange of opinions in the debate.*

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*The National Assembly is of opinion that, currently, no other amendments to the Rules of Procedure are necessary.*

*Ljubljana, 10 September 2010*

## Slovenia: Državni svet



### Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy

#### Questions:

**Until now there has been no debate on the EUROPE 2020 Strategy. Strategy's topics have been discussed at the meetings of the National Council's working bodies in the frame of the draft legislation debates. The National Council co-organized various conferences that tackled the Strategy goals, but there were no conclusions adopted regarding the Strategy as such. The National Council also established the Council of the Innovative Society of the Republic of Slovenia, which will discuss, among other things, the EUROPE 2020 Strategy goals.**

#### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

**See above.**

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

**See above.**

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

**See above.**

#### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your



Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

**See above.**

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

**See above.**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

**The monitoring depends on internal mechanisms of the national parliaments and political will to follow the EU, as well as the Member State's actions, including the adoption of legal acts.**

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

**The National Council will monitor the decision -making process according to its internal mechanisms, mainly through the scrutiny of the legal acts. The Council of the Innovative Society of the Republic of Slovenia may also follow the implementation of the Strategy's goals into the political decisions and propose the Government the actions/decisions that should be taken.**

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

**See 3.2**

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

**No.**

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

**The National Council is composed of the representatives of different interests; therefore these interests are always reflected in the opinions and decisions taken by the National Council. It also co-organizes conferences with the civil society which are involved in fields of sustainable development, aging of the population, environment, .... The conclusions and proposals are debated at the plenary session and afterwards submitted to the Government and the National Assembly. According to this practice the civil society may get involved into the legislative and decision making procedure.**

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?  
**Yes.**
2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?  
**Both.**
3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
**This decision has not been yet taken.**

If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - **Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?**
  - **Please specify other modalities.**
4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?
    - 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
      - In what form?
      - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
      - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
      - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
      - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
      - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
      - What changes/reforms are needed?

**This decision has not been yet taken.**

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
  - In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?

- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

**This decision has not been yet taken.**

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

**This decision has not been yet taken.**

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

**This decision has not been yet taken.**

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

**This decision has not been yet taken.**

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

**This decision has not been yet taken.**

**Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

**Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

**The best way to implement such monitoring is to hold debates where national parliaments can exchange the information on their practice. The same goal can be reached via written reports.**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national

Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

**The members of the European Commission may be invited to present Commission's legislative and work programme at COSAC. This task can also be preformed by exchanging the information orally or in writing between national parliaments. The coordination between national parliaments could be performed through the use of IPEX database.**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

**Member of the Commission should be invited to present the Work Programme of the European Commission. The general presentation should be followed by open debate in which every member of the delegation should have an opportunity to take part in.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

**Yes, if the topic on the agenda needs to be presented by the key speaker from outside the European Union.**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>63</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**We think that the debates should be conducted by introductory evaluation held by law enforcement services and judiciary and by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust.**

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

**The National Council prefers to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees independently from COSAC.**

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

**COSAC may take an initiative in this respect, but we consider that the organization of "European Week" depends solely on the interest of each national parliament.**

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

**The National Council thinks that introduction of the new technologies is necessary and beneficial. It will give even more possibilities to improve interparliamentary cooperation.**

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

**No, in our opinion the Rules of Procedure do not need to be amended in any other way.**

## **Spain: Cortes Generales**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

*The Joint Committee on EU Affairs has not examined the European Commission's COM (2010) 2020 and therefore is currently unable to answer any precise questions regarding aspects of the said Communication.*

*Nevertheless, it should be noted that the Joint EU Committee appointed a Working Group on the future of the Lisbon Strategy on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2008. This Working Group drafted a Report that was adopted by the Joint Committee on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2009. The Report on "the application in Spain of the Lisbon Strategy and the future objectives of a renovated Strategy" was published in the Official Journal of the Cortes Generales on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009 (IX Parliament, Series A, n°. 226). The Report was forwarded to the European Commission during the public consultation prior to the drafting of COM (2010) 2020.*

*The Joint EU Committee would also like to note that Recommendation 11 of the 2009 Report states that:*

*"The review of the Lisbon Strategy must be carried out in the awareness that the European Union also has another strategy for sustainable development. In the light of the challenges posed by climate change and energy security, it would appear advisable to unify the existing strategies under a single one, also bringing onboard the development of the European Social Agenda. Likewise, we should take into account the EU's external dimension, in such a way that the new Strategy clearly incorporates the instruments and policies related to third countries, particularly with regards to trade, agriculture and development aid."*

The EUROPE 2020 Strategy

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your

Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

### The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

*As mentioned above, the Joint Committee is currently unable to comment on COM (2010) 2020, although it might be noted that Recommendation 16 of the 2009 Report on “the application in Spain of the Lisbon Strategy and the future objectives of a renovated Strategy” stated:*

*“It is advisable to take into account the position of our Self-governing Regions and Cities when defining our national approach to the review of the Lisbon Strategy. A considerable share of the issues currently affected by the Lisbon Strategy fall under the full or shared attribution of the Regions (environment, education, streamlining of the public administration, etc.) and it is therefore essential to ensure ex ante coordination with each Ministry and with the ministerial department charged with coordinating the Lisbon Strategy throughout the review process.”*

*The issue of parliamentary oversight was mentioned by Recommendation 17 of the 2009 Report, which stated the following:*

*“Within the context of a review of the governance, follow-up and accountability system, we must ensure increased transparency and communication with our citizens. In addition, one of the reasons why the original Lisbon Strategy did not achieve the expected outcome was an insufficient oversight on the part of Parliaments. Better information must be provided to Parliaments and citizens regarding commitments adopted by their Governments as to the structural economic reforms the new Strategy will require. We must design new evaluation methods that are simple and understandable, so that citizens can be aware of what their Governments are trying to achieve.”*

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

*Although no decision has been taken by the Bureau of either Chamber on the procedure, the follow-up of the Strategy might fall within the mandate of the Joint EU Committee, notwithstanding the competences of the specific committees.*

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

*A decision has not yet been taken on the issue.*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

*A decision has not yet been taken on the issue.*

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*Please refer to Recommendation 17 of the Report, which has been reproduced in the answer to question 3.1 above.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

*The Joint EU Committee fully agrees with the Conclusions adopted by the XLIII COSAC, which underlined that COSAC should focus on political debates on Europe-wide subjects of common interest to the Committees on EU Affairs.*

*Therefore, a debate on Common Security and Defence Policy will be certainly welcomed by the Joint EU Committee.*

*Nevertheless, the specific issue of CSDP has not been debated by the Joint EU Committee, and therefore, the Joint Committee has no comments to offer on the subject at the current time.*

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

*The Joint EU Committee has no position on the issue at the present time.*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

*The Joint EU Committee has no position on the issue at the present time.*



3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,
- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.

***The Joint EU Committee has no position on the issue at the present time.***

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?
- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
  - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?
- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?
- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

***The Joint EU Committee strongly believes that COSAC should not impinge on the organisation and the mandate of other Conferences.***

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

***Due to the current financial and economic situation, the Joint EU Committee does not consider appropriate to make any funds available for any such undertaking.***

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?
7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

***The Joint EU Committee would like to note that the European Parliament has, according to the Treaties, no relevant competence on Foreign and Defence policies.***

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

***The Joint EU Committee believes that COSAC, in close link with the presidency's priorities, might include in the COSAC's Agenda specific and structured debates on the different powers of national Parliaments with keynote speakers from the different national Parliaments, officials from national Governments and EU institutions.***

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

***After the entry into effect of the Treaty, there is no need to coordinate subsidiarity checks. It may be much more useful to make use of COSAC to exchange information and best practices regarding the subsidiarity checks that have become a normal feature of the proceedings of each national Parliament.***

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

***The Joint EU Committee would welcome such a debate during the course of an ordinary meeting of COSAC or during a Chairpersons' Meeting. For that purpose, it might be especially useful to invite the President of the European Commission to make a presentation of the Work Program of his Institution.***

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

***The Joint EU Committee would certainly welcome keynote speakers that are not officials from national Governments or EU Institutions.***

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

***In compliance with articles 85 and 88 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, regulations have to be enacted in order to lay down the procedures for scrutiny of Eurojust's and Europol's activities. The Joint EU Committee would like to note that it might be advisable to wait for these regulations to be enacted before debating on COSAC's role on the matter.***

***In any case, the Joint EU Committee believes that these debates should be preceded by hearings of the heads of both entities.***

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

***The Joint EU Committee did not suggest that specialised parliamentary committees should be invited to COSAC, and would not support any modification of the Rules of Procedure in order to accommodate any such undertaking.***

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

***The Joint EU Committee does not, at the current moment, support this idea as a matter of principle, as the agenda of both Chambers are already very busy and are set in accordance to internal political priorities. The Joint EU Committee would strongly advise COSAC against such an initiative.***

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

***The Joint EU Committee would only like to point out that the use and optimisation of new technology must not, in the present economic circumstances, incur in any extra cost for national Parliaments.***

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise,

in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

***The Joint EU Committee does not believe that the Rules of Procedure should be amended in any other aspect.***

## Sweden: Riksdag

### Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy

#### Questions:

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

[Please see joint reply below.](#)

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

[Please see joint reply below.](#)

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

[Please see joint reply below.](#)

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

[Please see joint reply below.](#)

Yes    No

1. climate change and clean energy
2. sustainable transport
3. sustainable consumption and production
4. conservation and management of natural resources
5. public health
6. social inclusion, demography and migration
7. global poverty and sustainable development

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

#### **Joint reply to questions in 1.1.-1.3. as well as 2.1.-2.2.:**

[The Riksdag has scrutinised the Commission's Communication on EUROPE 2020 \(COM \[2010\] 2020 final\) in a statement from the Committee on Finance. The Committee](#)

on Industry and Trade, the Committee on the Labour Market, the Committee on Transport and Communications, the Committee on Social Insurance, and the Committee on Justice communicated their views to the Committee on Finance.

The statement was considered in the Riksdag in March 2010. The statement does not discuss the issues raised by COSAC in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific questions asked in the questionnaire, but a summary of Statement 2009/10:FiU29 follows:

#### Statement on the future EU 2020 strategy

“In this statement the Committee on Finance considers the Commission's Communication Europe 2020 – A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, presented in early March.

The Committee considers that the EU 2020 strategy can make a significant contribution to the work of increasing the EU's growth potential and employment. The Committee notes that a strategy for the future should have a more general focus and be oriented towards long-term structural growth. The strategy should be oriented towards increasing the competitiveness of the European economies and thus increasing Europe's long-term employment. If welfare and prosperity are to be maintained in the EU states, the question of developing business enterprise is decisive. Conditions for starting companies must be as straightforward as possible.

The strategy should contribute to sustainable public finances and promote a competitive, green economy and an efficient use of resources. The Committee notes that Sweden is well-placed in relation to the targets specified by the Commission. For Sweden to continue showing good results, policies are needed that are oriented towards (in the Commission's words) smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. The EU and its member states must implement policies that meet the structural challenges facing them.

The Commission singles out three areas for action. With regard to smart growth, the Committee emphasises the importance of research for long-term economic development. With regard to sustainable growth, the Committee calls attention to the importance of economic instruments in relation to environmental policy. With regard to inclusive growth, the Committee wishes to give particular emphasis to the fact that Sweden is energetically engaging with the issue of women's participation in the labour market. Although Sweden's position has been favourably received, in that gender equality issues are taken up in the Commission's Communication, there are still no concrete targets stating explicitly that increased employment must apply to both women and men. The Committee on Finance points out that the issue of greater participation by women in the labour market will need such sharp focus in our ongoing work that a clearly specified employment ratio target for women is highly desirable. To successfully meet such an employment target it is necessary for women and other groups currently outside the labour market to a high degree to be given incentives and instruments to facilitate entry. It is the view of the Committee on Finance that this circumstance should be reflected in the overall targets of the EU 2020 strategy, as well as in future integrated guidelines and employment guidelines.

The Committee's statement also deals with matters relating to the EU budget, public finances, and governance. The Committee notes that a restrictive approach should characterise budgetary policies in the EU.

The Commission's Working Document: Consultation on the future "EU 2020" strategy, of November 2009 is also included in this consideration.

This opinion contains 4 reservations from representatives of the Social Democratic Party, the Left Party and the Green Party. “

The statement is available in Swedish at [http://www.riksdagen.se/webbnav/?nid=3322&doktyp=bet&dok\\_id=GX01FiU29&rm=2009/10&bet=FiU29](http://www.riksdagen.se/webbnav/?nid=3322&doktyp=bet&dok_id=GX01FiU29&rm=2009/10&bet=FiU29)

### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

The issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

As has been stated above, the Finance Committee scrutinised the Communication on Europe 2020 from the Commission, and other committees communicated their views to the Committee on Finance. The Communication was also debated in the Chamber. The Government had consulted the Committee on EU Affairs prior to Council meetings in the EU where the EU 2020 strategy was discussed, as well as prior to meetings in the European Council where the EU 2020 strategy both was discussed and adopted.

Moreover, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has scrutinised the Commission Work Programme in statement 2009/10:UU17, where also the Europe 2020 strategy is touched upon. Further, the Committee on Transport and Communications will scrutinise the Communication “A Digital Agenda for Europe” from the Commission and present an account of its examination in a written statement to the Chamber in the autumn.

How the Europe 2020 strategy will be followed up remains to be seen. (The main responsibility to follow up the strategy lies with the Government.)

However, the “precursor” Lisbon Strategy was followed up by means of a Government Communication. The Government Communication was presented to the Riksdag annually, and scrutinised by the Committee on Industry and Trade. Each follow up concluded with a debate and decision in the Chamber.

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

Please see above, reply to 3.2, paragraphs 1-2. Regional level is not applicable.

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

Please see above, reply to 3.2, paragraphs 3-4.

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

The issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

Yes. As stressed by the Speakers at the EU Speakers' Conference on 14-15 May 2010 regarding "...the role of national parliaments in the smooth functioning of the European Union, the Speakers stress the fundamental role of national parliaments in the future parliamentary scrutiny of the common foreign and security policy including the CSDP."

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

Please see above, question 1.

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,

- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
- Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
- Please specify other modalities.

No. According to the Swedish replies to the questionnaire of the 13th bi-annual report, new fora should not be created. Apart from that, the issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

Yes. According to the Swedish replies to the questionnaire of the 13th bi-annual report and to the Presidency Conclusions of the EU Speaker's meeting in May 2010, political debates on particular issues are best taken care of by the relevant specialised committees. COFACC and CODAC already address these issues.

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?



- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

No. According to the Swedish replies to the questionnaire of the 13th bi-annual report, COSAC should not play a role in the scrutiny of CFSP or CSDP. The scrutiny of CFSP or CSDP falls within the area of the work of the specialised committees. These subjects could possibly be dealt with in joint meetings composed of delegations from committees that specialise in the subject matter. Please also see reply to question 4 above.

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

Please see reply to questions 4 and 4.1. above.

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

The issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question. Please also see reply to questions 4 and 4.1. above.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

The issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

The issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

The issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?  
According to the Swedish replies to the questionnaire of the 13th bi-annual report, a valuable contribution and role for COSAC would involve focusing on the exchange of best practices regarding EU scrutiny, Government scrutiny and general trends in parliamentary work with EU matters.

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?  
According to the Swedish replies to the questionnaire of the 13th bi-annual report, COSAC is not the forum for discussions on specific draft legislative acts. Please also see question 1 above.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?  
According to the Swedish replies to the questionnaire of the 13th bi-annual report, debates with the Commission can be relevant. However, the CWP or debates with the Commission do not necessarily need to be a regular item on the agenda. The CWP could be a topic for discussions in other fora as well.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?  
No. According to the Swedish replies to the questionnaire of the 13th bi-annual report, the CFSP and/or CSDP should not be a regular point on the COSAC agenda. Moreover, the Speakers stressed at the EU Speakers' Conference on 14-15 May 2010 that: *"Given that EU matters are increasingly on the agenda of the specialised committees as effective scrutiny and implementation often require their specialist competence, the Speakers consider that political debates on specific issues or themes are best held in meetings or other contacts involving the relevant committees. In this context, they highlight that contacts between specialised committees should be developed and strengthened."*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>64</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?  
No. According to the Swedish replies to the questionnaire of the 13th bi-annual report, the monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust activities should not be a regular point on the COSAC agenda: *"...political debates on particular issues should not be*

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

*necessary since this is taken care of by specialised committees or other fora.” Please also see the quote in reply to question 4 above.*

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

*The members of the Committee on EU Affairs are at the same time members of the various specialised committees in the Riksdag. Apart from that, the issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.*

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*The issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

*The issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.*

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*According to the Swedish replies to the questionnaire of the 13th bi-annual report, the question of modification of the composition of COSAC is connected with the issue of COSAC’s tasks. At this point there seems to be no immediate need for modification. Apart from that, the issue has not been dealt with by the Riksdag in a way which would make it possible to answer the specific question.*

*The response to the 14<sup>th</sup> bi-annual report is prepared by officials and must not be understood as in any way representing an official view of the Riksdag.*

## **United Kingdom: House of Commons**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

*The House of Commons has not agreed a resolution on the Europe 2020 Strategy nor has the strategy yet been the subject of a report by one of the House's departmental select committees.*

*The European Scrutiny Committee of the House of Commons considers documents and reports to the House on their legal and political importance. The Committee considered the Integrated Guidelines for the Europe 2020 Strategy at its meeting on 8 September and produced a report (see Chapter 8, HC428-I, session 2010-12). Because of its importance the Committee recommended that the Guidelines be debated in European Committee B that debate has yet to take place.*

*A weblink to the report will follow on publication.*

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

*See answer to 1.1 above.*

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

*See answer to 1.1 above.*

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

Yes

No

---

1. climate change and clean energy

2. sustainable transport

---

3. sustainable consumption and production

---

4. conservation and management of natural resources

---

5. public health

---

6. social inclusion, demography and migration

---

7. global poverty and sustainable development

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

*See answer to 1.1 above.*

### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

*See answer to 1.1 above.*

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

*See answer to 1.1 above.*

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

*See answer to 1.1 above.*

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

*See answer to 1.1 above.*

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

*See answer to 1.1 above.*

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

*The House of Commons has not yet taken a formal view on this. There is a consensus that interparliamentary scrutiny should continue but the form it takes will require further consultation.*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

*Both CSFP and CSDP.*

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
If so,
  - Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.

*No formal view has yet been expressed. Discussions are taking place between relevant committee chairmen and others. The Committee considers that Article 10 of Protocol 1 clearly gives COSAC a role in this matter and its preference would therefore be for COSAC to organize regular meetings for parliamentary scrutiny of the common foreign and security policy as well as the common security and defence policy. The meetings could be attended by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Defence Committee as well as members of the European Scrutiny Committee. The following factors apply:*

- *There is a need for continued parliamentary oversight of European foreign, defence and security policies;*
- *Any meetings should add value to the work that each parliament does on its own to oversee these policy areas;*
- *National parliaments, rather than the European Parliament, should take the lead;*
- *Costs should be kept to a minimum;*
- *These meetings should deal primarily with substance - EU policies, initiatives, missions and the like;*
- *The terms of reference of these meetings should be wide enough to allow consideration of any aspect of CFSP and CSDP;*
- *These meetings should hear from, debate and respond to presentations from, amongst others, government ministers, the High Representative, EU Special Representatives, staff of the External Action Service, Commission and Council, representatives from the Political and Security Committee and any others as relevant;*

- *The meetings should be able, but not obliged, to adopt Conclusions relevant to the debates held. These Conclusions may invite formal responses from the High Representative, Council, Commission or others;*
  - *Secretariat functions could be performed by staff from the troika country parliaments, with support from the COSAC Secretariat and national parliament representatives in Brussels.*
4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?
- 4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
  - Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

*Yes. See answer to 3 above.*

- 4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- In what form?
  - Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
  - Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
  - Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
  - If on a regular basis, at what interval?
  - Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
  - What changes/reforms are needed?

*See answer to 3 above.*

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

*No*

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

*No decision has been taken on this.*

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

*A mixed body. Other national parliaments could be invited on an ad hoc basis as observers.*

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

*The EP's membership status would be as with COSAC.*

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

*Setting the agenda of each COSAC meeting is a matter for the Presidency. COSAC is a forum for the exchange of information and best practice and should remain so, this should include exchange of information and best practice on Article 12 TEU.*

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

*COSAC already facilitates exchange of information and best practice and is a forum in which common problems can be addressed. For example the House of Commons recently raised the issue of the definition of legal acts within COSAC. This should continue on scrutiny issues including the implementation of Protocol 2. However, subsidiarity is just one of the criteria against which proposals are scrutinised and its importance should not be over emphasised in COSAC or on its agenda.*

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

*This debate is not always useful due to two factors:*

- *The House of Commons scrutiny system looks at all inter-institutional documents and so does not have a need to identify documents for*



*attention (and/or inclusion in a short list) as each one is assessed for legal and/or political significance and subsidiarity; and*

- *The Committee has found in the past that the AWLP does not give enough information for an accurate judgement to be made about the importance of a document.*

*However, if the debate is to continue (and it is up to the Presidency to propose the agenda of each COSAC), as the Commission points out in its reply to the Contribution of the XLIII COSAC, any discussions on the Work Programme should consider the future interinstitutional programming cycle of the Commission, and ultimately the date of publication of the document, so that any debate can be conducted in a timely manner.*

*To ensure the effectiveness of scrutiny by national parliaments, COSAC should conduct a further comparative study of the scrutiny methods adopted by its members in order to illustrate the different approaches taken and their respective impacts.*

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

*We see no procedural reason why outside speakers should not be invited if it is decided that COSAC is the correct forum within which to discuss CSDP matters.*

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>65</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

*It would be premature to answer this question before the Commission consultation with national parliaments and the European Parliament has been conducted.*

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

*It is for each Presidency Parliament not COSAC to determine which meetings of specialised committees it wishes to host. Having said this, the European Scrutiny Committee could consider whether the Chairmen of specialised committees of the*

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

*House of Commons could form part of its delegation to COSAC in those specific cases where relevant agenda items are programmed by the Presidency.*

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

*Neither the House of Commons nor the European Scrutiny Committee has considered this matter. The House of Commons already holds biannual debates on EU affairs.*

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

*The House of Commons has facilities for videoconferencing and participates fully in the work of IPEX. We would therefore happily consider any suggestions put forward by the Presidency for the use of these new technologies to enhance the work of COSAC.*

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

*No.*

## **United Kingdom: House of Lords**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

The EU Committee has not expressed its view on the level of integration of the concept as such.

However, the Committee has said the following on the division of responsibility between the EU and the Member States: "We agree that significant work needs to be done to determine the right balance between action at the EU and Member State level. We observe that some of these flagship initiatives contain a clear indication of action needed at EU level - for example creating a Digital Single Market."<sup>66</sup>

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

Again, this hasn't been discussed explicitly. However the Committee did note, in its consideration of the Digital Agenda, the Commission's assertion that EU R&D stands at only 40% of that of the US<sup>67</sup>.

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

Again, no view has been taken on this.

However, in a recent report<sup>68</sup> on the European Social Fund the Committee concluded the following (paragraph 174):

"The focus of Europe 2020 and the ESF should appropriately be on sustainable development as the development of the low-carbon economy is likely to be an important element of the EU's future economic growth. We therefore recommend that, when designing priorities for the European Social Fund in the 2014–20 period, the appropriate contribution of green skills across the economy, in terms both of greening existing jobs and professions and developing new skills, should be recognised and supported."

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

---

<sup>66</sup> Letter from Lord Roper to Ian Pearson MP, Economic Secretary to the Treasury, 30 March 2010.

<sup>67</sup> Letter from Lord Roper to Ed Vaizey MP, 6 July 2010.

<sup>68</sup> <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200910/ldselect/ldcom/92/92i.pdf>

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the abovementioned overall objectives.

The Committee has formed no views on whether these are sufficiently taken into account.

	Yes	No
1. climate change and clean energy		
2. sustainable transport		
3. sustainable consumption and production		
4. conservation and management of natural resources		
5. public health		
6. social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

The Committee's work has concentrated on the governance mechanisms for Europe 2020, in the light of the perceived governance weaknesses in the Lisbon Strategy. The Committee has not, as yet, expressed its view on how this governance should be structured, but has argued that the Open Method of Coordination, as used in the Lisbon Strategy, did not work<sup>69</sup>. Europe 2020 appears not to have a better solution.

The Committee has consistently probed the UK Government for their view on how enforcement could be improved. In particular this has focused on the possibility of sanctions for non-performance in the form of policy warnings; and on the capacity for such warnings actually to influence national policies<sup>70</sup>.

The Committee has also pressed for the EU budget to support Europe 2020's objectives<sup>71</sup>.

#### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

This is a matter of some interest to the Committee. In our March 2006 report<sup>72</sup> on the Lisbon Strategy we concluded (paragraph 79):

"We were struck by the fact that, although the Agenda is sometimes referred to as part of wider discussions, there have not been any recent debates in either House specifically on it. This is in contrast to a number of other Member States, whose National Action Plans indicate that parliaments have been more involved in drawing up and scrutinising the Lisbon policies. We

<sup>69</sup> Letter from Lord Roper to Ian Pearson MP, 27 January

<sup>70</sup> Letter from Lord Roper to Ian Pearson MP, Economic Secretary, HM Treasury 10 March 2010

<sup>71</sup> Letter from Lord Roper to Ian Pearson MP, Economic Secretary, HM Treasury, 10 March 2010

<sup>72</sup> <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200506/ldselect/ldcom/137/13708.htm#a21>

believe that parliamentary committees should keep a watching brief on the Agenda and we will seek to return to it ourselves in the future. We consider that parliamentary debates on the Agenda would help to raise its profile and engage citizens in the relative economic performance of the Member States and the urgency and desire for economic reform in Europe. We urge Members of both Houses to seek regular debates on the Agenda and ask the Government to consider formally laying the annual Action Plan before Parliament."

Against this background, the Chairman (Lord Roper) brought this issue to COSAC's attention with his letter of 26 May. Meanwhile the Committee has sought the UK Government's view on national parliamentary scrutiny of the EU 2020 Strategy. The response thus far has been non-committal: the Government will consider the most "appropriate form of parliamentary engagement" in setting national targets<sup>73</sup>. The Committee continues to push for clarity on this and will read the responses from other parliaments with a view to identifying examples of best practice to adopt.

As a result we have no answers, as yet, to QQ 3.2 to 3.5.

3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

It should be noted that the responses to this chapter represent the view of the EU Committee. The House of Lords itself has held no discussions on this issue and has no position.

The EU Committee considers that the disappearance of the Parliamentary Assembly of the WEU will accentuate the lack of oversight by national parliaments of CFSP and CSDP and that continuing interparliamentary exchanges on CFSP and CSDP will add value to the work that each parliament does in this area.

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CSFP and CSDP or CSDP only?

The EU Committee considers that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CFSP and CSDP.

---

<sup>73</sup> Letter from Lord Sassoon to Lord Roper of 26 July 2010.

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,
- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.

**The EU Committee has agreed that existing structures should be used to conduct this oversight. The details of our proposal are as follows:**

**Fundamentals:**

1. The disappearance of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Western European Union will accentuate the lack of oversight by national parliaments of CFSP and ESDP;
2. There is a need for parliaments to continue to meet to exercise oversight of European foreign, defence and security policies;
3. These meetings should add value to the work that each parliament does on its own to oversee these policy areas;
4. National parliaments, rather than the European Parliament, should take the lead;
5. Any body created for this purpose must be interparliamentary and not autonomous;
6. Costs should be kept to a minimum.

**Purpose and subject matter:**

7. These meetings should deal primarily with substance - EU policies, initiatives, missions and the like - not process - how each parliament conducts scrutiny, etc;
8. The terms of reference of these meetings should be wide enough to allow consideration of CFSP and CSDP;
9. These meetings should hear from, debate and respond to presentations from, amongst others, government ministers, the High Representative, EU Special Representatives, staff of the External Action Service, Commission and Council, representatives from the Political and Security Committee and any others as relevant;
10. The meetings should be able, but not obliged, to adopt Conclusions relevant to the debates held, these Conclusions may invite formal responses from the High Representative, Council, Commission or others.

**Structure and practical arrangements:**

11. Participation should be based on-
  - a) combining the existing meetings of foreign affairs committee and defence committee chairpersons;
  - b) expanding this to include additional delegates up to a maximum of 6 per parliament including the European Parliament / 3 per chamber (to allow party balance to be taken into account);
12. All EU member state parliaments, and only those parliaments plus the European Parliament, should have full membership of the body. Any additional invitations should be at the troika's discretion;
13. There is no need to continue the existing programme of foreign affairs and defence committee chairpersons in parallel as these meetings would be replaced by the new meetings;
14. Meetings should take place once every six months;
15. Meetings should last no more than one and a half days (two nights - as with COSAC at present);

16. To permit maximum engagement with the EU Institutions, meetings should, as a general rule, be held in Brussels, perhaps in the Council building, but not in the European Parliament;
17. There should be no committees;
18. Organisational responsibility should be borne by the parliaments of the troika countries;
19. The parliaments of the troika countries should be responsible for scheduling the meetings, proposing the agenda (in consultation with the High Representative), chairing the meetings and drafting any Conclusions (Brussels-based national parliament representatives should be used to facilitate practical arrangements and share views on draft Conclusions in advance of the meetings).

**Staffing and administration:**

20. Secretariat functions should be performed by staff from the troika country parliaments, possibly with support from the COSAC Secretariat and national parliament representatives in Brussels;
  21. Some provision should be made for engaging temporary specialist support to aid in drafting conclusions or providing written briefing or background information in advance of debates (perhaps in collaboration with the EU Institute for Security Studies);
  22. Translation and interpretation costs should be kept to a minimum, perhaps by adopting aspects of the regime used by the Speakers' Conference<sup>74</sup>;
  23. Costs should be borne by either the Council or the troika country parliaments.
4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?  
See answer to question 3.

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

The EU Committee does not consider that COSAC should play a role, because it is drawn from EU committees rather than foreign affairs and defence committees. However we do consider that there may be a role for the COSAC secretariat.

- In what form?

The COSAC Secretariat could provide administrative support (see point 20 in answer to question 3).

- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?

There is no role to be played by ordinary meetings of COSAC in this area.

- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

---

<sup>74</sup> During the meetings of the Conference, simultaneous interpretation is provided from and into official EU languages upon request according to the following:

- The technical facilities for the interpretation are provided and covered by the presiding parliament.
- Other practicalities, including languages to be used as base languages for translation, are defined and organised by the presiding parliament.
- Parliaments are entitled to bring their own interpreters. Those not bringing their own interpreters may request the presiding parliament to provide interpreters for them at their own cost.
- All parliaments choosing to use the languages provided by the presiding parliament share equally the cost of interpreters for all these languages.

Written papers are circulated in French and English. A translation into other languages may be provided by the parliament concerned.

4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,  
Yes, we consider that this is the best way to arrange oversight of CSDP and CFSP.

- In what form?

See answer to question 3, in particular points 1 to 10.

- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?

Yes

- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?

We do not consider that there is a need to meet more than once every six months, as COFACC does at present.

- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?

These meetings should be regular.

- If on a regular basis, at what interval?

Every six months.

- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?

Yes.

- What changes/reforms are needed?

See answer to question 3, in particular points 11 to 19.

4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

No.

- Which one?
- In what form?
- Please specify other modalities.

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

We do not envisage a significant cost increase compared to COFACC and "CODAC" at present. Indeed merging the two meetings may give rise to savings. Costs should be borne either by the Council or by the troika parliaments.

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?

See answer to question 3, in particular point 11. We favour including 6 members from each parliament including the European Parliament. These would be (i) the chairman of the committee(s) on foreign affairs, (ii) the chairman of the Committee(s) on defence, and (iii) further members to be appointed freely by each participating parliament.

7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

The European Parliament should have member status.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**



1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?  
**This is a matter for each Presidency to decide. However we remain keen to ensure that COSAC remains an effective forum for exchange of good practices. This includes in relations to the activities undertaken to fulfil the opportunities presented by Article 12 TEU.**

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

**Subsidiarity is but a small part of the work of national parliaments on EU affairs. As a result, we are pleased that it will no longer be a standing item on every COSAC agenda. Of course, however, where there are current and important subsidiarity debates (or issues raised in legislative proposals) these should be raised.**

**We would prefer to include a regular item where we compare the results of our policy scrutiny (which includes, but is not limited to, subsidiarity).**

**An annual debate on subsidiarity and experience with Reasoned Opinions would be useful while the system is still new.**

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

**This should be a matter for each Presidency.**

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

**Whilst inviting speakers from outside the Union would be acceptable in terms of procedure, the position of the EU Committee (as outlined in the response to the questions for chapter 2) is that scrutiny of CSDP and CFSP should not be the preserve of COSAC because it is drawn from EU committees rather than foreign affairs and defence committees. So, whilst COSAC can invite speakers from outside the EU, it should avoid doing so on CSDP / CFSP matters.**

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>75</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

**As stated in our reply to that questionnaire, further consideration needs to be given to the most appropriate forum for such oversight. We expect the Commission to consult fully with national parliaments and the European Parliament before issuing its proposal on how this should be organised.**

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

The Lords is in an unusual position here as our specialised committees are, in fact, sub-committees of the EU Committee. As a result we are able to involve Members with expertise in every meeting already.

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a “European Week” in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a “European Week” and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

The House has taken no position on this proposal and is not expected to do so in the foreseeable future. It is arguably better to mainstream EU issues than to confine them to a special week. Even if this was desired, the House's agenda is already busy and identifying a week to dedicate to European affairs would be very difficult.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

We would be happy to consider seriously any suggestions made by the Presidency. However, it is easier to see practical applications for new technology in facilitating bilateral contact between parliaments.

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

No.

## **European Parliament**

### **Chapter 1: Sustainable development in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy**

#### **Questions:**

##### *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy*

1.1. Given the intention of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy to bridge the different crises we are currently facing (economic, financial, social, ecological), does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Strategy's political standpoints constitute a well integrated concept?

EP Reply: The European Parliament has expressed its position on the EU 2020 strategy in two occasions. Firstly, with a resolution adopted on 10 March 2010 on "EU 2020 Follow-up of the informal European Council of 11 February 2010"<sup>1</sup>. Inter alia, Parliament announced that it would "put forward a more detailed resolution on bottlenecks, problems and flagship projects in time for the June summit". Secondly, in a resolution on the "EU 2020"<sup>2</sup> adopted on 16 June 2010.

In relation to the political standpoints of the EU 2020 Strategy, the resolution adopted on 16 June expresses the European Parliament's "disappointment at the main elements of the new EU 2020 strategy agreed by the European Council on 26 March 2010" and "calls for the EU 2020 strategy to pursue a broad political concept for the future of the EU as a competitive, social and sustainable Union putting people and the protection of the environment at the centre of policy making".

Furthermore, the European Parliament "stresses that the [...] headline targets [employment rate, research and development, greenhouse gas emissions, education levels and social inclusion] should be formulated in the framework of a consistent and coherent sustainable development strategy combining the economic, social and environmental policy agendas".

Finally, the EP holds "the EU 2020 strategy should provide an ambitious and more coherent and target-based approach to the economic crisis, ensuring greater coherence between overlapping strategies, such as the Sustainable Development Strategy and the Stability and Growth Pact (SGP), to help build a fair, sustainable and prosperous Europe".

Overall, the EP "takes the view that Member States should step up their economic performance by introducing structural reforms in order to optimise public expenditure, decrease bureaucracy, empower citizens, encourage entrepreneurship and innovation, make legislation more SME-friendly and provide people with the opportunity to maximise their potential". It also "considers that a strong and well- financed cohesion policy, embracing all European regions, should be fully in line with the EU 2020 strategy and that such a policy, with its horizontal approach, is a precondition for successful attainment of the EU 2020 goals, as well as for achieving social, economic and territorial cohesion; urges, therefore, that the rules for implementing cohesion policy should be further simplified in the interests of user-friendliness, accountability and a more responsive approach to future challenges and to the risk of economic crises".

<sup>1</sup> EP resolution P7\_TA(2010)0053 of March 2010.

<sup>2</sup> EP Resolution P7\_TA(2010)0223. Excerpts included in this paper are refer to this resolution, unless stated otherwise

1.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world, such as e.g. in the United States and in China?

EP Reply: There are neither specific references nor mentions of "economic and scientific development in the rest of the world" in the EP resolution. However there are a few concepts that could have an impact on the global scale, in particular:

- the EP wants to "maintain a strong manufacturing base in Europe and to boost competitiveness, growth and employment" and "stresses that more attention should be paid to the external dimension of the EU 2020 strategy". Therefore, the EP "urges the Commission to take a broader and more comprehensive approach in its external action, in line with the EU concept of policy coherence for development".

-the EP also "emphasises that the Commission should shape its trade strategy for EU 2020 so as to transform EU trade policy into a genuine vehicle for job creation and sustainable development worldwide".

- on the single EU patent system: the EP "urges the Commission to improve conditions for innovation, e.g. by introducing the single EU patent";

- on the global competitiveness and innovation: the EP "argues that well-intended programmes aimed at boosting competitiveness and shaping a sustainable economy are not working properly, and believes that SMEs, universities and businesses should be encouraged to participate in European programmes ".

- on knowledge migration: the EP defines very "important to look beyond the crisis and to explore European schemes offering scope for knowledge migration and the prevention of a European 'brain drain' ";

1.3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy sufficiently takes into account the social and environmental consequences and the respect for human rights (e.g. the right to food)?

EP Reply: 1. Social consequences

The EP "reiterates that high-quality employment should be a key priority in a 2020 strategy and that a stronger focus on properly functioning labour markets and on social conditions is vital to improve employment performance; calls, therefore, for a new agenda to promote decent work, ensure workers' rights throughout Europe and improve working conditions".

In addition, the EP "believes that the new strategy must put more emphasis on decent work, including the fight against undeclared work, and on ensuring that people who are currently excluded from the labour market can gain access to it".

Finally, the EP considers that the "strategy should explicitly include ambitious targets for reducing inequality and, more specifically, the gap between rich and poor; considers, therefore, that poverty must be measured as 'relative poverty' to help identify those at risk of exclusion".

2. Environmental consequences

The EP "considers that the environmental aspects of the EU 2020 strategy are generally too weak and need to be strengthened; urges that clear and measurable environmental goals be built into the main targets of the strategy, with emphasis on halting the loss of biodiversity".

The EP "deplores the fact that the European Council's headline targets on greenhouse gas emissions, renewables and energy efficiency lack ambition and, in this respect, are not geared towards leadership in a world which is facing climate change and serious natural resource depletion and where global ecosystems are on the verge of collapse".

Furthermore, EP "considers that the EU 2020 strategy should be geared towards meeting the Union's long-term goals of cutting greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050, in particular by increasing energy efficiency and cutting waste to improve Europe's competitive position and reduce costs".

### 3. Human rights

The EP "calls on the Commission to use its trade strategy for EU 2020 to promote the Union's core values, such as the promotion of human rights, democracy, the rule of law and fundamental freedoms and the defence of the environment".

## *The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*

2.1. In the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development 7 key challenges are identified, each of which is accompanied by an overall objective. In this context, is your Parliament/Chamber of the opinion that these challenges are sufficiently taken into account in the EUROPE 2020 Strategy? Please specify per challenge and comment on your specifications with reference to the above mentioned overall objectives.

### **EP Reply: 1. Climate change and clean energy**

The EP "considers that the EU 2020 strategy should be geared towards meeting the Union's long-term goals of cutting greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050, in particular by increasing energy efficiency and cutting waste to improve Europe's competitive position and reduce costs".

In addition, the EP "deplores the lack of any ambition, in the EU 2020 strategy, to develop a truly common European energy policy; stresses that, although a functioning internal market is a key goal for Europe – and the third energy package needs to be implemented rapidly – overemphasis on this aspect of Europe's energy policy is to the detriment of the other two objectives of "sustainable development" and "security-of supply"; recalls that the internal market cannot be dealt with separately from the external dimension, and that Europe needs a common European energy policy in order to have a real effect on security of energy supply, climate change and affordability of energy".

### **2. Sustainable transport**

EP "notes that, to tackle the climate challenge, substantial investments [...] will be needed before 2020 and beyond, including investment in [...] green corridors, interconnections, completing the Galileo project, [...], the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) programme [...]".

EP also "points out that the Union needs to invest more efficiently in existing transport infrastructures, such as TEN-T, to boost job creation, improve social and territorial cohesion and create a sustainable and interoperable transport system; calls for an interplay between transport modes and the smart use of logistics, since de-carbonising the transport sector and making it sustainable will require innovation, new technologies and financial resources".

### **3. Sustainable consumption and production**

The EP resolution states that "a more sustainable pattern of production, distribution and consumption is a fundamental requirement in the face of climate change, the loss of biodiversity and the depletion of natural resources".

Furthermore, the EP "underlines that sustainable production processes, coupled with resource efficiency and an integrated energy policy, and the further development of renewable energy sources will enable the EU not only to meet its climate and energy targets but also to maintain a strong manufacturing base in Europe and to boost competitiveness, growth and employment".

### **4. Conservation and management of natural resources**

EP "considers that innovation needs to be vigorously pursued in order to achieve the goals of environmental improvement, resource-use efficiency and cost reduction, and that the setting of legal targets and the introduction of regulatory measures are the most effective means of promoting such innovation". In addition, EP "urges that clear and measurable environmental goals be built into the main targets of the strategy, with emphasis on halting the loss of biodiversity" and that "a sustainable forestry strategy should be considered within the framework of the EU 2020 strategy".

### **5. Public health**

EP "notes that [...] substantial investments [...] will be needed before 2020 and beyond, including investment in [...] e-health".

### **6. Social inclusion, demography and migration**

The EP "stresses the need for robust lifelong-learning policies whereby training opportunities should be encouraged and should be available to individuals throughout their professional life; points out that it will be necessary to maintain the number of active people on the labour market and to strengthen social inclusion". In addition, the EP "considers it important to look at Europe's diminishing competitiveness on a global scale, and that, bearing in mind projected long-term labour shortages, it is also important to look beyond the crisis and to explore European schemes offering scope for knowledge migration and the prevention of a European "brain drain". Furthermore, the EP "believes that tackling youth unemployment and fostering an effective matching of skills and market needs should be focal points of policy and, to that end, there is a need to facilitate cross-border mobility for students and researchers, via exchanges, and to boost internships in order to enhance the international attractiveness of Europe's higher education institutions". The EP also "calls on the Member States, the Council and the Commission, with Parliament, to adopt by the end of the year an ambitious green jobs strategy, setting out the framework conditions for tapping the employment potential of a more sustainable economy based on skills and innovation, and ensuring that the transition towards such an economy is supported by training, lifelong learning and social security for all".

Finally, the EP "stresses that, in order to address high and growing unemployment, the EU must implement an ambitious social agenda, and a strong gender equality strategy and integration policy" and takes the view that "the ageing of Europe's population requires lifelong learning policies and a more flexible retirement age (where employees opt for this), so as to keep a sufficient number of active people in the labour market and enhance their social inclusion; is of the opinion that the employment potential of older people and disabled workers is often neglected, and expects proposals aimed at enhancing their potential; urges, furthermore, the Commission to put forward a strategy to combat youth unemployment";<sup>4</sup>.

### 7. Global poverty and sustainable development

The European Parliament "insists that the EU 2020 strategy should include a target for reducing poverty in the EU by half, and points out that a majority of Europeans currently living in poverty, or at risk of poverty, are women, in particular older women, migrant women, single mothers and carers". It also "welcomes the European Council proposals on social inclusion, particularly and as a priority through the reduction of poverty, and stresses the need for clear targets and initiatives; considers this goal as one of the main objectives of the EU 2020 strategy; calls for an ambitious long-term strategy against poverty, with far-reaching targets for poverty reduction, social inclusion – including for women, children and the elderly – and for combating in-work poverty; stresses the need for a target for reducing the number of jobless households".

<sup>4</sup> EP resolution of March 2010 (art. 2), P7\_TA(2010)0053

	Yes	No
1. Climate change and clean energy		
2. Sustainable transport		
3. Sustainable consumption and production		
4. Conservation and management of natural resources		
5. Public health		
6. Social inclusion, demography and migration		
7. Global poverty and sustainable development		

2.2. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that the EUROPE 2020 Strategy foresees enough instruments (1) to meet these challenges and (2) to measure and (3) to monitor their results (e.g. by the introduction of criteria similar to the euro convergence criteria)?

EP Reply: In its March 2010 Resolution<sup>5</sup> the European Parliament notes that "the Commission communication and the Council statements on aspects of the content of the EU 2020 strategy, such as the headline targets, flagship proposals, bottlenecks and indicators, have been of a very general nature and the Commission therefore urgently needs to come forward with more detailed plans to clarify how these initiatives will be implemented successfully, and to present such plans to Parliament".

The EP "welcomes the Commission's proposal for a platform against poverty but stresses that the fight against poverty must be stepped up; in this regard, considers that the EU 2020 strategy should explicitly include ambitious targets for reducing inequality and, more specifically, the gap between rich and poor; considers, therefore, that poverty must be measured as 'relative poverty' to help identify those at risk of exclusion".

Finally, the European Parliament asks "the Commission, while respecting the subsidiarity principle, to put forward new measures, such as regulations and directives, and possible sanctions for those Member States that do not implement the EU 2020 strategy and incentives for those that do".

<sup>5</sup> EP resolution of March 2010 (art. 2), P7\_TA(2010)0053

*The EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments*

3.1. Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the decision-making process, linked to the EUROPE 2020 Strategy, is sufficiently stringent for the Member States and that the oversight by the national and, if applicable, regional Parliaments is sufficiently assured?

EP Reply: The European Parliament has taken the view "that the Lisbon Strategy failed owing to a lack of commitment and lack of ownership by the Member States in relation to the implementation of agreed action plans, and the absence of effective incentives and binding instruments at EU level".

Consequently, the EP brought forward a number of proposals to foster the ownership of the EU 2020 Strategy.

Firstly, the EP has recalled "that both the Commission and the European Council have underlined Parliament's crucial role in the EU 2020 strategy", and called on both institutions "to acknowledge Parliament's key role in implementing a 2020 strategy" and "respect its prerogatives by presenting annual policy recommendations to Parliament before the European Council takes a decision" In this framework, the European Parliament has also called on "the Commission, while respecting the subsidiarity principle, to put forward new measures, such as regulations and directives, and possible sanctions for those Member States that do not implement the EU 2020 strategy and incentives for those that do". To this aim, the European Parliament "takes the view that an interinstitutional agreement needs to be drawn up in order to set down and formalise a democratic, effective way forward, which should include a commitment by the Council not to agree on changes to the strategy in coming years without formally consulting Parliament first".

In the field of economic policy, the EP has urged "the European Council to abandon the "open coordination method", based on the "exchange of best practices" and "peer pressure", and encouraged "the Commission to use all available provisions of the Lisbon Treaty, such as Articles 121, 122, 136, 172, 173 and 194, in order to coordinate the Member States' economic reforms and action plans".

Secondly, Parliament has stressed that "national parliaments, regions, municipalities, the social partners and NGOs should be actively involved in defining and implementing the strategy". The EP pleaded in favour of "better cooperation with national parliaments and civil society", and took "the view that involving more actors will increase the pressure on national administrations to deliver results".

Moreover, the EP underlined that, "since the Member States manage 80% of the EU budget themselves, the Commission should put more pressure on them to take responsibility for spending these funds correctly, and consider financial penalties in the event that Member States refuse to cooperate". To this aim, the European Parliament "believes that the Member States should indicate how they used EU funds to achieve the various EU 2020 objectives, and that EU funding should be conditional on results and compatibility with the objectives of the EU 2020 strategy".



3.2. Which parliamentary bodies of your Parliament/Chamber will be in charge of the follow-up of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and how will your Government be held to account for its actions in pursuit of the objectives of this strategy?

EP Reply: As for now, no specific body has been designated to monitor the follow-up of Europe 2020 Strategy.

This means that Parliament committees will deal with the proposals which are in the remit of their respective competencies as defined in Annex VII to the Rules of Procedure.

In specific reference to the EU 2020 and the Union's competences established in the ToL, the European Parliament will continue to act in the framework of its powers. Therefore, future proposals of whatever nature stemming from the development of the EU 2020 and which fall within the competence of the Union will continue to follow the established procedures.

In relation to the principle of subsidiarity and given the multilayer nature of the EU 2020, the European Parliament will continue to apply the provisions of the ToL and to carry out its dialogue with national parliaments at multiple levels.

3.3. Please briefly specify the parliamentary procedures involved (on national and, if applicable, on regional levels).

EP Reply: Does not apply

3.4. In case no such parliamentary body or procedure has yet been determined, is the establishment of either of them foreseen in the near future?

EP Reply: Does not apply

3.5. In which way national Parliaments/Chambers may contribute to strengthening the sustainable development aspect of the EUROPE 2020 Strategy?

EP Reply: See the section on "the EUROPE 2020 Strategy and the national Parliaments".

## **Chapter 2: Parliamentary Scrutiny of the Common Security and Defence Policy**

### **Questions:**

1. Does your Parliament/Chamber believe that an interparliamentary exchange on CFSP and CSDP is useful and helpful to improve parliamentary scrutiny at a national and/or European level?

EP Reply: The European Parliament believes that interparliamentary scrutiny of CFSP and CSDP is not only useful and helpful but necessary in a post-Lisbon context. Article 9 of Protocol 1 of the Lisbon Treaty states that the European Parliament and national

parliaments:

*"shall together determine the organization and promotion of effective and regular interparliamentary cooperation within the Union".*

2. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that interparliamentary scrutiny at EU level should cover both CFSP and CSDP or CSDP only?

EP Reply: Moreover, article 10 of the same Protocol adds that: *"a conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs ... may also organize interparliamentary conferences on specific topics, in particular to debate matters of CFSP, including CSDP"*.

Hence, interparliamentary scrutiny should cover both CFSP and CSDP.

In this context, it is necessary to recall the Treaty mandates the European Parliament in the area of CFSP **and** CSDP to be consulted, have its views taken into consideration and make recommendations. In addition, as an integral part of its budgetary prerogatives, the European Parliament has responsibility for co-deciding the CFSP budget which is predominately used for contributing to the financing of all **civilian** CSDP missions, **which are currently the majority of the missions deployed by the EU.**

Article 36 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) clearly states that: *"The High Representative ... shall regularly consult the European Parliament on the main aspects and basic choices of the common foreign and security policy and common security and defense policy ... He shall ensure that the views of the European Parliament are duly taken into consideration... The European Parliament may address questions or make recommendations to the Council or the High Representative. Twice a year it shall hold a debate on progress in implementing the common foreign and security policy, including the common security and defense policy"*.

The European Parliament also votes on the appointment of the Vice President within the Commission and thereby de facto endorses the High Representative in his/her job; was instrumental in the establishment of the External Action Service; and scrutinizes EU Special Representatives and senior heads of delegation upon their appointment.

Whilst military crisis management is not funded from the Union budget (article 41.2), a new "start up fund" is introduced by the Lisbon Treaty which shall be established after consulting the European Parliament. The creation and use of this "start up fund" is an important example of a new provision in the Lisbon Treaty that could be usefully discussed by interparliamentary cooperation.

One can therefore conclude that the Treaty gives the European Parliament a clear mandate in the area of CFSP and CSDP as well as the enhanced (scrutiny and budgetary) means to implement this mandate. Working closely with national parliaments, such as through interparliamentary meetings, could provide additional means to support its Treaty responsibilities as well as contribute to the overall European parliamentary scrutiny of this policy area.

Hence, the need of cooperation and complementarity between the European Parliament and national parliaments in the scrutiny of CFSP/ CSDP.

3. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that a special mechanism, structure or forum should be set up to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP? If so,
- Should it take the form of a new interparliamentary committee/ conference/ organisation/ institution?
  - Should the Member State holding the rotating Presidency have a special role in this new body?
  - Please specify other modalities.

EP Reply: Any new form of interparliamentary cooperation in the field of CFSP/CSDP must respect the Lisbon Treaty and reflect its logic, including the fact that there is now a permanent President of the European Council (speaking for the EU on CFSP matters at the level of the Heads of State and Government) and a permanent President of the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, VP/HR Catherine Ashton. This means that the rotating Presidency henceforward plays a reduced role in CFSP/CSDP.

The structure and modalities for such interparliamentary cooperation should therefore reflect the role played respectively by national parliaments and by the European Parliament in political and budgetary terms, and seek effectiveness (i.e. proximity to the major actors in this field), including cost-efficiency (i.e. avoid the setting up of permanent secretariats).

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber prefer an existing model or institutional arrangement to organise interparliamentary cooperation on and scrutiny of CFSP and/or CSDP?

EP Reply: There is therefore strong support in the European Parliament for the idea of organizing a **new, effective and innovative form of interparliamentary committee meetings involving representatives of all EU national Foreign Affairs and Defense Committees and its Foreign Affairs Committee and Subcommittee on Security and Defense.**

Such meetings could take place **twice a year**, supplemented, as and when appropriate, by extraordinary meetings on specific urgent topics.

The suggested meetings would be organized at specialized committee level by the European Parliament.

Lady Ashton and Mr Van Rompuy would be invited to participate in such interparliamentary fora on a regular basis. Representatives of other organizations - notably the Secretary-General of NATO - would be invited from time to time. And national parliamentarians from relevant third countries, such as the candidate countries, US and Norway, would also be included on a case by case basis.

4.1. Should COSAC play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COSAC?
- Should specific meetings of COSAC be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COSAC needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?
- What changes/reforms are needed?

EP Reply: See point 3 and 4

4.2. Should COFACC and/or "CODAC" play a part in such scrutiny? If so,

- In what form?
- Should this be during ordinary meetings of COFACC or "CODAC"?
- Should specific meetings of COFACC or "CODAC" be convened to discuss CFSP and/or CSDP?
- Should these meetings be convened on a regular basis or an ad-hoc basis?
- If on a regular basis, at what interval?
- Do you think COFACC or "CODAC" needs to be reformed in order to be able to deal with these issues?

- What changes/reforms are needed?

EP Reply: See point 3 and 4

- 4.3. Should still another existing conference/organisation/institution play a part in such scrutiny? If so,
- Which one?
  - In what form?
  - Please specify other modalities.

EP Reply: See point 3 and 4

5. Is your Parliament/Chamber prepared to make funding available for such scrutiny?

EP Reply: The proposed format would not involve the creation of a new form of administrative structure nor would it involve any cost to national Parliaments. The European Parliament would in fact make available the necessary facilities (meeting premises, interpretation and translation) and provide the secretarial support (the budgetary cost of the WEU and its Assembly was one of the main arguments put forward by the 10 Member States of the WEU to close down this organization, once the Lisbon Treaty came into force).

6. Does your Parliament/Chamber want a mechanism/structure or forum composed of Members of national Parliaments only or a mixed body which includes Members of the European Parliament?
7. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

EP Reply: The organization and promotion of effective and regular interparliamentary cooperation within the Union must be determined together by the European Parliament and national parliaments, in accordance with article 9 of Protocol 1 of the Treaty. Any new form of interparliamentary cooperation in the field of CFSP/CDSP must therefore respect the Lisbon Treaty and reflect its logic.

The critical questions such as the size of the respective - European and national - parliamentary delegations to such meetings, both enjoying equal rights, would be the subject of further consultations between the European Parliament and national parliaments.

For reminder, at their meeting in Stockholm on 14-15 May 2010, the Speakers asked the incoming EUSC Presidency (the Belgian parliament) to further explore the proposal to schedule regular conferences for parliamentary committees dealing with European Affairs, Foreign Affairs and Defense as well as Justice and Home Affairs, in cooperation with the European Parliament.

8. Does your Parliament/Chamber want the European Parliament to have a member status or an observer status in interparliamentary cooperation on CSFP and/or CSDP?

EP Reply: See answer to question 6 and 7.

### **Chapter 3: The future role of COSAC after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon - Continuation of the debate of the XLIII COSAC meeting**

#### **Questions:**

1. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.1) states that "monitoring the role of the national Parliaments as outlined in particular in Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union and its respective Protocols will remain one of COSAC's priorities". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how such monitoring could be implemented in practice and to what extent?

EP Reply: Dans sa résolution du 7 mai 2009 sur l'Évolution des relations entre le Parlement européen et les parlements nationaux dans le cadre du traité de Lisbonne (rapport Brok), le Parlement européen "estime que le rôle politique futur de la COSAC devra être défini dans le cadre d'une étroite collaboration entre le Parlement européen et les parlements nationaux, et que la COSAC (...) doit principalement rester un forum d'échange d'informations et de débat concernant les questions politiques générales et les meilleures pratiques en matière de contrôle des gouvernements nationaux"<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cosac.eu/fr/meetings/Madrid2010/ordinary.doc> / - pp. 37- 71

2. The Contribution of the XLIII COSAC (Para 10.2) states that "the so-called "Early-Warning System" as established in Protocol (No 2) and the coordination mechanism between national Parliaments should play an adequate role in COSAC". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how should COSAC perform this task in practice?

EP Reply: Dans sa résolution du 7 mai 2009 précitée, le Parlement européen affirme que " les informations et les débats [au sein de la COSAC] doivent à l'avenir se concentrer sur les activités législatives en ce qui concerne l'espace de liberté, de sécurité et de justice et sur le respect du principe de subsidiarité au niveau de l'Union européenne "

Il s'en suit que la poursuite des tests de subsidiarité - tels que pratiqués au sein de la COSAC avant l'entrée en vigueur du traité de Lisbonne - ne paraît plus aujourd'hui opportune.

3. What is your Parliament's/Chamber's view on the practical organisation of a debate in the framework of COSAC on the Work Programme of the European Commission?

EP Reply: En l'absence de position officielle du Parlement européen, l'on peut estimer que l'organisation d'un tel débat ne paraît pas prioritaire.

4. Does your Parliament/Chamber consider it acceptable to invite keynote speakers from outside the European Union (e.g. the NATO Secretary General, the U.S. Ambassador, etc.) to address COSAC on CFSP and/or CSDP?

EP Reply: Une telle proposition paraît en effet acceptable.

5. The replies to the questionnaire leading to the 13<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC showed that a large majority of Parliaments/Chambers<sup>76</sup> supported adding a recurrent item on the agenda of COSAC on political monitoring of Europol and evaluation of Eurojust's activities. In this context, how such debates should be conducted? In particular, should COSAC debates be preceded by hearings of representatives of Europol and Eurojust or should introductory evaluation be presented by, for instance, representatives of the academic world, judiciary and/or law enforcement services?

EP Reply: La coopération entre le Parlement européen et les parlements nationaux en matière d'évaluation de la politique d'Eurojust et d'Europol reste à définir dans le cadre d'un acte législatif qui doit être proposé par la Commission européenne.

6. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested that specialised parliamentary committees could be invited to participate in the activities of COSAC. In this context, would your Parliament/Chamber prefer to enhance the cooperation of specialised committees within the framework of COSAC or independently from it? In case the COSAC framework is given preference, please specify possible modalities of such cooperation.

EP Reply: Dans sa résolution du 7 mai 2009 précitée, le Parlement européen "estime que ses commissions spécialisées devraient être plus impliquées dans la préparation des réunions de la COSAC et dans la représentation au sein de celle-ci".

L'article 131, paragraphe 2, du Règlement du Parlement européen dispose en outre que "[l]es (...) membres de la délégation sont choisis en fonction des thèmes à examiner lors de la réunion de la COSAC et comprennent, autant que possible, des représentants des commissions compétentes dans ces domaines."

Par ailleurs, la résolution du 7 mai 2009 précitée "fait remarquer que les réunions bilatérales mixtes régulières des commissions spécialisées correspondantes et les rencontres interparlementaires ad hoc au niveau des commissions organisées à l'invitation du Parlement européen, permettent un dialogue à un stade précoce concernant les actes législatifs en cours ou en projet ou les initiatives politiques et qu'elles devraient par conséquent être maintenues et développées systématiquement pour prendre la forme d'un réseau permanent de commissions correspondantes".

Il est donc possible et souhaitable de renforcer la participation des commissions spécialisées au sein de la COSAC, tout en poursuivant, dans le même temps, le développement des relations directes entre commissions spécialisées en dehors du cadre de la COSAC.

7. At the debate on the future role of COSAC in Madrid, a number of speakers suggested organising a "European Week" in national Parliaments. In this context, does your Parliament/Chamber support the suggestion of organizing such a "European Week" and, if so, how does it view its practical organisation? Should COSAC take initiative in this respect?

EP Reply: A ce jour, les débats au sein du Parlement européen n'ont pas abouti à une orientation dans ce sens.

---

<sup>76</sup> Ibid. – p. 41.

8. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.4) state that "COSAC should reflect on the way new technologies, such as videoconferences and fora such as IPEX, could be employed and optimised to give effect to Article 10 of Protocol (No 1) on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union". In the opinion of your Parliament/Chamber, how, in practical terms, new technologies could be employed and optimised by COSAC?

EP Reply: Le Parlement européen se montre favorable à l'utilisation des nouvelles technologies dans le cadre des relations avec les parlements nationaux.

9. The Conclusions of the XLIII COSAC (Para 3.6) state that "speaking time should be limited in the Rules of Procedure to no more than 3 minutes, unless the Presidency determines otherwise, in view of specific circumstances". Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the Rules of Procedure of COSAC should be amended in other respects?

EP Reply: En l'absence d'une position officielle du Parlement européen, l'on peut estimer qu'il semble sage de prévoir une limitation du temps de parole, de manière à permettre au plus grand nombre possible de représentants des parlements nationaux et du Parlement européen de s'exprimer.