



**Euronest Parliamentary Assembly  
Assemblée parlementaire Euronest  
Parlamentarische Versammlung Euronest  
Парламентская Ассамблея Евронест**

**THIRD ORDINARY SESSION**

**Tuesday, 28 May and Wednesday, 29 May 2013  
Brussels**

**MINUTES**

**Tuesday 28 May 2013, 16:11-19:42hrs**

**Opening address by Mr Jacek PROTASIEWICZ, Vice-President of the European Parliament**

Mr PROTASIEWICZ welcomed the participants to the Third Ordinary Session of the Euronest PA, which for the first time was being held in Brussels. He mentioned the numerous developments that had occurred in the partner countries since the previous session in Baku: parliamentary elections in Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine. He welcomed the participants who were new to the Euronest PA. Mr PROTASIEWICZ qualified the parliamentary elections in Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine as being successful. He also expressed regrets about the way the elections were run in Belarus as the OSCE election observation mission found many irregularities. Such questionable results showed the lack of legitimacy of the Belarusian National Assembly; as a consequence, the ten seats reserved to the Belarusian Delegation in the Euronest PA were still left empty. Mr PROTASIEWICZ welcomed the efforts of the other Eastern partner countries to progress in line with the mutual commitments.

Concerning Ukraine, he underlined the efforts that had been made, but also stressed the fact that more progress was expected on the European Union's key requirements, such as: judiciary reforms, changes in the electoral code, addressing the issue of selective justice, in order to secure the success of the country at the Vilnius Summit. Moldova from its side had progressed on legislation concerning the enforcement of equality, non-discrimination and had made further progress in its visa dialogue with the EU. Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan had also shown encouraging results in their efforts to implement challenging reforms.

Mr PROTASIEWICZ illustrated to the Members of the Euronest PA the important upcoming projects linked to the area of remit of the Assembly: Euronest Scola programme and Young Leaders Forum of the Eastern Partnership and the EU.

Six months before the Vilnius Summit, where the Association Agreements and DCFTAs were expected to be signed or initialled, the work that was needed to be done in order to reach the defined objectives, remained very important. The Third session of the Euronest PA

was therefore a unique opportunity to discuss together the common goals and the progress that needed to be achieved.

Mr PROTASIEWICZ stressed the fact that consideration and discussion of bilateral disputes are not in the mandate of the Euronest PA and that the only way to send a strong message to the respective governments before the Vilnius Summit was to work together successfully. He mentioned the four reports to be debated and eventually to be successfully adopted during the session.

### **Welcoming address by Mr Borys TARASYUK, Co-President of the Euronest PA**

Mr TARASYUK joined Mr PROTASIEWICZ in his wishes for a fruitful cooperation between the EU and partner countries. He stressed that the year 2013 was crucial for the relationship between the EU and the Eastern Partners. He expressed regret that the processes in some of the Eastern partner countries did not give ground for much optimism in regard to the successful implementation of their commitments. He urged all the partner countries to do everything to make the Vilnius Summit successful.

### **Address by Mr Kristian VIGENIN, Co-President of the Euronest PA**

Mr VIGENIN reiterated that the Euronest PA project was based on joint ownership and shared responsibility. He gave a positive evaluation of the past two years of common work, underlining the crucial role that the Euronest PA had to play in enhancing governance, regional cooperation and better understanding and dialogue, as well as in holding the executives democratically accountable and fostering the links with the civil society. He briefly mentioned the Euronest Scola Programme and the Young Leaders Forum of the Eastern Partnership and the EU.

Mr VIGENIN emphasised that the Third Euronest PA session was a crucial moment of necessary choice and delivery. He therefore called for lowering the internal and external disagreements, and for unity on the common aspirations, thus sending a clear message to the heads of states and governments at the Vilnius Summit.

Underlining that the Euronest PA was the biggest achievement of his political and parliamentary activity, Mr VIGENIN announced his resignation from the Co-President position, as he had just decided to accept being part of the new Bulgarian Government team. The new EP Co-President was to be elected in the evening.

### **Address by Mr Stephan FÜLE, Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy on behalf of the European Union**

Commissioner FÜLE fully supported the statements of the previous speakers. He outlined to the Members of the Assembly the nine main points which expressed his view on the present situation and the future of the Eastern Partnership:

1. 28-29 November 2013, the Vilnius Summit. The most far reaching agreements ever with EU's Eastern Partners were expected to be signed or initialled with some Partners: the Association Agreement, including the Deep and Comprehensive Free

Trade Area, was a genuine instrument for political and economic integration leading to the transformation of the post-soviet space.

2. The overall expectations of the Vilnius Summit. The ambitions were rather high and the Summit was expected to show the ability of the partners to deliver on the reforms in their countries. The expected signature of the AA including the DCFTA with Ukraine, but also the initialling of the agreement with Moldova, Georgia and Armenia were of high importance. The EU and its Eastern Partners also needed to progress in the field of visa liberalisation action plans, as well as to deliver on concrete infrastructural projects such as transport networks.

Another important issue was focusing on the time between the Eastern Partnership Summits which take place every two years. In Warsaw the EEAS and the Commission had been asked to establish a roadmap: it took six months of negotiations, mainly among the Member States, to address the concerns of the partner countries. This way of proceeding raised among the partner countries the question of the ownership of the decisions taken. To proceed in a more inclusive way, an association agenda had to be established by the time of the Vilnius Summit in order for it to be discussed and adopted by all the partners.

3. The lessons from the Warsaw Summit had been learned and the need to involve the partner countries in the negotiation of the concluding document of the Summit was clear. Together with the High Representative, the Commissioner was preparing a new structure for a more inclusive process of preparation of those kinds of documents.
4. The Vilnius Summit was also an opportunity to focus on future developments of the Eastern Partnership. To address this issue a study on how the bilateral association agreements between the EU and its partners could be developed into an instrument of regional cooperation, both among the partners, and between the partners and the EU, had been launched. This study was expected to give an insight into the options available for the common choice of the ways to address the results of the bilateral work embedded in the Association Agreement. The Euronest Members could help the Commission and the EEAS to address this particular challenge. The negotiation of an Association Agreement was a demanding process involving the capacities of all partners in a process. The EU faced this challenge with Ukraine and could have faced it also with the other Eastern Partners. The challenge after the whole process of negotiating, preparing for signature, for ratification, etc., - working together on a daily basis, was to keep the level of engagement as high as possible, so as not to face the consequences of this intensive relationship being downgraded.
5. The Vilnius Summit was also going to be about differentiation. The partners were the ones who were expected to define their understanding of a closer relationship with the EU and of what it implied for the EU in terms of policies, programmes and arrangements, which would then allow Partners to deliver up to their level of ambition. The Eastern Partnership was from the very beginning based on the “more for more” principle. The more the partner countries are committed to reforms - the more support they receive from the EU, but also the more ambitious the partner countries become - the more the EU expects from them.

6. The EU Institutions had developed a strong and effective arrangement for involving the civil society: the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum. The EU had supported all the steps of the civil society in its effort for identifying and delivering on the necessary reforms and for monitoring their implementation. The Commissioner called on the Members of the Euronest PA to rely on the contacts with the Civil Society national platforms in their parliamentary work: a way to strengthen the right channels for the reforms in the respective countries.
7. The interaction of the Commission with the Eastern Partnership countries was developed on two levels: ministerial and parliamentary (Euronest) cooperation, Summits, Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum, but also informal partnership dialogue: informal exchanges of views with the High Representative Catherine Ashton and the Commissioner himself took place every six months in the capitals of the partner countries. The informal exchanges had induced partners' dialogue on sectoral cooperation (ex.: transport sector, education sector), as well as on cooperation with the civil society.
8. The more the European Union would strengthen and deepen the cooperation with its Eastern Partners, the more the EU should do so with the Russian Federation. During a recent visit to Moscow, Commission officials had made clear the lack of compatibility between DCFTA and Customs Union: legally binding arrangements with a partner who was not fully in charge of its external trade policies were not possible. The European Commission was ready to talk about possible arrangements which could have allowed the EU's partners to take into account the Customs Union and the Euro-Asian Union without putting their DCFTA commitments into question. In order to be able one day to build a free trade area between Lisbon and Vladivostok, the European Commission and the Euro-Asian Commission had to work together on the regulatory framework, in order not to create a wall of incompatibility.
9. In order to strengthen public diplomacy, the EU ought to create a platform not only for the civil society, but for the society at large. Also public institutions of the partner countries had to be strengthened: reforms, programmes, free and fair elections were crucial for the delivery of the democratic transformation of the Eastern Partners.

Mr VIGENIN thanked Commissioner FÜLE for his continuous availability and openness towards the Euronest PA.

Mr TARASYUK also expressed his gratitude to Commissioner FÜLE. He suggested him to stay for the presentation of the reports of the four committees of the Euronest PA and eventually for the rest of the meeting. Mr FÜLE accepted this suggestion. Mr TARASYUK invited the members of the Assembly to address the Commissioner with eventual questions.

**The following Members took the floor:**

**Mr SARYUSZ-WOLSKI (MEP)** - on the Russian intervention in Georgia, on trade relations with the zones which were affected by frozen conflicts, on Ukraine – Russia gas relations, on Azerbaijan.

**Mr RANSDORF (MEP)** - on unemployment of the youth and social exclusion in the European Union and in the Eastern Partner countries.

**Mr Elkhan SULEYMANOV (AZ)** - on the work of the Euronest Parliamentary Assembly and on the votes.

**Mr Victor DOLIDZE (GE)** on the « great job » of Commissioner FÜLE in regard to the Eastern Partnership, on Vilnius expected signatures and initialisations of Agreements and on post-Vilnius implementation process as well as on the role of the EU Defence component and the willingness of the Eastern Partners to contribute to EU Defence programmes.

**Commissioner FÜLE** addressed the concerns of the floor:

On Georgia: - the EU was fully committed to the defence of the territorial integrity of Georgia and had asked Russia to fulfil its commitments in terms of cease-fire; - the DCFTA would benefit to all the regions of Georgia.

On Russia - Ukraine gas issues: the proposal of multilateral negotiations on the management of Ukrainian pipelines had been excluded by Russia.

On the issue of youth unemployment and social exclusion, the Commissioner underlined that the Association Agreement was not only about trade: the regulatory framework of the AA and the DCFTA included a social development dimension.

On the participation of the partner countries in programmes linked to the EU Defence Policy: there was an effort from the EU side to find arrangements for inclusive cooperation.

The Commissioner expressed his gratitude to the Members of the Assembly for the important and enriching interaction and wished that the effective work of the Euronest PA would constitute an important contribution to the success of the Vilnius Summit.

**Mr Boris TARASYUK, Co-President of the Euronest PA, in the chair**, thanked Commissioner FÜLE for his time and proceeded with the agenda of the meeting.

### **1. Adoption of the draft agenda (AP 101.465)**

The agenda was adopted as proposed.

### **2. Approval of minutes of the Second Ordinary session, held on 3-4 April 2012 in Baku (AP 101.229)**

The minutes of the previous session were approved as such.

### **3. Contributions of the observers to the Euronest PA**

**Mr Terry LEYDEN, Senator of the Parliament of Ireland, Member of the joint Committee on EU Affairs**, stressed the importance of the Eastern Partnership for the European Union and for the Irish Presidency. He underlined the genuine characteristics of the partnership: the requirement of democracy and rule of law combined with trade agreements.

**Mr Linas BALSYS, Deputy Chair of the Committee on European Affairs of the Parliament of Lithuania** defined Euronest as the ideal format for the further promotion of the Eastern Partnership. The Eastern Partnership was indeed one of the first priorities of the forthcoming Lithuanian presidency of the European Union, with a strong emphasis on energy

security issues. He wished for the Vilnius Summit to be a big success in this regard with the signature of the Association Agreement including DCFTA with Ukraine.

**Mrs Natalya YERASHVICH, Director of the Brussels' Office of the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum**, thanked the European Commission for its support. She described the activity of the Civil Society Forum and its six national platforms. She raised her concern about the state of freedom of the civil society in Azerbaijan. She emphasised the role of the Euronest PA as a multilateral platform of exchange of the Eastern partner countries MPs and the MEPs for promoting the European values and expressed the will of the Civil Society Forum to cooperate with the Assembly.

**4. Presentation by Mr Ryszard CZARNECKI (EP) and Mr Boris TARASYUK (co-rapporteur ad interim, Ukraine), Co-Rapporteurs of the Euronest PA Committee on Political Affairs, Human Rights and Democracy, of a draft resolution on Regional security challenges in Eastern European countries**

The report had been successfully adopted during the meeting of the Euronest PA Committee on Political Affairs, Human Rights and Democracy the day before. Ten amendments had been received, three of which had been withdrawn.

**Mr Ryszard CZARNECKI (MEP), Co-Rapporteur**, stressed the fact that safety and security were crucial issues for EU's Eastern Partners, especially in view of regional conflicts. Despite the controversial nature of the document, a consensus had been reached by focusing on unity of goals rather than on divisive elements.

**Mr Boris TARASYUK (MP, Ukraine), Co-Rapporteur**, expressed gratitude to the delegations of Armenia and Azerbaijan for their compromises which had allowed for the report to be voted unanimously.

The following members took the floor during the exchange of views: **Mr HÖKMARK (MEP)** – in favour of the Amendment n.4 ; **Mr DOLIDZE (GE)** – against the Amendment n.4, suggesting a vote by separate houses on this amendment according to Art.16 §5 of the Rules of Procedure of the Euronest PA; **Mr HOVHANNESYAN (AM)** – thanked the Georgian delegation for its flexibility; **Mr MULDER (MEP)** – welcomed the draft resolution; **Mr ROUCEK (MEP)** – emphasised the importance of the rule of law, democracy, regional development, and expressed his disagreement with the amendment n.4; **Mr SULEYMANOV (AZ)** – called for compromise, expressed his disagreement as to the Rules of Procedure of the Euronest PA; **Mr LISEK (MEP)** – mentioned the EP delegation to be sent to Georgia, supported the view of MEP HÖKMARK on the Amendment n.4; **Mr DARCHIASHVILLI (GE)** – expressed his criticism towards the preventive detention of the former Prime Minister of Georgia and about lack of concern from his colleagues; **Mrs GURMAI (MEP)** – raised concern about the frozen conflicts in the Eastern Partnership countries; **Mr KOWAL (MEP)** – emphasised the importance of the future generations and drew the attention of Members to the project of European College of Eastern Partnership; **Mr KURPIL (UKR)** – supported the report, raised the issue of selective justice in Ukraine, supported Amendment n.4; **Mrs RIVASI (MEP)** - raised concern about the situation in Azerbaijan; **Mrs NETETSKA (UKR)** – spoke against the Amendment n. 4.

**Boris TARASYUK (MP, Ukraine), Co-Rapporteur**, stressed the fact that the report dealt with a sensitive issue and that its adoption would help to define the overall guideline.

**5. Presentation by Mr Veaceslav IONITA (MD) and Mr Evgeni KIRILOV (EP), Co-Rapporteurs of the Euronest PA Committee on Economic Integration, Legal Approximation and Convergence with EU Policies, of a draft resolution on Approximation of the national legislation of Eastern Partnership countries with EU legislation in the economic field**

The report had been successfully adopted by the Euronest PA Committee on Economic Integration, Legal Approximation and Convergence with EU Policies the day before. No amendments had been proposed for this text.

**[Mr Veaceslav IONITA (MD), Co-Rapporteur, could not attend the meeting.]**

**Mr Evgeni KIRILOV (MEP), Co-Rapporteur of the Euronest PA Committee on Economic Integration, Legal Approximation and Convergence with EU Policies** introduced to the Members the report which stresses the importance of compatibility of the Eastern Partners' policies with the EU standards as a genuine tool that helps to increase the competitiveness of Partners' economies and to stimulate investment. The "more for more" principle should be applied to the countries with the most ambitious agenda and successful results in order to allow them to move forward.

The following members took the floor during the exchange of views: **Mr ZALEWSKI (MEP)** – stressed that the ultimate aim of legal approximation was the establishment of the rule of law whereas the role of the European politicians was to observe the situation in the partner countries and to react on concrete political situations. Thus, he expressed his concern over the arrest of Mr MERABISHVILI, the former Prime Minister of Georgia; **Mr BAGRATYAN (AM)** – underlined the importance of legal approximation and supported the report; **Mr FÄRM (MEP)** – stressed the importance of overcoming regional disputes during the Euronest PA meeting in order to concentrate on areas of consensus for progress. He congratulated the members of the committee on the fact that the report had been unanimously adopted; **Mrs KHIDASHVILI (GE)** – supported the statement of Mr ZALEWSKI on the importance of the rule of law, but expressed her disagreement upon the case of Mr MERABISHVILLI whose arrest, according to her, had opened a new page in Georgian politics showing that impunity was no longer tolerated in Georgia. She brought to the attention of the members the fact that the European Court of Human Rights had criticised the manifest lack of cooperation and impartiality of the Ministry of Interior headed by Mr MIRABISHVILI during the investigation on the case of torture and murder of Sandra GIRGVLIANI. She called for the MEPs to respect this opinion; **Mrs NICOLAI (MEP)** – suggested to stop losing time on political discussions and focus on the report, which dealt with economic issues; **Mr BALANDIN (UKR)** – congratulated the efficiency of the ECON Committee and called for an increase of the budget to support the Eastern Partnership countries.

**Mr Evgeni KIRILOV (MEP), Co-Rapporteur** expressed his gratitude to the Members for their good capacity of cooperation in the ECON Committee.

**Mr Kristian VIGENIN, Co-President of the Euronest PA**, announced his departure, invited Mr UNGUREANU (MEP, ROM) to take his seat and wished the Members a successful session.

***[Mr Boris TARASYUK, Co-President of the Euronest PA in the chair.]***

**Mr Borys TARASYUK** invited the Members to wish all the best to Mr Kristian VIGENIN in his future endeavours.

**6. Presentation by Mr Gerben-Jan GERBRANDY (EP) and Mr David ONOPRISHVILI (GE), Co-Rapporteurs of the Euronest PA Committee on Energy Security, of a draft resolution on Energy security in connection with energy market and harmonisation between the Eastern Partner countries and the EU countries**

The report had been successfully adopted by the Euronest PA Committee on Energy Security the day before. No amendments were proposed for this text.

**Mr GERBRANDY (EP), Co-Rapporteur** congratulated Mr VIGENIN on his appointment as Foreign Affairs Minister in the Bulgarian Government. He expressed his gratitude to his co-rapporteur Mr ONOPRISHVILI and the Members of the Euronest PA Committee on Energy Security for the smooth and effective joint work. He stressed the fact that energy supply was one of the main challenges of the coming decades and a highly important and very difficult issue in the relations between the EU and the Eastern Partners. These complex relations resulted from the fact that there still was no common EU policy on energy, in spite of the deep interdependence of all the parties. The main element of the draft resolution was the accent on the importance of durable and coherent strategies inside the EU as well as with the Eastern Partnership countries in order to move towards new low carbon energy systems. The EU and its partners needed to develop a much more open and harmonised market for energy with strengthened integrated and interconnected energy networks.

**Mr ONOPRISHVILI (GE), Co-Rapporteur** underlined the importance of energy in the world politics. Energy policy could and should have become the most successful common policy for the EU and its Eastern Partners not only out of economic reasons, but also for security reasons. Many important issues such as the protection of human rights, prosperity and growth, strengthening and development of democracy, establishment of the EU values, were also, in one or another way, related to the implementation of energy supply projects. Energy projects and particularly those within the South Stream Gas Corridor, contributed to peaceful coexistence, fruitful cooperation, gradual mitigation of risk factors and stability. The EU had been successfully creating a fair environment for those nations in the neighbourhood who were striving to join the European Union. This was also related to the development and strengthening of the Eastern Partnership countries, their independence and sovereignty. The EU institutions had adopted unique acts towards the development of a common vision and attitude even though the energy policies were under the governance of individual EU Member states.

39 amendments including four compromise ones were tabled on the report.

The following members took the floor during the exchange of views: **Mr GRZYB (MEP)** – underlined the importance of extending the activity of the Energy Community to the diversification of sources of energy for the EU Member states and diversification of the markets for its producing partners. Also, he observed that the findings of the report should be included into the EU legislation as well as into the legislation of the Partner countries; **Mr CHSMARITYAN (AM)** – supported the report; **Mrs HERCZOG (MEP)** – congratulated the co-rapporteurs and agreed to their statements. She also expressed the hope that the Euronest PA would adopt the four reports and send a strong message at the Vilnius Summit; **Mr MURADOV (AZ)** – supported the report and invited all the participants to attend the



Energy Security Seminar taking place on the margins of the Vilnius Summit; **Mrs NICOLAI** (MEP) – supported the report as a beginning of a common European energy strategy; **Mrs RIVASI** (MEP) – underlined the importance of the security of energy supplies, but also pointed out that the energy resources available today were likely to end up by running out. She urged the members of the committee to also reflect on the development of renewable energies and on the increase of the energy efficiency of the European Union and Eastern Partner countries.

**7. Presentation by Mrs Elinar VARDANYAN (AM) and Mrs Elzbieta Katarzyna LUKACIJEWSKA (EP), Co-Rapporteurs of the Euronest PA Committee on Social Affairs, Education, Culture and Civil Society, of a draft resolution on Combating poverty and social exclusion in the Eastern Partnership countries**

The report had been adopted by the Committee the day before. No amendments for the plenary had been submitted.

**Mrs VARDANYAN (AM), Co-Rapporteur** and **Mrs LUKACIJEWSKA (MEP), Co-Rapporteur** underlined the importance of focusing on the causes of poverty and social exclusion in order to be able to benefit from all the good practice in the area. NGOs and the civil society had a role to play in this field. The problem of poverty and social exclusion was a reality not only among the Eastern Partner countries – many countries of the European Union were also concerned.

The following members took the floor during the exchange of views: **Mr ZAKARYAN** (AM) – supported the report pointing out the fact that the economic and social development of the region was one of the key objectives of the Eastern Partnership; **Mr ZWIEFKA** (MEP) – expressed his regrets on the fact that the social aspect was often forgotten in the debate on economic issues and congratulated the co-rapporteurs on their report; **Mrs GURMAI** (MEP) – pointed out that Eastern Partnership countries were hit hard by the global economic crisis and the challenge of poverty and social exclusion had to be urgently addressed. She expressed her support to the report underlining that a particular attention had to be paid to the most sensitive parts of the population such as elderly, disabled and migrants, as well as to young people and women. Gender equality had to be further promoted; **Mrs ANDRIKIENE** (MEP) – stressed the importance of tackling the problem of malnutrition.

*Mr Trian UNGUREANU, Vice-President of the Euronest PA, in the chair.*

**8. Adoption of the draft resolutions contained in the Committees' reports on which the debate is concluded**

After a reminder on Rules of Procedure, technical explanations and a test vote, Members proceeded to the vote on the four Reports presented during the meeting.

**Report of the Euronest PA Committee on Political Affairs, Human Rights and Democracy on *Regional security challenges in Eastern European countries*. Co-Rapporteurs: Mr Ryszard CZARNECKI (EP) and Mr Borys TARASYUK (Ukraine) (co-rapporteur ad interim).**

All the amendments except amendment 4 were voted according to the rule on simple majority. Amendment 4 was voted under the rule on voting by separated components/split vote: for the 46 MEPs present, the 2/3 majority was then established at 31, while, for the 32 EaP MPs, the majority was established at 22.

Amendment 1: **77** in favour; **3** against; **2** abstentions – amendment adopted

Amendment 2: withdrawn

Amendment 3: **79** in favour; **1** against; **2** abstentions – amendment adopted

Amendment 4, first part:

EP component: **28** in favour; **18** against; **2** abstentions – amendment rejected

EaP component: **15** in favour; **15** against; **0** abstentions – amendment rejected

After a long debate the second part of Amendment 4 was withdrawn.

Amendment 5: **67** in favour; **0** against; **2** abstentions – amendment adopted

Amendment 6: **67** in favour; **1** against; **3** abstentions – amendment adopted

Amendment 7: withdrawn

Amendment 8: **65** in favour; **1** against; **4** abstentions – amendment adopted

Amendment 9: **66** in favour; **1** against; **4** abstentions – amendment adopted

Amendment 10: withdrawn.

The Assembly adopted the report, as amended, with **63** votes in favour, **2** against and **3** abstentions.

**Report of the Euronest PA Committee on Economic Integration, Legal Approximation and Convergence with EU Policies on *Approximation of the national legislation of Eastern Partnership countries with EU legislation in the economic field.***

**Co-Rapporteurs: Mr Veaceslav IONITA (MD) and Mr Evgeni KIRILOV (EP).**

The Assembly adopted the report such as transmitted by the committee with **70** votes in favour, **0** against and **0** abstentions.

**Report of the Euronest PA Committee on Energy Security on *Energy security in connection with energy market and harmonisation between the Eastern Partner countries and the EU countries.*** Co-Rapporteurs: Mr Gerben-Jan GERBRANDI (EP) and David ONOPRISHVILI (GE).

The Assembly adopted the report such as transmitted by the committee with **76** votes in favour, **0** against and **3** abstentions.

**Report of the Euronest PA Committee on Social Affairs, Education, Culture and Civil Society on *Combating poverty and social exclusion in the Eastern Partnership countries.*** Co-Rapporteurs: Mrs Elinar VARDANYAN (AM) and Mrs Elzbieta Katarzyna LUKACIJEWSKA (EP).

The Assembly adopted the report such as transmitted by the committee with **70** votes in favour, **1** against and **2** abstentions.

**Mr TARASYUK** asked the MEPs to remain in the room for an extraordinary meeting of the EP Delegation who would have to proceed with the election of the new Chairman of the European Parliament Delegation to the Euronest PA.

\*\*\*

*Short suspension of the sitting*

\*\*\*

At the resuming of the session, **Mr TARASYUK**, Co-President of the Euronest PA, was informed that the newly elected Chairman of the European Parliament Delegation, also candidate for the position of Co-President of the Euronest PA, was **Mr Evgeni KIRILOV MEP**. He asked Mr KIRILOV whether he accepted the nomination to the post of Co-President of the Euronest PA. Mr KIRILOV responded positively. No Member present opposed the candidature of Mr KIRILOV who was therefore acclaimed by the Assembly as new Co-President of the Euronest PA.

**Mr KIRILOV** took the floor and thanked his Co-President and the Assembly for their trust.

\*\*\*

*Wednesday, 29 May 2013, from 9 : 13 to 12 : 30 hrs*

*Mr Borys TARASYUK, Co-President of the Euronest PA, in the chair.*

**Mr TARASYUK** reminded the Assembly of the election, on Tuesday 28 May 2013, of Mr Evgeni KIRILOV as new Co-President of the Euronest PA on behalf of the European Parliament component and called on the Members to wish him a successful and fruitful mandate.

**9. Exchange of views with a representative of the European Commission and with Mrs Sidonia Elzbieta JEDRZEJEWSKA (rapporteur in the EP Committee on Budgets) on the results, so far, of expenditure in the Eastern Partnership countries via the relevant EU financial instruments and on the current state of play of MFF planning**

**Mr BHARDWAJ, Head of Unit, Budget Expenditure External Policies, European Commission** explained to the Assembly the work and budget priorities of the European External Action Service regarding the Eastern Partnership policy. He underlined the importance of the “more for more” principle and the need for a change in the way of allocating the funds to the countries. The balance of budget allocation between the Eastern and the Southern Neighbourhood was 1/3 for the Eastern and 2/3 for the Southern Neighbourhood programmes, a balance which was likely to be changed in order to achieve higher efficiency. Specific programmes, rather than the Partners’ State budget, had to receive allocations. In this way the responsibility for the success of the policies would be shared.

Shared responsibility was crucial for the success of the programmes that were being implemented. Also, new ways of cooperation such as partnerships with the private sector, with the civil society and trust funds were being examined as tools for more efficient cooperation. Mr BHARDWAJ outlined the state of play of the multi-annual financial framework.

**Mrs JEDRZEJEWSKA, Rapporteur in the EP Committee on Budgets** presented the expert hearing on the financing of the Eastern Partnership that she had recently organized for the Committee on Budgets. The speakers of the hearing were academic researchers as well as practitioners working in the field of the Eastern Partnership. Their conclusions included the fact that the funds allocated to the Eastern Partnership had not brought much tangible political or social effect yet. Ordinary citizens in the countries of the Eastern Partnership were not necessarily aware of the EU funding that was invested in their countries. Mrs JEDRZEJEWSKA pointed out that the fact of not giving to those partner countries a clear perspective of European integration was clearly hindering the process of implementation of reforms aiming at approximation with the EU. She stressed the fact that this lack of clear perspective caused lack of perception of shared ownership and responsibility on projects implementation by the partner countries. The incentive for implementation of structural reforms had been identified in the “more for more” principle.

The following members took the floor during the exchange of views: **Mr FÄRM** (MEP) – underlined the crucial importance of the Eastern European Neighbourhood policy. Shared ownership, responsibility and conditionality were the key to the efficiency of this policy; **Mr BAGRATYAN** (AM) – underlined that the European Neighbourhood policy needed much more funding. Partner countries needed to be supported in their European aspirations and the EU had to be careful with the savings it had to make, because it risked to pay much more in the future for the advancements which could have cost much less before; **Mr BALANDIN** (UKR) – supported the previous statements on the importance of the funding of the Eastern Partnership which according to him was on the right track; **Mr HÖKMARK** (MEP) – supported the statement of Mr FÄRM. He underlined that the discussed projects were consistent with the overall aims of the Eastern Partnership cooperation; **Mrs MAGRADZE** (GE) – presented the initiative, still to be implemented, of the Euronest Women Forum and stressed the importance of the promotion of gender equality; **Mr TARASUYK** (UKR) – pointed out that there was a feeling within the Eastern Partnership component that the funding allocated to the Eastern Neighbourhood programmes was completely inadequate in comparison to the funding received by other countries such as Serbia or Turkey.

**Mr Vijay BHARDWAJ** expressed his support on the statements of the previous speakers. He pointed out that the budget would have gained in efficiency if it could have been more flexible. Also the division between Southern and Eastern Neighbourhoods as it was (2/3 - 1/3) had to be changed into a division based on merit and precise need.

**Mrs JEDRZEJEWSKA** highlighted some of the issues where progress could and had to be done. She encouraged the Assembly to send a strong political message to the Vilnius Summit. She invited the Members to look more in depth into the other financial instruments that the EU could offer such as the Instrument for Development and Cooperation (DCI), the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, the Instrument for Stability as well as the Nuclear Safety Cooperation Instrument. She called on the European Commission to be more attentive with the allocated funds, in the sense that they should be used to finance concrete projects rather than sent to the national budget of the partner states.

*Mr Evgeni KIRILOV, Co-President of the Euronest PA, in the chair.*

## **10. Exchange of views on the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius**

Mr KIRILOV announced that the Bureau had decided to prepare a message to the Heads of States and Governments who would gather at the Vilnius Summit of the Eastern Partnership. The departure point of the discussion on the main content of this message, as he said, would be a draft which had been distributed to all the Members of the Assembly. He invited the Assembly to debate on the message of the Euronest PA to the Vilnius Summit.

The following members took the floor during the exchange of views: **Mr HÖKMARK** (MEP) – underlined that each Eastern Member of the Assembly had to be reassured that their expectations regarding democracy, the rule of law and the defence of human rights in their respective countries were shared by their EU partners; **Mr ROUCEK** (MEP) – pointed out that the Vilnius Summit was a unique opportunity to make the Eastern Partnership successful, because the country which was assuring the presidency of the Council of the EU and was organising the Summit, Lithuania, as well as the Commission, were deeply committed to the Eastern Partnership; **Mr ZAKARYAN** (AM) – made a summary of the common work accomplished since the creation of the Eastern Partnership and underlined the progress that Armenia had made during that period. He expressed hope for the finalisation of the preparations for the signature of the Association Agreement between the EU and Armenia before the summer break; **Mr SARYUSZ-WOLSKI** (MEP) – pointed out that the Eastern Partnership was in crisis, or at a crossroad. From the European Union side it was losing support, because the Member States were very busy with handling their own problems. As to the Eastern Partners, regrettably democracy had been back-sliding there; **Mr DOLIDZE** (GE) – supported the achievement made so far by the Eastern European Partner countries on the path of reforms and strengthening of their democracies; **Mr KACIN** (MEP) – pointed out two issues which had not been debated enough, according to him, during the Euronest meeting: Russia and the enlargement. Indeed, the Association Agreements and the DCFTAs were not compatible with the Customs Union, although the EU was aware that it would be impossible to build exclusive relations with the countries of the common neighbourhood. Concerning EU enlargement, the Assembly had to be aware that no enlargement to the Eastern Partnership countries was foreseeable, for the time being; **Mr GULIYEV** (AZ) – called for a discussion on the frozen conflicts areas of the Eastern Partnership countries during the Summit in Vilnius; **Mr FLECKENSTEIN** (MEP) – reminded that great expectations born during the past years of hard work had, in a way, crystallized, and this would be brought to the Vilnius Summit; **Mrs KHIDASHVILI** (GE) – stressed that the rule of law started with the understanding by everybody of the fact that nobody was above the law; **Mr LANDSBERGIS** (MEP) – underlined the historical importance of the cooperation within the Eastern Partnership. He expressed his hope for a European mediation breakthrough and for peace in the Caucasus; **Mr TARASYUK** (UKR) – warmly supported the idea of sending a concrete message to the Vilnius Summit. As a representative of a democratic opposition party in Ukraine, he stressed the fact that the Ukrainian opposition strongly supported the signature of an Association Agreement with the EU at the Vilnius Summit, provided that the Ukrainian authorities would fully meet all the necessary conditions. He expressed concern on the fact that he did not see any steps forward from the Ukrainian authorities to meet the conditions put forward by the European Council, attitude that could cause the failure of the association project between Ukraine and the EU; **Mr PALECKIS** (MEP) – pointed out that the European Union had to make everything necessary to keep itself

attractive for its Eastern Partners. The objectives of the Vilnius Summit had a real potential to be achieved; **Mr HOVANNESYAN (AM)** – underlined in the intervention of Mr LANDSBERGIS the hope for reconciliation between Armenia and Azerbaijan. In his view, though, it was difficult to establish good relations between a democratic country on one hand and a dictatorship on the other; **Mr FÄRM (MEP)** – criticized the interventions of Mr SARIUSZ-WOLKSI and of Mr HÖKMARK; **Mrs ZOHRABYAN (AM)** – criticized the position of Mr LANDSBERGIS regarding the state of play in Azerbaijan; **Mr HÖKMARK (MEP)** – objected the statement of Mr FÄRM as to his own position on Hungary; **Mr HASANGULIYEV (AZ)** – agreed on Mr HOVANNESYAN’s statement as to the fact that the state of democracy in Azerbaijan was not perfect, but by a number of examples, he illustrated that the imperfection of democracy touched, in his view, Armenia even more than Azerbaijan; **Mrs HERCZOG (MEP)** – congratulated the Assembly for the achieved work during the session and emphasised that the ultimate target of Euronest PA was to facilitate the walk of the Eastern Partners towards European integration. The Eastern Partnership generated added value had to become visible for the citizens. She also condemned the statement of Mr HÖKMARK concerning Hungary; **Mr CZARNECKI (MEP)** – stated that the Euronest PA had to find a compromise position and to send a strong, positive message to the Vilnius Summit.

*Mr Borys TARASYUK, Co-President of the Euronest PA, in the chair.*

#### **11. Exchange of views and adoption of the proposals for amendment to the Rules of Procedure of the Euronest PA and the Standing Committees**

**Mr TARASYUK** congratulated the Working Group of the Euronest PA on the Rules of Procedure on the good work that they had done. They had indeed produced very pertinent amendments to be considered by the Assembly. He also reminded that the Bureau had recommended to the Assembly to vote for those amendments in one go as a whole package.

**Mrs HERCZOG (MEP), Co-Chair of the Working Group on Rules of Procedure** presented the amendments suggested by the Working Group. She suggested also to continue the work of the Working Group on Rules of Procedures in the future.

**Mr DARCHIASHVILI (GE)** underlined the interconnection between the Rules of Procedure and the content of the discussions in the Assembly. He stressed the fact that the Euronest PA was a platform for discussion on specific topics which did not include the solution of geo-political conflicts in the Eastern Partnership region, although, as he admitted, it was difficult to avoid discussing them in the Euronest Committee on Political Affairs, Human Rights and Democracy. Clear Rules of Procedure could help to define what and when to discuss. Mr DARCHIASHVILI suggested to support the introduction of the simple majority vote in the committees only in order to simplify the voting process.

**Mr HOVHANNESYAN (AM)** disagreed with the proposed amendment of Art.7 §3 of the Rules of Committees, about the decision-making of Committees, stressing that the 2/3 majority rule should be kept as an important tool for reaching consensus.

**Mr FLECKENSTEIN** (MEP) thanked the Working Group for its work, but agreed with his previous speaker on sticking to the rule of the 2/3 majority in the committees.

**Mr MURADOV** (AZ) asked for clarifications on the order of discussion on the proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure. He also suggested to work more on the rules concerning the voting procedure.

**Mrs IBRAHIMGIZI** (AZ) pointed out that the delegations of the Eastern Partner countries had the possibility in the Euronest PA to learn and exercise democracy. She called for the Assembly to vote in favour of the proposed amendments.

The Chair announced a package of three amendments related to the Plenary Rules. The Assembly proceeded to an electronic vote according to the rule of the 2/3 majority. **37** members voted in favour, **8** against, **0** abstentions: the amendments package on Plenary Rules was approved. The Chair reminded the members that the Bureau had recommended for the adopted amendments to enter into force immediately. The Assembly endorsed unanimously this recommendation.

The Assembly proceeded then to an electronic vote on the proposed amendments to the Rules of the Committees according to the rule of the 2/3 majority. The Chair suggested to vote for the package of amendments excluding the controversial amendment no. 3 which would be voted separately.

The Assembly adopted the package of six amendments on the Rules of Procedure of the standing Committees by **42** votes in favour, **4** against, **0** abstentions. The approved amendments entered into force immediately, as the Assembly endorsed the Bureau recommendation in this respect.

The Assembly rejected amendment no. 3.

**Mrs HERCZOG** (MEP), **Co-Chair of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure** suggested an oral amendment to the rule of Art. 7, § 3 of the committees' rules according to which only the Members who vote should be counted and not those who are present, but do not take part in the vote. The Chair, **Mr TARASYUK**, supported this oral amendment and invited the Assembly to vote on it.

The Assembly approved the amendment with **30** votes in favour, **11** against, **2** abstentions.

## **12. Debate and adoption of the decision on the prolongation of mandate of the Working Group on Belarus and the Working Group on Rules of Procedure**

According to the amendments voted at point 11 of the agenda, the debate and the vote on prolongation of the mandate of the two Working Groups were not any more necessary.

**Mr SARYUSZ-WOLSKI** made a presentation of the achievements of the Working Group on Belarus. At the fourth meeting, on 28 May 2014, the Foreign Minister, civil society and opposition were invited. The Foreign Minister did not take part. Six representatives of the civil society were present. Usually, the meetings of the Working Group had seen exchanges of view on the Eastern Partnership, but the fourth meeting had dealt with information and media in Belarus. The representatives of three independent TV, Radio and Internet media were invited. The needs of the independent media and relevant help from the EU had been discussed. The next meeting of the Working Group would deal with financial assistance to Belarus.

*Mr Evgeni KIRILOV, Co-President of the Euronest PA, in the chair.*

**13. Adoption of the work-plan for 2014**

The Bureau had recommended to the Assembly to hold the Fourth Ordinary Session in Yerevan, Armenia, in November 2014. The standing Committees also had to meet, as usual, during the November Session. Further committee meetings would take place during the first quarter 2014 in Brussels.

**Mr HOVHANNESYAN** (AM) confirmed that the Fourth Ordinary Session would be organised by Armenia at the highest level. He suggested, for organisational reasons, to anticipate the date of the meeting from November 2014 to the end of October 2014.

**Mr SARYUSZ-WOLSKI** (MEP) stressed the importance to organise the Fourth Plenary meeting in Armenia.

The Assembly unanimously approved the work-plan described above.

**14. Any other business**

None.

Co-Chair Evgeni KIRILOV congratulated the Assembly for the great work accomplished during the Third Ordinary Session and closed the meeting at 11:25.



## RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

### PRESENT

#### ***EP Delegation***

PROTASIEWICZ, Vice-President

VIGENIN, Co-President of the Euronest PA (until 28 May 2014)

KIRILOV (as of 28 May 2014)

UNGUREANU, Vice-President of the Euronest PA

CZARNECKI, Vice-President of the Euronest PA

GERBRANDY, Vice-President of the Euronest PA

SARYUSZ-WOLSKI, Vice-President of the Euronest PA

#### Member:

ANDRIKIENE

FÄRM

GRZYB

HYUSMENOVA

IMBRASAS

IOTOVA

JAHR

KACZMAREK

KARAS

KLEVA

LANDSBERGIS

LUKACIJEWSKA

MACOVEI

MIGALSKI

OVIIR

PALECKIS

RANSDORF

ROUCEK

SARYUSZ-WOLSKI

SAUDARGAS

SCHROEDTER

SCHULZ

SIWIEC

SZYMANSKI

TSOUKALAS

WINKLER

ZALEWSKI

ZDANOKA

ZWIEFKA

#### Substitutes:

ABELA BALDACCHINO

BAUER

DESS

HÖKMARK

KACIN

LISEK

MARTINEZ MARTINEZ

#### ***Eastern Partners***

TARASYUK, Co-President of the Euronest PA (Ukraine)

#### Armenia:

ZAKARYAN, Vice-President of the Euronest PA

HOVHANNESYAN

ZOHRABYAN

POSTANJYAN

ATSHEMYAN

BAGRATYAN

CHSHMARITIAN

SAHAKYAN

SHAHGELDYAN

VARDANYAN

#### Azerbaijan:

SULEYMANOV, Vice-President of the Euronest PA

MURADOV

GULLIYEV

HUSEYNLI

IBRAHIMGIZI

KARIMLI

MAMMADOVA

MUSABEYOV

HASANGULIYEV, Substitute

OSMANLI, Substitute

SALAYYEV, Substitute

#### Georgia:

DOLIDZE, Vice-President of the Euronest PA

AGULASHVILI

BESELIA

DARCHIASHVILI

JORJOLIANI

MELADZE

ONOPRISHVILI

JAPARIDZE

KHIDASHELI, Substitute

MAGRADZE, Substitute

MKOYAN, Substitute

#### Ukraine:

BALANDIN

KALIUZHNYI

KURPIL

KUTOVYI

PANKEVYCH

NETETSKA, Substitute

SHATVORIAN, Substitute

MULDER  
NEVEDALOVA  
OOMEN-RUIJTEN  
PIETIKÄINEN  
PIRILLO  
PREDA  
ROITHOVA  
SCHMIDT  
STOLOJAN  
TANNOCK  
THEIN  
TRZASKOWSKI  
ZELLER

Other Members:

KAZAK  
NICOLAI  
GURMAI  
JÄTTTEENMÄKI  
JAZLOWIEKA

ALSO PRESENT

**Accompanying persons of the Eastern Partners**

Armenia:

SHIMSHIRYAN (Secretariat)  
SEMONYAN, BARSEGHIAN (Mission)

Azerbaijan:

AGHAYEV (Secretariat)

Georgia:

DVALADZE (Secretariat)  
KARDAVA (Secretariat)  
BOTCHORISHVILI, SALOMONIA (Mission)

Moldova:

GRIGORITA (Mission)

Ukraine:

PROTASENKO (Secretariat)  
TSOK, BODENCHUK (Mission)

European Commission: Commissioner FÜLE, BHARDWAJ (DG Budget A4)

EEAS: KONNARI

EC: DE FOUCAUCOURT, DOWNHILL

COR: VAN DEN BRANDE

Member States' Parliaments:

LEYDEN (Ireland)  
BALSYS (Lithuania)

EU Missions:

JINHAGL (Sweden)

Others:

YERESHVICH, EaP Civil Society Forum

RYMASHEUSKI, Co-Chair of the Belarusian Christian Democracy

EP Political groups:

EPP: TROMBETTA, HANNIBAL, KOSINKA, ILIASA

S&D: LEPOURAS, VALLIN

ALDE: STANIASZEK, NESTORAS

ECR: GRABCZEWSKI, DANECKI

Verts: BERGAMASCHI

GUE/NGL: FRISOVA

Cabinet of the EP President:

PRANCKEVICIUS

DG COMM

KRIVADE, FRENZEL

EP - DG External Policies:

HUBER, CSASZI, MAISONNY, CZAPLICKI, KAMARIS REY, UDINA, MINAIRE, KAMINSKA,  
DORGERET, GARCES DE LOS FAYOS, CLAES, SIEGISMUND, TURANOVA

EP Euronest Secretariat

AGUIRIANO, Director-General, STOKELJ, Director,

MAZZI ZISSIS, Head of Unit

Assistance: SCHMUTTERER, CARPELAN