


# The statutory bodies of WEU

**Source:** CVCE. André Dumoulin.

**Copyright:** (c) CVCE.EU by UNI.LU  
All rights of reproduction, of public communication, of adaptation, of distribution or of dissemination via Internet, internal network or any other means are strictly reserved in all countries.  
Consult the legal notice and the terms and conditions of use regarding this site.

**URL:** [http://www.cvce.eu/obj/the\\_statutory\\_bodies\\_of\\_weu-en-236041a8-69bf-4c22-8337-f506900a764c.html](http://www.cvce.eu/obj/the_statutory_bodies_of_weu-en-236041a8-69bf-4c22-8337-f506900a764c.html)

**Last updated:** 08/07/2016



## The statutory bodies of Western European Union

Western European Union (WEU) had three statutory bodies: the Council, the Parliamentary Assembly and the Secretariat-General.

### The Council

As a result of modifications to the Brussels Treaty in 1954, the Consultative Council <sup>(1)</sup> became a Council so organised as to be able to exercise its functions continuously. The **Council of WEU** existed for the purposes of ‘strengthening peace and security and of promoting unity and of encouraging the progressive integration of Europe and closer co-operation between Them and with other European organisations’ (Article VIII(1)). Article VIII(3) states that ‘at the request of any of the High Contracting Parties the Council shall be immediately convened in order to permit Them to consult with regard to any situation which may constitute a threat to peace <sup>(2)</sup> in whatever area this threat should arise, or a danger to economic stability.’

The Council’s functions were defined by the Treaty, which states that it ‘shall decide by unanimous vote questions for which no other voting procedure has been or may be agreed’ <sup>(3)</sup> (Article VIII(4)). If the intergovernmental process in the Council required unanimity, it acted by consensus without taking a vote. Only the ten full members took decisions relating to WEU.

In practice this pivotal intergovernmental body of WEU did not lay down any fixed intervals for the holding of its meetings and the frequency of these was dependent on current events and on policies for reactivating the organisation or making it ‘dormant’. The Council was composed of representatives of the Member States. Each full Member State held the Presidency of the Council in turn <sup>(4)</sup> and meetings were, in principle, held in the country holding the Presidency.

The Council could meet at the level of permanent national representatives (for the Permanent Council, see below) or at the level of Foreign and Defence Ministers (the latter from 1984, when there was an attempt to breathe fresh life into the organisation by the Rome Declaration). For certain ministerial meetings, however, it was necessary to hold the meetings (Foreign Affairs and Defence) separately for political reasons. Ministerial meetings took place twice a year but extraordinary meetings could be called if required. The Council of Ministers could meet in a variety of configurations, involving full members only, or these together with the associate and observer states or all the above plus the associate partner states. Meetings with the associate and observer states were generally held in the morning, while those with the associate partners took place in the afternoon.

The **Permanent Council**, meeting under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General in the organisation’s headquarters and responsible for the day-to-day running of WEU with the help of military delegates, consisted of permanent representatives of the member countries, in most cases double-hatting, in that they also represented the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). This WEU representative body originally consisted of the member countries’ ambassadors to London; then, when the Council and the Secretariat-General moved to Brussels in January 1993, of permanent representatives appointed primarily or exclusively for that task. The Permanent Council could hold enlarged meetings attended by the political affairs directors from the Foreign and Defence Ministries (the enlarged Permanent Council) for the purpose of preparing ministerial Councils and drawing up reports for the ministers. In the early days, the Permanent Council used to carry out statutory tasks: the adoption of the annual report and of replies to recommendations from the Assembly and to written questions from its members (see below), the implementation of the Protocols to the Treaty, or the adoption of decisions relating to the work of the agencies. After the reactivation of WEU in the 1980s, the Permanent Council was also responsible for drawing up reports for ministers, through working groups set up under ongoing or special mandates. When the States parties had taken the decision to close the organisation, the Permanent Council was given the task of organising the cessation of WEU activities, preferably by the end of June 2011. ‘In this respect, the WEU Permanent Council will rely on the WEU General Secretariat’s expertise and support and consult with the WEU Assembly as appropriate. It will in particular deal with the following aspects: implementation of the social plan for the WEU General Secretariat’s personnel, the Paris-based administrative services and the WEU Assembly’s staff, on the basis of

the social plan of 2000 and in consultation with the personnel representatives; management of the pensions and settlement of issues related to the WEU premises in Brussels and Paris.’ <sup>(5)</sup>

Associate members, observers and associate partners were duly informed by the Presidency of the Permanent Council during this process. The EU’s Foreign Affairs Council also took note of this statement by the States parties to the modified Brussels Treaty in its conclusions of 26 April 2010, indicating that it ‘acknowledged the important contribution of the WEU in the development of the European security and defence architecture, including the substantial role of the interparliamentary WEU Assembly in developing a European culture on security and defence’.

According to figures by France, the closure of WEU resulted in savings of €1.5 million for France <sup>(6)</sup> and €2 million for the United Kingdom <sup>(7)</sup>, and enabled greater visibility to be given to the common security and defence policy (CSDP) established by the European Union under the Lisbon Treaty. The financial argument had also been put forward on 21 October 2008 by the Spanish authorities as grounds for suspending the participation of their national members of parliament in the activities of the WEU Parliamentary Assembly. On 30 March 2010, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Chris Bryant, cited the existence of the EU’s CSDP and budgetary reasons as grounds for the denunciation of the modified Brussels Treaty.

**Council working groups** prepared the ‘technical’ aspects of decisions, whether they concerned the Agency for the Control of Armaments (ACA), the military delegates, the Military Committee or the Planning Cell. It was particularly necessary to work interactively in this way during WEU operations undertaken as part of the Petersberg tasks, or as a way of gaining a better grasp of strategic matters of topical importance. The same method was followed when coordinating NATO and WEU missions in the same areas of operation (the Adriatic). Several working groups or subgroups were set up and/or followed on from each other in the course of the organisation’s existence, for the purpose of preparing ministerial decisions: the Council Working Group (CWG) on political, institutional or general questions which prepared all Council meetings; the Special Working Group (SWG) bringing together officials responsible for Foreign Affairs and Defence; the Defence Representatives Group (DRG) dealing with defence questions with long-term implications; the Politico-Military Working Group (PMWG) consisting of national delegates for Foreign Affairs and Defence; the Military Delegates Committee (MDC) consisting of the representatives of army staffs (planning and monitoring of the Planning Cell); the Space Group <sup>(8)</sup>; the Budget and Organisation Committee (BOC); the Security Committee (SC); and the Communications and Information Systems Committee (CISC).

Other groups were responsible for working on specific topics: the Politico-Military Working Group (PMWG) on the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) and Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF); the Mediterranean Group; the expert group on CFE verification <sup>(9)</sup>, the ‘Open Sky’ Working Group <sup>(10)</sup>, and the SDI (Strategic Defence Initiative) Group. The Council also had working groups which arose out of the transfer of certain Eurogroup <sup>(11)</sup> activities to WEU, making the set-up yet more complicated: the Council Working Group on the Transatlantic Forum; the Western European Logistics Group; the Eurocom Group (interoperability of tactical surface communications); and the Eurolongterm Group (long-term military planning). The Council could also call on the services of the Institute for Security Studies in Paris as a subsidiary body.

After the Marseille summit of November 2000, which laid down the ‘residual’ character of WEU, no further ministerial Council was held, while from July 2001 decisions relating to the Council such as the decision on the approval of budgets were ratified by written procedure. The Permanent Council held its last meeting at the permanent representative level on 28 May 2002, and only two Council working groups remained active: the organisation’s Budget Committee and a special group dealing with more specific administrative questions and internal management matters. In theory, the Council could still meet in ten-member format, essentially on management problems. Associate members, observers and associate partners could continue to appoint representatives to the Council of WEU. Finally, it was still possible to hold meetings of the Council or the working groups convened with 21 countries or 28 for questions associated with the Assembly of WEU (see below) requiring a special contribution from countries which were not full members <sup>(12)</sup> because their members of parliament took part in the work of that body.

## The Secretariat-General

The Secretariat-General was incorporated in Article 2 of Protocol No IV, which gave it administrative responsibility over ACA staff. It was not until the Agreement of 11 May 1955 on the Status of Western European Union that its remit was specified. The Secretariat-General, an administrative body, was located in London (until it moved to Brussels on 1 January 1993), even though the ACA and the Standing Armaments Committee (SAC) were in Paris, close to where the NATO headquarters were at the time. The Secretary-General of WEU chaired the meetings of the Permanent Council and coordinated the work of WEU's ministerial bodies. From 25 November 1999 this post was held by Javier Solana of Spain. In the 1990s the structure of the Secretariat-General consisted basically of the Secretary-General <sup>(13)</sup> and the Deputy Secretary-General, the policy section <sup>(14)</sup>, the Council Secretariat, the press and information service, the translation service and the administration section, not forgetting the Paris Administrative Service which was in operation from 2001 <sup>(15)</sup>. Although there were no official, institutional links with the European Commission, there were always unofficial relations and contacts on particular issues with certain representatives of the EU and NATO. These relations evolved in an uneven pattern depending on European advances in relation to the ESDI, the ESDP and interaction centred on the Berlin Plus process <sup>(16)</sup> between NATO and the EU.

As regards replies to recommendations and questions from the Assembly of WEU, the task of producing a draft could be assigned to one of the Member States or to the Secretariat-General. The improved or amended text was then submitted to the working group with a view to its adoption by the Council.

The Head of the WEU Secretariat-General <sup>(17)</sup> was responsible for replying to questions and recommendations from the Assembly of WEU, having first sent the 28 Member States <sup>(18)</sup> a draft reply with a translation and a deadline for reply based on the procedure of silence implying consent, assuming tacit agreement after five days.

The Secretariat of WEU, which moved to offices in the rue de l'Association in Brussels in July 2001, operated with reduced staffing and resources <sup>(19)</sup>. When the States parties decided to ask the WEU Permanent Council to organise the cessation of the organisation's activities in accordance with timelines prescribed in the modified Brussels Treaty and preferably by the end of June 2011, the WEU Secretariat was called on to offer expertise and support in dealing with administrative and staff matters in Brussels and Paris.

Several difficulties emerged concerning the severance schemes and compensation payments for the remaining employees <sup>(20)</sup> given that most of the WEU Member States had initially tried to shirk their pension obligations. The body that was asked to manage these schemes and monitor the pensions issue was the European Union's Satellite Centre <sup>(21)</sup>. The centre was given an additional contribution from the Member States for any expenses incurred. The WEU Council Decision of 27 May 2011 stated that the Ten 'recognise that they will be jointly liable, including financially, to the extent of the key governing mandatory contributions to the WEU, vis-à-vis the European Union Satellite Centre, with respect to the WEU residual administrative obligations' <sup>(22)</sup>. To make things easier, a pensions unit was set up in the premises of the Secretariat of the Council of the EU in Brussels, under the aegis of the ten-member Board of the European Union Satellite Centre.

## The Parliamentary Assembly

The Parliamentary Assembly of WEU came into existence with the modified Brussels Treaty of 1954. Unlike the European Parliament, members of the WEU Assembly were not elected by direct universal suffrage. The Assembly was organised on the basis of members of the national parliaments of the States that were parties to the Treaty whose representatives sat in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. Article IX of the Treaty implied that the Assembly of WEU existed only by virtue of its relations with the ministerial Council, which was required to submit an annual report to it. This severe limitation was partly removed by members' deliberately taking the initiative of deciding, through the Charter <sup>(23)</sup>, to widen their own powers. This happened in October 1995 and subsequently when the question of establishing different statuses for the various delegations of Assembly members arose. The Assembly of WEU, however, had no legislative or budgetary power and very little power of control over the executive, i.e. the Council.

The seat of the Assembly of WEU was in Paris, where it met twice a year in ordinary plenary session in the chamber of the French Economic and Social Council in the Place d'Iéna. Other extraordinary sessions could be held and the Assembly could sometimes meet in other countries. The Assembly drew up its own agenda, sent recommendations and opinions to the Council, which had to reply to them, and also reserved the right to withdraw its approval from it. However, acts of the Assembly had no institutional effect and could not really influence Council action in any significant way, notwithstanding the principle of political disavowal of governments by the Assembly in the event of a motion of disapproval.

Although the members of the Assembly of WEU were primarily members of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (and not necessarily members of the defence or foreign affairs committees of their national parliaments), the Assembly frequently acted as a sounding-board or as a support for the cause of European defence and transatlantic ties, through debates it held and parliamentary reports it tabled, drafted mainly with the help of experts from the permanent Secretariat of the Assembly and temporary interns. The Assembly held colloquies and ministers from the Member States could, at their request, be given the floor of the Assembly during its sessions, just as other prominent figures could be invited. The Parliamentary Assembly of WEU had six standing committees: the Defence Committee, the Political Committee, the Technological and Aerospace Committee, the Committee of Quaestors, the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges, and the Committee for Parliamentary and Public Relations. It also had a registrar <sup>(24)</sup>, a President, a Bureau, a Standing Committee and a Presidential Committee. The Assembly was organised into political groups: the Liberal Group, the Socialist Group and the Federated Group of Christian Democrats and European Democrats. The Presidential Committee consisted of the serving President of the Assembly, former Presidents who were still members of the Assembly, the Vice-Presidents and the Committee chairmen. As the Assembly's steering body, this Committee made sure that there was continuity in its work; it met between sessions to fix the dates for these, and drew up the agenda and the draft budget. All its decisions were submitted to the Assembly for ratification. By custom, the chairmen of the three political groups were invited onto it by the President of the Assembly. The Presidential Committee was widened to include 24 other members of the Assembly in order to form the Standing Committee, mentioned above, which was responsible for adopting positions on any topical subjects which arose between sessions. By generally accepted tacit agreement, the President of the Assembly and the chairmen of the Committees were re-elected to their posts for two further terms of one year.

In May 2009 there were 260 seats in the Assembly. It included the members of parliament from the full Member States as well as those from the associate members, i.e. any European State belonging to NATO but not to the EU (Albania, Croatia, Iceland, Norway and Turkey), the partner members (Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Russia, Serbia and Ukraine) and the observers (the other countries) <sup>(25)</sup>. Under the Assembly's Rules of Procedure, only full members (the Ten) had voting rights, while committee votes also included the associate members. Members in all categories had speaking rights and all were entitled to table amendments (except for the observers).

The official explanation for the fact that since the sessions in June and December 2001 Javier Solana, the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) — which includes the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) — as well as Secretary-General of WEU, did not take up invitations from the Assembly of WEU to address it was that his engagements diary was always too full. Priority was in fact given to CFSP-ESDP, which concerned only the EU, so that the parliamentary body closest to his mandate as High Representative remained, in his eyes, the European Parliament, where debates were less critical and speeches of praise more the usual practice (except as regards the question of parliamentary control over the ESDP).

In recent years, it could be said that in practice the Council of WEU virtually ceased to be an interlocutor for the Assembly. More often than not, in its replies (always brief, averaging one to three paragraphs) to written questions and recommendations the Council said, for example, that:

‘pursuant to decisions taken by the full Member States, these matters are discussed in other forums’ <sup>(26)</sup> or that ‘Member States of WEU do not propose to use the Council as a forum which duplicates the mechanisms by which the EU is striving to develop the ESDP’ <sup>(27)</sup> or, again, that despite ‘the importance of this question, the



Council would point out that it is not currently on the agenda for its deliberations and there are no plans for it to be placed on the agenda in the foreseeable future’ <sup>(28)</sup> and, lastly, that the matters raised by the Assembly were being given careful consideration in the context of ESDP, ‘which the Council fully supports’ or to which ‘it gives its full support’ <sup>(29)</sup>.

This did not apply, however, when it came to the budget of WEU ministerial bodies or aspects of arms cooperation involving the Western European Armaments Group (WEAG) and the Western European Armaments Organisation (WEAO), while they existed. The reason for this concern was the responsibility WEU bore for its residual functions, i.e. functions other than those related to crisis management, which came within the remit of the EU following the WEU Council Decision taken in Marseille in November 2000.

For fear of disappearing or being severely marginalised, the Assembly expanded its statutes, amended its Charter and Rules of Procedure, issued reports focusing heavily on subjects related to the ESDP, attempted to make contact with EU bureaucratic bodies dealing with security and defence matters and several times changed its name by adding subheadings: <sup>(30)</sup> ‘Interim European Security and Defence Assembly’ (2000), then ‘Interparliamentary European Security and Defence Assembly’ (2003) and finally ‘European Security and Defence Assembly’ (2008) in order to be more effectively ‘associated’ with the ESDP, even though the European Parliament and the High Representative for the CFSP (and Secretary-General of WEU) largely ignored the Assembly.

The European Security and Defence Assembly/WEU Assembly held its 60th and final session on Monday 9 May 2011 <sup>(31)</sup>. The addresses and interventions given during the final years of the Assembly focused on the future responsibility for and parliamentary scrutiny of the EU’s European security and defence policy. The members discussed and put forward various proposals based on the idea of an interparliamentary structure with responsibility in these areas, to be composed of members of the European and national parliaments. It was feared that, with the dissolution of WEU and its Parliamentary Assembly, the parliaments of the EU Member States would lose the ‘only tried and tested interparliamentary instrument they currently have for scrutinising the CSDP’ <sup>(32)</sup>. The aim was to preserve the role of the national parliaments in the CSDP by stepping up interparliamentary dialogue.

Several proposals were made, including proposals from the European Security and Defence Assembly/WEU Assembly, which was keen to maintain the continuity of interparliamentary scrutiny. Robert Walter, President of the Assembly, called on the Belgian Presidency of the EU/WEU (in the second half of 2010) to come up with an initiative <sup>(33)</sup>. The idea of British MP Walter <sup>(34)</sup> was to propose the establishment of a new interparliamentary structure that would be lightweight but permanent. He believed that ‘it [was] a matter of respect for the legitimate powers of the national parliaments and of the effectiveness of the democratic scrutiny that it is their full right and duty to exercise on behalf of the citizens who elected them’. The plan was to propose that a steering committee initially be set up on this question, jointly chaired by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the incoming Belgian EU Presidency (ideally represented by the Speakers of the Senate and the Chamber), the President of the European Security and Defence Assembly/WEU Assembly, the Chairman of the European Parliament’s Subcommittee on Security and Defence, the Chairman of COSAC <sup>(35)</sup> and representatives from the defence and foreign affairs committees in the national parliaments. This committee would determine the way ahead, ‘and in particular the legal and financial basis for such scrutiny’.

Note that a resolution adopted by the French Senate recommended the creation of a structure composed of members of parliament from the EU Member States who were specialised in defence matters. A resolution by COSAC at its meeting in Madrid in spring 2010 proposed setting up a ‘defence’ version of COSAC. Finally, a European Parliament resolution took the lead and supported the fundamental role played by the national parliaments in scrutinising the CFSP and the CSDP. It hoped to reach an agreement at the Conference of Speakers of EU Parliaments in April 2011 in Brussels with a view to launching an interparliamentary assembly in these fields. At the vote on the reports by Arnaud Danjean <sup>(36)</sup> and Gabriele Albertini <sup>(37)</sup>, the European Parliament came out in favour of the dissolution of WEU and its Parliamentary Assembly, considering that parliamentary scrutiny should be a matter for the European Parliament, while recognising that this scrutiny should be shared with the national parliaments within a mechanism for enhanced cooperation based on

## Protocol 1 annexed to the Treaty of Lisbon.

(January 2014)

- (1) Article VII of the Brussels Treaty (1948).
- (2) WEU embarked on this procedure three times: in 1987, over the Iran-Iraq War, in 1991 over the Gulf War and again the same year over the war in Yugoslavia.
- (3) The two-thirds majority was authorised in respect of amendments to the list in Annex III to Protocol No III at the request of the Federal Republic of Germany and following a recommendation from the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) regarding the lifting of restrictions on the possession by the FRG of long-range weapons and guided weapons, warships and strategic bombers. Similarly, voting by simple majority could also take place on questions submitted to it by the Agency for the Control of Armaments, on authorisation for the British to withdraw from the continent and on fixing the nuclear, biological and chemical weapons stocks held by Member States other than the FRG on the continent. The object of these procedures was to release certain countries from their obligations.
- (4) Following the decision of 12 September 1997, when the Presidency of the European Union was assumed by a High Contracting Party to the modified Brussels Treaty, the party concerned also held the Presidency of WEU. In all other cases, the Presidency of WEU was to be held by a High Contracting Party to the modified Brussels Treaty in the order of succession of Presidencies of WEU (by alphabetical order in English). This order of Presidencies entered into force on 1 January 1999.
- (5) Statement of the Presidency of the Permanent Council of the WEU on behalf of the High Contracting Parties to the Modified Brussels Treaty — Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom. Western European Union, Brussels, 31 March 2010.
- (6) Hearing of Bernard Kouchner, Minister for Foreign and European Affairs, National Assembly, Paris, 17 June 2009. The WEU budget was calculated as 13 million euros in 2010.
- (7) Press release from the Foreign Office, quoted in *Europe diplomatie & défense*, No 308, Agence Europe, Brussels, 7 April 2010.
- (8) Formerly the special subgroup on space questions.
- (9) CFE Treaty: Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe, signed in Paris on 19 November 1990 by the NATO and Warsaw Pact Member States.
- (10) Treaty on Open Skies, for the mutual conduct of observation flights over military activities and installations of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, signed on 24 March 1992 and brought into force on 1 January 2002.
- (11) Eurogroup was an umbrella organisation of European governments within NATO from 1968 to 1993. Its mission was to coordinate the policies of European countries in order to bring about some degree of standardisation of military equipment. Following a decision taken on 24 May 1993 by the Defence Ministers participating in Eurogroup, its activities as regards medical training (EUROMED) were transferred to NATO and its information and telecommunication functions (EUROCOM) were transferred to WEU. Eurogroup itself was disbanded on 1 January 1994.
- (12) From 2002, countries which were not full members were not required to make any further financial contribution to WEU budgets.
- (13) From 1992, the Secretary-General was able to call on the advice of a military expert.
- (14) Section for defence policy, security policy, general affairs and planning; WEAG Secretariat and, since 1992, including a military expert working with the Secretary-General.
- (15) When the Institute for Security Studies was transferred to EU authority, the EU had no authority to manage the building belonging to WEU.
- (16) The 'Berlin Plus' agreements were signed at the NATO summit in April 1999. They provide a mechanism for the guaranteed ceding of NATO resources and capacity to the EU for crisis-management operations when NATO does not wish to become involved itself. The agreements were formalised in 2003 and put into effect for the first time in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in April 2003.
- (17) This post was held by Arnaud Jacomet of France from July 2001.
- (18) If the subject matter involved management, drafts were first circulated among the ten full members, then to all 28.
- (19) At the end of 2010, its organisation chart comprised the Head of the Council Secretariat, the Paris Administrative Service, the Council Section, the Administration and Finance Section, Translation, Archives (compilation and public access), Finance, Security, Logistic Services, and Registry. Its staff numbered 65.
- (20) See the information report by John Greenway on 'The consequences of the closure of the Assembly', Committee of Quaestors, European Security and Defence Assembly/Assembly of Western European Union, Paris, 16 June 2010; Doris Barnett, 'Draft budget of the Assembly for 2011', European Security and Defence Assembly/Assembly of Western European Union, Paris, 30 November 2010; Nicolas Gros-Vereyden, 'UEO, quand le neveu vient au secours de l'oncle', [www.bruxelles2.eu](http://www.bruxelles2.eu), 12 August 2011; 'The staff reject the social plan', press release No 56/2010, European Security and Defence Assembly/Assembly of Western European Union, Paris, 2 December 2010.
- (21) This agency (formerly attached to WEU) appears to have been chosen because it was necessary to find an organisation that could act unanimously on behalf of the Ten, in a specific configuration, on several matters after 30 June 2011: administration of the 2010 WEU Social Plan, administration of pensions for former staff members, administration of any disputes between WEU and former staff members, implementing decisions by the appropriate Appeals Board, and providing assistance to the Member States for the liquidation of WEU's assets.
- (22) See source [http://www.weu.int/documents/Decision\\_WEU\\_en.pdf](http://www.weu.int/documents/Decision_WEU_en.pdf). The decision also refers to EU Council Decision 2011/297/CFSP of 23 May 2011.
- (23) A sort of preamble to the Assembly's Rules of Procedure.

- (24) Appointed by the Assembly on a proposal from the Presidential Committee.
- (25) These various names were changed in the past as and when the status of the members changed as regards their relationship with the EU and NATO.
- (26) This was the case with, for example, the Council's replies to Recommendation 704 on security in the Balkans (March 2002), Recommendation 697 on new developments in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus (4 December 2001), Recommendation 713 on developing a European space observation capability to meet Europe's security requirements (5 June 2002), Recommendation 722 on European defence — the role of naval power (3 June 2003), Recommendation 737 on security in Europe and stabilisation in the Middle East (3 December 2003), Recommendation 742 on rapidly deployable European land forces (2 June 2004), and others.
- (27) This was the case with, for example, the Council's reply to Recommendation 695 on Europe's security and defence policy confronted with international terrorism (3 December 2001).
- (28) Cases in point were the Council's replies to Recommendation 700 on European strategic lift capabilities (5 December 2001), Recommendation 701 on chemical and biological weapons control (5 December 2001) and Recommendation 734 on rapidly deployable European air forces (1 December 2003), and others.
- (29) See, for example, the Council's replies to Recommendation 707 on the new challenges facing European intelligence (4 June 2002), Recommendation 729 on European defence-related space activities and the development of launcher autonomy (4 June 2003), etc.
- (30) Subheadings have never been legally recognised by the Member States' governments. When the Assembly of WEU submitted its budget request to the Council, therefore, it always pragmatically used only its main title, 'Assembly of WEU'. To have used any other title would have caused the warnings from certain national capitals that they would freeze their country's contribution to the Assembly's budget to take effect, and that would have had repercussions on the formula for apportioning the whole budget. From 2008, on the covers of the Assembly's reports, the subheading became the title, while the name 'Assembly of Western European Union' became the subheading.
- (31) Note that 9 May is Europe Day. On 7 April 2011, the Assembly met again with the WEU Permanent Council/the EU Political and Security Committee (PSC) for its weekly exchanges of views with the representatives of the Permanent Council.
- (32) Statement by Robert Walter, President of the WEU Assembly, Paris, 15 June 2010.
- (33) Note that Belgium is the depository of the WEU Treaty.
- (34) Robert Walter, 'Parliamentary scrutiny of the CFSP and CSDP: the way ahead', Paris, May 2010. See also the report by Armand De Decker, 'Mise en œuvre du Traité de Lisbonne: le contrôle interparlementaire de la PSDC' ['Implementation of the Lisbon Treaty: interparliamentary scrutiny of the CSDP'] — Response to the Annual Report of the Council, document 2097, WEU Assembly, Paris, 28 March 2011.
- (35) Conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs of Parliaments of the European Union.
- (36) European Parliament resolution of 10 March 2010 on the implementation of the European Security Strategy and the Common Security and Defence Policy ([2009/2198\(INI\)](#)).
- (37) Resolution on the annual report from the Council to the European Parliament on the main aspects and basic choices of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) in 2008, presented to the European Parliament in application of Part II, Section G, paragraph 43 of the Interinstitutional Agreement of 17 May 2006 ([2009/2057\(INI\)](#)).