Amended draft reply from the WEU Council to Assembly Recommendation 338 on the definition of armaments requirements and procurement in Western Europe (London, 26 March 1980)

Caption: On 26 March 1980, the Secretary-General of Western European Union (WEU) circulates a new amended draft reply from the WEU Council to Recommendation 338 on the definition of armaments requirements and procurement in Western Europe. The document contains an amendment by the British delegation, which wishes to remove a phrase mentioning that preference should be given to equipment produced jointly by European countries. This request is accepted and the phrase is removed from the final reply (C(80)68).

Source: Council of the Western European Union. Secretary-General note. Recommendation N°338 on the definition of armaments requirements and procurements in Western Europe. London : 26.03.1980. WPM(80)10/4. 5 p. Archives nationales de Luxembourg (ANLux). http://www.anlux.lu. Western European Union Archives. Secretariat-General/Council's Archives. 1954-1987. Organs of the Western European Union. Year: 1980, 01/06/1980-30/06/1981. File 202.400.11 vol 1/1.

URL:
http://www.cvce.eu/obj/amended_draft_reply_from_the_weu_council_to_assembly_recommendation_338_on_the_definition_of_armaments_requirements_and_procurement_in_western_europe_london_26_march_1980-en-bcbf4f7c-ff04-4123-8aaa-db3cf5250d67.html

Last updated: 13/10/2016

WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION

W.E.U. RESTRICTED — WPM (80) 10/4

Original: English/French — 26th March, 1980

SECRETARY-GENERAL'S NOTE

Recommendation 338
on the definition of armaments requirements
and procurement in western Europe
(C (79) 163)

The Secretary-General circulates herewith a draft reply to Recommendation 338 on the definition of armaments requirements and procurement in western Europe.

This text, prepared at the working group of 24th March, 1980, on the basis of WPM (80) 10/3, will be considered at the meeting of the group on Monday, 14th April at 3.15 p.m.

9, Grosvenor Place,
London, S.W.1.

W.E.U. RESTRICTED

Draft reply to Recommendation 338

1. The Council consider that the creation of a number of international consortia for the production of defence equipment has been a useful contribution to a better organisation of armaments co-operation in Europe. In order to preserve the technological know-how and experience in management techniques gained by such co-operation when a continuing need is foreseen, these consortia, which might be opened to firms from other member countries, should be encouraged to bid for further co-operative projects and to adopt an appropriate structure; this would not necessarily rule out the possibility of any competition. Successful projects, such as the production of the Hot, Milan and Roland missiles and the Tornado aircraft clearly point the way to this new form of co-operation. The Council are of the opinion that if, in the context of their efforts towards harmonisation, member countries reach agreement on common requirements, this may stimulate the formation of such international consortia. Such agreement would provide opportunities for the industries to try to meet those common requirements by proposals for producing the necessary equipment jointly. It should nevertheless be left to the industries concerned to organise themselves and to choose the type of co-operation which best suits their requirements. At the same time, the Council wish to observe

/that this form ...

that this form of co-operation which primarily concerns European firms could, if necessary, be applied equally to joint production by European and North American firms together [taking into account, however, that preference should be given to equipment produced jointly by European countries.](1)

2(a). As the Assembly is aware, the member States of I.E.P.G. already undertook at the meeting of Armaments Directors in September 1977 to give preference to future collaborative equipment selected for production in the framework of the I.E.P.G. rather than non-European equipment in competition. The countries represented in the I.E.P.G. agreed not to depart from this preference unless for overriding reasons, particularly performance, price and delivery date.

2(b). The Council are fully aware of the advantages of an Alliance-wide market for defence equipment. Much work in this respect has already been done. Already in 1975, in this spirit, two member countries which had developed the Roland weapons system, granted the licence for that system to the United States on favourable terms. Furthermore, the proposals forwarded to CNAD by the United States representative

/constitute ...

(1) The United Kingdom delegation proposes deletion of this phrase.

constitute in the opinion of the Council a significant step towards achieving the goal of greater co-operation within the Alliance and a "two-way street" in defence equipment with the United States in so far as this is consistent with the guidelines recalled in paragraph 2(a) above. In this respect, it may be recalled that the member countries of the I.E.P.G. have given a favourable reception to the proposals mentioned above, which are designed to bring about an Alliance-wide co-operation in the defence equipment field through bilateral memoranda of understanding, dual production of defence equipment and the concept of families of weapons. Greater co-operation between the Allies and a better division of the production of defence equipment will indeed reduce the economic importance of exports to third countries, a consideration which certainly has the sympathy of the Council.

3(a). As stated by the Council in their reply to Assembly Recommendation 333, paragraph A, national parliamentary defence committees are generally kept informed on national defence budgets. However, it should be left to the governments of individual member States to decide within the context of existing national laws and procedures to what extent detailed information can be given about future national defence

/equipment requirements. ...

equipment requirements. The annual equipment replacement schedules prepared by the I.E.P.G. and completed by CNAD, which bring together the equipment requirements of the Alliance as a whole and, as a consequence, contain very sensitive information, are classified "confidential", and the Council are not in a position to request member governments to communicate these documents to national defence committees.

3(b). For the same reasons, the Council see no possibility of requesting the Chairman of Panel I of the I.E.P.G. to communicate these schedules to the Committee on Defence Questions and Armaments of the Assembly. The Council, though fully appreciating the wish of the Assembly to be kept informed, cannot ignore the difficulties encountered by some countries which are members of the I.E.P.G., but not of W.E.U. with regard to informing the Assembly or its Committee on Defence Questions and Armaments about the work undertaken by the I.E.P.G. and consequently have to leave it to the member governments to brief their national delegates on I.E.P.G. activities.