

Working Group VII

Working document 58

## **Working group VII – "External Action"**

**Subject: The comments by Mr Adrian Severin to the revised draft final report of Working Group VII on External Action (WG VII – WD 21 REV 3)**

Members of Working Group VII will find hereafter comments by Mr Adrian Severin, representative of the Romanian Parliament, alternate member of the Convention.

# Observations submitted by Mr. Adrian Severin to the report of WG VII

## “External Action” ( part A)

1. In order to meet the spirit and the letter of those discussed within the Working Group, the last sentences of the **recommendation 3, page 3**, should be replaced by the following ones:  
**“The Commission would be in charge of the implementation of these strategic objectives and interests. The External Action Council would then proceed to periodic examination of the degree of realization of these objectives and interests”.**  
In the worst case the last but one sentence should be replaced as follows: *“The Commission and the External Action Council would be in charge of the implementation of these strategic objectives and interests”*
2. As regard the **recommendation 10, page 8**, one should add the principle in the following terms:  
*“The CFSP will be subject to full parliamentary political oversight, exercised by the European Parliament and the Legislative Council (if any).”*
3. In the **recommendation 12, the second intend, page 9**, *“...the Group recommends that one should aim as much as possible to conclude one single agreement,...”* should be replaced by the following: *“...the Group recommends that one should conclude a single agreement,...”*
4. As long as the Group decided to recommend the double hated option under the name of the “European External Representative”, one should continue to use this name whenever it is the case and not the HR and the External Relations Commissioner. This would reflect properly the majority option of the Group for one person, one voice, one budget, one administration, and one representation.

5. I suggest **a new final recommendation** with the following formulation:

“The Group considers that the all above recommendations should be reflected in the Constitutional Treaty in an appropriate way by a clear indication of institutions and a clear definition of competences such as to allow their full implementation”.

Without such a recommendation one might think that only those recommendations in respect of which a mention is done should be incorporated in the Constitution. In fact, the concept developed in recommendations is coherent and one should shape the institutions and the competences in such a way as to reflect them as a whole.

---