D.5.2. Workshop on implications of the internal / external security continuum for the countries of the Eastern neighbourhood.

PRIO	International Peace Research Institute, Oslo	PO Box 9229 Grønland NO-0134 Oslo, Norway	T: +47 22 54 77 00 F: +47 22 54 77 01	www.inexproject.eu

Workshop on implications of the internal / external security continuum for the countries of the Eastern neighbourhood.

This workshop brought together a number of experts and practitioners from Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine together with think-tankers working on the Eastern neighbourhood and ENP.

The workshop was organised in collaboration with WP6 – the parallel INEX study on the Southern neighbourhood. Consequently, alongside WP5's invited speakers and participants, experts and practitioners working on cognate issues in the South were part of the event. A joint workshop was deemed of value for a number of reasons. First, ENP is itself a comprehensive policy which groups the Eastern and Southern neighbouring domains into one framework. Second, the two neighbourhoods bring to the EU's doorstep both similar and very different sets of security problems and challenges, thus a comparative angle on these issues, we believed, merited our attention. Similarly EU policies towards its borders with the two sets of neighbours are both analogous and differentiated. Whilst agencies like FRONTEX have the job of managing and coordinating border security efforts across frontiers with both neighbourhoods, developing and implementing similar methods, practices and technologies, EU policies on mobility and Visas, are quite different in the two neighbourhoods.

The workshop began with a panel '**Organising the Neighbourhood - The EU's approach to the South and the East'.** Speakers representing interests in the two neighbourhoods were asked to reflect upon the positives and negatives of the EU's so-called 'balanced approach' to ENP in line with such questions as **-** Should the East and the South be looked at together? Is the ENP's comprehensive approach to the Eastern and Southern neighbourhoods working? Do the two neighbourhoods bring similar FSJ issues to the EU's agenda? Most speakers found it quite problematic to define the ENP as a 'balanced approach', since EU policies towards the South and the East differed greatly. Moreover, it was argued that rather than focusing rigidly on either the Easterners or the Southerners, it can make sense to analyse ENP in terms of groups of neighbours. For example, Belarus, Algeria and to some degree Libya, have similar types of relations with the EU across many crucial areas. Speakers also stressed the salience of the enlargement process as well as the role of Russia for the Eastern neighbours' relations with the EU – equivalent factors do not exist in the South.

Following this, discussion turned to the Southern neighbourhood in a panel which attempted to identify and draw out some of the specific issues that determine EU policies in this domain. Since WP6 will provide their own detailed report on this particular panel, WP5's report will reflect on the discussion in so far as it relates to the Eastern neighbourhood. The panel '**The Southern Neighbourhood: Security, Border Management and Human Rights'** was interesting from an 'Eastern Perspective' for many reasons. Discussion showed that in contrast to the EU's broad approach to the East, relations with the South are acutely securitised and appear dominated by concerns over terrorism and the importance of maintaining and

strengthening hard borders – the facilitation of mobility and visa facilitation are issues that do not appear in this discourse. The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of border management are juxtaposed against the benefits (as seen by the EU) of keeping governments installed in the region, which whilst being autocratic, aid the EU's endeavours to keep at arm's length the insecurities originating from this 'troubled region'.   This seems to be at the heart of the EU's dilemmas in its relations with the Southern neighbours.

The third panel focused on the Eastern neighbourhood. Whilst the previous panel considered the implications of EU policies, anti-terrorism measures and the use of technology at the EU's southern limits alongside questions of freedom versus security, this panel took up the issue of **'security and democracy'.** This focus reflects the official discourse of EU policy towards the Eastern region. Arguably, when compared to the case of the Southern neighbours, the EU is more committed to bringing about change and installing good governance in Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus. Equally, one might conclude that Brussels has remained committed to exporting its own values to the region. Linked to this is the fact that the EU exercises conditionality in a far stricter manner in the East, as a means to induce political and economic change in its Eastern milieu.

The following questions guided our discussions. What is the ENP's score sheet on democratisation, security and human rights in the East? Does the ENP complement the EU's wider FSJ agenda in the Eastern Neighbourhood? What factors are driving EU policies on visas, mobility and cross-border crime in the East? Will developments in security technologies and a more coordinated EU border policy run counter to the EU's goals for visa liberalisation and the creation of a vibrant eastern border?

Speakers argued that what shapes EU policies towards the East in general and on security matters in particular is the interplay between the EU's emerging security culture, the expectations of partners and the role of Russia. It was also posited that whilst ENP provides a neat frame to coordinate policies, when it comes to developing JHA initiatives in the neighbourhood it is not necessarily needed – since bilateral relations between the neighbours and the EU and between the neighbours and individual member states are generally the motors of change.
On a more general note, it was pointed out that ENP and the Eastern Partnership are viewed by Ukraine and Moldova as stepping stones to EU membership – a clear difference to the case in the South. Meanwhile Belarus, though an outlier from ENP, cooperates at a technical level and will continue to do so long at the government in Minsk fails to enact the types of democratic reforms expected by the EU.
More specific discussion was had on the theme of border management and visa systems. It is important to stress that the question of visa liberalisation is of great salience in the Eastern neighbourhood. At the same time as hardening its external borders through the advancement of technologies, the EU and member states appear committed to make visas application procedures more user-friendly. This, all speakers agreed, was vital since it is in this area that expectations are very high amongst citizens from the region. The case of Moldova deserves special mention, since it is here that a number of pilot schemes in the JHA area have been set up – including a central application visa centre. Pilot schemes here are set to be rolled out across the region.

A conclusion shared by all participants was that whereas the South served the EU as a buffer-zone, to be keep problems in the immediate and further neighbourhood at a distance, in the East, the ENP states form part of a more 'porous' borderland. Despite this comment, it was proposed that the EU is still not doing enough to link up efforts to better manage its borders with endeavours at visa facilitation; bringing to the table what was called by one speaker the 'human element' in border management. This may be a result of the EU's technocratic approach to border issues, where political and technological issues are not sufficiently linked together, with the latter, speakers posed, apparently taking precedence.

This line of argument was taken even further with the comment that in Ukraine and Moldova EU visa facilitation is essentially the only security-related area that matters to ordinary citizens. Thus, the EU's style of decoupling visa-facilitation questions from the hardening of borders is problematic for the effectiveness of ENP in so far as it hinders the development of mechanisms for regular migration.

Work Package 5 draws the following six conclusions from the workshop:

1. The Eastern and Southern neighbourhoods bring to the EU a number of common security challenges. However, the functioning of the internal/external security continuum is felt and responded to in quite different ways. Borders in the South are being hardened via technology and integrated management to prevent and combat negative spill-over from the region, thus keeping this region fully at arm's length. Meanwhile, in the East though a hardening of borders occurs and efforts at stemming irregular migration/crime is proceeding, the EU appears to be committed to bringing the region closer to the West, to induce democratic change and to promote the idea of 'vibrant' people to people contacts across borders.

2. The impacts of enlargement were felt more acutely in the Eastern neighbourhood and this continues to be the case – the external implications of EU internal security policies are being strongly felt here and manifested on physical borders. Enlargement continues to impart affects, especially in the sense that Ukraine and Moldova seek membership and thus regard ENP as a stepping stone in this direction. The Eastern neighbours have a keen eye on the candidates-in-waiting in the Balkans and seek to move more rapidly towards the types of JHA/Visa regimes that these states are currently developing with Brussels.

3. More thought needs to be devoted to the question of the purpose of borders between the EU and the Eastern neighbours; what purpose do IBM, EUROSUR and FRONTEX serve in the Eastern neighbourhood? These institutions and new technological measures are not fully understood on the other side of the border. Anti-terrorism measures might provide a compelling rationale for developments in the South, and as a justification behind efforts that can stymie liberty and human rights, but the situation in the East is arguably different and often quite vague.

4. In the East, visa facilitation is a crucial question. It emerges as a key issue in those states that wish to join the EU and has become a symbol of the EU's relations with the eastern neighbours. Domestic audiences across the region expect progress in this area. But there is a lack of clear sequencing from the EU's side on what neighbouring states need to do in the direction of visa facilitation, liberalisation and mobility in general.

5. More thought needs to be given to the lessons being learnt from the EUBAM Ukraine/Moldova mission in terms of the policing of borders across the region. We should also be considering the question of mobility within the region itself and the particular nature of borders with Russia, which it has been argued are 'softer' and less securitised than borders with the EU.

Developments to follow in the Eastern neighbourhood include the reestablishment of a Ministry for Migration in Ukraine, the progress and contents of the Moldovan and Ukrainian Association Agreements with the EU as well as the content of agreements between FRONTEX and the Eastern neighbours.

Workshop in Paris, 19 March 2010

List of participants:

1. Bilgin Pinar, Bilkent University
2. Delcour Laure, Direction for European Affairs, Ecole Nationale d'Administration/IRIS
3. Fean Dominic, IFRI
4. Federau Andrei, Movement for Freedom (Minsk, Belarus)
5. Grans Jonas, PRIO
6. Groza Iulian, Minister-Counsellor, Mission of the Republic of Moldova to the European Communities
7. Kausch Kristina, FRIDE
8. Kawakibi Salam, Arab Reform Initiative
9. Klimowicz Ewa, European Parliament office of MEP J. Saryusz-Wolski
10. Kodmani Basma, Arab Reform Initiative
11. Lannon Erwan, College of Europe
12. Longhurst Kerry, Collegium Civitas
13. Lynch Dov, OSCE
14. Mikail Barah, IRIS
15. Motahari Amir, European Commission, DG Relex, Direction Moyen Orient & Méditerranée du Sud, Unité Euromed
16. Parmentier Florent, Centre for European Studies
17. Ponikowska Marta, European Parliament office of MEP J. Saryusz-Wolski
18. Rijpma Jorrit, University of Leiden
19. Schmid Dorothée, IRIS
20. Shumylo Olga, International Centre for Policy Studies (Ukraine)
21. Soler Eduard, CIDOB
22. Sushko Oleksandr, IEAC research director (Ukraine)
23. Trzaskowski Rafał, Member of the European Parliament
24. Wolczuk Kataryna, University of Birmingham
25. Zaborowski Marcin, EUISS/Collegium Civitas
26. Zielińska Anna, Collegium Civitas

Collegium Civitas

in:ex

Securing the Neighbourhoods:
Southern and Eastern Dimensions of ENP

Seminar of Work Packages 5 and 6
Organised by research groups from Bilkent University, CIDOB and Collegium
Civitas within the 7th Framework INEX project in cooperation with the EUISS

19 March 2010
Venue: EU Institute for Security Studies, Paris, 43 Avenue du Président Wilson,
PARIS

9:00   Coffee
9:15   **Welcome** - Marcin Zaborowski (EUISS)
Brief Introduction of INEX Programme

9:30 – 11:00   Session 1

Organising the Neighbourhood - The EU's approach to the South and the East
Should the East and the South be looked at together? Is the ENP's comprehensive
approach to the Eastern and Southern neighbourhoods working? Do the two
neighbourhoods bring similar FSJ issues to the EU's agenda?

Chair: Marcin Zaborowski, EUISS

- Rafał Trzaskowski, Member of the European Parliament

- South: Erwan Lannon, College of Europe / EUISS

- East: Kataryna Wolczuk, University of Birmingham

Discussant: Dov Lynch, OSCE

11:00 – 11:30 Coffee break

11.30 – 13:00 Session 2

The Southern Neighbourhood: Security, Border Management and Human Rights

What is the EU's approach to migration control, border management and human rights in the South? What have been the effects of new security and anti-terrorism measures on human rights and civil liberties? Are new technologies altering the delicate balance between security and freedom at the EU's borders?

Chair: Pinar Bilgin, Bilkent University

- Amir Motahari, DG RELEX, Middle East and Southern Mediterranean Directorate,

EuroMed and regional issues Unit (F1)

- Barah Mikail, IRIS

- Kristina Kausch, FRIDE

Discussant: Jorrit Rijpma, University of Leiden

13:00 – 14:15 Lunch

14:15 – 15:45 Session 3

The Eastern Neighbourhood: ENP, Security and Democracy

What is the ENP's score sheet on democratisation, security and human rights in the East? Does the ENP complement the EU's wider FSJ agenda in the Eastern Neighbourhood? What factors are driving EU policies on visas, mobility and cross-border crime in the East? Will developments in security technologies and a more coordinated EU border policy run counter to the EU's goals for visa liberalisation and the creation of a vibrant eastern border?

Chair: Dov Lynch

- Laure Delcour, Direction for European Affairs, Ecole nationale d'Administration/IRIS

- Olga Shumylo, ICPS, Ukraine

- Iulian Groza, Moldovan Delegation to the EU

Discussant: Oleksandr Sushko, IEAC

16:00 - 16.30 Conclusions

Dr Kerry Longhurst (Collegium Civitas) and Dr Eduard Soler (CIDOB) to lead a short conclusionary session loosely based on the following questions:

Has there been differentiation in the EU's approach to the East and the South, especially in the realm of FSJ? If so, why is this the case, and what might it suggest about EU values? Are the same Values and Interests driving ENP in the East and the South? What is the relationship between internal/external security challenges in the neighbourhood – what are the challenges for the EU?