




Converging and conflicting ethical values in the
internal/external security continuum in Europe

European Commission, 7th Framework Programme

D.5.5. Fact-finding workshop with partners, contacts: Mapping the terrain of research in the case countries

**Deliverable submitted April 2010 (M25) in fulfillment of requirements of the FP7
Project, Converging and Conflicting Ethical Values in the Internal/External
Security Continuum in Europe (INEX)**

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
|  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 |
|---|---|--|--|--|

Fact-finding Workshop with Partners and Contacts – Mapping the Terrain of Research in Moldova, Belarus and Ukraine.

19th March 2010, Hosted by the EU Institute for Security Studies in Paris

This workshop brought together a number of experts/practitioners from Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine, together with think-tankers working on the Eastern neighbourhood and ENP. This workshop was held on the same day as a larger INEX workshop ‘D.5.2’. By organising the workshops in this way we were able to invite some of the experts who had been in attendance at the earlier event. Though strongly interconnected and complementary to each other, these workshops were stand-alone events; separate deliverables with distinct objectives and programmes. Our overall aim in D.5.5 was to engage experts and practitioners from the Eastern region as a means to:

- Hone in on the empirical aspects of our WP.
- Further demarcate our research area.
- Gain an insight into the state of the art in research both in and outside of the neighbourhood.
- Learn about emerging policy developments from practitioners from the region.
- Define our key questions and strategy prior to the fieldwork phase of the project.
- Consolidate contacts and research partners in Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus.

The programme was led by Kerry Longhurst and Marcin Zaborowski with contributions from participants from Moldova, Belarus and Ukraine. Valuable additional input came from think-tankers who provided expertise on the state of the art in ENP research and the area of internal security. This workshop is being complemented by a series of interviews being carried out by Kerry Longhurst with officials working in EU institutions to gain an impression of developments on the ‘flip-side’ from neighbourhood perceptions.

To enable us to ‘hit the ground running’ participants were sent a list of key questions, presented below, prior to the workshop.

The key questions that interested us include:

1. What are the principal issues relating to the European Neighbourhood Policy and Eastern Partnership in the three countries? What are the forthcoming agenda issues?
2. What are the most important JFS issues in BE/UKR/MO with regards to relations with the EU?
3. Is there any regional cooperation on these issues? Coordination of border management schemes etc? Common visa practices?

4. What issues and developments are specific to the three countries?
5. What issues are on the domestic agendas with regards to migration/borders etc.?
6. What are seen as the advantages / disadvantages of cooperating with the EU on border management / migration issues?
7. Are EU ideas for Border security systems generally compatible with the ways in which Ukr/BE/MO would seek to shape their own borders with their neighbours? For example on the questions of visas, mobility, cross-border trade etc. How does this sit with relations with Russia?
8. How much knowledge is there about FRONTEX, EUROSUR, RABIT?
9. Which ministries/departments/think-tanks should be visited as part of our fieldwork? Could your think-tank help us organise our field work, arrange interview partners etc.?

A summary of the key points from the workshop are given below:

1. Speakers from the region were asked to reflect on the forthcoming issues in their countries' relations with the EU. Completion of the **Association Agreements** and the **Deep Free Trade Areas** for Ukraine and Moldova stand out as the most pressing tasks for these two states. Obviously for Belarus the situation is somewhat different since there is still no PCA with the EU in place. Prospects for change on this front remain modest.
2. Our participants pressed the following fact home; that although all three states were once constituent parts of the Soviet Union and have, since 1991 become independent states, their **reforms paths have deviated considerably**. Belarus' rigid autocratic regime marks it out from both Ukraine and Moldova's post Soviet trajectories, and as such needs to be approached in a differentiated fashion – this, our speakers confirmed has implications for our research agenda. Our Belarusian speaker confirmed, again, that there is perhaps more that unites Belarus with Algeria in terms of governance and relations with the EU, than with Ukr and MD.
3. There is ample evidence that **processes of democratisation are still not embedded**, neither can it be taken for granted that stable pro-EU regimes or pro-EU opposition forces will endure, nor that popular support will remain steady – much depends on perceptions of the EU's commitment to its neighbours (and in the cases of UKr and MD on the promise of actual membership). Participants stressed that we **keep a keen eye on domestic politics and not rule out prospects for change**. Political stability in Moldova appeared to be under threat last year, and the election of Yanukovich in Ukraine suggests that Kiev's enthusiasm for integration may wane. Changes in the state of Belarus-Russia relations will also have effects upon the latter's policies with the West in general.
4. Speakers from MD, UKr and BE all stressed **the significance of Russia** for relations within the neighbourhood and with the EU. Visa-free travel in the post-Soviet space has ensured substantial mobility in the region; the majority of economic migrants from UKr, MD and BE go to Russia, and not the EU. All participants noted the salience of this situation and the EU's apparent lack of willingness to confront it. We concluded that perceptions of the EU in the Eastern neighbourhood, and **effectiveness of EU 'value-laden' foreign policy**

is very much undermined and subsequently weakened by its restrictive visa policies.

5. Linked to point four - the EU is perceived by policy makers and think-tankers from the region as pursuing **a foreign policy ‘coated’ with ‘values’ that is not always followed consistently**. Overtures from Brussels and pledges for deeper integration and cooperation with the EU appear to clash with the objectives set and reforms required in the JHA area, in particular **border security regimes seem to stymie cross border activities**, which were once vibrant and important economically. At the same time, our think-tankers noted that **neighbours often pick and choose what particular EU values they want to adhere to**, and the pace of genuine reform is, in the main, far too slow.
6. Better and **smoother options for mobility for migrant workers and visa liberalisation stand out as key priorities for the neighbours**, with a commitment from the EU on these issues being regarded as a litmus test of the EU’s sincerity in developing its relations with the eastern neighbours. It is in this area that keen differences in EU policy to the Eastern and Southern neighbours are evident. Not a great deal of attention is devoted in the research communities in the East towards the Southern neighbourhood; though there is disquiet about the imbalance of EU ENP funds that favours the South.
7. The **JHA/FSJ area as a whole does not fit easily into the ENP framework**. National Indicative Programmes provide a starting point to consider the JHA/border management themes in the neighbourhood. Detail on progress on readmission and cooperation on biometrics is also to be found here.
8. The whole range of mobility-related questions hold a central spot in the neighbour’s relations with the EU. The issue is highly politicised in the region. Moreover, it also brings into focus relations with Russia and the prospect of **Russian citizens being able to travel more freely into the EU, than Ukrainians and Moldovans**. Thus it seems that at present, people holding Russian passports (including those holding Russian passports living in the region’s conflict zones) have a more privileged status than Ukrainians and Moldovans. This point brings up questions about the situation in South Ossetia, Abkhazia and Transdnistria; specifically in what ways **can the EU bring about desired change through ‘mobility levers’?**
9. The Eastern Partnership is viewed positively, with high expectations of the initiative bringing about a qualitative change in relations with the EU. In this context more coordination on border security and efforts at visa facilitation are preeminent issues. However, what complicates this matter is that whilst the EU has a wide JHA agenda and EaP talks about visa liberalisation, when it comes to the crunch, **visa issues are very much dealt with on bilateral bases with member states holding sway**. Thus we have to examine the policies of each member state – or at least the various groups of states and consider these perspectives against the broader EU discourse. But at the same time the **IBM ‘panel’ in the Eastern Partnership is set to provide for a more comprehensive policy basis and better coordination from the EU’s side**.

10. **EUBAM is regarded very favourably and potentially used as a template for the rolling out of IBM efforts across the region;** a very effective use of resources is to be seen in EUBAM. Moldovan and Ukrainian experts pointed to some excellent research being carried out in their think-tanks in this area.
11. There was a general consensus that the realm of border management is a very specialised area, often with **little known about what the EU expects in the way of reform and adaptation.** This is a **similar situation to that which existed during the enlargement process prior to 2004/7.** Participants suggested that we pay some attention to the literature and case studies from this period – specifically on how states in East Central Europe adapted to new EU border systems and then Schengen regimes.
12. It often seems that **EU border security efforts are increasingly high in technology, but low in terms of geopolitical thinking.** This might mean that only small sectors of the political elite in the countries are fully cognisant of developments and that broader political debate remains ill informed. **The EU needs to address this and to spell out more clearly the functions and purpose of its border management regimes and to speak more clearly about what constitutes regular and irregular migration.**
13. Participants from the neighbourhood confirmed that they can fully support our fieldwork and facilitate contacts with officials.

Programme

16.00 Introduction to INEX and Work Package 5

Marcin Zaborowski (EUISS / Collegium Civitas)

16.15 State of the Art in ENP Research

Kerry Longhurst (Collegium Civitas) *'Mapping the Terrain'*

17.00 Overview of Domestic Political and Security Situations in the Neighbourhood

Chair: Marcin Zaborowski (EUISS / Collegium Civitas)

Iulian Groza (Moldovan Delegation to the EU)

Oleksandr Sushko (Center for Peace, Conversion and Foreign Policy of Ukraine / Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, Kiev)

Discussant Kerry Longhurst (Collegium Civitas)

18.30 EU Border Management Endeavours – Perspectives from the Neighbourhood.

Intervention by Iulian Groza (Moldovan Delegation to the EU) – Moldova

Intervention by Olga Shumylo – (ICPS) Ukraine

Intervention by Andrei Federau – (Movement for Freedom – Minsk) Belarus

19.45 Round-Up Discussion

Led by:

Oleksandr Sushko (Center for Peace, Conversion and Foreign Policy of Ukraine / Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, Kiev) *On Mobility, Borders and the Eastern Partnership*

Kasia Wolczuk (University of Birmingham) – *Reflections on Parallels with the EU Enlargement Process*

20.30 Outstanding Questions and the Way Forward for WP5

Led by Marcin Zaborowski

Dinner

Participants:

Marcin Zaborowski (Collegium Civitas / EUISS),

Kerry Longhurst (Collegium Civitas),

Anna Zielinska (Collegium Civitas),

Peter Hobbing (CEPS),

Andrei Fedarau (Movement for Freedom - Minsk),

Iulian Groza (Moldovan Mission to the EU),

Oleksandr Sushko (Center for Peace, Conversion and Foreign Policy of Ukraine / Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation),

Kataryna Wolczuk (University of Birmingham),

Olga Shumylo (ICPS),

Laure Delcour (ENA/IRIS),

Florent Parmentier (Sciences Po)



Experts: Oleksandr Sushko, Olga Shumylo, Iulian Groza and Kataryna Wolczuk