



EU-27 revisited: discourses and debates on European integration after the convention and big bang enlargement

Summarising major trends of eight *EU-27 Watch* issues

May 2009

Edited by the Institut für Europäische Politik (IEP), Berlin

ie Institut für
ip Europäische Politik

Bundesallee 23, D-10717 Berlin
Internet: <http://www.iep-berlin.de>

www.eu-consent.net

Table of Contents

Preface: <i>EU-27 Watch</i>	2
1. Deepening and widening of the European Union: developments and national debates between 2004 and 2008	3
<i>Tanja Leppik-Bork and Julian Plottka</i>	
1.1. Deepening: the process of constitutionalisation.....	3
1.2. Widening: the process of enlargement and the development of a European Neighbourhood Policy	10
1.3. Policy-making: business as usual	15
2. Six observations on deepening and widening of the European Union from the <i>EU-27 Watch</i>	17
<i>Barbara Lippert</i>	
3. Chronology: major stages from January 2004 until May 2009	22

Preface: *EU-27 Watch*

*EU-27 Watch*¹ is an English internet publication by the Institut für Europäische Politik (IEP) in Berlin that has been published biannually by the EU-supported network of excellence EU-CONSENT.

The eight issues of the *Watch* provide a rich and unique set of material, collecting national debates from all 27 EU member states and the two candidate states Croatia and Turkey over five years. The country reports are written by researchers from well-known research institutes in the respective countries.

The key objective of the *Watch* has been to follow national debates concerning EU deepening and widening within all EU member states and the two candidate states Croatia and Turkey.

All issues of the *Watch* have therefore been based on joint event-driven questionnaires, which cover main events and topics related to deepening and widening, but also current policies and other issues.²

Thus, the eight issues of the *Watch* provide insights into the national debates on deepening and widening and on other European topics from Lisbon to Helsinki and from Dublin to Nicosia, reflecting the positions and arguments of actors such as governments, parties, civil society organisations, think tanks, media, and public opinion from January 2004 to December 2008.

Overall, the eight issues of the *Watch* comprise 2,001 pages, including 9,427 footnotes, and cover 54 questions dealing with key European topics.

In the following, we present a comprehensive comparative analysis based on the rich material of the eight issues of the *Watch*:

Tanja Leppik-Bork and Julian Plottka summarise the main events regarding deepening and widening during the last five years of European integration and complement them with insights into the respective national debates as represented in the *Watch* issues, while Barbara Lippert presents six observations on deepening and widening based on the debates collected in the eight *Watch* issues.

We hope to provide an incentive to read and use the issues of the *Watch* for research and wish an inspiring reading.

¹ Originally named “EU-25 Watch”, the publication has been renamed to take due notice of the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the EU: after a transitory period in 2007 in which it was called “EU-25/27 Watch” (issues No. 4 and No. 5), its title now reads “EU-27 Watch”. In the following, the term *Watch* will be used for all issues. The first issue of the *Watch* has been published before the lifetime of EU-CONSENT by the Institut für Europäische Politik in co-operation with the Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA) and the Centre International de Formation Européenne (CIFE).

² Cf. also chapter 2 by Barbara Lippert.

1. Deepening and widening of the European Union: developments and national debates between 2004 and 2008³

Tanja Leppik-Bork and Julian Plottka

Five years ago in 2004, major steps were taken towards a deeper and wider EU: the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe (TCE) was agreed upon and signed and ten more countries became EU members.

Today, the EU has 27 members, but still no new treaty base: new European treaties have been twice rejected in referenda by citizens of old EU member states and the last five years have been characterised by a continuous process of treaty reforms, the outcome still being uncertain.

1.1. Deepening: the process of constitutionalisation

The country reports of the first issue of the *Watch* show that most member states welcomed the TCE, agreed on by the Intergovernmental Conference in summer 2004,⁴ as a fair balance of different positions.⁵

Two weeks after the TCE was signed in Rome on 29 October 2004,⁶ Lithuania had already ratified the new treaty.⁷

The ratification process continued in the first half of 2005 with 11 more countries ratifying the TCE, until French⁸ and Dutch⁹ citizens rejected the TCE in referenda at the end of May and

³ This chapter is based on the eight *Watch* issues and especially on the introductions to these issues written by Barbara Lippert together with Timo Goosmann and Tanja Leppik-Bork respectively. In this context, deepening is understood as a process of formal vertical integration, i.e. as a process of further constitutionalisation of the EU; widening as process of formal horizontal integration, i.e. as a process of further enlargements of the EU and further ties with third countries. These definitions are based on the definitions formulated by EU-CONSENT, see Anne Faber/Wolfgang Wessels: Revisited background paper on the project's theoretical and methodological framework including sets of expectations and yardsticks with indicators, Deliverable 6, 26/04/2006, p. 3.

⁴ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 17 and 18 June 2004. Presidency Conclusions, 10679/2/04, p. 1, available at: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/81742.pdf> (last access: 06/05/2009); Conference of the Representatives of the governments of the member states: Meeting of Heads of State or Government, Brussels, 17/18 June 2004, CIG 81/04, available at: <http://ue.eu.int/igcpdf/en/04/cg00/cg00081.en04.pdf> (last access: 06/05/2009); Conference of the Representatives of the governments of the member states: Meeting of Heads of State or Government, Brussels, 17/18 June 2004, CIG 85/04, available at: <http://ue.eu.int/igcpdf/en/04/cg00/cg00085.en04.pdf> (last access: 06/05/2009).

⁵ Cf. the country reports on the Intergovernmental Conference / Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 1, December 2004, Berlin, pp. 9-63.

⁶ Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. C 310 from 16/12/2004, pp. 1-474, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2004:310:SOM:EN:HTML> (last access: 06/05/2009).

⁷ William Metzger/Katrin Pecker: IEP-Ratifizierungssurvey. Der Stand der Ratifizierungsprozesse zur EU-Verfassung in den Mitgliedstaaten und in den Beitrittsländern Bulgarien und Rumänien, p. 17, available at: http://www.iep-berlin.de/fileadmin/website/09_Publikationen/Sonstige/Laenderueberblick.pdf (last access: 04/05/2009).

⁸ Ministère de l'Intérieur: Scrutin du 29 mai 2005. France Entière (résultats validés par le conseil constitutionnel), available at: http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/sections/a_votre_service/resultats-elections/rf2005/000/000.html (last access: 04/05/2009).

⁹ William Metzger/Katrin Pecker: IEP-Ratifizierungssurvey. Der Stand der Ratifizierungsprozesse zur EU-Verfassung in den Mitgliedstaaten und in den Beitrittsländern Bulgarien und Rumänien, pp. 19-21, available at:

beginning of June 2005. This rejection of two founding member states resulted in a ‘constitutional crisis’. Yet, as also evident by the country reports of *Watch No. 2*, the governments of the then 25 member states regarded the two ‘No’s’ rather as a “setback”,¹⁰ a “warning”,¹¹ or a “wake-up call”¹² than as a ‘turning point’ in European integration.

The following ‘period of reflection’¹³ has sometimes been described to be characterised by a “sound of silence”:¹⁴ the situation was pointedly compared, in a Dutch article, to “a soccer match in which the audience waits impatiently while the players still sit in the dressing room instead of playing the game”.¹⁵

Several ways to overcome the ‘constitutional deadlock’ have been discussed in *Watch No. 3*.¹⁶ While some countries regarded the TCE as ‘dead’ (UK) and some stopped the ratification (see table 1), others continued with the ratification, or saw the TCE as the best possible compromise (e.g. Germany, Lithuania, Spain).

A year after the failed referenda, the European Council mandated the German EU Presidency in June 2006 to come up with an instructive “assessment of the state of discussion with regard to the Constitutional Treaty and explore possible future developments”.¹⁷

As can be seen from the country reports of *Watch No. 4*, most member states had great expectations for the German EU Presidency, even though they also acknowledged the narrow margin in which the German government would have to operate.¹⁸

The meeting of the “friends of the constitution”¹⁹ (the 18 EU member states that had ratified the TCE) in Madrid on 26 January 2007 signalled, as pointed out in the introduction to *Watch*

http://www.iep-berlin.de/fileadmin/website/09_Publikationen/Sonstige/Laenderueberblick.pdf (last access: 04/05/2009).

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. the Finnish, Lithuanian, Slovak, and Slovenian chapters on the Constitutional Crisis (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin.

¹¹ Cf. e.g. the Bulgarian and Croatian chapters on the Constitutional Crisis (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin.

¹² Cf. e.g. the Austrian, Cypriot, Irish, and Latvian chapters on the Constitutional Crisis (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin.

¹³ Declaration by the Heads of State or Government of the member states of the European Union on the ratification of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe (European Council, 16 and 17 June 2005), SN 117/05, p. 2, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/85325.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).

¹⁴ Barbara Lippert/Timo Goosmann: Calming down and setting the sights lower – The EU recovers in the period of reflection, in: EU-25 Watch, No. 3, July 2006, Berlin, pp. 9-14, here p. 11; Barbara Lippert/Timo Goosmann: The State of the Union: Period of Reflection or the Sound of Silence, Análisis del Real Instituto Elcano, No. 29/2006, available at: www.realinstitutoelcano.org/analisis/924.asp (last access: 19/05/2009).

¹⁵ Dutch chapter on the period of reflection (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 3, July 2006, Berlin, pp. 47-49, here p. 47.

¹⁶ Cf. the country reports on the period of reflection (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 3, July 2006, Berlin, pp. 17-61.

¹⁷ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 15/16 June 2006. Presidency Conclusions, 10633/1/06, p. 17, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/90111.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

¹⁸ Cf. especially the Danish, Portuguese, and Romanian chapters on expectations for the German Presidency (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin. See also Michael Dauderstädt/Barbara Lippert/Andreas Maurer: Die deutsche EU-Ratspräsidentschaft 2007: Hohe Erwartungen bei engen Spielräumen, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, International Policy Analysis Unit, November 2006, available at: <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/04140.pdf> (last access: 19/05/2009).

¹⁹ In addition to the 18 member states which ratified the Constitutional Treaty Ireland and Portugal sent representatives to the meeting. Cf. Ministère des Affaires étrangères du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg: Traités et

No. 4,²⁰ the discomfort of these countries with the ‘no-countries’ that did nothing to come to alternative solutions. For example, Luxembourg’s Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker declared that he was “not amused that some member states who had not even started the ratification processes, such as the United Kingdom, Portugal and Sweden, now feel free to give lessons to the member states having accepted and ratified the treaty. ‘They are not entitled to adopt this provocative attitude until they have done their homework’”.²¹ More and more, the TCE became accepted as the basis for any further negotiations.²²

The German government pursued a cautious approach of systematic, inclusive and intensive consultations, making it clear that it expected especially the ‘no-countries’, to be particularly flexible. As the German Minister for Foreign Affairs, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, stated: “‘some EU member states have to move more than others’ to reach a compromise between those who already have ratified the treaty and those who do not react or whose public voted against it”.²³

In the end, the German EU Presidency succeeded in providing a precise mandate for an immediate and short Intergovernmental Conference.²⁴ The country reports of *Watch No. 5* show that German Chancellor Angela Merkel, the “Queen of Summits”,²⁵ was especially praised for her strong leadership,²⁶ negotiation skills²⁷ and her persistent commitment.²⁸

Most governments were satisfied with the compromise and reported that their major objectives were fulfilled and their red lines observed.²⁹ For example, the Dutch government emphasised that “the vast majority of its ‘wish list’ [among other things, no mentioning of constitutional elements such as the flag, anthem or ‘Minister’ title for the Foreign Affairs

Affaires institutionnelles. Les objectifs de la réunion de Madrid des 18 pays du “oui” au traité constitutionnel, 26/01/2007, available at: http://www.europaforum.public.lu/fr/actualites/2007/01/madrid_annonce/index.html (last access: 11/05/2009); Ministère des Affaires étrangères du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg: Traités et Affaires institutionnelles. Réunion ministérielle des Amis de la Constitution “Pour une Europe meilleure” – Madrid, 26 janvier 2007, 26/01/2007, available at: http://www.europaforum.public.lu/fr/actualites/2007/01/madrid_cdp/index.html (last access: 11/05/2009).

²⁰ Barbara Lippert/Timo Goosmann: Make or break – The EU in 2007, in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin, pp. 10-15, here p. 11.

²¹ Cited in the Luxembourgian chapter on scenarios (question 3), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin, pp. 88-90, here p. 88.

²² Cf. e.g. the Austrian, Cypriot, Estonian, Hungarian, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Luxembourgian, Portuguese, Romanian, and Spanish chapters on scenarios (question 3), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin.

²³ Cited in the German chapter on scenarios (question 3), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin, pp. 81-85, here p. 82.

²⁴ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 21/22 June 2007. Presidency Conclusions, 11177/1/07, p. 2, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/94932.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

²⁵ Bulgarian chapter on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 23-25, here p. 25.

²⁶ Especially pointed out in the Austrian, Danish, Finnish, Luxembourgian, and Spanish chapters on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin.

²⁷ Cf. the Austrian, British, Dutch, and Portuguese chapters on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin.

²⁸ As outlined in the Austrian, Hungarian, and Irish chapters on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin.

²⁹ See Barbara Lippert/Tanja Leppik: All’s well that ends well? The EU heading for a reform treaty, in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 7-18, here p. 9. Cf. also, for example, the Dutch, Finnish, Irish, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Spanish, and Swedish chapters on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin.

representative] had been accepted by the negotiating partners”,³⁰ and the Polish government announced that “the results obtained (prolongation of the Nice system and Ioannina mechanism) protected the Polish interests to the greatest possible degree”.³¹ While, for instance, the Spanish President of the Government Rodríguez Zapatero emphasised that the agreement “preserves the essential elements and principles which inspired the Constitutional Treaty”, which was Spain’s main negotiation target”.³²

At the same time, the media in many member states often focussed on the conflicts during the summit. For example, the “Bulgarian weekly newspaper ‘Kapital’ described the June summit as ‘European treaty wars’, comparing negotiation talks among key EU member states (Germany, France, UK, Poland, and Spain) to the blockbuster ‘Star Wars’”.³³ And, for example, Jean-Claude Juncker especially criticised the ‘anti-German mood’ of the Polish government: “All German chancellors, I met (since 1995) have always been strong supporters of Poland. [...] Without Germany you would not have been accepted as a member at the same time as your neighbours”.³⁴

The new treaty was signed on 13 December 2007 in Lisbon, and accordingly called Treaty of Lisbon.³⁵ While ten member states had held or foreseen a referendum for the ratification of the TCE, only Ireland, which was obligated to do so, would also hold a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty (see table 1).

Some insights into the national debates on the ‘referendum-question’ are provided by the country reports of *Watch No. 6*: In France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Spain referenda had been held on the Constitutional Treaty.³⁶ In Luxembourg and Spain, where citizens had already voted in favour of the Constitutional Treaty in 2005, it was uncontroversial to use only a parliamentary procedure this time. But also in France and the Netherlands, the new President Nicolas Sarkozy and the new cabinet of Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende were determined to oppose any calls for a second referendum. In the Czech Republic, Denmark, Poland, Portugal and the UK, where referenda on the Constitutional Treaty had been considered, the case was made as well for using only a parliamentary procedure for ratification.³⁷

³⁰ Dutch chapter on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 57-58, here p. 57.

³¹ Polish chapter on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 58-64, here p. 59.

³² Cited in the Spanish chapter on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 72-73, here p. 72.

³³ Bulgarian chapter on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 23-25, here p. 24.

³⁴ Cited in the Luxembourgian chapter on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 55-56, here p. 56.

³⁵ Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. C 306 from 17/12/2007, pp. 1-271, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:SOM:EN:HTML> (last access: 11/05/2009); Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. C 115 from 09/05/2008, pp. 1-388, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:115:SOM:EN:HTML> (last access: 11/05/2009).

³⁶ Cf. the French, Dutch, Luxembourgian, and Spanish chapters on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

³⁷ Cf. the British, Czech, Danish, Polish, and Portuguese chapters on the future of the EU (question 1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

The ratification process began with Hungary as the first country ratifying the Lisbon Treaty on 17 December 2007.³⁸ 18 member states had already ratified the Lisbon Treaty when Irish citizens rejected the Lisbon Treaty in a referendum on 12 June 2008.³⁹

The country reports of *Watch No. 7* show that the immediate reaction in most member states was disappointment, but not despair. There was also a strong consensus that ratification should continue.⁴⁰

Today, 26 member states have ratified the treaty, although in the Czech Republic, Germany, and Poland the Presidents have not yet signed the respective bills. While German Federal President Horst Köhler decided to wait with signing the ratification bill until the German federal constitutional court ('Bundesverfassungsgericht') returned a verdict on the appeals against the Lisbon Treaty,⁴¹ the Czech and Polish Presidents, Václav Klaus⁴² and Lech Kaczyński, chose to wait until Ireland ratifies the Lisbon Treaty: "If the Irish change their mind, not under pressure, but of their own free will [...] I will also sign the treaty".⁴³

A way of possibly overcoming the Irish 'No' has been found at the European Council meeting in December 2008: Ireland was promised some concessions and agreed, in exchange, to hold a second referendum, probably in autumn 2009. These concessions will include special arrangements regarding sensitive areas touching upon Ireland's neutrality such as taxation policy, family, social and ethical issues, and Common Security and Defence Policy.⁴⁴ While most member states seem to be satisfied with this agreement, the country reports of *Watch No. 8* highlight the fact that the further concession, the agreement to keep the principle of 'one Commissioner per member state', has been the most controversial.⁴⁵ While some governments welcomed the fact that all countries will keep 'their' European Commissioner,⁴⁶ especially the Benelux countries deplored the keeping of this principle as a "step back"⁴⁷ with regard to the supranational character of the European Commission.⁴⁸

³⁸ DW-World.de: Hungary First to Ratify EU Treaty, 18/12/2007, available at: <http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,3010107,00.html> (last access: 19/05/2009).

³⁹ ReferendumIreland: Results, available at: <http://www.referendum.ie/current/index.asp?ballotid=78> (last access: 25/09/2008).

⁴⁰ Cf. the country reports on the EU after the Irish referendum (question 1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 7, September 2008, Berlin, pp. 20-65.

⁴¹ See German chapter on the future of the EU after the Irish 'No' (question I.1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin, pp. 37-39, here p. 38.

⁴² Václav Klaus: Press Statement by the President of the Czech Republic after the Senate Vote on the Lisbon Treaty, 06/05/2009, available at: <http://www.hrad.cz/en/for-media/press-releases/6085.shtml> (last access: 25/05/2009).

⁴³ Lech Kaczyński, cited in the Polish chapter on the future of the EU after the Irish 'No' (question I.1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin, pp. 54-55, here p. 54.

⁴⁴ For further details see: Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 11 and 12 December 2008. Presidency Conclusions, 17271/1/08, pp. 1-3, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/104692.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

⁴⁵ Cf. the country reports on the future of the EU after the Irish 'No' (questions I.1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin, pp. 19-70.

⁴⁶ Mentioned, for instance in the Austrian, French, or Slovenian chapters on the future of the EU after the Irish 'No' (chapter I.1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin.

⁴⁷ Belgian chapter on the future of the EU after the Irish 'No' (chapter I.1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin, pp. 20-22, here p. 21.

⁴⁸ See the Belgian, Dutch, and Luxemburg chapters on the future of the EU after the Irish 'No' (chapter I.1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin.

Overall, the rejection of two treaties agreed on by political elites by citizens of two founding member states and one of the older member states can be interpreted as signalling a growing gap between political elites and citizens in the EU.

Yet, as pointed out in the introduction to *Watch No. 7*, some did also believe that referenda were on principle not the ideal instrument for ratifying international treaties.⁴⁹ As some Estonian columnists put it: “referendum votes on such treaties resemble attempts to ‘repair a watch with a blacksmith’s hammer’”.⁵⁰

As evident in the country reports of *Watch No. 2*, some believed that the constitutional crisis was a crisis of political leadership.⁵¹ For example, then British Prime Minister Tony Blair “argued [that] the crisis should be seen as one of political leadership in general: neither at the national nor at the European level have politicians been providing the answers that the people are demanding as a response to economic and social change”.⁵² Similar views were also expressed in the Hungarian report: “In fact European integration is desperately missing political leadership and visions of the future. One can say that the highest ranking politicians of the Member States ‘betrayed’ Europe, since they do not perceive the EU any more as an excellent historical opportunity to solve problems and face challenges in common, but rather as a battlefield of clashing national interests”.⁵³ While, for example, in Finland, the “political elite views the constitutional crisis as a failure of the European leadership in listening and relating to the wider public”.⁵⁴

The issue of political leadership in the EU has been correspondingly covered in further issues of the *Watch*.⁵⁵ The views on how leadership in the EU could be improved depend, as outlined in the introduction of *Watch No. 7*, on the size and status of the member states.⁵⁶ For example, especially small (e.g. Ireland, Portugal, Sweden) and new (e.g. Cyprus, Czech Republic) member states feared that their voice would not be heard, and that they would not be duly represented in the new institutions created by the Lisbon Treaty, like the European External Action Service or in the new tableau of top positions, namely the High Representative, the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission.

⁴⁹ Cf. Barbara Lippert/Tanja Leppik-Bork: With or without the Lisbon Treaty – member states watch out, in: EU-27 Watch, No. 7, September 2008, Berlin, pp. 13-19.

⁵⁰ Estonian chapter on the EU after the Irish referendum (chapter 1), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 7, September 2008, Berlin, pp. 32-33, here p. 33.

⁵¹ Cf. e.g. the Belgian, British, Croatian, Finnish, Greek, Hungarian, and Slovak chapters on the Constitutional Crisis (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin.

⁵² British chapter on the Constitutional Crisis (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin, pp. 102-104, here p. 103.

⁵³ Hungarian chapter on the Constitutional Crisis (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin, pp. 61-65, here p. 62.

⁵⁴ Finnish chapter on the Constitutional Crisis (question 1), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin, pp. 48-49, here p. 48.

⁵⁵ There are country reports on leadership in the EU (question 3), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 3, July 2006, Berlin, pp. 93-110; and on political leadership in the EU (question 4), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 7, September 2008, Berlin, pp. 161-181.

⁵⁶ Cf. Barbara Lippert/Tanja Leppik-Bork: With or without the Lisbon Treaty – member states watch out, in: EU-27 Watch, No. 7, September 2008, Berlin, pp. 13-19, here p. 15.

Table 1: Status of ratification – Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe and Lisbon Treaty

		Austria	Belgium	Bulgaria	Cyprus	Czech	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Luxembourg	Malta	Netherlands	Poland	Portugal	Romania	Slovakia	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	United
Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe																												
deposit⁵⁷		Y	Y	Y	Y	•	•	Y	•	N	•	Y	Y	•	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	•	•	Y	•	Y	Y	•	•
type of decision	parl. decision	x	x	x	x			x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x		x				x	x	x		x	
	referendum					p	x			x				x						x	p	x						p
	both																	x								x		
decision		Y	Y	Y	Y	•	•	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	•	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	•	•	Y	Y	Y	Y	•	•
Lisbon Treaty																												
deposit⁵⁷		Y	Y	Y	Y	•	Y	Y	Y	Y	•	Y	Y	•	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	•	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
type of decision	parl. decision	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	referendum													x														
	both																											
decision		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Y = yes; N = No; p = possible referendum, decision not made; • = process not completed

Source: Own table.

⁵⁷ Deposit with the Italian government. In the cases of Bulgaria and Romania the Constitutional Treaty was ratified as part of the accession treaty.

1.2. Widening: the process of enlargement and the development of a European Neighbourhood Policy

With the enlargement by ten new member states in 2004, the external borders of the EU changed, giving the EU new neighbours. One answer to these new challenges was the development of a European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) as outlined in the strategy paper by the European Commission in 2004.⁵⁸ Not surprisingly, and as also evident in the country reports of *Watch No. 1*, the geographic focus of the member states depends on their geographic and historic proximity to the various neighbourhood countries.⁵⁹

This is further outlined in the country reports of *Watch No. 6*. While 15 member states had a clear preference for countries in the Eastern neighbourhood,⁶⁰ France, Italy, Malta, Portugal, and Spain looked towards the South.⁶¹ Other countries, like Cyprus, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Slovenia showed a balanced interest in both directions.⁶² Also among those looking towards the East, some, like Germany and Sweden, supported a balanced approach.

In line with geographic preferences and economic, political, societal and historical ties, regional initiatives and formats of cooperation were supported and developed, e.g. the Black Sea Synergy, the “Union for the Mediterranean”, and the Eastern Partnership.

The Black Sea Synergy was established in May 2007⁶³ and a joint statement was adopted at the level of Ministers on 14 February 2008 in Kiev.⁶⁴ The country reports of *Watch No. 6* show that, perhaps not surprisingly, Bulgaria and Romania were very supportive of this initiative.⁶⁵ Also supportive were, for instance, Austria, France, Germany, Hungary, and Slovenia.⁶⁶ The French initiative to create a “Mediterranean Union” outside the framework of ENP was, as also evident in the country reports of *Watch No. 6*, initially criticised by many member states, and especially Germany rejected the establishment of a Mediterranean Union

⁵⁸ European Commission: Communication from the Commission. European Neighbourhood Policy. Strategy Paper, COM (2004) 373, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2004:0373:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 12/05/2009).

⁵⁹ Cf. country reports on European Neighbourhood (question 4), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 1, December 2004, Berlin, pp. 121-141.

⁶⁰ Cf. country reports of Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Sweden on the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and Russia (question 3), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

⁶¹ Cf. country reports of France, Italy, Malta, Portugal, and Spain on the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and Russia (question 3), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

⁶² Cf. country reports of Cyprus, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Slovenia on the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and Russia (question 3), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

⁶³ Council of the European Union: Council Conclusions on the Black Sea synergy initiative, 2800th EXTERNAL RELATIONS Council meeting, Brussels, 14 May 2007, press release, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/gena/94080.pdf (last access: 19/05/2009); European Commission: Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Black Sea Synergy – A new regional cooperation initiative, COM (2007) 160, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0160:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 19/05/2009); European Commission: Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Report on the first year of implementation of the Black Sea Synergy, COM (2008) 391, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0391:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 19/05/2009).

⁶⁴ Joint Statement of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries of the European Union and of the wider Black Sea area, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/blacksea/doc/joint_statement_blacksea_en.pdf (last access: 19/05/2009).

⁶⁵ Cf. Bulgarian and Romanian chapters on European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and Russia (question 3), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

⁶⁶ Cf. Austrian, French, German, Hungarian, and Slovenian chapters on European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and Russia (question 3), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

outside the EU structures.⁶⁷ In the end, a compromise was found at the European Council meeting in spring 2008,⁶⁸ and the “Barcelona Process: Union for the Mediterranean” was launched at the Summit in Paris in July 2008.⁶⁹ As a way to counterbalance this strengthening of the Southern dimension of the European Neighbourhood Policy, Sweden and Poland proposed an Eastern Partnership in May 2008.⁷⁰ The Eastern Partnership was inaugurated at the Summit in Prague on 7 May 2009.⁷¹ The country reports of *Watch No. 8* indicate that particularly the Bulgarian government expected to play an important role in the Eastern Partnership due to its regional know-how⁷² and that, among others, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, and Lithuania especially welcomed this Swedish-Polish initiative.⁷³

Overall, it seems that the EU has no joint strategic vision for how to deal with its neighbours. While in the country reports of *Watch No. 7* some member states, like the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland, insisted that there should be no alternative to membership; other member states, like Germany, Greece, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, and Portugal, speculated about privileged partnerships or special relations of the EU with neighbouring countries.⁷⁴ For instance, in the Netherlands, a new form of alternative membership, called ‘partenariat’, was suggested and debated by the government.⁷⁵

The Georgian crisis in 2008 underlined once more the importance of stability and peace in the EU’s neighbourhood. While most member states were highly satisfied with the common EU response to this crisis, the consequences for the future strategic goals of the European Neighbourhood Policy and enlargement seem to be far from clear.

Looking into the reports of *Watch No. 8*, it can be observed that discussions about the ENP seem to be of higher salience in Eastern European countries. The focus of many of these newer member states was first and foremost on guaranteeing security, a statement emphasised by the former Romanian Minister of Foreign Affairs Lazăr Comănescu describing the ENP as “instruments that we have at our disposal for pursuing our security policy in the neighbourhood”.⁷⁶ Overall, despite the lack of clear strategic goals, it seems that the ENP was

⁶⁷ Cf. e.g. the Austrian, Bulgarian, Finnish, German, Hungarian, Irish, Romanian, and Turkish chapters on European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and Russia (question 3), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

⁶⁸ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 13/14 March 2008. Presidency Conclusions, 7652/08, p. 19, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/99410.pdf (last access: 25/05/2009).

⁶⁹ Joint Declaration of the Paris Summit for the Mediterranean, Paris, 13 July 2008, available at: http://www.ue2008.fr/webdav/site/PFUE/shared/import/07/0713_declaration_de_paris/Joint_declaration_of_the_Paris_summit_for_the_Mediterranean-EN.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).

⁷⁰ Cf. Swedish chapter on concentric circles around the EU? (question 5), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 7, September 2008, Berlin.

⁷¹ Council of the European Union: Joint Declaration of the Prague Eastern Partnership Summit, 7 May 2009, Prague, press release, 8435/09 (Presse 78), available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/er/107589.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

⁷² Cf. Bulgarian chapter on prospects for ENP and enlargement after ‘Georgia’ (question III), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin.

⁷³ Cf. Czech, Estonian, Finnish, German, Latvian, and Lithuanian chapters on prospects for ENP and enlargement after ‘Georgia’ (question III), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin.

⁷⁴ See country reports on concentric circles around the EU? (question 5), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 7, September 2008, Berlin, pp. 182-207.

⁷⁵ Cf. Dutch chapter on concentric circles around the EU? (question 5), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 7, September 2008, Berlin.

⁷⁶ Cited in the Romanian chapter on the prospects for ENP and enlargement after ‘Georgia’ (chapter III), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin, pp. 223-225, here p. 223.

widely regarded as an important instrument to create a “ring of prosperous and democratic neighbours”.⁷⁷

With regard to enlargement, the rejection of the TCE in France and the Netherlands intensified the debate on the limits of the EU and contributed to a growing enlargement fatigue, especially within the older EU member states.⁷⁸ In this period, the European Commission emphasised consolidation, conditionality and communication as important principles regarding further enlargements: “consolidating the EU’s commitments on enlargement, applying fair and rigorous conditionality, and communicating enlargement better”.⁷⁹

Despite the enlargement fatigue and a rising debate on the absorption capacity of the EU, the country reports of *Watch No. 3* also show that the EU governments remained convinced that the membership perspective for the Western Balkans was essential for stability, democratisation, and transformation of the region. Especially neighbouring countries and those close to the region, such as Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Italy, took special interest in the developments of the Western Balkan countries.⁸⁰ However, only in the new member states did citizens support EU membership of the Western Balkans in larger proportions.⁸¹

The debate on absorption capacity resulted in a communication of the European Commission on the enlargement strategy and the ‘integration capacity’ of the EU⁸² which was endorsed by the European Council at the end of 2006.⁸³

The country reports of *Watch No. 4* show that while this debate was welcomed as useful, “valuable” (Ireland) and “inevitable” (UK) by some, others suspected it to be a new obstacle designed to impede Turkish membership.⁸⁴ For example, in the Portuguese report it is stated that “absorption capacity has clearly become shorthand for ‘stalling Turkey’s accession’ by adding a hidden criterion to those publicly stated, which should apply equally to all EU

⁷⁷ Dutch chapter on the prospects for ENP and enlargement after ‘Georgia’ (chapter III), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin, pp. 219-221, here p. 219.

⁷⁸ Cf. e.g. the Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, and Luxembourgian chapters on the Future of EU Enlargement (question 2), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin.

⁷⁹ European Commission: Consolidation, Conditionality, Communication – the strategy of the enlargement policy, IP/05/1392, available at: <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/05/1392&format=PDF&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=de> (last access: 19/05/2009); European Commission: Communication from the Commission. 2005 enlargement strategy paper, COM (2005) 561, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0561:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 25/05/2009).

⁸⁰ Cf. the Austrian, Czech, Hungarian, and Italian chapters on developments in the Western Balkans and enlargement of the EU (question 6), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 3, July 2006, Berlin.

⁸¹ Cf. Standard Eurobarometer 65. Die öffentliche Meinung in der Europäischen Union, pp. 160-163, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb65/eb65_de.pdf (last access: 19/05/2009).

⁸² European Commission: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2006-2007. Including annexed special report on the EU’s capacity to absorb new members, COM (2006) 649, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0649:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 11/05/2009).

⁸³ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 14/15 December 2006. Presidency Conclusions, 16879/1/06, pp. 2-5, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/92202.pdf (last access: 19/05/2009).

⁸⁴ See the respective reports on absorption capacity (question 4), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin, pp. 97-118.

candidates and hopefuls, and one to which furthermore the latter are powerless to comply”⁸⁵ and in the Spanish report it is underlined that “blaming enlargement for all EU ills may help the EU feel better in the short-term, but it will not cure it in the long-term”.⁸⁶

In 2007, the enlargement process continued with Bulgaria and Romania joining the EU at the beginning of 2007. The country reports of *Watch No. 6* show that the importance of keeping or bringing the Western Balkan countries and Turkey on a pro Western and Euro-Atlantic track was still emphasised by most member states.⁸⁷ What the country reports also show is that Turkey remained the most controversial candidate for both governments⁸⁸ and the public across the EU.⁸⁹

With regard to the Western Balkans, the recognition of independence of Kosovo, as declared by the ‘Assembly of Kosovo’ on 17 February 2008,⁹⁰ was the most pressing challenge in 2008. In the country reports of *Watch No. 6*, most of the 27 countries, including those that had already recognised Kosovo, were concerned about probably opening a “Pandora’s box of secessions”⁹¹ and insisted that Kosovo was a unique sui generis case without precedence. For instance Cyprus was particularly sensitive that the independence of Kosovo could be regarded as a “precedent in international relations”.⁹² Despite the different responses of the member states to the declaration of independence, the EU was united in its decision to send a European Union Rule of Law Mission to Kosovo (EULEX Kosovo),⁹³ and several member states expressed their willingness to contribute to the mission.⁹⁴

As outlined in the introduction to *Watch No. 6*, there was a “strong awareness that the mission in Kosovo and the coordination between EULEX, UNMIK and KFOR is a test case for the operation ability and the capacities of ESDP”.⁹⁵ As the French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner explained “it was the EU’s responsibility to formulate a European position, distinct from that of Russia and the US. This idea accurately summarizes the general feeling amongst French observers, who consider the Kosovo question to be a crucial challenge for the

⁸⁵ Portuguese chapter on absorption capacity (question 4), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin, pp. 112-113, here p. 112.

⁸⁶ Spanish chapter on absorption capacity (question 4), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin, pp. 115-116.

⁸⁷ Cf. e.g. the Austrian, Bulgarian, Czech, Estonian, Italian, Latvian, Romanian, Slovakian, and Spanish chapters on Western Balkans – Enlargement (question 2), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

⁸⁸ Cf. e.g. the Austrian, Cypriot, Danish, French, German, and Irish chapters on Western Balkans – Enlargement (question 2), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

⁸⁹ Cf. e.g. the Austrian, Czech, Finnish, French, and German chapters on Western Balkans – Enlargement (question 2), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

⁹⁰ Assembly of Kosovo: Kosovo Declaration of Independence, 17/02/2008, available at: <http://www.assembly-kosova.org/?cid=2,128,1635> (last access: 06/05/2009).

⁹¹ Term taken from Danish chapter on Western Balkans – Enlargement (question 2), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin, pp. 76-77, here p. 77.

⁹² Cypriot chapter on Western Balkans – Enlargement (question 2), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin, pp. 73-75, here p. 75.

⁹³ Council Joint Action 2008/124/CFSP of 4 February 2008 on the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo, EULEX KOSOVO, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. L 42 from 16/02/2008, pp. 92-98, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:042:0092:0098:EN:PDF> (last access: 19/05/2009).

⁹⁴ Cf. e.g. Austrian, Estonian, Finnish, and German chapters on Western Balkans – Enlargement (question 2), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

⁹⁵ Barbara Lippert/Tanja Leppik: The art of ratification management and the caution with forward planning, in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin, pp. 10-20, here p. 13. Cf. also the Finnish chapter, and the Estonian, Luxembourgian, and Romanian chapters on Western Balkans – Enlargement (question 2), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

European security and defence policy. The aim is to understand whether the EU has already learned from past mistakes”.⁹⁶

Another issue of high importance in this context are relations with Russia – a topic that has been covered by various issues of the *Watch* and was discussed very controversially in the country reports.⁹⁷

For example, in the first issue of the *Watch*, especially the Central and Eastern European member states were quite critical towards the strategic partnership with Russia and pushed for a tougher and more realistic approach towards Moscow.⁹⁸

The negotiations over a new Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with Russia remained difficult in the following years. For example, the Polish government vetoed the start of the negotiations of a new PCA with Russia because of the Russian embargo on Polish meat,⁹⁹ and the Lithuanian government temporarily blocked the negotiations, demanding a number of points to be included in the agreement. Among them were the issue of energy security and the supply of oil by pipeline to the Lithuanian refinery “Mažeikiai Oil”.¹⁰⁰ That the relationship with Russia is frequently discussed in the context of energy policy is also evident in the country reports of *Watch No. 6*, where Russia is described to be a very difficult but crucial partner.¹⁰¹

In general, the positions of the ‘older’ member states towards Russia seem to be less ‘demanding’ and less fearful than those of some of the ‘new’ member states. The ‘older’ ones are less preoccupied with security aspects, stressing more the “enormous potential of common interests”¹⁰² especially with regard to energy and economic cooperation in the European-Russian relations.

The different perceptions of Russia became once more prominent in the country reports on the Georgian crisis in 2008. While, for example, the Luxembourg Minister for Foreign Affairs Jean Asselborn cautioned against the isolation of Russia,¹⁰³ other member states such as

⁹⁶ Mentioned in the French chapter on Western Balkans – Enlargement (question 2), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin, pp. 80-81, here p. 80.

⁹⁷ See country reports on European Neighbourhood (question 4), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 1, December 2004, Berlin, pp. 121-141; on Russia and the European Neighbourhood Policy (question 8), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin, pp. 208-231; on European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and Russia (question 3), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin, pp. 108-158; and on prospects for ENP and enlargement after ‘Georgia’ (question III), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin, pp. 196-230.

⁹⁸ See country reports on European Neighbourhood (question 4), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 1, December 2004, Berlin.

⁹⁹ Cf. Polish report on current issues and discourses in your country, in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Lithuanian report on European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and Russia (question 3), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin; Kai-Olaf Lang: Die baltischen Staaten und ihr Verhältnis zu Russland, SWP-Aktuell 61, July 2008, available at: http://www.swp-berlin.org/en/common/get_document.php?asset_id=5099 (last access: 19/05/2009).

¹⁰¹ Cf. e.g. the Dutch, Finnish, French, and German chapters on European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and Russia (question 3), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin.

¹⁰² Belgian chapter on European Neighbourhood (question 4), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 1, December 2004, Berlin, pp. 122-123, here p. 123.

¹⁰³ Mentioned in the Luxembourgian chapter on the prospects for ENP and enlargement after ‘Georgia’ (chapter III), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin, p. 218.

Estonia showed concerns about Russia being treated too preferentially by stating that “Europe has not given its neighbours the same privileges as have been given to Russia”.¹⁰⁴

When looking at the positions towards Russia or the views on the European Neighbourhood Policy one is once more reminded of the fact that after the enlargement in 2004/2007, the EU comprises many countries with very diverse historical backgrounds as well as unique economic, political and geographic situations and is thus faced by the challenges of great internal heterogeneity and diversity.¹⁰⁵

1.3. Policy-making: business as usual

Even though the focus of the *Watch* was on deepening and widening, some policy areas were also regularly covered, such as budget, climate and energy policies, economic and social policies as well as external relations. In the following, some developments in budget, climate and energy policies are touched upon and complemented by national views as represented in the *Watch* issues.

In 2004 and 2005, the continuous bargaining over the financial framework showed that it was increasingly difficult for the bigger and more diverse EU to reach a consensus. At the same time, the adoption of the Financial Perspective by the European Council in December 2005 indicated that finding a consensus was still possible.¹⁰⁶

The country reports of *Watch No. 2* indicate that the new member states in particular were interested in reaching a deal during the British EU Presidency. For example, in the Maltese report it is stated that the government and opposition “have argued that a compromise agreement is better than no agreement at all”.¹⁰⁷

Not surprisingly, and also evident in the *Watch* reports of *No. 1* and *6*, topics on the domestic agendas were often related to country specific aspects of the EU budget.¹⁰⁸ For example, as outlined in the country reports of *Watch No. 6*, an important topic for Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom was the issue of their net contributions to the EU budget. In Spain, the possibility of becoming a net contributor after 2014 was also closely monitored, while in Bulgaria and Romania, the opportunities for absorbing structural funds received much attention. In the candidate countries Croatia and Turkey, on the other hand, the

¹⁰⁴ Estonian chapter on the prospects for ENP and enlargement after ‘Georgia’ (chapter III), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 8, March 2009, Berlin, p. 205.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. also Barbara Lippert/Timo Goosmann: Introduction: A portrait of the Union in a puzzling state of mind, in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin, pp. 8-17, here pp. 9ff.

¹⁰⁶ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 15/16 December 2005. Presidency Conclusions, 15914/1/05, p. 2, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/87642.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009); Council of the European Union: Financial Perspective 2007-2013, 15915/05, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/misc/87677.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009). The final agreement was reached in April 2006: European Parliament: EU budget 2007-2013: a deal is done - €4 billion more but some dissatisfaction, press release, 06/04/2006, available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+IM-PRESS+20060330IPR06876+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN&language=EN> (last access: 11/05/2009).

¹⁰⁷ Maltese chapter on the Financial Framework 2007/13 (question 3), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 2, January 2006, Berlin, p. 165.

¹⁰⁸ See country reports on the Agenda 2007 (question 5), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 1, December 2004, Berlin, pp. 142-160; and on the Budget review (question 4), in: EU-27 Watch, No. 6, March 2008, Berlin, pp. 159-184.

issue of IPA funds (Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance) and how they might be affected by the budget review was an important issue.

Another area where the enlarged EU kept working even without a new treaty base is the area of climate and energy policy. There was, of course, a greater variety of energy markets, infrastructures, and specific problems within the EU after enlargement, and the issue of energy security became more prominent.

Despite this increased heterogeneity, a common energy and climate policy developed. Since the green paper by the European Commission issued in 2006¹⁰⁹ and the conclusions of the European Council meeting in spring 2007,¹¹⁰ a lot of legislation has been drafted and adopted in this area.¹¹¹

The country reports of the *Watch* issues No. 3, 4 and 5 followed those developments and give some insights into the specific discourses on climate and energy policies in the member states.¹¹² The issue of the European Union Greenhouse Gas Emission Trading System (ETS) and the question of national energy mixes are two examples. In Poland, for instance, the European Commission's decision on emission allowances for Poland that were 26 percent below the Polish allocation plans provoked a "wave of disagreement". Not only was it regarded as unfair, it also could "stifle Polish economic growth for many years".¹¹³ To take another example, at "the spring summit Slovakia joined the group of EU member states led by France that pushed for including the nuclear energy among 'clean' energy sources (it does not produce CO₂ emissions)".¹¹⁴

What the developments in the area of budget, climate and energy policies show is that even with the increased heterogeneity and lack of a new treaty base, the enlarged EU has remained capable of reaching compromises in vital areas and establishing new policies at the European level.

Overall, one can say that, despite all the uncertainty regarding the reform of the treaty base, the EU has continued working as usual. And, despite the increased heterogeneity due to the almost doubled number of members, the EU has been able to establish new policies at the European level (like energy policy) and face crises (such as the Georgian crisis or the financial and economic crisis).

¹⁰⁹ European Commission: Green Paper. A European Strategy for Sustainable, Competitive and Secure Energy, COM (2006) 105, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/green-paper-energy/doc/2006_03_08_gp_document_en.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

¹¹⁰ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 8/9 March 2007. Presidency Conclusions, 7224/1/07, pp. 10-13, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/93135.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

¹¹¹ For regularly updated information about developments in the area of energy policy see: Institut für Europäische Politik (ed.): EU Energy Policy Monitoring, available at: <http://energy.iep-berlin.de/php/index.php> (last access: 25/05/2009).

¹¹² See country reports on the Middle East and Energy Policy of the EU (question 7), in: EU-25 Watch, No. 3, July 2006, Berlin, pp. 187-208; on European Energy Policy (question 5), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 4, January 2007, Berlin, pp. 119-156; and on Climate Change/Energy (question 2), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 78-115.

¹¹³ Polish chapter on Climate Change/Energy (question 2), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 100-103, here p. 101.

¹¹⁴ Slovakian chapter on Climate Change/Energy (question 2), in: EU-25/27 Watch, No. 5, September 2007, Berlin, pp. 109-111, here p. 109.

2. Six observations on deepening and widening of the European Union from the *EU-27 Watch*¹¹⁵

Barbara Lippert

Events and focus of surveys

The eight issues of the *EU-25/27 Watch* cover the years 2004 up to 2008. Starting points were the big bang enlargement (May 2004) and the agreement of the Intergovernmental Conference on the Constitutional Treaty resulting from the European Convention (June 2004).¹¹⁶ The European Union's agenda was set on the background of economic globalisation and transnational threats to security and welfare. Major events in the development of a deeper and wider EU during the five year period were the following:

2004: Big bang enlargement; onset of European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP); Constitutional Treaty agreed and signed in Rome

2005: two failed referenda; Financial Perspective 2007-2013 agreed; accession treaty signed with Bulgaria and Romania, candidate status granted to FYRO Macedonia; opening of accession negotiations with Turkey and Croatia

2006: the 'period of reflection'; freezing of negotiation chapters with Turkey, report on absorption capacity of EU; new energy policy agreed; communication of the Commission on strengthening the ENP

2007: accession of Bulgaria and Romania; "Berlin Declaration"; Slovenia introduces the euro currency as 15th member of the eurozone; Treaty of Lisbon signed; cooling down of relations with Russia (Samara Summit); integration of "Prüm Treaty" into EC law; Heiligendamm '20:20:20 goals' to combat climate change; start of EU budget review process

2008: onset of Mediterranean Union; Eastern Partnership initiative; 5 days war in Georgia; gas price and transit quarrel between Ukraine and Russia; independence of Kosovo; European Pact on Immigration and Asylum adopted; failed Irish referendum; European Economic Recovery Plan to meet the economic and financial crisis; energy and climate change package

The almost half-yearly reports and interpretations published in the *Watch* focussed on the national debates on current events and issues with regard to deepening and widening of the EU. The underlying assumption was that the domestic/national arena is important for a better understanding of actors' behaviour in the Brussels arena. Also the European Council in December 2005 emphasised the importance to follow closely the "national debates on the future of Europe underway in all Member states".¹¹⁷ Moreover, a synopsis of all 27 member states (plus Croatia and Turkey) and comparisons between them seem useful for a better understanding of the formulation of policy options and for an assessment of their likely realisation.

¹¹⁵ Contribution to the panel "Wider Europe, deeper integration?", 4th Plenary Conference EU-CONSENT network of excellence, Brussels, 26/27 March 2009.

¹¹⁶ These observations are based on issues No.1-7 of the online survey IEP (ed.): *EU-27 Watch*, available at: <http://www.iep-berlin.de> (last access: 19/05/2009), and in particular on the introductions to each issue, which I co-authored with Timo Goosmann and Tanja Leppik-Bork respectively. Due to the character of a panel contribution only few references to sources and academic literature are made here.

¹¹⁷ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 15/16 December 2005. Presidency Conclusions, 15914/1/05, point I.5, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/87642.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).

Throughout the eight *Watch* surveys the deepening dimension¹¹⁸ became manifest in the attempts and failures within the process of revising the Treaty of Nice; the dimension of widening was mostly equalled with enlargement policy and the newly set up Wider Europe and European Neighbourhood Policy. Thus, the questionnaires for the eight issues were – in line with the policy-driven onset of EU-CONSENT – merely event-driven. The eight issues of the *Watch* can be read as politically well informed and educated interpretations and reflections on the selected topics.

From my reading six observations and reflections shall be put forward for further discussion.

1. The process of enlargement continued as expected, while the process of deepening derailed. This induced a shift in focus of agenda (reflected in the *Watch* questionnaire) from the implementation of new treaty provisions or the effects of enlargement towards stronger emphasis on the functioning of the political system of the EU, on polity building and legitimacy. In short: more focus on obstacles than on dynamics of European integration.

In light of initial expectations of the EU-CONSENT network of excellence (application and theoretical framework) it appears that the enlargement process continued as expected. Enlargement remained on track, while deepening derailed. Formally referenda and the new veto players, the citizens, blocked the ratification process twice (2005 French and Dutch majorities against, 2008 Irish majority against revised treaties). Domestic constellations (weak governments, tactical miscalculations etc.), but also currents of specific criticism and opposition as well as a more general discontent and concern over the ever closer polity-building came to the fore. The blocking of the ratification process showed the vulnerability of the EU multi-level system and in particular its dependence on member states as its constitutional components. However, the reports from member states show an amazing trust in the robustness and functioning of the EU system and hint at an underestimation of the vulnerability of the EU system.

A way of articulating uneasiness is the widely reported enlargement fatigue in some, mostly old member states. It now appears that 2005 was the peak of enlargement followed by a stalled process (see above). Also, a debate on the absorption capacity of the EU, including borders, boundaries etc. restarted but without generating a new consensus. Thus the focus of the *Watch* shifted towards the deepening side.

The onset of the Wider Europe policy or ENP was partly due to the foreign and security policy challenges and strategic interest of the EU. It is however also fuelled by the stalemate in the enlargement policy. As not only the contributions to *Watch* from Turkey and Croatia show, the magnetism of the EU towards outsiders continues, for the countries of the Western Balkans as well as for some in the Eastern (and perhaps also Southern) neighbourhood as well as for bankrupt EFTA countries that desire a membership perspective.

¹¹⁸ For a definition see Anne Faber/Wolfgang Wessels: A common theoretical and methodological framework for EU-CONSENT, Working Paper for the Kick-off Meeting, 18-19/11/2005, Brussels.

2. The loss of momentum for reform and deepening leaves the EU in a transitory stage and hybrid type of polity. A sense is growing that this openness is now for ever and there is no talk about ‘completion’ (see the triptych of The Hague Summit in 1969). Elites in old and new member states come to terms with this downscaling of ambitions: ‘It is as it is.’

Ambivalences and complexities of the two tier EU (the Union of states and citizens) with its many different modes of governance and policy-making, hence the co-existence and contamination of more intergovernmental or more supranational features continue (forever). The big bang enlargement showed that accession of new members and growth of the EU does not trigger a victory of one over the other concept of European policy-making. Also the logic of using enlargement as a whip to reinforce deepening failed. Moreover, it seems that the discourse on enlargement was disconnected from the debate over deepening. Consolidation and adaptation have become increasingly prominent slogans. The method of propagating mega projects and strategically working towards their realisation has also passed its peak. This does not, however, rule out a cumulative approach in establishing new policy areas (see energy policy, climate policy, ‘Prüm’) and giving flesh to them. Most likely integration and innovation of the EU system will mostly occur by stealth. So, the EU still considers itself as a slowly maturing polity (still no claims for ‘acquis minus’) with a vision of incremental and trial-and-error progress and change. Against the background of the pre-Lisbon constitutional settlement the question arises what it will mean for the further evolution of the EU system when the EU cannot refer to the option of treaty change for decades or so to come.

3. Monnet method dominates the scene but the genie of legitimacy is out of the bottle.

Limiting the damage and managing the imminent crisis of ratification became priorities and were widely reflected in the questionnaires of the *Watch*. Two characteristics can be distilled from the member states and EU institutions (namely the European Council):

Firstly: Pragmatism and reactive approaches of piecemeal nature remained key features in the process of deepening and widening. This step-by-step and process-bound strategy is reflected in the way the EU continued to apply and adapt its method of ‘governance by time tables’ (Klaus Goetz) to structure the process of problem solving and break problems into smaller parts to be tackled. Thus also the preference for consensus building survived in the EU-27 as the preferred method of policy-making. Its steering centre was the European Council with the Council Presidency, assisted by the European Commission. Good examples were the German and Portuguese EU Presidencies playing their cards close and handing over the crucial questions to small circles for confidential pre-cooking of solutions. After initial irritations also under the French EU Presidency, a formula for structuring the agenda and defining the corridor of solutions was agreed upon between the 27.

Secondly: All this can be interpreted as following the Monnet method. However, the dark side of the elitist and expert centred method of Monnet is the deficit of wider participation of actors in the process and the lack of public debate and awareness, hence few checks and balances. The European Convention can be interpreted as an attempt to address or even mend the legitimacy deficit on the input side. Whatever its merits and long term effect, throughout the years of the ratification crisis the Convention has not become a point of reference or example to be remembered and definitely not an exercise to be repeated. The negative referenda catapulted the citizens on the agenda of the EU as unpredictable veto players with a big proportion of mistrust. Criticism with regard to the manoeuvring, the bargaining, the

incremental solutions etc. was frequent. However, in the period concerned, the plea for stronger and better leadership was more vocal than the plea for more public debate, discourses and deliberation. This now appears as an episode, while the diagnosis, the shrinking acceptance and probably also legitimacy of the EU, is not disproved. Therefore more attention shall be given, particularly in the run-up to the elections to the European Parliament in June 2009, to political forces and NGOs outside the mainstream or of established actors.

Notwithstanding the wake-up call of the negative referenda and fashionable rhetoric that the political elites shall reconnect with the citizens, little has changed as far as the communication strategies and key messages of national governments and parties on EU affairs are concerned. Not surprisingly, the reflection group “Horizon 2020-2030” chaired by former Spanish President of Government Felipe Gonzáles owes to this timid but very traditional approach. The “Berlin Declaration” to mark the 50th anniversary of the Rome Treaties with its inventive language and feeble substance was a respectable product of the difficult state of mind of the 27 members.

4. Almost no frictions in integrating new member states into the old EU.

New members do not constitute a ring-fenced group in terms of the discourses at domestic level or their involvement in EU policy-making. Apparently the twelve new member states did not face bigger frictions or problems in adapting to their new status after effectively entering the EU. As widely expected the ten or twelve new members also do not form a group or try to do so. Accordingly apart from identity related issues we found no indications that new cleavages following the old/new member states division are underway. Also worries and worst case scenarios of a paralysis of decision-making in the EU-27 are exaggerated or even groundless. On the contrary, trouble in paradise initially came from old (France, the Netherlands, Ireland) not from new member states. This can be interpreted as another example of the old EU’s strength in triggering convergence processes and is a success of the imperative to take over the *acquis* as part of the “enlargement doctrine”.¹¹⁹

This does of course not mean that the salience of issues is not seen differently and so priorities may vary (see integration areas of different speeds, like euro, Schengen area etc.). It is important for new members to swiftly achieve the status of fully fledged ‘ins’. This is from a more principle perspective a strong barrier against the formation of core groupings and exclusive formats. All in all, we can confirm that a formal differentiation between old and new members is not a convincing organising principle for interest formation nor is it helpful as a fundamental pattern to explain the behaviour of EU actors beyond individual cases.

Why is that so? Why did the ten new members from Central and Eastern Europe not make a ‘big bang’ difference and transform the EU polity and politics? For an answer one should look beyond the accession to the EU. ‘1989’ was a conservative revolution in the sense that the new members did neither claim nor work towards alternatives to the existing models and practices, neither in political, economic nor social terms. The elites and citizens of Central and Eastern Europe want to share the modernity and democracy as spelled out by Western Europe in all its facets and plurality.

¹¹⁹ Barbara Lippert: Alle paar Jahre wieder – Dynamik und Steuerungsversuche des EU-Erweiterungsprozesses, in: *integration* 4/07, pp. 422-439, available at: http://www.iep-berlin.de/fileadmin/website/09_Publikationen/integration_2007/lippert.pdf (last access: 19/05/2009).

A second explanation for the ‘business as usual’ and limited modifications (see scenarios 3 and 4¹²⁰), is that the twelve did not challenge the power equilibrium between the three big members, France, the UK and Germany. Only imagine a future membership of Turkey and the transformative effect, e.g. on this power triangle, will very likely be far stronger.

5. Domestic constraints and shaping factors multiply in the EU-27.

Despite the overall status quo and business as usual assessments, policy formulation and decision-making inside the EU has become more complicated with the growth of players. Domestic constraints and shifts (see for example the number of elections at different levels in member states) multiply in the wider EU. A central theme is how to cope with heterogeneity. The assessment that after enlargement deepening inevitably means differentiation has not materialised so far. The building of core groups and other provisions for structural differentiation inside the EU has not become the key approach or solution to the problem. These proposals lack acceptance as a standard procedure and initiatives like the one of Nicolas Sarkozy to build on the euro group got stuck early.

6. External shocks and events make up the agenda and will drive European integration.

Today, with the international financial crisis and world recession it is obvious how deep the EU is embedded in the international system. These developments strike at the core of EU policies (internal market, eurozone) and fears of a fragmentation and break up of the EU can be heard in many member states. Effects on policies and shifts in policy priorities are very likely to occur in response. While also in the past the EC/EU has been driven by external challenges, after 1989 and the widening of the EU up to the borders of Russia, for each of its members, the EU has become the most important indispensable arena for foreign policy and making global governance. Member states’ dependence on the EU as an effective international actor is enormous. While the EU internally already handles a state-like agenda, it will increasingly also be challenged to act collectively and more and more like a state in international politics.

¹²⁰ Scenario 3: “The ‘re-invented/transformed Union’: A fresh outlook” and scenario 4: “No further EU ‘deepening’ and ‘widening’: A ‘status quo’ Union”. For the different scenarios see Gaby Umbach: EU-CONSENT 2005-2009. Four Years of Research on EU “Deepening” and “Widening”: Evidence, Explanation, Extrapolation, Draft D144, 2009.

3. Chronology: major stages from January 2004 until May 2009

Date	Deepening	Widening	Policies
2004			
22/03/2004		The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) applies for EU membership. ¹	
01/05/2004		The Eastern enlargement takes place: ten states become new members of the European Union. ²	
12/05/2004		The European Commission publishes its strategy paper on European Neighbourhood Policy. ³	
10-13/06/2004	European elections. ⁴		
17-18/06/2004	The European Council welcomes the “draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe”. ⁵	The European Council declares Croatia being a candidate country. ⁶	
29/10/2004	The “Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe” is signed in Rome. ⁷		
04-05/11/2004			The European Council approves the “Hague Programme”. ⁸
22/11/2004	Appointed on 19/11/2004 the new European Commission starts its work. ⁹		
2005			
25/04/2005		The accession treaty with Bulgaria and Romania is signed. ¹⁰	
29/05/2005	The referendum on the Constitutional Treaty in France fails. ¹¹		
01/06/2005	The referendum on the Constitutional Treaty in the Netherlands fails. ¹²		
16-17/06/2005	The European Council agrees on a ‘period of reflection’ after the failed French and Dutch referenda. ¹³		

Date	Deepening	Widening	Policies
03-04/10/2005		The accession negotiations between the EU and Croatia ¹⁴ and the EU and Turkey ¹⁵ officially start.	
09/11/2005		The European Commission publishes its “2005 enlargement strategy paper”. ¹⁶	
15-16/12/2005	The European Council takes note of a joint UK-Austrian interim report on national debates on the future of Europe underway in all member states. ¹⁷	The European Council declares FYROM being a candidate country. ¹⁸	The European Council agrees on the Financial Perspective 2007-2013. ¹⁹
2006			
08/03/2006			The European Commission publishes the green paper on European energy policy. ²⁰
04/04/2006			The European Parliament, the Council and the European Commission agree on the Financial Perspective (2007-2013). ²¹
15-16/06/2006	The European Council adopts a ‘two-track’ approach, meaning a future reform should be based on the current treaties and the Constitutional Treaty. ²²		
08/11/2006		The European Commission publishes its enlargement strategy which includes a special report on the EU’s capacity to integrate new member states. ²³	

Date	Deepening	Widening	Policies
04/12/2006		The European Commission publishes its communication on strengthening the European Neighbourhood Policy. ²⁴	
14-15/12/2006		The European Council endorses the European Commission's communication on enlargement strategy including a special report on 'integration capacity'. ²⁵	
2007			
01/01/2007		The accession of Romania and Bulgaria to the EU takes place. ²⁶	
01/01/2007		Slovenia introduces the euro as its currency. ²⁷	
26/01/2007	The "friends of the constitution", a Spanish-Luxembourgian initiative, meet in Madrid, back the current text and warn of minimalist solutions. ²⁸		
08-09/03/2007			The European Council agrees on binding targets for greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy by 2020. ²⁹
24-25/03/2007	The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Treaties of Rome is celebrated with an informal meeting of the Heads of State and Government in Berlin, who agree on the "Berlin Declaration". ³⁰		

Date	Deepening	Widening	Policies
14/05/2007		The External Relations Council welcomes the European Commission's communication "Black Sea Synergy – A new Regional Cooperation Initiative". ³¹	
06-08/06/2007			The G8 Summit takes place in Heiligendamm. ³²
12/06/2007			The Justice and Home Affairs Council agrees on a decision which contains provisions based on essential parts of the "Prüm Treaty". ³³
21-22/06/2007	The European Council agrees on a mandate for an Intergovernmental Conference to draft a reform treaty. ³⁴		
12/09/2007			The European Commission publishes its communication "Reforming the budget, changing Europe" on the budget review. ³⁵
18-19/10/2007	At an informal summit/session of the Intergovernmental Conference in Lisbon, the Heads of State and Government agree on a precise text for the reform treaty. ³⁶		
05/12/2007		The European Commission publishes its communication "A Strong European Neighbourhood Policy". ³⁷	
12/12/2007	The European Parliament, the Council and the European Commission proclaim the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. ³⁸		

Date	Deepening	Widening	Policies
13/12/2007	The “Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community” is signed. ³⁹		
2008			
01/01/2008		Malta and Cyprus introduce the euro as their currency. ⁴⁰	
04/02/2008			The Council of the European Union agrees on the joint action 2008/124/CFSP on the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo. ⁴¹
14/02/2008		First Black Sea Synergy meeting of the Foreign Ministers takes place in Kiev. ⁴²	
17/02/2008		The ‘assembly’ of the UN administrated Kosovo declares the Kosovo as independent. ⁴³	
13-14/03/2008		The European Council approves the principle of a Union for the Mediterranean. ⁴⁴	
26-27/05/2008		The Swedish and Polish delegations present their suggestions for an Eastern Partnership to the External Relations Council. ⁴⁵	
12/06/2008	The referendum on the Lisbon Treaty in Ireland fails. ⁴⁶		
13/07/2008		At a summit in Paris, the Heads of State and Government from the EU and the Mediterranean and the European Commission launch the “Barcelona Process: Union for the Mediterranean”. ⁴⁷	

Date	Deepening	Widening	Policies
28/08/2008		An agreement on Liechtenstein's participation in the Schengen area is signed. ⁴⁸	
03-04/11/2008		The "Barcelona Process: Union for the Mediterranean" ministerial conference agrees on institutional structures of and a working programme for the "Barcelona Process: Union for the Mediterranean". ⁴⁹	
11-12/12/2008	The European Council establishes an approach to enable the Treaty of Lisbon to come into force before the end of 2009. ⁵⁰		The European Council approves a European Economic Recovery Plan and agrees on the energy and climate change package. ⁵¹
12/12/2008		Switzerland becomes member of the Schengen area and the Dublin systems. ⁵²	
17/12/2008			The European Parliament agrees on the energy and climate change package. ⁵³
2009			
01/01/2009		Slovakia introduces the euro as its currency. ⁵⁴	
28/01/2009			The European Commission publishes its proposals for a global pact on climate change at Copenhagen. ⁵⁵
07/05/2009		At the Eastern Partnership Summit in Prague the Eastern Partnership is launched. ⁵⁶	

¹ European Commission: Communication from the Commission. Commission Opinion on the application from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for membership of the European Union, COM (2005) 562, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0562:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 06/05/2009).

² Documents concerning the accession of the Czech Republic, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Cyprus, the Republic of Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, the Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Malta, the Republic of Poland, the Republic of Slovenia and the Slovak Republic to the European Union, in: Official Journal of the

-
- European Union, No. L 236 from 23/09/2003, pp. 3-988, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:236:SOM:EN:HTML> (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ³ European Commission: Communication from the Commission. European Neighbourhood Policy. Strategy Paper, COM (2004) 373, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2004:0373:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 12/05/2009).
- ⁴ European Parliament: Results, 30/06/2004, available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2004/ep-election/sites/en/results1306/graphical.html> (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ⁵ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 17 and 18 June 2004. Presidency Conclusions, 10679/2/04, p. 1, available at: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/81742.pdf> (last access: 06/05/2009); Conference of the Representatives of the governments of the member states: Meeting of Heads of State or Government, Brussels, 17/18 June 2004, CIG 81/04, available at: <http://ue.eu.int/igcpdf/en/04/cg00/cg00081.en04.pdf> (last access: 06/05/2009); Conference of the Representatives of the governments of the member states: Meeting of Heads of State or Government, Brussels, 17/18 June 2004, CIG 85/04, available at: <http://ue.eu.int/igcpdf/en/04/cg00/cg00085.en04.pdf> (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ⁶ European Commission: Communication from the Commission. Opinion on Croatia's Application for Membership of the European Union, COM (2004) 257, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2004:0257:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 06/05/2009); Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 17 and 18 June 2004. Presidency Conclusions, 10679/2/04, pp. 7-8, available at: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/81742.pdf> (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ⁷ Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. C 310 from 16/12/2004, pp. 1-474, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2004:310:SOM:EN:HTML> (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ⁸ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 4/5 November 2004. Presidency Conclusions, 14292/1/04, available at: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/14292-r1.en04.pdf> (last access: 11/05/2009).
- ⁹ Council of the European Union: Council appoints the President and Members of the European Commission, press release, 14866/04 (Presse 328), available at: <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=PRES/04/328&format=PDF&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en> (last access: 11/05/2009).
- ¹⁰ Documents concerning the accession of the Republic of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. L 157 from 21/06/2005, pp. 3-395, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2005:157:SOM:EN:HTML> (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ¹¹ Ministère de l'Intérieur: Scrutin du 29 mai 2005. France Entière (résultats validés par le conseil constitutionnel), available at: http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/sections/a_votre_service/resultats-elections/rf2005/000/000.html (last access: 04/05/2009).
- ¹² William Metzger/Katrin Pecker: IEP-Ratifizierungssurvey. Der Stand der Ratifizierungsprozesse zur EU-Verfassung in den Mitgliedstaaten und in den Beitrittsländern Bulgarien und Rumänien, pp. 19-21, available at: http://www.iep-berlin.de/fileadmin/website/09_Publikationen/Sonstige/Laenderueberblick.pdf (last access: 04/05/2009).
- ¹³ Declaration by the Heads of State or Government of the member states of the European Union on the ratification of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe (European Council, 16 and 17 June 2005), SN 117/05, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/85325.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ¹⁴ Negotiation Framework, Luxembourg, 3 October 2005, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/croatia/st20004_05_hr_framedoc_en.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ¹⁵ Negotiation Framework, Luxembourg, 3 October 2005, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/turkey/st20002_05_tr_framedoc_en.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ¹⁶ European Commission: Communication from the Commission. 2005 enlargement strategy paper, COM (2005) 561, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0561:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 25/05/2009); European Commission: Consolidation, Conditionality, Communication – the strategy of the enlargement policy, IP/05/1392, available at: <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/05/1392&format=PDF&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=de> (last access: 19/05/2009).
- ¹⁷ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 15/16 December 2005. Presidency Conclusions, 15914/1/05, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/87642.pdf (last access: 25/05/2009).
- ¹⁸ European Commission: Communication from the Commission. Commission Opinion on the application from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for membership of the European Union, COM (2005) 562, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0562:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 06/05/2009); Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 15/16 December 2005.

Presidency Conclusions, 15914/1/05, p. 7, available at:

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/87642.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).

¹⁹ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 15/16 December 2005. Presidency Conclusions, 15914/1/05, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/87642.pdf (last access: 25/05/2009).

²⁰ European Commission: Green Paper. A European Strategy for Sustainable, Competitive and Secure Energy, COM (2006) 105, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/green-paper-energy/doc/2006_03_08_gp_document_en.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

²¹ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 15/16 December 2005. Presidency Conclusions, 15914/1/05, p. 2, available at:

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/87642.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009);

Council of the European Union: Financial Perspective 2007-2013, 15915/05, available at:

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/misc/87677.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009);

European Parliament: EU budget 2007-2013: a deal is done - €4 billion more but some dissatisfaction, press release, 06/04/2006, available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+IM-PRESS+20060330IPR06876+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN&language=EN> (last access:

11/05/2009).

²² Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 15/16 June 2006. Presidency Conclusions,

10633/1/06, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/90111.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

²³ European Commission: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2006 – 2007. Including annexed special report on the EU's capacity to integrate new members, COM (2006) 649, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0649:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 11/05/2009).

²⁴ European Commission: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on strengthening the European Neighbourhood Policy, COM (2006) 726, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0726:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 12/05/2009).

²⁵ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 14/15 December 2006. Presidency Conclusions,

16879/1/06, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/92202.pdf (last access: 19/05/2009).

²⁶ Documents concerning the accession of the Republic of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union, in:

Official Journal of the European Union, No. L 157 from 21/06/2005, pp. 3-395, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2005:157:SOM:EN:HTML> (last access: 06/05/2009).

²⁷ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 15/16 June 2006. Presidency Conclusions,

10633/1/06, p. 12, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/90111.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

²⁸ Representatives of all member states which ratified the Constitutional Treaty and from Ireland and Portugal take part. Ministère des Affaires étrangères du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg: Traités et Affaires

institutionnelles. Les objectifs de la réunion de Madrid des 18 pays du “oui” au traité constitutionnel,

26/01/2007, available at: http://www.europaforum.public.lu/fr/actualites/2007/01/madrid_annonce/index.html (last access: 11/05/2009);

Ministère des Affaires étrangères du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg: Traités et Affaires institutionnelles. Réunion ministérielle des Amis de la Constitution “Pour une Europe meilleure” – Madrid, 26

janvier 2007, 26/01/2007, available at: http://www.europaforum.public.lu/fr/actualites/2007/01/madrid_cdp/index.html (last access: 11/05/2009).

²⁹ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 8/9 March 2007. Presidency Conclusions,

7224/1/07, pp. 10-13, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/93135.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

³⁰ Declaration on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the signature of the Treaties of Rome, available at: http://www.eu2007.de/de/News/download_docs/Maerz/0324-RAA/English.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

³¹ Council of the European Union: Council Conclusions on the Black Sea synergy initiative, 2800th

EXTERNAL RELATIONS Council meeting, Brussels, 14 Mai 2007, press release, available at:

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/gena/94080.pdf (last access: 19/05/2009);

European Commission: Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament.

Black Sea Synergy – A new regional cooperation initiative, COM (2007) 160, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0160:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 19/05/2009);

European Commission: Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament.

Report on the first year of implementation of the Black Sea Synergy, COM (2008) 391, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0391:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 19/05/2009).

-
- ³² Chair's Summary. Heiligendamm, 8 June 2007, available at: http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/_g8-summit/anlagen/chairs-summary.templateId=raw.property=publicationFile.pdf/chairs-summary.pdf (last access: 25/05/2009).
- ³³ Council of the European Union: Press release. 2807th Council meeting Justice and Home Affairs. Luxembourg, 12-13 June 2007, 10267/07 (Presse 125), available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/94682.pdf (last access: 25/05/2009); Council of the European Union: Draft Council Decision on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime, 10232/07, available at: <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/07/st10/st10232.en07.pdf> (last access: 25/05/2009).
- ³⁴ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 21/22 June 2007. Presidency Conclusions, 11177/1/07, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/94932.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).
- ³⁵ European Commission: Communication from the Commission. Reforming the budget, changing Europe. A public consultation paper in view of the 2008/2009 budget review, SEC (2007) 1188, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/budget/reform/library/issue_paper/consultation_paper_en.pdf (last access: 25/05/2009).
- ³⁶ Portuguese Presidency of the European Union: Informal European Council Lisbon, 18-19 October 2007. Presidency Press Release, available at: <http://www.eu2007.pt/NR/ronlyres/65B21C46-856F-44D2-A325-03BE22ED7DF1/0/PressRelease19102007Final.pdf> (last access: 11/05/2009); Portuguese Presidency of the European Union: Lisbon Informal Summit / Session of the Intergovernmental Conference, available at: http://www.eu2007.pt/UE/vEN/Reunioes_Eventos/ChefesEstado/IMHSG.htm (last access: 11/05/2009).
- ³⁷ European Commission: Communication from the Commission. A Strong European Neighbourhood Policy, COM (2007) 774, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0774:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 12/05/2009).
- ³⁸ Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. C 303 from 14/12/2007, pp. 1-16, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:303:0001:0016:EN:PDF> (last access: 11/05/2009).
- ³⁹ Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. C 306 from 17/12/2007, pp. 1-271, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:SOM:EN:HTML> (last access: 11/05/2009); Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. C 115 from 09/05/2008, pp. 1-388, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:115:SOM:EN:HTML> (last access: 11/05/2009); Portuguese Presidency of the European Union: Signing ceremony of the Treaty of Lisbon, available at: http://www.eu2007.pt/UE/vEN/Reunioes_Eventos/ChefesEstado/20071023Tratado.htm (last access: 11/05/2009).
- ⁴⁰ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 21/22 June 2007. Presidency Conclusions, 11177/1/07, p. 11, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/94932.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).
- ⁴¹ Council Joint Action 2008/124/CFSP of 4 February 2008 on the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo, EULEX KOSOVO, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. L 42 from 16/02/2008, pp. 92-98, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:042:0092:0098:EN:PDF> (last access: 19/05/2009).
- ⁴² Joint Statement of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries of the European Union and of the wider Black Sea area, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/blacksea/doc/joint_statement_blacksea_en.pdf (last access: 19/05/2009); European Commission: Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament report on the first year of implementation of the Black Sea Synergy, COM (2008) 391, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/blacksea/doc/com08_391_en.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ⁴³ Assembly of Kosovo: Kosovo Declaration of Independence, 17/02/2008, available at: <http://www.assembly-kosova.org/?cid=2.128.1635> (last access: 06/05/2009).
- ⁴⁴ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 13/14 March 2008. Presidency Conclusions, 7652/08, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/99410.pdf (last access: 25/05/2009).
- ⁴⁵ Council of the European Union: Press release. 2870th Council meeting General Affairs and External Relations, Brussels, 26-27 May 2008, 9868/08 (Presse 141), available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/gena/100674.pdf (last access: 25/05/2009).
- ⁴⁶ ReferendumIreland: Results, available at: <http://www.referendum.ie/current/index.asp?ballotid=78> (last access: 25/09/2008).
- ⁴⁷ Joint Declaration of the Paris Summit for the Mediterranean, Paris, 13 July 2008, available at: http://www.ue2008.fr/webdav/site/PFUE/shared/import/07/0713_declaration_de_paris/Joint_declaration_of_the_Paris_summit_for_the_Mediterranean-EN.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).

⁴⁸ Council of the European Union: Council Decision on the signature, on behalf of the European Community, and on the provisional application of certain provisions of the Protocol between the European Union, the European Community, the Swiss Confederation and the Principality of Liechtenstein on the accession of the Principality of Liechtenstein to the Agreement between the European Union, the European Community and the Swiss Confederation on the Swiss Confederation's association with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen acquis, 16459/06 and 16461/06, available at:

<http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/06/st16/st16459.en06.pdf> and <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/06/st16/st16461.en06.pdf> (last access: 11/05/2009); Council of the European Union: 2853rd Council meeting Justice and Home Affairs, press release, 6796/08 (Presse 48), available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/99114.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

⁴⁹ Final Statement, Marseille, 3-4 November 2008, available at:

http://ue2008.fr/webdav/site/PFUE/shared/import/1103_ministerielle_Euromed/Final_Statement_Mediterranean_Union_EN.pdf (last access: 06/05/2009).

⁵⁰ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 11 and 12 December 2008. Presidency Conclusions, 17271/1/08, available at:

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/104692.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Agreement between the European Union, the European Community and the Swiss Confederation on the Swiss Confederation's association with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen acquis, in: Official Journal of the European Union, No. L 53 from 27/02/2008, pp. 52-79, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:053:0052:0079:EN:PDF> (last access: 11/05/2009).

⁵³ European Parliament: Minutes of the sitting of Wednesday 17 December 2008, P6_PV(2008)12-17, pp. 5-7, available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+PV+20081217+SIT+DOC+PDF+V0//EN&language=EN> (last access: 11/05/2009).

⁵⁴ Council of the European Union: Brussels European Council 19/20 June 2008. Presidency Conclusions, 11018/1/08, p. 11, available at:

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/101346.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

⁵⁵ European Commission: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Towards a comprehensive climate change agreement in Copenhagen, COM (2009) 39, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2009:0039:FIN:EN:PDF> (last access: 11/05/2009).

⁵⁶ Council of the European Union: Joint Declaration of the Prague Eastern Partnership Summit, 7 May 2009, Prague, press release, 8435/09 (Presse 78), available at:

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/er/107589.pdf (last access: 11/05/2009).

The IEP is grateful to the *Otto Wolff-Foundation*, Cologne, for supporting the IEP's research activities in the field of "Enlargement and neighbourhood policy of the EU" and thus for contributing to this project. Download the *EU-27 Watch* issues at the IEP's homepage www.iep-berlin.de.

EU-27 Watch is part of EU-CONSENT, a network of excellence for joint research and teaching comprising more than 50 research institutes that addresses questions of the mutual reinforcing effects of deepening and widening of the EU. EU-CONSENT is supported by the European Union's 6th Framework Programme.



www.eu-consent.net