



Analizy *natolińskie*

6(38)2009

JOANNA POPIELAWSKA

Perfect Together?

*Eastern Partnership in the Context
of Other EU Initiatives in the East*

The Eastern Partnership (EaP) was initiated at the EU Summit in Prague on May 7. The project is the fruit of efforts on the part of Poland and Sweden, supported by the Czech presidency. Thanks to the determination of the project sponsors it has been possible to inaugurate it within a very short – by EU standards – period of time. For Poland however, the EaP kickoff is a result of a long-standing campaign to influence the EU's eastern policy, dating back to the time before Poland became a member of the EU.

I. Eastern Partnership beginnings

As regards EU policy, the term “eastern dimension” was first coined in 1998, when it entered the public debate in a speech given at the ceremony inaugurating Poland's EU membership talks by Professor Bronisław Geremek, then the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs. In reference to this initial declaration, three years later (in 2001) the Ministry of Foreign Affairs published a document presenting this concept in greater detail¹. Offering on the one hand its own experience gained in the course of political and economic transformation as well as in the context of integration with EU structures, and on the other the close ties with its eastern neighbors, Poland advocated

tighter cooperation between the EU and the countries east of its borders so as to forestall the rise of new dividing lines. Geographically, the proposal covered not only the direct eastern neighbors of the enlarged EU but rather the entire post-Soviet territory, although with a particular emphasis on Russia and the Kaliningrad Oblast as well as Ukraine. Interestingly, the document handled the question of European aspirations – which, at that time, were being openly voiced by the countries in the region, such as Ukraine – in a very cautious manner.

The concept of the Eastern Dimension as presented in 2001 was subsequently further developed by the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs in late 2002 and early 2003², by which time the discussion within the EU about the Community's new neighbors had begun in earnest, even if it was not at the forefront of the EU agenda. The revised document now defined specific areas of cooperation as well as its goals, while limiting its scope to Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus and Russia. It also stipulated that each of these countries should be approached differently taking into account their individual capabilities and aspirations, which was in line with the thinking outlined in documents then already circulating in the EU. Specifically, there was the idea of differentiation as well as, to a lesser extent, joint ownership by the recipient countries of the policies relevant to them, which in effect was equivalent to having them participate in formulating those policies. Incorporating these approaches within a multilateral framework such as the Eastern Dimension would ensure their enhanced coherence and coordination. Unlike the original document dating from 2001, the version developed in 2003 clearly recognized the European aspirations of Ukraine and Moldova, initially extending to them an offer to enter into EU association agreements.

This proposal, as presented by Poland in 2003, was akin to the concepts then under consideration on the EU forum. It shared a common character and policy tools – if not the ultimate goals and geographical scope – of the other notions, starting with the New Neighborhood Initiative advocated by the United Kingdom, which triggered the debate about future new EU neighbors³, and ending with the definition of the neighborhood policy presented by the Commission in a Communication in 2003⁴. The one crucial difference was that the Polish proposal set more ambitious aims for the EU in its relations with its eastern neighbors. Ultimately, the neighborhood policy drawn up as a result of the discussions within the EU went in an entirely different direction than what was proposed by Poland. First and foremost, the policy failed to

create a singular eastern dimension, instead combining all of the countries on the EU's eastern flank with EU Mediterranean neighbors. This was done at the urging of mainly Spain and France, both of which were concerned about the political and financial marginalization of a region squarely within their sphere of interest. But aligning together the Mediterranean countries – which by definition do not qualify for EU membership and often simply lack such aspirations – with the EU's eastern neighbors not merely called into question but downright threatened the European aspirations of the latter. Poland was also critical of the idea of basing the new policy exclusively on bilateral cooperation between the EU and the respective countries as this approach removed the support necessary to establish regional ties, which in turn initially precluded the implementation of the Eastern Dimension if only as part of the new policy framework. In addition, Poland refused to view the neighborhood policy as an end in itself, deeming it instead to be an instrument whereby the European aspirations of the EU's eastern neighbors would be recognized⁵.

Subsequent efforts on the part of Poland – especially in the wake of the Orange Revolution in Ukraine – were focused on strengthening the links between its eastern neighbors and the EU. In practical terms, this meant seeking to increase the flow of funds to the eastern beneficiary countries of the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) as well as attempting to make the ENP rely to a greater extent on differentiation – not only in relations with individual countries but rather on the regional level. The argument in favor of such an approach was provided by a commonly accepted notion that it is necessary to enhance the EU offer addressed to its eastern neighbors, which are increasingly determined to deepen their integration into EU structures. The stars ultimately aligned when France, traditionally opposed to the eastern dimension, undertook the realization of the Mediterranean Union – i.e. the key project of its last presidency – and thereby was prepared to accept the new initiative in the east⁶. The other EU member states with vital interests in the south followed suit. Certainly

Presenting

the EaP in the context of the EU's other eastern regional initiatives allows for a clearer definition of opportunities and barriers which can be encountered throughout project implementation, especially since the EaP intends to partially exploit the mechanisms used by the other initiatives.

another impulse was provided by the war in Georgia, which clearly demonstrated the need for increased EU involvement in the east.

The Eastern Partnership cannot altogether be accurately juxtaposed with the Mediterranean Union, an equally fresh EU initiative. Admittedly, both of these projects are addressed to EU neighbor states and are strongly – or, in the case of the EaP, entirely – correlated with the European Neighborhood Policy. However, firstly each of the two initiatives pertains to a disparate group of countries with incongruent political, social and cultural identities. Secondly, as already mentioned, while the Mediterranean Union is the sole project being implemented on the EU's southern border, the EaP is one of three initiatives together forming the eastern dimension of the ENP. The first of the other two initiatives is the Northern Dimension, a project that has been up and running since the late 1990s and which formally is not part of the ENP, although it does play a very important role in relations with Russia (Kaliningrad) and will in the future expand its scope to include Belarus as well. The other initiative is the Black Sea Synergy, newly launched in 2007 and firmly rooted not only in the ENP but also in the enlargement process – specifically as it relates to Turkey – and in the EU strategic partnership with Russia. All three of these initiatives – the Northern Dimension, the EaP and the Black Sea Synergy – have unique character, goals and modus operandi. At the same time, they are all addressed to a group of countries resembling one another and vie for similar sources of funds as well as the attention of the same institutions and international actors, while reflecting competing interests of the different EU member states. The EaP is therefore not the first EU regional initiative on its eastern flank, although it certainly is the most ambitious one. For in contrast to the other projects, it aims to authentically bring the countries it is relevant to closer to the EU, up to and including opening to them the perspective for EU membership.

Presenting the EaP in the context of the EU's other eastern regional initiatives allows for a clearer definition of opportunities and barriers which can be encountered throughout project implementation, especially since the EaP intends to partially exploit the mechanisms used by the other initiatives. It is useful then to take a closer look at how these mechanisms really function so as to see which solutions are worth emulating.

II. What is the Eastern Partnership⁷?

The Eastern Partnership envisions cementing cooperation with three eastern neighbors of the EU: Ukraine, Belarus⁸ and Moldova, as well as the three South Caucasus nations of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, both on the bilateral and multilateral levels. This initiative intends to fortify the European Neighborhood Policy toward these countries by enabling them to tighten their links with the EU, especially as regards economic cooperation as well as movement of persons and security.

A decidedly new feature of the Eastern Partnership is its structure around two planes, the primary one being bilateral cooperation and the other one being multilateral cooperation. The main role of the latter will be to promote cooperation between countries on the issues at the heart of their collaboration with the EU.

On the bilateral level, which is to remain the basis of the relations between the above-mentioned countries and the EU, the EaP proposes tightening the relations according to the individual countries' aspirations and capabilities. The substance and form of the planned goals, as well as the speed with which they will be implemented will therefore depend on the individual character of each beneficiary country in conformity with the idea of differentiation. The other basic principle – originally borrowed from the enlargement policy – is the idea of conditionality, meaning that the progressive broadening of cooperation is conditional upon internal reform implementation by individual countries. The most ambitious partners are offered new association agreements, which would not only formalize stronger political ties but also encourage greater convergence with EU legislation and standards as well as promote closer foreign and security policy cooperation. To assist partners in developing the capabilities necessary for the implementation of the reforms stipulated by the new agreements, the EU foresees elaborating comprehensive institutional development programs with each partner.

As regards progressive economic integration it is proposed that agreements to create a deep and comprehensive free trade area be signed with each of the partner states (providing they join the World Trade Organization first). The agreements would in short order provide for increased access to the Common Market as well as sector-specific support to the economies of the partner states which would first have to adopt rele-

vant EU legislation, regulations and standards. In the long term it is envisioned that a Neighborhood Economic Community⁹ be created by linking the partners with a network of bilateral agreements.

With regard to movement of persons, the EU is offering its partners a “mobility and security” agreement. Such an agreement would envision progressive visa regime liberalization by easing visa restrictions (while at the same time implementing readmission agreements), abolishing visa fees, and coordinating and enhancing the services of the EU member states’ consular sections located in the countries involved, including opening shared visa application centers¹⁰. In the long term, which was given special emphasis in the Prague Declaration, cooperation in this area would eventually lead to the establishment of visa-free travel. These steps would be accompanied by initiatives to enhance security and border management as well as combat trans-border crime¹¹.

The new association agreements or separate bilateral agreements signed with the EU would also include clauses pertaining to energy interdependence which aim would be to ensure mutual energy security, especially as regards energy demand, transmission and delivery. Measures taken with respect to individual partners will – in the case of Ukraine, for example – involve its accession (along with Moldova) to the Energy Community¹² as well as lending greater support for full integration of the Ukrainian energy market with its EU counterpart, achieved by the means of natural gas delivery infrastructure repair and development. It is worth noting that as regards the latter issue the Commission has already signed a letter of intent with the Ukrainian authorities¹³.

Addressing structural challenges faced by the partner nations – resulting from differences in their respective level of economic and social development – is also anticipated. This would be accomplished by sharing with them the experience and mechanisms behind the EU social and economic policy.

The goal of the multilateral cooperation is to aid the individual efforts undertaken by the EU partners by creating a forum whereby they would be able to share their reform experience and tips on reform implementation and which would become a conduit of EU assistance to these countries (by enabling, for example, the organization of common information or training sessions, etc.). Decisions on this multilateral level of partnership will be made together by the EU and the partner nations.

Cooperation on the multilateral level will be organized around four thematic platforms:

- Democracy, good governance and stability¹⁴;
- Economic integration and convergence with the EU policies (i.e. access to EU agencies and programs¹⁵);
- Energy security;
- People-to-people contacts.

In an effort to bring both the EaP and its multilateral cooperation dimension into sharp focus it is proposed that several flagship projects be implemented. These signature projects, as enumerated by the Commission, include: an integrated border management system; an SME facility; the promotion of regional electricity markets, energy efficiency and renewable energy sources; development of the southern energy corridor; as well as measures concerning prevention of, preparation for and response to natural disasters and man-made catastrophes.

The multilateral cooperation has also been given a clearly defined structure featuring biennial summits to be attended by country leaders and prime ministers (hosted by the EU and the partner nations), annual foreign affairs ministers' meetings each spring, as well as meetings of senior officials revolving around the four thematic platforms to be held at least twice yearly. The latter will also be supported by special panels, whose composition and form are yet to be constituted. The first working meeting encompassing all four platforms is expected to convene as early as July 2009. Such formula guarantees first and foremost the continuity of this process while providing – in principle, at least – clear political support lent by the gatherings of country leaders and prime ministers.

The projects and the thematic platform work products will be available for review to third countries whose participation will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Although neither the Declaration nor the Communication specifically point to any third countries in particular, some EU member states deemed it important to keep the project open to Russia and Turkey.

The Commission Communication as well as the Prague Declaration also mention a European Parliament proposal initiated by the EPP-ED Group to create the EU-

Neighborhood-East Parliamentary Assembly (EURO-NEST). Aside from MEPs, the EURO-NEST would also include deputies from Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and the democratic factions in Belarus, thus allowing them the opportunity to engage in mutual debate¹⁶. Meanwhile, the Commission was invited to submit a proposal regarding the creation of a special civil society forum within the EaP framework.

As concerns the necessary financial support, the Commission in its Partnership Communication explicitly pointed to additional resources which should be devoted to this initiative. The sum allocated was €600 million for the years 2010-2013, and this commitment was subsequently confirmed by the European Council in a special declaration issued in March 2009. During the Prague Summit, institutions such as the European Investment Bank, the EBRD and other financial organizations operating in the region were invited to participate in this project. The former has already given favorable consideration to this request, expressing the desire to co-finance projects which are within the scope of its priority areas (i.e. transportation, energy, telecommunications and environmental protection). Another existing instrument is the Neighborhood Investment Facility, with €700 million at its disposal. These funds are earmarked for the years 2009-2013 and are available to all ENP beneficiary countries. Poland has also submitted a proposal for the creation of a group of “friends of the EaP” consisting of countries outside the EU which are interested in financially supporting the project. The Commission has been requested to recommend the legal and technical means to implement this proposal. The individual contributions of the member states are the last source of financing. However, the new financial perspective and negotiating an appropriate sum for the Eastern Partnership are the most crucial issues.

Eastern Partnership in the Context of the Development of the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP)

- 2002/2003 British New Neighborhood Initiative; Polish non-paper on the new eastern EU neighbors after enlargement.
- 2003 European Commission Communication entitled: Wider Europe-Neighborhood: A New Framework for Relations with Eastern and Southern Europe.
- 2004 EU Eastern Bloc enlargement. The establishment of the ENP, gradual introduction of the so-called Action Plans regulating the cooperation of the ENP beneficiary countries with the EU.
- 2007 European Commission Communication on the Black Sea Synergy, initiating regional cooperation with the Black Sea nations¹⁷.
- 2006/2007 ENP reform to introduce the terms of “differentiation” and “thematic dimension”¹⁸.
- May 2008 Polish-Swedish proposal to strengthen cooperation with the six eastern EU neighbors.
- XII Communication of the European Commission announcing the Eastern Partnership.
- European Commission working document accompanying the Communication SEC(2008)2923/3.
- May 2009 Summit inaugurating the Eastern Partnership in Prague; proclamation of a common declaration.

III. The Northern Dimension

Policy elaboration background

The Northern Dimension (ND) EU policy was originally a Finnish initiative which aim was to coordinate the actions undertaken by the EU, its member states and Norway and Iceland in their relations with Russia as well as the then EU candidate nations of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Poland. Inaugurated in 1999, geographically the ND initially included the Baltic Sea basin as well as northwestern Russia with Ka-

liningrad Oblast¹⁹. Behind the initiative was Finland's desire to create an EU context for the activities concerning this far-flung northeastern peripheral region. Finland was also seeking to protect its interests in the region ahead of the EU Eastern Bloc enlargement, which was to include countries whose ambitions as regards eastern policy could cause the center of gravity of EU activity to move south²⁰.

The first stage of the ND, which included two action plans for the years 2000-2003 and 2004-2006 and which was based on the classic modus operandi of the European Commission, did not bring about the expected results, primarily because of limited involvement by Russia. Russia was not particularly interested in cooperation with the EU, accusing it of taking a one-dimensional approach in the development of both action plans²¹. After the 2004 enlargement when the entire weight of the ND was resting squarely on Russia's shoulders, Finland – which at the time held the EU presidency – made giving the ND a more open character toward Russia one of its priorities. The ND was recast as a partnership between the sides participating in the initiative – i.e. the EU, Russia, Norway and Iceland – which was the only form of cooperation that Finland believed would lead to constructive cooperation with Russia²². And, in fact, Russia's attitude toward the initiative became more positive from that point on, especially in relation to other EU regional initiatives. At that time, the geographic scope of the ND was also modified, extending it to include the Arctic and the Barents Sea, two regions gaining rapidly in importance. Because of the latter region, Canada and the United States were granted observer status in the ND as well²³.

As the longest-running and generally well-received initiative in the region, the ND often serves as a point of reference – especially as regards its mechanics, but also the principles behind it – for the newly created Black Sea Synergy, the Eastern Partnership, and even for the basic premises of the ENP itself.

Policy mechanics

The ND, in contrast to the other EU regional initiatives in the east, is not part of the ENP but rather an autonomous EU foreign policy tool. It is also distinguished by a unique philosophy that is equitable in character and treats all sides working together under its auspices as partners, which implies full participation in formulating and im-

plementing projects undertaken within the scope of this initiative. Accordingly, it also operates under the principle of co-financing. It is worth noting that the increased participation of Russia in the revamped ND is in no small part a consequence of Russia's greater affluence, boosting its ability to amplify its financial contribution to the projects realized within the ND²⁴.

Furthermore, the ND to a great extent relies on local and regional actors and institutions, including the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, the Council of the Baltic Sea States, the Nordic Council of Ministers and the Arctic Council, as well as the following financial institutions: the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the European Investment Bank (EIB), the Nordic Investment Bank (NIB) and the World Bank. The great number of and the very active role played by these and other institutions present in the region are an important characteristic of the ND.

Finally, as evidenced by examples given below, the ND focuses on politically marginal issues, tackling matters of practical significance revolving around the subject of the EU-Russian border. This is precisely the reason why the ND is deemed a successful initiative, as it skillfully steers around controversial issues in EU-Russia relations as well as among the EU member states themselves.

By design, the ND is a regional expression of the four EU-Russia Common Spaces instituted in 2003. It is intended to serve as an instrument facilitating the introduction of roadmaps for implementation of the Common Spaces where they relate to the ND geographic scope²⁵. The foundation of the identified priority sectors for cooperation within the ND is comprised of the four Common Spaces, including:

- Common Economic Space;
- Common Space of Freedom, Security and Justice;
- Common Space on External Security (civil protection);
- Common Space on Research, Education and Culture.

It also includes issues beyond the four EU-Russia Common Spaces: Environment, Nuclear Security and Natural Resources; Healthcare and Social Well-Being²⁶.

And – as a result of the fact that they are the least controversial – it is within the scope of the latter two areas that the greatest number of projects is being realized.

The ND also possesses an institutional structure which guarantees the continuity of the project as well as the political support of the partner countries. This structure is made up of biennial ND foreign affairs ministers' meetings which define the political direction going forward and monitor prior accomplishments; senior officials' meetings at the ministerial level that take place at least annually, at a time not concurrent with the foreign affairs ministers' meetings; and the specially established Steering Group, a group of experts consisting of representatives from all four sides, which meets three times yearly and manages the activities undertaken within the scope of the ND on an ongoing basis.

The mechanism driving the ND relies on a model of partnership which must enjoy the support of all ND partners, have at its disposal financial resources assigned in advance and, importantly, be autonomously managed. In addition, it must also show measurable results in the ND priority spaces identified above. Currently, there exist two partnerships; one dealing with environmental protection (www.ndep.org) and another one handling healthcare (www.ndphs.org). So, for example, the former operates in two areas, the first one explicitly unrelated to nuclear waste (and thus primarily concerned with municipal wastewater treatment facilities for large Russian urban centers) while the second one specifically deals with radioactive waste management (such as disposal of spent nuclear submarine fuel). Other than the European Commission and several EU member states, its sponsors include Russia and Canada, while the implementation is handled by the EBRD, NIB, EIB, the World Bank and the Nordic Environment Finance Cooperation²⁷.

There is also an information system in place within the ND framework. It can be accessed through the European Commission website and it contains information on regional projects pursued under the ND initiative and grouped by ND priority spaces. Its purpose is to avoid duplication of effort and boost efficiency.

Official ND documents also list a number of other measures not directly implemented as part of the initiative (nor the two partnerships mentioned previously, being the NDEP and NDPHS) but which are comprised within the ND priority spaces²⁸. These measures include Tempus, a program for cooperation with Russia in the area of education, an arrangement for cooperation between Frontex, an EU agency, and the Russian border guard as well as cross-border cooperation under the auspices of the

Baltic Sea Region Program 2007-2013²⁹. Also enumerated in the ND documents are the activities of regional organizations. From this perspective, the ND serves as a point for information exchange and a potential center for coordinating actions taken by the four partners and other actors active in the region. The latter ones are not only invited to Ministerial Sessions but also to Steering Group meetings, which allows them the opportunity to genuinely influence the decisions made on the ND forum.

Currently, starting cooperation in the area of energy is also being considered. Meanwhile, actual work is being accomplished on inaugurating a partnership in the area of transport and logistics.

The exceptional nature of the Northern Dimension

As the longest-running and generally well-received initiative in the region, the ND often serves as a point of reference – especially as regards its mechanics, but also the principles behind it – for the newly created Black Sea Synergy, the Eastern Partnership, and even for the basic premises of the ENP itself. Although during the initial years that the ND was up and running it failed to yield the expected results, the need to coordinate actions impacting the region taken by various external actors, EU institutions as well as EU member states – which is the cornerstone of the philosophy behind the ND – is also the overarching aim of the ENP and is at the core of the regional initiatives submitted to the ND forum. A defining feature of the ND, especially since its reform during Finland's EU presidency, is the principle of partnership whereby all sides have equal status, as well as the principle of joint ownership between the EU and the beneficiary countries, also applied albeit with mixed results to the ENP³⁰. Joint ownership implies active participation of all stakeholders involved, beginning with the stage when the policies are being formulated (as action plans and association agreements). In the case of the ND, joint ownership extends to the co-financing of specific projects.

The ND is nonetheless distinguished from the EaP and the Black Sea Synergy by its unique aims and the region it includes in its scope. Not counting Russia, it encompasses fully democratic countries featuring highly developed economies which can afford to bear the costs of implementing the projects pursued under the auspices of this initiative.

The ND is also not at risk of falling prey to the controversial issue of further EU enlargement. The dissenting positions taken by various EU member states on this issue cast a long shadow on the remaining EU regional initiatives in the east. Meanwhile, Russia – as opposed to for example Ukraine and Georgia – does not seek to attain EU membership, instead choosing to play the role of an EU strategic partner. Employing the principle of joint ownership as the basis for the ENP is thus an attempt to substitute the principle of conditionality, a core concept of the enlargement policy. For the ultimate goal of the enlargement policy – i.e. EU membership – is not offered to the ENP beneficiary countries, although that is precisely what they often aspire to achieve. In turn the newly affluent Russia can afford to participate to a greater extent in the ND project expenses. This increased financial clout contributed to the renaissance of the initiative and makes the partnership assertion more credible.

This is not to say that the ND has no inherent limitations. It lacks the ambition to solve the principal problems plaguing EU-Russia relations, instead restricting its scope to merely addressing rather practical issues concerning limited territory, resolving which does not require making decisions on the highest political level. Cooperation in the area of so-called “hard” security has been consciously omitted from the ND agenda, as have been matters relating to foreign and security policy. Cooperation in the domains of transport, logistics and energy is being potentially considered but as regards the latter area the most controversial issues – i.e. concerning new oil and gas deposits – are shunned. The focus is on adjacent subjects, such as environmental protection, renewable energy sources and perhaps joint initiatives aimed at exploiting the above-mentioned resources³¹.

IV. The Black Sea Synergy

Policy elaboration background

The third – chronologically, the second – regional initiative which, unlike the other two, operates on the southeastern flank of the EU is the Black Sea Synergy. The Black Sea basin region is a whole mosaic of problems and potential threats emanating therefrom, including “hard” security issues as dramatically evidenced by the war in Georgia in August 2008. It is also an area boasting great economic potential, especially for growth in the energy sector which incidentally is of strategic importance to

the EU member states. In fact, up until the time when the discussions surrounding the Black Sea Synergy began and the subsequent inauguration of this initiative, the energy questions and the gas and oil pipelines crisscrossing the region dominated the interest of the member states³². The discussion on the need to better coordinate EU activities in the Black Sea basin intensified in view of the impending Eastern Bloc enlargement and especially the accession of Romania and Bulgaria, which was to shift EU borders to the shores of the Black Sea³³. The need for enhanced coordination of the EU policies already being implemented and for increased commitment to the stabilization, democratization and economic development of the region became the direct motive for the launching of the Black Sea Synergy initiative. Germany led the way, with the new regional initiative in the Black Sea basin becoming one of the priorities of its 2007 EU presidency. The European Commission swiftly seized the baton pointing to the ENP reform announced the prior year, which among other items stipulated the expansion of the regional approach³⁴. Ultimately, the Commission was able to formulate the Synergy and issued a relevant Communication in the same year³⁵.

Areas of cooperation

Compared to the ND, the Black Sea Synergy is a much more ambitious endeavor. Geographically, it includes the Black Sea countries (i.e. Turkey, Bulgaria, Romania, Georgia, Ukraine and Russia) as well as Armenia, Azerbaijan, Moldova and Greece. Its goal is to coordinate initiatives on the regional level which revolve around the problems concerning the Black Sea, especially in such sectors as energy, transport and the environment, as well as movement of persons and security.

In its Communication on the Black Sea Synergy, the European Commission for the first time treats the Black Sea region very clearly as a whole, thereby bestowing upon it a distinct political profile. It is worth noting that as recently as 2003 the EU member states refused to see this region as a sovereign political entity, preferring instead to target their policies individually to the various Black Sea basin countries³⁶.

Three processes, all mainly relying on bilateral cooperation between the EU and the countries of the Black Sea region, form the basis for relations between both sides. The first one is the ENP, which comprises Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, Armenia and Azerbaijan; the second is the enlargement process which includes Turkey; and the

third is the strategic partnership with Russia. The Black Sea Synergy is intended to infuse the existing forms of cooperation with multilateral character in all the areas where it would increase the efficiency of the initiatives being implemented. In addition, the policy aims to enhance coordination between the three processes mentioned above as well as other projects deployed in the region (such as the Baku Initiative in the energy arena³⁷). Its overarching goal, however, is to develop and strengthen regional cooperation, as well as to encourage and support the cooperation of the Black Sea region as a whole with the EU. That is the reason for exerting pressure on the EU to engage with bodies such as the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC)³⁸. The Commission also emphasizes the collaborative character of the initiative which requires active participation of the beneficiary countries (also with regard to co-financing) and is intended to move the initiative's center of gravity away from Brussels and closer to the Black Sea region. Nonetheless, there are no plans to create new institutional structures, unlike in the case of the ND or the EaP. The cooperation within the Black Sea Synergy framework is plainly organized to rely on a thematic approach, defined by the European Commission on the occasion of the announcement of the revamped European Neighborhood Policy in 2006³⁹. The assumption behind the thematic approach is that developing multilateral cooperation with the ENP beneficiary countries will revolve around specific thematic areas, such as transport, the environment or energy.

In the case of the Black Sea Synergy the Commission defines many such areas, including⁴⁰:

- Democracy, respect for human rights and good governance;
- Managing movement and improving security;
- “Frozen” conflicts;
- Energy;
- Transport;
- The environment;
- Maritime policy;
- Trade;

- Research and education networks;
- Science and technology;
- Employment and social affairs;
- Cross-border cooperation.

By defining so many thematic areas the Commission certainly raises the bar – and raises it high – for the Black Sea Synergy, especially since it chose not to omit the most sensitive issues such as resolving regional conflicts which today can hardly anymore be referred to as “frozen”. Although the Black Sea Synergy definitely fulfills a socializing role, it is nonetheless difficult to imagine that this initiative – moderated for the most part by the European Commission – will become the forum where these conflicts are settled.

In the remaining areas much depends on the role of the BSEC, which is meant to sustain cooperation in the region. However, this organization is not especially active in all of the above-mentioned areas, and, worse yet, has to cope with numerous other problems⁴¹. Fundamentally, even the very cooperation between the BSEC and the EU is not exactly harmonious as differences have emerged in the interests of individual BSEC members and the EU, which makes these countries reluctant to elevate certain issues from their current bilateral status to the rank of multilateral cooperation⁴².

At the implementation level – taking the ND as a model – use of a cooperation mechanism, driven by formulating specific goals and executing specific projects intended to help achieve those goals, has been proposed. Experience shows that the biggest potential for such modus operandi lies in the above-mentioned areas of transport, energy and environmental protection. Because of the fact that these areas happen to be the ones where BSEC is most effective one can conclude that the projects emanating therefrom will constitute the essence of the Black Sea Synergy initiative.

Long term outlook

The report summing up the first year of the Black Sea Synergy implementation names activities undertaken in nearly all of the areas mentioned above⁴³. For the most part, however, these activities involve initiatives pre-dating the inauguration of the Synergy, while other activities have not yet moved beyond the study, research or consultation stages. So far, specific new projects exist only in the area of cross-border cooperation

where a common operational program (i.e. the Black Sea CBC Program) involving ten countries in the region has begun. Another example is the transnational program for cooperation in the coastal areas between Romania, Bulgaria and Moldova. Moreover, at the initiative of Romania, the Black Sea Forum was established; its focus is to foster civil society in the region.

The report likewise indicates the future development directions of the Black Sea Synergy, pointing to transport, the environment and energy as well as Black Sea security as areas with the greatest potential for cooperation. Referencing the ND, the report also postulates that similar policy mechanics be used, meaning that the activities pursued by the Black Sea Synergy ought to be based on the model of sector-specific partnerships, especially in the context of financing and the participation of international financial institutions. Bearing in mind that the countries involved in the Black Sea Synergy are considerably less affluent compared with those comprising the ND, the co-financing principle could present problems in the future. However, there lies significant potential in the various manners that the different EU financial instruments can be linked together, thus mitigating the risks⁴⁴.

In a discussion

of the future of the Black Sea Synergy, one cannot overlook the issue of further EU enlargement, nor the proposals to substitute the enlargement policy with one that brings the EU neighbors nearer by establishing a framework for cooperation that is alternative to outright membership.

In a discussion of the future of the Black Sea Synergy, one cannot overlook the issue of further EU enlargement, nor the proposals to substitute the enlargement policy with one that brings the EU neighbors nearer by establishing a framework for cooperation that is alternative to outright membership. In the case of the Black Sea Synergy, this issue relates above all to Turkey. In light of the idea of surrounding the EU with a ring of countries more or less closely associated with it – a concept that is especially popular in Germany – one can infer that the call for the creation of the Union of the Black Sea in place of the Black Sea Synergy is nothing more than an attempt to devise a way for Turkey to draw closer to the EU that would be an alternative to membership. Incidentally, the Mediterranean Union supported by Nicolas Sarkozy is intended to play a very similar role⁴⁵. In the same vein, even before the Black Sea Synergy was inaugurated it was billed as a substitute for the need to ultimately define future EU borders⁴⁶. Meanwhile in Turkey, there are voices deeming full membership

too costly and instead advocating an association on preferential terms, although the explicit foreign policy goal of the main political parties remains nothing less than full integration with the EU. If Turkey takes such a tainted view of the Black Sea Synergy, it may simply become entirely discouraged toward the initiative.

Russia's attitude toward the Black Sea Synergy is also problematic. At the time when this initiative was inaugurated, Russia did not see a need to create new structures for cooperation among countries of the Black Sea region, arguing that even though EU presence in the region increased after the enlargement, both Romania and Bulgaria are members of the BSEC which should remain the primary regional cooperation forum⁴⁷. Accordingly, Russia did not take part in preparing a common position during the Black Sea Synergy inaugural meeting in Kiev in February 2008 attended by foreign affairs ministers, instead preferring a joint EU-BSEC declaration⁴⁸. However, given the launch of the EaP, a new vehicle for cooperation in the region – which although open to Russia's participation does not explicitly include it – Russia's attitude toward the Black Sea Synergy may yet change.

In conclusion, it is apparent that – starting with the highest political level – the Black Sea Synergy is faced with considerable challenges. On the one hand, it is confronted with suspicion on the part of the largest EU partners in the region – i.e. Turkey and Russia – both of which play a major role in the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC), the purported primary EU partner in the whole endeavor. On the other hand, merely a year after the Black Sea Synergy was inaugurated, a new EU project – the Eastern Partnership – throws down the gauntlet to this initiative. The lack of unambiguous political support could in turn directly affect the specific activities undertaken within the Black Sea Synergy framework. As demonstrated by the report summing up the first year of the Black Sea Synergy implementation, the accomplishments are so far rather modest, although in fairness it is difficult to expect meaningful results in such a short period of time.

V. Eastern Partnership in the context of other EU initiatives in the East

In light of the fact that there are three projects dealing with the eastern aspect of the ENP, a question arises as to the long term position of the EaP as an element of the ENP and as to its relations with the other regional initiatives. The latter point is es-

pecially relevant given the multilateral character of the EaP, which according to its authors constitutes its greatest asset.

From the perspective of the EaP, certainly the most important of all the initiatives is its direct neighbor, i.e. the Black Sea Synergy. Meanwhile, the relations between the two projects have been controversial from the beginning. In her first reaction to the joint Polish-Swedish initiative, the European Commissioner for External Relations herself warned against duplication of effort⁴⁹. The work document accompanying the Communication on the EaP issued by the Commission brings up this issue, devoting most of its attention to the Black Sea Synergy⁵⁰. The concern about competition from the EaP has recently been quite forcefully expressed in the European Parliament, where a demand was submitted to create a Union of the Black Sea, which would be modeled after the Mediterranean Union and which would in the long run absorb the EaP⁵¹. Such a measure would definitely strengthen the Black Sea Synergy politically which is what its supporters advocate, but whether it would also serve to tighten the ties binding the EU and its eastern neighbors is rather less certain.

In the work document the Commission emphasizes that whereas the primary goal of the EaP is to develop the potential for its beneficiary countries to integrate more closely with the EU, the Black Sea Synergy focuses instead on the problems facing a specific region (i.e. the Black Sea basin) requiring a multilateral, regional approach. Accordingly, the main objective of the Synergy is to support regional cooperation. Meanwhile, the direct involvement of the Black Sea Synergy unit director – who oversees its implementation on a daily basis – in the preparations for the EaP within the Commission could indicate that the Commission is interested in maintaining coherence within the ENP framework⁵².

Nonetheless, a closer look at the initiatives proposed within the multilateral framework of the EaP reveals that in the Commission documents the same tasks are being discussed for the Black Sea Synergy, in the area of energy for instance. The question that presents itself then is whether the EaP genuinely represents added value, even with respect to energy only, and thus whether the two projects will bolster one another or merely result in duplication of effort. This question is ever more relevant when one takes into account the fact that the inclusion of Belarus in the framework of the Black Sea Synergy is being openly considered. If that came to pass, the Black Sea

Synergy would wind up containing the entire geographical scope of the EaP⁵³. At the end of the day and on the most mundane level the main objective will be to obtain financing, and the resources in the ENP budget are limited as it is.

It is also worth noting that in the not-so-distant past some member states – mostly France and Italy – were advocating for the EaP to include Turkey and Russia⁵⁴, which would be utterly disastrous for this initiative and serves to show just how difficult maintaining the necessary political support for the success of the EaP could be. Incidentally, the EaP remains open to both Turkey and Russia on the multilateral level. These kinds of demands, however demonstrate the diverging priorities of the member states as regards regulating relations between the EU and its nearest neighbors, especially those who openly declare their aspirations for membership. This state of affairs directly translates to the challenges faced by the ENP and undoubtedly presents a challenge to the EaP itself. The controversy around the appropriate term to name the EaP countries in the Prague Declaration was symptomatic of such problems. Ultimately, describing them by the term of Eastern European States seems to have pleased both sides, i.e. both the supporters of further eastern EU enlargement because the adjective “European” was used, and the opponents because the prefix “Eastern” sharply distinguishes them from the unqualified European states.

As previously indicated, similar controversies do not plague the ND, although it is worth keeping this initiative in mind for it may serve the EaP and the Black Sea Synergy – both of which are firmly rooted in the ENP – as an example, particularly from the practical point of view (if not the conceptual). The most frequently cited attribute of the ND is its *modus operandi*, i.e. the model of partnership. A similar model is evoked in the documents pertaining to the Black Sea Synergy and the Polish-Swedish EaP proposal⁵⁵. In this model is where the opportunity to successfully implement the objectives declared for both initiatives can be seen, as the execution of projects based on this framework involves combining various sources of finance and engages multiple actors. That said, it is worth noting that within the geographical scope of the ND there exists a well-developed and very active network of regional and local actors whose involvement extends to all project phases, and especially to the implementation phase. Unfortunately, such an extensive network is not present in central and eastern Europe⁵⁶, and that is precisely the region which the EaP will need to rely on, at least partially, to achieve its objectives. In this context it behooves us to take a closer look

at the initiatives undertaken by the Polish authorities to foster the development of civil society in the regions across Poland's eastern borders, as well as the support lent to the Polish NGOs operating therein.

Also of interest from the perspective of the EaP are the attempts to engage Belarus within the ND framework. Currently, funds slated for use by Belarus are available only within the NDPHS initiative⁵⁷, however since December 31, 2008 – when an agreement to finance cross-border cooperation was signed – Belarus can also take advantage of funds at the disposal of the European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) as part of the Baltic Sea Region Program 2007-2013, which lies within the scope of the ND Common Spaces. If the cooperation in this new area can be successfully conducted, it will be a useful lesson in working together with the Belorussian local authorities.

From the point of view of the other regional initiatives, what is also important is the growing interest in the Arctic region shown by the ND countries, which could forebode the drift of the ND center of gravity toward that region. The shifting interests primarily have to do with the natural resource deposits abundant in the Arctic region as well as with the strategically important transit corridors which will

gradually open up as the Arctic ice cap melts. The European Commission, in its Communication entitled “The European Union and the Arctic Region”, suggests that the Arctic should become a regularly discussed subject on the ND agenda⁵⁸. It also proposes conducting a feasibility study to explore the potential for including the European Arctic region in the scope of the Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP). Moreover, it points to the potential behind the new partnership in the area of energy for supporting initiatives aimed at boosting energy efficiency in the Arctic region. The Commission also exhorts increasing energy efficiency in a separate Communication devoted to the activities of the EU revolving around the Arctic. Meanwhile, the ND partners, in a Communication from the last meeting of foreign affairs ministers held in October 2008, recommended to the Steering Group

Given the political controversy surrounding the EaP and the inconsistent support on the part of the EU member states, the only hope for the project in the longer perspective may well prove to be the European Commission. For this to happen, however, the Commission needs a partner on the other side of the table.

that it investigate what form the actions pursued in the Arctic region within the ND framework might take. Nonetheless, given the multiple sources of controversy among the ND partners surrounding the Arctic, such as the dispute over the continental shelf, it is difficult to imagine that any actions pursued would be far-reaching in scope.

Conclusion

At the present stage the priority is to ensure that the EaP is off to a good start. This not only involves maintaining the relevant political support (also on the side of the beneficiary countries) but also ensuring the appropriate conditions, financial and otherwise, are created. The Polish-Swedish proposal for EaP financing relied on the resources already available to the ENP, emphasizing that in this manner the EaP will remain neutral to the EU budget. This certainly boosted the idea within the EU forum where many countries are reluctant to increase the amount of resources devoted to the ENP, given the current economic crisis and the fact that any such increase would diverge funds from the initiatives on the EU southern flank favored by some member states. The European Commission, in its Communication on the EaP, pointed however to additional financing without which the implementation of the projects stipulated in the Communication would not be possible. The amount of the additional resources was pegged at €600 million for the years 2010-2013, a relatively modest sum but one that nonetheless increases funding for the eastern dimension of the ENP. The ENPI budget will be tapped for some of these resources, while the rest will come from the financial margins in the EU budget for the years 2007-2013. The financial margins are engineered into the EU budget and are intended to provide a cushion for handling unforeseen world events. Whereas the commitment to provide financing from these sources was confirmed in a separate declaration at the European Council Summit in March 2009, some member states admittedly expressed concern about using the financial margins for such purposes, with the United Kingdom, for instance, pointing to the uncertain situation in Kosovo and in Palestine⁵⁹.

Aside from confirming the financing, the European Council declaration also expressed support for the flagship initiatives meant to represent the EaP. Similar assurances were repeated in the Prague Declaration. Indeed, it is extremely important to

begin implementing these initiatives if the offer of assistance directed at EU eastern neighbors is to be seen as credible by the intended recipients. Furthermore, achieving meaningful results quickly would be useful in lending the EaP a sharp clarity of purpose. The EaP adopts very ambitious objectives, not least of which is the resolution of the southern energy corridor issue where two competing projects vie for completion: the Gazprom-sponsored Southstream and Nabucco, favored by Poland. At this juncture EaP competencies cross with those of the Black Sea Synergy which has similar goals in this regard.

The focus of the EaP, however, revolves around new association agreements with the EU, deeper free trade agreements and the liberalization of the movement of persons regime, all of which are tasks characterized by a long time-horizon. Moreover, the latter issue is particularly politically charged although even the presently existing visa concessions are not exploited to the fullest extent, for which Poland is also to blame⁶⁰.

Presently, the EU is negotiating a new generation agreement only with Ukraine. The fact that both partners are already two years into the negotiations just serves to show how difficult the whole process is. Taking that as a reference point, it is clear that judging the EaP will not be possible until a longer period of time has elapsed. Commentators analyzing the odds for the success of the initiative arrive at the same conclusion, especially given the current economic crisis which poses challenges both for the EU member states (including those which are most interested in pursuing the EaP) and the EU's eastern neighbors such as Ukraine which is teetering on the verge of bankruptcy⁶¹. The threat of waning support for the initiative on the part of EU member states themselves faced with internal difficulties is very real, while the danger that the Ukrainian authorities may implement measures that fly in the face of the EaP objectives, such as raising import tariffs, is more real still. At the same time, there are voices asserting that the economic crisis is in fact an opportunity for the project to deliver because the dramatic economic predicament of the recipient countries makes the EU assistance that much more precious.

Given the political controversy surrounding the EaP and the inconsistent support on the part of the EU member states, the only hope for the project in the longer perspective may well prove to be the European Commission. If it succeeds in setting its bureaucratic wheels in motion – implementing specific initiatives and negotiating new

agreements binding the recipient countries with the EU, despite the reluctance of some member states for closer cooperation with the countries on the EU eastern flank – it could well be that the process becomes unstoppable, much like the Balkan enlargement process. For this to happen, however, the Commission needs a partner on the other side of the table. And although the internal situation of the individual EaP beneficiary countries and their very different European aspirations are outside of the scope of this analysis, the ultimate success of this project depends to a large extent on their attitudes.

(May 2009)

JOANNA POPIELAWSKA is a research fellow in Natolin European Centre, Warsaw
(translation from Polish by Michal Nawrot)

¹ The Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2001. EU eastern policy in the context of EU Eastern and Central Europe enlargement – the Polish perspective. Reprint.

² Non-paper with Polish proposals concerning Policy toward New Eastern neighbors after EU enlargement. URL: <http://www.mfa.gov.pl/?document=2041>; The Eastern Dimension of the European Union. The Polish View. Speech by Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs at the Conference The EU Enlargement and Neighborhood Policy, Warsaw, 20 February.

³ Draft Council Conclusions, Council of the European Union 14078/02

⁴ Wider Europe COM(2003)104

⁵ Cimoszewicz 2004

⁶ Before that, during its 2007 EU Presidency, Germany also pursued the same objective, albeit unsuccessfully.

⁷ Based on a December 2008 European Commission Communication and the subsequent May 2009 Prague Declaration.

⁸ At this stage Belarus is offered conditional participation on technical and expert levels only. Future cooperation will be continued depending on the progress of the democratic processes in Belarus.

⁹ The Prague Declaration makes no mention of this point.

¹⁰ Such centers are to be modeled on the already existing facility in the Moldavian city of Chisinau.

¹¹ Among other things, it is proposed that the partner nations receive special status in the relevant EU agencies.

¹² The Energy Community extends common electricity and natural gas market to the Western Balkans countries. Presently, in addition to Ukraine and Moldova also Turkey and Georgia hold observer status therein.

¹³ *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 24 March, 2009, p. 24.

¹⁴ The rather controversial proposal floated with regard to this thematic platform calls for mutual assessment of governance practices. For further reading consult *The Eastern Partnership: context, key Commission proposals and the EP's role*, Dag Sourander, EP Policy Department, 2008.

¹⁵ A detailed analysis of this issue has been conducted by R. Trzaskowski in *How to strengthen the European Neighborhood Policy? Participation of the ENP countries in the Community policies and agencies*, Analizy Natolinskie 1/2009.

¹⁶ European Parliament report on Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), 2008.

¹⁷ Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine, Russia, Georgia, Turkey and Greece, Moldova, Armenia and Azerbaijan.

¹⁸ The term “differentiation” means that the ENP offer addressed to the countries covered by this policy depends on their aspirations and their level of development. “Thematic” approach is one that is characterized by fostering multilateral cooperation with ENP countries within specific thematic areas, such as transport, the environment or energy.

¹⁹ *The implementation of a Northern Dimension for the policies of the European Union*, Conclusions adopted by the Council on 31 May, 1999.

²⁰ H. Haukkala, *Towards a Union of Dimensions: The effects of eastern enlargement on the Northern Dimension*, FIIA Report 2002/2, p. 8.

²¹ P. Aalto, H. Blakkisrud, H. Smith (ed.), *The New Northern Dimension of the European Neighborhood*, CEPS Paperbacks, 2007, p. 8.

²² P. Aalto, H. Blakkisrud, H. Smith (ed.), *Energising the New Northern Dimension*, Policy paper, Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2008, p. 11.

²³ *Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document*.

²⁴ P. Aalto, H. Blakkisrud, H. Smith (ed.), 2007, p. 10-11.

²⁵ *Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document*.

²⁶ *ibidem*

²⁷ The three most generous donors include the EU, France and Russia.

²⁸ *Progress Report for the First Ministerial meeting of the Revised Northern Dimension Policy*, URL: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/north_dim/doc/progress_report_revisednd_281008_en.pdf

²⁹ The Baltic Sea Region Program 2007–2013 could set a precedent for consistent use of funds available through the European Regional Development Fund, ENPI as well as Norwegian and Russian sources, although the latter have not yet been identified. With the 31 December, 2008 signing of an agreement to finance cross-border cooperation from ENPI funds, the Program became opened to Belarus.

³⁰ E. Lannon, P. van Elsuwege, *The EU's Northern Dimension and the EMP-ENP: Institutional Frameworks and Decision-Making Processes Compared*, 2004, p. 69 URL: www.fscpo.unict.it/EuroMed/EDRC5/euneighbours01.pdf

-
- ³¹ P. Aalto, H. Blakkisrud, H. Smith, *Energising...*, URL:
http://www.uta.fi/laitokset/iss/monnetcentre/Energising_the_new_northern_dimension.pdf
- ³² M. Aydin, *Europe's next shore: after EU enlargement*, ISS-EU Occasional Paper no. 53, 2004.
- ³³ Inter alia ibidem; M. Emerson, *Europe's Black Sea Dimension*, CEPS Paperback 2002; F. Tassinari, *A Synergy for Black Sea Regional Cooperation: Guidelines for an EU Initiative*, CEPS Policy Brief no. 105, 2006.
- ³⁴ *Strengthening European Neighborhood Policy*, COM(2006)726
- ³⁵ Black Sea Synergy – a new regional cooperation initiative, COM(2007)160
- ³⁶ M. Aydin, *Europe's next shore...* 2004, p. 33.
- ³⁷ Inaugurated in 2004 at a ministerial meeting on energy in Baku, with the participation of the European Commission and the Black Sea and Caspian Sea countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Romania, Georgia, Moldova, Turkey, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, as well as Russia and Iran as observers), this initiative aims to promote the process of gradual integration of local energy markets with their EU counterpart as well as to support the efforts to transport Caspian oil and natural gas to Europe. Thematically, the initiative also includes transport. Two specific projects being implemented within its framework is the INOGATE program in the area of energy and the TRACECA program in the area of transport.
- ³⁸ Other than the Black Sea Synergy countries, members of this organization also include Albania and Serbia.
- ³⁹ COM(2006)726
- ⁴⁰ COM(2007)160
- ⁴¹ For example G. Karnov, *The EU's Black Sea Synergy; From concept to implementation*, in K.Y. Nikolov (ed.), *The European Neighborhood Policy: Time to Deliver*, Sofia: BESCO, 2008.
- ⁴² M. Aydin, *Europe's next shore...* p. 29.
- ⁴³ COM(2008)391
- ⁴⁴ Because of the countries involved, the funds for the initiatives can be tapped from sources including the ENPI, pre-accession funds (whenever they involve Turkey) and the Regional Development Fund (whenever they involve Romania and Bulgaria).
- ⁴⁵ J.C. MacLennan, *The EU-Turkey Negotiations*, in: C. Arvanitopolous (ed.), *Turkey's Accession to the European Union. An Unusual Candidacy*, Berlin: Springer, 2009, p. 28.
- ⁴⁶ M. Aydin, *Europe's next shore...* p. 33.
- ⁴⁷ A. Ratmann, *EU's new Black Sea policy faces Russian misgivings*, EU Observer 16 February 2007
<http://euobserver.com/aid=23494>
- ⁴⁸ COM(2008)391
- ⁴⁹ Benita Ferrero-Waldner, European Commissioner for External Relations and European Neighborhood Policy at the Parliamentary Conference on the "European Neighborhood Policy East", Brussels, 5 June, 2008.
- ⁵⁰ SEC(2008)2974/3
-

-
- ⁵¹ The contention that the Mediterranean Union would absorb the EaP was included in the amendment no. 50 to the annual European Parliament report on EU foreign policy. URL: http://europarl.europa.eu/meetdoc/2004_2009/documents/am/756/756393/756393pl.pdf
- ⁵² EU assigns funds and staff to Eastern Partnership, EU Observer, 20 March, 2009, URL: <http://euobserver.com/9/27824>
- ⁵³ COM(2008)391
- ⁵⁴ Eastern Partnership for now moneyless, wyborcza.pl, 24 February, 2009, URL: http://wyborcza.pl/1,75477,6310845,Partnerstwo_Wschodnie_na_razie_bez_pieniedzy.html
- ⁵⁵ *Eastern Partnership. Polish-Swedish Proposal*, Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2007, URL: <http://www.msz.gov.pl/Polish-Swedish,Proposal,19911.html> ; Report from the first year of implementation of the Black Sea Synergy, COM(2008)391
- ⁵⁶ More on this topic in: Ch. S. Browning, P. Joenniemi, *The European Union's Two Dimensions: the Eastern and the Northern*, Security Dialogue, Vol. 34, No. 4, 2003, p. 463-478.
- ⁵⁷ *Progress Report for the Ministerial Meeting of the Revised Northern Dimension Policy*, URL: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/north_dim/doc/progress_report_revisednd_281008_en.pdf
- ⁵⁸ COM(2008)763
- ⁵⁹ The EU Eastern Partnership, UK Parliament European Scrutiny Committee, URL: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmeuleg/19-xiii/1903.htm>
- ⁶⁰ EU border crossings monitoring, Stefan Batory Foundation, 2008
- ⁶¹ T. Valasek, *Economic crisis and the Eastern Partnership*, Centre for European Reform, URL: <http://centreforeuropeanreform.blogspot.com/2009/03/economic-crisis-and-eastern-partnership.html> ; N. Popescu, *The Eastern Partnership in crisis*, ECFR, URL: http://ecfr.eu/content/entry/commentary_popescu_eastern_crisis_euobserver/