

Press Kit



The contribution of 14 European think tanks to the Spanish, Belgian and Hungarian Trio Presidency of the European Union

Directed by Elvire Fabry and Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul, *Notre Europe*

Presentation: 4 March 2010

At Egmont II - Rue des Petits-Carmes 24, 1000 Brussels

www.notre-europe.eu/en/tgae

Press Contact :

Stéphanie Baz, sbaz@notre-europe.eu, 00 33 1 44 58 97 84



TABLE OF CONTENTS



ABSTRACTS OF THE REPORT:

PREFACE

INDEX

INTRODUCTION

15 SELECTED RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SBH TRIO PRESIDENCY

THE 14 THINK TANKS AND THE AUTHORS

PRESS CONTACTS

PREFACE

The Spanish, Belgian and Hungarian Trio Presidency of the EU Council comes at the time of a new start. Decisions taken as well as precedents set by this Trio will determine the course of European integration in the years to come. The first element of this start is our need to emerge from the economic crisis and to deal with its social consequences. Despite (or because of) this context, the new EU-2020 Strategy should also be the occasion to ensure a determined transition to a low-carbon economy.

Moreover, the coming into force of the long-awaited Lisbon Treaty should mark the move from a period of institutional reform to one more focused on the elaboration of common policies and projects. Finally, these three rotating presidencies must henceforth share the responsibility of agenda-setting with the newly appointed permanent President of the European Council. The numerous ideas and recommendations contained in this report should help the Trio Presidency to manage this new start in the most effective way. After the publication of the first Think Global – Act European report in May 2008, this second edition brings together fourteen of the most eminent think tanks dealing with European affairs.

“United in diversity” was the spirit that guided the contributors of this volume, as in 2008. However, this time the participating think tanks decided to increase their efforts to foster collective thinking. Firstly, as coordinator of the project, Notre Europe worked closely, within an Editorial Committee, with three think tanks based in the countries of the Trio Presidency, i.e. Real Instituto Elcano, Egmont and GKI. Secondly, some of the papers were written by several think tanks together. Finally, the think tanks’ representatives for the project agreed to select 15 recommendations they wished to bring to the specific attention of the Trio.

As President of Notre Europe, I am proud to introduce here the product of a long and enriching process of cooperation between the contributing think tanks. I congratulate and thank them for the constructive spirit with which they participated in the project. I hope that this report will be considered by the Trio and the European Council President as a proof that cooperative work can produce original, relevant and useful results.

Tommaso Padoa-Schioppa President of Notre Europe

INDEX

INTRODUCTION

Elvire Fabry Notre Europe,
Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul Notre Europe,
Ignacio Molina Real Instituto Elcano,
Jacques Keller-Noëllet Egmont,
Attila Ágh GKI

PART I **SUSTAINABLE GROWTH CONDITIONS** 1

POST LISBON STRATEGY

The EU-2020 Strategy: Re-Launching (and Matching)
the Ambitions for a More Competitive and Sustainable
European Growth in the Globalised World. 7
Jacques Keller-Noëllet Egmont, **Ignacio Molina** Real Instituto Elcano, **András Vértés** GKI

The Challenge of Building a Low-Carbon European Future:
Combining Economic, Social and Environmental Policies
into a Post-2010 Lisbon Strategy 17
Elvire Fabry and **Eulalia Rubio** Notre Europe

Greening the Stimulus Debt. 23
Jakob von Weizsäcker Bruegel

ECONOMIC GOVERNANCE

Governing the Eurozone out of the Crisis. 26
Daniela Schwarz SWP

New Changes and Old Challenges in the Economic Governance
of the Eurozone 32
Clara Crespo Real Instituto Elcano

The Governance of the European Patent System 40
Bruno van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie Bruegel

PART II
ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE CHALLENGES 45

ENERGY

Towards a New Energy Policy for Europe: the Need for a New Framework. **51**
Sami Andoura Notre Europe

Key Strategic Decisions for Europe in Energy and Climate Change **57**
Paul Isbell and **Federico Steinberg** Real Instituto Elcano

The Nabucco Project: Implications for the EU Strategic Energy Review. **62**
Ioannis N. Grigoriadis ELIAMEP

CLIMATE CHANGE

The Climate Change Agreement the World Needs... Rather Urgently **67**
Peter Timmerman for Egmont

Weak Carbon Prices Threaten the EU's Environmental Leadership **73**
Simon Tilford CER

The Missing Link: an Integrated Strategy to Reduce Greenhouse Gas
 Emissions from Transport **76**
Arno Behrens CEPS

The Role of Clean Coal in Addressing Energy and Climate Policy **81**
Agata Hinc demosEUROPA

PART III
A RENEWED ACTION IN JUSTICE AND HOME AFFAIRS 87

MIGRATIONS

The Area of Freedom, Security and Justice:
 a New Horizon for European Integration **93**
Charles Powell and **Alicia Sorroza** Real Instituto Elcano

Achievements and Challenges towards a European Asylum
 and Immigration Policy: the Stockholm Programme and Beyond **99**
Maria Bergström Uppsala University; for SIEPS,
Katrine Borg Albertsen and **Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen** DIIS

Migration Policy-making under the Stockholm Programme and
 the Lisbon Treaty: Getting back to the Serious Business of Governing? . . . **105**
Steffen Angenendt and **Roderick Parkes** SWP

Strengthening EU Borders at the Expense of the Fundamental Right to Asylum? The Externalisation of EU’s Asylum Policy. **112**
Anaïs Faure Atger CEPS

INTERNAL SECURITY AND JUDICIAL COOPERATION

The EU and Counter-terrorism: Next Steps. **117**
Hugo Brady CER

EU Police and Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Law:
 Balancing Efficiency and Human Rights Protection **123**
Ivo Šlosarčík Europeum

PART IV
EU IN THE WORLD 127

GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Internal and External Challenges for the EU: the Economic Agenda of the Spanish-Belgian-Hungarian Trio Presidency **136**
András Inotai Institute for World Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences; for GKI,
Jean Pisani-Ferry Bruegel

Crisis Calls for Greater EU Cohesion to Manage Globalisation **142**
Adam Jasser demosEUROPA

The Post-Crisis Financial Market Agenda. **148**
Karel Lannoo CEPS

Global Governance as Multilateral Regionalised World Order:
 Planning for the Global Role of the EU in the SBH Trio Presidency **152**
Attila Ágh Corvinus University of Budapest; for GKI

FOREIGN POLICY AND DEFENCE

Building a European External Action Service: a Difficult Birth? **158**
Hugo Brady CER, **Natividad Fernández Sola** Real Instituto Elcano

A Realistic Ambition: Setting Priorities for CSDP **164**
Sven Biscop Egmont, **Tomáš Weiss** Europeum

More Coherence, more Normative Power:
 Key Elements in the Consolidation of CFSP / CSDP **169**
János Terényi and **Gergely Romsics** Hungarian Institute of International Affairs; for GKI

Becoming a More Effective Actor in Crisis Management and Post-Conflict
 Peace Building: Strengthening CSDP Missions and Operations. **175**
Muriel Asseburg and **Ronja Kempin** SWP

A New Standard for Fighting Terrorism under the Rule of Law. **181**
Anthony Dworkin ECFR

Integrating Peace, Security and Environmental Priorities
 in EU Development Cooperation Policies **188**
Ruby Gropas ELIAMEP

ENLARGEMENT AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

Enlargement: Stalemate or Breakthrough? **193**
Adam Balcer demosEUROPA, **Vladimír Bartovic** Europeum, **David Král** Europeum

The EU's Role Towards Russia and the Eastern Neighbourhood:
 Between Consultation, Cooperation and Confrontation **199**
Annegret Bendiek SWP, **Andrew Wilson** ECFR

The European Neighbourhood Policy and North Africa:
 Acknowledging Tensions and Putting Reforms First. **206**
Ulla Holm and **Fabrizio Tassinari** DIIS

PART V GOVERNING THE EU: WAYS AND MEANS. 213

INSTITUTIONS

Delivering on the Institutional Reform of the Lisbon Treaty
 and Looking beyond **219**
Paweł Świeboda demosEUROPA

The Distribution of Competences under the Reform Treaty:
 Some Suggestions towards an Improved Policy-Making Process **225**
Filippa Chatzistavrou ELIAMEP

The Potential of the Lisbon Treaty: How one Treaty May Conceal Another? . . **230**
Jacques Keller-Noëllet Egmont, **Sami Andoura** Notre Europe

Differentiated Integration and Flexibility in the EU under the Lisbon Treaty:
 Challenges for the Trio Presidency **236**
Carlos Closa Montero Real Instituto Elcano

Use or Abuse of National Constitutional Requirements in the Dynamic
 Development of EU Treaties? **243**
Carl Fredrik Bergström SIEPS

INTRODUCTION

Editorial Committee:

Elvire Fabry Notre Europe

Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul Notre Europe

Ignacio Molina Real Instituto Elcano

Jacques Keller-Noëllet Egmont

Attila Ágh GKI

The EU Trio Presidency of Spain, Belgium and Hungary (SBH) – beginning in January 2010 and ending in June 2011 – is not just another round of rotating presidencies. It comes at a crucial moment of transition and profound change in European governance, involving new actors, new rules and new priorities.

The challenge is not only about finding the right compromises to put the new institutional apparatus into place but to take its full potential for increasing urgently the efficiency of policy-making at EU level and timely allowing the EU to take fundamental decisions in a worrying international context (I). The Trio is also confronted with an existential problem: with the creation of a stable President of the European Council and an enhanced function of High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, does the rotating presidency still matter and what is the place of the Trio (II)?

Europe in transition?

Alongside renewed Parliament and Commission, the Lisbon Treaty brings a deep re-organisation of institutions. The implementation of the new institutional rules by the current Trio will set a precedent and doubtless determine the conduct of EU affairs for a period, in particular the efficiency of its coordination work with Herman van Rompuy and Catherine Ashton.

However this phase of institutional transition comes in a difficult international context marked by major economic and climate crises. The major challenges at stake for our societies call for urgent and decisive action, and cannot be content with a ‘business as usual’ scenario. Taken together, these facts should prevent Europeans to waste energy on internal quarrels and rather encourage them to think about the role they play and the role they would like to keep on the international stage.

This call for a more global approach is nothing new. It was already at the core of the previous *Think Global – Act European* report, dedicated to the French-Czech-Swedish Trio Presidency, which emphasised the need to better integrate the international context into the conduct of EU policy.

But it is particularly relevant today at a moment of obvious global shift of balance driven by the arrival of the Obama Administration, closer to Europe than the previous administration and yet focused strategically on China; China itself recovering faster than the West from the economic crisis and which the Copenhagen Summit has shown little cooperative; the withdrawal of Russia to an introverted concern for its own interests; and a rebalancing of North-South relations, evident during both the Doha Round and the preparations for a post-Kyoto agreement.

Paying heed to the risk of a deteriorated economic situation (and its social impact) in the months to come, the SBH Trio must bind the institutional transition to a deep transformation of the EU, one which allows it to guarantee sustainable growth in the medium and long-term.

The experts from the 14 European think tanks mobilised in this report have focused on this changing global context, and on analysing Europe's current challenges, in order to address concrete recommendations to the SBH Trio.

More coordination for better efficiency

Without going into the detail of the propositions made in every article and summarised at the start of each chapter, one fact in particular emerges from this collective reflection: today's situation of crisis demands more than ever that Europeans extricate themselves from the excessively segmented framework in which EU policy has developed until now. This leitmotiv appears in each analysis as a warning against the logic of progressive adjustments, which are too slow to respond to the current challenges, of a return to growth, of maintaining EU cohesion, and of the strengthening of emerging economies. It calls for more integrated European strategies.

The eruption of issues like the world economic crisis, climate change, energy supplies onto the European agenda as well as the perspective of the negotiations of new financial perspectives are a call for a transversal approach to EU policy-making, with more active synergies created between policies.

The urgency of European economic governance

The current context of rampant budget deficits and increased public debt will favour neither the completion of the single market nor the structural reforms in employment, productivity-related policy (R&D, higher education, etc.), industry, taxation, and the like. In addition, the divergence between national policies within the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) is increasing.

These issues are at the heart of the current preoccupations of Europe's leaders, who are looking for ways out of the crisis. They demand the thorough revision of Europe's economic governance, with the aim of making the EU an economic actor in the crisis. The institutional agenda, with its planned EU-2020 Strategy for sustainable growth, might not alone be able to meet this challenge.

Whatever measures are adopted to combat the crisis, the options chosen by member states will have negative effects (low spending, with an impact on social protection; higher taxes, resented during a period of zero growth; a spacing out of the costs, which will fall on the next generation; even a return to inflation in order to liquidate some of the debt, etc.). These could be a source of major tension between member states.

Europeans cannot avoid closer coordination on these subjects without the risk of lasting damage to the EU's cohesion. From this point of view, the SBH Trio should give immediate priority to a concerted effort by member states to decide when to end crisis-management policies (concerning central-bank liquidity, massive public debt and state interventionism).

A unique European representation (or at least for eurozone countries) within the G20, IMF and World Bank is also put forward as a means of increasing European influence. As has been seen in trade policy, a single voice is more audible than the cacophony of (sometimes contradictory) voices of the current range of European and national representatives. In place of this representation of disparate interests which harms the common European interest, such a measure would encourage member states to coordinate better between themselves.

Energy for all, but clean energy

The need to guarantee citizens access to energy can today no longer be separated from Europe's self-imposed CO2 emissions targets, nor from the need to increase the competitiveness of European business. If there were one cross-cutting issue which demanded coordination of a wide range of EU policies, it would be this one.

In order to guarantee a constant supply to all Europe's regions, Europeans must create an internal energy market backed up by a major interconnected infrastructure network. By tackling this issue the SBH Trio would be boosting the common interest in this field and facilitating the task of the High Representative (HR) and permanent President in the creation of a Common Foreign Policy for Energy, one which would aim to establish a coherent European position *vis-à-vis* Russia, the Caspian Sea region (decisive for the Nabucco project) and the Middle East, in order to secure oil and gas supplies to the Union's borders.

Mutualising the effort necessary to move energy consumption towards clean sources would be a way of avoiding a situation where measures (stimulating technological innovation, creating sectoral leaders, reducing the cost of clean energy, etc.) are postponed in the name of current budgetary constraints.

Sustainable growth

The adoption in 2008 of the "20-20-20 for 2020" climate package was an important step. But giving Europe a low-carbon economy will be much more difficult than setting objectives. It means a fundamental rethinking of our growth model, and therefore of all policy aiming at economic development. Hence the need to place climate change at the heart of the post-Lisbon Strategy for growth and development. This new Strategy must be able to create synergies between the social, economic and environmental dimensions of policy. A social policy must be considered less as a compensation tool than as a factor of productivity. Similarly, it is vital to build environmental policies which open the way to growth (job creation, competitiveness in low-carbon products, etc.). Instead of trying to reconcile the environment, social policy and economic growth, we must try to make them reinforce each other mutually.

In addition, it would be unhelpful to define this new Strategy without coordinating the discussion with that over the next multiannual financial framework. By taking care to coordinate these two debates, the SBH Trio would help prevent the budget debate from becoming bogged down in the defence of net-contributor and national interests, and would instead be directing the debate towards the objectives of the Union.

It must also be pointed out that we cannot continue to separate the issues of climate change and international trade, even though the complexity of the Doha Round negotiation makes new blockages undesirable.

Strategic thinking in external relations

As the HR and the External Action Service comes into operation, there is particular interest in how these new 'instruments' might play a role in defining a clearer European strategy for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). How to adopt a constructive policy *vis-à-vis* Russia which might allow a stabilisation of the Eastern neighbourhood? What are the EU's crisis-management priorities, and how might the criteria used for trade-offs over tools (civil and military) be clarified? How to integrate the priorities of peace, security and environment into the EU's development cooperation policies? None of those questions can be dealt seriously without an active exercise of clarification of the EU priorities for the CFSP and the CSDP.

Instead of waiting for the next European Security Strategy review in four or five year's time, the Trio should keep the strategic debate high on the agenda of CSDP in particular, possibly feeding the parallel work on the new NATO strategic concept and linking the EU's overall objectives to particular tools.

In addition concerning enlargement and neighbourhood policy, the Trio should be aware of adopting a new vision for a widening process well before the new budgetary period in order to take it into account in its financial consequences.

On all those issues, the Trio will still have a role to play along with the HR, when it will chair the Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER) which will continue to deliberate on all issues of external relations that are nested in the community dimension of policy-making; and via its chairing of the horizontal coordinating General Affairs Council, which will also coordinate various policies that are linked with CFSP tasks and priorities.

Helping to create convergent interests between member states would contribute increasing the influence of the HR on the international stage.

Does the rotating presidency still matter?

Establishing a stable presidency of the European Council had been an objective of several member states for a long time. It was taken up by the Convention that drafted the Constitutional Treaty as a key element of the new institutional set-up and maintained when the Lisbon Treaty was negotiated. For the promoters of that idea, the six-month rotating presidency of the Council prevented that institution from having a consistent long-term and strategic agenda, each presidency wanting to impose its own priorities. It was also intended to avoid the constant change of EU interlocutors in international bilateral and multilateral meetings.

However, the deal that was struck during the Intergovernmental Conference is a hybrid one since the stable presidency only concerns the European Council and not the Council of Ministers.

The system is therefore from now on the following: all the formations of the Council including the General Affairs Council, most preparatory bodies and not the least the powerful COREPER, are chaired by the rotating presidency except for the European Council (chaired by the permanent President, designated for two and a half years) and the External Affairs Council and its preparatory Committees (chaired by the new HR for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy). The Treaty also emphasises the role of the Trio Presidency (successive groups of three rotating presidencies, the list of which is established in advance according to certain size and geographic criteria by the Council) in drafting an 18-month programme that is meant to complement and provide the overall consistency of the three agendas of the rotating presidencies.

This new setting is criticised for its complexity and for its failure to truly address the need for the countries dealing with the EU to be able to identify who exactly speaks for 'Europe'. Several analysts therefore predict that this hybrid solution can only be transitional and that the rotating presidency will not survive what is seen as the 'Brusselisation' of the function of agenda-setting in the EU. The complicated character of the system is indeed clear and disappointing when one remembers that one of the objectives of the Laeken Declaration –which started the constitutional process in 2001 – was to simplify the existing treaties so that they would be more understandable by ordinary citizens.

However the think tanks which have contributed to this report believe that the rotating presidency will continue to play a role. They even argue that this role can actually be very useful provided that it evolves in the most fruitful and complementary way alongside the stable presidencies and that it makes the most of the coordinating mechanism provided by the Trio system. There are two major reasons to believe this to be true:

Firstly, the system of the rotating presidency has some virtues that have tended to be forgotten while devising the concept of a stable presidency of the European Council. One of these is even essential in a period when EU citizens' support for the European project seems at best lukewarm. The rotating presidency has shown itself to be an unparalleled opportunity to "bring Europe" to individual countries. It is a good opportunity for the national government to clarify its priorities in European Affairs, for a better coordination and Europeanisation of its administrations, and an

incentive for national parliaments, political parties and trade unions to get involved in European networks.

Moreover, for six months, the people of one member state are exposed to an unusual level of media coverage of EU affairs, and many official events are organised in their country. We should not underestimate people's pride at seeing their national government lead a union of 27 member states and represent these states in international meetings. Any diplomat who has been active in organising a country presidency would recognise that it has a learning and emotional effect on citizens' attitudes towards the EU that is difficult to achieve in any other way.

Secondly, the rotating presidency has taken on a new dimension with the formalisation of the Trio Presidency. The concept of the Trio has sometimes been criticised as a purely administrative process with no political dimension, but it has a number of obvious qualities. Above all, it creates a link between three countries that are not necessarily used to working together, given differences of size, geographical location, history or levels of support for European integration. A quick look at the last Trio (France, the Czech Republic and Sweden), the current one (Spain, Belgium and Hungary) and the next one (Poland, Denmark and Cyprus) suffices to illustrate that point. Compromises reached within these Trios can be useful to prepare the ground for EU negotiations. The Trio may indeed operate in a way similar to the functioning of the Franco-German axis: a shared position of three sometimes very different member states can become an excellent basis for an EU agreement.

Cooperation between these countries' administrations and diplomacies is not enough in itself, but the virtue of it should not be underestimated. Administrations are key actors in the preparation of decisions, and in their implementation once adopted at the EU level. Fostering a spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding between them should not be overlooked. As for involvement at the political level, this has varied from one trio to the other, but it has improved over the years, and relatively rapidly given that the first 18-month programme was established by the German, Portuguese and Slovenian Trio in 2007. Since then, the work of the Trio has been increasingly visible, as is symbolised by the common logo and website of the current Trio.

Moreover, the Trio formula was provided by the Lisbon Treaty in response to the need for more coordination between rotating presidencies in the presence of a stable presidency. The Lisbon Treaty has only been in force since December 2009, so it would be hasty to condemn this formula before it can find its space in the new system. And there is no alternative for the rotating presidency but to make the most of the Trio if it wishes to keep any credibility in the agenda-setting process, one most likely to be dominated by the stable president of the European Council, who is more easily and more permanently in touch with the European Commission.

So, does the rotating presidency still matter? The answer is yes, for its unmatched potential to mobilise citizens in individual countries, and because it can have a unique contribution to the function of agenda-setting in the EU. However, this contribution will only be heard and respected if it is done in a way that complements the work of the stable president, and if it is made in close cooperation with the other two countries of the Trio as a means of facilitating a Council position.

15 SELECTED RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SBH TRIO PRESIDENCY

1. Ensure that the new General Affairs Council – chaired by the Trio Presidency – fulfils the role of a strategic coordinator of policy-making in the EU.
2. Focus on improving European economic governance and strengthening Economic and Monetary Union within a broadened framework of macroeconomic coordination and surveillance.
3. Endorse a highly constructive role for the Ecofin presidency, along with a pro-active Commission and a strong Eurogroup chair, in order to foster better economic coordination.
4. Maintain the momentum for reform of financial-market regulation, specifically through close coordination with the G20.
5. Strengthen EU influence through a single representation in international bodies, starting with the Eurogroup, in the institutions and forums of world economic governance (G20, IMF, World Bank).
6. Ensure that the EU-2020 Strategy, integrating social, environmental and growth objectives, rests on an in-depth diagnosis of the economic crisis and its social impact. Striving for quick agreement should not take precedence over the need to build a solid political consensus.
7. Identify complementary EU initiatives within a framework of Europeanwide employment policies in order to better meet the challenge of high unemployment.
8. Build an internal European energy market supported by a Europe-wide infrastructure network.
9. Complement the EU climate change strategy by a transport and climate change package, major initiatives on clean coal technologies, and an increase in carbon prices, with the aim of preserving the credibility of the EU's emissions trading scheme.
10. Guarantee that cooperation with third countries concerning illegal immigration and pre-border controls does not undermine the right of asylum and other human rights obligations.
11. Work with the United States towards shared priorities on counter-terrorism, specifically on aid for North and West Africa as well as stabilising Pakistan.
12. Help the High Representative set up a European External Action Service (EEAS) that adds real value to EU foreign policy. The EEAS should be given the means to deliver high-quality political reporting and to tackle energy, migration, and security issues.
13. Contribute to a peaceful debate on enlargement in order to maintain the issue high on the agenda, with a clearer roadmap, and to make sure that the momentum for reform in the countries applying for accession is not damaged.
14. Encourage intensified dialogue with national parliaments in order to foster constructive attitudes in a way that allows EU affairs to enter the national political scene earlier in the policy-making process.
15. Start the debate on the revision of the EU budget with a clear understanding of political priorities and common principles, such as coherent and consistent EU funding for traditional policies (particularly Cohesion and Agriculture) and for new priorities (such as the EU-2020 Strategy); work on overcoming the net-contributor logic, linking revenue and spending sides and reforming the Common Agriculture Policy beforehand.

Signatories: *Attila Ágh* Corvinus University/GKI, *Adam Balcer* demosEUROPA, *Hugo Brady* CER, *Filippa Chatzistavrou* Eli amep, *Elvire Fabry* Notre Europe, *Jacques Keller-Noëllet* Egmont, *Thomas Klau* ECFR, *David Král* Europeum, *Piotr Maciej Kaczyn'ski* CEPS, *Ignacio Molina* Real Instituto Elcano, *Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul* Notre Europe, *Daniela Schwarzer* SWP, *Anna Stellingner* SIEPS, *Fabrizio Tassinari* DISS

THINK TANKS AND AUTHORS

NOTRE EUROPE, PARIS (TGAE Founder and Coordinator)



Notre Europe (www.notre-europe.eu) is a European independent think tank dedicated to promoting closer European unity. Under the guidance of Jacques Delors, the association's aim since 1996 has been to "think a united Europe."

This involves participating in current debates from a vantage point of informed positions based upon thorough policy analysis and relevant policy proposals that are designed to help Europeans achieve closer unity. It also entails fostering the active involvement of citizens and civil society in the process of European integration and in the emergence of a European public space. Its analyses and policy proposals focus upon four themes: Visions of Europe; European democracy in action; Competition, cooperation and solidarity; Europe and world governance. Notre Europe is committed to maintaining strict independence of thought as well as work, in keeping with the spirit of promoting the public good. The association was successively headed by Jacques Delors (1996-2004), Pascal Lamy (2004-2005), and Tommaso Padoa-Schioppa (since November 2005).

Contributors:

- Dr. Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul, Secretary General
- Sami Andoura, Research Fellow
- Nadège Chambon, Research Fellow
- Dr. Elvire Fabry, Research Associate
- Dr. Eulalia Rubio, Research Fellow

EGMONT Royal Institute for International Relations, BRUSSELS

EGMONT – The Royal Institute for International Relations (www.irri-kiib.be) is an independent think tank based in Brussels. Its interdisciplinary research is conducted in a spirit of total academic freedom. Drawing on the expertise of its own research fellows, as well as that of external specialists, both Belgian and foreign, it provides analysis and suggests international policy options that are meant to be as operational as possible.

Along with research and meetings, the Institute has also developed specialised training activities both in Brussels and abroad. It can, on request, offer specific programmes for visiting and resident diplomats and foreign professionals.

Closer collaboration with other research centres, both in Belgium and in the rest of Europe and beyond, has resulted in a growing number of joint conferences and in more structured cooperation on research and publications. It has proved to be mutually beneficial and enriching. The president of EGMONT is Étienne Davignon.

Contributors:

- Dr. Sven Biscop, Director of Security and Global Governance Programme
- Jacques Keller-Noëllet, Senior Research Fellow
- Peter Timmerman, Former Research Fellow

ELCANO Royal Institute, MADRID



The Elcano Royal Institute (www.realinstitutoelcano.org) is a private entity, independent of both the public administration and the companies which provide most of its funding. It was established on 27 December 2001, under the honorary presidency of HRH the Prince of Asturias, for the purpose of generating ideas on the international scenario and on Spain's strategic options in international relations that are of practical use to politicians, the business world, academics, the media and public opinion at large.

From its inception, the Elcano Royal Institute considers itself a non-partisan – but not neutral – institution that seeks to promote the values by which it was inspired and which, by means of multidisciplinary analysis of existing and, especially, forward developments, aims to establish a global strategy resulting in political proposals having a practical application. The chairman of the Elcano is Gustavo Suárez Pertierra.

Contributors:

- Dr. Charles Powell, Deputy Director
- Dr. Carlos Closa Montero, Research Associate
- Clara Crespo, Research Associate
- Dr. Natividad Fernández Sola, Research Associate
- Paul Isbell, Senior Analyst
- Dr. Ignacio Molina, Senior Analyst
- Alicia Sorroza, Analyst
- Dr. Federico Steinberg, Senior Analyst

GKI Economic Research Co, BUDAPEST



GKI Co. (www.gki.hu) is the market leader in the market of independent macroeconomic analyses and forecasts. It continues and refreshes the best traditions of its predecessor, the Economic Research Institute (established in 1928 by István Varga). It uses the most up-to-date domestic and foreign research achievements and the methods developed in the European Union. It is member of the AIECE - Association of European Conjuncture Institutes and of the joint organisation of institutions that follow the economic expectations (CIRET - Centre for International Research on Economic Tendency Surveys). Its basic principle is the objectivity: it regularly revises and publicly corrects its forecasts.

GKI Economic Research Co. continuously develops and expands its activity. By 2002 it had developed into a group of companies. It is the majority owner of the: GKINET Internet Research and Consulting Ltd.; GKI Health Care Research Institute Ltd.; GKI Energy Research and Consulting Ltd.; GKI Consulting Ltd. The president of GKI is András Vértés.

Contributors:

- Dr. Attila Ágh, Department of Political Science, Corvinus University of Budapest
- Dr. András Inotai, Director of the Institute for World Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
- Dr. Gergely Romsics, Research Fellow at the Hungarian Institute of International Affairs
- Amb. János Terényi, Director of the Hungarian Institute of International Affairs
- András Vértés, Chairman

10 Associated Think Tanks:

BRUEGEL, BRUSSELS



Bruegel (www.bruegel.org) is a European think tank devoted to international economics. It was created in Brussels in early 2005 with the intention of bringing a new voice into Europe's economic policy discussions.

Its governance and funding model makes Bruegel unique, being the only think tank partly funded by EU member states. It is supported by 16 European governments, as well as a number of leading private corporations.

Bruegel does not represent any particular policy doctrine. It aims to contribute to economic policymaking in Europe through open, fact-based and policy-relevant research, analysis and discussion. The director of Bruegel is Jean Pisani-Ferry.

Contributors:

- Jean Pisani-Ferry, Director
- Dr. Bruno van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie, Senior Research Fellow
- Jakob von Weizsäcker, Research Fellow

CEPS, BRUSSELS



Founded in Brussels in 1983, the Centre for European Policy Studies (www.ceps.be) serves as a leading forum for debate on EU affairs, but its most distinguishing feature lies in its strong in-house research capacity, complemented by an extensive network of partner institutes throughout the world.

CEPS' funding is obtained from a variety of sources, including membership fees, project research, foundation grants, conference fees, publication sales and an annual grant from the European Commission.

The goals of the CEPS are essentially to carry out state-of-the-art policy research leading to solutions to the challenges facing Europe today; to achieve high standards of academic excellence and maintain unqualified independence; to provide a forum for discussion among all stakeholders in the European policy process; to build collaborative networks of researchers, policy-makers and business representatives across the whole of Europe; to disseminate our findings and views through a regular flow of publications and public events. The chairman of CEPS is H. Onno Ruding.

Contributors:

- Karel Lanno, Chief Executive Officer
- Arno Behrens, Research Fellow
- Anaïs Faure Atger, Researcher
- Piotr Maciej Kaczyński, Research Fellow

CER, LONDON



The Centre for European Reform (www.cer.org.uk) is a think tank devoted to improving the quality of the debate on the European Union. It is a forum for people with ideas from Britain and across the continent to discuss the many political, economic and social challenges facing Europe. It seeks to work with similar bodies in other European countries, North America and elsewhere in the world. The CER is pro-European but not uncritical. It regards European integration as largely beneficial but recognises that in many respects the Union does not work well. The CER therefore aims to promote new ideas for reforming the European Union.

The CER makes a point of bringing together people from the worlds of politics and business. The conclusions of our research and seminars are reflected in our publications, as well as in the private papers and briefings that senior officials, ministers and commissioners ask us to provide. The CER's work is funded by donations from the private sector. It has never received core funding from governments or EU institutions. The director of CER is Charles Grant.

Contributors:

- Hugo Brady, Senior Research Fellow
- Simon Tilford, Chief Economist

demosEUROPA, WARSAW



demosEuropa – Centre for European Strategy (www.demoseuropa.eu) is an international, non-partisan, policy-oriented research institution which aims to provide answers to the challenges facing the European Union, its Member States and its citizens. It is a forum for ideas about the political, social and economic dimension of European integration and international relations. demosEuropa – Centre for European Strategy has four programmes which have to do with the political aspects of European integration, economic reform in the EU, sustainability and the EU's role in the world. The think tank publishes policy papers and reports formulated on the basis of interactive discussions, conferences and seminars. The president of demosEUROPA is Paweł Świeboda.

Contributors:

- Paweł Świeboda, President
- Adam Balcer, Senior Fellow, Project Leader, EU Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy
- Agatha Hinc, Project Leader, Low Emission Economy
- Adam Jasser, Member of the Board, Director of Programmes

DIIS, COPENHAGEN



The Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS, www.diis.dk) is an independent research institution engaged in research in international affairs. The institute started activities on 1 January 2003. The institute draws up reports and analyses and follows developments in international affairs continuously in order to assess the security and foreign policy situation of Denmark.

DIIS also communicates research findings, analyses and knowledge, and performs functions concerning documentation, information and library services. Furthermore, DIIS contributes to the education of researchers, supports the development of research capacity in developing countries and establishes contacts between Danish and international research environments.

DIIS's research and activities are organized in several research units and a few major commissioned works. DIIS and the Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) together constitute the Danish Centre for International Studies and Human Rights (DCISM), sharing a common administration and library.

The chairman of DIIS is Georg Sørensen. The management of the institute is the responsibility of the director, Nanna Hvidt.

Contributors:

- Katrine Borg Albertsen, Researcher
- Dr. Ulla Holm, Senior Researcher
- Dr. Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen, Project Researcher
- Dr. Fabrizio Tassinari, Head of Research Unit, Foreign Policy and EU studies

ECFR, LONDON-MADRID-BERLIN-PARIS- SOFIA



The European Council on Foreign Relations (www.ecfr.eu) was launched in October 2007 to promote a more integrated European foreign policy in support of shared European interests and values. ECFR was founded by a Council whose members include serving and former ministers and parliamentarians, business leaders, distinguished academics, journalists and public intellectuals. ECFR has developed a strategy with three distinctive elements that define its activities: a pan-European Council; a physical presence in the main EU member states; and a distinctive research and policy development process. With its unique structure, ECFR brings a genuinely pan-European perspective on Europe's role in the world.

ECFR's pan-European work through advocacy, the mass media and campaigns make the necessary connections between innovative thinking, policy-making and civic action. The director of ECFR is Mark Leonard.

Contributors:

- Anthony Dworkin, Senior Policy Fellow
- Dr. Andrew Wilson, Senior Policy Fellow

ELIAMEP, ATHENS



Established in 1988, the Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (www.eliamep.gr) is an independent, non-profit and policy-oriented research and training institute situated in Athens, Greece.

Eliamep's mission is to provide a forum for public and political debate on issues of European integration and international relations and to conduct scientific research that supports policy makers in making informed decisions.

Eliamep provides decision-makers, both in the public and private sectors in Greece, Europe and beyond, with authoritative and independent information, analysis and proposals for action. The president of Eliamep is Loukas Tsoukalis.

Contributors:

- Dr. Filippa Chatzistavrou, Research Fellow
- Dr. Ioannis N. Grigoriadis, Research Fellow
- Dr. Ruby Gropas, Research Fellow

EUROPEUM, PRAGUE



Europeum Institute for European Policy (www.europeum.org) is a non-profit, non-partisan and independent institute. It focuses on the issues of European integration and its impact on the transformation of political, economic and legal milieu in the Czech Republic. Europeum strives to contribute to a long-lasting development of democracy, security, stability, freedom and solidarity across Europe.

Europeum formulates opinions and offers alternatives to internal reforms in the Czech Republic with a view of ensuring her full-fledged membership and respected position in the European Union. Its mission statement is: *"Czech visions for Europe, European visions for the Czechs"*. The director of Europeum is David Král.

Contributors:

- David Král, Director
- Vladimír Bartovic, Research Fellow
- Lukáš Pachta, Research Fellow
- Ivo Šlosarčík, Director of Research
- Tomáš Weiss, Research Fellow

SIEPS, STOCKHOLM



The Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies (www.sieps.se) conducts and promotes research on European policy and policy-making. The research is conducted under three broad themes: power and democracy; the external dimensions of the European Union; consequences of EU policies. SIEPS considers that it is important to broaden and intensify research into matters that are significant for the future development of the European Union and, towards that end, actively seeks to develop close cooperation with institutes and research centres in Europe and globally. SIEPS strives to act as a link between the academic world and policy-makers at various levels. By publishing reports and arranging seminars and conferences, SIEPS aims to further stimulate research on the future of Europe. The director of SIEPS is Anna Stellingner.

Contributors:

- Dr. Maria Bergström, Research Fellow at Uppsala University
- Dr. Carl Fredrik Bergström, Researcher
- Göran von Sydow, Researcher

SWP, BERLIN



The Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik – German Institute for International and Security Affairs (www.swp-berlin.org) is an independent scientific establishment that conducts practically oriented research on the basis of which it then advises the Bundestag (the German parliament) and the federal government on foreign and security policy issues. The analyses and publications produced by SWP researchers and their participation in national and international debates on key issues help to shape opinion in their respective domains. Since January 1965, the Institute has been federally funded. This support is supplemented by contributions from other research sponsors. The director of SWP is Dr. Volker Perthes.

Contributors:

- Dr. Steffen Angenendt, Senior Associate
- Dr. Muriel Asseburg, Head of the Middle East and Africa Research Division
- Peter Becker, Senior Associate
- Dr. Annegret Bendiek, Research Fellow
- Dr. Ronja Kempin, Research Fellow
- Roderick Parkes, Head of Brussels office
- Dr. Daniela Schwarzer, Head of the EU Integration Research Division

PRESS CONTACT



Ms. **Stéphanie Baz**, Communications Officers, sbaz@notre-europe.eu, 00 33 1 44 58 97 84

This press kit, the Press release and the report
“Think Global – Act European”
are available online:

www.notre-europe.eu/en/tgae

