



Project no: **028386**

Project acronym: **GO-EuroMed**

Project title: **The Political Economy of Governance in the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership**

Madrid Conference Report

March 2008, Madrid

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Conference 1<sup>st</sup> day</b> .....	3
1.1. Public conference agenda .....	3
1.2. Minutes of public meeting .....	5
<b>2. Conference 2<sup>nd</sup> day: internal meeting agenda</b> .....	9
2.1. List of Participants at the internal meeting.....	10
2.2. Minutes of internal meeting.....	11
2.2.1. Stage II Summary Report (Chair: Thierry Montalieu) .....	11
2.2.2. WP11: Domestic institutions (Chair: Pablo Gándara).....	12
2.2.3. WP12: Bilateral institutions (Chair: Nada Zouag).....	13
2.2.4. WP13: Multilateral institutions.....	13
2.2.5. Wrapping-up: Stage III - The way forward.....	13
<b>3. Picture Gallery</b> .....	14

### **Executive Summary/Abstract**

The 3<sup>rd</sup> GO-EuroMed conference took place in Madrid on 21st-22nd of February 2008. The meeting was hosted by University San Pablo CEU. The conference's 1st day consisted of a public event called "The Euro-Mediterranean Dialogue: a Challenge for the XXI Century". The event was attended by scholars from Spain, journalists and general public, and broadcasted online. Experts from politics and academia discussed at three panels about the future of the EMP. Particularly remarkable was the debate about the institutional future of the EMP in the light of France's proposal for a Union for the Mediterranean. The conference's 2nd day consisted of a GO-EuroMed internal meeting for discussing the way forward towards research on stage 3. Participants agreed on a common approach and on cooperation procedures. Internal deadlines for presenting research results were set. The GO-EuroMed consortium would like to thank the European Commission Directorate General Research for their generous support for this project under the 6th Framework Programme. The Consortium also extends its appreciation to the staff of Institute for European Studies CEU, University San Pablo, whose hospitality made this event a pleasure for all concerned.

## 1. Conference 1<sup>st</sup> day

### 1.1. Public conference agenda

<b>GO-EuroMed, Madrid Conference</b> <b>“The Euro-Mediterranean Dialogue, a Challenge for the Twenty First Century”</b> <b>21 February 2008, University Institute for European Studies, Spain</b>	
10:30 a.m	<b>Opening Ceremony and Conference</b>  Alfonso Bullón de Mendoza Vice - Chancellor. CEU San Pablo University  Marcelino Oreja President. University Institute for European Studies. CEU San Pablo University  Mark Furness Senior Researcher. Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence. Freie University of Berlin  José Maria Beneyto Director. University Institute for European Studies. CEU San Pablo University  <i>Speaker</i>  Fidel Sendagorta Gómez del Campillo Special Ambassador for Mediterranean Affairs. Spanish Foreign Affairs Ministry
11:30 a.m.	<b>Coffee Break</b>
12:00 a.m.	<b>Panel discussion: The Future of the Barcelona Process</b>  <i>Chairman</i>  Miguel Ángel Bastenier Subdirector of International Relations. Diary El Pais  <i>Discussants</i>  Bichara Khader Director. Centre for Studies and Research on Arab World. University of Louvain  Ibrahim Saif Director. Centre for Strategic Studies. University of Jordan  Abdelfetah Daghmoum

13:30 p.m.	<p>Plenipotentiary Minister of the Democratic and Popular Argelian Republic</p> <p><b>Lunch</b></p>
16:00 p.m.	<p><b>Panel discussion: The European Neighbourhood Policy, an Opportunity for the Mediterranean?</b></p> <p><i>Chairman</i></p> <p>Bhari Yilmaz. Professor. Istanbul Policy Center. Sabanci University</p> <p><i>Discussants</i></p> <p>Hugues Mingarelli Deputy General Director for Eastern Europe, South Caucasus, Central Asia, North Africa, Middle East and European Neighbourhood Policy. DG for External Relations. European Commission</p> <p>Senén Florensa General Director. European Institute for the Mediterranean (IEMed)</p> <p>Álvaro Vasconcelos Director. European Union Institute for Security Studies</p> <p>Gema Martín Muñoz General Director. Arab House – IEAM</p>
18:00 p.m.	<p><b>Panel discussion: Recent Developments and Cooperation Initiatives in the Mediterranean</b></p> <p><i>Chairman</i></p> <p>José Maria Benyeto. Director. University Institute for European Studies. CEU San Pablo University</p> <p><i>Discussants</i></p> <p>Bruno Delaye Ambassador of France in Spain</p> <p>Haizam Amirah Fernández. Principal Researcher. Elcano Real Institute for International and Strategic Studies</p> <p>Gemma Aubarell Programme Director. European Institute for the Mediterranean (IEMed)</p>
19:45 p.m.	<p><b>Closing Ceremony</b></p>

	<p>Álvaro Iranzo Gutiérrez General Director of Foreign Policy for the Mediterranean, Middle East and Africa. Spanish Foreign Affairs Ministry</p> <p>Alfredo Dagnino President. San Pablo CEU University Foundation</p> <p>José María Beneyto Director. University Institute for European Studies. CEU San Pablo University</p>
--	---

## 1.2. Minutes of public meeting

### 1st Session

Alfonso Bullón de Mendoza, Vice – Chancellor of the CEU San Pablo University, welcomed participants from European and MENA countries to the conference and referred to the dissemination work of CEU San Pablo University towards the European Union.

Marcelino Oreja, President and Director of the University Institute for European Studies at CEU San Pablo University, inaugurated the conference by referring to the crucial momentum of the EMP. He underlined the need to reflexion about institional setting of the Barcelona Process in order to achive its ambicious goals. Nevertheless, the most important dimesnion of the EMP is the dialogue between civilizations.

Mark Furness, Senior Researcher of the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence at the Free University of Berlin presented the main results of GO-EuroMed Stage II. The Barcelona Process conveys two distinct advantages to its member governments: first, it facilitates the coordination of policy reform efforts among Mediterranean Partner Countries (MPCs) and Europe, providing a stable environment within which governments and other actors can negotiate with each other. Second, dialogue and exchange in the context of the Barcelona process may help create windows of opportunity for mutually beneficial agreements, particularly as changes in political or market circumstances influence government preferences.

Fidel Sendagorta Gómez del Campillo, Special Ambassador for Mediterranean Affairs of the Spanish Foreign Affairs Ministry, hold a key note on the state of the art in the EMP. He stressed the fact that France’s proposal for a Mediterranean Union has launched a vivid debate about the future of the EMP. Nevertheless he underlined the need for a common European initiative, which would consider all EU member states. The value added of the Med Union would rely on the high-level political commitment (yearly meetings of heads of state) and on the focus on big integration projects. Among the largest challenges for the EMP is the economic development of the MPCs, especially in light of the demographic growth. Mr. Sendagorta mentioned the strong presence of Asian, US & Gulf companies in the Southern Mediterranean, which would by far take more advantages than European companies do.

José Maria Beneyto, Director of the University Institute for European Studies CEU at San Pablo University, presented the GO-EuroMed research project, which assembles a team of economics and political science institutes from European Union and Mediterranean Partner Countries. The three year project aims to identify multilateral, bilateral and domestic institutional design and management strategies for furthering the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership’s governance objectives. Research is generously funded by the European Commission under its 6th framework programme. The project’s major milestones are its conferences and related publications, its deliverable working package reports, its annual activity reports, its workshops and its public

awareness local meetings (PALMs). Since the project started in January 2006, conferences have taken place in Berlin, Istanbul and Madrid. The final conference will take place in Brussels in December 2008. The consortium has held workshops in Warsaw, Orléans, Amman and Ifrane, and will meet in Beirut and Berlin in 2008. These events bring the consortium together to develop and disseminate research. The project's second year output is extensive: 18 working papers on the key challenges that the Euro-Mediterranean partnership is facing during the next decade have been published and are available for download from the project website. This summary has been compiled by the JMC Berlin on the basis of these working papers, with the objective of providing a concise overview of the main outcomes of the project's second phase. Naturally, this summary can never reflect fully the depth and breadth of the work of all of our consortium members, and the JMC-Berlin asks that readers refer to the working papers themselves. The GO-EuroMed project's Stage II publications are available along with further information, news and updates at [www.go-euromed.org](http://www.go-euromed.org).

### **Panel 1: The Future of the Barcelona Process**

During his introductory notes, Miguel Ángel Bastenier Miguel Ángel Bastenier, Subdirector of International Relations of the Spanish Newspaper El País, referred to the new Roadmap in the Middle-East conflict agreed in Annapolis in November 2007.

Prof. Ibrahim Saif, Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies (CSS) at the University of Jordan, referred to the goals of the EMP, specifying that people would lose faith if the EMP keeps its modest performance. For instance, whereas FDI from EU to the Mediterranean region is declining, other regions are investing more than before. At the same time, the trade deficit between both the MPCs and the EU is continuously increasing. With regard to stability, he asked to question which kind of stability we want, as maintaining status quo would mean losing stability in the long term. Domestic reforms, like education would need a radical & fast implementation. On the security dimension of the ENP, Dr. Saif criticized the EU for not being present at the Annapolis meeting with a common position. Finally Mr. Saif referred to the US policies in the region and to the need for coordination with EU policies.

Prof. Bichara Khader, Director of the Centre for Studies and Research on Arab World at the University of Louvain, referred first to the policy advocacy of Spain for the EMP in the European Union. With regard to the ambitious goals of the Barcelona declaration, he balanced that today there is a positive economic development, although catching-up with the European economies would remain a long term objective. In the political field, he stressed Morocco's and Egypt's efforts for implementing democratic reforms, although only Lebanon and the Palestinian Territories would be the only authentic democratic regimes. Therefore the EU's embargo on Hamas would damage credibility of EU policies in the region. Prof. Khader concluded that although the 1995 committed goals would remain very ambitious, the EMP has not failed. He also stressed that the Mediterranean Union would be an attempt of France to counter-rest Germany's East European policy and that this proposal could be very positive.

The representative of the Embassy of the Democratic and Popular Algerian Republic in Spain focused on the relationship between the ENP and the EMP. He pointed out that new institutional settings of cooperation -like the intended Mediterranean Union- could be helpful only if agreed commitments would be implemented (unlike EMP's FTA). Mr. NN underlined that Algeria has 3 core aspects on the EMP: 1) Dialogue about security policy, 2) Implementation of free movement of persons and cooperation on migration issues, and 3) increasing EU FDI's to Algeria. He noted that Algeria has a 5<sup>th</sup> generation cooperation agreement with the EU, including technology transfer which should be a key topic for further cooperation.

### **Panel 2: The European Neighbourhood Policy, an opportunity for the Mediterranean?**

Mr. Hugues Mingarelli, Deputy General Director for Eastern Europe, South Caucasus, Central Asia, North Africa, Middle East and European Neighbourhood Policy at the DG for External Relations in the European Commission, focused on the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). Mr. Mingarelli noted that the ENP was originally not designed for the MPCs, but for Eastern Europe after the expected 5<sup>th</sup> EU enlargement round. However, the ENP is compatible with the EMP as its key objective is the gradual integration of economies into the EU single market. Also EU's Eastern European and Southern neighbours share challenges like migration management and fighting trafficking and organized crime. He noted that the European Commission make strong efforts for dismantling both tariff and non-tariff barriers, assisting MPCs in the implementation of EU's *aquis communitaires*. Also in the infrastructure the EU has helped to improving electricity and pipelines connections in the South and East Mediterranean region. Mr. Mingarelli also referred to the achievements of the EMP and ENP in the MPCs, especially functioning as reference points for the own reform agenda. However the ENP hasn't been able to shorten the economic gap between both sides of the Mediterranean shore. Mr. Mingarelli mentioned EU's efforts towards liberalizing sensitive products in agricultural issues. Finally, he also underlined EC's efforts towards visa facilitation agreements with the MPCs.

Senén Florensa, General Director of the European Institute for the Mediterranean (IEMed) in Barcelona, referred to the different phases of the EMP, being 1<sup>st</sup> the launch of the EMP in 1995 and, 2<sup>nd</sup> the cooperation in several fields. He urged for a 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of the EMP based on the design of additional structural funds for the Mediterranean. He asked for a reshuffle of Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) funding to the EMP after agriculture will be further liberalized in the WTO framework. Mr. Florensa mentioned that these funds would be 5 times higher than current EU commitments to the Mediterranean. Regarding the MPCs, he said that Morocco is the country which has best performed in implementing economic reforms.

Álvaro Vasconcelos, Director of the European Union Institute for Security Studies in Paris, referred to the ENP as a opportunity for the MPCs. However, south-south regional integration should be kept as the long term goal as a regional dynamic is necessary. However, the incentives for integration under the ENP are too weak. On the other hand, the confusion of initiatives like EMP, ENP, 5+5, MedUnion, etc. would not contribute to EMP's ownership by the people. Finally, European states should encourage MPCs for democratic reforms by creating a EuroMed community of democratic states.

### **Panel discussion: Recent Developments and Cooperation Initiatives in the Mediterranean**

Bruno Delaye, Ambassador of France in Spain, referred especially to the Mediterranean Union. He noted that there has been a positive reaction in the EuroMed community to the French proposal in terms of boosting the EMP. Mr. Delaye also noted that President Sarkozy was inspired in the ECCS proposal of Jean Monnet in the 1950s. On July 13<sup>th</sup> 2008 all participants will be invited to join an initiative which has been supported especially by Italy and Spain. The Mediterranean Union is based on the concept of cooperation rather than integration. There is a need for a political forum to solve problems of Mediterranean basin countries, like pollution and water issues. The Med Union is to be based on projects and on a variable geography of its participation: those who want to work closely in certain areas might do so, those who don't might not do it. The proposal is not about dividing the UE, but about boosting cooperation with the MPCs. Regarding the implementation, France will be flexible, as the Med Union is not primarily about a new institutional setting, but about accelerating economic convergence.

Haizam Amirah Fernández, Principal Researcher of the Elcano Real Institute for International and Strategic Studies noted that the proposal has a strong potential as a new debate about effective ways of cooperation is needed.

Gemma Aubarell, Programme Director of the European Institute for the Mediterranean (IEMed) underlined the positive political will of the Med Union proposal. Both the EMP and the Med

Union should be aware of not repeating existing structures of coordination, like the 5+5 dialogue and the Rabat process (migration). Particularly important for the future funding of the initiative will be the reshuffling of European structural funds. The key issues for all cooperation initiatives remain a) closer cooperation among certain EMP countries, b) project based implementation according to realistic plans of action, c) linking public-private sectors, d) linking EMP cooperation with other multilateral donors and initiatives (IMF, Worldbank, US Aid, etc.), and 6) inclusion of decentralized networks of cooperation already at work in all three EMP baskets.

### **Closing Ceremony**

Alfredo Dagnino and José María Beneyto, President of the San Pablo CEU University and Director of the Institute for European Studies respectively, thanked all participants for valuable contributions and invited to further developing scientific research with the San Pablo CEU University in order to contribute to political dialogue among people. Prof. Beneyto pointed out that the GO-EuroMed consortium will present the final findings and major policy recommendation to the wider community in Brussels and the end of November 2008. All attendants are cordially invited to join the conference to be announced soon in the project's website.

Álvaro Iranzo Gutiérrez, General Director of Foreign Policy for the Mediterranean, Middle East and Africa of the Spanish Foreign Affairs Ministry hold a key note speech on the EMP. The French proposal of a MedUnion should not threat European cohesion. Therefore all EU member states should be invited to join the MedUnion. In any case, the most important challenge of the region remains the political will to implement reforms. Against this backdrop, the EuroMed FTA is an important anchor, which needs to be fully implemented in order to accelerate the modernization process in the south. Regarding the two leading principles of the ENP (co-ownership and differentiation), Mr. Iranzo noted that both have become internalized in most MPCs. The Spanish Presidency of the EU in 2010 will reinvigorate the EMP and the MedUnion. Regarding the later, the emphasis should rely on visible and viable core regional projects, like in maritime connections, environmental protection. New agencies are not necessary.

## 2. Conference 2<sup>nd</sup> day: internal meeting agenda

<b>Location: Conference Room Rectorado, San Pablo University CEU, Madrid</b>	
09:30 a.m.	Welcoming remarks by Professor Belén Becerril Atienza University Institute for European Studies, Madrid, Spain
09:45 a.m.	Go-EuroMed Stage II. Research Summary Report Chair: Thierry Montalieu Presentation: Mark Furness, JMC, Berlin, Germany
10:35 a.m.	Consortium comments and remarks, general discussion
10:50 a.m.	Session 1 / Working Package 11: Domestic Institutions Chair: Pablo Gándara Presentation: Bahri Yilmaz, Sabanci University Istanbul, Turkey
11:20 a.m.	Discussants: Lebanon, Morocco
11:45 a.m.	Coffee Break
12:00 a.m.	Session 2 / Working Package 12: Bilateral Institutions Chair: Nada Zouag Presentation: Katarzyna Zukrowska, Warsaw School of Economics, Poland
12:30 a.m.	Discussants: Germany, Jordan
12:45 a.m.	Session 3 / Working Package 13: Multilateral Institutions Chair: Bahri Yilmaz Presentation: José Maria Beneyto, University Institute for European Studies, Madrid, Spain.  Discussants: France, Morocco
13:15 p.m.	Lunch
14:30 p.m.	“The Way Forward”: Key Issues & Objectives for Stage III Chair: Ibrahim Saif, Center for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan Presentation: Pablo Gándara, JMC, Berlin, Germany
15:00 p.m.	Consortium comments and remarks
15:30 p.m.	Coffee Break
15:50 p.m.	Practical arrangement and next meetings Chair: Alfonso Rincón, Institute for European Studies, Madrid, Spain.  Presentation: Mark Furness, JMC, Berlin, Germany
16:30 p.m.	Farewell

## 2.1. List of Participants at the internal meeting

	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>E-Mails</b>
1	<b>ARGEREY</b>	Patricia	Institute for European Studies, Madrid San Pablo CEU University	<a href="mailto:pargerey@ceu.es">pargerey@ceu.es</a>
2	<b>BENEYTO</b>	José María	Institute for European Studies, Madrid San Pablo CEU University	<a href="mailto:idee@ceu.es">idee@ceu.es</a>
3	<b>BECERRIL</b>	Belén	Institute for European Studies, Madrid San Pablo CEU University	<a href="mailto:becati@ceu.es">becati@ceu.es</a>
4	<b>ESTEVEZ</b>	Lucana	Institute for European Studies, Madrid San Pablo CEU University	<a href="mailto:lucana@ceu.es">lucana@ceu.es</a>
5	<b>RINCÓN</b>	Alfonso	Institute for European Studies, Madrid San Pablo CEU University	<a href="mailto:arincon@ceu.es">arincon@ceu.es</a>
6	<b>EHRET</b>	Sönke	Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence FU - Berlin	<a href="mailto:s.ehret@jmc-berlin.org">s.ehret@jmc-berlin.org</a>
7	<b>FURNESS</b>	Mark	Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence FU - Berlin	<a href="mailto:markfurness@go-euromed.org">markfurness@go-euromed.org</a>
8	<b>GANDARA</b>	Pablo	Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence FU - Berlin	<a href="mailto:p.gandara@jmc-berlin.org">p.gandara@jmc-berlin.org</a>
9	<b>VOM HOVE</b>	Linda	Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence FU – Berlin	<a href="mailto:lvomhove@jmc-berlin.org">lvomhove@jmc-berlin.org</a>
10	<b>EL RAYYES</b>	Thoraya	Center for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan	<a href="mailto:thoraya@css-jordan.org">thoraya@css-jordan.org</a>
11	<b>OMET</b>	Ghasam	Center for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan	<a href="mailto:gomet@ju.edu.jo">gomet@ju.edu.jo</a>
12	<b>SAIF</b>	Ibrahim	Center for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan	<a href="mailto:i.saif@css-jordan.org">i.saif@css-jordan.org</a>
13	<b>ACHEHBOUNE</b>	Amale	Institute of Economic Analysis & Prospective Studies (IEAPS)	<a href="mailto:A.Achehboune@aui.ma">A.Achehboune@aui.ma</a>
14	<b>ZOUAG</b>	Nada	Institute of Economic Analysis & Prospective Studies (IEAPS)	<a href="mailto:N.Zouag@aui.ma">N.Zouag@aui.ma</a>
15	<b>GRACIK</b>	Malgorzata	Warsaw School of Economics	<a href="mailto:malgorzata.gracik@sgh.waw.pl">malgorzata.gracik@sgh.waw.pl</a>
16	<b>JAGIELLO</b>	Beata	Warsaw School of Economics	<a href="mailto:bjagie@sgh.waw.pl">bjagie@sgh.waw.pl</a>
17	<b>STRYJEK</b>	Joanna	Warsaw School of Economics	<a href="mailto:joanna.stryjek@sgh.waw.pl">joanna.stryjek@sgh.waw.pl</a>
18	<b>ZBYTNIIEWSKI</b>	Marcin	Warsaw School of Economics	<a href="mailto:mz26532@sgh.waw.pl">mz26532@sgh.waw.pl</a>
19	<b>ZIMOWSKA</b>	Ewa	Warsaw School of Economics	
20	<b>ZUKROWSKA</b>	Katarzyna	Warsaw School of Economics	<a href="mailto:zukrowska@warszawa.home.pl">zukrowska@warszawa.home.pl</a>
21	<b>YILMAZ</b>	Bahri	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Sabanci University, Istanbul	<a href="mailto:bahri@sabanciuniv.edu">bahri@sabanciuniv.edu</a>
22	<b>MONTALIEU</b>	Thierry	University of Orleans - LEO	<a href="mailto:thierry.montalieu@univ-orleans.fr">thierry.montalieu@univ-orleans.fr</a>
23	<b>TRANDAS-BOBOC</b>	Cristina	University of Orleans - LEO	<a href="mailto:cristina_trandas@yahoo.com">cristina_trandas@yahoo.com</a>
24	<b>MOUAWAD</b>	Jamil	Lebanese Center for Policy Studies, Lebanon	<a href="mailto:jmouawad@lcps-lebanon.org">jmouawad@lcps-lebanon.org</a>
25	<b>MALAAB</b>	Makram	Lebanese Center for Policy Studies, Lebanon	
26	<b>BRAUNSTEIN</b>	Virginia	DG Research, European Commission	<a href="mailto:Virginia.BRAUNSTEIN@ec.europa.eu">Virginia.BRAUNSTEIN@ec.europa.eu</a>

## 2.2. Minutes of internal meeting

### 2.2.1. Stage II Summary Report (Chair: Thierry Montalieu)

#### Presentation by Mark Furness

Mark Furness presented the areas in which BP is strong and in which improvement is needed. He noted that BP is a negotiated framework with 2 key advantages: the stable environment and windows of opportunity. The Barcelona Process is capable of advancing the political and economic stabilization processes in partner countries. It exercises distributive bargaining, in which outcomes depend on the institutional level, such as the setting for negotiations, bargaining power, choice of bargaining issues, and the domestic arena, which includes the institution and preference formation. Pareto and Nash equilibria are the key concepts. In regard to energy and soft security issues, exogenous change has created a window of opportunity in the partner countries.

A question was raised by Katarzyna Zukrowska regarding the windows of opportunity. It was suggested that issues concerning the Cultural Basket of the Barcelona Process operate in an opposite way, namely the economic progress contributes to and accentuates cultural advancements. It was also insisted that page 10 contained some contradictory arguments in regard to the zero sum game and the benefit of all involved parties. It has been also proposed to take into consideration past experiences when analyzing Sarkozy's proposal. For example, in the beginning Poland had little perspective of membership in the European Union and was striving for at least come collaboration with the EU (vision of the membership), Article 49 Euro. However, as it is now a full member of the Union, where will the enlargement process end? It has been also asked what can be negotiated and what are the ultimate goals of the MPCs? What benefits does the EU want to offer? Finally, it was suggested to eliminate the contradictions, even if they come from the WPs.

Mark Furness answered the comment of Katarzyna Zukrowska by proposed to look at the stakeholders involved. He contended that the window of opportunity is identified and is the energy and the education sectors.

A question was raised by Bahri Yilmaz regarding the special case of Turkey, which is not interested in the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, but rather seeks membership in the EU. Ibrahim Saif commented on the merit of the approach, but suggested that timeframes are important and must be considered in the analysis. He also recommended identifying the stakeholders in a more clear way and highlighting the education policies, as well as suggested that it may be too strong to refer to the achievements in the areas of economy and finance as being major (page 3). Finally, a question was raised regarding possible suggestions emerging from the analysis.

The above comments were followed by an acknowledgment of the necessity to include the timeframes. Mark Furness then argued that the MPCs should decide how to put together a body that would be capable of effectively concentrating and equilibrating their individual preferences.

It was then argued that the MPCs want to maintain power in the relationship and that it is difficult to articulate national interests, if they do not exist. The need for effective institutions was stressed and it was contended that nongovernmental bodies are not interested in changing the regime, but rather in having effective 'things.'

Bahri Yilmaz suggested that in the bargaining process between the EU and the MPCs, there is a power asymmetry, as the partners are not equal. Katarzyna Zukrowska argued that deeper integration creates more obstacles to EU membership, as for example the necessity for more adjustments and the subsequent high costs. Marcin Zbytniewski then suggested that MPCs should articulate their interests.

Mark Furness answered the above comments by proposing a two-level framework on international and domestic issues and suggested that it is necessary to quality issues into the two categories. It was also proposed to identify the payoffs for the process of domestic institutional reforms.

Thierry Montalieu concluded the discussion by pointing out that the questions of bargaining power and symmetry of the relationship are important to the analysis. The Conditionality principle was also mentioned, as neither the MPCs nor the EU are able to force or impose policies on each other.

### **2.2.2. WP11: Domestic institutions (Chair: Pablo Gándara)**

The next presentation was conducted by Bahri Yilmaz from the Sabanci University in Istanbul, Turkey. The central objective of the presentation was to analyze the political, jurisdictional and economic reforms in Turkey and their impact on institutions. It was argued that identifying the costs and benefits of these reforms would allow to project Turkish experiences to the MPCs. Growth was taken into consideration as an exogenous factor.

Presentation by Makram Malaeb from Lebanon adopted a bottom-up approach in relation to Lebanon and suggested benchmarking as a potentially effective tool in reform promotion. The presentation focused on domestic institution, investment encouragement and enterprises, with specific attention given to cross-company and not necessarily just Foreign Direct Investments. Company rules were analyzed and a question was raised regarding the details and effectiveness of the existing formal and informal institutions. Specifically, Makram Malaeb looked at companies' interests in maintaining the status quo and the steps taken by the enterprises. The implications of the EU intervention were analyzed and an important problem was observed, namely the EU's policy to target funding only to governmental and not private institutions. In response to Mark Furness' question regarding the possible steps that the EU can take to improve this policy, Makram Malaeb answered that the EU must focus on Technical Assistance Parlamentarier and should take on a positive role.

Mark Furness posed a question of how can the EU deal with resistance from the executive branches. Katarzyna Zukrowska asked for a better definition of domestic institutions; do they involve only existing institutions or also create institutions. Makram Malaeb suggested that in Lebanon institutions are also created. Ibrahim Saif proposed to look at the oligopoly/monopoly market organization in the case of Lebanon and Zbytniewski Marcin asked what kind of policy recommendation is possible at this stage? He argued that laws need to be changed. Finally, it was suggested that it is important to raise the issue of stock exchange. However, Mark Furness pointed out that this problem was already addressed by the creation of the MPSG, involving Egypt and financial governance.

The next presentation by Nada Zouag from Morocco dealt with intellectual property rights (IPR) and the domestic institutions that are in charge of protecting these rights. The prospects for this issue were analyzed, as well as description of institutions, including their strategies and regulations, was presented. A comparative analysis based on previous work was presented of the FDIs and the trade and economic reforms in the MPCs. Policy changed, bilateral agreements and methods for innovation and technology adoption were analyzed.

Mark Furness pointed out that a discussion about the property rights in Morocco in generally must be included.

### **2.2.3. WP12: Bilateral institutions (Chair: Nada Zouag)**

In the presentation by Katarzyna Zukrowska from the Warsaw School of Economics it was argued that not only bilateral institution design is present not only in the economic sector but also in the political one. Bilateral institutions were defined as those between government of two states, i.e. the MPC and the EU (Commission or the European Council). It was suggested that partners should concentrate on windows of opportunity and the possible achievements, timeframes and decision margins were analyzed. Seven issues were raised: (1.) Are there any reasons (benefits) of establishing NEW institutions between EU and MPCs? ; (2.) Bilateral energy cooperation between the EU and the MPCs; (3.) The impact of bilateral special relationships within the EU and MPCs on the European Foreign Policy and the European budget; (4.) Bilateral financial instruments established for the partnership-comparison; (5.) Bilateral institutions serving democracy building; (6.) The impact of the bilateral US/MPCs relations on the bilateral negotiations between the EU ad MPCs; and finally. (7.) What are the bilateral benefits of developing bilateral educational and research and development policy.

Mark Furness commented on the presentation by mentioning the equilibrating preferences and the soft security issues. Ibrahim Saif proposed a micro approach to the trade relations between the EU and the MPCs and suggested that the created parallel institutions lack sustainability. In regard to the EU-Jordan relation, it was proposed to look at education, which is the winning sector in Jordan, and extend lessons from this example to other MPCs.

### **2.2.4. WP13: Multilateral institutions**

The presentation by José María Beneyto from Spain addressed the issue of international and multilateral institutions and tried to find a model of competition/cooperation between the EU and the other actors. The details of current projects, as well as the potential to make proposal for the future in terms of improving cooperation was analyzed. Finally, the institutional system of the EMP was once again looked at, taking into account the new initiatives, such as the Sarkozy proposal and the 5+5 Dialogue.

In response to the presentation, it was asked whether the contradictions of negative/positive and explicit/implicit conditionality case studies were included in the policy recommendations. It was also suggested to look at the role of migrant financial flows as a possible promoter of DVT, as well as the possible institutions that will be in charge. Mark Furness proposed to include the Lisbon Treaty in the discussion, as the first proposal was too ambitious. Katarzyna Zukrowska posed a question of whether conditionality is needed and Ibrahim Saif suggested that there must be coordination between the IMF, World Bank and the EU in Jordan as well as in other partner countries, since the IMP plays a crucial role and the EU lacks an independent policy. However, recently the EU Commission signed a framework, which shows that the EU in practice does have a coherent, official policy in regard to these issues.

### **2.2.5. Wrapping-up: Stage III - The way forward**

#### **Presentation by Pablo Gándara**

Pablo Gándara summed up the discussions of the 3 sessions and presented the key issues and objectives for GO-EuroMed stage 3. He stressed that the analysis of problems had been done in stage 2. Stage 3 would rather try to present policies to solve stated problems. Therefore the working Papers should be concentrated on single issues and on the EMP (not single country case studies). Emphasis should lie on policy recommendations for institution building within the EMP. The Working packages structure and topics for stage 3 would be:

- Domestic: national reforms within EMP countries
- Bilateral: cooperation between EMP countries
- Multilateral: new coordination schemes

Mr. Gándara finished by presenting the timeline for 2008:

Completing Stage 3 Preparing Brussels

	Feb.	March	April	May	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.
Workshops & Conferences	21st-22nd <b>MADRID</b>	26th -27th <b>Beirut Workshop</b>						21st -23rd <b>Berlin Workshop</b>		27th-29th <b>BRUSSELS FINAL CONFERENCE</b>
Deadlines		10th of March ! Working paper outlines to WP coordinators  17th of March ! Working package outlines to JMC		31st of May ! Working paper drafts to coordinator		31st of July ! Working paper drafts to JMC	31st of August ! complete working packages to JMC			

### 3. Picture Gallery Conference – Day 1



Conference – Day 1 (cont')



Conference – Day 2

