

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union
Project no. 177316-LLP-1-2010-DE-ERASMUS-ENWA

LISBOAN
**Linking Interdisciplinary Integration Studies by Broadening the European Academic
Network**

Report on the third LISBOAN PhD Summer School
‘Beyond the Crisis: The Institutional Politics of the European Union’

Deliverable No. D 83

April 2013
www.lisboan.net

Dissemination level: Public

Funding Disclaimer: This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Introduction

The PhD summer school ‘Beyond the Crisis: The Institutional Politics of the European Union’, was held at the Grand Hotel de l’Empereur, Maastricht, NL, from 8-12 April 2013. The PhD school was organised by the University of Maastricht on behalf of the LISBOAN (Linking Interdisciplinary Integration Studies by Broadening the European Academic Network) project. The school aimed explicitly to attract students as well as lectures from different disciplines such as political science, law, and economics by drawing on a wide academic network of 68 institutions from all over Europe. Students were selected on the basis of a letter outlining their interest in attending the school and an outline of their PhD thesis. Professor Thomas Christiansen (University of Maastricht, LISBOAN partner no. 38) was in charge of the overall coordination and organisation of the PhD school, assisted by Lidwien Hollanders of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

The PhD school aimed to bring together PhD students to broaden their perspective on EU studies by meeting with renowned scholars and fellow students from different disciplines and academic cultures. At the same time, the school offered support on issues relating to their individual theses. The general theme ‘The Institutional Politics of the European Union’ provided a framework for a variety of thematic contributions, from financial regulation to European Neighbourhood Policy to EU Agencies (see annex for a detailed programme). The format of the PhD school was a mix of lectures by scholars in the mornings and the presentations of PhD projects in the afternoon. The aim was to make both elements as interactive as possible. The morning lectures were followed by time for Q+A, and students were invited to make use of the opportunity to engage with the invited speakers and discuss their research with them. As much as possible, speakers were also present in the afternoon for students’ presentations. Where this was not possible due to travel arrangements, Thomas Christiansen as Researcher-in-Residence as well as fellow students provided comments on each presentation so that a discussion was always ensured. In addition to thematic issues, research techniques in the field of European international relations were also discussed including methods and approaches of comparative politics, European integration theory, policy analysis and international relations.

Prior to the school, students were asked to

- circulate a paper (max. 10 pages) or an outline (1-3 pages) summarising the main points of their presentation to all participants.
- prepare a powerpoint presentation that highlights the main points of their research project (initial puzzle, research question, hypothesis, analytical framework, theoretical and methodological choices, expected or initial findings).
- present their project in maximum 10mins, focusing on the above points and any problems they encountered in their research. Instead of presenting lots of empirical material in great depth, the school’s focus was on the general issues related to PhD research and writing.

As a result the school was an interactive event in which everyone could learn from others’ experiences. The feedback after the event was overwhelmingly positive, encouraging further

activities in the area of international events for graduate students. Incidentally, it may be noted that two PhD students had already attended one of the previous LISBOAN PhD schools.

The group of participants consisted of 10 doctoral students from the LISBOAN network (see Annex). They received a travel grant of up to 400 €. LISBOAN also provided accommodation as well as covering travel and accommodation costs for lecturers from the network. The reimbursement on behalf of LISBOAN was managed by Maastricht University.

Minutes

Monday, 8 April

Thomas Christiansen and Tobias Kunstein (University of Cologne, LISBOAN project manager) welcomed all participants to Maastricht. After a short presentation of the Erasmus Academic Network LISBOAN by Tobias Kunstein, Thomas Christiansen introduced the topic of the PhD school and provided an overview on the programme as well as practical arrangements. Subsequently, Aneta Spendzharova (University of Maastricht – partner 38) kicked off the summer school with a lecture on “Reforming Financial Services Regulation”. She outlined the reforms in this area, starting from the Financial Services Action Plan in 1999 and the Lamfalussy Framework to the current European System of Financial Supervision and plans for a Banking Union. She discussed in more details European Supervisory Authorities and the interplay of regulators, (central) banks and governments in the area of financial services.

After the lunch break, Li Xue (University of Bologna, LISBOAN partner no. 30) presented her PhD project which deals with insider dealing and market manipulation in financial markets, and on ways to overcome such instances of market abuse through regulation. Research questions concerned (i) mechanics of market manipulation, (ii) the framework of EU market manipulation regime and its reform in recent years, and (iii) the appropriate approach to perfect market manipulation regime in China. During the discussion, a number of points were discussed. Participants suggested to work on a clear definition of market manipulation. Others felt that the thesis would benefit from a clearer focus, i.e. by limiting it to one research question. Participants felt that a full comparative approach including the EU, the US and China was perhaps overambitious and that it might be sufficient to use the two countries as yardsticks in order to focus the analysis of the EU instead. Other points raised concerned the title of the dissertation, the re-formulation of which might help to better focus the research, and the proposal to make it clearer whenever normative aspects were addressed in the work.

The first day concluded with a guided tour through the city of Maastricht, shedding light on some parts of its (European) history, followed in the evening by a reception at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of the University of Maastricht, where participants had the opportunity to network with local students and docents.

Tuesday, 9 April

In her lecture, Meltem Müftüler-Bac (Sabanci University Istanbul – partner 55) introduced students to the topic “EU Enlargement and ENP”. She described the different processes currently underway, including a number of Balkan countries on the one hand, and Turkey on the other. With a view to very different speeds of the negotiation process with different countries, she underlined that involving the public was a key condition for the enlargement process. She also argued that many of the Lisbon Treaty’s innovation did not take into account the eventual accession of a big state like Turkey and would have to be adapted again if Turkey entered the Union.

The second lecture in the morning was delivered by Sergio Fabbrini (LUISS, Rome – partner 32). Entitled “Intergovernmentalism and its limits: what lies ahead?”, the lecture revisited the theoretical debates on European integration in general and the intergovernmentalist perspective in the tradition of Stanley Hoffmann, Andrew Moravcsik and others in particular. With a view to the eurozone crisis and debates about a “core group” of Member States forming within the EU, he outlined scenarios of differentiated integration as a possible alternative to a re-nationalisation of European politics.

In her presentation, Maria Amélia Valle-Flor (ISEG Lisbon – partner 43) dealt with the EU response to the sovereign debt crisis in the period of 2010-2012. The project’s main question is whether it is plausible to conceive an extension of the Community method to the fields of economic policy-making as a result of the crisis. This question is addressed in four papers, covering the European integration process, the evolution of legislative decision making, EMU governance and institutional change 2010-2012, respectively. A focus is on the role of the European Commission. Making reference to Pierson, she argued that even despite an apparent increase in intergovernmentalism, European actors were likely to resort to the Community method in response to the crisis. While in the general discussion the theoretical foundation of the work was commended, participants also suggested that it might be worthwhile to reduce the descriptive elements and try to link the empirical part more with the (somewhat counterintuitive and therefore all the more interesting) central proposition of the work. The fact that the thesis was organized into four separate papers raised questions as to its overall coherence. Subsequently, the discussion turned to the issue of Community method vs. Intergovernmental method. The discussants argued that the decision to depart from the Community method needed to be better explained and justified.

Subsequently, Hristo Panchugov presented his PhD thesis “Organizational development and institutionalization of the parties in the post-communist party systems 1989 – 2011”. The thesis attempts to cover not only structural properties such as fragmentation and volatility, but also organizational preferences of politicians. Out of three major phases of development in the period of observation, it is especially the last phase from 2005 onwards which offers links to the process of EU integration where (immanent) EU membership potentially impacted on the organizational development, the programmatic potential and the institutionalisation of the Bulgarian party system. Discussants *inter alia* recommended to streamline the theoretical part and highlighted some methodical problems related to the research design as a longitudinal study of one case. Some of

them felt that ultimately, the issue should be addressed in a more comparative way across countries in order to grasp the complexity of the “charismatic leadership” concept.

Wednesday, 10 April

Uwe Puetter (Central European University) gave a lecture on “The European Council – deliberative intergovernmentalism and institutional change in the post-Maastricht era”. After introducing his approach of deliberative intergovernmentalism, meaning a self-commitment of national governments to common rules and guidelines in the absence of a legal framework in a policy field, he applied it to the role the European Council played during the last twenty years of European integration. In particular, he focused on the Heads of State or Government’s role in the economic and financial field, as illustrated during the recent eurozone crisis.

The thread was then taken up by Jaap de Wilde (University of Groningen – partner 67), whose presentation was entitled “(How)Does Sovereignty Matter in the EU Today?”. While his question addressed a similar topic as the previous presentation, Jaap de Wilde’s approach was rooted in international relations theory and stressed the Member States as autonomous actors.

The EU-level focus of the morning session was complemented in the afternoon by presentations dedicated to the regional level on the one hand, and the global level (or at least a global policy problem) on the other. Magnus Lindh (Karlstad University – partner 51) presented his PhD thesis on “Fusing Regions Plus: the asymmetry and variation of how regional actors in Europe handle EU-affairs”. Lydia Avrami (University of Athens – partner 61) in turn dealt with “EU policy on climate change: Compliance as a necessary or/and sufficient condition for advanced domestic policy outcomes”. Despite of their different research topics, both projects adopt a bottom-up perspective, looking at the impact of European Integration in the domestic context rather than its properties at EU level. During the subsequent discussion, participants commended the structured approach of both projects. A general suggestion was to elaborate more on the empirical basis in the former, and on the theoretical contribution expected to derive from the project in the latter. Participants also suggested that some reflection on the bargaining process between individual Member States at the EU level might yield additional explanations for the outcome of EU legislation.

Thursday, 11 April

The morning of day four was dedicated to practical research capabilities and methodological questions. Some students of Maastricht University were part of the audience as well on this day. Assem Dandashly (University of Maastricht – partner 38) held a “Skills Workshop: Research Design for Social Science”. This was followed by a PhD presentation on a topic with rather practical connotations, namely “the role of think-tanks in EU policy making” by Konstantina Karydi. Focussing on the day-to-day involvement of non-state actors in EU policy-making, the work also aims to contribute to theory formulation in the area of governance and democratization beyond the nation-state. The approach mainly builds on semi-structured interviews with representatives of a sample of EU think tanks, among them Bruegel, ELIAMEP, CEPS, CPS, ECFR, CIDOB, NEF and EPC. Issues discussed after the presentation included the selection criteria

of think tanks considered in the work and their relationship to EU agencies, the question whether think tanks can be seen as “neutral”, their possible contribution in terms of democracy at the EU level and the definition of concepts such as “influence” and, indeed, “think tank”. It was recommended to further specify the research hypothesis along the lines of a refutable proposition.

In the afternoon Athanasia Vasilopoulou presented her thesis entitled “the regulatory framework of the counter-terrorism policy in EU-USA: a comparative analysis of the trends (1991/2-2008)”. Given that the author has been involved herself in intergovernmental negotiations on this topic, her thesis provides a combination of academic and more policy oriented insights. Using the criteria i) voting procedure of the decision making process, ii) the role of European institutions and iii) the content of the legislative tools, the thesis concludes that after 9/11, a shift of powers from the national level to the EU level can be observed in the area of counter terrorism legislation (although the Member States still have last word). Secondly, with a view to horizontal interactions of the counter-terrorism legislation between the EU and the US, preliminary findings suggest that more interaction in the area of data protection will evolve as the result of a compromise between both parties. Commentators gave suggestions regarding the bibliography related to the multi-level and global governance and to the ECJ case law. The role of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, of the ECHR and – possibly – of the “solidarity clause” (art. 222 TFEU) was raised as well. Other questions concerned the clarity of the terminology and the definition of the meaning of the concept of “serious threat to security”. These definitions were highlighted as especially important for the comparative part of the research.

The final contribution on this day was provided by Giovanni Zaccaroni. His research deals with the contribution of the principle of non-discrimination to the construction of a European Constitutional Identity. It can be divided into two parts. The first part concerns theoretical considerations related to the basic principles of non-discrimination and equality and is underpinned largely by legal analysis. The second part focuses on the methods used by (ECJ) judges in order to cope with the problem of non-discrimination, and tries to propose a uniform test under which judges can confront different or similar situations. The subsequent discussion of the thesis outline *inter alia* dealt with questions of legitimacy and also turned to the possible negative impact of the current austerity measures in that regard.

Friday, 12 April

In the morning of the final day of the PhD school, Tannelie Blom (University of Maastricht – partner 38) gave a lecture on the growth of EU Agencies. She thus addressed a very topical area of European politics, also against the background of the present discussion of the formal status of the European Supervisory Authorities. Subsequently, Arjan Schakel (University of Maastricht – partner 38) addressed the changing institutional landscape of regional Europe, coming back to the PhD presentation on Wednesday afternoon.

After lunch, Oana Poiană presented her PhD project, entitled “The Black Sea Region: Geopolitics and Geo-strategies at the European Union’s border”. It seeks to answer two questions: 1) What is the impact of the energy security issues on the Black Sea regional dynamics? 2) Do the current

energy cooperation practices favor the rise of economic nationalism instead of supporting the overall regional cooperation? The approach chosen to answer these questions includes document and discourse analysis in all Black Sea littoral countries, as well as a comparative analysis between country profiles (case studies). The aim is to represent each country on a bi-dimensional graphic. A particular focus is on the EU's influence on the overall cooperation framework. Discussants were impressed by the comprehensive approach but also wondered if it might be preferable to narrow down the number of cases in order to allow for a higher level of detail for each country.

Andrea Usai dealt with the impact of the Free Movement of Services and of the Services Directive. He focuses on a narrow case study of services which are offered on areas assigned to individuals through concessions concerning Italian beaches. While this might seem to be a very specialized topic, its relevance stems not only from the fact that beaches are an important business area in Italy, but also because services amount to 70% of the GDP of the member States of the EU. Consequently, EU legislation in this area can be expected to have an impact throughout the EU. The discussion focused on the legal or/and political approach of the thesis and the need for further clarification of the main research goals. Discussants argued that in terms of theoretical groundwork it might be worthwhile to include political science literature on EU governance and to analytically differentiate between EU level, national level and local level.

“The PhD school went very well, and both participants and speakers were very satisfied with the good quality of presentations and discussions. I was quite impressed with the group who really did make an effort to get the best out of the event, and who I also believe very appreciated the opportunity we provided for them.”

Thomas Christiansen, Research-in-Residence and Coordinator of the PhD School

List of Participants and Programme

Lecturers

1. Tannelie Blom (University of Maastricht – partner 38)
2. Thomas Christiansen (University of Maastricht – partner 38)
3. Assem Dandashly (University of Maastricht – partner 38)
4. Jaap de Wilde (University of Groningen – partner 67)
5. Sergio Fabbrini (LUISS, Rome – partner 32)
6. Meltem Müftüler-Bac (Sabanci University Istanbul – partner 55)
7. Uwe Puetter (Central European University)
8. Arjan Schakel (University of Maastricht – partner 38)
9. Aneta Spendzharova (University of Maastricht – partner 38)

Students

10. Lydia Avrami (University of Athens – partner 61)
11. Konstantina Karydi (University of Athens – partner 61)
12. Xue Li (CIRDCE University of Bologna – partner 30)
13. Magnus Lindh (Karlstad University – partner 51)
14. Hristo Panchugov (New Bulgarian University, Sofia – partner 11)
15. Oana Poiană (Babes-Bolyai University Cluj – partner 44)
16. Andrea Usai (CIRDCE University of Bologna – partner 30)
17. Maria Amélia Valle-Flor (ISEG Lisbon – partner 43)
18. Athanasia Vasilopoulou (University of Athens – partner 61)
19. Giovanni Zaccaroni (CIRDCE University of Bologna – partner 30)



PhD School of the LISBOAN Network
The Institutional Politics of the European Union

Maastricht, 8–12 April 2013

Programme

Monday, 8 April

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 10.00–11.00 | Welcome/Overview Introductions
<i>Prof Thomas Christiansen, Maastricht University</i> |
| 11.00–11.15 | Coffee Break |
| 11.15–12.45 | Reforming Financial Services Regulation
<i>Dr Aneta Spendzharova, Maastricht University</i> |
| 12.45–14.00 | Lunch |
| 14.00–15.00 | European Union Financial Market Manipulation Regulation
<i>Xue Li, University of Bologna (Discussant: Konstantina Karydi)</i> |
| 15.00–15.15 | Coffee Break |
| 15.15–17.00 | Guided Tour of Maastricht
<i>Sueli Brodin, Maastricht Tourist Office</i> |
| 17.00–18.00 | Reception with Staff and PhD Researchers at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (Grote Gracht 90-92) |

Tuesday, 9 April

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 09.30–11.00 | EU Enlargement and the ENP
<i>Prof Meltem Müftüler-Bac, Sabanci University, Istanbul</i> |
| 11.00–11.15 | Coffee Break |
| 11.15–12.45 | Intergovernmentalism and its limits: what lies ahead?
<i>Prof. Sergio Fabbrini, LUISS University, Rome</i> |
| 12.45–14.00 | Lunch |
| 14.00–15.00 | EU response to the sovereign debt crisis in the period of 2010-2012
<i>Maria Amélia Valle-Flor, ISEG Lisbon (Discussant: Li Xue)</i> |
| 15.00–15.15 | Coffee Break |

15.15–16.15 Organizational development and institutionalization of the parties in the post-communist party systems 1989 – 2011
Hristo Panchugov, New Bulgarian University (Discussant: Giovanni Zaccaroni)

Wednesday, 10 April

09.30–11.00 The European Council – deliberative intergovernmentalism and institutional change in the post-Maastricht era
Dr Uwe Puetter, Central European University, Budapest

11.00–11.15 Coffee Break

11.15–12.45 *(How) Does Sovereignty Matter in the EU Today?*
Prof Jaap de Wilde, Groningen University

12.45–14.00 Lunch

14.00–15.00 Fusing Regions Plus: the asymmetry and variation of how regional actors in Europe handle EU-affairs
Magnus Lindh, Karlstad University (Discussant: Oana Poiană)

15.00–15.15 Coffee Break

15.15–16.15 EU policy on climate change: Compliance as a necessary or/and sufficient condition for advanced domestic policy outcomes
Lydia Avrami, University of Athens (Discussant: Athanasia Vasilopoulou)

Thursday, 11 April

10.00–11.30 Skills Workshop “Research Design for Social Science”
Assem Dandashly, Maastricht University

11.30–11.45 Coffee Break

11.45–12.45 The role of think-tanks in EU policy making
Konstantina Karydi, University of Athens (Maria Amélia Valle-Flor)

12.45–14.00 Lunch

14.00–15.00 The regulatory framework of the counter-terrorism policy in EU -USA: a comparative analysis of the trends (1991/2-2008)
Athanasia Vasilopoulou, University of Athens (Discussant: Andrea Usai)

15.00–15.15 Coffee Break

15.15–16.15 The Contribution of the principle of non-discrimination to the construction of a European Constitutional Identity
Giovanni Zaccaroni, University of Bologna (Discussant: Hristo Panchugov)

Friday, 12 April

09.30–11.00 The growth of EU Agencies
Prof Tannelie Blom, Maastricht University

11.00–11.15 Coffee Break

11.15–12.45 The changing institutional landscape of regional Europe,
Dr Arjan Schakel, Maastricht University

12.45–14.00 Lunch

14.00–15.00 The Black Sea Region: Geopolitics and Geo-strategies at the European Union's border
Oana Poiană, Babes-Bolyai University (Discussant: Magnus Lindh)

15.00–15.15 Coffee Break

15.15–16.15 The impact of the Free Movement of Services and of The Services Directive on Services which are offered on areas assigned to individuals through concessions contracts: the Case Study of Italian Beaches
Andrea Usai, University of Bologna (Discussant: Lydia Avrami)