

Report

LISBOAN Working Group Workpackage VI (WP leader: Ian Manners)

“External Action and CFSP”

June 16th 2011, 15.30 - 17.00 h

The working group of workpackage VI, chaired by *Ian Manners* (Roskilde University), dealt with the principal changes the Lisbon Treaty brought about for External Action and CFSP. *Ian Manners* introduced the topic opening that the Areas of Justice and Home Affairs and External Action were the ones that changed the most after the entry into force of the LT.

The first speaker, *Elfriede Regelsberger* (Institut für Europäische Politik Berlin), spoke in favour of a comparative approach in order to assess the changes introduced by the Lisbon Treaty. Arguing that it was essential to look both at the provisions in the Treaty and their actual implementation, she stressed that the degree to which the European Union’s actors fulfil their roles as defined by the LT should be taken into consideration. Moreover, a comparison of the roles – both formal and informal – of the High Representative and the President of the European Council should also be envisaged. In this respect, *Elfriede Regelsberger* mentioned the relevance of other institutions to be analysed that were usually not associated with CFSP but nevertheless had some influence on it, for example the European Parliament. Thirdly, she pointed out the role of the member states and, in particular, the conceivable leadership of one member state or a group of member states.

In her presentation, *Louise van Schaik* (Institute of International Relations Clingendael), addressed a number of problems in the current set-up of CFSP. Focusing on the lack of coordination between EU and member states, she gave some examples, such as the division of the tasks between both levels, the membership of the EU in international organisations – the Security Council being the most sensitive case – and external representation of the EU in general. She concluded by pointing out that questions of identity and sovereignty would continue to frame research on this topic.

Michele Comelli (Istituto Affari Internazionali), as the third speaker, turned to the European Neighbourhood Policy. He mentioned that LT devotes one article on the ENP (art. 8 TEU), even though the ENP is not explicitly mentioned because at the time of drafting it was not yet clear what its final denomination would be. The second paragraph of article 8 TEU is interesting in that it provides a legal basis for possible ENP agreements. However, when exploring how the LT affected the ENP it is more useful to consider the whole reform of the external action system, and particularly the creation of a HR/VP and of the EEAS. Both innovations are supposed to bring about coherence and consistency to the EU’s external action, traditionally divided between a supranational and an intergovernmental cluster. However, it appears that the ENP and European foreign policy more in general have not (yet) benefited from more coherence following the entry into force of the LT. Also, in the emergent re-nationalisation of foreign policy, it seems that there is increasingly a division of labour between the MS and EU institutions.

The final speaker, *Ian Manners*, concentrated on the consequences of the Treaty of Lisbon on the ‘normative power appearance’ of the EU. He argued that a ‘communalisation’ took place, for example in the cases of the European Parliament and the High Representative.

After these five short presentations, a general discussion followed on the basis of some guiding questions prepared by the chair: i) what are challenges and crises the EU has recently been confronted with in External Action?, ii) does the LT offer a framework to cope these challenges?, iii) did new and unexpected problems arise with regard to crisis management?, and iv) what priorities for academia with a view to researching and teaching External Action in the Lisbon Treaty derive from these findings?. *Attila Ágh* (Budapest College of Communication) stressed the importance of the question ‘Who sits in the driving seat in the European Union?’. *Pami Aalto* (University of Tampere) advocated a standardization of the terminology. Scholars should agree, for example, on a single term for the external action of the European Union instead of continuing the use of ‘EU and the world’, ‘EU’s external relations’ and ‘European Foreign Policy’, among others. Claiming that Catherine Ashton and Herman van Rompuy were characterized by weakness, *Eugene Eteris* (Riga Stradins University) argued that strategic partnerships could not be envisaged without having a real common European strategy. *Giacomo DiFederico* (University of Bologna) examined the Lisbon Treaty’s attempt to

overcome the problems of coherence and consistency, remarking, however, that current events, like the military action in Libya, demonstrated that there still is a lack of both. *Geoffrey Edwards* (University of Cambridge) elaborated on issues related to common representation, including diplomacy issues and common embassies. *Hanspeter Neuhold* (Diplomatic Academia of Vienna) emphasized the gap concerning security questions since the 'S' in CFSP is often ignored.

During the discussion, the idea of a common publication – developed from working papers – or a common website was raised . Besides, it was proposed to improve the exchange of experience among the network partners, for example as for simulation games, and to prepare common panels.