ADDRESSING STRATEGIC ISSUES

Through the set of questions in this block, the opinion of the respondents on two main strategic aspects of the ENP was investigated. Questions 7, 8 and 9 explore issues related to the articulation of the ENP with the wider EU policy framework and address the application of values, the prospects for integration with other EU policies for the partners and the relation with other foreign policy instruments. Questions 16 and 17 have been designed to illustrate the concept of ownership by ENP partners; they investigate the expectations and interests of partner countries towards the ENP.

**Main findings**

- The Survey shows that respondents, and especially academics, think that the ENP is not applying EU values consistently.
- The vast majority of respondents see positively the integration of the ENP with the Common Foreign Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).
- In terms of expectations, it was mostly indicated that MPC interests and aspirations would be better served by reviewing the institutional setting of EU policies and the nature of the partnerships involved.

**ARTICULATION WITH OTHER EU POLICIES**

The key documents of the European Neighbourhood Policy consistently refer to the values enshrined in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union – freedom, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law – as well as to Article 8 (“The Union shall develop a special relationship with neighbouring countries, aiming to establish an area of prosperity and good neighbourliness, founded on the values of the Union and characterised by close and peaceful relations based on cooperation”) and underline how these are at the heart of the processes of political association and cooperation with the neighbours.

Question 7 asked respondents to what extent they think these values are actually applied through the ENP. The answers were mainly negative (43%), showing a general scepticism (even greater in the case of respondents from MPCs than respondents from the EU), yet with a large percentage of respondents not expressing a clear view on the matter (33%).

**Graph 39: To what extent are the EU values applied through the European Neighbourhood Policy?**

Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey/Question 7
Differences according to institutional affiliations are even wider, with experts expressing the strongest degree of scepticism (51%).

**Graph 40: To what extent are the EU values applied through the European Neighbourhood Policy?**
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Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey/Question 7

It was then asked (in question 8) to what extent the European Neighbourhood Policy should offer prospects for further integration with some of the EU policies. In general, respondents were quite positive on the idea (52%). However, many chose not to give a clear answer on the issue (32% stated neither low nor high extent).

**Graph 41: To what extent should the European Neighbourhood Policy offer prospects for further integration with some of the EU policies?**
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Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey/Question 8

Rather counter-intuitively, a breakdown of answers based on geographical criteria shows that respondents from the EU seem to be keener on offering prospects for further integration with some of the EU policies than respondents from MPCs.

Respondents who agreed that the ENP should offer prospects for further integration were then asked what these policies could potentially be. The respondents itemised a number of policies that could be regrouped in a few main policy sectors: 23% listed policies concerning economic cooperation, 17% migration, 11% education, 8% security, 8% environment; other issues were human rights, governance, culture, energy, agriculture, and transportation.
Graph 42: To what extent should the European Neighbourhood Policy offer prospects for further integration with some of the EU policies? (categories developed from the open-ended question)

Another strategic issue addressed by this block (question 9) is the relation of the ENP with the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). The vast majority (67%) of respondents agree that the ENP should be better integrated into these policies, 20% do not position themselves and only 13% are negative. The idea that the ENP should have a more integrated role in the overall external policies of the EU seems to feature strongly in the answers from EU respondents (71%).

Graph 43: To what extent should the ENP be better integrated in the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP)?

These results can be complemented with the results of Q.12.1, where participants responding to proposals to redefine the neighbourhood consider that countries unwilling to cooperate within the ENP can be dealt with through the CFSP (41% to a high or very high extent and 26% considering to a low or very low extent).
**EXPECTATIONS OF PARTNER COUNTRIES**

This part of the Survey aims to investigate what, according to respondents, the Mediterranean Partner Countries seek in the European Neighbourhood Policy. Open answers show that it is mainly thought that the economic benefits are driving the interest of the MPCs in the Policy (28% of respondents stating this as one of the main purposes). Complementarily, many respondents also address the issue of sharing expertise and know-how in public policy and technical matters (22%) and the improvement of trade through the ENP (14%).

Stability and security (14%) constitute another concern for MPC countries that are interested in their partnership with the EU. The same goes for mobility (10%), which since the beginning has played a major role in the attractiveness of the overall relations of Europe with the Mediterranean. However, the complexity of the issue is made clear by the large number of additional themes that are mentioned, such as the interest in maintaining special relations with the EU and in having a cooperative framework in which human rights are promoted and civil society is empowered:

*Putting human rights approach and norms at the core of the ENP and consolidating strong partnerships with civil society in the Mediterranean Partner Countries.*

Tunisian respondent

The following statement sharply recapitulates some of the most sophisticated aspects in terms of needs and expectations in the ENP:

*It is important to distinguish between governments and societies. Governments seek trade, mobility, investment, and tourism so mainly economic prosperity. Societies seek to get closer to the value model the EU represents, especially in terms of human rights, freedoms and pluralism (and often differ in this desire with their governments).*

German respondent
Graph 45: What do partners (Mediterranean Partner Countries) seek in the European Neighbourhood Policy? (categories developed from the open-ended question)
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Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey/Question 16

Question 17 consequently addresses how the ENP could best accommodate the interests and aspirations of the Mediterranean Partner Countries. It was mainly argued by the respondents that a step in this direction could be the reform of the ENP and changes in its institutional setting (32%). In more detail, the observations made underlined the need for a more differentiated and equitable partnership, including civil society, promoting regional integration on the southern shore of the Mediterranean, increasing mobility and complementing the bilateral setting with more effective foreign policy initiatives in the Euro-Mediterranean space.

The idea of enhancing the social, human and cultural dimensions in the ENP has been indicated as one of the most preferable (26%) and country-by-country approach has been listed in 21% of the answers, hence the enhancement of the bilateral negotiations. Another element that has been widely mentioned is the prioritisation of economic demands in terms of market integration, trade and investments (21%); moreover, as seen in question 16, this dimension is perceived to have a major role.

Graph 46: How can the ENP best accommodate Mediterranean Partner Countries’ interests and aspirations? (categories developed from the open-ended question)
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Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey/Question 17
Individual country-related programmes and solutions; support regional South-South integration (political, economic, cultural); increase opportunities for legal migration and mobility (interregional, intraregional between MPCs and Europe); involve MPCs more efficiently in political EU-MED dialogue processes and the conceptualising process of new programmes and instruments.

German respondent

Revoir la notion de valeurs partagées, politique adaptée aux besoins de chaque pays, équilibre entre différenciation par sous-région, par pays et vision commune sur la base de principes fondateurs, mise en cohérence et efficacité des instruments, mobiliser plus de ressources, appropriation effective de la PEV par des pays membres et des pays partenaires.

Moroccan respondent