GENERAL REVIEW OF THE ENP

This first block is composed of two sets of questions. The first group on “General Assessment” seeks to capture the overall support for the ENP and also to identify factors where the ENP has not been able to offer adequate solutions to the EU neighbourhood. The second group of questions on “Reviewing the ENP” aim to take the pulse on some fundamental questions underpinning the ENP review: what the vision of future relations between the EU and the Southern Neighbourhood partner countries should be, what is expected from these relations and finally how the ENP could perform best.

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Main findings

- A significant majority of respondents agree that the ENP framework should be maintained. Notwithstanding general support for the ENP, responses from Israel and Turkey show a slightly more nuanced picture.
- Those calling for the ENP to be reshaped do so on various accounts but often regret the inability of the ENP to address ongoing challenges in the Mediterranean in a more reactive, political but also differentiated way, and to link the long-term approach with short-term actions.
- When asked to identify the reasons explaining why the ENP did not deliver in a more decisive way, the impediments of the Syrian and Libyan wars are mentioned by a majority of respondents. More generally, the inability to respond to southern partners’ expectations is also identified as a critical issue.
- Asked to share their vision and expectations for the ENP, respondents think that the ENP is bound to adapt to a growing multipolar scenario, to address security and economic challenges more forcefully and that both shores of the Mediterranean should enhance their cooperation.
- Fostering a partnership based on mutual interests and on differentiation (country-by-country approach) is seen as a critical condition for the ENP to perform best.

The first question was aimed at determining the overall support for the ENP framework. 79% of respondents agree that the ENP should be kept. However, a closer analysis of the answers by geographical origin and institutional affiliation reveals some discrepancies that need to be mentioned.

Maghreb countries (87%) and non-Mediterranean EU countries (83%) show a percentage of negative answers (in favour of maintaining the ENP framework) higher than the Survey mean. Just below the mean, Mediterranean EU countries and Mashreq countries (76%) still express strong support for maintaining the ENP. Answers from Turkey and Israel show a slightly different trend, with a ratio of positive answers twice the Survey mean (see graph 1).
A more detailed reading of the results ordered according to the institutional affiliation of the respondents shows that those who are mostly negative about keeping the ENP are the experts based in think tanks (31%), while those most favourable are respondents from international organisations (only 7% want to put an end to the ENP). Responses from governmental policy actors also show a very low ratio contesting the continuity of the ENP (12.5%). Finally, the percentages in answers given by respondents from EU institutions, academia and NGOs are close to the Survey mean (see graph 2).
Respondents answering yes to question 1 also had the option to substantiate their position. Three clusters can be identified from the open answers. A first group of answers regret a lack of strategic scope of the ENP, and suggest going back to the roots of the policy or developing a more mature strategy, linking the long-term approach and political goals, taking into account the conflicts in the region.

The ENP was typically conceived as a "strategy by default": what to do when we don't know what to. It was clear from the very beginning that it wouldn't work. The circumstances in the last few years simply aggravate this.

Spanish respondent

The ENP has been a clumsy and incoherent instrument, with equally unclear objectives. It should be replaced by a range of area frameworks, with regionally specific objectives and modi operandi.

British respondent

A second group of answers focuses on differentiation. Respondents insist on the new needs of the southern countries after the political and social changes from 2011 onwards, and underline the importance of developing a specific policy for the South, especially tackling socio-economic issues.

The EU should propose a policy having a Mediterranean focus, instead of the double focus (East/South) the ENP has today. This should entail a differentiated budget line, exclusively dedicated to the South. A more pragmatic approach is needed. Relations should develop on a bilateral EU/state basis.

Greek respondent

In the aftermath of the Arab revolutions there is a need for a complete rethinking of this policy.

French respondent

The EU neighbourhood policies should be more aligned with the needs of the southern Mediterranean countries and more importantly should respond to the aspirations of their population, i.e. focusing on growth and development is essential but equally important is the distribution of the gains, benefits of this growth.

Egyptian respondent

Keep all ENP members in one format but organise them after the degree of transformation (not geographically).

German respondent

Increased differentiation between different countries and regions in the EU’s neighbourhood according to the variety of needs, expectations, and political realities.

Israeli respondent

The ENP should be reviewed in such a way that neighbours’ demands are taken into account.

Turkish respondent

A third group observes that the ENP should be reformulated in light of the multiple crises and challenges in the Mediterranean (including migration and terrorism). These answers hint at the need to develop rapid reaction tools.

Une attitude plus réaliste comprenant la menace des islamistes et la difficulté extrême de l’émigration qui va faire « dégénérer » les projets européens.

Moroccan respondent
The current migration crisis in the Mediterranean region shows the need for revision and adjustment to the new circumstances.

Montenegrin respondent

As a complement to this overall assessment, question 3 of the Survey lists six possible factors that may explain why the ENP has failed to offer adequate solutions to the EU neighbourhood.

Graph 3: To what extent do the following elements explain why the European Neighbourhood Policy has not always been able to offer adequate responses?

Two main groups can be identified from the graph above. Respondents identify the first three elements as the main causes for which the ENP has not been able to offer adequate responses. The Libyan and Syrian wars (78%) and more generally the inability to respond to southern partners’ expectations (74%) are identified as the main causes. The second group comprises less decisive explanatory factors according to the respondents, including recent changes in the region (58% state that it affects to a high or very high extent the ability of the ENP to deliver), the unequal treatment of southern partner countries (57%) and the fact that ENP partner countries do not share ENP goals (56%).

The outlook changes slightly between answers from EU respondents on the one hand and respondents from Mediterranean Partner Countries (MPC) on the other hand. The MPC respondents stress the EU’s inability to respond to southern neighbours’ expectations (74% of the answers from MPC countries), while EU respondents indicate in a larger proportion the spillover effects of the Syrian and Libyan wars (81%) as illustrated by the following open answer:

Political developments in the Arab World have made a large part of the ENP irrelevant. The basic pre-assumption of the ENP framework by which partner countries are all functioning states has become inadequate. Thus, the issues such as engaging the non-state actors in conflict-torn areas and state-reconstruction assistance should be included in the ENP.

Polish respondent
It is also worth mentioning that respondents from the Maghreb have indicated “falling short of expectations” at a higher percentage than the respondents from the Mashreq.

Graph 4: To what extent do the following elements explain why the European Neighbourhood Policy has not always been able to offer adequate responses? Falling short of expectations leads to decreasing credibility

La PEV n’a pas apporté de solutions pour les deux rives de la Méditerranée, elle peut être considérée comme un autre instrument à côté d’autres qui n’ont pas su apporter du nouveau pour la région.

Moroccan respondent

La PEV manque d’une vision claire contre les stratégies d’un islamisme armé soutenu par des partis politiques intégristes qui profitent des révolutions arabes. La PEV manque d’une vision claire pour répondre aux attentes des jeunes diplômés dans les pays partenaires du voisinage du sud pour assurer la continuité du partenariat.

Tunisian respondent

Finally, an open-ended question offered the possibility for the respondents to substantiate their views. In this context, a number of answers refer to ENP tools and to the need to further engage with civil society, thereby anticipating other questions of the Survey.

The timeframe necessary to finalise the administrative procedure on behalf of the EU is long and by the time the support is translated into projects on the ground, the priorities might have changed.

Lebanese respondent

The tool is not properly geared towards supporting societies of the South as it doesn’t take into consideration the priorities and work experience of the civil society prior to setting its own priorities, which are defined by the southern countries’ governments who do not consult their own civil society.

Jordan respondent

Other open answers question the nature of the ENP, its coherence and the role of principles and values.

Ambivalence about the very nature of the ENP: an EU policy (in which case it should be based on EU interests and some degree of conflicts with the interests of partner countries is normal and acceptable) or a partnership with southern partners? There is a tendency of EU Member States to leave to Brussels the promotion of the ENP principles.

French respondent
The ENP was not designed regarding partner countries development needs, expanding trade opportunities are not enough. The ENP should also consider investment in human capital and production sectors to enhance employment.

Turkish respondent

EU inability to fully respond to the “normative expectations” it has set to fulfil its relations with the South. There is an intense feeling that EU policy is based on hypocrisy and, at times, hidden superiority. The following paradox arises: how can the EU claim to promote democratisation in the South when it clearly faces one of its most severe political crises in its interior?

Greek respondent

REVIEWING THE ENP

Questions 4, 5 and 6 were open-ended and aimed to take the pulse on some fundamental questions underpinning the ENP review: what should be the vision of future relations between the EU and the Southern Neighbourhood partner countries, what is expected from these relations and, finally, how the ENP could perform best.

Question 4 resulted in 650 open-ended answers that can be clustered in five main categories (see graph 5) that reflect some of the main debates over the ENP revision.

Graph 5: What should be the vision for the future relations between the EU and the Southern Neighbourhood partner countries? (categories developed from the open-ended question)

Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey/Question 4

About 34% of open-ended answers somehow relate to the need for the EU and its southern Mediterranean neighbours to face an increasing multipolar scenario with new interdependencies in the region.

A vision which takes into account that the world and the MENA region are moving towards multipolarity – in other words, a vision which seeks to stake out a new role for the EU in a multipolar world.

Italian respondent

Il y a plusieurs scénarios qui se présentent, d’abord certains pays du sud peuvent faire un choix stratégique en s’orientant vers les pays de l’Afrique et aussi pour les pays de l’Asie pour combler l’insuffisance et le retard des relations avec l’UE.

Moroccan respondent

Supporting democratic political processes and developments; creating a space of shared responsibilities and interdependence in human, environmental, security and economic areas.

Portuguese respondent
A future vision should be more closely related to a future vision also of the EU and its diverse circles of relationships with enlargement and partner countries, also beyond the neighbourhood.

German respondent

Conflict resolution is mentioned in 22% of the answers. The EU’s capacity to act as a mediator and peace broker in the region (which was assessed as weak in last year’s Survey dedicated to this issue) is identified as a major concern.

…the vision should focus on conflict resolution including the Arab-Israeli conflict as well as other conflicts by addressing the root causes instead of dealing with the results.

Lebanese respondent

The vision for the future relations between the EU and the Southern Neighbourhood countries should reinforce the EU’s contribution to promoting the settlement of regional conflicts.

Greek respondent

The vision should be long term – horizon 2040 for instance – to develop civil society actors in the Southern Neighbourhood with tools of methods of strategic nonviolence, mediation/negotiation, and leadership, especially designed to empower women, but also young men who are willing to challenge the age-old patriarchal structures of their societies, which are at the core of the systemic violence.

French respondent

A similar percentage of answers (19%) addressed social and economic cooperation.

Basic reasons behind the unrest in the Southern Neighbourhood countries are those related to economics, insufficient income of the majority of the population, uneven distribution of wealth, corruption, etc. More attention should be provided to economic and developmental cooperation.

Turkish respondent

La relation doit mettre l’accent beaucoup plus sur un accompagnement réel et sur une stratégie d’uniformisation ou de mise à niveau du développement du pays par rapport à ses voisins immédiats.

Mauritanian respondent

The vision should be aimed more at contributing to improving the people’s wellbeing through more youth employment based on local industrialisation and rural development.

Italian respondent

Les futures relations des pays partenaires du voisinage sud avec l’UE doivent prendre avec sérénité les problèmes liés au rattrapage des économies des pays du sud.

Belgian respondent

16% of answers relate to the idea of differentiation based on partners’ capacities, priorities and challenges.

At this point, there is not a single vision. Some countries need stabilisation, like Libya; others need real help and involvement, like Tunisia; some need to be monitored closely, especially in terms of civil rights, like Egypt…

Spanish respondent
Every Southern Neighbourhood partner country’s democratic and economic status should be seriously taken into consideration. If the ENP is to have continuing relevance as an overall policy framework for such a diverse, and currently violent, region, the principle of differentiation in approaches between countries will need to come even more to the fore.

Lithuanian respondent

Need for a clear common vision (including common strategy) of what we want to achieve in the neighbourhood, particularly with regard to countries/regions in conflict. Working closely with them and listening to their ideas. Existing regional comprehensive strategies, Action Plans as a basis for preparing comprehensive (sub) regional and country-specific external action (including security) strategies.

Slovakian respondent

Finally, 9% of responses point out the importance of fostering human rights and democratic values.

The vision should be based on some kind of conditionality. The EU should not assist countries where there are systematic violations of human rights.

Spanish respondent

Engage in more dialogue with a wider variety of partners (country leaders, NGOs/civil society organisations, and other stakeholders), Alliance building platform with partners in order to agree common aims for the region. Proactive engagement: the European policy-makers should engage with partner countries in order to direct their activism towards promotion of peace, stability, and democracy.

Cypriot respondent

Among other answers, some express the need to rethink interdependence between the two shores; some make reference to challenges in the region, to the need for more EU political weight and for an increased consistency and coherence of EU Members States.

... Europe will continue to be the reference for standards and values for the next decade. The European policy needs to be more independent and more intrusive, based on soft power.

Syrian respondent

“Neighbourhood” and “partnership” need to be re-conceptualised to mean something. Relations cannot be seen and formed as a “lesser form of accession”. It’s not only about common and shared standards and principles but about shared objectives in the area of foreign policy.

German respondent

Less differentiation and more “positive engagement”. A vision based on sincerity (telling the truth), equality (real and not formal co-ownership) and respect. It should be a vision based not on the idea of “Southern Neighbourhood” but on the idea of shared Mediterranean neighbourhood.

Belgian respondent

Ces relations sont confrontées à des défis importants qui risquent, s’ils ne sont pas pris sérieusement en compte, d’aggraver la fracture entre les deux rives de la Méditerranée.

Moroccan respondent

Sortir de l’approche ambivalente avec les pays du sud. Dans le discours on prétend vouloir soutenir les reformes démocratiques et le progrès social, alors qu’une étude attentive de l’action réelle de l’UE dans le cadre de la PEV montre qu’elle vise avant tout à imposer un modèle économique ultra libéral et un plus grand contrôle des migrations.

Lebanese respondent
Question 5 asked what respondents expect from the relations of the EU with its southern partner countries. Answers generally provide constructive assessments, although some reflect a certain sense of pessimism. They are grouped in five main categories giving some indications on what the respondents expect from a renewed ENP.

Graph 6: What do you expect from the EU relations with its Southern Neighbourhood partner countries?
(categories developed from the open-ended question)

About a third of the responses refer to a strengthened and enhanced cooperation, and propose specific fields of cooperation. The principle of differentiation again constitutes a common denominator in a number of answers.

I expect a closer cooperation, more specifically adjusted cooperation programmes which could respond to the serious challenges confronting the Southern Neighbourhood partner countries, which also affect the EU.

Romanian respondent

Bilans des politiques précédentes et approche constructive (par le dialogue) face aux défis économiques, écologiques et culturels communs qui forment la base des futurs rapports et détermineront leur nature conflictuelle ou de coopération.

Algerian respondent

A strong support for education and culture. An economic partnership based on traditional relations with some well-known historical partners, no global agreements with the EU, no take-it-or-leave-it free-trade agreements (even with grace periods), no intimidation using unrealistic economic theories.

Lebanese respondent

Davantage de coopération universitaire (formation, recherche) sur des enjeux communs aux pays méditerranéens (changement climatique, pollution, démographie, religions...). Un renforcement de la coopération des régions (plus que des États).

French respondent

Finding common grounds to achieve the needs of the Southern Neighbourhood partner countries by addressing the needs of each country and not grouping the needs of all countries in one basket.

Lebanese respondent

Every partner country should be given the possibility to develop its relations with the EU in its own way, in accordance with its own needs and capacities. This does not imply the adoption of double standards, nor does it negate the unified nature of the ENP, by which means the EU has succeeded in taking a coherent approach to all its ENP partners.

Spanish respondent
22% of the open-ended answers address security and stability in a broad sense, tackling violence and conflict resolution in the region, but also as a result of socio-economic security and stable governments.

The EU should be more proactive in helping to settle the region’s conflict, and boost the efforts of viable countries to regain growth and development.

Egyptian respondent

Play an active role of diplomacy in bridging internally the Middle East and overcoming the divides (intra-country conflicts like in Yemen, Libya, Syria or Bahrain), between the countries like Morocco and Algeria, between major religious communities like Sunni and Shia, or ethnic groups like Kurds, Arabs and Turks, etc.

Belgian respondent

A serious commitment to implement programmes for less unemployment, less poverty, lower population growth, less corruption and less despotism, which would provide hope for the southern neighbouring countries and security for the EU.

Syrian respondent

18% of answers express a concern about human mobility in the region, namely irregular migrants and refugees. Answers point out the importance of facing the challenges in a comprehensive way.

The EU will only have enough leverage on the southern partners if it starts sharing the migratory burden seriously.

Slovenian respondent

More EU understanding of the realities of the southern Mediterranean. Dealing better with human aspects (migrations, refugees...). Better EU understanding of conflicts and their dynamics and logics. More awareness of the social dimension.

French respondent

Traiter la question migratoire avec une logique réaliste qui doit aider les Etats partenaires à confronter les problèmes de développement au niveau local, source d’émigration vers l’étranger. La PEV doit intégrer dans ses directives les immigrés présents sur les territoires européens et qui sont très attachés par la dynamique de leurs réseaux sociaux aux origines locales dans leurs pays.

Tunisian respondent

13% of answers believe that EU relations with southern partners should be based on strategic long-term objectives.

Close cooperation on jointly tackling trans-national challenges; and functional bilateral cooperation reflecting both sides’ interests without losing sight of the long-term goal of developing a shared political vision.

German respondent

Longer-term commitment to those who share the EU values, if the EU strategy is, say, 5 or 10 years long, gives the local non-governmental partners more time to achieve the same objectives and goals.

British respondent
13% of answers give a more pessimistic outlook.

I don’t expect a lot if it continues working in the same way, building only on security and economics and stopping immigrants.

Palestinian respondent

I don’t see a real European policy in Syria, Palestine, Iraq, Egypt, Yemen, even Tunisia. Instead, disinterest, alignment on US position or continuation with national policies.

Turkish respondent

That we will have continuous difficulties in developing agreements which in a real way make it possible for the southern partners to see the advantages in cooperating with the EU.

Danish respondent

The last question of this block aims to assess how the ENP can perform best. Results reflect some of the main issues that dominated the debate over the ENP review, e.g. ownership and differentiation. Results also relate to the very nature of the ENP, with some answers calling for the ENP to concentrate on its cooperation pillar and others calling for the ENP to be more political.

**Graph 7: How can the European Neighbourhood Policy perform best?** (categories developed from the open-ended question)

More equitable partnership: 33%

Differentiation: Country-by-country/East-South: 25%

As a cooperation instrument: 24%

As a political instrument: 19%

Source: Compiled by IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey/Question 6

A large number of answers address the importance of fostering a partnership based on mutual interests (33%). The idea of differentiation can be traced in 25% of the answers, with some respondents emphasising the country-by-country approach, and others referring to a deeper East-South differentiation. Part of the answers highlight that the ENP can best perform acting as an exclusively cooperation instrument (24%), while 19% consider the ENP would perform better as a more political instrument.

**More equitable partnership:**

To develop partnerships based on mutual interests. We should also prevent ritualised and technocratic discussions both within the EU and in partner countries, and look into more innovative formats of engaging bilaterally and regionally. In this respect, initiatives such as the Barcelona Conference should guide us towards more synergy between the EU and its neighbours.

Slovak respondent

When it cooperates on principles: equality and reciprocity as well as consultation and mutual assistance in order to effectively bring about poverty alleviation, sustainable development and promote the participation and integration of all concerned major groups.

Lebanese respondent
En renforçant l'équité, la transparence et la représentativité sud. Alléger les procédures et la bureaucratie.

Moroccan respondent

**Differentiation:**

La PEV devrait davantage distinguer les mécanismes de coopération entre le volet à l'Est et celui au Sud. La différenciation doit se poursuivre étant donné une hétérogénéité croissante des États méditerranéens. Il importe aussi de mettre davantage l'accent sur certains secteurs de coopération où les intérêts stratégiques sont forts, comme l’agriculture, la sécurité alimentaire et les zones rurales.

French respondent

The European Neighbourhood Policy could perform better if it took into consideration the diversified needs and situation in each country, and setting achievable milestones to attain reciprocal development on all levels in the region.

Lebanese respondent

**Performing as a cooperation instrument:**

Multilateral cooperation, solidarity, visibility, sufficient funding, including better coordination with EU Member States. Now there is a lot of competition (GIZ, AFD, etc.) and all this should be labelled EU. What we are giving southern countries is ridiculous; we also need to better involve all EU Member States. Southern countries want dialogue with all EU Member States and not only a few coming with funds.

Spanish respondent

The current ways of working need serious improvement. The EU should act decisively on all fronts in cooperation with its international partners to support younger generations and women in science and technology careers and integration (with an appropriate recovery plan).

Syrian respondent

**Performing as a political instrument:**

A serious effort is needed in order to enhance the information and visibility of the ENP and other policies. Better coordination between the EC, EEAS, and EU Member States and a stronger focus on policy actions are crucial to increase the EU’s impact and visibility. More organised migration management is urgently needed.

Cypriot respondent

Par en faire un instrument politique plutôt qu'un instrument budgétaire comme c’est le cas aujourd'hui.

Lebanese respondent

By adapting the policies to the needs of the different countries and by being part of a broader geopolitical assessment of the region. It needs to be in line with the strategic thinking developed in the new European Security Strategy (the policies of the ENP should be aimed at implementing the political/strategic priorities defined in Mogherini’s new strategy).

Spanish respondent