THE SIXTH EUROMED SURVEY
METHODOLOGY

General Approach

The 6th Euromed Survey dedicated to the ENP review was conducted concomitant with the consultation process launched by the European Commission and the European External Action Service (EEAS) ahead of the release of the Joint Communication on the ENP review. In order to shape the questionnaire of the Survey, the IEMed formed a Steering Group on the ENP review1 composed of top experts in the field of European external relations in the Mediterranean from the EuroMeSCo network, as well as researchers from other think tanks and institutions.

The questionnaire comprises 22 general questions designed to capture the main elements of the ENP review. It follows the broad lines of the Joint Consultation Paper.2 It starts with a general assessment, followed by several blocks dedicated to the articulation with EU policies, the neighbourhood’s definition, relations with partner countries and expectations of partner countries. Finally, a broader block of questions turns to the possible areas of cooperation, including addressing security threats and enhancing orderly migration.

The questionnaire combines open-ended questions and multiple-choice questions with predefined answers offering respondents the possibility to grade on a “very low” to “very high” scale. For these questions, an optional space is provided to explain the answer. This open part of the multiple-choice question is considered of great importance for a Survey of this kind as it contributes to improving the interpretation of its overall results. It has also to be noted that the “Don’t know” option is of importance as it provides significant information in terms of the knowledge of the experts and actors of the variety of policies and actions proposed and implemented by the EU.

The descriptive report of this Survey is divided into four main chapters. The first one is a general review of the ENP; the second one tackles the redefinition of the ENP policy framework, including the geographical scope of the policy, the actors and interlocutors it has to involve and the balance between interests and values. The third chapter targets current policy tools. The last chapter addresses key strategic issues on the outset and implementation of the ENP.

1. The composition of the ad hoc Research Group was as follows: Xavier Aragall, Euro-Mediterranean Policies Technical Advisor, European Institute of the Mediterranean (IEMed); Sven Biscop, Director of Europe in the World Programme, Egmont-Royal Institute for International Relations; Gabriel Busquets, Spanish Ambassador on Special Mission for Mediterranean Affairs; Silvia Colombo, Senior Fellow, Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI); Francesca Fabbri, Research Assistant, European Institute of the Mediterranean (IEMed); Josep Ferré, Managing Director, European Institute of the Mediterranean (IEMed); Senén Florensa, Executive President, European Institute of the Mediterranean (IEMed); Marc Franco, Egmont-Royal Institute for International Relations, Former EU Head of Delegation in Cairo; Andrea Frontini, Policy Analyst, Europe in the World Programme, European Policy Centre (EPC); Florence Gaub, Senior Analyst, European Union Institute for Security Studies; Kristina Kausch, Nonresident Associate at Carnegie Europe; Erwan Lannon, Professor in European Law, University of Ghent and College of Europe; Stefan Lehne, Visiting Scholar, Carnegie Europe; Iván Martín, European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies; Juliane Schmidt, Programme Assistant, Europe in the World Programme, European Policy Centre (EPC); Claire Spencer, Senior Research Fellow, Middle East and North Africa Programme, Chatham House; Richard Youngs, Senior Associate, Democracy and Rule of Law Program, Carnegie Europe.

A Preliminary Survey to Feed a Structured Contribution to the ENP Review

Before launching the 6th Euromed Survey to 4,900 experts and actors, the IEMed collected initial feedback from EuroMeSCo network researchers and other experts that participated in the Steering Group on the ENP review. 206 people were invited for this preliminary step. The results were mentioned in the IEMed contribution to the consultation process “Reviewing the European Neighbourhood Policy”.

Survey Sample

To conduct the Survey, a universe of 4,900 experts, actors and policy-makers from the 43 Union for the Mediterranean countries was selected, all of whom received an invitation to participate in the Survey. As in previous years, geographical distribution, institutional typology, field of knowledge and gender balance were the reference criteria for selecting the universe, as well as knowledge of and involvement in the Euro-Mediterranean Process. Out of this broad universe, 760 responses were received (including 54% from the EU-28 countries).

Graph 1: Breakdown of responses by geographical origin: EU-28 and Mediterranean Partner Countries

* Albania, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Monaco.

Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey
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4. Corresponds to UfM members
As to the distribution of responses per region, the Mediterranean EU countries\(^5\) (32%), the remaining EU countries and the Maghreb countries\(^6\) (with a 22% participation rate respectively) account for the bulk of the responses. Mashreq\(^7\) countries come in fourth position with 14.5% of responses.

**Graph 2: Breakdown of respondents by region (in %)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean EU countries</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of EU</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghreb</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashreq</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European non-EU</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The participation this year has been as important as in previous years. It continues to prove difficult to reach a representative distribution by country. Some countries are over-represented and others under-represented. In order to avoid bias in the results, we have weighted them according to distribution of the target by the countries in the sample (see annex II). With this weighting we avoid the over-representation of Spain, France, Italy Morocco and Tunisia largely determining the results of respondents overall.

**Profile of Respondents**

In the first block of questions, in addition to providing their country of origin, respondents were asked to indicate their gender, age range, and the type of institution (see graph 3) they belonged to.

As shown in the graph below, the majority of respondents to the questionnaire are “experts”, an aggregated category that includes respondents from think tanks, media and, above all, academia. Altogether, these groups roughly account for 49% of the total number of responses. The second category is “policy-makers”, embracing responses from diplomatic bodies, European or international institutions, political parties and governments. Altogether, these groups account for 28% of the total number of responses. Finally, the comparatively smaller but still well-represented category is “civil society”, encompassing trade unions, companies and mainly NGOs.

5. Spain, France, Italy, Portugal, Malta, Cyprus, Greece, Croatia and Slovenia. The first three alone account for nearly 77% of responses from this region.
6. Maghreb countries include Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Mauritania and Libya. The first three alone account for 95% of responses from this region.
7. Mashreq countries include Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, the Occupied Palestinian Territories and Syria.
When looking specifically at the individual groups (see graph 4 below), academia clearly emerges as the most represented institution (35% of total responses), followed by NGOs (18%) and governmental bodies (13.7%). Altogether, these groups account for two thirds of the total responses. Comparing the relative participation of the different groups in 2015 with their participation in the last Survey, there seems to be an overall continuity although an increase of 2.7 points of respondents from academics can be noted while NGOs and governmental institutions are slightly less represented (around 3 points each). From the remaining categories, it is interesting to note that representatives of EU institutions, with an increase of 3 points, double their presence.

Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey
Respondents were also asked about their main sector of activity and were given the opportunity to indicate one or two areas of specialisation. As shown in the graph 5, which features aggregated figures for main and secondary areas of specialisation, 42% of the respondents operate in the area of “social, cultural and human exchanges”. “Political cooperation and security” ranks second as the main area of specialisation of respondents (35%), immediately followed by “economic and financial cooperation” (31%). Finally, “migration and justice affairs” comes in fourth place with 11%.

Graph 5: Breakdown of respondents by area of specialisation

Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey (Respondents could indicate one or two areas of specialisation. This graph shows aggregated totals for first and second choices as areas of specialisation. This is why the total percentage exceeds 100%).

When analysing the previous figures by factoring in the geographical dimension, North and South have a differentiated distribution of areas of specialisation. In the North, political cooperation and security is the first area followed by a similar percentage of social, cultural and human exchanges. In the South, this latter area is the main one, while economic and financial cooperation experts is in second place.

Graph 6: Breakdown of respondents by area of specialisation and by region

Source: Compiled by the IEMed based on the results of the 6th Euromed Survey. (Respondents could indicate one or two areas of specialisation. This graph shows aggregated totals for first and second choices as areas of specialisation. This is why the total percentage exceeds 100%).

Finally, to complete the description of the sample on which this Survey is based, it is important to note that 30% of respondents are women, in line with the gender balance of the last Survey (see graph 7). When analysing the North/South dimension, the aggregate proportion of women amounts to 23% for MPCs, while it increases to 35% for EU countries. By regional groups, the Maghreb stands out as an outlier with around 20% of female participation, while the other regions, including the Mediterranean EU countries and the Mashreq, fall within the overall gender ratio (see graph 8).
Graph 7: Breakdown of respondents by gender

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

Graph 8: Breakdown of respondents by gender and regional groups

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