

**“CEEC – DEBATE”
REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE IN LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE AND BRUSSELS
FRIDAY, 7 MAY AND SATURDAY, 8 MAY 2004**

„THE NEW EUROPE STARTS ON 1 MAY 2004”



the project is financed by the European Commission, in the framework of the 5FP for Research

The Conference in Louvain-la-Neuve and in Brussels was the fourth and the last one in the CEEC-Debate series of conferences (after similar events in Lodz, Ljubljana and Budapest). The issues related to the future of the new European Union and the European constitutional process were discussed by experts from new and older member states as well as candidate countries, in front of an audience of students and researchers.

The two-day conference was divided into three thematic parts:

- **The Intergovernmental Conference and the New Members: Positions, Outcomes and Perspectives** – round table chaired by Luc Bernard (Professor at the Université Catholique de Louvain) with the participation of Péter Balázs (Member of the European Commission), Mateja Norcic (Counsellor, Permanent Representation of Slovenia to the EU), Paulo Ponzano (Director of the Task Force Future of Europe in the European Commission), Philippe de Schoutheete (Ambassador, former Belgian representative to the EU) and Rafal Trzaskowski (European Centre Natolin). The comments were given by Barbara Lippert (Institute for European Politics Berlin) and Lucia Serena Rossi (Professor at the University of Bologna).
- **European Elections in an enlarged Union: election campaigns, candidates and future perspectives** – session chaired by Barbara Lippert with the participation of Brendan Donnelly (Director of the Federal Trust for Education and Research, London, former MEP), Bojko Bucar (Professor at the University of Ljubljana) Eszter Czuriga (Hungarian National Assembly) and Rafal Trzaskowski (European Centre Natolin).
- **The European Union’s capacity to enlarge. Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey and who next?** – Session chaired by Christian Franck with the participation of Alexis Brouhns (Ambassador, former EU special representative to FYROM), Krassimir Nikolov (Bulgarian European Community Studies Association) and Alain Servantie (Adviser at DG Enlargement, European Commission).

The conference took place only a few days after the accession of 10 new members to the European Union and ten days before the IGC re-launch in mid-May 2004. These two particular aspects were the main points of reference for the debate. Positions, interests and the role of the new members in shaping the new Union constituted a major focus of all interventions, although discussants' perspectives were different: they were both academics and practitioners, representing the old and the new EU member states.

In the introductory part of the conference Professor **Christian Franck**, the project co-ordinator, recalled the four major questions that the CEEC-Debate project is addressing, namely the dilemma of supranationality and community method vs. national sovereignty which implies a stronger intergovernmentalism (the role of the European Commission, extension of the QMV and prospects of enhanced cooperation); the relationship between larger and smaller countries (the protection of the equality of the member states against a possible "*directoire*" of the biggest); potential dualism between joining the EU and NATO at the same time (the relationship of the newcomers with the US) as well as the question of actorship in shaping national preferences on EU affairs. It has been observed that the shaping of national positions on EU draft Constitutional Treaty was restricted to an elitarian circle including governmental sphere and a few groups of experts. It is to be stressed that two main political issues proved to be of great sensitiveness of the public opinion in the new member states. The commitment of all CEECs to the US-led intervention in Iraq has met reluctance of the public opinion; and in Poland, the question of voting modalities in the Council, which has been made popular by the slogan "to keep Nice or to die" has found a large echo in the media and has become an issue of domestic politics. All these questions were discussed in the course of the following three sessions of the conference.

For such a short paper, I think it is a bit confusing to have the conclusions here – especially after having presented the introduction/beginning of the conference. I have put them in the end.

I. ROUND TABLE: THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE AND THE NEW MEMBERS: POSITIONS, OUTCOMES AND PERSPECTIVES

Paolo Ponzano gave a first-hand information from the meeting at ministerial level which took place in Dublin on 4 May 2004 as a first step to re-launch the IGC. The main elements for further IGC negotiations, included in the working document entitled "Meeting of Focal Points"¹, are the following:

- amendment to the team presidency setup (Irish Presidency proposal: 18-month Council team Presidency, whereas each of the three Member States would chair each Council for one six-month period),

¹ Conference of the Representatives of the Governments and the Member States, CIG 73/04; PRESID 16; IGC 2003 – Meeting of Focal Points (Dublin, 4 May 2004) working document; Brussels, 20 April 2004

- no new proposals with regard to the qualified majority voting (QMV),
- a reference to Christianity is unlikely to be included in the Constitution since a reference to religious values is already made in the text,
- reintroduction of unanimity in the field of the Area of Justice and Freedom is envisaged.

Mateja Norcic stressed the Slovenian official position at the IGC, which slightly differs from the consensus reached by the European Convention (NB: she is former advisor to the Slovenian government delegate at the Convention). The proposed modifications concern the Commission (number of commissioners: one per country), the parity in voting rights (double majority) and the number of Slovenian MEPs (increase of the number of Slovenian seats). Slovenia welcomes the Irish proposal, which is lagging for transparency. As to a general assessment of the IGC, it is considered to be a turning point in the process of learning how to work together, which is particularly important for the new members. Two momenta are crucial for Slovenia in terms of a successful outcome of the IGC: the adoption of the Constitution and a successful ratification (in particular in countries which foresee a referendum therefore).

Rafal Trzaskowski (intervened in a double function: representing Jacek Saryusz-Wolski who had to cancel his participation in the conference at last minute and in his own name. The intervention focused on the Polish vision of an enlarged Union and the evolution of Poland's position over the last months. The main criticism of the draft constitutional treaty touched the intergovernmental characteristic which was perceived as too strong. The draft treaty strengthens the Council to the detriment of the Commission. Proportionality is meant to be ensured in the EP rather than in the Council. When explaining Poland's position during the Brussels summit, he stressed that Poland proved to be a strong and operational partner while defending the conditions of membership accepted by the country's population in the accession referendum. Therefore, one shall not demonise Poland's role in the European Union in the future, because this country remains open to compromises, it wants to appear as a constructive partner, it is involved in most of the Union's projects such as the Lisbon strategy, as well as security and defence policy when participating in the structured cooperation. Finally, Poland intends to play an important role in strengthening the cooperation in the framework of the new neighbourhood policy.

Ambassador **Philippe de Schoutheete** stressed the impact of the ongoing enlargement on the institutional system and in particular on the importance of building up the EU as an action-oriented multinational system. At the heart of his intervention was a reflection on the motives of acting of countries participating in the IGC, namely the difference between the concepts of prestige and power. While "power" refers rather to the quality of leadership (see: the bargaining in Nice), political reality has to do rather with "prestige". New members of the Union are involved in the complex process of adaptation and they often lack experience in terms of EU decision-making (e.g. performance of civil servants, role of representatives from the new members in the Council and in COREPER).

Consequently “prestige” is to be acquired together with practical experiences on the functioning in the EU. In this context, also the question of the number of votes in the Council is a problem of prestige. Finally, Ambassador de Schoutheete stressed the character of cleavages in the EU. Concerning COREPER, he argued cleavages between big and smaller member states are rare. Other types of system cleavages are predominant, namely concerning the an intellectual approach to the community method, the degree of liberalism or the country’s position as donor or receiver in budgetary terms.

The discussion following these interventions concentrated on two main points: the question of equality between the member states and the future perspectives of a more integrationist approach to the CFSP. On the first point, it was stressed that political equality between EU member states in terms of decision-making/is illusory (contrary to the Council of Europe and the United Nations where decisions are not taken). On the other hand, equality may be envisaged in a federal system, whereas the system introduced by the Treaty of Nice does not correspond to any of the existing federal systems. On the CFSP, a reflection was made on the impact of a blocking minority and facilitating majority on decision making in security matters. This problem remains however hypothetical, because so far the qualified majority does not apply to CFSP.

Lucia Serena Rossi focused on the case of non-ratification of the constitutional treaty and possible solutions. She stressed the role of the reinforced cooperation and other forms of international cooperation and proposed four solutions to a possible stalemate situation:

- Coexistence of the Constitutional Treaty and the existing treaties,
- Separate agreements with countries which have not signed the Constitutional Treaty (see: Penelope project),
- Clause of a “voluntary withdrawal” (*retrait volontaire*),
- Breaking with the current system, reference to the international law (*rebus lex tantibus*).

Barbara Lippert presented two possible scenarios for the future of the enlarged Europe, focusing on the impact of enlargement on EU decision-making and the role of national interests. The first scenario (inspired by Moravcik’s approach) stresses continuity, reinforcement and development, but also a slower legislative output and decision making. A budgetary cleavage would be accompanied by a pillarisation of governance implying a deeper intergovernmental approach and a stronger role of the Council. According to this scenario, there would be more recourse to flexibility and “coalitions of willing”, whereas the overall focus of integration would shift from deepening to widening, which would lead to a refinement of the existing status quo (by means of possible accessions of Bulgaria, Romania, countries of Western Balkans and Turkey). The second scenario – “EU as a new entity” – implies a long transitory period in which no record would be made on the reform of the system, but it also means a chance for the Council to develop a more supranational approach. This scenario would imply a new group dynamics in the Union and a regrouping of

political coalitions in the EU of 25, a new mix of orientations and policy preferences as well as a practical differentiation as far as the implementation of the *acquis* is concerned. Under this scenario there would be an increased demand for leadership, but at the same time reluctance to accept hegemony or any form of *directoire*.

Barbara Lippert drew conclusions of the role of the new members in the Convention. In her opinion, the Convention was not the constitutional moment, but it has generated the collective will to reach a common outcome. Representatives from the new member states had a low profile as mainstreamers, which may be explained by the fact that the new members are going through a learning process.

A key-note speech done by **Peter Balazs**, the new Hungarian Commissioner, was the culmination of the session on Friday. He evaluated the dimension of the Constitutional Treaty as “more than a treaty and less than a constitution” and its outcome as “more than expected, less than necessary”. In general, the Convention proposed too less to ensure a coherent leadership for an enlarged Europe. Relatively few points were controversial at that moment, including the voting system which refers not only purely to the decision-making procedures but also to the question of equality of EU member states. On the institutions, he stressed the importance of the rotating presidency as a sign of symbolic presence of Member States representatives in the Union (a team presidency could be a solution ensuring a satisfactory level of effectiveness); as well as the need to reduce the number of commissioners (30 or even 25 can not guarantee operability and efficiency of the Commission as a governing body). However, there was no answer to the question on criteria for rotation of commissioners. The external action of the Union shall be much more concentrated on a clear set of competencies. Commissioner Balazs presented a prognosis for the new developments of the Union and stressed a new dynamics arising with 25 member states, implying an active role of the newcomers and their involvement in the coalition-building, which will also mean fewer attempts to represent national interests. However, on issues such as the creation of a European labour market, there is an increased danger of national fragmentation. By emphasising national interests, the Union as a whole will become disadvantaged on competitiveness compared for example to the USA.

II. SECOND SESSION: EUROPEAN ELECTIONS IN AN ENLARGED UNION: ELECTION CAMPAIGNS, CANDIDATES AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

The sixth European elections are unique because of special circumstances: the current enlargement; realistic prospects for a Constitutional Treaty, new European Commission; the number of entitled to vote (almost 350 million people) and the increased size of the EP (732 Members of the European Parliament will be elected, which means 108 more MEPs than in EU 15). The elections campaigns for the so-called “pan-European elections” to the EP to be hold on 10-13 June 2004 have already started in all EU member states.

In this context, the second session of the conference concentrated on the approach of the new members vis-à-vis the EP elections, exemplified by Hungary, Poland and

Slovenia. At the same time, the session tried to answer some general questions on the role of the EP, its legitimacy and public interest.

In an introductory speech, **Brendan Donnelly**, Director of the Federal Trust and former MEP, concentrated on the general “raison d’être” of the European elections, possible solutions on how to increase the public awareness for the EP and the interest for these elections as well as major existing problems. It was noticed that the attention to the EP elections is constantly declining. A low turnout in most of the EU members may be explained by a “European fatigue”. In each country the elections are different, which is due to the interconnection between the domestic situation and the European elections as well as to different national parliamentary systems. The domestic situation is essential in each country, therefore topics for discussion differ from one country to another. In some cases there is an interaction between a referendum on domestic issues and the EP elections. To improve the general attitude towards the EP elections, proposed setting up of transnational parties could shift the dynamics of European elections. Technically such a step seems to be difficult to achieve, because national parties would only pretend to get into transnational parties. The second solution, proposed by the European Convention, would consist in according the EP the competence to elect the President of the European Commission (this proposal has not been retained, in fact the President of the Commission will be elected by the European Council, the EP may, however, veto this decision). The major problem of the EP is its limited scope of competencies. For example, in areas such as taxation or foreign policy the EP is unable to vote. Although the European Convention gave some additional prerogatives to the EP, it proved that the EU reached a deadlock between intergovernmental and supranational approach. The member states are masters of treaties and the EP - with its limited role - is a victim of the EU schizophrenia on institutional issues. In these circumstances, there is a need of a coherent conception to explain to the public what the EP is for. As to Brendan Donnelly, foreign policy and EURO (implying softened and more integrationist economic governance) are two fields where the EP should have a word. In particular, if it comes to a creation of a “core Europe” in the field of CFSP, a substantial involvement of the EP will be inevitable.

In Slovenia, as to **Bojko Bucar**, the general public is not aware at all of the European elections, although the election campaign started in March. Only business circles are informed about and interested in these elections. This situation can be interpreted as a projection of the democratic deficit and the predominance of the domestic issues over the European ones. The candidates for the EP are not first rank politicians in national politics, because the top candidates started already to run their campaign for national elections which will take place in Slovenia in Fall 2004. Political parties do not consider the EP elections as an important issue, which also leads to a lack of interest in the media. The nominations cover second and third rank runners or potential losers in the national elections (sending some politicians to Brussels, means getting ride of them on the national scene). There is no discussion on substance yet, but possibly the issues for debate will be domestic and not European ones. To sum up, the role of the EP as a latecomer in the European integration has not been

properly understood in Slovenia, because during the pre-accession period attention was given to other institutions, in particular the European Commission and the Council.

Eszter Czuriga gave an overview of the modalities for EP elections in Hungary, which started on 17th March 2004, when the President of the Hungarian Republic officially announced the polling day. The funding of the election campaign is not regulated by the Act on the election of members of the EP: in a Resolution the Hungarian Parliament agreed with the use of 4.350 million Forint for preparation and completion of the elections. During the campaign period, broadcasters may publish political advertisements based on equal conditions for each party. No opinion polls may be published between the 5th of June and the 13th of June, until the close of polling stations. The election campaign finishes at 24 p.m. on 11th June 2004. The legal basis for the EP in Hungary is the Constitution and a law on election of the members of the EP (Act No. CXIII. adopted 13 December 2003).

On the basis of a forecast the main opposition party FIDESZ together with the smaller opposition party MDF should beat the governing Socialist Party in the June elections. In comparison with the current composition of Hungarian MEPs the Socialists may gain one more mandate and the SZDSZ should lose one of their two seats. On the basis of a forecast there is a reasonable chance that only FIDESZ and MSZP will reach the five percent threshold.

Party	EP Group	Votes		MEPs			
		National election	Forecast Mean	Current	June 04 Mean	June 04 Max	June 04 Min
Citizens' Party-Democratic Forum (Fidesz-MDF)	EPP-ED	41.1	42.2	12	12	13	11
Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP)*	PES	42.1	37.6	10	11	12	9
Alliance of Free Democrats (SzDSz)*	ELDR	5.5	5.0	2	1	2	1
Justice and Life Party (MIEP)	NA	4.4	4.8	0	0	2	0
Centre Party (CP)		3.9	4.4	0	0	0	0
Workers' Party (MP)		2.8	3.6	0	0	0	0
Smallholders' Party (FKgP)		0.8	2.4	0	0	0	0

Source: Eszter Czuriga, Presentation in Louvain-la-Neuve

Rafal Trzaskowski explained the current situation in Poland with regard to public support for political parties and its implications for the EP elections. He stressed a “two-reality” situation, namely the difference between the current – provisory - repartition of seats in the EP (where the ruling Alliance of Democratic Left - SLD-predominates) and the public preferences in Poland as on May 2004. Two parties are leading in polls: the centrist Civic Platform (Platforma Obywatelska) and the populist Self-defence (Samoobrona) both with 30% of public support. The expected turnout is of about 30%, which would be a quite optimistic perspective.

The main political parties (the ruling social-democrats, Civic Platform and Law and Justice) decided to put a few high profile names on their lists, but in general candidates are locally known people without European experience. The Polish

Parliament opted for having 13 regional lists instead of one (contrary to Hungary which has only one constituency).

The central issues in the electoral debate are very likely to be EU-linked. The EP campaign will probably turn into a continuation of the accession referendum campaign. At the same time, because of the differences of opinion between Poland and some of the EU countries on the constitution, the budget, the VAT and so on – the opposition parties will present themselves as defenders of national interests and attack the government on the grounds that it has been too lenient vis-à-vis the EU. It seems that national issues (taking into account a very weak position of the social-democratic government) are going to be of secondary importance.

The chairperson **Barbara Lippert** was concerned about the high percentage of Central European populations voting for populist parties (e.g. Samoobrona in Poland – 30%), which proves to be a significant element of the political culture in the new democracies. Also more consolidated democracies are not free from a risk of instability.

III. THIRD SESSION: UNION'S CAPACITY TO ENLARGE. BULGARIA, ROMANIA, TURKEY AND WHO NEXT?

Discussions during the third session concentrated on two major issues: the next EU enlargements and the new neighbourhood policy, in particular in the context of the new strategy launched by the Commission in Spring 2004. The situation in the Western Balkans, EU membership of Bulgaria and Turkey were the major focus of this session.

Ambassador **Alexis Brouhns** presented the case of the Western Balkans as an example of the capacity of the EU to lead a successful CFSP. The EU showed a significant evolution in this region, from a failure of EU action in the beginning of the 90ies (due to divergences of positions of the Member States and an operational paralysis of the EU) towards a development of a clear EU policy on the Balkans in the end of the 90s.

The EU policy towards the Balkans contains three main elements:

- A “European perspective” as a replacement of the logic of disintegration by a logic of progressive integration;
- The stabilisation and association process (including the Stabilisation and Association Agreements; commercial exchanges and financial assistance of 4,6 billion EUR);
- Reinforcement of the crisis management capacity of the Union.

The Western Balkans constitute a challenge for the EU, in particular in view of the consolidation of the political stability and security, support for the institutional building, etc. To be successful, the EU shall have recourse to a better use of the

instruments of the second and third pillar in order to reinforce its credibility in the region by means of giving a membership perspective (“European perspective”) and increase the financial support for the reform of institutions. The role of the EU in Kosovo seems to be less pronounced, because the EU is not effectively involved in the discussions on the final status of this province. Among proposed solutions, including return to the Federation of Serbia and Montenegro or independence, an evolution from an UN protectorate to a EU protectorate could be the most effective. So far, Croatia is the only country, which has received a clear perspective of EU accession (accession negotiations may start by the end of 2004), although the country is still characterised by a fragile political situation and a weak institutional building.

Bulgaria has entered in the final stage of the accession process. In his intervention, **Krassimir Nikolov** focused on Bulgaria’s preparations for EU membership, its participation in the constitutionalisation process, the prospects for a future institutional set-up as well as the perspectives of the new neighbourhood policy. Bulgaria’s main challenges in Spring 2004 are the finalisation of the accession negotiations (as on May 2004 Bulgaria provisionally closed 26 out of 30 negotiation chapters) and the domestic challenges related to the policy making, with a special focus on the question of absorption of the EU funding.

As to the position of Bulgaria in the Convention, its representatives followed the mainstream, in particular the positions of the Benelux countries. Lack of practical experience of EU decision-making proved critical in the proposals made by the Bulgarian representatives e.g. proposal of Ms. Kuneva to give independent budgetary powers to the EP. The role of Bulgaria as an observer country in the IGC remains marginal, but in the opinion of Krassimir Nikolov, both Bulgaria and Romania should have the opportunity to sign the Constitutional Treaty together with other 25 EU Member States.

From the Bulgarian perspective, the new neighbourhood policy shall contain a coherent design of policy instruments and reflect a balance between the credibility of European dimension and a will to build a broader common market.

Alain Servantie pointed out that the present enlargement is unachieved, in so far the question of Cyprus has not been solved. As to the three next candidates, clear perspectives can be drawn only for Bulgaria, whereas accession of Romania and Turkey remains unclear (see: very critical reports of the EP). Croatia received a comprehensible perspective of membership in March 2004 (see: opinion of the Commission). Next enlargements are often subject of internal debates in current EU member states, for example the question of Turkey is a point for electoral campaign in France, Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands. Defence policy is used as an argument in the discussion on Turkey’s membership: if Turkey becomes member of the Union, the need of a common defence will be even more pronounced.

The central focus of Mr. Servantie’s intervention was the Commission’s communication – a “Strategy Paper” on the neighbourhood policy, issued one week

after the conference (published on 12 May 2004) , containing an action plan for seven neighbouring countries: Ukraine, Moldova, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Jordan, Tunisia and Israel. In the future, this strategy will be expanded to three Caucasus countries, namely Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. The Commission's proposal for a new strategy shall be based on:

- differentiated Action Plans based on political dialogue, economic and social development policy, market opening, as well as close cooperation in JHA;
- a new financial instrument in support of ENP (the European Neighbourhood Instrument, completing the existing TACIS and MEDA programmes);
- encouragement for a closer regional cooperation.

The objective of the new neighbourhood policy shall be to share the benefits of the ongoing enlargement with neighbouring countries, including stability, security and well-being in a way which is distinct from EU membership. However, this approach is not likely to be accepted by countries like Ukraine, which aspires for EU membership in a mid-term perspective.

Several points were discussed in the discussion following the three interventions:

- The importance of the neighbourhood policy as a guarantee of ensuring minority rights (e.g. Hungarian minorities in Ukraine or Serbia and Montenegro).
- The openness of the new EU members for further accessions, which want to strengthen their regional interests (e.g. Poland backing Ukraine and in the future Belarus, Slovenia backing Croatia),
- The efficiency of the new neighbourhood policy. The current overstretch of the Union makes a coherent neighbourhood policy difficult, since there is no real investment in coming to a more coherent neighbourhood. To achieve this goal, the EU shall be more inventive in the future, showing flexibility and accepting special arrangements – thus showing a larger degree of openness for its neighbour countries.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The EU as an actor and national preferences:

- Cleavages are not taking place between smaller and larger member states. There are other more salient points of divergence: approach to the community method, degree of liberalism, the country's position as donor or receiver in budgetary terms, etc.
- The terms of “complex of a Lilliputian” (Paul Mignette) and “complex of Gulliver” are gaining on importance with the accession of 9 smaller – in terms of population - countries to the EU.
- Coalitions in an enlarged Union are not to be permanent but will be built according to issues.

- The terms “power” and “prestige” are determining the behaviour of actors at EU level.
- Equality between member states is illusory: there are obvious differences in terms of size, economic power, etc.
- There is a need for more leadership in the enlarged Union, with or without a constitutional treaty.

Institutional questions:

- All new members are in favour of reaching a consensus on the Constitutional Treaty under the Irish Presidency in June 2004 .
- In principle, all CEECs represent pro-integrationist positions, however when it comes to the extension of the QMV, they opt for keeping the unanimity in questions related to taxation and budgetary issues.
- All new members are in favour of keeping the Nice provision “one Commissioner, one country”. This standpoint is also understandable from the point of view of the Commission (see: position of the Commission on the IGC).

European elections:

- Like in older EU member states, the expected turnout in the CEECs will be very low (with the exception of Slovenia where 70% of the voters intend to cast their votes).
- There is a lack of interest in the European elections in the new members, which can be interpreted as a consequence of the democratic deficit, the predominance of the domestic issues over the European ones, and a limited information policy about the EP and its role during the accession process.
- Election campaigns in the new member states show a lack of clearly defined issues. In general, current domestic debates prevail over European issues, except in Poland where the central issues in the electoral debate are very likely to be EU-linked. The EP campaign in this country will probably turn into a continuation of the accession referendum campaign.
- In Hungary, Poland and Slovenia only few candidates are experts on EU affairs. In their majority, the candidates are second-rank politicians, only regionally known people without EU experience or candidates “uncomfortable” for a party on the national political scene.

EU neighbours:

- The new EU neighbourhood strategy opens new ways for cooperation with countries for which a perspective of EU membership is excluded or very distant. The Commission’s new strategy paper proposes differentiated Action Plans, a new financial instrument in support of ENP and it encourages a closer regional cooperation.

- The Western Balkans constitute a challenge for the EU, in particular in view of the consolidation of the political stability and security and the support for the institutional building. To be successful, the EU shall have recourse to a better use of the instruments of the second and third pillar in order to reinforce its credibility in the region. The EU should give a perspective of EU membership and increase the financial support for the reform of institutions.
- The new EU members are generally open for further accessions. They want to strengthen their regional interests (e.g. Poland backing Ukraine and in the future Belarus, Slovenia backing Croatia) and to ensure a higher level of protection for their minorities (e.g. Hungarian minority in Serbia and Montenegro).



CEEC-DEBATE: Final Conference

Louvain-la-Neuve/ Brussels:
7 and 8 May 2004

The New Europe starts on 1 May 2004

In the framework of the project: The debate on the *finalité politique* of the European Union in the applicant countries from Central and Eastern Europe, funded by the European Commission under the Fifth Framework Programme for Research.

Friday, 7 May 2004

Louvain-la-Neuve, Institute for European Studies, UCL

Working languages – Langues de travail : EN-FR

14.00 - 14.30 Welcome to the Participants and short Introduction of the CEEC-Debate Project

Christian Franck, Professor, Coordinator of the CEEC-Debate Project
Dorota Pyszna-Nigge, Research Fellow, Université Catholique de Louvain

14.30 – 16.30

**Round Table:
The Intergovernmental Conference and the New Members:
Positions, Outcomes and Perspectives**

Chair:

Luc Bernard, Professor, Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut d'études européennes

Speakers:

Péter Balázs, Member of the European Commission

Mateja Norcic, First Secretary, Permanent Representation of the Republic of Slovenia to the EU

Paulo Ponzano, Director, European Commission, Task Force *Avenir de l'Union et questions institutionnelles*

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski, President of the European Centre Natolin, former Polish Minister of European Affairs, represented by Rafal Trzaskowski, Senior Researcher, European Centre Natolin

Philippe de Schoutheete de Tervarent, *Ambassadeur honoraire, Professeur invité*, Université Catholique de Louvain

16.30 - 17.00

Coffee Break

17.00 - 18.00

Commentators:

Barbara Lippert, Deputy Director, the Institut für Europäische Politik, Berlin

Lucia Serena Rossi, Professor, University of Bologna, European Law Department

Discussion

18:00 - 18:30

Reception

Saturday, 8 May 2004
Brussels, TEPSA (Fondation Universitaire)

09.00 - 11.00

Session I
European Elections in an enlarged Europe:
Election Campaigns, Candidates and future Perspectives

Keynote speech:

Brendan Donnelly, Director, the Federal Trust for Education and Research, London

Chair:

Barbara Lippert, Deputy Director, the Institut für Europäische Politik, Berlin

Bojko Bucar, Professor, Head of the International Relations Division, University of Ljubljana

Eszter Czuriga, Hungarian National Assembly, Office for Foreign Relations, EU Department

Rafal Trzaskowski, Senior Researcher, European Centre Natolin

Discussion

11.00-11.15

Coffee Break

11.15-13.00

Session II
Union's capacity to enlarge. Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey and who next?

Chair:

Christian Franck, Professor, Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut d'études européennes

Alexis Brouhns, Ambassador, Former EU Special Representative to FYROM

Krassimir Nikolov, Secretary General, Bulgarian European Community Studies Association, Sofia

Alain Servantie, Advisor, DG Enlargement, European Commission

Discussion

13.00

Lunch

Closing meeting of the project partners