



## Documentation of the Brussels Think Tank Dialogue 2011

### “Europe 3.0: Building a Viable Union”

25. January 2011, Résidence Palace, Brussels.

Organizer: Bertelsmann Stiftung, Bruegel, Center for European Studies (CEPS), Confrontations Europe, Royal Egmont Institute, European Policy Centre (EPC), Friends of Europe, Institut français des relations internationales (Ifri), Madriaga - College of Europe Foundation and Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik.

Media partner: Agence Europe



Dialogue for a positive impact on Europe (f.i.t.r.): Thomas Fischer (Bertelsmann Stiftung), President of the EU Commission José Manuel Barroso and think tanker Olivier Jehin (Ifri).

## Prologue

# Think tanks and policy decision makers: dialogue for Europe's bright future

**“Europe experiences a strongly dynamic moment” said José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission, thus summarizing the main concern of the second Brussels Think Tank Dialogue 2011.**

With the enormous pressure the financial markets are under, there is no option for the European Union other than to work in unison, whilst still trying to work out its design of the future. “Europe 3.0” should bring its message across with a single voice, finally placing itself in the global arena and chancing more democracy at the same time – this was what the experts and the participants of this forum were aiming for.

The goal is to honour the sovereignty of the member states, their parliaments and constitutions, as well as managing to incorporate them all into the new Europe. This, according to Barroso, is an opportunity, rather than a crisis.

More than ever the situation should be considered a chance to prove the European idea. “We need a European dimension more than ever”, concluded Barroso the state of the European Union.

This documentation follows up on the appeal of EU Council's President Herman Van Rompuy to the think tanks: they should assist the policy makers with questions such as how to discover potentially disastrous economic trends ahead of time, so steps can be taken in time. Or they could help work out how to include both national parliaments and national legal frameworks into the Stability and Growth Pact.

Barroso asked the think tanks for their active assistance in designing the future of the European Union: “And don't forget to put pressure on us. We work better under pressure.”

### **What's the meaning of Europe 3.0?**

This year's forum is titled “Europe 3.0: Building a Viable Union”. It refers to the “Web 3.0” debate on how the next generation of the World Wide Web will look like after the current generation 2.0. Web 2.0 provides frameworks for user participation, like social networks. 3.0 goes one step further: It enables the processing and filtering of information according to its relevance to the user. Applied to the next generation of the EU, it would set its policy priorities according to the needs of its “users”.



Think tank spokesmen (f.l.t.r.): Dominique Moïsi (Ifri), Giles Merritt (Friends of Europe), Philippe De Schoutheete (Egmont), Philippe Herzog (Confrontations Europe), Michael Emerson (CEPS), Nicolas Véron (Bruegel) and Thomas Fischer (Bertelsmann Stiftung).

#### Opening Plenary – Impulse Statements

## The State of the European Union

### **Representatives of Brussels think tanks on recent accomplishments and looming challenges.**

“The banking crisis is still not solved”, is Nicolas Véron’s (Bruegel) diagnosis of the European Union’s state of health. The Euro-Crisis was strongly related to the banking crisis, said Véron. Like a cancer it spreads out into the Eurozone, he said. “Efforts should be undertaken by all players”, stated Véron. The comparison with Japan and the USA shows: “They waited ten years before solving their financial crisis.” Sweden only needed one year. “They look good compared to the EU. They did their homework in banking legislation.” Véron blames a lack of coordination within the European Union for this.

Europe would not even be on the map for the USA and Asia, Michael Emerson of the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) added. It would be even worse if the EU were not to take advantage of its new instrument, the European External Action Service (EEAS), to bring itself into position as a significant global actor. In the face of discussions about slimming down the EU budget, he has even less understanding for the weak effort put into building up the EEAS. After all, the Member

States spend no less than 7.5 billion euros on their national diplomatic services each year (excluding humanitarian aid and operational expenditures). The 27 countries employ about 94.000 staff, of which nearly 55.500 are full diplomats, twice as many as the USA. The EEAS started with around 3.700 staff, costing 476 million euros. To Emerson, restructuring the European diplomacy means a chance to save money.

The EEAS is the only positive of two recent achievements of the EU, says the Belgian Ambassador Philippe De Schoutheete (Egmont). The second, negative, achievement, according to him: no open conflict between people and institutions. “Tensions exist, but seen from the outside, there is no open conflict.” This lowers the credibility of the EEAS, and credibility is the instrument of collective action, De Schoutheete concluded. He appealed to increase the credibility of the EEAS outside the EU.

“Although the Lisbon Treaty has introduced the European External Action Service, the Union still seems to be far away from speaking with one voice in international relations”, Thomas Fischer, Executive Director, Brussels Office, Bertelsmann Stiftung, pointed out. For instance, the negotiations about how to implement the EEAS were considerably hampered by the power struggles between the European institutions. And moreover China’s call to boycott the 2010 Nobel Prize, awarded to Liu Xiaobo, was not turned down

unisonous by EU governments. “Europe’s single voice at the World Climate Summit in Cancun was still missing,” criticised Fischer. One year after the Lisbon Treaty entered into force, he sees several indications that illustrate the need for policy innovation which may only be achieved by further deepening European integration. In Fischer’s opinion, this is hardly possible if the Union fails to define clear priorities on its political agenda. “Focusing its activities on key European policy fields may also be one of the most promising approaches towards strengthening public support for and democratic participation in the European project.”

“If we don’t manage the monetary crisis then we are no real union,” said Philippe Herzog of Confrontations Europe. He described the European Union as “lame”, hobbling on only one foot: financial stability. Its second foot could be the strengthening of the growth potential of the union. He criticised that two and a half years passed and the crisis has yet to be solved, and the President of the EU commission, José Manuel Barroso has not launched the priorities, Herzog said. According to him, markets are testing the EU. In this situation, absence of the Commission would be with severe consequences. The Commission was too weak and did not have the right people to achieve changes, Herzog said. “This should be a subject of public debate. This should be discussed, so as to build a common will and solidarity.”

One who self-critically questioned the think tanks itself was Giles Merritt, Friends of Europe: “Who are we and what are we for?” Change would require pulling EU policy makers and think tanks out of their comfort zone, away from business as usual and debating the same topics over and over. “It is up to the think tanks to press the reset button. Ring the alarm bells!” Merritt appealed.

“Are we actually proud of our leaders?” asked Dominique Moïsi of the Institut français des relations internationales (Ifri). It was a matter of trust, he said. He worried that heads of states and governments were choosing the people leading the Union “not based on their ability of visionary speeches, but on their inability.” The exclusion of extraordinary, respectable personalities became a problem, as the public was calling for respectable characters embodying tomorrow’s EU.

So, what could think tanks do to wake up the EU’s politicians and encourage them to use their tools? Giles Merritt stated: “We don’t have a global horizon yet.” And also Philippe Herzog appealed: “Look globally first! Think tanks do not only have influence on the EU council, we have to push the economic actors to discuss with us what place in the world we want the EU to take in future.”

Think tanks could reach the public opinion through the parliaments and national think tanks, according to De Schoutheete. More power for EU’s citizens to get involved would be a solution, according to Nicolas Véron. He demands to hear more of the citizens’ voice in the EU’s institutions and the whole European system.

Talk with José Manuel Durao Barroso

## Europe needs to close ranks

**The President of the European Commission, José Manuel Durao Barroso, faced the questions of experts and audience at Brussels Think Tank Dialogue 2011.**

“Co-operation” is his credo. The markets are not leaving the EU a choice but to grow closer, explained the President. “The markets demand from Europe: be credible in terms of political response, with concrete decisions, not just statements.” In this crisis of national debt and the euro, the union had learnt that it is not enough to only talk about budgets and its internal market. “They ask to not only have the monetary union, but to some extent an economic union in terms of stronger economic coordination and policy shaping on a European level.”

A type of crisis such as this had been unthinkable only two years ago, Barroso said. He continued that now there was the European Semester as well as proposals for stronger economic governance. “So we are in fact in a very dynamic moment of building tools” and “the markets ask for a more coherent approach to an economic government,” said Barroso and added that all European institutions and Member States got the signal. Barroso highlighted the importance of cooperation and warned that the factors that increase competitiveness must no longer be overlooked. From now on it is all about executing the right resolutions, he said. Barroso stated that they had learned from the past: procrastination occurs if there is not enough pressure. “So, put us under pressure!”

At the same time he showed understanding for the reluctance of some national decision makers. In these times in particular it was not easy at all to be responsible in Europe, Barroso commented. “It is extremely difficult for the Heads of Government – they are under heavy pressure.” Nevertheless he will not cease to promote this responsibility, even to the German Chancellor Angela Merkel. He met



“Close ranks!”: José Manuel Durao Barroso, President of the EU Commission.

her the same evening for a comprehensive talk. Barroso said: “Germany and Mrs. Merkel are extremely important for our project.”

At the same time it was essential to also engage the European public, the President stated. Visiting Baden-Württemberg in Germany, the local Prime Minister Stefan Mappus explained to Barroso that he did not belong to the founder’s generation of the European Union. Europe had to live with the fact that the idea which gave rise to the European agreement needs to be retold and passed on. The project is at risk without the public.

However, he was not talking about propaganda, Barroso said. It was more important to distinguish what the public gains from the EU. “And explain what we lose if we do not achieve a higher level of this European dimension.”

Thus he acted on calls from the forum attendees for more democracy. However, a new debate about the institutions is, according to Barroso, not needed. Democracy should continue to be developed on all levels.

Barroso admitted that there had been deficits in the Union’s reaction to Tunisia. He trusted that the new European External Action Service would be the solution, once it had been given time to establish itself properly. This new external instrument would become of utmost importance for positioning the EU in the world, he said, and in the long run would lead to its Member States speaking with a single voice towards the world.

Keynote by Herman Van Rompuy

## Direction comes before speed

**First set the direction, then move together – step by step. Herman Van Rompuy, President of the European Council expresses in his speech his contentment about the EU slowly pacing in the right direction.**

Saying this, he reacted to the European Parliament's critique: the action of the EU government was always "too little and too late." Rompuy thus did not feel entirely comfortable with the forum's title "Europe 3.0: Building a Viable Union". The version number 3.0 gave him the impression that yet another Europe should be created and fundamental changes were needed. That "all that is solid melts into air," was his quote of the Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. From Van Rompuy's point of view upgrading to 2.1 should be the aim at most, if 2.0 is the condition Europe is in today. This "upgrade" was introduced by launching the Lisbon Treaty. The framework has – "after significant effort" – been recently improved and had proven its worth already in the first year of its "real-life existence", he said. "It gives the Union several new instruments and tools to do what we need to do in getting in to terms with the economic crisis, short-term and long-term, as well as in better defending our interests and values in the world."

And setting the course was what the European Council is all about, said its President, even if "it is no easy task to get 27 Heads of State and Government in the same direction." Nevertheless all 27 share the strong conviction that they belong together and have to work together, he said. Van Rompuy highlighted the importance of political determination in times of a crisis, rather than "la politique gesticulatoire" – gesture politics.

So in this step-by-step spirit the EU has dealt with the public debt crisis in the Eurozone. "And we also had to make sure they were supported by public opinions," he pointed out. He called all decisions together the biggest reform of the Economic and



"We need political courage": Herman Van Rompuy, President of EU Council

Monetary Union since the creation of the euro. "I do not agree with all those who minimise this progress – not at all!" He appeared to be intrigued by people suggesting that markets should not determine everything, often the same people who complain that reaction on the markets is coming too late.

The President drew a positive balance of the euro and the Eurozone: Economic growth was stronger than had been anticipated months or even weeks ago. Employment would be picking up in most countries. "Who would have thought this in 2008, 2009, when we were in the worst economic crisis since the 1930s?" asked Van Rompuy. The Eurozone as a whole had a current account of a balance of payment in equilibrium. The average public deficit was about half that of other major economies. "And the euro is at 1,35 to the dollar. When at some point in the past it was at 80 dollar cents, nobody said anything, and now, at 1,35, it is being attacked!" commented Rompuy. "However, all 27 members are fully convinced that the stability of the Eurozone is vital for the Union as a whole."

Van Rompuy explained that a new conviction was coming to the fore: "We could strengthen the Monetary Union thanks to a stronger and more credible economic pillar." This would involve those non-euro countries that did wish to be concerned: "We must pull in the same direction, for instance on pension reform."

The President of the European Council assigned a task to the think tanks, the following “pressing and important matters deserve much of your intellectual energy”: Could unsustainable economic trends be discovered, ahead of the curve, to give a clear, timely alert? Can a comprehensive analysis be given on the costs and benefits of financial regulation, for instance Basel-III? Van Rompuy then asked a more institutional question: how national parliaments and national legal frameworks could be involved more closely “in the discipline of the Stability and Growth Pact”. And another economic question on the European budget was, where can the EU save money and what should it spend money on? The last question to the think tanks posed by the President was: “Could you identify areas where spending more at European level saves spending at national level, through economies of scale or by avoiding duplication?”

Furthermore, Van Rompuy noticed a global shift from military to economic power in the world. The question for him was: “To what extent does it influence the EU’s strategic interests? What could it mean for our strategic relationships, for instance, with the USA and with China?” Van Rompuy highlighted the EU’s opportunity within this. “All Heads of State or Government are aware that there is much potential if they succeed in translating our own financial and economic clout into political influence.” The EU has a certain number of cards, which we can only play together, he said and gave examples as granting increased market access and negotiating visa regimes.

Solid new tools such as the EEAS existed now. According to the President the focus should now be put on implementation, not on innovation. For EEAS’s success, it would not be enough to draw an organigram. Now would be the time to build up trust between EU institutions and 27 national diplomacies. “It is a matter of habit and trust. Thinking in terms of rivalry is self-defeating.” Van Rompuy asked EU institutions to consider the bilateral relationships between Member States and third countries as an asset.

The President of the European Council concluded that the state of European politics is to a large extent the reflection of the political climate in our

Member States. “There is some reason to worry about an anti-European sentiment within the Union. However, there is a more general malaise towards politics and politicians, in almost all our countries.” In the end he highlighted the need for political courage and critical thought in this kind of climate in Europe.

## Results: What think tanks recommend the EU policy makers

### Workshop 1

## More money for new energy technology

**Attendees of the workshop “What Role for the EU in Today’s Global Climate Governance? Key Challenges and Strategic Choices” were discussing the future international strategy of the EU’s Climate Policy and asked if an international and legally binding agreement can be achieved.**

Furthermore the question was raised whether the EU should increase its unilateral 20 percent reduction target, in order to undock from the international progress. The climate expert of the European Commission, Jos Delbeke, asked: “There is a multilateral framework, but how does each EU Member State understand the meaning of ‘legally binding’?” Delbeke praised China, South Korea and New Zealand as co-operation partners in emission trading. And he appeared to be deeply disappointed in the USA. The Commissioner also confirmed that the 30 percent emission reduction was not yet off the table.

Rapporteur Susanne Dröge, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, outlined two more recommendations: Firstly, the attendees believe that the EU energy markets need to be integrated quicker. In this process a pan-European infrastructure is the dominant driver. “A better coordination of national energy policy action is needed to deliver the 2020 targets in a cost-efficient way.”

Secondly, she reported that the multilateral EU Climate Policy needed the support from bilateral action. “This should be the focus of the European External Action Service (EEAS).” Including key countries in low-carbon partnerships could help achieve multilateral goals. The EU should use carrots and sticks when approaching its partners, claims the workshop. According to Christian Egenhofer, Centre for European Policy Studies



Workshop 1 speakers (f.l.t.r.): Christian Egenhofer (CEPS), Maïté Jauréguy-Naudin (Ifri), Frank-Detlef Drake (RWE) and Jos Delbeke (EU Commission).

(CEPS), EEAS’s future achievements in the EU’s Climate Policy interests will make or break the efficiency of its operations in other policy fields. “This inevitably means that climate change policy has to become a core responsibility for the EEAS.” And as the EU was a far cry from a consensus on the EEAS, climate policy could become a catalyst to sort out existing differences between Member States and EU institutions.

The team stated that reaching the existing climate targets would get more difficult once the EU’s economy recovers. However, given the long-term climate targets with minus 80 percent by 2050, a modern policy would need to set interim targets beyond 20 percent by 2020.

Solutions about how the EU could achieve its targets by 2050 have been analyzed by Frank-Detlef Drake, RWE. While presenting them to the workshop he emphasized the importance of changing the energy system entirely. He then explained how this could be implemented cost-efficiently. The implementation would require a super-infrastructure for energy – however, this would also be “super-expensive”. “Without conventional power plants, no basic supply”, was Drake’s conclusion. And so the workshop agreed on an energy mix rather than aiming for entirely renewable energy by a given date.

Maïté Jauréguy-Naudin, Institut français des relations internationales (Ifri), recommended: “Member States should look for efficient locations of renewable energy sources and to better balance these capacities across the European network in coordination with neighbouring countries. Furthermore she demanded that the European Commission and Member States address the



coherence of support scheme policies, as large amounts of wind power in the European network would have an impact on profits. According to RWE's expert, Drake, there are plenty of efficient locations to gain renewable energy from. "But in order to be implemented successfully, EU plans must be given priority over national plans."

The workgroup agreed that a first important step in 2011 should be to support the deployment of low carbon technologies by upgrading the financing of innovation under the Strategic Energy Technology (SET) plan. "First of all efficiency could be increased by developing a funding framework that would implement the SET plan," Delbeke said. He described this year as "a golden moment". The Commissioner confirmed that EU's Climate and Energy Policies were still performing well; he said, they were guide lines for companies.



## Workshop 2

### How much money does Europe need?

**The financial crisis is confronting Europe with new challenges: How large will EU's budget be in the future and which modifications and adaptations are possible? This Workshop was asking openly: "Money for Nothing? The Role of the EU Budget in European Economic Governance."**

The financial crisis has further increased the severity of the question, which should have already been solved at the beginning of the fiscal period 2007 to 2013: Which role does the EU budget play for the future policy? And how does the Union finance itself as of 2014? Policy analyst Fabian Zuleeg, European Policy Centre (EPC), felt certain, that the ongoing, off-the-record talks for the past three years had not sufficed to advance the real core issues (EU's capital resources, EU tax etc.).

According to him, one may rather reckon that there will be no major move anymore, since anybody who tries this would effectively call for a standstill. Member States hid behind the need for national cost cutting measures to manage the consequences of the banking crisis, he said. Thus the future EU budget could, at best, cement the status quo with some minor corrective actions. Zuleeg did not see any evidence of willingness for major adjustments amongst the Member States, so the Commission would just sum up the situation and show possible options, but would not actually demand any of them.

Clear corrective actions were needed within the Cohesion Fund, highlighted Benedicta Marzinotto, policy expert of Bruegel. She stated that the regional fund at times of EU 15 had been more effective than this. One of the main problems were

the funds that haven't been used. Marzinotto pointed out three reasons for this: national bureaucracies, the EU's Public Procurement Rules, which to some extent had not been translated adequately into national law, and corruption. An additional burden on the

situation were the Member States – such as Luxemburg – who took an interest in money out of the cohesion fund even though they did not actually require it, said the Bruegel's expert. In her opinion, a combination of EIB borrowings and funds were more result-oriented. This would make it possible to place aid money more precisely and related to particular projects. Marzinotto stated that this in fact exists already but it would make more sense to make it a rule.

The conflict about EU's budget 2011 had led to a power struggle amongst the Heads of State or Government, the Commission and the European Parliament. In view of this, Carole Ulmer, Confrontations Europe in Brussels, appealed that Member States' parliaments should in particular be more involved in decisions related to the so called public goods – such as cross-border transport and energy.

Summing up the discussion, Joachim Fritz-Vannahme (Director of the Europe Future Program, Bertelsmann Stiftung) noted that one question was key: Which initiatives and single steps are expected by European institutions that are involved? Janós Martonyi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Hungary and representative of the current Presidency of the European Council, argued that it were not so much economic considerations which were holding back the Member States from making major improvements in the EU's self-financing and budget – but that instead it was the public opinion about the Union.



Workshop 3 speakers (f.l.t.r.): Sergio Carrera (CEPS), Jean Louis De Brouwer (EU Commission), Krisztina Berta (Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Hungary), Claude Moraes and Jean Lambert (both MEP).

### Workshop 3

## Migration as society's opportunity

**“Look at migration as an opportunity at a time of enhancing demographic challenges of an aging society and shrinking labour force!” was the appeal of the workshop entitled “The Next Phase of EU Labour Immigration Policy: Enhancing Policy Coherence and Advancing a Rights-Based Approach.”**

“Migration should be seen as a natural phenomenon in a world of globalisation and flows,” noted workshop reporter Dora Kostakopoulou, professor of European Law and Integration at the University of Manchester. Another attendees' recommendation for EU's policy makers was to design a European labour migration regime taking into account the opportunities provided by Lisbon and Stockholm and the legally binding Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Key issues that came out of the workshop were on the one hand the progressing of adaptation of the free directives and supporting the Commission in designing a European Migration Code as well as addressing the nexus between Migration and Employment Policy. And on the other hand strengthening the communications on the strategy of informing the public in order to challenge populist discourses.

The workshop pointed out the opportunity to design the European Model of Migration in the same way as its own unique Citizen's Model. Kostakopoulou highlighted the importance of leadership in this context. “Protecting the vulnerable in the European Union enhances its added value.”

“It looks like the EU is the centre of immigration but there are people migrating to other countries,” explained Jean Lambert, Member of European Parliament. With US

President Barack Obama's health reform it was most interesting for medical staff to migrate to the US. And the EU economic system was also pushing this phenomenon, she said.

The workshop was stressing the key issue, that different groups of labour migrants have different needs. The recommendation was to develop a treatment that respects each migrant's dignity as a human being, not just as a worker. Lambert called for a common humanity approach in the EU to increase the quality of treatment, where national legislation had been failing so far. Even so solidarity became more difficult towards third countries because people were worried about their jobs during economic crises.

“Circumstances are difficult and communities need to be reassured, but I don't use the word ‘crisis’ – it is a profoundly changing landscape,” said EU Commissioner Jean Louis De Brouwer during the workshop. “Demographic change requires political decisions which of course cause political consequences.” He complained about Member States being still “so unwilling” to face the challenge of the nexus between unemployment and the immigration of workers.

Besides that Claude Moraes of EU's Parliament criticized the absence of a migrant's voice within the migration policy debate in which one only hears the voices of organised labour and business. But they were there, "millions of workers in an unregulated state," stated Moraes "and they will keep coming." So for them he wanted good health and security in the EU, too.

Krisztina Berta of the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Hungary reassured the workshop attendees that the Hungarian representatives of the Presidency of the European Council will do their best to aim for a well managed labour migration.

"If this process of coordinating legal migration needs more mobility partnerships between countries – and national agreements, why not?" asked Sergio Carrera of the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS). He agreed also on a policy considering the different needs of the labour migrants. "But rapidity and urgency are not a good basis for policy making," Carrera said. After all, the Lisbon treaty included an article about labour migration, "so the glass is half full."

Carrera gave the advice not to follow the national governments too closely, because "they come and go." EU should rather find out what the labour markets really were in need of and then decide, based on research and studies, which policies do and which do not work. "The EU should promote standards," said the policy expert and concluded that an EU Migration and Asylum Policy were needed. Not only because of the Schengen Agreement: "According to the people, freedom of circulation is one of the most positive values of the EU."



Workshop 4 speakers (f.l.t.r.): Jan Wouters (University of Leuven), Michael Emerson (CEPS), Franziska Brantner (MEP), Toby Vogel (European Voice) and Paul-Skytte Christoffersen (EU Ambassador).

#### Workshop 4

## Where is Europe's united message?

**Europe requires an upgrade of its role as global actor. Based on this thesis the workshop "A Single Voice or Not? – The External Representation of the European Union" started its discussion.**

Michael Emerson, Head of the EU Neighbourhood, Foreign and Security Policy Unit of the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), opened his lecture by showing a picture of an impressive cacophony: Perplexed Heads of State or Government sitting around US President Barack Obama at the Copenhagen climate change summit. And as counterpoint to this a picture of a harmonious conversation between the leaders of the USA, China and India.

Europe is involved in 249 multilateral and 649 bilateral agreements, said Jan Wouters. The Professor of International Law and Organization at the University of Leuven defined this as the clear opposite to Europe's impact on international organisations. There the EU often only took the observer stand and there, according to Wouters, the lack of clarity about leadership after the launch of the Lisbon Treaty became apparent. "The Lisbon Treaty hasn't solved the problem of shared competencies but rather increased it," said Wouters. Neither in the European Council, nor in the United Nations was the importance of the EU adequately represented, despite its heavy financial responsibility in both of these organisations.

Foreign policy needed many tools, stated Poul-Skytte Christoffersen, who is Ambassador, and former Special Advisor to the High Representative Catherine Ashton. And the new European External Action Service (EEAS) was a new tool. "There are problems which must be solved fast, otherwise

they will be insolvable," he said. He agreed with an existing issue, concerning the fact that the rotating Presidencies of the European Council were disrupting a consistent appearance of the European Union. "But it was a political decision to hold on to this structure." Nevertheless the EEAS should get its chance. "Because it has to show to local authorities and global actors what the EU stands for and what it aims for." Christoffersen was doubtful that this would be successful on site, because "diplomats like to compete against each other." However, the ambassador expects the Member States to increasingly join up their foreign policies and that the EEAS eventually is able to communicate their united message.

This was one of the key issues of the workshop, that there can be several voices, but in any case there should be a united message brought across. That had not been the case for instance with Tunisia, where it took the Union a substantial amount of time to agree on one position. The workshop attendees would appreciate at least a couple of success stories from the EEAS to prove its abilities this year.

The workshop focused on presenting a study on "Upgrading the EU's Role as Global Actor – Institutions, Law and Restructuring of European Diplomacy" a joint project of the CEPS and the European Policy Centre (EPC), Egmont – The Royal Institute for International Relations and the Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies at the University of Leuven.

The Study was proving the central message (Emerson) of this workshop: "Europe has to pool together first in order to get anywhere." The question on who represents the Union was not clear yet for many of the European partners, he said. Redesigning EU's foreign policy actions is therefore essential, said Emerson.

Closing Plenary**Members' voice**

**They were the voices of the Member States at Brussels Think Tank Dialogue 2011: János Martonyi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Hungary as well as representative of the current Presidency of the European Council, and Mikolaj Dowgielewicz, Secretary of State for European Affairs, Government Plenipotentiary for the Polish Presidency in the EU.**

Their comments on the workshop outcomes highlighted the Union's current challenges.

About the Presidency of the European Council:

The Presidency of the European Council is more of a stewardship than a leadership: coordinating, cooperating and compromising "it is more the job of a shepherd." (Martonyi)

"When we have almost finished the safety net for the Euro and economic coordination, the time will have come for more growth-oriented initiatives, as 17 plus countries, not only the Euro zone. We want to try focusing on EU's growth, implementing ideas for a big green island." (Dowgielewicz)

"During this economic crisis we were chasing events and always came too late. Now, we need a joint responsibility – especially while faced with a series of elections, lying ahead in many European countries." (Dowgielewicz)



The voices of Member States: János Martonyi (left) und Mikolaj Dowgielewicz.

About the European External Action Service (EEAS) and foreign policy:

"The important thing is not who has spoken, but what has been said." (Martonyi)

Migrants shouldn't be seen only as workers but above all as people with family. "The human touch should be strengthened in our program." (Martonyi)

Tunisia's crisis has proven that we still have to learn about and rethink neighbourhood policy. "It has challenged our policy – to put it politely." The EU went in the opposite direction that Poland had foreseen for this country. (Dowgielewicz)

About the rotating Presidency of the European Council:

The key for the rotating Presidency of the European Council lies in harmony and co-operation between the institutions. Not in exclusion or bypassing the President of the Commission. The Polish Presidency in the EU will be the "time for a more bottom-up feed in EU discussions." (Dowgielewicz)