

### **1. Name**

michael emerson

### **2. Organisation**

CEPS, Brussels

### **3. Type of Organisation**

Think Tank

### **6. What subject area of the Foreign Policy Report does your evidence relate to?**

Institutional Framework for EU Action in Foreign Affairs

European Neighbourhood Policy and Regional Agreements

Strategic Partnerships

### **7. What are the comparative advantages/disadvantages of working through the EU in the area you wish to comment on, rather than the UK working independently?**

The UK on its own would not be much taken notice of, especially from outside the EU, given that partner states in the neighbourhood or among the EU's strategic partnerships will regard the EU as some kind of minority dissident actor.

### **8. In what areas of global affairs does the EU add value or deliver impact or not on behalf of the UK?**

EU's declared values (democracy, human rights) are the same as those of the UK, but what helps in terms of global influence is for 'Europe' to be perceived as delivering a united message. Fragmented Europe makes all seem irrelevant to the rest of the world. In fields of concrete negotiations on trade, climate change etc the UK on its own would become just a bystander rather than actor.

### **9. How effective is the EU at combining its foreign, defence, economic and civil contingency policy instruments to deliver best effect in foreign policy? What, if anything, should it do differently?**

The EU does what its member states want. At present the modest defence function (ESDP missions) is not well integrated because some member states, especially the UK, want to limit its actorness in this field. Also the present government's intense diplomatic activity to minimise the institutional advances foreseen by the Lisbon Treaty has been damaging, taking up so much time and effort over the small print over who should speak for the EU and its member states.

### **10. How effective are the EU's delivery mechanisms? Would any changes make them more effective, and if so, which ones and why?**

At project and 'micro' level of execution of technical assistance programmes, especially for small projects, the EU is terribly overburdened by a financial regulation that makes quick, flexible action so difficult. But the rules here are set by the member states in the Council and

---

European Parliament. For example the Council has insisted that onerous competitive tendering procedures be continued that are far more burdensome and bureaucratic than individual member states, including the UK, allow for their own operations. Also the member states try to micro-manage the Commission (and no doubt now also the EEAS) in ways that encumber operations unreasonably.

**11. Would a different division of EU and Member State competence in a particular area produce more effective policies? If so, how and why?**

Many EU policy domains are areas of 'mixed competence' in the language of the Lisbon Treaty. At the level of broad sectoral identification in Lisbon (e.g. transport, energy, as well as 'foreign' policy etc) there is no real case for these mixed competences to become either 'exclusive competences', or 'non-competences'. One has to go one level down in the detail before being able to discuss sensibly whether this or that proposed EU regulation or action is best performed at EU or national level. It is beyond the scope of simple monkey survey to do this - indeed it is for your two year research project to do it.

**12. How might the national interest be served by action being taken in this field at a different level e.g. regional, national, UN, NATO, OECD, G20 – either in addition or as an alternative to action at EU level?**

National interests can best be served by national diplomacy mainly at the level of promoting commercial and cultural interests. In all matters concerning global governance EU member states either agree on a common line, or they cancel each other out ('the Europeans disagree so we can ignore them' is what other countries will say or think).

**13. What future challenge/opportunities might we face in this area of policy and what impact might these have on the balance of competence between the UK and the EU?**

Strategically the massive 21st century phenomena - of globalisation, multipolarity, the declining aggregate relative weight of Europe in the world, and even more strikingly the very small weight of Europe's medium-sized countries compared to the new giants - mean that there is some possibility of a strongly united EU to have a real say in world affairs, whereas disunited diplomacy means that all these expensive European national foreign offices will do little of value.

**14. Are there any general points you wish to make which are not captured above?**

General points are made.