

Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University

Institute *for* European Studies

EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly as new Window for ENP Eastern Synergy

Miriam Chakhvadze

Supervisor: Sergi Kapanadze

Associate Professor at Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University

Tbilisi

2012

## List of Abbreviations

- **ACP –EU** - Africa Caribbean Pacific – EU joint Parliamentary Assembly
- **ALDE** – Alliance of Liberals and Democrats
- **CIB** – Comprehensive Institution Building Programs
- **COE** –Council of Europe
- **EaP** - Eastern Partnership
- **EaPIC**- Enhanced cooperation in the Eastern Partnership: the Eastern Partnership Integration and Cooperation program
- **EBRD** – European Bank for Reconstruction & Development
- **ECON** – EURONEST Committee on Economic Integration, Legal Approximation and Convergence with EU Policies
- **ECR** – European Conservatives & Reformists
- **EIB**-European Investment Bank
- **ENERGY** – EURONEST Committee on Energy Security
- **ENP** - European Neighborhood Policy
- **EP**- European Parliament
- **EPP** –European Peoples Party
- **EU** – European Union
- **EUROLAT** - Euro-Latin American Parliamentary Assembly
- **EUROMED** - Euro-Mediterranean Partnership
- **EURONEST PA** - EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly
- **ICMPD** – International Centre for Migration Policy Development
- **IES** – Institute for European Studies, Tbilisi State University
- **MEP** –Member of the European Parliament
- **MP** – member of parliament
- **PCA** – Partnership and cooperation agreements
- **POL** - EURONEST Committee on Political Affairs, Human Rights and Democracy
- **SOCIAL** – EURONEST committee on Social Affairs, Education, Culture and Civil Society.
- **TEU** – Treaty on European Union
- **WTO** – World Trade Organization

## Executive Summary

This Master's thesis is in the field of European Studies, which might be defined as a systematic study on European economy, politics, history and society, probing into the perspective towards Europe's economic and political integration. This thesis aims to evaluate the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly as a cooperation platform for countries with different political experience.<sup>1</sup> The analysis and discussion in this paper, therefore, runs in the political dimension. The main research question relates to the search for the main determinants for successful transformation of the EURONEST PA turbulent working process into a fruitful collaboration. Two possible hypotheses are outlined: one is that persuasion and "punishments" were the primary engine behind this change; the second is that, internally, the Member States' will to change and/or desire to strengthen EURONEST PA's power was the determining factor.

In the case of the persuasion hypothesis, namely that EURONEST member countries see the high costs of disagreement and possible loss of EaP benefits; the dependent variable defined is the will of the EURONEST parliamentary assembly member states for cooperation and the independent variable is the EaP benefits. In the second case, addressing the feeling of increased responsibility towards EURONEST joint ownership, the dependent variable is member states' will of strengthening the power in EURONEST PA on international level. The independent variable remains the same. Due to the fact that the EURONEST Parliamentary assembly was established one year ago, this Master's thesis is one of the first scientific attempts to evaluate the issue. This paper represents the EURONEST PA as a unique platform for developing Eastern Partnership multilateral and bilateral tracks. Finally, the comprehensive follow-up of the EaP legislative development trends is beneficial for the further integration of Georgia in EU, as Georgia is both active and initiator EURONEST PA member.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this case under the term political experience of a country is meant the aspiration towards the EU, as well as political background, as for instance the enrollment in the regional conflict. Best case is the relations between Armenia-Azerbaijan.

*Table of Content:*

---

Review of the related literature	5
Introduction	8
1. The New response to changing Neighborhood & Eastern Dimension	12
1.1. The bilateral and multilateral tracks of the Eastern Partnership	17
1.2. The Parliamentary Experience within the European Neighborhood Policy	19
2. What happens in the EURONEST PA after the Curtain comes down?	24
2.1. The south Caucasian dimension in the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly	31
3. The Responsibility towards the EURONEST joint ownership	42
Conclusion	51
Literature Used	53

## Overview of the related literature

Due to the fact that EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly was founded in 2011 the master thesis is mainly based on EU official regulations, EURONEST PA resolutions, as well as the working documents of the committee on European integration, parliament of Georgia. During the research, two interviews were conducted: one with Ms. Chiora Taktakishvili, the co-Chair of the Committee on Political Affairs, Human Rights and Democracy of EURONEST; and the other was with Ms. Ekaterine Qardava, Chief Specialist with the Committee on European Integration at the Parliament of Georgia.

Regarding the ENP second decade, the discussion is based on “a new response to a changing Neighborhood policy”, 2011. For outlining the level of democracy, the Statistical Annex of “Implementation of the European Neighborhood Policy in 2011” is presented. For the explanation of the South Caucasus dimension in EURONEST PA, the National indicative programs, as well as the ENP Package Country Progress Reports are used.

One of the first Communications from the Commission to the European Parliament and Council regarding the Eastern Partnership was adopted in 2008. This communication gives the new framework for the multilateral cooperation and the bilateral engagement. The Joint Declaration of the Prague Eastern Partnership Summit, 7 May 2009, also bears several important messages: a more ambitious partnership between the European Union and the partner countries, deeper bilateral engagement, focus on multilateral co-operation and founding.

The EaP roadmap to the autumn 2013 Summit: the joint communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions addresses the issues, as the bilateral and multilateral track of the EaP, as well as the meaning of the road map for the EaP implementation. The discussion of the EURONEST PA origins is based on the rules of procedure and the constituent act. The constituent Act speaks about the basic values and objectives, as well as gives the definition of membership. The responsibilities of the EURONEST PA bodies, the working procedure of the plenary sessions and voting rights are outlined in the rules of procedure. The founding documents of the four standing committees and the two working groups are used.

The resolutions adopted during the Baku summit relate to challenges for the future of democracy, including the question of a free and independent media in Eastern Partnership and EU countries; trade agreements between the EU and the Eastern European Partners, including the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas, and the EU assistance in this field; energy security, renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy infrastructure: developments in the Eastern Partnership and in the EU countries; strengthening of civil society in the Eastern Partnership Countries, including the question of cooperation between government and civil society, and the question of the reforms aimed at empowerment of civil society ; the situation of Yulia Tymoshenko.

This Master thesis analyzes the working documents on the Eastern Partnership adopted by the committee on European integration, parliament of Georgia: Considerations regarding the founding document of EURONEST PA Constituent Act and Rules of Procedure addresses such important issues as the distribution of votes and the voting procedure.

This research paper involves the Report by the chairman of the committee Mr. David Darchiashvili about the EURONEST Bureau Meeting on 22 June, 2011, as well as the Report about the meeting of Bureau and the working group on rules and procedures on 14-15 March, 2012 in Strasburg. Regarding the EaP, thematical platforms from the General Guidelines and Rules of Procedure is used.

The discussion on flagship initiatives is based on the official website of the external action service. The minutes of the meeting of the enlarged Bureau of European Parliament's Delegation to the EURONEST PA with the heads of five national parliamentary delegations to the EURONEST PA in June 2010 is also accessed.

In the paper, the other sources are speeches, statements, articles. For instance, Maaner's work on Normative power Europe: a contradiction in term, as well as Therbon's article on Europe in 21 Century. The interviews as with Andrey Fedorov, with the title "Lukashenko knows Russia's Pressure points very well", or Sarysz-Wolski's "Belarus remains the weakest Point. European Dialogue", as well as the Speeches delivered by the EaP civil society Forum and HR/VP Ashton Catherine is value added.

For the clarification of the Parliamentarian ENP experience and structural comparison of the EURONEST with EUROMES, EUROLAR, and ACP-EU the constituent acts, as well as the other partnership documents linked to EU are accessed. The master thesis also addresses the

other valuable documents as the 1<sup>st</sup> EPP Eastern Partnership Summit with the messages as clear perspective for the EaP, an enhanced role for the EPP in the EaP more content for the EaP in deep; Declaration on the situation in Belarus. 2011; Wolf Stefan's re-thinking the European Neighborhood Policy: From "Alternative to Enlargement" to Regional Foreign and Security Policy; OSCE Observation of Parliamentary Elections in Armenia.

The analytical basis of the master thesis is completed using the following works. The theoretical framework is based on the article "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The logic of Two-Level Games" along with the book "Double Edged Diplomacy" edited by Peter B. Evans, Harold K. Jacobson, and Robert D. Putnam, as well as on Andrew Moravcsik's article on "Why the European Community Strengthens the State: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation." "The Power of Freedom: central and Eastern Europe after 1945" by Mart Laar offers a compact overview of the history of Central and Eastern Europe since 1945. The author covers topic as central and Eastern Europe in new millennium and outlines the results of the 20 years of freedom, as well as the new challenges for new Europe. The other interesting book "EU Foreign Policy in a globalized world" edited by Zaki Laidi that is written by experts and analyzes the Normative power and preferences of the European Union Foreign Policy.

## Introduction

The master thesis refers to the field of European Studies. Based on the accepted academic experiences in European related issues, the European Studies is defined as a systematic study on European economy, politics, history and society, probing into the perspective towards Europe's economic and political integration. The master thesis aims to present the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly as beneficial cooperation platform with the countries of different political experience. Due to the fact that the EURONEST Parliamentary assembly was established one year ago this master thesis is one of the first attempt of the scientific approach towards the issue.

The Paper represents the EURONEST as the unique platform developing EaP multilateral and bilateral tracks. Finally, Georgia is both active and initiator EURONEST member; therefore the comprehensive follow up of the EaP legislative development trends is beneficial for the further integration of Georgia in EU. My encouragement for writing this topic was strengthened also at the Academy of the center for European Studies in Brussels, where I met Mr. Jerzy Buzek, Mr. Wilfred Martens and later during the internship at the committee on European Integration.

The research question of the paper explores main determinants for changing the EURONEST turbulent working process in to the fruitful collaboration, within the "two level game" theory.

Two possible explanations are outlined: in case of the persuasion of EURONEST member countries in the high costs of disagreement and possible lose of the EaP benefits-the dependent variable is the will of the EURONEST parliamentary assembly member states for cooperation and the independent variable-the EaP benefits. In the second case-responsibility towards EURONEST joint ownership, the new dependent variable is member states will of strengthening the power in EURONEST as on international level. In



terms of the methodology the master thesis is qualitative research. It is based on interviews, case-study, as well as the documentary analysis.

”EURONEST is particularly important for the EU High Representative because it completes the institutional framework of the Eastern Partnership. The EaP is not only a partnership of governments: it is also a partnership of peoples and of the Parliaments that represent them” (HR/VP Catherine 2011). The EURONEST parliamentary assembly strengthens the link between the bilateral and multilateral processes, of boosting the sense of joint ownership of the Eastern Partnership and of fostering a regional dynamic. The EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly is a forum, promoting political association and further economic integration between the European Union and the Eastern European Partners. EURONEST is to contribute to the strengthening, development and visibility of the Eastern Partnership, as the institution responsible for parliamentary consultation, supervision and monitoring (EURONEST PA 2011, 2).

The master thesis involves three main chapters and three sub-chapters. The final part-conclusion addresses the findings of the paper. The first chapter the new response to changing Neighborhood & Eastern Dimension focuses on the renewed ENP and its eastern dimension with regard this communication on review of ENP, as well as the European Neighborhood & Partnership Instrument is analyzed. The documents give the good explanation of the determinants for the ENP support. This of the thesis also speaks about the new legislative framework and describes the 8<sup>th</sup> Article of TEU.

The sub-chapter analyzes the bilateral & multilateral tracks of the Eastern Partnership. It is outlined that the bilateral track supports the main objectives of the EaP outlined under the general principals of Association Agreement. The multilateral track is presented as the forum of sharing experiences and fostering the links. The sub-chapter also describes the EaP structure and addresses such important patterns, as panels, platforms, as well as flagship initiatives.

The last part analyzes the ENP parliamentary experience and sets the argument about the link between the normative power and accession process. Also outlines the role of the

legislative branch in the harmonization process and speaks about the institutional features of Euro-Mediterranean, Euro-Latin American, as well as both ACP-EU and EURONEST parliamentary assemblies.

The second chapter explores the effect of the independent variable-the EaP benefits on the dependent variable-the EURONEST Member states' will for collaboration. Within the two-level game theory it analyzes the Argument that as soon as the EURONEST delegates were assured in the high costs of the disagreement and possible loss of the EaP benefits the negotiation stepped up. In order to outline the interaction of the national and international levels the comparative study of the first turbulent session and the fruitful Baku summit is given. These case-studies outline the positions of governments, as gatekeepers attempting to balance between potentially conflicting international and domestic pressures. During the sessions it might be told that responsibility of the chief negotiator was mostly taken by the European Parliament.

For the Baku session the preparation process was turned in to more systematical approach. As an argument for the opinion the EPP Family session in Georgia and the resolution on Timoshenko case is stressed. The other resolutions of the Baku summit are realized as the fruit for the further comprehensive collaboration between the EaP states.

For the clarification of the possibility how the national executives can use the international negotiations for enlarging the win-set in domestic politics four mechanisms initiated by Moravcsik are outlined. The arguments are supported by the specific examples from the EURONEST PA context. As for the sub-chapter on the south Caucasian dimension in EURONEST parliamentary assembly, aims to show the meaning of strategies of the level I negotiator for the final output. Therefore the national indicative programs of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia are good material for outlining the main national priorities.

The discussion outlined several other dimensions for the cooperation that need the regional solidarity and are the good tool for achieving the compromise. It might be concluded that although EURONEST PA is not declared as the conflict resolution

platform in long run it still has such capability, as it contributes to such important preconditions as mutual trust and development of dialog channels between the EaP states.

The final chapter addresses the second explanation for the will of comprehensive cooperation between the EaP member countries. The discussion is based on the argument of responsibility towards EURONEST PA joint ownership, as the possibility of strengthening the power in EURONEST - on international level. The approach is discussed in the general framework of the Liberal Intergovernmentalism. As for the supporting argument the case on Belarus is discussed. The other cases in these are relating to the interdependence between the EaP states and the case of Baku summit, namely the result of the dispute between Armenia-Azerbaijan.

The conclusion outlines the findings of the paper and gives more proper answer to the research question within the chosen explanation. Also outlines the add-hoc outputs, emerged during the discussion process of the research question.

## **1. The New response to the changing Neighborhood & Eastern Dimension**

The Lisbon Treaty grants EU with the opportunity to become a more effective international actor. The 8<sup>th</sup> Article TEU addresses the development of a special relationship with neighboring countries, aiming to establish an area of prosperity and good neighborliness, founded on the values of the Union and is viewed as a new legal basis for concluding specific association agreements. The special relationship between the EU and the partners should be based on the mutual will of cooperation and shared EU values. EU founds its neighborhood policy on a value-based conditionality. Conditionality is likely to produce the expected results when it supports an existing domestic policy process driving towards the implementation of EU values.

The renewed European Neighborhood Policy focuses on knowledge and innovation, climate change and the environment, energy, transport and technology, as well as facilitates partner countries' participation in the work of selected EU agencies and programs. Mobility and people-to-people contacts are viewed as core elements for promoting the mutual understanding and economic development. "Mobility Partnerships provide the comprehensive frameworks to ensure that the movement of persons between the EU and third country is well-managed. This partnership brings together all measures which ensure that mobility is mutually beneficial. They provide for better access to legal migration channels and handle irregular migration (European Commission 2011, 18)."

In the European Parliament resolution of 7 April 2011 on the review of the European Neighborhood Policy-Eastern Dimension the conflict resolution is outlined as one of the essential preconditions for the further comprehensive integration. EP calls on the VP/HR to develop more confidence-building measures, including the new missions and public communication strategies and the consideration of pragmatic initiatives such as informal contacts with the societies of the breakaway territories (European Parliament 2011, 1-3).

Regarding this issue, the renewed European Neighborhood Policy aims the intensification of the political and security co-operation, namely the enhancement of EU involvement in conflict resolution, joined-up use of the common foreign and security policy and other EU instruments, as well as the promotion of the joint action with the European Neighborhood Policy partners in international key security issues.

The renewed ENP objectives are comprehensively expressed in the joint communication on “A new response to a changing Neighborhood.” The new approach aims to: provide greater support to partners in building deep democracy and economic development. This renewed ENP strengthens the regional dimension, namely covering the eastern and the southern Mediterranean Partnerships. The core objective is to work out regional initiatives such as trade, energy, transport, migration and mobility, completing and strengthening the bilateral co-operation (European Commission 2011, 9). Regarding the enhancement of the Eastern Partnership, the renewed European Neighborhood Policy focuses on certain objectives: the conclusion of the Association Agreements, including Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement; pursuit of democratization, visa facilitation and liberalization; enhancement of sectoral cooperation; promotion of the benefits of the EaP citizens and strengthen cooperation with the civil society and social partners.

In order to translate the need for more flexible implementation of financial assistance into practice, a new European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument should be discussed. From 2014, the new European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument funding will be provided in forms of bilateral, regional and cross border co-operation programs (European Neighborhood Info Center 2011, 1). The next priority – reducing complexity and length of the programming process will be dealt with in order to shorten and better focus the programming. The objectives of the streamlining the scope of the Instrument include: promoting human rights, and support in the progressive economic integration into the EU internal market.

The amendment of the provisions on the cross-border cooperation program promotes economic and social development in the border areas. The new provisions are supposed to facilitate effective implementation of the programs, benefiting the EU and partner countries. The other essential priority addresses the promotion of the closer links with EU internal instruments and policies that will be done by promoting mechanisms for the pooling of funds from international and external instruments of the EU budget.

The new European Neighborhood and partnership Instrument aims to simplify the implementation provisions within a new implementing Regulation common to all EU external assistance Instruments. The budget for the period 2014-2020 will allocate €18.2 billion. The total amount of financial support proposed for the nine geographic and thematic instruments is €96,249.4 million over the period 2014-2020 (European External Action Service 2011, 1).

Pre-accession instrument (IPA)	€14,110 million
European Neighborhood Instrument (ENI)	€18,182 million
Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI)	€23,295 million
Partnership Instrument (PI)	€1,131 million
Instrument for Stability (IfS)	€2,829 million
European Instrument for Democracy & Human Rights (EIDHR)	€1,578 million
Instrument for Nuclear Safety Cooperation	€631 million
Instrument for Greenland	€219 million
European Development Fund (EDF, outside EU Budget)	€34,276 million

EU Neighborhood Info center, 29 June 2011

The renewed ENP aims to secure additional loan possibilities by the European Investment Bank and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. “Comparing to the ENIP for the period 2011-2013 the Budget is increased by 40%. The amounts allocated for the two regions, according to the Regional Indicative Programs 2011-2013, are:

<i>ENPI South</i>	€288 million	The start of the Partnership and the Barcelona declaration, and cover: Political and Security Dialogue (justice, freedom & security, migration, political dialogue); Economic and Financial Partnership (economy, energy, environment, information society, transport); Social, Cultural and Human Partnership (audiovisual & media, culture, education & training, gender issues, youth, civil society and local authorities).
<i>ENPI East</i>	€348.57 million	Transport; Energy; Sustainable management of natural resources; Border and migration management: the fight against transnational organized crime and customs; People-to-people activities; elimination of landmines, explosive remnants of war, small arms and light weapons.

The ENPI - Supporting Reform, ENP Info Center, 2011

The new European Neighborhood Policy outlines several common elements for the democratic reforms: the free and fair elections; freedom of association, expression and assembly and free press and media; the rule of law administered by independent judiciary and right to fair trial, fight against corruption, as well as security and law enforcement sector reform and establishment of democratic control over armed and security forces.

The political groups in the European Parliament focus on the renewed European Neighborhood Policy actively. For the better clarification several cases might be briefly discussed. The European Peoples Party in non-paper outlined two issues as the “Symmetrical treatment of both South and East in terms of funding conditionality and the “Tailor-made offers in the strategic areas of cooperation (European Peoples Party 2012,1).”

Under the first dimension it's outlined that more for more concept should be based on adequate methodology, meaning that the reviewed ENP should focus on flexible approach towards each of the EU neighbors' specific political, social and economic reform priorities. The other sub-issue of this part is the financial framework of the European Neighborhood Policy. It is mentioned that "Only a no divisible framework for the European Neighborhood Policy will offer adequate assistance to both Eastern and Southern neighbors, thereby allowing them to get closer to the EU. (European Peoples Party 2012, 3). "

The second part of the "Tailor-made offers in the strategic areas of cooperation" addresses the general objectives as the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement, Visa Facilitation, as well as the support in conflict resolutions and the further cooperation regarding the energy and transport policies. Addressing the conflict resolution five main fields are discussed where the EU active involvement is urgent. First of all the peace-keeping envisage and peace-building activities in the areas of frozen conflicts. In case of Georgia it is stated that EU should offer its direct involvement in the negotiation and insist on the fulfillment of international commitments by Russia. In case of the Transnistria it is stressed that in the conflict resolution EU should move from an observer status to a fully-fledged participant. The non-paper focuses that the EU should send an observation mission in the area of Nagorno-Karabakh.

As for the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe group leader's Guy Verhofstadt's assessment the new European Neighborhood Policy is an important step in building democracy on EU doorstep. He welcomed the announcement by the European Commission responding to the challenges in EU southern and eastern neighborhood. »The real challenge will be to convince the Member States to fully support these proposals especially in relation to market access and mobility. The Council should go one step further and cancel the debts of those emerging democracies in order to give them a real chance to kick-start their economies ". Due to the fact that the situation in the ENP area is changeable in the short time, Guy Verhofstadt outlined the necessity of the regular



reevaluation of the policy by the EU commission. Alexander Graf Lambsdorff especially welcomed the establishment of a European Endowment for Democracy and stressed that the European Parliament must be fully involved in the process of setting-up such an endowment. Ivo Vajgl pointed out that an efficient European Neighborhood Policy should address case by case the existing “frozen” conflicts in the ENP region (Alliance of Liberals & Democrats for Europe 2011, 1).

### **1.1. The bilateral and multilateral tracks of the Eastern Partnership**

The Eastern Partnership framework combines bilateral and multilateral tracks. The bilateral track includes the most important objectives in EU-partner countries’ cooperation: the upgrading of contractual relations towards association agreements, the prospect of negotiations for deep and comprehensive free trade areas, progressive visa liberalization, and deep co-operation in energy security, and support for economic and social policies. The multilateral track gathers all six Eastern partners and the EU at various levels of representation. The objectives are: provide a forum to share experience on partners’ steps towards transition, facilitate the development of joint activities, foster links among the partners themselves (commission of the European Communities 2008, 4-9).

When we speak about the EaP operational structure the ministerial duties of the foreign ministers should be outlined. “The third Foreign Ministers’ meeting of the Eastern Partnership took place in Brussels on 23 July 2012. Ministers stated that the Roadmap put forward by the European Commission and High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy constituted a basis for guiding and monitoring the further implementation of the objectives of the Eastern Partnership defined in the Prague and Warsaw Declarations (European Commission 2012, 1).”

The previous EaP summits of Prague and Warsaw are considered as the EaP legislative basement. For instance, the Prague declaration outlined several issues: necessity of more ambitious partnership, importance of the bilateral and multilateral cooperation (Council of EU 2009, 5-11). In Warsaw, with the adoption of the Joint Declaration, the heads of state and government acknowledged the European aspirations and their own commitment to build deep and sustainable democracies. As for the Declaration on the situation in Belarus, it expresses the deep concern at the deteriorating human rights, democracy and media freedom situation in Belarus (Council of EU 2011, 3-10).

Four main areas of cooperation between the eastern partner countries and the European Union are reflected by the EaP platforms: Democracy, good governance and stability; Economic integration and convergence with EU policies; Energy security and Contacts between people. Meetings are held at least twice a year at the level of senior officials (Eastern Partnership Multilateral Platforms, 2). Each platform can establish panels in order to support its work in specific areas. In the first group the panel on integrated Border Management, on Fight against Corruption and on Administrative reform are unified. The second platform involves three panels on small and Business Enterprise, on Trade and Trade Related Regulatory Approximation and on environment and climate change (European External Action Service 2009 1).

The other important element of the eastern partnership multilateral track is the Flagship Initiatives. Like other formats, they engage all Eastern partners with a view to providing visibility and focus to multilateral cooperation. They are managed by the European Commission (DG DEVCO).

Integrated Border Management (IBM)	Improve Security; reduce smuggling, human trafficking; facilitate mobility of people.	EUR 2 million. 2010-contract with ICMPD
Small & Medium size Enterprise	Support to business associations, funding facility.	EUR 8,75 million 2010

Regional Electricity Markets, Energy Efficiency & renewable Energy Sources	Sustainable energy, energy market convergence & security of supply	EUR 46 million INOATE Program 2010
Prevention, preparedness & response to Natural & man-made disasters	Strengthen disaster management capacities through enhanced cooperation	EUR 6 Million 2010
Environmental Governance	Improving the collection and management of environmental data	EUR 3 Million 2010
Diversification of the Energy supplies	In the form of projects to existing regional initiatives on Regional east program	2010-2013

European Union External Action Service, the EaP- Flagship Initiatives, 2011

Within the participatory principals Civil Society Forum should be stressed. It is organized in four working groups corresponding to the four thematic platforms. Each group is coordinated jointly by an EU and an EaP representative (Civil Society Forum 2009, 1). The other participatory EaP initiative Business Forum aims to provide a platform for experience sharing, establishing business contacts and discussing investment opportunities and joint projects implemented by entrepreneurs and governments (EaP Business Forum 2011, 1).

## **1.2. The Parliamentary Experience within the European Neighborhood Policy**

In terms of the foreign policy EU is often viewed as the normative power. Ian Manners is admitted as the father of the concept of “normative power of Europe.” Manners considers that EU’s role in international politics must be seen as one of “normalization”, spreading common principals disregarding “Westphalian conceptions” of power balances no matter how do states behave in their mutual competition, the EU enjoys the unique ability to shape conceptions of “normal” in International Relations (Manners 2002,239).

“A combination of historical context, hybrid policy and legal constitution” turned the EU into a worldwide promoter of those universal norms & principals, by whom its external relations are, now completely informed (Manners 2002, 241).” Within the comprehensive European Integration the EU accession process is valuable pattern, moreover when the renewed European Policy focuses actively on the possibility for the comprehensive European integration. In order to create a set of bilateral relationship with the partner states the EU actively uses its normative tools. The legislative branch in the European Neighborhood Policy gives the possibility of avoiding the legislative obstacles during the harmonization process; the strong legislative branch of the ENP highlights the interests of the ENP citizens, as well as contributes to the cooperation between the ENP states. In the legislative dimension several parliamentary assemblies might be outlined.

The Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly stands on three baskets: political, financial, as well as on the Social, cultural and Human one. The objectives are: definition of a common area of peace and stability, Construction of a zone of shared prosperity through an economic and financial partnership; rapprochement between peoples through a social, cultural and human partnership. There are four committees and one ad-hoc committee. The committees deal with the issues as political Affairs, Security and Human Rights; Economic, Financial and Social Affairs and Education; The two other committees are on the promotion of the quality of life, human Exchanges and culture, committee on women’s rights. The ad-hoc committees work on energy policy issues. The EUROMED consists of 280 members, 130 EU members, and 150 members from the partner countries (Parliamentary Assembly of the Union for the Mediterranean 2009, 2). The EUROMED Bureau consists of four members, two appointed by the parliaments of the Mediterranean partner countries of the European Union, one appointed by the EU national parliaments and one appointed by the European Parliament (Parliamentary Assembly of the Union for the Mediterranean 2009, 3-5). The priority areas for regional co-operation within the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership have been defined in the European commission’s

regional strategy paper (2007-2013) & regional Indicative Program (2007-2010). Funding of about Euro 333 mill has been earmarked during 2007-2010. The new amount of the financial support for 2011-2013 periods is Euro 343, 3 million (Development and cooperation-EUROPEAID 2011, 1-2).

The other important legislative body is the Euro-Latin American Parliamentary Assembly. The Euro-LAT is a transnational body of the 150 Parliamentarians from the European Union and the Latin America. Half of the members are represented from the Latin America and the other half are from the EU. The constituent sessions were hold in Brussels in October 2006. EUROLAT adopts the resolutions, for the different institutions responsible for the development of the BI strategic Association.<sup>2</sup> The two co-presidents alongside 14 vice presidents compose the Euro-LAT executive bureau. There are three standing committees: on political affairs, security and human rights; on economic, financial and commercial affairs; on social affairs, Human exchanges, environment, education and culture. (Euro-Latin American Parliamentary Assembly 2006, 7). The main legal instrument governing European cooperation with the Latin America is the Development cooperation Instrument. The total amount of money for the period 2007-2013 is EUR 2 690 million (European commission 2008, 8).

The other interesting ENP legislative body is the ACP-EU joint parliamentary assembly. This institution represents various countries sit together with the aim of promoting the interdependence of north and south. A substantial part of the work of the joint Parliamentary assembly is directed towards promoting human rights and democracy and the common values of humanity. The representatives of the 78 ACP states have plenary session for one week twice a year.

---

<sup>2</sup> BI strategic Association - established in June 1999; in the context of the European Union- Latin American and Caribbean summits.

Twenty -four vice-presidents together with the two co-presidents are elected by the Bureau of the joint Parliamentary Assembly. The Bureau meets several times a year in order to ensure the continuity of the work of the joint Parliamentary Assembly. The three standing committees deal with issues as political affairs, economic development; finance and trade; social affairs and environment. The Assembly forms exploratory or fact-finding missions. The ACP –EU joint Parliamentary Assembly is set up to Article 17 of the partnership Agreement. The Assembly is composed of two houses containing equal numbers of EU and ACP representatives (ACP –EU joint Parliamentary Assembly 2003, 6). The ACP-EU joint Parliamentary Assembly takes in to consideration the term of the regional meetings. The meetings are held upon the request of the Bureau or of the regions concerned (ACP –EU joint Parliamentary Assembly 2003, 8). The main basement is the Cotonou agreement.<sup>3</sup> The European Development Fund is main responsible institution for the financial support. The 10<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund covers the period 2008-2013 and has allocated Euro 22 682 million (Development and cooperation – EUROPEAID 2008, 1).

The newly born EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly aims to review the EaP questions; to adopt resolutions; to establish appropriate relations between the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly and the various ministerial conferences and institutions associated with the Eastern Partnership; to assist in the legislative harmonization (EURONEST constituent act 2011, 2). The Plenary of the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly meets once a year. The two components of the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly elect a Bureau from among their members, consisting of two Co-Presidents of equal status and eight Vice-Presidents. The EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly takes its decisions by a two thirds majority of the members (EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly 2011, 3-5). EURONEST PA unifies four standing committees.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Cotonou Agreement is a treaty between the European Union and the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States ('ACP countries'). It was signed in June 2000 in Cotonou, the largest city in Benin, by 79 ACP countries

The committee on Political Affairs, Human Rights and Democracy is responsible for the development of stable democratic institutions, questions of governance and the role of political parties; the promotion of political dialogue, multilateral confidence building measures and contribution to peaceful conflict settlement. Committee on Economic Integration, Legal Approximation and Convergence with EU Policies deals with the matters as monitoring economic, financial and commercial relations between the EU and the Eastern European Partners, with third Actors. Committee on Energy security is focuses on monitoring the development and implementation of a mutual energy support and security mechanism; supporting the strengthening of contacts in relation to energy policy; supporting the creation of an interconnected and diversified energy market. The Committee on Social Affairs, Education, Culture and Civil Society is in charge of the promotion of cooperation in the fields of culture and education and relations with relevant international organizations and agencies (EURONEST PA 2011, 12-14). There are two working groups in EURONEST, dealing with the case of Belarus and the rules of Procedure. Due to the relevance of these issues the mandate of both working groups was prolonged at the Baku Summit.

In 2009 EU assigned €600m to EaP. The 'EaP funds' are incorporated into the ENPI and are dispensed by the Commission in accordance with usual ENPI procedures (EaP Community 2011, 1).” The Eastern Partnership budget is following:

- Eastern Partnership Funds

Comprehensive Institution Building	€175m
Pilot regional development programmes	€75m
Multilateral dimension	€350m

- Indicative breakdown of EaP financing

2010	€ 85 m
2011	€ 110m
2012	€ 175m
2013	€ 230m

Update on Eastern Partnership implementation, 2011

## **2. What happens in the EURONEST PA after the Curtain comes down?**

In his book Mart Laar states: “it is crucial to understand that we are now all in the same boat and must therefore work together for a better Europe. At the same time, it is important not only to move forwards current western European values but also to integrate them into central and Eastern Europe’s value system. To do this, we need a more common approach to history (Laar 2010, 248-250).” In spite of the Eastern Dimension’s general progress towards democracy the degree to which the partners have addressed EaP elements varies. Some of them are clearly committed to reaching the full potential, gain all benefits, others have made gradual progress.

The various approach to the European integration emerged as well as during the EURONEST PA negotiations. For the better clarification of the interaction between the international and national levels the theory of “two-level game” will be used, which argues that international politics is undertaken by national executives who strategize at the national and international levels. According to the theory, in order to achieve gains from international cooperation the negotiators have to be able to bargain, as well as implement the international agreements (Evans and others 1993, 437-442). Robert D. Putnam, Peter B. Evans and Harold Karon Jacobson are recognized as the founding fathers of the following approach.

The comparative study of the EURONEST PA first turbulent session with the Baku summit leads to the analysis of the negotiation determinants. This chapter explores the effect of the independent variable-the EaP benefits on the dependent variable-the EURONEST Member states’ will for collaboration. It discusses that as soon as the EURONEST PA delegates were assured in the high costs of the disagreement and possible loss of the EaP benefits the negotiation stepped up. According to the two –level game theory, the foreign policy might be assessed as one of the most challenging dimension. From the theoretical framework perspectives, foreign policy is a function of incentives and constrains both on the international and on the domestic level.



The governments as gatekeepers between the two levels balance between potentially conflicting international and domestic pressures and attempt to formulate and implement foreign policies satisfying both. If on the international level, governmental policies are shaped by the dynamics of international political events, as well as by the power and negotiation strategies of other governments, domestically, the main determinants are the preferences and political resources of those actors on which a government depends for political support. Putnam outlines that “neither of the two games can be ignored by central decision-makers, so long as their countries remain interdependent, yet sovereign. Each national political leader appears at both game boards. Across the international table sit his foreign counterparts, and at his elbows sit diplomats and other international advisors. Around the domestic table behind him sit party and parliamentary figures, spokespersons for domestic agencies, representatives of key interest groups, and the leader's own political advisors (Putnam 1997, 434).”

The two-level game theory decomposes the process in two stages: The first level stands for the bargaining between the negotiators, leading to a tentative agreement; On the second level the separate discussions within each of group of constituents about the ratification process is run. It might be told that the disagreement between the EURONEST PA member states during the first session emerged already on the first level. If we take Putnam's Argument the reason for the disputes between Armenia and Azerbaijan at the level I was the expectations of rejection at Level II (Putnam 1997, 436). During the negotiation Azerbaijanian MPs expressed the will to accept the inclusion of the Armenian proposition of “non-use of military force in the conflict's settlement”, but not the principal of “right of nations to self-determination”. As for the new principal “right of free and democratic self-expression”, the Azerbaijanian delegation was for adding it to the article related to the civil society and not to the conflicts (History of Truth 2011, 1-2).

It might be told that in this case, the EURONEST co-president Mr. Christian Vigenin, the MEP took the role of the chief negotiator. He as the chairman of the plenary meeting suggested discussing the issue at the Bureau again to reach a compromise. In the two-level

negotiations the chief negotiator is the only formal link between the two stages. Thus Putnam assumes that the chief negotiator acts merely as an honest broker, or as an agent on behalf of his constituents (Putnam 1997, 457).

”Two-level negotiations are costly risky for the chief negotiator, and they often interfere with his other priorities (Putnam 1997, 457).” Putnam outlines three main reasons: Enhancing his standing in the Level I1 game by increasing his political resources or by minimizing potential losses; shifting the balance of power at Level I1 in favor of domestic policies that he prefers for exogenous reasons; to pursue his own conception of the national interest in the international context. In case of the EURONEST co-presidents’ attempt for the successful fulfillment of the negotiation the third explanation might be the most appropriate. His interest has been determined by the will of proving the efficiency of EU normative power of providing trust among the opposing countries and finding the space for the cooperation. Although the final result of the negotiation round was the Armenian delegation’s veto and the non-adoption of the compromise document (HistoryofTruth 2011 1-2).

Mr. Vigenin maintained the role of the mediator and after the Baku summit stressed the importance of outlining the progress of Armenia & Azerbaijan, instead of constant critics. He supported the strong ambition of Armenia to run the most democratic elections, being fulfilled in May and emphasized the swift progress in the talks for Armenia's association agreement. As for the Azerbaijan, Mr. Vigenin noted that it is rapidly becoming a strongly ally of the EU of growing regional importance not only with respect to energy, but also with respect to security and diplomacy (Novinite 2012, 1-2).

It might be told that before the second parliamentary summit the preparation process was changed. The European Parliament as the chief negotiator tried to unite the EaP states before the Baku meeting, emphasizing the EaP benefits essential for the national levels of the EURONEST member countries and putting aside the essential issue – the conflict

resolution. Regarding this approach as a supporting argument, the initiative of the European Peoples Party might be discussed. On the 31<sup>st</sup> of March in the parliament of Georgia the delegates of the EPP family discussed the issues for consideration at the EURONEST plenary session. The session gave the opportunity to define the common strategy for the upcoming win-set at the Baku Summit & combine the national interest. One of the most valuable outputs of EPP Family is the resolution on the situation of Yulia Tymoshenko (EURONEST 2012, 21-23). Later the wording of the resolution has been almost maintained during the Baku summit and voted up. It might be told that the appropriate strategy on the Level I increased the size of the win-set and successfully moved to the ratification stage (Putnam 1997, 450). The EPP Family's joint action gives the response to the first determinant of the size of win-set outlined by Putnam, namely "the distribution of power, preferences, and possible coalitions among Level II constituent (Putnam 1997, 442)."

The other adopted resolutions during the Baku summit give the basement for the further comprehensive cooperation. For instance, the resolution on trade agreements between the EU and the Eastern European Partners, including the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas proposes that the countries of the EaP which are not members of the World Trade Organization complete the negotiations and join the WTO promptly as a necessary step to deepen convergence with the EU markets via the DCFTAs. It urges the World Trade Organization to accelerate and speedily finalize the negotiation process with the non-member EaP countries. (EURONEST Resolution 2012, 5-9). The resolution on challenges for future of democracy, including the question of free and independent media in Eastern Partnership and EU countries calls on the establishment of the European Endowment for Democracy. The EED aims to support political actors, as well as non-governmental organizations and trade Unions. (EURONEST resolution, 2012, 16-21).

The European integration has effect at least on one aspect of national politics. "By transforming issues traditionally defined as 'domestic policy' into 'foreign policy,' international engagement can open and close channels for domestic actors to influence

the initiation of policy (initiative); alter the domestic constitutional and statutory procedures under which policy decisions are ratified and implemented (institutions); create or redress asymmetries in knowledge (information); and reshape the possibilities for domestic actors to justify policies (ideas) ( Moravcsik, 1994 , 7).” Andrew Moravcsik’s paper “Why the European Community strengthens the state: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation” advances the discussion clarifies the potential effect on domestic politics of international cooperation. Moravcsik sets out four different mechanisms to show how national executives can use the international negotiations to enlarge their win-sets in domestic politics and to apply this to the case of European integration. Out of these mechanisms two are procedural and two are cognitive.

Under the mechanism institutions Moravcsik advances an Argument that international negotiations may strengthen the executive because of constitutional or other provisions which enhance executive autonomy. He states that European law acts to reinforce executive initiatives for policy change (Moravcsik 1994, p. 21). If we generalize this approach within the EURONEST cooperation framework, the energy policy might be considered as the best Argument for the discussion. Energy policy is one of the most evident dimensions that strengthens the executive<sup>4</sup> autonomy and at the same time contributes to the development of the multilateral track. Under the Eastern Partnership the Energy security is put at the third platform. The core idea is that the European Commission, Member states and the Partner Countries engage in a dialogue on how to encourage the development and implementation of mutual energy support and security mechanism. Support for infrastructure development, interconnection and diversification of supply and the promotion of increased efficiency and use of renewable resources in the partner countries (EURONEST parliamentary assembly 2011, 132-135).

The need for a common EU energy policy is generally accepted fact. “The energy policy is really a matter of two intertwined policies: energy policy and security policy. In terms of

---

<sup>4</sup> Executive- in this case EURONEST member states

the energy policy, the issues of security of supply and managing demand are vital. In terms of foreign policy, assuring diversity in supply in order to reduce the dependence of Europe on one source of energy and creating political security through a proper management of energy sources through foreign policy cannot be overlooked. The EU currently imports around 54% of all its energy consumption; the percentage of imports, therefore could rise to 64) by 2030. For almost 30 years, EU energy policy has been confined to the fields of nuclear energy and coal, as prescribed by the treaties on the European Coal and Steel community and on the European Atomic community. Attempts to extend the EU's jurisdiction to energy supplies remained unsuccessful. As a result, EU energy policy largely relies on intergovernmental co-operation, in which each member state exercise veto power (EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly 2011, 64-69).

Therefore, the development of the Energy cooperation within the Eastern Dimension is the crucial point. The EaP countries, particularly Ukraine, Georgia and Azerbaijan, should be included in a wider European Energy community. The active participation of these countries in the projects of diversification of the energy supply routes will have the positive effect of decreasing the general reliance of Europe on Russian energy. The Russian Federation holds the largest share in the imported energy in EU. For instance in 2009 Russia accounted for 36% of EU gas imports-around 6% of the EU's gross energy consumption. On the other hand, the EU is by far the largest trading partner of Russia. 47% of all Russian imports are from the EU and the EU accounts for about 75% of foreign investment in Russia (EURONEST PA 2011, 131).

The resolution addressing energy policy stresses the need to foster strategic partnerships on green technologies between the EU and the Eastern European partners. The EURONEST parliamentary assembly recommends to raise the European investments in the production of energy resources and their supply to the markets, to increase the volumes of joint development of the hydrocarbon resources in the Eastern European partners, specifically the Caspian Sea basin; recommends to increase the political and

financial support of the existing pipeline systems, including the Trans-Caspian system (EURONEST PA resolution 2012, 2-5).

The other mechanism the initiative (Agenda-setting) international negotiations may strengthen the agenda setting power of national, because the outcomes of international agreements – such as European legislation or institutional agreements – can be presented to parliaments to as an un-amendable “take it or leave it decision.” This is the equivalent to a legislative deliberation under a “closed rule (Moravcsik 1994, 9).” In the framework of the EURONEST several cases might be discussed. One of the EURONEST challenging questions is the distribution of votes. The EURONEST Assembly comprises “120 members: 60 members of the European Parliament and 60 members representing the parliaments of the partner countries (10 per country). The question is whether this formula ensures a balanced representation, given that the population of Ukraine (48 million inhabitants) is 16 times that of Armenia (3 million) (COE Parliamentary Assembly 2012, 1).

The temporally exclusion of Belarus from the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly only aggravate such misbalance. As the decisions generally are taken by the two components and later combined, the 10 free votes have definitely the added value. With regard Georgia has been for coming up with a legal norm declaring the quantities equality of members of the two components (50/50 for the current level), and equalizing the number adding members to be components in the case of changes in the membership) (Qardava 2012, 2). At the current stage, the fact that exact number is defined only by the European Parliament, traditional form of parliamentary assembly and it impacts on other procedural matters like quorum is destroyed. According to the 10<sup>th</sup> Article of the rules of procedure the quorum at the assembly is formed if 1/3<sup>rd</sup> (20 members) of the European Parliament component and 1/3<sup>rd</sup> (16 or 17 members) of the European Partners’ representatives are presented (Committee on European Integration, Parliament of Georgia 2012, 4).

The other case is connected with the simple majority voting. On the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> March, 2012 in Strasburg during the meeting of the Bureau and the working group on the Rules

of procedure, one of the most important issue was the decision making process regarding the vital interest issues. It might be told that the principal of consensus was being mistreated in the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. For instance, the official Azerbaijan delegation usually asked for the consensus declaring the issue as vital national interest. “With regard this, the Georgian delegation proposed to identify a list of the vitally important issues although the list of certain fields of issues of vital importance hasn’t been defined, the attitude has been renewed. The EaP member Country has to apply beforehand and give explanations why the certain issue has the vital importance (Qardava 2012, 4-5).

Putnam’s logic of two-level game takes the state its bureaucratic apparatus, domestic veto-players and the domestic and international levels as two different spheres as given aspects that need to be problematical in order to bring discourse analysis into play (Putnam 1988, 433-435). If we transfer the approach at the EURONEST level several challenges might be outlined. First of all the misbalanced between the mandate of EU and EaP secretariats might be stressed. Generally the EaP Secretariats are more in charge of the technical duty (Taktakishvili 2012, 3-6). Regarding the harmonization, the Committee on European Integration of the Parliament of Georgia organized, together with the Conrad Adenauer Foundation, a study-visit for the EURONEST South Caucasus local Secretariats. The other important initiative is the future foundation of the EURONEST office. The staff of the office will include the representatives of the EURONEST co-chairing countries (Qardava 2012, 4).

The core argument of the next mechanism- information is that International negotiations can create domestic informational asymmetries in favor of the executive. Executives may, through their direct participation in international negotiations and institutions, possess technical and political information which is not available to domestic societal groups which seek to influence or control their actions (Moravcsik, 1994, 23). In order to avoid such mistreatment of the information, it might be told that the important role is played by

the EaP civil society forum, linked to the fourth platform, called contacts between people (EURONEST parliamentary assembly 2011, 49-52).

The EaP Civil Society forum aims to support civil society development in EaP countries and strengthen cooperation between the civil society organizations of the EU and its partner countries. Opinions and recommendations addressed to intergovernmental platforms. At the Baku summit the forum stepped up with the initiative of the enhancement of the cooperation with the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. The possible suggestions for the collaboration are cooperation between Civil Society Forum national groups in the partnership countries and their EURONEST Members of Parliament, as well as between CSF national groups and MEPs from EURONEST which could include public consultations in the partnership countries involving non-governmental organizations and the general public in monitoring policy developments between the European Union and partner countries (EaP civil society forum 2012, 1).

The argument of the last mechanism-idea is that International negotiations can bolster the domestic power of political executives by providing them with additional sources of ideological legitimating associated with international cooperation. The “European idea” is, on the one hand, formidably connected to ideas of peace, prosperity and cosmopolitanism and, on the other, is notably vague and open-ended; it thus provides a particularly flexible instrument through which executives can legitimate their policies ideologically (Moravcsik 1994, 24). The eastern partnership countries mostly tend to use the features of the European idea as prosperity and democratic development. Therefore the member states actively use the possibilities as Comprehensive Institution Building. Comprehensive Institution Building programs aim to support the Association Agreement negotiation process and provide the member states’ institutions with the capability to successfully implement the reforms.



The EaP national level benefits as the determinants for the international cooperation in EURONEST will be discussed as a separate case within the South Caucasian frame in the following sub-chapter.

**2.1. The South Caucasian Dimension in the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly**

One of the determinant of the size of win-set is the strategies of the level I negotiators. “Each Level I negotiator has an unequivocal interest in maximizing the other side's win-set, but with respect to his own win-set, his motives are mixed” (Putnam 1988, 25-27). During the two EURONEST sessions the south Caucasian states emerged as the separate case of the interaction between the national and international levels. In spite of the verified European Integration trends of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia and the individual partnership tracks within the ENP, EU still often unifies them as the south Caucasian area. Therefore for the clarification of their national strategies as guidelines during EURONEST negotiations is valuable.

First of all, the priorities of these states are visible in the National Indicative Programs. For instance between the period 2007-2010 Armenia mainly stood for support for strengthening of democracy structures, building administrative capacity, reducing poverty. For 2011-2013 national indicative programs, the priorities are slightly changed. The 157, 3 million euro is allocated for the following issues: Support for Strengthening of Democratic Structures and Good Governance, Trade and investment, regulatory alignment and Socio-economic reform and sustainable development (European Commission 2010-2013, 12-13).

National Indicative Program for 2007-2010	€ 98, 4 million
support for strengthening of Democratic Structures and Good Governance	30%
Support for regulatory reform,	30%

administrative capacity building	
poverty reduction efforts	40%

Armenia National Indicative Program 2007-2010, 4-5

The national indicative program of Azerbaijan outlines slightly different priorities. During 2007-2010, 92 million euro was focused on support for democratic development and Good Governance, support for socio-economic reform, fight against poverty and administrative capacity building and support for legislative and economic reforms in the transport, energy and environment sectors (European Commission 2007-2010, 4-5). As for the period 2011-2013, 122, 5 million euros are allocated for “democratic structures and good governance, socio-economic reform and sustainable development, trade and investment, regulatory approximation and reform, including in the area of energy security, mobility and security” (European Commission 2011-2013, 13-15).

Comparing to Azerbaijan and Armenia Georgian national indicative program has had four main priorities for two ENP decades stably. Financial resource available to Georgia under this National Indicative Program for the period 2007-2010 was € 120.4 million was shared for the objectives, as the support for democratic development, rule of law and governance; support for economic development and ENP AP implementation; Poverty reduction and social reforms; Support for peaceful settlement of Georgia's internal conflicts (Georgian National Indicative Program 2007-2010, 13-16). Under the NIP 2011-2013 Georgia is supposed to receive € 180.29m from the European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI). This includes the additional allocations from the Eastern Partnership of € 30.86m for the Comprehensive Institution Building program (CIB) and € 7.43 m for regional development programs (European Commission 2011-2013, 13-16).

When Putnam speaks about the win-set, he defines it for a given level II constituency as the set of all possible level I agreements that would win. Therefore the range of the level

II win-sets of each country is important. In accordance with the EURONEST negotiations and the EaP development trends in the south Caucasus the discussion of the implementation of ENP requirements is worthwhile, because it gives the explanations, as well as future expectations for the further collaboration among these states on the international level. It might be told that the key feature for the further development of the south Caucasian dimension in EURONEST is to shrink down the possible uncertainty during the negotiations as much as possible. As Putnam outlines that “uncertainty can be a bargaining device or a stumbling block: uncertainty about the size of an opponent’s win set can increase the risk of involuntary defection but at the same time negotiators have an incentive to understate their own win sets and mislead their opponent (Putnam 1994, 446).”

In the framework of the regional cooperation one of the most relevant issues is the energy sector. Within the EURONEST the strategic geopolitical location of the south Caucasus region and its increasing importance as an energy, transport and communication corridor connecting the Caspian region and central Asia with Europe is underscored. Due to the fact the EU-south Caucasus cooperation should be given high priority as well as in matters relating to the transit of energy resources, diversification of EU’s supply routes. The readiness of Azerbaijan and Georgia for the further play an active role in the promotion of market-based energy supply and transit diversification and their contribution to shortening the general reliance of Europe on Russian Energy is crucial. With regard this there might be outlined the south gas corridor.

The Southern Gas Corridor, as an overarching concept, only emerged later. In a second review of the energy strategy, the European Commission categorized the – meanwhile also called – “Southern Gas Corridor” as a Community priority. It was especially through the Russian-Georgian war of August 2008 and the Ukrainian-Russian gas crisis of January 2009 that the Southern Gas Corridor and its key project, the Nabucco Pipeline, became a central component of a European debate about diversification especially from the

dependence on gas deliveries from Russia (Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Auswertige Politik, 2011, 2-3).

In the framework of a project "Improving energy efficiency in buildings, 2010-2015" Armenia has initiated several important activities. Armenia underlined its considerable potential in renewable, pointing out planned projects in hydro, wind, solar, geothermal and biomass energies. Along with such initiatives as Baku initiative<sup>5</sup> and the INOGATE Program<sup>6</sup>, there is the clear attempt of developing alternative energy sources, through the continued use of nuclear power and diversifying gas supply by setting up a gas pipeline connection with Iran. Despite this policy of diversification, it appears that the energy sector in Armenia is increasingly coming under Russian influence (EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2011, 70-85). The resolution of the committee on Energy Security stresses the need to ensure that the highest nuclear safety and security standards in the preparation, construction and operation of nuclear power plants are maintained in the EU and concerned Eastern European partners; welcomes the participation of Ukraine and Armenia in the stress-test exercise and encourages the other concerned Eastern European partners to confirm their commitment to participate (EURONEST 2012, 3).

Azerbaijan's activities to create a framework for promotion of energy efficiency are covered by a State Program for the Development of the fuel and energy sector for the period 2005-2015. Within this State Program Azerbaijan invested in acquiring state of the art technology with high production capacity, which has led to a reduction of emissions. In 2009 it signed a Memorandum of Understanding, creating the Azerbaijan-Georgia-Turkey Power Bridge Project. The future regional high voltage transmission lines among

---

<sup>5</sup> The "Baku Initiative" was launched on the occasion of the Energy Ministerial Conference held in Baku on 13 November 2004 with the participation of the European Commission and the Black Sea and the Caspian Littoral States and their neighbors, namely Azerbaijan, Armenia, Bulgaria, Georgia, Iran (observer), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Russian Federation (observer), Romania, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

<sup>6</sup> The INOGATE Programme is an international energy co-operation programme between the European Union and the Partner Countries of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

the countries will contribute to energy savings (EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2011, 86-93).

Georgia plans to ensure efficient utilization of renewable energy and support improvement of energy efficiency in public and industrial fields by creating a sound legislative framework. Several projects are being implemented including "new applied technology efficiency". Georgia's energy and gas tariffs have been oriented to stimulate energy efficiency and saving, by introducing a step tariff. Georgia participates in European, international programs (EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2011, 94-8).

The necessity of diversification of energy projects and immediate support of the ongoing projects, as first of all the Nabucco Pipeline Project is the good tool for finding the compromise on the EURONEST level. The last resolution of the committee on energy security stresses several joint initiatives, as the need for the elaboration of joint energy roadmaps by EU and by all key energy suppliers, as well as the international cooperation among researchers in the energy science and participation in such energy related initiatives as 'Smart Cities and Communities' and the Covenant of Mayors (EURONEST PA 2012, 2).

If the Energy policy might be considered as the tool for bringing Armenia for cooperation and achieve compromises during the EURONEST, the fulfillment of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement might be more beneficial for Azerbaijan that stands a bit behind then Georgia and Armenia that have already launched the negotiations. In Armenia substantial progress in implementing the "key recommendations" caused the launch of negotiations on a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area in 2009(European Commission 2012, 1-2). As for Georgia the first round of official negotiation on the EU-Georgia Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement went underway in the end on March, 2012(European Commission 2011, 1-4). Georgia, Azerbaijan and Turkey link the energy resources of rich Caspian region with the EU.

Georgia hosts oil and gas transportation projects of international and regional dimension, as Baku/Tbilisi/Ceyhan pipeline, Baku/Tbilisi/Erzurum gas pipeline, Baku/Supsa oil pipeline, North/South gas pipeline transporting Russian gas to Armenia.

In response to resolution on Trade agreements between the EU and the Eastern Partners, including the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas, and the EU assistance in this field the government of Georgia adopted several crucial strategies in 2010 within the framework of the European Neighborhood Policy Action Plan and Eastern Partnership: Comprehensive Strategy and Legislation Approximation Program in Food; Comprehensive Strategy in Competition Policy; Approval of Strategy of the Government of Georgia in Standardization, Accreditation, Conformity Assessment, Technical Regulation and Metrology. The adoption of the draft laws: The Code of Georgia on Safety and Free Movement of Products, the Law of Georgia on Free Trade and Competition and the Code of Georgia on Food/Animal Food Safety, Veterinary and Plant Protection responded to the approximation of the Georgian legislation in the field of regulation and management with the European standards, envisaged by Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (Parliament of Georgia Committee on European Integration 2012, 5-7).

Azerbaijan displays major differences with the two other Caucasus countries in its relationship to the EU and therefore also in ENP implementation. Unlike Armenia and Georgia, it can rely upon major resources and assets. On the one hand, no or limited progress has been made in those areas where the EU's and Azerbaijan's interests and values diverge. On the other hand, there are positive developments in the areas where interests converge, such as energy. Nowadays, EU imports from Azerbaijan increased by 52.2%, and EU exports to Azerbaijan rose by 22%. Azerbaijan made limited progress towards accession to the WTO, which is the first pre-condition for the EU to consider starting negotiations on a DCFTA. Azerbaijan continued to benefit from the GSP+ within the EU Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) in 2011 but needs to take further measures to comply with the conventions on core labor standards. Azerbaijan made some progress on the free movement of goods and technical regulations, notably with the

adoption of international standards on energy and food products (ENP progress country Report-Azerbaijan 2011, 1-5).

As for the other millstone for the collaboration, might be considered the implementation of the Mobility Partnership in the south Caucasus. Generally Mobility contributes to the promotion of mutual understanding and economic development. Labor mobility is considered as an area where EU and its neighbors can complement each other. The launch of the Partnership with the EaP states is an important step towards bringing the citizens closer. The Mobility Partnership is key instruments in increasing the mobility of the citizens in a well-managed and secure environment.

For instance, the Mobility Partnership will enhance Armenia's ability to manage migration and inform, integrate and protect migrants and returnees, the press release said, adding that it will boost Armenia's capacity to curb irregular migration and human trafficking. Ten EU Member States (Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania and Sweden) as well as the European Training Foundation (ETF) are involved in this partnership, which remains open to other Member States wishing to take part (Parliament of Georgia Committee on European Integration June 2012, 2-4). As for the Georgia, the presentation of Visa Liberalization Action Plan (VLAP) from the side of EU partners and plans to start the implementation is awaited later this year (committee on European integration, parliament of Georgia June 2012,8). Azerbaijan still lacks a comprehensive Integrated Border Management Strategy. Negotiations between Azerbaijan and FRONTEX on the conclusion of a Working Arrangement continued. An EU Migration Mission to Azerbaijan took place in June, which allowed for in-depth exchanges on migration-related issues. Negotiations on visa facilitation and readmission agreements were launched in March 2012 (European Commission 2011, 1-5).

The final important dimension where the south Caucasian countries need the solidarity in order to get the EaP benefits is the democratic development. Starting from January 2012 in Georgia the legislative amendments entered into force and information on the owners of media entities as well as the sources of finances is available for interested parties.

New legal provisions were introduced in the Election Code to ensure further guarantees for the access to media ahead of 2012 October parliamentary elections. Also there was created the state found commission verifying the accuracy of Georgia 'voters, as well as a new inter-agency task force-transparent & fair electoral environment (committee on European integration parliament of Georgia, 2012, 6-7).

Regarding Armenia the expected results for the period 2011-2013 are improved respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms by the judiciary, prosecutors, law enforcement bodies and penitentiary staff. Strengthened capacity of the Civil Society to express its voice in political, economic and social debates and channels; Increased use of systematic consultation of civil society on draft legislation; Improved and enforced legal and administrative framework to ensure respect of media freedom, including journalists' rights(European Commission 2011-2013,15).

In Azerbaijan in terms of the good governance, rule of law and development of the other democratic trends the EU expectations are enhanced independence and effectiveness of the judiciary and prosecutors; Effective enforcement of court rulings; Increased access to justice; Strengthened capacity of democratic institutions, including the Ombudsman institution and the Parliament; Improved quality of electoral processes and electoral administration in line with international standards (European Commission 2011-2013,14).

The Eastern Partnership accelerates the European Integration Process in the south Caucasus, giving the dimension of cooperation on Energy, Mobility Partnership, Economic Integration, democratization. Although EURONEST isn't officially declared as conflict management platform, it still has the capacity for positively influencing over the issue. In EP resolution on the need for EU strategy for the south Caucasus direct stress on



conflicts, as the constant risk for escalation is considered unsuitable (European Parliament 2010, 4-7). Therefore EU should motivate more the EaP states that offered benefits are essential for their national prosperity and that EURONEST capability provides more understanding, as well as channels for dialogues.

### **3. The joint ownership of the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly**

The other possible explanation to the research question regarding the determinants of the negotiations might be the responsibility towards the joint ownership of the EURONEST Parliamentary and the possibility of using it as the tool for strengthening the authority on international level. This chapter discusses this approach in the framework of the liberal intergovernmentalism theory. Moravcsik and Schimmelfing outline that main reason why intergovernmentalism is the “grand theory” in terms of states’ behaviors explanation is the fact that it seeks to explain the broad evolution of a regional integration. Liberal Intergovernmentalism is a theoretical synthesis or framework, not a narrow theory of a single political activity”. This enables it to be very versatile, and simple to use, and the “apparent accuracy of the substantive assumptions and empirical predictions” show it to be successful (Moravcsik, Schimmelfennig 2009, 67 – 68).

The first founder of the intergovernmental theory is Hoffman. He set the argument that the national governments were key people who made decisions and their special power was coming from two reasons: Firstly the legal sovereignty of their country, and linked to this, the legitimacy in the form of being the only elected officials in the integration process. Hoffman believed that a major failure in the neofunctionalist approach was the prediction of unavoidable further integration based on an internal dynamic which supposed that international background situation would stay the same.. He also argued that even though ‘national interests’ could be a reason to integrate with some parts of government, this process will never include higher politics such as national security. Lastly it was this desire to preserve the national interest that led to governments taking part in the integration, and so it was the national governments that controlled the degree and speed of integration, rejecting the neofunctionalist idea that states were overwhelmed by demands from interest groups (Bache, George 2006, 12-13).

The following chapter follows the arguments of more contemporary International Relations' theory based on state rationality. This concept of rationality gives two explanations: firstly national preferences formation and secondly, theory of interstate strategic interaction (Moravcsik, Andrew 1993, 271). Regarding the term of the joint ownership the second approach will be used.

Based on the liberal intergovernmentalism theory the EURONEST PA might be analysed as the result of strategies pursued by the members national governments acting on the bases of their preferences and Power. The Baku Summit showed the image of collective approach and reconciliation of the interstate disputes. The three mechanism of interstate bargaining might be well transmitted in the EURONEST parliamentary assembly area. First of all, the countries' participation in the EURONEST parliamentary assembly is voluntary, secondly the EURONEST PA working environment is relatively rich and third transaction costs of intergovernmental bargaining is low (Moravcsik, Andrew 1993, 282). It means that EURONEST Parliamentary assembly, as international institution may promote greater co-operation, because the transaction costs of identifying issues, negotiations, bargaining, monitoring and enforcing compliance-are significant (Moravcsik 1993, 291).

Moravcsik sets the argument that „to a much greater extent than unco-ordinated policies, alternative coalitions can create negative policy externalities for those left outside it (Moravcsik, Andrew 1993, 288). With regard the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly several determinants might be outlined. The greatest cost for exclusion from the joint work might be the suspension of the membership; It might be told that the increased responsibility towards the status in EURONEST is closely linked with the EaP „more for more“ principal. Therefore in case of a sanction the implementation of the EaP objectives will be obstructed and the national state preferences harmed.

In order to get better explanation for the democratic level of these countries the brief overview of statistics published by Transparent International corruption perception Index(2011). It ranks the level of corruption of public sector on the scale of 0-10. If the country gets 10 it means that it is perceived as very clean. As for country's rank indicates its position on relative to other countries included in index. If we divide the countries in several groups, it might be told that in the period 2010-2011 the Azerbaijan(2,4) and Armenia(2,6) maintained their scores stable. However progress in Georgia was shrunked down, namely from 3,8 to 2,9. But in case of the country ranking Georgia achieved progress moving from the 68th to 64th place. As for Moldova, Ukraine and Belarus the situation in terms of corruption is stable. The average score of three countries in 2010 was 2,6 and 2,5 in 2011. But in terms of the ranking all three countries have moved to backward places.

The political trends might be followed according to the statistics published Freedom House(2012). The material gives the explanation of Human Rights and fundamental Freedom. On the evaluation scale the 10th is the maximum freedom. All EaP countries are recognized as partly free countries, whereas their average scores in civil rights rating and freedom rating are 4 and 5,4. Regarding the political rights rating the best result gave Armenia, Azerbaijan and Belarus( European Commission, 2012, 10-11).

Belarus might be viewed as the best study-case for a sanctions of lack of democratic norms and precondition for the interstate bargaining. The dilemma of Belarus consists of two parts. on the one hand it's accepted that on the one hand it should not overshadow all project of the parliamentary assembly and on the other hand the problem shouldn't be underestimated, as it might block the EURONEST progress. The official discussions give the explanation how the EaP states and EP delegates try to present their interest and maintain their authority with their positions. During the enlarge Bureau meeting of the European Parliament's delegation to the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly with the heads of five national parliamentary delegations Mr. Darchiashvili, head of the Georgian

delegation outlined: „we have to „make peace“ somehow with Belarusian geopolitics and history. The current level of development of the process in the eastern partners' space dictates us to do it, because we depend on each other. Not all influential forces in our part of the world are interested in europeanization. In order to succeed we should help each other including the Belarusians. Engagement is very important in this respect in order to succeed, not only in terms of foreign policy but also in terms of opening European doors for all of us as well as in preparing our institutions to harmonise with European standards and values(Darchiashvili 2010, 4)“. The specific features as the differentiation, „more for more“ and conditionality cause the competitive environment between the EURONEST member states, therefore their motivation of maintaining the authority is also increased. As a result the meaning of engagement and exclusion is increased.

During the meeting the MEP from socialists and democrats pointed two obsessions: the continuation of current situation, keeping talking about the compromises and missing the support of the parliamentary dimension. The other is work on the compromises, talking to each other, waiting for the elections. Mr. Siwiec outlined the possible problem solution the representation by ten members of the parliament and ten members of the civil society. Mr Gerbrandt the MEP from the ALDE stated that instead of isolation of the problematic country, the doors should be left opened(Gerbrandt 2010, 10).

The hot debating issue during the meeting was the distribution of votes for Belarus. The format 5 plus 5 was supported by ALDE, EPP, as well as by ECR. Some politicians as for instance Mr. Protasiewicz the chairman of delegation for relations with Belarus expressed the attitude towards the approach „take it or leave it“<sup>7</sup>, stressing the fact that Belarus wasn't willing for compromise. However, Georgian delegation pointed out the possible threat. Mr. Darchiashvili stressed that for the EaP countries the emancipation process

---

<sup>7</sup> The term used during bargaining in international relations. The actor has dilemma either to accept the offer or lose completely.

from foreign colonial regime was not completed and there was threat that uncaredful attitude would narrow the door from the west and widen the door from the east. This would be risky not only for Belaruse but for all other EaP members that are interdependent in the struggle for emancipation. Georgian delegation outlined the meaning of perseption in politics and stressed the possibility of uncertainty, „acknowledging and agreeing on the 5+5 formula, would be the same as telling that they are half legal, half human and half not(Darchiashvili 2010, 20). Therefore he suggested not to rush with the desicion and organise a conference with Belarusian delegates and discussion of questions: the expectations from the EURONEST Parliamentary assembly general, other parliamentarian experiences as EUROLAT and EUROMED, standarts.

The meeting didn't took final descion, but the evidence how the states use different strategies for bargaining and competing for the value-added authority. As it is known Belaruse has 10 delgates and due to the temporary expnasion the 10 votes are free, unfortunately destorying the balance between the two components of the EURONEST parliamentary assembly. “The EU's offer of closer cooperation is contingent on the Belarusian government committing to democratic reforms, especially on electoral law and the freedom of the press. The future path of EU-Belarus relations will be conditioned by the latter's own relationship with Russia. Indeed, if Minsk were to push ahead with the democratic reforms requested by Brussels, it would indicate a willingness to pull away from Russia. Having said this, the picture is likely to remain fuzzy.

Whilst the outcome of the recent meeting between ENP Commissioner Ferrero Waldner and the Belarusian Foreign Minister Sergei Martynov seemed to inspire a new sense of confidence that Belarus might come into the EU-fold, Moreover, the Lukashenka regime appears set to further entrench its dependency on Russia, economically as well as politically ( Korosteleva 2011, 9-18).” The co-chairman of the WG on Belarus Jacek Saryusz-Wolski declared that the danger of changing Belarusian EaP aspiration is less possible, but under the question remains “the intention of Belarus to accomplish the

conditions for inclusion into this program...the conditions of democratization, observance of human rights, freedom of speech and Mass Media (Saryusz-Wolski 2012, 16). “

In the declaration on Belarus adopted during EaP summit in Warsaw, outlined several important messages: the EaP delegation expressed deep concern at the deteriorating human rights, democracy, rule of law, as well as media freedom. The official Belarus was called for the immediate release and rehabilitation of all political prisoners. The EU offered to deepen its relations with Belarus (Declaration on the situation in Belarus 2011, 2). The National Indicative Program for Belarus, 2012-2013 there are two main priorities outlined: Good Governance and Economic Modernization. The object of the financial support is to make Belarus harmonized with the EU standards and Values. Regarding the Russian financial support Andrey Fedorov expressed interesting position. “The whole situation is that in the nearest time there will be less money that there is in the West. 2011 – 2014 will be the years of great outgoings in Russia: the Olympic Games, the World Student Games, elections and many others.

This is the situation when Belarus won't have the possibility to get money from Russia under many reasons. But there will be money in the West, which considers investments to Belarus to be strategic (Fedorov 2012, 3).” From the perspectives of the issue of territorial integrity, it might be presumed that the decision of official Belarus of not recognizing south Ossetia and Abkhazia will cause more support among the other EaP Countries. ” The whole situation which we see there, it wasn't just a test for Belarus, it was the test for the whole post soviet area... the fact that there wasn't any recognition from the side of Belarus was very influential. Belarus became this very doubt-worm which got into the apple of CIS” – stated the Executive director of National informational centre of Russia (Federov 2012, 5).

“Each national political leader appears at both game boards. Across the international table sit his foreign counterparts, and at his elbows sit diplomats and other international

advisors. Around the domestic table behind him sit party and parliamentary figures, spokespersons for domestic agencies, representatives of key interest groups, and the leader's own political advisors. The unusual complexity of this two-level game is that moves that are rational for a player at one board (such as raising energy prices, conceding territory, or limiting auto imports) may be impolitic for that same player at the other board (Putnam 1988, 9).

So, regarding the link between the national decision-making process in Belarus & the EURONEST benefits it might be concluded that “there will be an attempt of changing of the image of Belarus. There will be stress on Belarus being a European country. The main thesis will be that Belarus is ready to develop together with Europe. And in the same time it will try to keep good relations with Russia. But these movements will touch interests of Russia anyway. And the conspicuousness towards Minsk can grow much. And the main problem of the state relations between our countries is that the both sides are unpredictable (Federov 2012, 8).” Moravcsik realized that the negotiations realized that the negotiations would imitate the power of the states taking part, and that states allowing supranational bodies to make decisions were attempting to ensure that all members would abide by these decisions (Bache 2006, 13 - 15).

Regarding the coalition within the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly and adoption of joint positions it might be told that the EPP eastern Partnership first summit hold in Georgia is a good example. In the adopted declaration several important messages are outlined. First priority addressed the clear perspective for the EaP: “The Eastern Partnership should offer a clear perspective for EU-membership to the Eastern Partners who are willing and acting accordingly.

The participants of the Summit share the importance of: increasing the effectiveness of the Eastern Partnership through concrete initiatives and projects with tangible results in priority fields of cooperation (European Peoples Party, 1-3). The third priority is an



enhanced role for the EPP in the EaP. “The participants to the Summit acknowledge the importance of political support for the EaP in the EU and welcome the EPP’s commitment to develop the political dimension of the EaP.

The participants of the Summit welcome the creation of the EPP group in EURONEST, which held its first meeting in Tbilisi in 2012 before the EURONEST session in Baku. Such a meeting will take place again in October in Chisinau. The participants agreed to organize an EPP Foreign Affairs Ministers meeting (EU and non EU) in Chisinau in September 2013 to prepare the Vilnius EaP Summit. The participants affirm that the Batumi Summit marks the beginning of a sustainable initiative (European Peoples Party 2012, 3).” Moravcsik also sets the argument within the economic interdependence, claiming that increasing transborder flows of good, services, factor...create “international polity externalities” among nations, which in turn create incentives for policy coordination (Moravcsik 1993,273).

Within the EURONEST Framework, it might be told that the Eastern Partnership aims to implement four freedoms of European Union. Also its object is to contribute to the development of these values between the EaP countries. The best example is the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement and the goal of establishing the customs union between the EaP states. For the same reasons are the member countries eager to conclude the negotiations on such vital issues as visa free regime, association agreement.

During the Baku Summit European Commissioner for enlargement outlined that for strengthening the EaP cooperation the EU has strengthened the Eastern Partnership following the review of the ENP. As a result the EU adopted the instrument that allows to make the EU support better tailored to the ambitions, needs and aspirations of the partners- not only for those who have EU aspirations but also for those who want a strategic partnership with the EU. ( Fuele 2012, 1).

Therefore it might be told that the ENP strategic approach emerged as one of the key precondition to the peaceful settlement of the raised tensions between Armenia and Azerbaijan during the Baku Summit. The case might be discussed as the proof of illustrating the increased responsibility towards the EURONEST Parliamentary assembly. As it is known the speech of Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev and the attribution of Armenians fascists made the Armenian Parliamentary delegation angry and European officials shocked. In spite of the obstacles the assembly ended with the adoption of resolutions and both sides accepted that there emerged the possible dimension for collaboration. Even though the relation between these countries isn't yet stable both of them started to make compromises in order not to shrink down their authority within the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly frame.

## Conclusion:

After discussing the determinants for changing the EURONEST turbulent working process into the fruitful collaboration, we came to two possible explanations: First, the EURONEST negotiations featured with the interaction between the national and international levels was stabilized as soon as the negotiators were persuaded that the costs of disagreements could overlap the EaP benefits. Second, the renewed ENP contributes to the free competition within the Eastern Partnership states and turns into the increased responsibility towards the joint ownership, as the active engagement and inclusion in the EURONEST Parliamentary assembly is the possibility for strengthening the state authority on the international level.

Within the theoretical frameworks consisted of Putnam's two level game theory and the main points of the liberal Intergovernmentalism, outlined by Moravcsik several ad-hoc conclusions might be stressed:

- The ENP parliamentary experience contributes to the successful harmonization process in the partner country. It provides the link with the EU institutions, as well as within the EaP states.
- Due to the fact that Eastern Partnership is EU driven and the direct emphasizes are considered risky for the negotiation, the EU as the chief negotiator should increase the role of the EURONEST Parliamentary assembly constantly.
- The second summit of the EURONEST PA was constructed according to "two level game" theory: On the first level the sensitive issue as the conflict resolution was put aside and initiatives, as the EPP Family meeting outlined the preferences being beneficial for both levels and prepared the space for collaboration. The outputs were ratified later on the 2<sup>nd</sup> level in Baku.

- Moravcsik's four Mechanisms: institutions, initiatives, information and idea contributed to outlying the other dimensions for cooperation between the EaP, needing the joint position.
- The EaP regional development on the south Caucasian example gave the output that the main precondition for cooperation is the determination of the priorities and challenges that stress the necessity of supporting each other during the EURONEST negotiations.
- The discussion of cases on Belarus, Armenia-Azerbaijan relation during the Baku summit, as well as the EaP strategy as incentive for cooperation gave the prove for the conclusion that the joint ownership of the EURONEST Parliamentary assembly might be realized as the opportunity of strengthening the international authority of states.

In conclusion it might be told that in the first decade of the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly the first explanation is more proper for several reasons: first, the possibility to harm the national level and loose the EaP benefits encourages the EaP states to negotiate; second, in the regional development framework the will of obtaining the EaP prosperity makes the countries to make compromises and work on joint positions. Finally, the dialogue channels and mutual trust leads the countries to the more comprehensive development of the EURONEST Parliamentary assembly.

## Literature Used

- **Eastern Partnership Institutions**

1. Committee on European Integration Parliament of Georgia. 2012. Responses on EURONEST PA Resolutions. Committee on European Integration 1-8(June). Tbilisi.
2. EaP Business Forum. 2011. The first EaP Business Forum was hold in Sopot. EAP Community 1(September).Internet. Available from <http://www.easternpartnership.org/community/events/eastern-partnership-business-forum-sopot>; accessed 5 May 2012.
3. Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum. 2009. The Role of the Civil Society Forum. Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum 1(May). Internet. Available from <http://www.eap-csf.eu/en/about-eap-csf/about-the-eastern-partnership/>; accessed 28 April 2012.
4. Eastern Partnership Panels. 2009. European External Action Service 1-2(May).Internet. Available from [http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/platforms/docs/panel\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/platforms/docs/panel_en.pdf)
5. Eastern Partnership multilateral Platforms. 2009. European External Action Service 1(May).Internet. Available from [http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/panels/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/panels/index_en.htm).
6. Eastern Partnership Summit. 2011. Declaration on the situation in Belarus. European External Action Service 1 (September). Internet. available from [http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/docs/komunikaty/20110930EAP/declaration\\_eap\\_belarus.p df](http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/docs/komunikaty/20110930EAP/declaration_eap_belarus.pdf); accessed 30 June 2012
7. EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2011. First Ordinary Session. European Parliament 64-135(August). Strasbourg. DG for External Policies of the Union Policy Department
8. EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2011 Constituent Act. EURONEST PA 1-5(May). Internet. Available from [http://www.euronest.europarl.europa.eu/euronest/webdav/site/mySite/shared/constituent\\_act/Constituent%20Act\\_EN.pdf](http://www.euronest.europarl.europa.eu/euronest/webdav/site/mySite/shared/constituent_act/Constituent%20Act_EN.pdf); accessed 17 April 2012.
9. EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly 2011. Rules of Procedure. EURONEST PA 1-20(May).Internet. Available from [http://www.euronest.europarl.europa.eu/euronest/webdav/site/mySite/shared/rules\\_of\\_procedure/Rules\\_of\\_Procedure\\_EN.pdf](http://www.euronest.europarl.europa.eu/euronest/webdav/site/mySite/shared/rules_of_procedure/Rules_of_Procedure_EN.pdf); accessed 8 June 2012.
10. European Peoples Party. 2011. Non-paper on the European Neighborhood Policy's Eastern dimension. EurActiv 1-6(May). Internet. available from <http://www.euractiv.com/europes-east/non-paper-european-neighbourhood-analysis-505103>; accessed 20 April 2012.
11. EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2012. Resolution on energy security, renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy infrastructure: developments in the Eastern Partnership and in the EU countries. Official Journal of the EU 1-5(April). Internet. Available from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2012:153:FULL:EN:PDF>; accessed 19 May 2012.
12. EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2012. Resolution on the situation of Yulia Tymoshenko. Official Journal of the EU 21-23(April). Internet. Available from

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2012:153:FULL:EN:PDF>;  
accessed 19 May 2012.

13. EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2012. Resolution on strengthening civil society in the Eastern Partnership Countries, including the question of cooperation between government and civil society, and the question of the reforms aimed at empowering civil society. Official Journal of the EU 16-21(April).Internet. Available from

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2012:153:FULL:EN:PDF>;  
accessed 25 May 2012.

14. EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2012. Resolution on Trade Agreement between the EU and the Eastern European Countries, including Deep and Comprehensive Areas and EU Assistance in this field. Official Journal of the EU 5-9(April).Internet. Available from

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2012:153:FULL:EN:PDF>;  
accessed 25 May 2012.

15. EURONEST PA. 2012. EURONEST PA Committee on Energy Security. EURONEST PA 2-15(March). Internet. Available from

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009\\_2014/documents/nest/dv/eap\\_energy\\_security\\_documentation/eap\\_energy\\_security\\_documentation\\_en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/nest/dv/eap_energy_security_documentation/eap_energy_security_documentation_en.pdf); accessed 18 April, 2012.

16. EURONEST PA. 2012. Report on energy security, renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy Infrastructure. EURONEST PA 1-7(April); Internet. Available from <http://euronest.blogspot.com/2012/04/adopted-report-on-energy-security.html>; 25 April,2012.

17. European Parliament. 2010. Meeting of European Parliament Bureau and the Heads of the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. EURONEST PA 1-26(June).Brussels

18. First European People's Party Eastern Partnership Summit Declaration 2012. Internet. available from

[http://images.europaemail.net/client\\_id\\_5328/BatumiSummit\\_final.pdf](http://images.europaemail.net/client_id_5328/BatumiSummit_final.pdf);  
accessed 11 July 2012.

- **EU Institutions**

1. Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly. 2012. The Council of Europe and the Eastern Partnership of the European Union. Strasbourg: COE Parliamentary Assembly. Internet. Available from

<http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/Documents/WorkingDocs/Doc12/EDOC12871.htm>;  
accessed 27 June 2012.

2. Commission of the European Communities. 2008. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council Eastern Partnership. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities. Internet. Available from

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/eastern\\_partnership/documents/eastern\\_partnership\\_communication\\_from\\_the\\_commission\\_to\\_the\\_european\\_parliament\\_and\\_the\\_council\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/eastern_partnership/documents/eastern_partnership_communication_from_the_commission_to_the_european_parliament_and_the_council_en.pdf); accessed 25 April 2012.

3. Council of the European Union. 2009. Joint Declaration of the Prague Eastern Partnership Summit. Brussels: Council of the European Union. Internet. Available from

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/eastern\\_partnership/documents/prague\\_summit\\_declaration\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/eastern_partnership/documents/prague_summit_declaration_en.pdf); accessed 25 April 2012.

4. Council of the European Union. 2011. Joint Declaration of the EaP Summit. Warsaw: Council of the European Union. Internet. available from [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/whereneighbourhood/eastern\\_partnership/documents/warsaw\\_summit\\_declaration\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/whereneighbourhood/eastern_partnership/documents/warsaw_summit_declaration_en.pdf); accessed 25 April 2012.
5. European Neighborhood Info Center. 2011. European Neighborhood Instrument: providing increased support to the EU's Partners. Brussels: European Neighborhood Info Center. Internet. Available from [http://www.enpi-info.eu/main.php?id\\_type=1&id=27348&lang\\_id=450](http://www.enpi-info.eu/main.php?id_type=1&id=27348&lang_id=450).
6. European Commission, High Representative of the EU for foreign affairs and security policy. 2012. Eastern Partnership: A Roadmap to the autumn 2013 Summit. Brussels: European Commission. Internet. available from [http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/docs/2012\\_enp\\_pack/e\\_ship\\_roadmap\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/docs/2012_enp_pack/e_ship_roadmap_en.pdf); accessed 17 April 2012.
7. European Commission. 2011. Joint Communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. A new response to a changing Neighborhood. Brussels: European Commission. Internet. Available from [http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com\\_11\\_303\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com_11_303_en.pdf); accessed 20 April 2012.
8. European External Action Service. 2009. Eastern Partnership Multilateral Platforms General Guidelines and Rules of Procedure. Brussels: European Commission. Internet. Available from [http://www.eeas.europa.eu/eastern/platforms/rules\\_procedure\\_en.pdf](http://www.eeas.europa.eu/eastern/platforms/rules_procedure_en.pdf); accessed 28 April 2012.
9. European External Action Service. 2010. Eastern Partnership Flagship Initiatives. Brussels: European Commission. Internet. Available from [http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/initiatives/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/initiatives/index_en.htm); accessed 28 April 2012.
10. European Parliament. 2011. Resolution on the review of the European Neighborhood Policy-Eastern Dimension. Brussels: European Commission. Internet. Available from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2011-0153+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>; accessed 20 April 2012.
11. European Parliament. 2010. Resolution on the need for an EU strategy for the South Caucasus. Brussels: European Parliament. Internet. Available from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2010-0193&language=EN>; accessed 1 July 2012.

- **ENP Parliamentary Assemblies**

1. ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly. 2006. Role of the Joint Parliamentary Assembly. Brussels: The ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly. Internet. Available from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/acp/20\\_01/default\\_en.htm](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/acp/20_01/default_en.htm); accessed 15 June 2012.
2. ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly. 2003. Rules of Procedure. Brussels: ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly. Internet. available from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/acp/25\\_01/reglement\\_en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/acp/25_01/reglement_en.pdf); accessed 20 June 2012.
3. Development and cooperation-EUROPEAID. 2011. Regional Co-operation, An overview of Programmes and Projects. Brussels: European Commission. [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/regional-cooperation/enpi-south/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/regional-cooperation/enpi-south/index_en.htm); accessed 25 June 2012

4. Euro-Latin American Parliamentary Assembly 2006. Rules of Procedure. Brussels: Euro-Latin American Parliamentary Assembly. Internet. available from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/eurolat/documents/rules\\_of\\_procedure/version\\_april\\_2009/785140en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/eurolat/documents/rules_of_procedure/version_april_2009/785140en.pdf); accessed 5 June 2012.
5. EURO Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly. 2009. Rules of Procedure. Brussels: EURO Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly. Internet available from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009\\_2014/documents/dmed/dv/dmed20090930rules\\_/dmed20090930rules\\_en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/dmed/dv/dmed20090930rules_/dmed20090930rules_en.pdf); accessed 2 June 2012.
6. European Commission. 2008. The strategic partnership between the EU, Latin America & Caribbean. Brussels: European Commission. Internet. Available from [http://eeas.europa.eu/la/docs/lima\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/la/docs/lima_en.pdf).

- **Research-Interviews**

1. Ms. Ekaterine Qardava. The chief specialist in the committee on European Integration, Parliament of Georgia. 26 June 2012.
2. Ms. Taktakishvili, Chiora. First Deputy Chairperson of the legal issues committee, parliament of Georgia, Co-chair of committee on political affairs, Human Rights and Democracy of EURONEST 21 June 2012.

- **Country Reports**

1. European Commission. 2007-2010. European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument, National Indicative Program Armenia. Brussels: European Commission. External Relations Directorate General. Internet. Available from <http://www.enpi-info.eu/library/content/armenia-national-indicative-programme-2007-2010>; accessed 1 July 2012.
2. European Commission. 2011-2013. European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument, National Indicative Program Armenia. Brussels: European Commission. External Relations Directorate General. Internet. Available from [http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/country/2011\\_enpi\\_nip\\_armenia\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/country/2011_enpi_nip_armenia_en.pdf); accessed 1 July 2012.
3. European Commission. 2007-2010. European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument, National Indicative Program Azerbaijan. Brussels: European Commission. External Relations Directorate General. Internet. Available from [http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/country/enpi\\_nip\\_azerbaijan\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/country/enpi_nip_azerbaijan_en.pdf); accessed 2 July 2012.
4. European Commission. 2012. ENP Package, Country Progress Report – Armenia. Brussels: European Commission. Internet. Available from <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/330&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>; accessed 9 July 2012.
5. European Commission. 2012. ENP Package, Country Progress Report – Georgia. Brussels: European Commission. Internet. Available from <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/334&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>; accessed 10 July 2012.
6. European Commission. 2007-2010. Georgian National Indicative Program. Brussels: European Commission. Available from



[http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/country/enpi\\_csp\\_nip\\_georgia\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/country/enpi_csp_nip_georgia_en.pdf); accessed 2 July 2012.

7. European Commission. 2011-2013. Georgian National Indicative Program. Brussels: European Commission. Available from [http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/country/2011\\_enpi\\_nip\\_georgia\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/country/2011_enpi_nip_georgia_en.pdf); accessed 2 July 2012.

- **Speeches**

1. Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum. 2012. Short speech to EURONEST parliamentary Assembly(May). Internet. available at [http://www.euronest.europarl.europa.eu/euronest/webdav/site/mySite/shared/speeches/2nd\\_csf\\_speech.pdf](http://www.euronest.europarl.europa.eu/euronest/webdav/site/mySite/shared/speeches/2nd_csf_speech.pdf); accessed 24 June 2012.

2. HR/VP Ashton Catherine. 2011. Welcome speech at convening the first EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly Meeting (May). Internet. Available From <http://euronest.blogspot.com/2011/05/ashton-welcomes-convening-of-first.html>; accessed 17 April 2012

3. Wolf, Stefan. 2011. Re-thinking the European Neighborhood Policy: From “Alternative to Enlargement” to Regional Foreign and Security Policy( May) 2011. Internet. Available From <http://www.stefanwolff.com/files/Rethinking%20the%20European%20Neighbourhood%20Policy.pdf>; accessed 20 April 2012.

- **Articles**

1. Alliance of Liberals and Democrats. 2011. Europe’s new Neighborhood Policy. Official Website of ALDE (May). Internet. Available from <http://www.alde.eu/press/press-and-release-news/press-release/article/europes-new-neighbourhood-policy-an-important-step-in-building-democracy-on-our-doorstep-37421/>; accessed 2 May, 2012.

2. EaP Community. 2011. The first (turbulent) session of EURONEST. EaP Community (September). Internet. Available from <http://www.easternpartnership.org/community/events/first-turbulent-session-euronest>; accessed 29 June 2012.

3. EaP Community. 2011. Eastern Partnership Funds. EaP Community (September).Internet. Available from <http://www.easternpartnership.org/content/eastern-partnership-funds> accessed 29 June 2012.

4. History of Truth. 2011. Azerbaijani, Armenian Delegations Dispute during EURONEST PA Session. History of Truth (September). Internet. Available from <http://www.historyoftruth.com/news/latest/10160-azerbaijani-armenian-delegations-dispute-during-euronest-pa-session>; accessed 29 June 2012

5. Korosteleva, Elena. 2011. Eastern Partnership: A New Opportunity for the Neighbors. Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics, Special Issue, 27 (January): 9-18.

6. Kramchuk, Dmitry. 2012. Interview with Andrey Fedorov: Lukashenko knows Russia’s Pressure points very well.” Eurodialogue(July). Internet. Available

from <http://eurodialogue.org/eastern-partnership/Lukashenko-Knows-Russias-Pressure-Points-Very-Well>; accessed 27 June 2012.

7. Manners, Ian. 2002. Normative power Europe: a contradiction in term. *Journal of common market studies* 40: 235-258.
8. Moravcsik, Andrew, and Schimmelfenning, Alexander. 2009. *Liberal Intergovernmentalism*. Diez, T., Wiener, A., 2009 *European Integration Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press : 67 – 87
9. Moravcsik, Andrew. 1993. Preferences and Power in the European Community: A liberal intergovernmentalist Approach. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31: 473-525.
10. Moravcsik, Andrew. 1994 .Why the European Community Strengthens the State: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation. Center fro European Studies Harvard University, Working Paper Series #52(September).
11. European Peoples Party. 2012. Press realizes of the European Peoples Party, Georgia: EPP to host Eastern Partnership Summit in Batumi. European Peoples Party official Website (July).Internet. Available from <http://www.epp.eu/pressnew.asp?artid=1885>; accessed 10 July 2012.
12. Sarysz-Wolski, Jacek. 2012. Belarus remains the weakest Point. *European Dialogue*. Internet. Eurodialogue (March). Internet. Available from <http://eurodialogue.org/587>; accessed 13 May2012.
13. Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Auswertige Politik. 2011. Südlicher Gaskorridor und Südkaukasus. Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Auswertige Politik(October).Internet. Availabel from <https://dgap.org/de/think-tank/publikationen/weitere-publikationen/s%C3%BCdlicher-gaskorridor-und-s%C3%BCdkaukasus>
14. Vigenin, Kristian. 2012. Bulgarian co-chair lauds Armenian, Azerbaijan. Internet. Novinite(April).Internet. Available from [http://www.novinite.com/view\\_news.php?id=138627](http://www.novinite.com/view_news.php?id=138627); accessed 15 May 2012.

- **Books**

1. Evans Peter B, Jacobson Harold K, Putnam Robert D. 1993. International Bargaining & Domestic Politics. Double-edged Diplomacy. Los Angels, California: University of California press.
2. Bache, Ian, and George, Stephan. 2006. Politics in the European Union. United States: Oxford University Press
3. Laar, Mart. 2010. The power of freedom central and Eastern Europe after 1945. Vilnius: Center for European Studies.
4. Parmantier Florent. 2008. The reception of EU neighborhood Policy in the book EU Foreign Policy in a Globalized World Normative Power & Social preferences. Canada, USA: Routledge