

Global Governance Transformed: Explaining the Nexus between the EU and International Organizations

Workshop Venue:

Queen Mary University of London (Mile End Campus). Student Union, Blomeley Room 2, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS. For details on how to get to Queen Mary please see:

<http://www.qmul.ac.uk/about/howtofindus/mileend/index.html>

Thursday 24th of September

20:00: Welcome Dinner (*participants only*). Venue: TBC

Friday 25th of September

09.30-10.00: Registration and Coffee

10.00-10.15: Welcome and Introductions

10.15- 11.45: **Panel One: The EU and Transnational Governance**

Chair and Discussant: Dr. Paul Copeland, Queen Mary University of London

Sevie Chatzopoulou (ISG Roskilde University) *“EU-A ‘Hybrid’ bureaucracy in the making
The transnational governance of food policy and policy uploading to WTO”*

Janice Morphet (University College London) *“The EU and the OECD: combining interests to
rescale the state”*

Stella Ladi (Queen Mary) and **Dimitris Tsarouhas** (Bilkent University) *“The EU in the World:
public procurement policy and the EU-WTO relationship”*

11.45-12.00: Coffee Break

12.00-13.45: Panel Two: EU Institutions and International Organizations

Chair: Ino Afentouli (NATO, Public Diplomacy Division)

Discussant: Dimitris Tsarouhas (Bilkent University)

Nina Luz Da Silva (Sciences Po Grenoble) *“Policy diffusion between international organizations: the relationship between the WHO and the EU since the 2000s”*

Deniz Bekaroğlu Erdem (Middle East Technical University and Turkish Armed Forces) *“The Nexus between the NATO and EU from Security Perspective: Its Implications on Global Governance”*

Scott Schorr (University of St. Andrews) *“Quantum Voyage, Cosmic Sail, Nuclear Future: The European Union’s Interaction with CERN, ESA, UNOOSA, EUROfusion, and ITER”*

Paul Stephenson (Sciences Po/Maastricht University) *“Norms, experts and standard-setting: the European Court of Auditors and the International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions”*

13.45- 15.00: Lunch

15.00-16.30: Panel Three: The EU and the United Nations

Chair: Liam Campling (Queen Mary)

Discussant: Stella Ladi (Queen Mary)

Maria Giannou (Athens University of Economics and Business) *“Much Ado about Nothing? The Resolution 65/276 and the European Union as a New Diplomatic Actor in the UN General Assembly”*

Ryuya Daidouji (Waseda University) *“EU’s Multi-dimensional Influences on the UN Security Council: The EU’s role in the introduction of due process to targeted sanctions”*

Ries Kamphof (Leiden University) *“EU shared competences and the UNFCCC”*

16.30-16.45: Coffee Break

16.45- 17.30: Roundtable: EU-IOs and Next Steps

17.30: End of Workshop

LIST OF ABSTRACTS

Maria Giannou (Athens University of Economics and Business) *“Much Ado About Nothing? The Resolution 65/276 and the European Union as a New Diplomatic Actor in the UN General Assembly”*

The adoption of the Lisbon Treaty brought about significant changes regarding the European Union’s external representation system. As a relatively new diplomatic actor, the EU is in a continuous quest for more coherence and visibility. In this context, the EU struggled in 2011 for an enhanced institutional standing in the UN General Assembly. The Resolution 65/276 was finally adopted after significant political turmoil. Our paper examines (a) the repercussions of this Resolution to the EU diplomatic actorness and (b) the degree to which Resolution 65/276 has affected the EU’s coherence and visibility in the work of the UNGA. We focus empirically on the work of the Plenary and the six Main Committees of the UNGA based on verbatim records of the EU’s official oral interventions in them and a series of semi-structured interviews with officials in New York and Brussels. Our study covers the period from the 64th to the 68th UNGA session.

Sevie Chatzopoulou (ISG Roskilde University) *“EU-A ‘Hybrid’ bureaucracy in the making The transnational governance of food policy and policy uploading to WTO”*

The EU faced a series of challenges and dynamic developments over time that led to the significant expansion of policy making competences and contributed to the development of the EU transnational administrative system with significant policy and politics dimensions. This article aims to unfold the internal dynamics of the EU administrative institutional innovations and to open up the discussion on the EU as a ‘hybrid’ bureaucracy and the capacities that this incorporates in the internal and external global level. Such an analysis allows for a better understanding of what the EU bureaucracy is and what it does. ‘Bureaucratisation’ refers to ‘the emergence and growth of bureaucratic forms’ (Olsen, 2005:3). ‘Bureaucratization’ in the EU refers to the dynamic process that incorporates the proliferation of national and transnational administrative bodies. This article employs an integrated approach of the EU ‘bureaucracy’ and incorporates the expanded EU administrative institutions from the Commission to the European Parliament (EP), the European Court of Justice (ECJ), the Council but also the agencies, specialized institutions (e.g. European Central Bank) and transnational informal administrative networks. This allows for understanding how the EU bureaucratization process amplified the EU regulatory capacity building that has significant internal and external dimensions. Internally, the EU bureaucracy(ies) contributes to the expansion of the regulatory policies which goes beyond the bureaucratic politics of policy coordination at the national level. Externally it corroborates the externalization and uploading of these policies and standards at the international level, by participating and negotiating within the international organisations. First, the article delineates the EU’s bureaucracy/bureaucracies characteristics and discusses the commonalities and differences from the ‘classical’ Weberian state level bureaucracy. Then, it shows that the EU has developed into a ‘hybrid’ bureaucracy(ies) that consists of a ‘core’ and a ‘periphery’ and combines supranational, transnational and national characteristics. Finally, it unfolds the formal elements of the EU bureaucracy along with the

informal transnational networks that this incorporates. Empirically, the article considers the cooperation between the EU and the WTO with respect to food and trade policy an area where the EU transnational hybrid bureaucracy supported and promotes the uploading of its standards supported by the emergence of informal transnational regulatory networks.

Ryuya Daidouji (Waseda University) *“EU’s Multi-dimensional Influences on the UN Security Council: The EU’s role in the introduction of due process to targeted sanctions”*

This study examines how the EU exerts influence over the decision-making of the United Nations (UN), especially the Security Council (SC), with the attention on the process of modifying global counter-terrorism measures called “targeted sanctions” in favor of fundamental rights protection. According to the UN Charter, the relationship between the UN and other international organizations including the EU is characterized as hierarchical one. Moreover, while the researches on influence of the UN on the EU exist, there are few studies on influence in the opposite direction, namely, influence of the EU on the UN. Therefore, this study illustrates three pathways for the EU to exert influence on the UN. First, the EU may indirectly influence the UN by way of declarations or resolutions. Second, the EU commits itself in the decision-making of the UNSC through the SC’s permanent members (the UK and France) as well as non-permanent ones. Third, the EU courts influence the SC decision-making by suggesting the possibility of breaking down the implementation of the UN-led policy within the EU. This paper concludes that these multi-dimensional approaches of the EU induced the SC to introduce some forms of due process into targeted sanctions.

Nina Luz Da Silva (Sciences Po Grenoble) *“Policy diffusion between international organisations : the relationship between WHO and the EU since the 2000’s”*

Since the 1990's, policy diffusion studies have been largely developed. However, most of the research focuses on diffusion between states or explores the concept of *Europeanization*. This presentation takes place in this context but tries to explore another type of diffusion between two international actors, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the European Union (UE). The EU and WHO maintain a partnership since 1972 but their working relationship only became effective as from the 1990's and strengthened since 2000's with the signing of reinforced cooperation agreements (1999, 2000 and 2010). Several internal and external factors may explain this merger process that seems to lead to the diffusion of ideas, practices and discourses in the field of public health policies. This work is based on the study of several examples of diffusion between the two organizations and explores more particularly the making process of the WHO FCTC (Framework Convention on Tobacco Control), the first international treaty negotiated under the auspices of WHO between 1999 and 2003. We will explore the role of the EU through the action of its Member States but also through the action of its representatives such as David Byrne , European Commissioner for Health and Consumer protection between 1999 and 2004. Diffusion mechanisms will be used in the presentation to demonstrate the pro-active role that EU can play in other International Organisations, such as WHO.

Deniz Bekaroğlu Erdem (Middle East Technical University and Turkish Armed Forces) *“The Nexus between the NATO and EU from Security Perspective: Its Implications on Global Governance”*

The Cold War and the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) with the United States interpreted as the delaying factors for a more active European role in security initiatives until the 1990s. With the end of the Cold War, the EU was encouraged to revisit its security chapter and this resulted in the creation of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) as a second pillar of the Maastricht Treaty of 1991. On the other hand, there have been three distinct periods within which NATO’s strategic thinking has evolved (1) the Cold War period, (2) the immediate post-Cold War period and (3) the security environment since 9/11. One could say that from 1949 to 1991, NATO’s strategy was principally characterized by defence and deterrence, although with growing attention to dialogue and détente for the last two decades of this period. From 1991 a broader approach was adopted where the notions of cooperation and security complemented the basic concepts of deterrence and defence. As the détente period initiated the composition and increasing capabilities of new actors, with the end of Cold-War the process gained momentum and pluralist approaches increased its influence. Critical theories started to voice the fact that, in the new era it was not rationale to consider the security of states apart from international structure and as long as the securitization of a single or few state insecure the others including the overall international system, a robust and long-lasting peace structure could not be established. At this specific point, EU and NATO have significant roles to play in order to install a comprehensive and cooperative defense/security structure that addresses the multidimensional contemporary security challenges. Taking the above mentioned issues into consideration, mainly since the Lisbon Summit in 2010 NATO and EU commonly decided to improve their existing relations and the level of integration particularly on security matters (i.e.: counter-terrorism) as they have officially noted the fact that any fragmentation in related policies creates security vulnerabilities which is harmful for the entire global community. Considering the economic aspects and budget shortfalls, both actors aimed to reduce the duplications in security policies, developed “smart defence” concepts emphasizing cooperation among them. Additional to their “realistic” ambitions and hard power instruments, the NATO and EU decided to cooperate to improve their soft power capabilities to fulfill the necessities of contemporary security environment. As the projects within this frame are continuing, there are setbacks in the process as well. For instance, the prioritization of threats among member nations could be interpreted as the main obstacle to proceed, whereas the vulnerabilities in voting and decision-making mechanisms in both organization withholds them to react for the crisis promptly (as it was the case for the annexation of Crimea). In this paper, the nexus between the NATO and EU will be elaborated from the security perspective and constructivist theories will be utilized as the main framework by means of methodology in order to explain the policy shifts occurred and remaining gaps. Furthermore, the impact of NATO’s and EU’s “normative” and “interest-based” prioritization discrepancies on the global governance will be discussed to shed light upon the existing reluctances being experienced particularly on decision-making processes.

Ries Kamphof (Leiden University) *“EU shared competences and the UNFCC”*

The Lisbon Treaty clarifies the division of competences between the EU and Member States and the notion of 'shared competences'. The whole idea of 'sharing' EU competences and powers in international organisations can add to existing political theories on EU external relations and policy formulation. On the basis of a case-study on environment and climate change in a United Nations (UNFCCC) framework this paper seeks to answer whether the shared legal competence framework of the EU enables or restrains EU and Member State actors in climate change negotiations. Semi-structured interviews have been conducted and literature and case-law of the Court of Justice of the EU have been consulted. It is found that the legal concept of 'shared competences', along with its more concrete implementation in 'working arrangements', explains policy formulation of EU and Member State actors alongside more popular political theories. Internal legislation', once concluded, changes the external 'playing field' of EU and Member State diplomats at UNFCCC. Only when issues are becoming 'really political' this finding is contradicted. This case-study paves the way for more interdisciplinary approaches to global governance and empirical research on the nexus between the EU and international organisations.

Stella Ladi (Queen Mary) and **Dimitris Tsarouhas** (Bilkent University) *"The EU in the World: public procurement policy and the EU-WTO relationship"*

This paper analyses the role of the European Union (EU) as a global actor by examining the Union's relationship to the World Trade Organization (WTO), adopting and revising public procurement regulations. Using a qualitative research methodology and relying on 12 face-to-face interview sessions with 18 key actors, the paper sheds light to an underdeveloped research area. Theoretically, we point to the limitations of the Principal Agent (PA) approach in EU governance and adopt a transnational regulatory networks approach instead. Empirically, the paper demonstrates the cyclical nature of the relationship between the EU and the WTO in adopting and revising the Union's public procurement Directives as well as the WTO's Global Procurement Agreement (GPA). This cyclical relationship demonstrates the existence of an informal transnational regulatory network negotiating the modernization of the EU procurement directives. On the other hand, much fewer actors are active in the revision of the GPA.

Janice Morphet (University College London) *"Global Governance Transformed: explaining the nexus between the EU and international organizations"*

The OECD is a soft power membership organization that supports policy change in its membership through a variety of means including economic comparisons, policy reviews and benchmarking between its members. As an organization with a primarily economic focus, the OECD has developing its policy range into associated areas including education, through the PISA rankings and through LEED – local economic and employment development. The role of OECD LEED policy has gained in prominence as it has espoused Krugman's new economic policies and the new economic geography (Krugman 1991; 2011) has focussed on the social, sustainable and efficiency arguments of functional economic areas. This has been further enhanced through a drive towards rescaling states to align governance to FEAs

rather than traditional administrative boundaries (Ahrend, R. et al 2014). In policy terms this is being encouraged through the better life Index for FEAs launched in 2013 (Brezzi et al 2013), on the 50th anniversary of the OECD and has now been used for similar governance scales by the World Bank (2010). The EU has also been enrolled in this policy delivery. It has engaged in development of FEAs policies with the OECD (2013) and implementation of FEA special and economic policies through the revision of the Cohesion Regulation 1303 2013. The president of the OECD, Angel Gurría announced at the EU's regional open week in 2014 that over 50% of OECD member states had now espoused this policy and that alignment between EU state economic and governance boundaries was well underway. It is a significant policy objective for any international organization to attempt to influence governments to change their sub-state governance systems although there is evidence in the US, Canada, Australia and NZ that this approach is being adopted (Schakel 2015; Rompuy 2015; Kortt et al 2015). Within the EU, the close convergence between OECD and EU policies for FEAs and governance reform have been little discussed although can be evidenced through published reports and policy objectives (Dijksra 2010, 2011; Charbit, 2011). The purpose of this paper is to examine further the relationship between the OECD and EU, to identify the key drivers for common working and the relative success of the use of soft power in transforming sub-state government across 28 member states.

Scott Schorr (University of St. Andrews) *"Quantum Voyage, Cosmic Sail, Nuclear Future: The European Union's Interaction with CERN, ESA, UNOOSA, EUROfusion, and ITER"*

The European Commission is one of many European institutions active in the realm of science, technology, and engineering policy formulation. As an institution of the European Union, the European Commission exhibits EU agency to collaborate and negotiate directly with non-EU intergovernmental research organizations (IROs) and international organizations (IOs). Discussions often revolve around the development of joint research initiatives or exploratory missions, the supranational funding of intergovernmental projects, or the drafting of policy related to a scientific or technical domain that had previously not been discovered or never existed. My paper will present a taxonomy of EU interactions with five scientific IROs and IOs that are global leaders in experimental and applied research fields ranging from particle physics to space science to nuclear fusion. This will be achieved by examining patterns of EU engagement with the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), European Space Agency (ESA), United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA), European Consortium for the Development of Fusion Energy (EUROfusion), and International Thermonuclear Energy Reactor (ITER). Each IRO and IO in this study is a non-EU institution that is headquartered in Europe, represents a global policy or research area in science/technology/engineering, and engages directly with both the EU and many of its member-states on common projects.

Paul Stephenson (Sciences Po/Maastricht University) *"Norms, experts and standard-setting: the European Court of Auditors and the International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions"*

The European Court of Auditors (1977) is the external auditor of the EU budget, and fifth institution of the EU. Yet it has received relatively little attention from scholars of European politics. Based in Luxembourg, it employs 900 people, of which about 400 auditors. The Court carries out audit tasks in 'close cooperation' with national supreme audit institutions (SAIs). The Court shapes and adopts new audit standards as a member of International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) (1953) and its European arm, EUROSAI (1990), which bring together professional and technical experts worldwide through a series of working groups and task forces. Nonetheless, the Court has no legal mandate to ensure that the norms it adopts in its own audit practice are used by the EU member states SAIs, which presents a challenge for multi-level financial control and any move towards a 'single audit'. This paper examines the Court's motives for engaging with INTOSAI at the international level (as well as a host of other standard setters) – why does the EU establish formal contacts with an IO in the field of accounting and audit? Drawing on interviews, it then analyses the process of engaging with INTOSAI, looking close up at socialization processes and tracing the emergence of individual audit standards. The paper argues that membership of an IO has significantly helped bolster the professional and technical legitimacy of the Court in the last 20 years, but may now have limited added value. Moreover, membership has reinforced the Court's operational and institutional independence vis-à-vis its main stakeholders, the European Parliament and European Commission. The paper contributes to our understanding of how the EU works at the latter stages of the policy cycle and brings new insights to implementation and evaluation.