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**ACADEMIC EVENT - EUNPACK CONFERENCE**

**The EU and crisis response – a bottom up perspective**

**Abstract**

By combining bottom–up perspectives with an institutional approach, this panel aim at increasing our understanding of how EU crisis responses function and are received on the ground in crisis areas. This entails exploring local agencies and perceptions in target countries without losing sight of the EU’s institutions and their expectations and ambitions. It also entails examining the whole cycle of crisis, from pre-crisis, through crisis, and into post-crisis phase. The conference is part of a H2020 project (EUNPACK) that analyses two gaps in EU crisis response: the intentions–implementation gap and the implementation-local reception/perceptions gap. The main hypothesis is that the severity of the two gaps is a decisive factor for the EU’s impacts on crisis management and thereby its ability to contribute more effectively to problem-solving on the ground. In this conference, both gaps will be addressed. Two panels will address issues of more conceptual character as well as case studies from some of target countries.

**Keynote**

**Keynote speaker:** Prof. Roger MacGinty (Manchester University

**Discussant:** tba

**Panel I**

**Chair:** Tijana Recevic (Belgrade University)

***Paper 1: The EU's integrated approach to crisis response: learning from NATO, UN and OSCE***

**Author:** Steven Blockmans (CEPS)

**Abstract:** While the EU implements a unique version of comprehensiveness to fit its *sui generis* setup, there are important similarities with other international organisations' evolving approaches to crisis response. A comparative analysis of the main security institutions' structures, procedures and resources to respond to conflicts and crises may therefore allow for the identification of common challenges and the distillation of best practices to improve the EU's "integrated approach". This paper aims to do just that. It will present the headquarters' approach to crisis response of NATO, the UN and the OSCE in order to place a more detailed analysis of the EU's integrated approach into a broader perspective and tease out lessons to optimize the European Union's crisis response machinery to improve efficiency and impact on the ground while maintaining horizontal, system-wide coherence.

***Paper 2: Competing Logics of Local Stability: EU Crisis Management in Mitrovica***

**Authors:** Jozef Batora, Sonja Stojanovic (BCSS), Florian Qehaja (KCSS), Kari Osland

**Abstract:** This paper analyses local dynamics in the EU’s crisis management in Mitrovica in Kosovo. The main argument is that the EU’s role in crisis management is mediated by a number of local dynamics including locals’ perceptions of the EU and local dynamics of practices and networks. The findings from Mitrovica call for a critical reexamination of some of the major approaches to the EU’s role as actor in international affairs. This includes ideas of the EU as normative power or civilian power using conditionality to bring about change. Instead, building on the insight of the ‘local turn’ in conflict studies (McGinty and Richmond), the current paper argues that we need to consider locally anchored sources of social action to understand how the EU’s support of stabilisation efforts and reforms can operate. It argues, however, that the local turn underestimates the role of meso-level intersubjectively shared ideational structures – institutional logics – that inform local actors actions and daily practices. First, the paper outlines the prevalent approaches to the EU’s role as a normative power and transformational in the EU’s neighbourhood. Second, it briefly outlines the context of the EU’s involvement in the post-conflict situation in Kosovo more broadly and in Mitrovica more specifically. Third, in the empirical part, the results of surveys of the locals’ perceptions of the EU in North and South Mitrovica are presented. Fourth, local practices and logics in boundary-setting and boundary-crossing are discussed. In the conclusion, theoretical implications for the study of the EU’s role in crisis management and in external affairs more broadly are discussed.

***Paper 3: “Long Day’s Journey into Night” - the EULEX mission in Kosovo***

**Author:** Kari M. Osland (NUPI) and Mateja Peters (Univerity of St. Andrews)

**Abstract:** The European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX) is EU’s largest Common Security and Defence Policy mission. It is also the only mission where the EU holds an executive mandate, directly implementing policies on behalf of a host state. In this article, we look at the implementation and perceptions of EULEX. In the spirit of the practice turn, our interest is in understanding how those most directly responsible for the execution of the EULEX mandate (e.g., judges and prosecutors) and those directly affected by its outcomes (i.e., the local population) perceive the implementation of an EU executive mission. We contend that while the EU is uniquely positioned to address Kosovo’s rule of law problems, its sui generis character and competing objectives in the region present other, EU-specific challenges. These become particularly pronounced when mounting an executive statebuilding mission, where the clash between the political objectives and the legal mandate is more consequential. The mission, while trying to implement its technical/legal mandate, is circumscribed by political realities not just of Kosovo, but also of the EU, resulting in the intention–implementation gap. This tension between the legal and the political is in turn picked up in local perceptions of the mission, contributing to the implementation–perception gap. We argue that political interference in EULEX’s legal work comes in two forms: direct and ingrained. Direct interference in EULEX judiciary can best be seen in corruption scandals, a concern that the EU could have managed through swift and decisive action. The ingrained interference, on the other hand, presents a more fundamental challenge for the rule of law. It can be seen in the fact that rule of law is intertwined with other EU objectives for the region, objectives that were deemed to be more important to the EU than an independent judiciary by both EULEX staff and local actors. Such broad political considerations, which are more pronounced in regions where the principal has strong interests of their own, make it impossible for an executive rule of law missions to live up to the ideals it is promoting.

***Paper 4: The Quest for Coherence in EU Crisis Management: The Case of South Ossetia***

**Author:** Irena Mnatsakanyan (Sapienza University of Rome)

**Abstract:** The 2008 Russo-Georgian war and the sudden eruption of the violence in Nagorno Karabakh frozen conflict zone on April 1, 2016 reminded everybody that contrary to wide-spread beliefs, the “frozen” conflicts in the South Caucasus in fact are not `frozen` and have unusual escalating patterns. In response to the escalations of the conflicts in the South Caucasus the EU expanded its presence in the South Caucasus via introducing new crisis management instruments in the region. However, the EU was unable to use the variety of its crisis management tools in a coherent manner. The paper aims to demonstrate that the incoherence of EU crisis management in the South Caucasus is undermined by the overlap of the mandates of EU institutional agents. The casual relationship between the mandate overlaps and incoherence is analysed in the prism of bureaucratic politics which reviews EU supranational institutions as multiple bureaucratic organizations. The paper shows that due to the absence of formal coordination mechanisms the overlap of institutional mandates have contributed to incoherent crisis decision making process in South Ossetia.

**Panel II**

**Chair:** Jelena Radoman (Belgrade University)

***Paper 5: The EU at the Borders: Crisis Response and Border Management in Libya and Ukraine***

**Authors:** Loschi Chiara (IMRC) & Alessandra Russo (IEP Bordeaux)

**Abstract:** This paper discusses how and why the EU considers borders management concepts, the strategies and practices as an instrument of stabilisation and crisis response in its neighbourhood. To this end, it focuses in particular on the cases of Libya and Ukraine: while in the former case a border management mission has been explicitly conceived of part of the EU crisis response mechanisms, in the latter case it is interesting to study whether and how the political and security crisis have transformed pre-existing border management assistance. To do so, the paper draws on qualitative and quantitative evidence collected through surveys, interviews and focus groups in both countries between July and December 2017. New challenges and changing securitisation patterns have promoted the uneasy integration of stabilisation templates within the EU Neighbourhood Policy. As the EU enhanced its CFSP and CSDP missions by emphasising the border security dimension, the increasing reliance on strategies and tools aimed to promote an Integrated Border Management (IBM) in its vicinity will be investigated through the analysis of existing bordering practices and of the practitioners’ security perceptions. Drawing on the hypothesis that short-term stabilisation measures may lead to contradictory and unsustainable outcomes, the paper will pay a particular attention to the way in which the EU frames and deals with the informal and extra-legal economy on the borders, in order to explore the capacity of EU border management policies to ensure conflict sensitivity and integrated approach to security.

***Paper 6: EU crisis response in the extended neighbourhood. Effectiveness of the Comprehensive Approach in the cases of Iraq, Mali and Afghanistan***

**Authors:** Enver Ferhatovic and Ingo Peters (FREIE University in Berlin)

**Abstract:** This paper will focus on EU crisis response practices and explore local agencies and perceptions in target countries without losing sight of the EU’s institutions and their expectations and ambitions. The investigation will cover the full cycle of crisis response policy effectiveness from EU's intentions & motivations, and subsequent policy implementation (outcome effectiveness) to the evaluation of impact effectiveness, including local actors' perceptions, reactions and ownership, and back again to EU intentions and understanding.  We will thus present how the EU is implementing its approach to crises/conflicts in practice and address constraining factors for the implementation of the EU’s ‘comprehensive approach’ within the EU Crisis Management in the extended Neighbourhood (WP7).

***Paper 7: The European Union in Mali – five years to little avail?***

**Authors:** Morten Bøås (NUPI), Bård Drange (NUPI) and Abdoul Wahab Cissé (ARGA)

**Abstract:** The Sahel region confronts both its inhabitants and the international community with a huge set of serious challenges, ranging from weak states, transnational crime and jihadist insurgencies to poverty, refugees. Migrants, climate change and lack of development. Thus, as the international community and Europe fear a deepening of the crisis after instability first erupted in Mali in 2012, the region is higher on the international agenda than it ever has been, with more money being spent and several international interventions: by France (Operation Barkhane), the United Nations MINUSMA, and several EU operations as CIVCAP-Sahel and the EUTM. Despite all these efforts and the conclusion of a peace agreement for Mali in Algiers in 2015, the situation on the ground is not improving, and in Mali the conflict has gone from bad to worse as the conflict has spilled over from northern to central Mali. In the period since 2012 external interventions have increasingly taken a narrow security approach. While there may well be good reason for providing military assistance to Mali, we should ask ourselves not only what it is that these countries seem to need, but also what balance there be between the priorities of external stakeholders and local needs. Europe wants fewer northbound migrants and refugees, and a reduction in what it sees as terrorist threats. But that is not necessarily the main priority for the local inhabitants: they are more immediately concerned with their living conditions, which have come under immense pressure. The question we will discuss in this presentation is if current EU approaches contains the right balance between security and development, and what balance there should be between the priorities of external stakeholders and the local needs in the region.

**Paper 8: *Failing to prevent and preventing failure: the EU Comprehensive Approach and the ‘Ukrainian Crisis’***

**Author:** Vsevolod Samokhvalov (University of Liège & Vesalius College - Free University of Brussels)

**Abstract:** The paper seeks to analyse EU policies in the Ukrainian crisis. It argues that the EU failed to prevent part of the Ukrainian crisis, by making several mistakes in the run-up to the crisis. In particular, the paper will show that the EU fell short from setting up proper information-sharing and foresight intelligence mechanism to deliver to the HR/VC three emerging challenges: 1) gradual take-over of Ukrainian political and security sphere by Russia; 2) growing societal resistance against Yanukovych government; 3) changing perception of Europe in Moscow. Lack of awareness of or even indifference to the potential resonance between the three processes resulted in the EU facing crisis inside Ukraine and Russia’s intervention. However, having faced the crisis, the EU turned out to be a fast learner. Despite challenging situation inside and gravity of the challenge outside, Brussels and MS mobilized numerous resources and deployed multiple instruments. The paper will use the case of EU Support Group for Ukraine, deployment of multiple instruments, including ad-hoc streamlining of procedures, as an example of the comprehensive crisis approach. The paper will also assess how successful this newly-created approach was in addressing challenges facing the Ukrainian state. In particular, it will use the case of the public administration reform to show strengths and limitations imposed on the approach by the local agency/conditions.

**Concluding remarks:**

**Pernille Rieker (NUPI)**

**Title:** *Potential and limits of the EU in the field of crisis response and crisis management*

**Abstract:** This paper analyses the potential and limits of EU crisis response. The analysis in the paper is based on the findings in a series of empirical studies of EU crisis response in the enlargement area (the Balkans), the neighbourhood (Libya and Ukraine) and the extended neighbourhood (Afghanistan, Iraq and Mali). Based on these findings, this paper presents a comparative analysis of EU crisis response that shows how and to what extent the Union’s crisis response activities are implemented in different conflict areas. In addition, it analyses the Union’s ability to contribute effectively to problem-solving on the ground and identifies the main challenges that may prevent the EU from living up to its intentions. The main aim of the paper is to improve our understanding of the impact of EU’s approach to crisis response and crisis management by combining a top-down with a bottom up perspective.