



### About EUNPACK

EUNPACK, a project funded by the European Commission’s Horizon 2020 programme, takes an integral approach to the crisis cycle. It considers the EU’s intentions and use of the tools at its disposal (from financial and technical assistance to the launch of military missions); reception on the ground and perceptions in host countries. The project started in April 2016, and its first substantive research reports are now available. Fieldwork is ongoing.

### Follow us:

[www.eunpack.eu](http://www.eunpack.eu) @eunpack

*This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no.: 693337. The content reflects only the authors’ views, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.*



Open Dialogue organised by AREU in Kabul, Afghanistan, to discuss the findings from EUNPACK’s field work. Photo: AREU

### The EU, security sector reform and border management in Mali

**Morten Bøås, Abdoul Wahab Cissé, Aboubacar Diallo, Bård Drange, Frida Kvamme and Eva Stambøl**

A new working paper (Deliverable 7.4) considers the EU’s missions in Mali, arguing that they are yet another example of international interventions that may be well-intended but that end up producing very mixed results on the ground.

Since 2013, several international actors have sought to tackle the security situation in Mali. Despite their efforts, the security situation in Mali is deteriorating. The European Union has sought to address this security situation in Mali through efforts to restoring state authority, most notably by missions to reform and rebuild Mali’s armed forces (since 2013) and the national police (since 2015). This paper finds that both missions (the EUTM and



European Commission

Horizon 2020  
European Union funding  
for Research & Innovation

## MERI

MERI researchers participated in a panel debate under the title "Turkey-EU Relations: Present and Future of Security and Politics" on 20 February 2018 at the Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara. The panel was organised to share and discuss research findings with senior EU and national officials, EU experts, stakeholders and academics. The aim was to jointly elaborate on the future of EU-Turkey relations, focusing in particular on the politics and security dimensions of their relations in various areas in the Middle East including Iraq.

MERI researchers also participated in a workshop titled "Economic, Energy and Climate Change Drivers in EU-Turkey Relations" on 22-23 March 2018 in Rome, organised by Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI). MERI provided an analysis on how these drivers in the Middle East impact EU-Turkey relations.

## AREU Working Paper

Published on 31 January 2018, this paper examines the implementation process and impact of the European Union Police Mission in Afghanistan (EUPOL) as a case study of EU crisis management response. The paper has used a mixed method of quantitative and qualitative research. It has utilized survey findings, conducted by AREU, for the first phase of this project from July to August 2017, as well as in-depth interviews with key national and international informants, including former Afghan officials who were involved in the EUPOL project, former international EUPOL staff and senior civil society activists. It also extensively used a literature review including EUPOL official documents and other documents, reports and articles to comprehend the project management, structure and implementation processes.

The paper is available at:  
<http://eunpack.eu/publications/working-paper-implementation-eu-crisis-response-afghanistan>

## Coming up

Working papers on XXXX

## All publications are

H2020 Grant agreement No 693337

## Mali (contd.)

EUCAP, respectively), show laudable intentions. However, missions are complicated by divergence in stated intentions, real member state intentions, and sometimes contradicting ones. This has left the EU without a conflict sensitive approach, and with a limited ability to effectively transform the security situation on the ground.

Among the underlying issues are the questionability of the legitimacy of the forces it trains, and the true potential of having a long-term impact. These are linked, as may leave the EU's efforts in Mali without significant impact. A more concrete example is that EU personnel are not allowed to monitor Malian soldiers in combat, which limits the ability to observe impact and provide follow-ups. A second example concerns the EU's efforts in border management, which seem not tailor-made to address Malian challenges and those of the Malian people, but may be more concerned with migration (coupled with terrorism). Along the lines of the EUNPACK's overarching approach, this paper finds that in the EU's efforts in Mali, significant gaps exist both between intentions and implementation, and between implementation and reception/perception.

The full working paper is available at <http://eunpack.eu/publications>

## Short-termist and self-defeating: Assessing the EU's response to the crisis in Libya

Luca Raineri

21 March 2018

European Politics and Policy blog, London School of Economics and Political Science

Political instability in Libya is viewed as one of the key contributing factors to Europe's migration crisis, and the EU has taken an active role in addressing the problem. But how effective have the EU's efforts been in Libya? Based on new research, Luca Raineri highlights some key failings in the EU's approach, noting that there has been a significant disjoint between the ambitious objectives highlighted by EU leaders and their capacity and willingness to achieve these goals in practice.

The blog post is available at:

<http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2018/03/21/short-termist-and-self-defeating-assessing-the-eus-response-to-the-crisis-in-libya/>

## Report: Perceptions of EU crisis response in Iraq

This policy paper, prepared by MERI, provides a bottom-up analysis of the impact of the European Union's (EU) crisis response policies in Iraq. Based on 295 interviews with refugees, internally displaced individuals (IDPs), local government, and civil society organizations (CSOs) in Erbil, Sulaimaniah, Dohuk, and Kirkuk governorates, it examines how the EU's engagement in crisis response is received and perceived by different local actors throughout the conflict cycle. This study also seeks to unpack whether the EU's responses

correspond to the needs of target groups, perceived as conflict-sensitive and geared to the needs of vulnerable groups. Although the findings indicate that general attitudes towards the EU are favourable, we propose the following policy recommendations:

1. The EU should place more emphasis on its image as a contributor in crisis response in Iraq since there seems to be a lack of visibility towards the EU in Iraq;
2. The EU may also consider raising awareness of its endeavours in the various fields that it contributes to, especially rule of law and development aid since misconceptions might be due to a lack of awareness;
3. The EU should identify the causes behind the partial satisfaction with its assistance scheme in responding to the crisis in Iraq since a significant number of respondents mentioned that the EU's support has not improved their status;
4. The EU should consider developing the capacity and expertise of local organisations in order for them to be able to engage with international organisations, including the EU itself, in mutually beneficial endeavours;
5. The EU should consider increasing its staff members in Iraq in general and in the KRI in specific, given the size of its engagements and the magnitude of the crises in Iraq.

## Open dialogue on EU crisis response in Afghanistan

**Kabul, 1 October 2017**

The Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (AREU) conducted an open dialogue on 1 October 2017 to share its survey findings on the assessment of the EU crisis response in Afghanistan. The participants included representatives of the Ministry of Interior (MOI) and the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) and of civil society. However,



the EU Delegation in Afghanistan were invited to the event but could not make it. During the event, Qayoom Suroosh presented the survey findings and recommendations, highlighting key discussion questions for the participants and asking them to share their views on those issues and questions.

During an hour-long open discussion, most of the participants agreed with and supported the survey findings and recommendations. Moreover, the participants highlighted some key challenges and obstacles and explained why they believe the EUPOL project did not achieve its objectives. One participant noted that the main reason for EUPOL's limited impact was

that the mission had many short-term contract advisors who were keeping busy coming and going to the ministries. By the time they knew their Afghan partners, their contract was over. Other participants noted illiteracy, corruption and the lack of a civilian police culture as the main internal obstacles to Afghan police reform projects, including EUPOL.

## Café debate on EU crisis response in Mali

**Bamako, 27 October 2017**

The Alliance for Rebuilding Governance in Africa (ARGA) in collaboration with researchers from the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) and St'Anna School of Advanced Studies, University of Pisa conducted an Open Dialogue to share its survey findings on the assessment of the EU crisis response in Mali. The

participants in the event included representatives from Malian government and nongovernment organisations, local media, academia and representatives from the EU Delegation to Mali and from EUCAP-Sahel.

The Dialogue started with a short introduction by ARGA's Abdoul Wahab Cisse. This was followed by an introduction to the EUNPACK project and its relevance for Mali by Morten Bøås (NUPI). After these initial introductions, the main findings from the survey was presented by Abdoul Wahab Cisse.

These introductions were followed by a general debate moderated by Dr. Younoussa Touré. The participants commented upon many issues, and the questions raised concerned methodological as well as substantive issues. The information and local ownership gap that the survey identified was of concern to the Malian participants and this led to an interesting and constructive dialogue to which also the representatives from the EU Delegation and EUCAP-Sahel participated. Several suggestions concerning how the EU and local stakeholders could enter into a more equal partnership was brought to the table and discussed, and it was generally noted that more events like this was much needed to even further improve the efficiency of the interaction between the EU in Mali and various local stakeholder groups.

- ARGA also organised a sub-regional panel on migrations in partnership with Ivory Coast civil society during the **EU-AU summit** of 30 November in Abidjan. Ivory Coast youth organizations, students, former young migrants, public authorities and researchers on migrations did attend the workshop. Recommendations were made by participants and civil society leaders who attended the summit have the duty to share them with EU and AU high representatives.
- The **Sub-Regional Forum on democratic governance of the security sector** bringing together parliamentarians and civil society organizations from Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger in Bamako closed on 28 February 2018. The three-day forum ended with panels between Defense and Security Parliamentary Committees and Liptako Gourma civil society organizations. This forum, the second of its kind after that of Ouagadougou, is an initiative of the National Democratic Institute (NDI) financially supported by the embassies of the Kingdom of Denmark and Norway, the Danish ambassador to Mali felt on this occasion that the opportunity offered to Liptako Gourma civil society organizations and parliamentarians to reach solutions that will inevitably give an innovative and dynamic face to a sector that was previously inaccessible.

## Work Package 6: Libya and Ukraine

The past six months have been among the busiest for this WP, which carried out some of its most important activities. In early October, the WP published two policy briefs on the perceptions of local stakeholders from Libya and Ukraine about EU crisis response in their respective countries.

A **Summary of Perception Studies in Ukraine**, co-authored by Kateryna Ivashchenko-Stadnik, Roman Petrov, Alessandra Russo includes an account of a multi-sited survey conducted in Ukraine in July 2017, with the aim of assessing how local stakeholders consider the EU's approach to crisis management in the country. EUNPACK researchers have targeted specific groups, namely Internally Displaced People (IDPs), traders/entrepreneurs, NGO activists, security sector officers, local council representatives and other actors and practitioners that represent categories of actual and/or potential beneficiaries of EU crisis response instruments, programmes and policies. Whereas the EU is reportedly considered a key international actor involved in crisis response in Ukraine - especially in the development and humanitarian sectors, a number of respondents have mentioned different criticalities of the EU's presence and actions in the country. Proceeding from respondents' inputs, the policy brief's authors have formulated some policy recommendations.

A **Perception Study about the EU's Crisis Response in Libya**, co-authored by Chiara Loschi and Luca Raineri, discusses the perceptions of those who have been exposed to the EU's responses to the crisis unfolding in Libya. It is based on the results of a survey completed in the summer of 2017 by 228 respondents. It highlights, on the one hand, that while the EU is the most widely-known international actor involved in crisis response in Libya, the impact of its initiatives is less visible, thereby prompting a certain degree of dissatisfaction, if not of scepticism. This reaction is particularly pronounced remarkable among ethnic minorities living in peripheral regions. On the other hand, the EU is particularly praised for its initiatives in the fields of humanitarian assistance and capacity building, targeting most notably the most vulnerable social groups.

Starting in October, the members of the WP have carried out several weeks of fieldwork aiming to collect qualitative data on the practices of EU crisis response in the neighbourhood, and particularly in Libya and Ukraine.

During this phase, we developed and realised 2 workshops, one in Kharkiv (on Ukraine) and one in Tunis (on Libya). The informal setting of a Café Debate was selected with a view to sharing some provisional findings related to the perception studies, discussing the way ahead of our research, and promoting exchange between academics, policy-makers, media and local stakeholders.

The **Café Debate in Kharkiv** took place on 20 October 2017, and it was promoted jointly by the EUNPACK team in Ukraine and the NGO “Ukrainian European Studies Association” (UESA). It was particularly impactful, as it was hosted in the premises of one of the leading regional NGO “Free University Maidan Monitoring”, located around 70 km from the conflict area in Donbass. Participants included representatives of NGOs, local authorities and researchers from all over Ukraine. Following the presentation of EUNPACK objectives and findings, the participants openly shared their views on the situation in Ukraine the aftermath of the conflict and underlined some key challenges and obstacles to successful collective conflict response. It was argued that since EU visa-free travel for Ukraine came into force, the European support for Ukraine became more apparent for a wider local public: it was generally perceived as a positive sign. The contributors of the open panel also highlighted the prominent role of Kharkiv in crisis management (“Kharkiv has become a security umbrella of Europe” in front of the conflict in Donbass”). The event was broadcasted on Youtube and available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TMClw8owu7o&feature=youtu.be>

The **Café Debate in Tunis** was held on 29 November 2017. Attendees included staff from different EU institutions, UN agencies, INGOs and local CSOs, Libyan activists, journalists, scholars, and many others, coming from Tunisia, Libya and Italy to join an informal exchange session. In spite of being initially conceived as an open discussion, the whole session was held under Chatham House rules. The change was due to the suggestion of the EU Delegation, who felt that the topics discussed were particularly sensitive and needed to be handled with care. Following the presentation of EUNPACK’s objectives and provisional findings, a number of invited speakers contributed by sharing their particular expertise and perspectives, including: a representative of ICMPD (International Centre for Migration Policy Development); a representative of the humanitarian organization LibAid; a representative of the INGO ACTED; a representative of ECHO (European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office) North Africa office; and a representative of Amnesty International. These thought-provoking interventions triggered a lively debate among the audience, whose conclusions emphasized that rigorous research can contribute to constructively addressing the limits of EU crisis response in Libya.

The evidence collected during the fieldwork has been the basis for the drafting of **two working papers on the implementation of EU crisis response in practice**, discussing again the two case studies of Libya and Ukraine.

The Working Paper **Implementation of the EU crisis response in Ukraine**, co-authored by Kateryna Ivashchenko-Stadnik, Roman Petrov, Pernille Rieker, and Alessandra Russo, examines how the EU implements its responses to crises in practice, with specific attention on those factors that constrain implementation of a comprehensive approach. During the fieldwork, conducted in October-December 2017, in-depth interviews were carried out in Kyiv and Kharkiv cities, Ukraine (face-to-face and via videoconference tools). Interviewees were either international officials or representatives working for Ukraine-based organizations and missions or Ukrainian citizens (these included representatives of the implementation groups, institutions, partners or programs funded by the EU, direct beneficiaries of the programs funded by the EU, and experts, journalists, activists and other actors who cooperate with the EU or have knowledge in the security sector reform and humanitarian sector as the two key areas being investigated). The interviews demonstrated that the EU is seen as a reputable international actor that, with the support of other global players (such as the US and international agencies), considerably contributes to the further containment of the conflict. The EU is generally perceived in Ukraine as an respectful international player endowed with solid ideological foundations for its crisis-response mission in Ukraine, since the EU is keen to protect and to promote common European values, which remain a target for the Ukrainian development project. Through its projects in Ukraine, the EU has managed to initiate the first phase of key reforms to contribute to the modernization of Ukraine (such as the introduction of a new National Police and selection of the new cohort of judges of the Supreme Court). Still,

interviewees called for the EU to pay more attention to gathering a deeper understanding of the Ukrainian problems on the ground, to facilitating better mechanisms for implementing the complex reforms and to evaluating the consistent and long-term outcomes. Specifically, in the security sector, anti-corruption interventions and systemic, durable solutions (such as the creation of the National Anti-Corruption Court) has been named as the most urgent need. In the humanitarian sector, the creation of an international platform for monitoring human rights in the occupied territories (in Donbas and Crimea) and border zones was defined as the most pressing task to protect people who need help most. It was also underlined that a shift from humanitarian aid to development aid should take place in the areas where the hot conflict phase is over.

The working paper **The implementation of EU Crisis Response in Libya: Bridging theory and practice** discusses how the EU substantiates its crisis response in Libya, by focusing on the security practices of practitioners connecting decision-makers in Brussels to final beneficiaries in Libya. It questions whether EU approach in Libya is actually consistent with the commitments that, according to available strategic documents, should orient European action abroad, including policy coherence and consistency, a comprehensive approach to security, conflict sensitivity, local ownership, human rights obligations and humanitarian principles. Indeed, European crisis response in Libya has exposed Brussels to unprecedented levels of criticism, that seriously call into question the Union's ambition to be perceived as a bulwark of liberal values inspired by "principled pragmatism" (as per the 2016 Global Strategy for the EU's Foreign and Security Policy), let alone as a "force for good" (2003 European Security Strategy) in its foreign policy and in its neighbourhood.

With a view to combining the top-down understanding of policy design with a bottom-up investigation of the implications and practicalities of crisis response on the ground, the research relies on a large set of interviews with key stakeholders in Tunis and Rome. The findings of the research are quite disturbing, and indeed they are nourishing heightened debates in Tunis and Brussels (which was one of the implicit aims of the research). A few examples are particularly illustrative of how EU crisis response in Libya risks to fall short of fulfilling its normative commitments. While the training of the Libyan coast guard is officially meant to contribute to saving migrants at sea and disrupting human smuggling, the research finds out that some individuals accused of being responsible for smuggling oil and trafficking human beings appear amongst the beneficiaries of EU trainings, thereby suggesting that the vetting procedure of the trainees have fallen short of appropriate standards of due diligence. This outcome is largely in line with the predictions of the literature on protection economies, which has been warning that the most likely result of security-oriented responses is the sucking of state actors into the wheels and gears of the business of irregular migration.

More in general, EU-sponsored humanitarian and development programs in Libya are often subject to high politicisation and pressures from Brussels, carrying the risk to turn needs-driven projects into politically or funds-driven projects. The limited room for local stakeholders to provide inputs reduces local ownership as well as context and conflict-sensitivity, while remote management amplifies the room for suboptimal project design and monitoring. These shortcomings also affect some of the projects funded by the EU Trust Fund (EUTF), a newly established tool that should theoretically contribute to tackling the root causes of migration. The research therefore suggests that there is a significant mismatch between, on the one hand, the ambitious objectives and grandiloquent declarations of EU response policies in Libya, and, on the other, the capacity or willingness to achieve them.

Distorted expectations among beneficiaries, local counterparts, and European audiences are the result of short-term objectives having too often been prioritised. EU leaders have sought quick-fix solutions to offer immediate answers to the anxieties of their constituents, who allegedly perceive growing migrant flows from Libya as an existential threat. In other words, as migration has become securitised and framed as an emergency, EU leaders have appeared to address the needs of European audiences more than those of Libyan stakeholders and vulnerable groups. The decoupling of rhetoric and practice, however, can lead to EU external action and crisis response being seen as no more than a rhetorical wish-list than seriously considered policy options.

## Graduate Course, Freie Universität Berlin

### Winter semester 2017-18

#### EU foreign policy in action: EU ambitions and practice of conflict and crisis management

Building on the EUNPACK project, Dr. Ingo Peters (head of Work Package 7) and Enver Ferhatovic (senior researcher in WP 7) offered a graduate seminar on “EU foreign policy in action: EU ambitions and practice of conflict and crisis management” at Freie Universität Berlin (Otto-Suhr-Institute for Political Science. OSI) in winter semester 2017/18.

After introducing the research design of the EUNPACK project, eight sessions were used for providing basic features of EU foreign policy in general and its conflict and crisis management policy in particular, including theoretical and method issues. The second part (another eight sessions) focused on students’ case study presentations drawing on the about 30 finished and continuing CSDP missions.

As in the previous semester, this seminar attracted a group of 32 graduate students with a very mixed background in terms of academic specialisation and countries of origin. In addition to students from the US (2), France (3), the UK, Sweden, Estonia, Italy, Russia, Iraq and Mexico, German students with a variety of impressive international backgrounds also participated. The level of student expertise and engagement was remarkable, and thus we are looking forward to some 18 seminar papers being prepared.

Many students expressed their appreciation of the close connection between the ongoing EU research project and the seminar. In view of its great success for the second time in a row, we will be offering this course again in the upcoming summer semester for spreading the news about the EUNPACK project.

---

### Consortium

The consortium consists of researchers with a special competence on the EU and specialists on peace and conflict studies within different sectors and/or regions. More specifically, it will consist of the following key institutions.



NUPI  
Norway



UoM  
UK



ATASP  
Germany



CEPS  
Belgium



Comenius  
Slovakia



Sant’ Anna  
Italy



BCSP  
Serbia



KCSS  
Kosovo



NaUKMA  
Ukraine



IRMC  
Tunisia



ARGA  
Mali



AREU  
Afghanistan



MERI  
Iraq