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Abstract

This paper outlines the current status of EU-Bilateral relations with the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Brazil, Canada, China, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Japan, Libya, Pakistan, Russia and the United States of America. By providing an overview of these cases, the paper seeks to detail the nature of the EU bilateral relations with these countries and provide information to be used as part of the wider EU-GRASP project. It does this, by firstly defining the parameters of the term bilateralism, and then detailing the relationship by looking at Cooperation on Regional Conflict, Cooperation on Terrorism, Cooperation on WMD, Cooperation on Migration, Cooperation on Human Rights and Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change where applicable.
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Introduction

Bilateral relations between the European Union and other states within the global system is a traversal issue pertaining to the EU-GRASP project. This paper seeks to “map” the EU’s bilateral relationships around the world with key states in the global system and the case study countries agreed upon by the EU-GRASP partners. This includes: The United States, Canada, Brazil, Russia, China, Japan, Pakistan, India, Israel, The Palestinian Territories, Afghanistan, Iran, North Korea, Libya and Myanmar. Of particular concern are issues relating to regional conflict, terrorism, WMD, migration, human rights, energy security and climate change.

Defining Bilateralism

The term “bilateralism” refers to matters affecting two parties, in contrast to unilateral (one party) and multilateral (many parties). This meaning is reflected in the etymology of the term, in which the pre-fix “bi-” is derived from the Latin for two or twice, whilst the adjective “lateral” has its roots in the Latin term “lateralis”, belonging to the side of. In international affairs the term indicates joint policies adopted by states, especially but not exclusively in matters of trade, defence and diplomacy.

In the context of the EU-GRASP project, mapping bilateral relations will focus on the European Union’s relations with other states, e.g. EU-US relations, EU-Canadian relations, etc. Instructively, it should be noted that the EU is not a single state. Consequently, the EU can be understood as a geographical “region” and/or an integrated set of institutions that create a multilevel and multilocational foreign policy (Keukeleire & MacNaughtan 2008: 8-34). This creates two significant problems for understanding bilateral relations. Firstly, as the EU is itself a region, bilateral relations constitute “regional-state relations”. This has led to Heiner Hänggi going beyond the term

---

1 An earlier version of this paper was presented at an EU-GRASP workshop in July 2009 hosted by UNU-CRIS.
bilateralism, and referring to EU bilateral interactions with single powers as ‘hybrid interregionalism’ (2000: 7).

Secondly, there is a danger of EU-centrism, which could give the impression that for Member States, the EU is the main or only international framework for developing foreign policy, promote foreign policy goals or fulfil commitments. This is not the case, as often Member States have their own bilateral relations with states that also have bilateral relations with the EU, e.g. UK-US relations, France-US relations. However given these conceptual caveats, this paper will proceed by mapping the EU’s bilateral relations without problematising or theorising these issues; its concern is overwhelmingly empirical.

**European Union – The Islamic Republic of Afghanistan Relations**

**Overview**

The EU is one of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan’s largest donors, and is committed to helping create a secure, stable, free, prosperous and democratic Afghanistan. The EU and Afghanistan set out the nature of their partnership in a Joint Declaration made on 16 November 2005 (see European Commission 2005a). This declaration outlines the desire for increased co-operation, between the EU and Afghanistan across a range of areas. Moreover, both partners are committed to regular political dialogues, with annual meetings at Ministerial level. Notably, the EU’s partnership with Afghanistan is being conducted against the background of an evolving political and economic scene, which is reflected in its political framework for cooperation. The EU has however made sure that its

[A]ssistance reflects the priorities set out in Afghanistan’s National Development Strategy adopted at the Paris Conference on 12 June 2008, including support for justice and law and order; combating narcotics production; and assisting on health sector (see European-Commission 2005a).

Despite controversy over the 2009 Afghan presidential elections, the EU has welcomed their conclusion and has congratulated President Hamid Karzai on his second term in office.

**EU-Afghanistan Cooperation on Regional Conflict**

The EU considers regional cooperation on security and economic issues to be ‘a prerequisite for stable and sustainable development in Afghanistan’, and has asserted that ‘in general terms, Afghanistan has developed constructive relations with its neighbours in recent years but continued
efforts will be required to support overall stabilisation and development efforts in the country’ (European Commission 2006b: 7). Such a statement reflects the EU view that stabilising Afghanistan is central to the peace and security of the region, in particular the future stability of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Indeed, Javier Solana, EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, has argued that

The need to support Afghanistan and Pakistan is more urgent than ever ... the EU is boosting its engagement under a coherent policy towards the region as a whole. It is leading the international community in showing Afghanistan and Pakistan that they do not stand alone (in Europe 2009b).

Central to the EU-Afghanistan strategy is the notion that ‘economic and political development depends on the progressive strengthening of a functioning state’, and that Afghanistan should be governed through ‘accountable, democratic institutions, and able to ensure security and the rule of law over the entire national territory’ (European Commission 2006b: 22). To this effect, Benita Ferrero-Waldner, the EU Commissioner for External Relations, has asserted that

We need to step up our efforts to achieve our goal of the Afghan authorities taking over more responsibilities. To underpin the new compact we aim for with the new Afghan government, I will propose to substantially increase the annual amount of Commission assistance for the next financial perspective 2011 – 2013 (in Europa 2009b).

This is part of a sustained effort to ensure that Afghanistan’s ‘rudimentary state of the administration and the infrastructure supporting it’ does not determine

Afghanistan becoming a failed state, due to both low capacity and the lack of good governance, especially in provinces and districts, and the continuing prevalence of poppy culture, which raises the risk of narco-interests capturing the state apparatus with potential wider implications in terms of regional stability (European Commission 2006b: 22).

**EU-Afghanistan Cooperation on Terrorism**

In light of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks against the United States of America, Afghanistan has become the central military focus of the war on terror. Indeed, EU policy towards Afghanistan is part of its wider commitment against terrorism (General Affairs and External Relations Council conclusions of 8-9, 17, 29-30 Oct 2001). This was outlined in the conclusions of the Laeken European Council (15-16 Dec 2001) and further detailed during several GAERC meetings in 2001 (19-20 Nov and 10 Dec), 2002 (28 Jan, 15 Apr, 22 Jul and 10 Dec) and 2004 (13
December) and 2005 (12 December) (European Commission 2006b: 36). Notably the EU and the Government of Afghanistan have declared their commitment to a

Secure, stable, free, prosperous and democratic Afghanistan as laid out in the Afghan Constitution adopted on 4 January 2004 [14 Dalwa 1383]. Both parties wish to see Afghanistan play a full and active role in the international community and are committed to building a prosperous future free from the threats of terrorism, extremism and organised crime (European Commission 2005a).

Significantly, the EU argues that instability and insecurity in Afghanistan has a ‘direct impact here in Europe’, and terrorism constitutes one of the most serious global threats facing Europe today (Council of the European Union 2009c). Consequently the EU has declared that it is prepared to ‘actively engage in strengthening counter-terrorism cooperation in a range of areas, including fostering regional law enforcement and judicial cooperation’ (Council of the European Union 2009c).

**EU-Afghanistan Cooperation on Migration**

The 2009 UNDP Human Development Report for Afghanistan highlights that Afghanistan is facing acute poverty, being ranked 135th out of 135 countries on the Human Poverty Index. Moreover, Afghanistan is ranked 181st out of 182 countries on the Human Development Index (UNDP 2009). Given such widespread poverty and instability in the country, the country is faced with massive population movement. Indeed, the EU estimates that in total, ‘more than 5 million Afghans are living outside the country, mostly as refugees in urban areas in Pakistan and Iran’ and adds that

Repatriation is an ongoing process and although it is expected that a significant proportion will remain in Pakistan, returns will raise challenges in terms of sustainable reintegration and reinforcing the rural-to-urban shift in population. In terms of livelihood, migration has become a perennial part of the Afghan economy. An estimated USD 500 million in remittances are sent back each year by Afghan migrants, mostly from Iran, Pakistan and the Gulf countries (European Commission 2006b: 9).

Given this situation, the EU has confirmed that it stands ready to support schemes that may be agreed between the Governments of Afghanistan, Pakistan and other countries in the region, to promote improved migration management, to fight illegal migration, including the signing of readmission agreements, and to enhance the synergies between migration and development (Europa 2009b).
Significantly, regional migration is not the only level of bilateral cooperation the EU has pursued with Afghanistan. The UN Refugee Agency has declared that there has been a ‘sharp rise in attempted illegal migration to Europe’ from Afghanistan. With 12,600 Afghans seeking asylum in EU countries in 2008, they represent the fifth largest group after Iraqis, Russians, Somalis and Serbs. The UK was the most popular Member State destination in 2008 with ‘3730 Afghan applicants seeking asylum’ according to the Statistical Office of the European Commission (UNCHR 2009). To counter this trend, an EU Afghanistan Returns Plan has been constructed to facilitate the flow of Afghan returnees back to Afghanistan from EU countries (European Commission 2006b: 19).

EU-Afghanistan Cooperation on Human Rights

Since the fall of the Taliban Regime Afghanistan has witnessed improvements in its human rights record. However, this record remains deeply problematic. The EU has identified significant issues for concern in the ‘transitional justice process for handling human rights abuses which were committed during 23 years of warfare, women’s rights and an unreliable justice system’ (European Commission 2006b: 7). Consequently, the EU is working with the Afghan government to improve this situation. Notably, the EU is reinforcing its efforts in ‘strengthening Afghan capacity and will work with and through the Afghan Government to foster effective and accountable state institutions, especially for governance at sub-national level, and efficient public administration’ (Council of the European Union 2009c). The EU has also declared that it will

Further enhance its emphasis on the rule of law and governance in Afghanistan, on fighting corruption and improving the human rights situation, especially for women and girls. The EU is committed to assisting the Afghan Government in the political challenge of reintegration and reconciliation. Leading combatants away from the path of violence requires providing them with alternative aspirations and livelihoods (Council of the European Union 2009c).

The EU is especially keen to assist in building a civilian police force through EUPOL, supporting the implementation of the National Justice Programme, and supporting economic growth, especially through rural development and social progress (Council of the European Union 2009c). The EU will thus reinforce its efforts in strengthening Afghan capacity and will work with and through the Afghan Government to foster effective and accountable state institutions, but is fully aware that ‘international assistance must be a transition strategy, focusing on enabling the Afghan government to assume full responsibility, while the international community gradually takes a more supportive role’ (Council of the European Union 2009c). However, the EU remains concerned about human
rights issues within Afghanistan, 'in particular women's and children's rights, are at the centre of a strengthened EU political dialogue with the Afghan Government' (Council of the European Union 2009c).

EU-Afghanistan Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change

The EU has identified Afghanistan as 'one of the most disaster-prone regions in the world' due to the country's 'landslides, avalanches, sandstorms and floods'. Consequently, the country's 'sustainability of economic growth will depend in part on the country's ability to adapt to this kind of climate change' (European Commission 2006b: 39). Indeed being a rural based economy, the EU has identified that the 'country urgently needs to improve the productivity of its agricultural sector, which suffers from water scarcity, soil erosion and desertification' (European Commission 2006b: 39). The EU has asserted that given the 'vast scale of environmentally related issues to be addressed in Afghanistan, recommendations for priority actions can only be general in nature. During the forthcoming years, emergencies related to environmental impacts may arise which will require urgent attention' (European Commission 2006b: 40). Given such predictions and a lack of policy detail, it is evident that resources and interventions in Afghanistan will be ad hoc.

With regard to energy security, the EU has estimated that 'Afghanistan's total primary energy supply still relies 85-97% on fuel wood', whilst electricity is mainly generated 'from rehabilitated hydropower stations, diesel powered plants and a myriad of mobile generators' (European Commission 2006b: 40). However the EU is keen to point out that 'Afghanistan has substantial natural gas resources and coal', and that 'environmental policy objectives have been formulated by international agencies in cooperation with the former Interim Administration and the current Government' (European Commission 2006b: 40). The four most pressing needs for Afghanistan's environmental sector are:

- Capacity building and institutional development;
- Ecosystem and biodiversity conservation and management, including the combating of deforestation;
- Integrated pollution control;
- Private sector investment in the environment sector.

European Commission 2006b: 40
European Union - Brazil Relations

Overview

Diplomatic relations between the EU and Brazil were established in 1960. However, the present relationship is governed by the EC-Brazil framework co-operation agreement (1992), EU-Mercosur Framework Co-operation Agreement (1995) and the Agreement for scientific and technological cooperation. In May 2007 the EU recommended the launch of a strategic partnership to further deepen its ties with Brazil. The first ever EU-Brazil Summit was held in Lisbon in July 2007. Central topics of the new partnership include effective multilateralism, climate change, sustainable energy, the fight against poverty, the Mercosur’s integration process and Latin America’s stability and prosperity. This new relationship places Brazil, the Mercosur region and South America high on the EU’s political map. A total of €61mn is earmarked for Brazil in the Brazil Country Strategy paper 2007-2013, with the two focal areas of: enhancing bilateral relations [through sectoral dialogues, scholarship programmes and European Studies Institute] and environment. Trade is another important subject of dialogue, as Brazil is the most important market for the EU in Latin America (European Commission 2009q).

EU-Brazil Cooperation on Migration

Given that the Strategic Partnership between the EU and Brazil is only in its second year, cooperation in most areas has yet to be institutionalised. In this context negotiations on illegal immigration continue to be discussed in order to establish closer cooperation between the EU and Brazil. Of particular relevance in the context of migration is the question of remittances from Europe to Brazil, which have grown substantially in recent years. This, however, is seen as a macro-economic issue, in that remittances are seen to contribute to economic growth and development. This area continues to be discussed (European Commission 2007a).

EU-Brazil Cooperation on Human Rights

The EU and Brazil claim to share core values and interests, which include respect for the rule of law and human rights. Moreover the EU regards Brazil as a vital ally in addressing these and other challenges in international fora. Both have been strong proponents of building up a comprehensive body of global standards and a range of tools for their implementation. In the Human Rights Council and the UNGA (United Nations General Assembly) Third Committee there is great potential for synergies and further co-operation to promote global human rights. Both the EU and Brazil also
share a common interest in fostering democracy and the rule of law and good governance in all countries. Regarding human rights, the EU is particularly keen to work closely with Brazil to achieve greater consensus on resolutions or to co-sponsor initiatives on specific countries and issues in the relevant UN bodies (European Commission 2007a).

**EU-Brazil Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change**

EU concern over energy security and climate change is a major factor in its bilateral relations with Brazil. This is a direct consequence of Brazil being the custodian of the largest remaining areas of rainforest in the world and a critical partner for the EU in campaigning for greater international action to combat climate change and to halt the decline in biodiversity. In turn this relationship is based on EU concerns that

Strong and continued political will be required to reach a comprehensive global climate agreement to limit increase in temperatures to less than 2°C compared to pre-industrial levels. As expressed in the Commission Communication of 10 January 2007 on 'limiting global climate change to 2°C' and endorsed by Heads of State and government at the Spring Council of 8-9 March 2007, the EU believes that, considering the urgency of the issue, negotiations for a global and comprehensive post-2012 agreement, based notably on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities need to be launched at the UN Climate Change Conference to take place in Bali in December this year, and completed by 2009. High-level political engagement is necessary to strengthen and implement the UN Convention on Biological Diversity and to achieve the World Summit on Sustainable Development biodiversity 2010 target. The EU and Brazil also share a particular concern for other environmental challenges notably the protection of forests, water management, the marine environment, the global mercury challenge and unsustainable patterns of consumption and production (European Commission 2007a).

As well as working together on the international stage, the EU and Brazil consult bilaterally on a range of environmental issues, through regular policy dialogue meetings. The EU has the following priorities:

- The EU is interested in sharing experiences in water management and in dealing with unsustainable patterns of consumption and production.
- The EU should develop and reinforce our Environmental Policy dialogue with Brazil on topics such as climate change, water management, bio-diversity and deforestation, including the role of indigenous people so that we better understand each other’s positions, thereby enhancing our collective influence in these areas.
The EU should work with Brazil in international fora to advance climate change and deforestation discussions with a view to reaching agreement for a global post-2012 framework.

Closer co-operation should also be envisaged towards implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity and achieving the biodiversity 2010 target as well as on other key global concerns, such as addressing mercury pollution.

European Commission 2007a

Brazil was the first country to successfully develop a very large indigenous biofuels production which has significant further potential. It has taken a leading role along all different stages of production, distribution and consumption of biofuels. The EU has recently confirmed that greater use of renewable energies is a key priority for EU energy policy. The 2007 action plan on an energy policy for Europe, which has been endorsed politically by EU leaders, sets ambitious targets for the use of renewable energy (20%) and of biofuels (minimum 10%) until 2020. The EU and Brazil share the conviction that co-operation in this area can offer mutual benefits: a partnership has been forged in the context of the International Biofuels Forum initiated by Brazil in March 2007 (European Commission 2007a).

The EU is also keen to enhance co-operation on energy efficiency with Brazil, both at the bilateral level and through a future international framework agreement. The EU claims the following:

The launch of the EC-Brazil Energy Policy Dialogue in 2007 could allow significant progress in EU-Brazil energy co-operation, both at regulatory and technical level. Topics should include sustainable biofuels and other renewable energy sources, energy efficiency and low carbon energy technologies. The dialogue would also allow closer ties, exchanges on major international energy developments and promoting policies to improve energy security and sustainability (European Commission 2007a).

European Union – Canada Relations

Overview

Relations between the EU and Canada began in the 1950s as a purely economic relationship and have since evolved into a close strategic partnership. Consequently, the EU now claims to work closely with Canada on global challenges such as ‘the environment, climate change, energy security and regional stability throughout the world’ (European Commission 2009e). The EU and Canada meet annually in a bilateral summit of leaders, the last of which was on 9 May 2009 in Prague. The EU-Canada Partnership Agenda adopted at the Ottawa Summit on 18 March 2004, identifies ways of
working together to move forward, especially where joint action can achieve more than acting alone. The Partnership Agenda acknowledges the significant evolution of EU-Canada relations as a result of developments in the EU since 1976, when the relationship with Canada was first formalised through the Framework Agreement on Economic Co-operation. This was the first formal agreement of its kind between what was then the EEC and an industrialised third country (European Commission 2009e).

**EU-Canada Cooperation on Regional Conflict**

The EU and Canada are seeking to build greater capacity in the areas of conflict prevention, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and crisis management. For example, in Africa this has manifested itself in cooperation on the African Union Exercise AMANI AFRICA as well as support to peace operations training centres. Currently both parties are looking to build on this co-operation in other areas.

Support for transparent, democratic elections is an area of common interest to the EU and Canada, and consequently both parties seek further cooperation in this field, including, where appropriate, in the context of EU Election Observation Missions.

With regard to specific regional conflicts, the EU and Canada share some common goals. For example, in Afghanistan they both seek to ensure security and stability in the wider region. To this end the EU claims that

> Consistent with the 31st March Hague International Conference on Afghanistan, we will work together to support capacity-building of all levels of government in Afghanistan and the upcoming elections, and we will encourage Afghan-led reconciliation efforts and dialogue with regional partners, particularly Pakistan. We will also work together to promote human rights and we urge the Afghan government to honour its human rights treaty obligations under international law, including respect for equality of women before the law. We value our on-going cooperation in EUPOL and seek to intensify EU-Canada collaboration on the ground, we strongly support the UN-mandated mission in country, and we remain committed to the people of Afghanistan. We reaffirm our commitment to support the democratic government of Pakistan, which we encourage to undertake important reforms aimed at improving the current political and security situation. In particular, we are concerned about recent developments in certain parts of North West Frontier Province, and urge the Pakistani government to take decisive action to ensure that human rights are fully respected and the security situation does not deteriorate further. We welcome the outcome of the 17 April Tokyo
conference, which generated pledges in excess of US $ 5 billion in development assistance (Council of the European Union 2009a).

On the Middle East Peace Process, the EU and Canada

[U]rge the parties to resume the bilateral negotiations in order to move forward the Peace Process towards a two-state solution. We also urge consideration to be given to the Arab Peace Initiative, which offers a solid and appropriate basis for progress towards achieving comprehensive peace in the Middle East (Council of the European Union 2009a).

Both Canada and the EU already work in tandem to strengthen police forces in Afghanistan, the Balkans, and the Palestinian territories. Both will continue dialogue on how to operationalise the responsibility to protect, both bilaterally and within a wider UN context (Council of the European Union 2009a).

**EU-Canada Cooperation on Terrorism**

Cooperation on countering terrorism is an important feature of EU-Canadian relations, under the remit of justice and security. Engagement between the EU and Canada on such issues has become closer through meetings between the European Commission's DG for Freedom Security and Justice, and Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada with Public Safety Canada and Justice Canada. There is particular interest in further developing discussions in the area of information sharing (European Commission 2009f). The EU claims that

This is a key aspect of formal agreements between Canada and the European Commission, such as the API/PNR, and with other European bodies e.g. the Canada-Europol Agreement. An important issue is privacy and the protection of personal information. Police cooperation between the EU and Canada continues to be achieved pursuant to the Europol-Canada agreement of November 2005 (European Commission 2009f).

**EU-Canada Cooperation on WMD**

The EU and Canada share an interest in combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. Both parties see the proliferation of WMD and their delivery systems as a threat to international peace and security. Consequently, both parties are seeking to work jointly towards

Achieving the universalisation of multilateral non-proliferation and disarmament treaties, regimes and other arrangements, including the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention and Chemical
Both parties place a strong emphasis on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and are committed to achieve a successful outcome of its Review Conference in 2010. The EU and Canada claim to actively underline the importance of full and unconditional application of UN Security Council Resolutions and of strengthening UN specialised agencies dealing with disarmament and non-proliferation issues (Council of the European Union 2009a).

Both the EU and Canada remain deeply concerned about the Iranian nuclear issue and Iran’s failure to comply with its international obligations. Consequently they remain committed to a diplomatic solution based on the dual-track approach, affirming their commitment to work together in the context of the European Security and Defence Policy, both in civilian and military crisis management (European Commission 2009f).

**EU-Canada Cooperation on Migration**

In May 2007, Citizenship and Immigration Canada and the European Commission’s DG for Freedom, Security and Justice signed a memorandum of understanding (MoU) to establish a new framework for cooperation on a range of immigration and asylum issues. The first meeting under the MoU was held in Brussels in July 2007. Intensive discussions have also continued on the issue of extending Canada’s system of visa exemption for short stays to citizens of all EU Member States’ (European Commission 2009f).

**EU-Canada Cooperation on Human Rights**

For the European Union human rights issues fall under the common foreign and security policy (CFSP), and therefore under the remit of the Troika². The last Troika human rights consultations between the EU and Canada took place on 6 September 2007 in Brussels and on 28 February 2008 in Ottawa. The EU reports that

Canada and the EU had an exchange of views on thematic and country priorities for the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly and the Human Rights Council as well as other HRC issues. Furthermore, the EU and Canada exchanged information on human rights dialogues and

---

² The Troika refers to the Foreign Affairs Minister of the Member State holding the Presidency of the Council of the European Union, the Secretary-General/High Representative for the common foreign and security policy, the European Commissioner in charge of external relations and European neighbourhood policy.
consultations with third countries. Other topics discussed included EU concerns over Canada’s decision to pull out of the Durban Review Conference and Canada's reluctant stance on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The EU affirmed its commitment to solving human rights issues through multilateral institutions, in particular the UN, which it describes as the ‘main fora for international cooperation on peace and security, human rights and democracy’ (Council of the European Union 2008).

**EU-Canada Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change**

Cooperation between the EU and Canada on energy and the environment is a key bilateral issue. Notably, at the 2008 EU-Canada Summit in Quebec the EU and Canada agreed to continue cooperation in the context of the High-Level Dialogue on Energy, particularly in key areas such as increased energy efficiency, market transparency, and intensified co-operation on energy research. Consequently both parties declared that

```
We will continue our cooperation in the context of our High-Level Dialogue on Energy, particularly in key areas such as increased energy efficiency, renewable energy, improved market transparency and stability, and the implementation of cleaner energy technology. We believe research, development and demonstration are the activities most suited for our energy cooperation within, for example, our existing Science and Technology Cooperation Agreement; we identify Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS), bioenergy, and distributed generation and smart electricity networks as the main priority areas for collaboration. We seek to move forward the process – begun at the last Summit - to review the Euratom-Canada cooperation agreement regarding peaceful uses of atomic energy. We will work together in the International Partnership for Energy Efficiency Cooperation (IPEEC) to develop a shared and strategic view in promoting energy efficiency internationally. The EU and Canada are committed to building a low-carbon global economy that is safe and sustainable while strengthening capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate change. In this regard, we reaffirm our determination to collaborate closely to ensure that an ambitious and comprehensive global climate agreement is reached in Copenhagen in December 2009, which places us on the pathway to achieving at least a 50 per cent reduction in global greenhouse gases by 2050, consistent with the conclusions of the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and which provides for regular review in the light of new scientific evidence. This ambitious and comprehensive agreement should cover the vast majority of global greenhouse gas emissions, and include all major emitters, taking into account mitigation potential and national circumstances (European Commission 2009f).
```
Both parties want to establish emission reduction goals for developed countries by 2020, with developing countries committing to mitigation actions that lead to a substantial and quantifiable deviation from current emissions growth rates by 2020, based on their mitigation potential and national circumstances. Consequently the EU and Canada

Welcome the national climate change strategies and plans put in place by a number of developing countries and call for further action in the lead-up to Copenhagen. We agree that adequate, predictable and timely financial support for implementation of a Copenhagen agreement will be crucial. The EU and Canada will take on their fair share in the framework of an overall agreement and are ready to look into options for generating the necessary funds (European Commission 2009f).

Both parties support the establishment of an international carbon market, claiming that ‘[a]n effective carbon market is essential for achieving emissions reductions at the lowest cost and for encouraging investment in safe and sustainable low-carbon technologies’.

A fundamental area of concern is the extent to which aviation and maritime transport contribute to an increasing source of greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore both advocate the ‘need for the International Civil Aviation Organisation and the International Maritime Organisation to rapidly advance work on emissions reductions in those sectors, including in view of the anticipated Copenhagen agreement’. A similar area of concern is the tropical deforestation and forest degradation, mostly in the tropics, which is responsible for between 15-20 per cent of annual global greenhouse gas emissions. Consequently both parties agree that a ‘Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) mechanism has the potential to be an important element in a future global agreement on climate change to assist developing countries in reducing deforestation and halting global forest cover loss.’

Both parties also recognise the challenges and opportunities faced in the Arctic and the North, which include protecting the environment and ensuring that Northerners benefit directly from economic and social development in the region now and in future generations. The EU and Canada agree to maintain a bilateral dialogue and cooperate on Arctic issues, with a focus on research and the concerns and interests of Arctic peoples and communities (Council of the European Union 2009a).
European Union – China Relations

Overview
EU relations with China were established in 1975 and are governed by the 1985 EU-China Trade and Cooperation Agreement. In 2007 negotiations began to upgrade this to a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement. The EU is China’s second largest trade partner, with China being the EU’s largest partner. The main objectives of EU policy towards China are to:

- Broaden and deepen dialogue with China, both bilaterally and on the world stage (e.g. working together on global challenges such as climate change);
- Support China’s transition to an open society based on the rule of law and respect for human rights,
- Encourage the ongoing integration of China into the world economy and trading system, and support the process of economic and social reforms;
- Raise the EU’s profile in China, to aid mutual understanding.

These objectives are reflected in EU assistance to China. On the 30th of January 2009 a meeting took place in Brussels between the European Commission and the Chinese government (European Commission 2009s).

EU-China Cooperation on Regional Conflict
The EU has a “One China” policy, which excludes recognition of Taiwan as a sovereign state. Consequently, the EU has no diplomatic or formal political relations with Taiwan. Despite this the EU does support Taiwan’s participation in international organisations that do not require statehood. Taiwan and the EU have a healthy trade relationship - Taiwan is the EU's 4th largest trade partner in Asia and the EU is Taiwan’s fourth largest market. Regular contacts take place in sectors such as research and technology, information society, education and culture, fisheries, environment, intellectual property rights and standards and norms. Regular EU-Taiwan “consultations” are held in order to ensure coordination and coherence of activities in these fields, the most recent being in October 2007 in Taipei (European Commission 2009h).

The EU has also sought to work with China on supporting a negotiated settlement of the Israeli - Palestinian conflict based on existing agreements which include the relevant UN Resolutions and the principles laid down in the Road Map. Both the EU and China expressed their support at the international meeting in Annapolis. The EU and China confirmed that ‘the international community
stands ready to support the political process, including support for the crucial implementation period’ (Council of the European Union 2007a).

**EU-China Cooperation on Terrorism**

At the 10th EU-China summit held in November 2007, both parties reaffirmed their condemnation of terrorism ‘in all its forms and manifestations without qualification, committed by whomever, whenever and for whatever purposes’ (Council of the European Union 2007a). They also reaffirmed their recognition of the United Nations as the only truly global forum for the fight against terrorism. By adopting the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy by consensus on 8 September 2006 the General Assembly and the Member States of the UN demonstrated their unity and resolve in combating terrorism. The EU and China both expressed their support for the Counter Terrorism Implementation Task Force in coordinating the implementation of the Global Strategy. Leaders also emphasised their continued commitment to reaching an agreement on the Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism (CCIT) as soon as possible (Council of the European Union 2007a).

Both the EU and China also stressed the importance of multilateralism in the fight against terrorism and underlined the importance of universal adherence to, and full implementation of, all UN Conventions and Protocols related to acts of terrorism. Both sides expressed the need to address the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism and supported the view that terrorism should not be linked to any religion or culture, and there should be consistency in the fight against terrorism. Leaders recognised that any measures undertaken to prevent and combat terrorism must comply with obligations under international law, in particular international human rights law, refugee law and humanitarian law. Both parties claim to see effective counter-terrorism measures and the protection of human rights as not conflicting, but complementary and mutually reinforcing goals. The two sides agreed to strengthen cooperation in areas such as anti-terrorism, along with combating transnational organised crime, human smuggling and trafficking in persons and drug-related crimes (Council of the European Union 2007a). An example of such cooperation was evident in July 2009, when the EU and China held a workshop on anti-money laundering. The workshop focused on legislation and experiences with anti-money laundering in China, the European Union and EU Member States. It also addressed criminal penalties and the freezing and forfeiting of assets related to the financing of terrorism and enforcement of UN resolutions (Jacobsen 2009).
**EU-China Cooperation on WMD**

Both the EU and China have expressed a commitment towards working for lasting peace and stability in the Korean Peninsula, including the effective denuclearisation of the Korean Peninsula. Engaging with North Korea, concerning its nuclear weapons programme is, however, dealt with under the Six Party talks process, which includes the People’s Republic of China, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and the United States of America. It is therefore not a bilateral issue, but rather a multilateral issue. Despite this, the EU has declared its intention to ‘cooperate on foreign and security policy, [with] particular attention ... to combating WMD proliferation, WMD agents, materials and know how’ with China (European Commission 2006a).

**EU-China Cooperation on Migration**

The issue of illegal migration is a priority of great concern for both the EU and China. Whilst seeking to facilitate people-to-people exchanges, leaders of both the EU and China are keen to facilitate readmission and visa issues more readily. Both parties have reiterated their willingness to open negotiations on issues of respective concern and agreed to start concrete cooperation on related issues as soon as possible. This has resulted in significant progress with regard to the implementation of tourism agreements (Approved Destination Status, ADS). Further intensified cooperation is welcomed, with specific emphasis on combating illegal migration and human trafficking (Council of the European Union 2006).

**EU-China Cooperation on Human Rights**

Since 1995, the EU and China have held biannual talks regarding human rights issues, under the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue. The 27th round of these talks was held on 14 May 2009 in Prague. The Dialogue provides both parties with a platform for ‘candid and constructive exchange of views’ on a wide range of human rights issues. Both parties use this platform to express concerns and differences of opinion with regard to the implementation of international human rights standards in China and the EU. For the EU, key issues concerning internal Chinese policy remain:

- Freedom of expression
- Freedom of the press
- Rights of human rights defenders
- The situation in Tibet and Xinjiang
- The death penalty
- Torture
- The ratification by China of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)

The EU ‘welcomed the recently published Human Rights National Action Plan of the People’s Republic of China while pointing at the challenges in its implementation’. China raised racism and discrimination in the EU as issues of concern, pointing to a number of alleged incidents of racial discrimination in some Member States (Council of the European Union 2009b).

**EU-China Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change**

The EU and China have held dialogues concerning energy since 1994. These take the form of annual working group meetings and a bi-annual Conference on EU-China Energy Co-operation. Current subjects of discussion include energy policy and development strategy, the evolution of energy markets, and security of supply and sustainable development. Of particular concern for the EU is China’s increasing desire for and consumption of energy, which has significant repercussions on global markets and on the environment. This was reflected at the seventh EU-China Energy Co-operation Conference, in November 2008, which was dominated by six main themes:

- Renewable energy for power generation (solar & wind);
- Increasing the role of biofuels;
- Promoting hydrogen energy and fuel cells;
- Coal and gas hydrates;
- Carbon Capture and Storage
- Nuclear energy

The EU expects that concrete action will be taken in the future, concerning areas ‘such as energy regulation, renewable energy (including alternative transport fuels), energy efficiency, natural gas, clean coal technology (near zero emissions) and other new technologies in the energy sector’ (European Commission 2009z). Moreover, the new EURATOM agreement with China focuses on research into the peaceful use of nuclear energy and grants researchers from both sides access to each other’s facilities. The EU and China are both participating in the international ITER programme for the construction of an experimental controlled fusion reactor. On 4 March 2005 the Commission’s Directorate General for Transport and Energy (TREN) and the Chinese Ministry for Science and Technology (MOST) signed an Action Plan on Clean Coal and terms of reference for an

With regard to the environment, Chinese policy makers increasingly see environmental protection as a major challenge for the country and with the 11th Five Year Plan they have set some specific goals to reduce certain environmental pressures. China has an important global role to play in the area of environmental protection and climate change mitigation (European Commission 2009z). The EU claims that

Over the last decade, contacts between the European Commission and the Chinese State Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) have been intensified. The dialogue on environmental issues, which covers most of the environmental problems of concern in China, was upgraded to ministerial level in 2003. A substantial part of the EC/China financial assistance budget is allocated to environmental support programmes in response to the clear wish among policy makers in China to learn from EU experience. Co-operation and exchanges cover a wide range of environmental issues, from biodiversity, climate change and waste management to water and air pollution, vehicle emissions, environmental indicators, sustainable consumption and production and chemicals management. The Joint EU-China Declaration on Climate Change and Partnership, adopted at the September 2005 summit, is a major achievement and adds the important component climate change to the policy cooperation between the EU and China. The partnership is characterized by a strong focus on concrete steps to be made in tackling the problems of climate change. The flagship project is the agreement to cooperate to build in China a near zero emission coals fired power plant before 2020. The technology will allow the use of coal while avoiding most of the CO2 being emitted. A Memorandum of Understanding commencing this project was signed in Shanghai in February 2006.

**European Union – India Relations**

**Overview**

The European Union and the Republic of India have mutually benefited from a longstanding relationship dating back to the 1960s. Their relationship is based on a legislative framework for cooperation, ratified in the *Joint Political Statement of 1993* and the *1994 Co-operation Agreement*. These opened the door for broad political dialogue in the form of annual summits, regular ministerial and expert level meetings (European Commission 2009m). More recently, in 2004, India has become one of the EU’s “Strategic Partners”, and the *2005 Joint Action Plan* is helping to realise the full potential of this partnership in key areas of interest for India and the EU (European Commission 2009m). The EU has argued that
India and the EU, as the largest democracies in the world, share common values and beliefs that make them natural partners as well as factors of stability in the present world order. We share a common commitment to democracy, pluralism, human rights and the rule of law, to an independent judiciary and media. India and the EU also have much to contribute towards fostering a rule-based international order - be it through the United Nations (UN) or through the World Trade Organisation (WTO). We hold a common belief in the fundamental importance of multilateralism in accordance with the UN Charter and in the essential role of the UN for maintaining international peace and security, promoting the economic and social advancement of all peoples and meeting global threats and challenges (EU 2005:1).

EU-India Cooperation on Regional Conflict

Both India and the EU stress the importance of a ‘multilateral approach, in which the UN plays a central role’ as the best way of addressing global challenges (EU 2005: 4). Consequently, both the EU and India work bilaterally to promote effective multilateralism. Indeed, both parties have declared a ‘common interest in UN peacekeeping and in post-conflict political and economic rehabilitation and reconstruction’ (EU 2005: 4). Both India and the EU have agreed to consultations before major UN debates on peacekeeping and peace-building and in the preparation of major peace conferences. This is in addition to a commitment to exchange ‘perspectives on conceptual and operational aspects of Peacekeeping Operations, including post-conflict reconstruction and rehabilitation’ (EU 2005: 4). Significantly, there have been calls for greater cooperation in the area of peacekeeping in regional conflicts. For example, the Centre for European Reform has argued that India is one of the world's leading providers of peacekeepers, and currently has 9,000 blue helmets in Africa. However, India has had less experience of some of the broader tasks of helping societies to recover from conflict, such as co-ordinating the work of soldiers with civilian agencies and personnel. Recently, India has become a major provider of assistance to Afghanistan, where it (like the EU) wants to sustain Mohammed Karzai’s government. Both the EU and India would benefit from exchanging expertise on peacekeeping and post-conflict reconstruction (Grant 2008).

However, the 2005 Joint Action Plan has set out a commitment for bilateral cooperation in the following sectors:

- Training for military and civilian components of peacekeeping missions, including police and other security forces;
- Exchange of trainees and instructors between Peacekeeping Training Centres of India and EU Member States;
- Joint support of UN peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts, including as regards improved analytical capacities and greater cooperation between EU and Indian components of UN peacekeeping missions;
- Trade and development in peace-building;
- Post-conflict and confidence building projects in other regions of the world;
- Seminars and other activities designed to facilitate post conflict management.

The *EU-India 2005 Joint Action Plan* was amended in 2008 to include ‘cooperation on regional issues’, and to ‘organise seminars and exchange best practice on civil-military peace building issues, including on Africa’ (EU 2008: 3).

**EU-India Cooperation on Terrorism**

Since the 2000 EU-India Summit an increasingly strong political dialogue has characterised EU-India cooperation. This has taken the form of

Yearly Troika Ministerial Meetings, Senior Officials Meetings every six months, and regular, de facto, yearly Summits, along with the establishment of political working groups on Consular Affairs and terrorism (COTER Troika) and the adoption of Joint Declarations on Terrorism and Cultural Cooperation (European Commission 2007b: 7).

Evidently, terrorism features as a prominent component of this relationship, and both India and the EU have declared that they

Stand united in combating the challenge of terrorism, which constitutes one of the most serious threats to international peace and security. The leaders [of India and the EU] condemned terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, committed by whomever, wherever and for whatever purpose (European Commission 2009n).

To further both parties’ fight against terrorism, they argue that the ‘Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism should become a vital law enforcement instrument in our joint counter-terrorism efforts’ (European Commission 2009n). Both partners respectively place a significant emphasis on the importance of counter-terrorism cooperation, particularly in the UN and in accordance to international law, and seek to work together to ensure the ‘universal ratification and full implementation of all UN counterterrorism conventions and related protocols, as well as
supporting the work of the Counter Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF)' (European Commission 2009n).

To combat terrorism, the EU has extended its full support towards India’s bid for membership of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), which it is argued will reinforce India’s commitment to combat terrorist financing and money laundering. At a bilateral level,

India and EU looked forward to advance the negotiations between Europol and the Indian authorities in order to conclude an agreement that will reinforce cooperation in the field of counter terrorism. India and the EU recognise the fact that terrorism constitutes one of the most serious threats to international peace and security, and reaffirm their condemnation of all acts of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, irrespective of their motivations, forms and manifestations (European Commission 2009n).

Indeed the 2005 Joint Action Plan sets out an agreement between the EU and India, in which both parties concurred that they would:

- Cooperate in the fight against terrorism and establish contacts between the Indian and EU Counter Terrorism Coordinators;
- Work closely to promote the early entry into force of the International Convention for Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism;
- Work closely to promote the early conclusion of the Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism;
- Work together to reduce terrorist access to financing and to fight money-laundering, and monitor suspicious transactions, taking into account international standards adopted by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF);
- Exchange views on how to develop the comprehensive United Nations counter-terrorism strategy based upon the recommendations in the Secretary General’s report “In Larger Freedom”;
- Expand the EU-India dialogue to include the link between drug trafficking and terrorism, document security, illicit arms trafficking and cyber-terrorism;
- Promote cooperation between Europol on the EU side and the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) on the Indian side;
- Establish an Indian contact point in India for Eurojust.

EU 2005: 5.
Significantly, the 2008 amendment of the Joint Action Plan included the commitment to ‘intensify contacts in the fight against terrorism including through the operationalisation of co-operation between Europol and India’ (EU 2008: 3).

**EU-India Cooperation on WMD**

Both the EU and India have declared a shared interest in working towards accomplishing ‘the goals and objectives of universal disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery’ (EU 2005: 5). The declared rationale for this is that both parties believe that the ‘proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and its linkages with terrorism poses a threat to international peace and security’ (EU 2005: 5). Consequently, both parties have agreed to ‘enhance collective action to fight the proliferation of WMD as well as their means of delivery’ (EU 2005: 5). Both parties have agreed that

> Effective export control measures for dual use goods can play an important role in preventing proliferation, and at the same time, such measures should not hamper international co-operation in materials, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes (EU 2005: 5).

To ensure further dialogue on this issue, the 2005 Joint Action Plan confirmed the establishment of a ‘bilateral India-EU Security Dialogue at Senior Official level which will include regular consultations on global and regional security issues, disarmament and non-proliferation to increase mutual understanding and identify possible areas of cooperation’ (EU 2005: 5). Indeed, this was a prominent element of the 2009 EU-India Summit, at which India and the EU ‘reaffirmed their shared interest in working together for disarmament and for countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems’. Consequently, both parties stressed the importance of strengthening national export control laws. India and the EU also supported the adoption of a programme of work for the 2009 session of the Conference on Disarmament, including the negotiation of a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty. India and the EU share the understanding that the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes should take place in conformity with the highest standards of safety, security, and non-proliferation (European Commission 2009n).

**EU-India Cooperation on Migration**

As part of the 2005 Joint Action Plan, the EU and India identified migration as a central issue requiring bilateral cooperation. Notably, both parties define its importance in the ‘context of
globalisation’ and the ‘large-scale movement of people from region to region for economic or other reasons and the large migrant communities in both India and the EU’ (EU 2005: 6). The EU has identified India as a ‘source, transit point and a destination for migrants’, and consequently recognises that there is a ‘need to maintain a constant dialogue on all aspects relating to migration and consular issues’ (EU 2005: 6). Notably, the EU and India have defined the need for cooperation in the following terms:

Given the inter-connections between migration and other issues such as public security, we are convinced of the need for an exchange of views in this area. It is, therefore, felt useful to hold a comprehensive dialogue on migration issues (EU 2005: 6).

Following the 2000 India-EU Summit, a Joint Working Group on Consular Issues was set up to ‘enhance cooperation in facilitating the movement of people between India and the EU, including the speedy delivery of consular and visa services and enhancing business relations and tourism’ (EU 2005: 6). The Working Group meets twice a year to discuss issues of concern on either side.

**EU-India Cooperation on Human Rights**

Both India and the EU regard their relationship as being based on shared values such as democracy, pluralism and respect for the rule of law. Consequently, both are committed to upholding human rights and fundamental freedoms and have ratified the major international human rights instruments. To strengthen and deepen this relationship, the 2005 Joint Action Plan committed both partners to:

- Continue in a spirit of equality and mutual respect, the dialogue on Human Rights both in a multilateral and bilateral context, with the objective of building greater mutual understanding and expanding common ground in order to strengthen the foundations of the strategic partnership
- Consult and discuss positions on human rights and democracy issues and look at opportunities for co-sponsoring resolutions on thematic issues in relevant fora such as UN Commission on Human Rights or UNGA Third Committee
- Look together for possible synergies and initiatives to promote human rights and democracy
Notably the EU’s *Country Strategy Plan 2007-2013 for India* notes that India has in the past been a beneficiary of this bilateral emphasis on human rights cooperation, outlining successful projects such as those related to the training of elected Panchayat representatives and training projects for municipal governance; projects for Dalit women; the abolishment of the death penalty and helping victims of torture. However, the EU has identified scope for continued support for ‘well defined projects, especially with regard to Governance issues’ (European Commission 2007b: 11-12).

**EU-India Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change**

India and the EU have made distinct commitments towards creating the conditions necessary for sustainable economic development. This is a result of each party recognising the interdependencies in the field of environment and the transboundary character of many environmental problems. As major global actors, both partners are fully conscious of their capacity to play a central role in international efforts towards better environmental global governance (EU 2005: 12).

To realise this shared vision, the *2005 Joint Action Plan* committed both partners to:

- Strengthen the dialogue on global environmental issues with a view to building mutual understanding in particular on the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Kyoto Protocol, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the UN Convention to Combat Desertification and the Convention on Biological Diversity
- Hold meetings of the Joint Working Group (JWG) on Environment on a yearly basis and develop high level visits
- Organise an India-EU environment forum in 2005 with stakeholders involving business, academia and civil society to exchange views and information
- Hold an experts’ meeting to exchange views on voluntary eco labelling schemes
- Identify key environmental issues and approaches to sustainable development where exchange of experiences and cooperation could be mutually beneficial.

EU 2005: 12

The desire for sustainable economic development is in large part derived from the Indian and EU understanding that urgent action is required by all countries to address the issue of climate change. Moreover, both sides agree that this should be conducted on a basis of ‘equity and in accordance
with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities’ (EU 2005: 13). To realise this shared vision, the 2005 Joint Action Plan committed both partners to working closely together on future global negotiations for tackling climate change. Indeed, India and the EU agree to launch an India-EU Initiative on Clean Development and Climate Change, which has subsequently been addressed at EU-India summits. Additionally, the 2005 Joint Action Plan committed both partners to:

- Identify and develop ways of widening access and overcoming the barriers to dissemination of such technologies in India and the EU and more widely
- Increase funding and promote public-private partnerships for research and development of cleaner technologies
- Promote adaptive research and development to suit the resource endowment of both parties
- Reduce the price gap between “cleaner” and “less efficient” technologies by seeking economies of scale
- Hold experts’ meetings on climate change, including on the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) in 2005
- Cooperate to enhance the scientific, technical and institutional capacity to predict climate change and its socio-economic impacts. Research and development on technologies and measures to adapt to climate change will be further pursued by India and the EU.

EU 2005: 12

Notably, the desire for sustainable economic development is related to Indian and EU concerns regarding energy security. Indeed, energy is of major significance for both India and the EU, and both sides ‘recognise the need to work towards achieving safe, secure, affordable and sustainable energy supplies’ (EU 2005: 13). Joint efforts in the development of more efficient, cleaner and alternative energy chains are regarded as paramount, and an India-EU Energy Panel has been set up to coordinate joint efforts and discuss energy related matters of mutual interest. The Energy Panel has set up Working Groups in the areas of:

- Energy efficiency and renewable energies
- Coal and clean coal conversion technologies
- Fusion energy including India’s membership in ITER

Both sides agree to cooperate closely in the areas of:
Promoting energy efficiency and energy conservation

- Development of affordable clean energy technologies
- Identification of new technologies in the field of new, renewable, conventional and nonconventional energy sources
- Oil and gas, with a view to promoting security of supplies and stability in prices
- Nuclear energy
- Technology and expertise in exchange of energy between different grid systems and development of energy markets
- Development of hydrogen and fuel cells
- Methane recovery and use.

EU 2005: 13

**European Union – Islamic Republic of Iran Relations**

**Overview**

The Islamic Republic of Iran and the European Union established a Comprehensive Dialogue in 1998 to discuss a wide range of issues and explore possibilities for co-operation. However, due to Iran’s failure to progress with the outstanding issues related to its nuclear programme, all economic and political talks are on hold. Consequently, bilateral relations between the EU and Iran are limited, and whilst practical cooperation does exist there is clearly deeper scope for cooperation. The European Commission has no Delegation in the Islamic Republic of Iran (IRI) but is nevertheless working in close collaboration with the EU Member States’ embassies in Tehran.

Notably, the EU is Iran’s main trading partner, and Iran ranks as the 6th supplier of energy products for the EU. The EU argues that

In view of Iran’s aim of becoming a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO), such an agreement would help Iran to adapt to WTO rules. It would boost Iran’s economic development potential, enhancing the climate for trade with, and investment from, Europe and the wider world (European Commission 2009b).

Moreover, the main areas of cooperation between the EU and Iran exist on issues such as higher education, drugs control, development cooperation, humanitarian assistance and refugees.
EU- Iran Cooperation on WMD

The Iranian nuclear programme is of considerable concern to the EU, which is, however, mostly being dealt with by the UN Security Council and the IAEA. Moreover, whilst three EU Member States are part of the ongoing group of countries that are engaged with continuous discussions with Iran, the EU3+3 (UK, France, Germany, US, China and Russia), this is a multilateral effort. Where the EU does play a significant role is in urging Iran to cooperate with the international community with regard to questions of its nuclear programme. In a recent statement, the EU has reconfirmed that "The European Council reaffirms its grave concern over the development of Iran’s nuclear program and Iran’s persistent failure to meet its international obligations" (in Globalsecurity.org 2009). The EU has also formally made proposals to help Iran build "a safe, economically viable and proliferation-proof civil nuclear power generation and research program", which Iran has rejected (Wikipedia 2009).

EU-Iran Cooperation on Human Rights

The EU has a history of pursuing dialogue with Iran over Human Rights issues. Thus, in 2002,

   On the basis of the principles enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ratified by Iran, the EU and Iran decided to set up a bilateral Dialogue on Human Rights, allowing for discussion on a comprehensive range of issues. The dialogue is complemented by a round table involving Iranian and EU civil society actors, academics and experts (European Commission 2009w).

Four rounds of dialogue were held between 2002 and 2004. However, in 2006 a fifth round of talks was rejected by Iran despite EU efforts to maintain future dialogues. Indeed since that time, the EU has argued that

   Serious violations of human rights continued to occur in Iran. There was no progress in the EU's main areas of concern since the last Annual Report [2007]; in many respects the situation has worsened. The use of the death penalty, including juveniles, is increasing in an alarming way. Iran executes more juvenile offenders than any other country in the world and is one of a very small group of countries that continues to retain the death penalty for crimes committed before the age of 18. Freedom of expression is severely restricted. Iran's treatment of religious and ethnic minorities continues to be of concern to the EU. Reports of torture are frequent. Human rights defenders are increasingly being imprisoned for their work, and report growing harassment's and intimidation. There is little effective action to reform the laws, institutions and official practices that allow human rights violations to occur. On the contrary, the
EU is concerned by the draft penal code under consideration, some sections of which clearly violate the Islamic Republic of Iran's commitments under the international human rights conventions, such as introducing a mandatory death sentence for crimes of apostasy, heresy and witchcraft (Council of the European Union 2008: 177).

In light of the social unrest following the 2009 Presidential election in Iran, the EU continues to monitor events as the situation is in flux.

**European Union – Israel Relations**

**Overview**

The European Community and Israel established their first contractual relations in 1975 by signing a Cooperation Agreement. This was later inaugurated at the Barcelona Conference and the establishment of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. In 2008 this partnership was reinforced with the creation of the Union for the Mediterranean. Bilateral relations between the EU and Israel fall under the remit of the European Neighbourhood policy. Indeed, both the EU and Israel have expressed the desire to establish a partnership which 'provides for close political and mutually beneficial trade and investment relations together with economic, social, financial, civil scientific, technological and cultural cooperation' (European Commission 2009t). The current relationship between the EU and Israel has been greatly aided by the Action Plan adopted after the May 1 2004 enlargement of the EU (European Commission 2009p). The Action Plan's objective is to gradually integrate Israel into European policies and programmes.

The legal basis of the EU's relationship with Israel is codified in the EU-Israel Association Agreement. The Association Agreement with Israel, which entered into force in 2000, sets out in more detail the specific areas in which relations can be developed bilaterally. In addition, institutional cooperation through the EU–Israel Association Council, the EU – Israel Association Committee and ten subcommittees, nine of which are activated, has enabled both sides to move forward and follow closely the implementation of the ENP Action Plan. Following a request by Israel to upgrade bilateral relations, the validity of the current Action Plan was prolonged in April 2008. This prolongation provided for more time to discuss the contents of a successor document to the Action Plan. As a result of the Action Plan discussions on the most contentious issue of EU-Israel relations over the years, namely the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, have
been stepped up. The EU believes that the creation of an independent, viable and democratic Palestinian state is in Israel’s interest (European Commission 2009t, 2009).

**EU- Israel Cooperation on Regional Conflict**

The EU regards the resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict as a strategic priority, arguing that without this there ‘will be little chance of dealing with other problems in the Middle East’ (European Commission 2009v). The EU’s objective in this conflict is cited as being ‘a two-state solution with an independent, democratic, viable Palestinian state living side-by-side with Israel and its other neighbours’, and the EU states that it ‘undertakes a range of activities in support of the MEPP, both political and practical’ (European Commission 2009v).

Given both the length of time and the fast changing nature of the Arab-Israeli conflict, this section will not try to detail with it in depth, but will rather focus on EU-Israeli bilateral relations from 2008-9. Notably, during this period the EU-Israel political dialogue intensified. However, by the EU’s own assessment, which is worth quoting at length, there has been little progress on the conflict:

Little progress was made regarding cooperation with the EU on a comprehensive settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Despite Roadmap obligations and the commitment made at the Annapolis conference to freeze settlements’ growth, a sharp increase in settlement and outpost construction can be noted for 2008, including in East Jerusalem. No progress was made with regard to the further improvement of access and co-ordination to facilitate the implementation and delivery of humanitarian and other forms of assistance ... the European Commission, in line with Council conclusions and Quartet statements, continuously requested a regular and predictable opening of the border crossings to and from Gaza for goods and people. Delivery of EU assistance to Gaza was hindered during most of the reporting period, generating higher costs, and an even greater dependency of the Gaza population on external aid ... No significant progress can be noted on secure and safe movement of civilians and goods in the West Bank and Gaza ... the EU on a number of occasions raised individual cases of Human Rights defenders facing travel restrictions or other obstacles to carrying out their work in the context of the political dialogue. Human rights defenders are being subject to unjustifiable restrictions on freedom of movement, violence and ill-treatment by Israeli settlers as well as Israeli security forces ... Furthermore, medical patients attempting to exit the Gaza Strip through the Erez crossing in order to access medical treatment were denied authorisation by the Israeli Security Agency in a number of instances. On several occasions, the EU Presidency managed to help secure some permits to cross Erez for patients in need of life saving treatment ... Demolition of Palestinian houses without a building permit in Area C (which comprises
areas under exclusive Israeli control) of the West Bank, the so-called administrative demolitions, resumed in the last quarter of 2008, after a *de facto* moratorium of six months (European Commission 2009).

The EU Presidency has issued multiple statements condemning these acts and calling on the Israeli government to protect the Palestinian civil population. However, the EU’s *2009 Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy: Progress Report Israel* confirms that ‘no progress can be noted with regard to minimising the impact of security and counterterrorism measures on the civilian population, in particular in the context of the Gaza crisis’ (European Commission 2009).

**EU- Israel Cooperation on Terrorism**

The Israeli government places a considerable emphasis on countering terrorism and the challenge this poses to Israeli security. Since 2008 Israel has expressed a desire to deepen collaborations with the EU on counter terrorism, and in particular draw upon Israeli expertise in this area. Similarly, the EU has been eager to ensure that bilateral cooperation in this field has continued to progress through:

- Regular contacts among specialists from both sides; and
- An *ad hoc* “Israel-EU Troika ENP seminar on the dilemmas and concerns of democracies in fighting terrorism”, which took place in December 2008 in Brussels.

However, despite this eagerness for cooperation, the EU has been keen to illustrate that

A report by the UN Special Rapporteur for Human Rights found a number of incompatibilities between Israel’s counter-terrorism laws and practices and the country’s international human rights obligations ... Israel continues to hold hundreds of Palestinians in administrative detention without formal charges, including minors. Under Israeli law, the age of majority is attained at 18 whereas the Military Order 132 defines a minor as a person under the age of 16. In contravention of Article 37 (c) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, Palestinian children are routinely detained with adults both before and after sentencing. For the first time, two female minors were held in administrative detention in 2008. They were released in January 2009. The total number held in administrative detention fell from 813 in January 2008 to 548 in December. 42 Palestinians had been held in administrative detention for more than two years. A number of violations by Israel of its treaty obligations under the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT) was reported in 2008, and is being examined by the relevant authorities in Israel (European Commission 2009).
**EU- Israel Cooperation on WMD**

The EU and Israel participate in an ‘informal dialogue on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction’, which has ‘focused on a number of issues of common concern such as non-proliferation treaties and instruments, Israel’s participation in export control regimes, multilateral nuclear fuel approaches, arms transfer to terrorists’ (European Commission 2009).

**EU- Israel Cooperation on Migration**

Both Israel and the EU share information and best practices in the area of migration. Indeed, one such occasion took place in June 2008 under the auspices of the Technical Assistance and Information Exchange Instrument (TAIEX), where several experts from Israel, the EU and Member States held a seminar on legal and illegal immigration and asylum. Similar meetings have been held within the framework of the Euromed Migration II project (European Commission 2009). With regard to Israel’s migration policy, Israel ‘in coordination with Egypt, continues to instantly and forcibly send back asylum seekers/migrants from countries such as Sudan, Eritrea and Somalia’ (European Commission 2009).

**EU- Israel Cooperation on Human Rights**

Israel’s political situation is deeply affected by the continuation of the conflict with the Palestinians and the state of relations with the Arab world in general. Indeed, since the second Intifada in September 2000, some measures taken to respond to this have been criticised by the EU as ‘disproportionate or incompatible with its obligations under international law’ (European Commission 2006: 4). This situation has clearly had an impact with regard to the regional human rights situation. Throughout 2008, Israel has attempted to engage with the EU in a constructive dialogue on making progress with regard to ‘the promotion of democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights and international humanitarian law’ (European Commission 2009). However, in light of the Gaza Crisis at the end of 2008 the EU has maintained that

- Overall, the promotion and protection of the Israeli Arab minority remained unsatisfactory … particularly in areas like land allocation, housing, planning, economic development, investment in social infrastructure and justice … During 2008, demolition of unrecognised villages continued … In the context of the promotion of fundamental freedoms, restrictions to freedom of expression and assembly could be noted since the onset of Israeli military operations in Gaza, leading to the arrest of over 700 Arab Israelis demonstrating against the offensive, including over 200 minors. Tight
restrictions on access to Gaza for journalists existed already prior to the crisis, but were reinforced during the crisis. This measure significantly curtailed freedom of the press (European Commission 2009).

As a result, the EU has argued in the 2009 Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy: Progress Report Israel that progress on human rights cooperation ‘has been limited’ (European Commission 2009).

**EU- Israel Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change**

The EU engages in trilateral cooperation in the field of energy with Israel and the Palestinian Authority. Throughout 2008 and 2009 progress was made in coordinating cooperation with a particular emphasis on cooperation in the field of solar energy. Bilaterally, the EU has further strengthened its cooperation on energy with Israel. This was done by taking ‘preparatory steps towards the country’s future participation in the Intelligent Energy Europe Programme’ (European Commission 2009). Throughout 2008 and 2009 Israel has continued to improve energy efficiency and enhance its use of renewable energy, to meet a target of a 20% energy saving by 2020 and a 10% share of renewable energy sources in electricity generation (European Commission 2009). Moreover, Israel has pursued Euro-Mediterranean energy cooperation through multiple projects. Thus, ‘the July 2008 Summit of the Union for the Mediterranean endorsed the development of a Mediterranean Solar Plan’ and ‘Israel, the Palestinian Authority and the European Commission relaunched their trilateral energy cooperation with the aim of facilitating the joint Israeli-Palestinian “Solar for Peace” initiative and the establishment of a joint energy office’ (European Commission 2009).

**European Union–Japan Relations**

**Overview**

The bilateral relationship between the EU and Japan is founded on the 2001 Action Plan. The EU argues that this relationship is determined by ‘both sides being advanced industrialised democracies who share many common interests and values’ (European Commission 2009). Cooperation takes place at all levels, culminating in the EU- Japan annual summit meetings, and covers foreign policy, economic and trade relations and regional and global challenges. The EU and Japan actively participate in each other’s reform processes through the Regulatory Reform Dialogue.
EU-Japan Cooperation on Regional Conflict

The area of regional conflict is largely dealt with through international institutions such as the UN, by both the EU and Japan. However, bilateral cooperation has been pursued with regard to specific conflicts, namely in the Korean Peninsula and in the Balkans. This was in line with the 2001 Action Plan, which set out the following objectives:

The Korean Peninsula, objectives for the EU and Japan:

- To support the process of reducing tensions in the Korean Peninsula, including through the Republic of Korea's "engagement policy", and to continue their support for the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO);
- To urge the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to comply with and commit itself fully to relevant international norms with regard to nuclear non-proliferation and weapons of mass-destruction and stop its missile related activities, including deployment;
- To urge the DPRK to respond positively to international concerns, especially on humanitarian issues; and
- To exchange information on each other's policies towards the DPRK, including on the EU's efforts to improve the human rights situation and to promote dialogue on economic reform.

The Balkan's objectives for the EU and Japan

- Sustained and substantial efforts in the Balkan region to promote security, democratisation, and economic development;
- Co-operation within the framework of the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe, extending help to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (including Kosovo), Bosnia-Herzegovina, and other parts of the Balkan region in support of democratisation and economic recovery;
- The exchange of information, and strengthened co-operation, on humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in the region.

European Commission 2001

EU-Japan Cooperation on Terrorism

At the 8 September 2001 EU-Japan Summit, both partners made declarations to fight against terrorism. Evidently this was in light of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks against the United States, and both partners declared their continued concrete support for the global coalition and
humanitarian assistance to those who suffer. Indeed, it was asserted in the 2001 Action Plan, that ‘the events of 11 September 2001 show that we have to cooperate - multilaterally and bilaterally - to fight as a priority terrorism in all its expressions and whatever its cause’ (European Commission 2001: 14). Both parties agreed that the ‘perpetrators, sponsors, and accomplices must be brought to justice’, and agreed to exchange information on the measures each side is taking (Europa 2001).

The 2001 Action Plan set out the following joint programmes for immediate action on counter-terrorism:

- Enhanced co-operation in all relevant international and regional fora;
- Early signature and ratification of relevant counter-terrorism conventions and protocols, and smooth and rapid implementation of relevant UN Security Council Resolutions;
- Early finalisation of the UN Comprehensive Convention against International terrorism;
- Enhancing common efforts to stop the financing of terrorism, including freezing of funds and other financial assets of terrorists;
- Reinforcement of technical co-operation to developing countries for their capacity building in the field of counter-terrorism.


Additionally the 2001 Action Plan committed both partners to further combating terrorism through:

- Early finalisation of the international convention for the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism;
- Strengthening of non-proliferation regimes of weapons of mass destruction and related materials and technologies connected with terrorism;
- Cooperation between the European Police Office (Europol) and Japanese police authorities, with a particular focus on money laundering, other illicit practices, illegal drugs and cyber-terrorism;
- Enhanced drugs control and active measures to reduce the supply and demand of drugs.


**EU-Japan Cooperation on WMD**

In the 2001 Action Plan both parties established their ambitions to develop relations in the political sphere. The auspice of this was to develop co-operation in common shared objectives and broaden the basis of their relationship. One of the central themes of this was the declaration to continue ‘co-
operation designed to achieve the elimination of all Weapons of Mass Destruction, based on the principle of undiminished security for all’ (European Commission 2001: 1).

Consequently, the 2001 Action Plan established that the following initiatives would be carried forward immediately:

- Continued co-operation to achieve the elimination of all Weapons of Mass Destruction;
- Promoting the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty as soon as possible, as well as urging all states to maintain global existing moratoria on nuclear testing pending the entry into force of the CTBT;
- Making efforts for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee in the Conference on Disarmament as soon as possible in its 2002 session, to negotiate the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty with a view to its conclusion within five years and, pending its entry into force, a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons;
- Joint efforts aimed at strengthening the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) including in multilateral negotiations on the BWC Protocol, to be concluded at an early date;
- Promoting universal ratification of and adherence to the Chemical Weapons Convention and working to ensure the full and effective implementation of all its provisions.

European Commission 2001: 5

The 2001 Action Plan also established that the following actions would be pursued:

- Strengthening co-operation on disarmament and non-proliferation issues, both bilaterally and in relevant multilateral fora, on the basis of mutual understanding of each other’s security concerns, including the universalisation of the International Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation.
- Regular consultations will be strengthened, targeting also non-state actors such as terrorists.
- The exchange of information, between Europe and Japan, on co-operation with Russia in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, such as the disposition of surplus weapon-grade plutonium.
- Close co-operation towards ensuring that strengthened IAEA safeguards are universally applied.

European Commission 2001: 5
EU-Japan Cooperation on Migration

EU-Japanese cooperation on migration issues largely falls under the 2001 Action Plan’s Terrorism, Transnational Crime, Drug Trafficking, and Judicial Co-operation section. In this capacity there is agreement to further cooperation between Europol and the Japanese police departments fighting transnational crime, and one of the objectives set is to increase cooperation on ‘the trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants’ (European Commission 2001: 20). The 2001 Action Plan also sets out the desire to facilitate the early entry into force of the UN Convention against Transnational Organised Crime, and its related Protocols, one of which relates to the smuggling of migrants by land, sea and air.

EU-Japan Cooperation on Human Rights

EU-Japanese cooperation on Human Rights issues can be dated back to the 1991 European Community – Japan Joint Declaration. However under the 2001 Action Plan this has evolved, and is seen as central to both parties in addressing new global issues and shaping a common future. Consequently, this reflects shared values and objectives. Both parties regard a multilateral focus through the UN as key to achieving human rights objectives. This was highly evident in the 2001 Action Plan, with its emphasis on holding

regular EU-Japan meetings on human rights, in principle, before the annual session of the UN Commission on Human Rights and before the meeting of the 3rd Committee of the UN General Assembly (European Commission 2001: 6).

This emphasis was reaffirmed at the 18th EU-Japan Summit held in May 2009, where both parties reaffirmed their intention to

Cooperate in the area of human security by promoting this concept in the UN and other international fora, and to pursue dialogue on human security. They also stressed the need for the General Assembly of the United Nations to continue consideration of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity and its implications, bearing in mind the principles of the Charter and international law, as stated in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (European Commission 2001: 6).

Despite the focus on the UN, however, it is important to point out that EU-Japan bilateral meetings, held at expert level in Troika format, seek to develop cooperation on geographic and thematic
human rights initiatives, and consider the possibility of the joint submission of resolutions (European Commission 2001: 6). Moreover, the EU and Japan remain committed to:

- Coordinating efforts to establish and render fully operational the International Criminal Court.
- Working together in overseas aid programmes, to ensure respect for human rights, promotion of democracy, and good governance.
- Specific joint actions against child labour, notably in the context of strategies for poverty eradication and social development.

European Commission 2001: 6

**EU-Japan Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change**

The EU and Japan have declared energy security and climate change as shared common challenges. This was established in the 2001 Action Plan, and has been substantially developed over time. Indeed, there have been repeated calls for increasing bilateral cooperation between the EU and Japan on energy cooperation, with President Barroso and former Prime Minister Shinzo Abe confirming the need for regular bilateral energy dialogues (see European-Union 2009). The first EU-Japan energy dialogue was held on 29 June 2007 in Brussels between the European Commission's Directorate-General for Energy and Transport and the Agency for Natural Resources and Energy (ANRE) of the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry. Evidently this built on the 16th Summit between the two sides in June 2007, at which the EU and Japan reaffirmed their commitment to contribute to the resolution of global challenges, including global climate change and the question of energy security. This emphasis was carried forward at the 18th EU-Japan Summit held in May 2009, where both parties declared their intention to

continued bilateral cooperation on energy security, sustainable energy policies and energy technologies ... underl[ing] the need to promote open, transparent, efficient and competitive energy markets, to strengthen energy security including through enhanced dialogue and cooperation between producing and consuming countries, and to promote sustainable energy choices (European Commission 2009a: 3).

Both the EU and Japan have acknowledged a shared interest and synergy between the EU Energy Strategy Policy and Japan's National Energy Strategy. Both parties agreed to strengthen cooperation in the field of energy in the following areas:
• increasing transparency, predictability, and stability of global markets;
• improving the investment climate in the energy sectors;
• enhancing energy efficiency and energy saving;
• diversifying the energy mix;
• ensuring physical security of critical energy infrastructure;
• reducing energy poverty;
• addressing climate change and sustainable development;
• increased use of non-fossil fuels and low-carbon technologies including clean coal technology, renewable energy resources (e.g. solar energy, wind power, bio-fuels);
• The use of nuclear energy for those who decide to use this option.

European Union 2009

European Union - Libya Relations

Overview

The EU and Libya do not have any contractual relations despite EU sanctions against Libya being lifted in 2004. Since this time, an informal dialogue has begun with the objective of strengthening bilateral EU-Libyan relations. Notably, in February 2009 Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Commissioner for External Relations and European Neighbourhood Policy, travelled to Tripoli to meet representatives of the Libyan government. Before leaving Libya she stated that

Libya has the potential to become a key partner for the EU in the Mediterranean as well as in Africa. We share common interests in important areas such as trade, energy and the development of the African continent. This is why I am determined to advance in developing our relations through a policy of dialogue, cooperation and engagement (Europa 2009a).

Significantly, Libya has the status of observer in the Euro-Mediterranean-Partnership and is also eligible to benefit from assistance under the European Neighbourhood Policy instrument. The EU has declared that ‘current EU-Libya co-operation is concentrated on two areas: migrations and HIV-AIDS’ (European Commission 2009u).
EU-Libya Cooperation on Migration

The EU has serious concerns about illegal migration from North Africa to Member States, and consequently it is a central area of cooperation between the EU and Libya. This issue is covered by two projects implemented under the Aeneas programme, and Libya is also eligible to benefit from the Migration and Asylum instrument (European Commission 2009u). The sum of this funding has financed:

- Cooperation activities between Libya and Niger on border control and prevention of illegal immigration;
- Activities of the International Organization of Migration related to the voluntary returns of sub-Saharan illegal migrants;
- Various activities of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in relation to Libya and neighbouring countries.

The European Commission has announced that a further 20 million euro will be allocated in order to provide assistance in the migration domain (European Commission 2009c). This comes in the wake of Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Commissioner for External Relations and European Neighbourhood Policy, declaring that 'the flux of migrants reaching Libya and the EU is a cause of increasing concern for both sides' (Europa 2009a).

EU-Libya Cooperation on Human Rights

The human rights situation in Libya continues to be a source of great concern for the EU. This was certainly evident in the 2008 Annual Human Rights report, in which it was noted that:

The situation of human rights in Libya remains a source of high concern. The EU observes a number of obstacles to political and civil rights, in particular freedom of expression, press and association. Political parties are prohibited; the judicial system is far from being independent from political influence. Incommunicado arrests, torture and capital punishment occur regularly. After the successful conclusion of the case of the Bulgarian and Palestinian medical personnel in the summer of 2007, the EU initiated the process of opening negotiations with Libya with a view to concluding a framework agreement. This agreement would cover a broad range of political issues, through a political dialogue and cooperation in the fields of foreign and security policy. Respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and democratic principles will constitute essential elements of the agreement. During the negotiations, the EU is committed to start a constructive dialogue on strengthening respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the rule of law and good governance in order to encourage Libyan reforms (Council of the European Union 2008).
European Union – Pakistan Relations

Overview

The European Union and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan have declared a commitment to strengthening their relationship under a Cooperation Agreement on Partnership and Development, which entered into force in 2004. Indeed, despite starting cooperation with Pakistan in 1976, the importance of the EU’s relationship with Pakistan has grown substantially in importance over time, culminating in the first EU-Pakistan summit being held in Brussels on 17 June 2009.

EU - Pakistan Cooperation on Regional Conflict

The Islamic Republic of Pakistan shares borders with Afghanistan, Iran, India, China and Tajikistan. Consequently, it is strategically located at the crossroad between South Asia, Central Asia and the Middle East. Pakistan’s ties with its neighbours are traditionally complex. For example, since the 1947 partition of India there have been multiple wars and small scale skirmishes between India and Pakistan. More recently, this relationship has been characterised by dramatic shifts, swinging from ‘a tense border stand-off during 2002 to a resumption of the composite dialogue in January 2004’ (European Commission 2007d: 7). At the 2009 EU-Pakistan summit, both parties stated that they

Recognised the importance of efforts by both Pakistan and India to normalise relations. [And] The EU and Pakistan encouraged the introduction of measures to build confidence and create conditions conducive to resuming and sustaining the Composite Dialogue (CPEC 2009).

Despite this ongoing regional conflict, however, in the context of EU – Pakistan bilateral cooperation, Pakistan’s strategically located border with Afghanistan strongly influences the relationship. Indeed, the *Pakistan-European Community Country Strategy Paper for 2007-2013* asserts that

Pakistan’s relations with the European Union are in large measure influenced by its important role as a partner in the fight against terrorism. Pakistan is located in a region which is of crucial interest to the EU and its security (European Commission 2007d: 15).

Evidently, the importance of this relationship has increased in the aftermath of the September 11 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States, and the subsequent invasion of Afghanistan. Thus, the
EU has argued that its reasons for engaging with Pakistan are “compelling” and include “core strategic interests”:

Apart from fighting terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the associated means of delivery, these include assisting in disarmament efforts on small arms and light weapons, contributing to efforts on clearing explosive remnants of war, facilitating successful implementation of the Afghanistan project, supporting reconciliation with India, tackling the narcotics business, and promoting human rights, democratisation and a tolerant society. Pakistan could be a powerful and stabilising voice in the Islamic world, building bridges with the west and promoting stability and conflict resolution in the region … The primary means for the EC to address these issues through its aid programmes is by way of reducing poverty and promoting good governance, both of which are essential components of the EU strategy (European Commission 2007d: 15).

**EU - Pakistan Cooperation on Terrorism**

Given that Pakistan is a central partner in the EU’s policy towards fighting terrorism, it is unsurprising that discussions of this policy were prominent in the 2009 EU-Pakistan summit. Indeed, shortly after this summit both parties declared that they ‘recognised that terrorism, extremism and militancy represent serious threats to international peace and security and should be eliminated and terrorist organisations prevented from recruiting’ (CPEC 2009). In the EU-Pakistan joint statement after the summit, it was confirmed that

The EU leaders recognised the resolve and the sacrifices which the Pakistani people and security forces are making in confronting these issues. They acknowledged Pakistan’s strong commitment to promoting stability and peace in the region … Both sides stressed the critical importance of international support to Pakistan’s ongoing counter-terrorism efforts, including through the interdiction of supply of weapons and money to terrorists and armed groups, drug dealers and criminal gangs. The EU and Pakistan re-affirmed their commitment to cooperate with each other in the fight against terrorism, both within the framework of the United Nations and bilaterally (CPEC 2009).

The EU has focused on counter-terrorism strategies with Pakistan in multifaceted ways, in particular on an ‘integrated long term strategy’ that includes ‘social economic development, civilian law enforcement structures and the rule of law, in order to secure the gains of the present security measures on a permanent basis’ (CPEC 2009). Moreover, the leaders of both the EU and Pakistan welcomed the
Initiation of cooperation between Pakistan and the EU aimed at improving Pakistan’s counter-terrorism capabilities, notably in the field of law enforcement and criminal justice. They agreed that it was particularly important to support Pakistan’s police forces. In this regard, Pakistan and the EU agreed to start a regular Pakistan-EU Counter-Terrorism dialogue. In addition the parties also acknowledged the great significance of countering extremism, particularly through education, civil society and mass media communication (CPEC 2009).

The EU/EC has also supported Pakistan’s prominent role in the fight against terror by increasing market access (European Commission 2007d: 15).

**EU - Pakistan Cooperation on WMD**

Despite increased diplomatic pressure from the EU, Pakistan is not a signatory of the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). Indeed, many analysts regard the EU's “soft” approach of using declarations or “reminders” to join the NPT as having little chance of success, or worse, having a counterproductive effect (see Zakharchenko 2007: 24). Despite this, the EU and Pakistan have declared a shared interest ‘in working towards achieving the goals and objectives of universal disarmament and non proliferation of nuclear materials, technology and WMDs’ (CPEC 2009). In this regard, the EU has noted the continued work Pakistan has done with the International Atomic Energy Agency on safeguards and physical protection. Moreover, ‘both sides agreed that consultations between the EU and Pakistan on arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation issues should take place regularly’ (CPEC 2009). The EU has stated that it will ‘engage in an enhanced expert dialogue in the context of existing frameworks on non-proliferation, in order to identify possible areas of cooperation’ (Council of the European Union 2009c).

**EU - Pakistan Cooperation on Migration**

The EU is highly aware of the problems Pakistan faces with both outward and inward migration. Indeed, the Pakistan - European Community Country Strategy Paper for 2007-2013 explicitly asserts that

Pakistan's population growth rate is the highest in South Asia at around 2%. If this trend continues, the country’s population could double by 2025, which would render integration of the working age population into the economy even more challenging than it is today. Indications are that recent growth has not been very employment-intensive, casting some doubt on MTDF projections that unemployment will come down from 7.5% in 2004-05 to 4.0% in 2009-10, unless the relationship between growth and labour absorption capacity improves dramatically. Demographic pressure has
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been contributing to out-migration for several decades. This is likely to continue in future (European Commission 2007d: 9).

Moreover, the EU is acutely aware that migratory flows out of Pakistan principally head westwards, and consequently the EU has encouraged the Pakistani authorities to step up their capacity to prevent and fight illegal migration, ‘especially through improving their ability to detect forged or fraudulent travel documents and to collect information on smugglers’ networks’ (European Commission 2007d: 10). In the context of EU migration policies and negotiation of a readmission agreement, the commission has signalled that it is prepared to ‘provide focused support in this field from the migration and asylum thematic budget line’ (European Commission 2007d: 25).

With regard to inward migration, Pakistan has had a continuous stream of migrants from Afghanistan. This trend began with the 1979 invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union, with reverse migration occurring at the end of the Cold War, but beginning again in 1996 with the rise of the Taliban regime (Gibney & Hansen 2005: 464-5). The EU has confirmed that it supports

Schemes that may be agreed between the Governments of Afghanistan, Pakistan and other countries in the region, to promote improved migration management, to fight illegal migration, including the signing of readmission agreements, and to enhance the synergies between migration and development (Council of the European Union 2009c).

**EU - Pakistan Cooperation on Human Rights**

Given that the EU regards itself as a normative power, it has strongly welcomed ‘Pakistan’s major progress in transition to democratic civilian rule following the February 2008 parliamentary elections’ (CPEC 2009). Moreover, the EU has expressed its appreciation of

Pakistan’s efforts to realize the vision of a democratic, progressive, welfare state, committed to the consolidation of democratic institutions, the rule of law and achieving economic and social development … The EU also recognised efforts being made by Pakistan for the integration of women and minorities in the social, economic and political structures, and encouraged continued efforts in this regard (CPEC 2009).

Both the EU and Pakistan have stressed the need for future open and constructive dialogues in human rights forums, and the need to implement relevant international conventions in the human rights field (CPEC 2009). However, the EU recognises that in the context of Pakistan and its surrounding region, there are other political challenges and a need to improve the human rights situation.
Instructively, this was reflected in the *Third Generation Cooperation Agreement*, which entered into force in 2004, and provides the overall framework for EC cooperation with Pakistan. When the European Parliament ratified the Agreement in 2004 it also suggested that the Commission place particular emphasis on progress in the fields of democratisation and human rights. Thus,

The new Cooperation Agreement contains a clause on respect for human rights and democratic principles as an essential element which gives the European Union and the Commission a strong mandate to re-enforce the policy dialogue and projects in these areas. Pakistan was chosen as a focus country under the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights for a number of years (European Commission 2007d: 16).

Moreover, the EU’s Electoral Observation Mission following the 2008 parliamentary elections have led to the EU offering Pakistan assistance to implement recommendations in the areas of:

- Election reform
- Improved election legislation
- Supporting the freedom of the press
- Training for political parties
- Development of a complaints and appeals procedure
- Strengthening oversight of the election administration by Parliament
- Training for media coverage of elections

*Council of the European Union 2009c*

Moreover, the EU has made a commitment to support Pakistani civil society, ‘specifically targeting media, political parties, think-tanks, NGOs and advocacy groups, in ways which are in line with internationally recognised norms and practices (Council of the European Union 2009c).

**EU - Pakistan Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change**

The leaders of both the EU and Pakistan have explicitly recognised the need to work towards achieving safe, secure, affordable and sustainable energy supplies. Indeed both have welcomed the commitment of the EU to support the development of renewable energy in Pakistan, and the cooperation with the EIB as part of a multi-donor facility in the construction of hydro-electric plants (CPEC 2009). Additionally, both sides have agreed to cooperate closely in the areas of:

- Promoting energy efficiency and energy conservation
- Development of affordable clean energy technologies
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- Identification of new, renewable, conventional and non-conventional energy sources
- Technology and expertise.

European Union – Russia Relations

Overview
Russia is the EU’s third largest trading partner. A large percentage of this trade comes from Russia exporting oil and gas to Europe. Alongside this economic relationship the EU and Russia co-operate on dealing with a number of challenges, both at the international level and in the common neighbourhood. These include climate change, drug and human trafficking, organised crime, counter-terrorism, non-proliferation, the Middle East Peace Process, and Iran. The EU and Russia concluded a Partnership and Co-operation Agreement in 1994 (European Commission 2009). Currently the relationship between the EU and Russia has been strained due to the Russia/Georgia conflict, and Russia’s willingness to cut of energy supplies to Europe via Ukraine.

EU-Russia Cooperation on Regional Conflict
Russia is a major geopolitical power in the global system, and consequently the EU maintains extensive dialogue on global political issues. With regard to regional conflicts, this includes dialogue on conflicts such as those in the Middle East, Afghanistan and the Western Balkans. However, tensions between the EU and Russia have manifested themselves over Kosovo, the so-called frozen conflicts in the former Soviet Union republics, and in particular over the Chechen Conflict. The armed conflict between Georgia and Russia over South Ossetia has also demonstrated tensions in EU-Russia relations (European Parliament 2009).

This being said, the EU maintains under the Common Space on External Security remit that ‘There is much scope for Russia and the EU to combine their efforts in conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict reconstruction. This is especially the case with regard to ‘frozen’ regional conflicts in the common neighbourhood’ (European Commission 2009).

EU-Russia Cooperation on Terrorism
EU-Russia cooperation in the common space for justice, freedom and security has become a key component in developing a strategic relationship between the parties. In November 2003 the EU law enforcement organisation EUROPOL signed a Cooperation Agreement with Russia, which
established a framework for cooperation on criminal matters between the Europol and Russian law enforcement authorities. This expanded cooperation on issues such as terrorism, in which both parties have reaffirmed their commitment to

Strengthen our cooperation to prevent and suppress terrorist acts including by full implementation of the relevant international anti-terrorism conventions and Security Council resolutions, in particular Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001).

In addition to this, the EU Action Plan on Combating Organised Crime plays a key role in the fight against crime and terrorism. Under this auspice the EU asserts that it is

Working with Russia to help prevent and combat instances of terrorism by helping to reduce radicalisation and the availability of channels used to finance terrorists, for instance by freezing assets...The protection of critical infrastructure, denying safe haven to terrorists and combating terrorism in third countries are other promising areas of cooperation. Russia also benefits from a Tacis project which supports the introduction of biometric features in travel documents and which is aimed at increasing the security of travel documents in general (European Commission 2009x).

The EU has identified the following objectives to intensify EU-Russian cooperation in the field of counter-terrorism:

- implement the Joint Statement on the fight against terrorism adopted at the EU – Russia summit in November 2002, and regularly review its implementation in existing appropriate EU-Russia formats
- sign, ratify and implement all 12 UN counter-terrorism conventions and protocols; fully implement relevant UN Security Council resolutions, including UNSCR 1373, 1540, 1267 and 1566
- pursue efforts to seek the early finalisation of the draft UN Comprehensive Convention against international terrorism and to sign and ratify the International Convention Against Acts of Nuclear Terrorism
- continue to cooperate within the Council of Europe including by finalizing and implementing the draft European Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism
- develop cooperation including through exchange of know-how and typologies / models to strengthen the fight against the financing of terrorism, including by freezing of funds and other terrorist assets, in accordance with the relevant international instruments
- exchange legislation models in due course on the fight against the financing of terrorism, including on the abuse of non-profit/charitable sector and the confiscation of assets
- implement the agreement on cooperation between Europol and the Russian Federation signed in Rome on 6 November 2003, in order to enhance cooperation to fight terrorism
- enhance cooperation in all relevant international and regional fora to improve the capacity of third countries to fight terrorism
- cooperate fully in the fight against terrorism, in accordance with obligations under international law, in order to find, deny safe haven and bring to justice, on the basis of the principle to extradite or prosecute, any person who supports, facilitates, participates, or attempts to participate in the financing, planning, preparation, or commission of terrorist acts or provides safe havens (this point equally applies to asylum in 1.4)
- discuss within existing structures specific measures to fight against international terrorism in new areas, such as the use of internet for terrorist purposes and recommendations for self regulation of mass media
- explore the possibility of an EU-Russia agreement on Mutual Legal Assistance, based on the experience gained from the implementation of the Second Additional Protocol to the 1959 European Convention
- consider the possibility of a Memorandum of Understanding on the fight against terrorism between EU and Russia, taking account of the Joint Statement of 2002 on the fight against terrorism (European-Union 2006b).

**EU-Russia Cooperation on WMD**

As part of the EU and Russia’s extensive dialogues on political issues around the world, preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the relevant technologies is high on the agenda. This has been a particular feature of discussions over Iran and North Korea. Such discussions fall under the EU’s Common Space on External Security remit.

With regard to Russian weapon reductions in the post-Cold War era, the EC-funded International Science and Technology Centre has been instrumental in redirecting the talents of former WMD scientists and engineers to civilian purposes, whilst the Russian government has stressed the importance of the destruction of chemical weapons and the dismantling of nuclear submarines in Russia.
EU-Russia Cooperation on Human Rights

Russia and the EU agree that human rights are an essential element in their dialogue. Since November 2004 the EU and Russia have held regular consultations on human rights every six months. These consultations provide a forum for discussions about the human rights situation in both Russia and the EU. The commitment to shared values is reflected in the EU-Russia Partnership and Cooperation Agreement and in the four Common Spaces – in particular the Common Space for Freedom, Security and Justice. Moreover the EU is involved in a number of human rights activities in Russia. These include observation of human rights related trials, regular meetings of human rights desk officers from the EU Member States’ embassies, contacts with human rights defenders and the organisation of conferences and seminars. The EU actively supports international human rights initiatives in Russia in partnership with the United Nations and the Council of Europe.

Despite this, however, the 2008 EU annual report on human rights states that

The sixth round of EU-Russia human rights consultations was held in Brussels on 3 October 2007 and the seventh round in Ljubljana on 17 April 2008. The sixth and especially the seventh round of human rights consultations repeated much of the ground covered in previous rounds and demonstrated that there were few points of agreement between the two sides, with Russia systematically counterattacking whenever criticised. Russia was keen to focus on the process, stressing that the Russian Federation saw the consultations as a confidence-building exercise, while the EU called for a more results-oriented approach.

Discussions covered the human rights situation in the EU and Russia as well as issues relating to the international protection of human rights. The EU raised a number of concerns about the human rights situation in Russia, in particular freedom of media, expression and assembly, especially in the light of the recent parliamentary and presidential elections, the functioning of civil society, the rights of persons belonging to minorities, combating racism and xenophobia and the rights of children and women. Both sides also discussed human rights in the Northern Caucasus. On both occasions, the EU also raised individual cases with the Russian side.

The discussions also focused on the international human rights obligations of the EU and Russia, including cooperation with UN human rights Special Procedures. The meetings also discussed cooperation within the Council of Europe, including the issue of implementation of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights. At Russia’s request, the EU provided details of current developments in various EU Member States.
In keeping with its policy to closely involve civil society in dialogues on human rights, the EU made a point of associating NGOs in the preparation of the consultations and held a round-table with domestic and international NGOs on the day preceding the dialogue meetings. The Russian authorities declined to participate in the round-table meetings (Council of the European Union 2008).

**EU-Russia Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change**

In October 2000 an EU-Russia Summit was held in Paris. A key decision of that meeting was to establish an Energy Dialogue to launch a partnership for enhancing the reliability of energy supplies both in the EU and Russia. Subsequently, guidelines were established for the practical implementation of the strategic partnership between the EU and Russia by increasing interaction in the Energy Dialogue. The aim of the Dialogue is the development of a long-term energy partnership between the EU and Russia as part of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement. The Dialogue is focused on oil and natural gas, cooperation in the interconnection of the European Union and Russia’s electricity grids, trade and enhancing the safe use of nuclear materials. Both Russia and the EU have a mutual interest in maintaining close development and cooperation of the Dialogue. For instance, 50% of Russia’s oil exports go to the EU, representing 17% of total EU oil consumption. 63% of Russia’s natural gas exports arrive in the EU, with contractual requirements foreseeing an increase in deliveries to around 180-200 billion cubic metres by 2008 (European Commission 2007c).

It is claimed that Russia recognises that the EU is developing the world’s largest and most integrated energy market as a result of the EU’s internal market, on its borders. Similarly, the EU acknowledges the efforts of Russia to structurally reform its economy and energy sector and to provide the framework necessary to attract EU investment (European Commission 2009d). Consequently, mutual interests exist and common objectives have been set. Both Russia and the EU seek to ensure stable energy markets, to secure reliable imports and exports at an increased volume and recognise a pressing need to modernise the Russian energy sector. Both wish to see improved energy efficiency and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from energy production and use in their respective economies. The overall objective of the Energy Dialogue is to enhance the energy security of the European continent by binding Russia and the EU into a closer relationship in all issues of mutual concern in the energy sector (European Commission 2007c).

More concrete, short and medium term, objectives include:
- Ensuring reliable energy supplies in the short and long-term future;
- Increasing energy efficiency;
- Securing long term investment;
- Opening up energy markets;
- Diversifying the range of imports and exports of energy products;
- Enhancing the technological base of the energy sector of the economy;
- Improvement of the legal basis for energy production and transport in Russia;
- Ensuring the physical security of transport networks;
- Reducing the impact Russia’s energy infrastructure causes the environment;
- Encouraging the ongoing opening of energy markets;
- Facilitating the market penetration of more environmentally friendly technologies and energy resources; and
- Promoting energy efficiency and energy saving.

A major objective of the Energy Dialogue is that of establishing the conditions necessary to encourage investment and technology transfers in Russia’s energy sector. This would also include investment in production, transportation, and consumption. According to Russia’s Energy Strategy 2001 – 2020, ‘up to 600 billion euro investment will be needed to renew ageing capital stock and to sustain a planned 4-5% annual rate of growth in the economy. Of this amount, around 150 billion euro will be required before 2010, 30% of which is expected to come from foreign investment’ (European Commission 2005b). To aid in the attraction of investment, the EU has claimed that Russia needs to increase the ‘predictability and transparency of its business and investment climate’ (European Commission 2005b). Moreover, this is in line with the EU’s longer security concerns over energy supplies, in which the EU argues that

> It is important to agree on a set of realistic and mutually beneficial commitments with Russia that will facilitate EU-Russia energy cooperation and to identify concrete steps to rapidly improve the investment climate (European Commission 2005b).

For these reasons the Dialogue supports policy reform in the Russian energy sector. Conversely for Russia, attracting investment to increase its oil and gas exports, to rehabilitate and upgrade its energy infrastructure and to use knowledge and technology transfers are a means of enhancing economic growth. Variables in these processes are quality, the timing and implementation of policy reforms; the deregulation of monopolies; the freeing up of energy tariffs; access to networks; investment protection; and transit issues (European Commission 2005b).
After having studied particular questions of energy strategies and balances, investment, technology transfer, energy infrastructure, and energy efficiency and the related environmental dimension during the initial, exploratory phase of the Dialogue, four thematic groups of EU and Russian experts have delivered their joint reports in the following key areas of mutual interest:

- Energy trade
- Investment
- Energy infrastructure
- Energy efficiency.

There have also been multiple assistance projects within the scope of the Energy Dialogue, which are financed through the EU-Russia Cooperation Programme. These include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Budget (€)</th>
<th>Duration (months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation of EU-Russia Energy Policies</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency in Arkhangelsk, Astrakhan and Kaliningrad regions</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation of Technical Standards in the Gas Sector</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EU-Russia Energy Technology Centre</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy and Rehabilitation of Small Scale Hydroelectric Power Plants</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: European Commission 2009d

Russian and EU experts are also already currently studying the feasibility of the interconnection of EU and Russian electricity grids.

Russia is involved in all aspects of nuclear power and is of particular importance in the nuclear energy sector. Nuclear energy is an important source of electricity and the civil nuclear industry is also a major source of employment. Russia clearly wishes nuclear energy to continue to be predominant in its overall energy mix. It continues to build new reactors and has a policy of prolonging the life span of its first-generation reactors to exceed the nominal lifetime of 30 years. Initial, EU cooperation programmes in the nuclear field have worked on three priorities:
The promotion of an effective nuclear safety culture;
- The development and implementation of strategies for dealing with spent fuel, decommissioning and managing nuclear waste;
- Contributions to international initiatives such as the G8/EU initiative on the closure of Chernobyl (Europa 2007).

However, from 2007, EU assistance sought to:

- Strengthen the role of the national nuclear safety authorities to encourage improved licensing procedures and to ensure regulatory involvement in all relevant nuclear activities.
- Link Russian nuclear power plants’ on-site assistance with EU operators.
- Promote projects in support of nuclear safety.
- Support regulatory work and safety analyses.
- Improve spent fuel and radioactive waste management and encourage the timely preparation of decommissioning.
- Help to improve the corporate structures of nuclear utilities and industrial nuclear operators in order to bring about a financially sound electricity and nuclear sector.
- Promote the training of inspectors and plant operators, accountability for nuclear material and the implementation of measures at plant level to prevent illicit trafficking (Europa 2007).

Another key area for bilateral cooperation between the EU and Russia concerns the environment. Given common land and sea borders, it is argued that environmental problems can and should be tackled together. Russia boasts huge areas undisturbed by man and holds over 20% of the Earth’s water resources and forests. But while Russia is home to quite unique natural resources, it also suffers from environmental problems, some a legacy of the Soviet past, some brought about by more recent economic growth. Finding solutions to some of these problems, such as wasteful energy use, the depletion of natural resources and the management of radioactive waste, are key components of EU-Russia cross-border co-operation programmes (European Commission 2009k).

European Union – United States of America Relations

Overview
The European Union and the United States established diplomatic relations as early as 1953, but it was only in 1990 that this relationship was formalised for the first time in the Transatlantic
Declaration. Since December 1995 this relationship has been based on the New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA), which focuses on the following objectives:

1. Promoting Peace and Stability, Democracy and Development around the World
2. Responding to Global Challenges
3. Contributing to the Expansion of World Trade and Closer Economic Relations
4. Building Bridges across the Atlantic
5. Parliamentary Links
6. Implementing our Agenda

Dialogue between the EU and the US is a consistent factor in their bilateral relationship, and is reinforced with annual summit meetings, the last of which was on 10 June 2008 held in Ljubljana (European Commission 2009o).

Within the framework of the NTA, the 1998 Transatlantic Economic Partnership (TEP), and 2007 the Transatlantic Economic Council, the EU and the US have bilaterally cooperated in promoting the transatlantic economy. This relationship is the largest bilateral trade and investment relationship in the world, consisting of 40% of world trade and over 60% of the world GDP (European Commission 2009o).

EU-US Cooperation on Regional Conflict

With regard to regional conflicts throughout the world the EU and the US often work together through multilateral bodies and arrangements. This can include the United Nations at a global level, but can also include more ad hoc groupings such as the Quartet for the Middle East, which includes the US, the EU, the UN and Russia. Notably, such arrangements do not pertain to the definition of “bilateralism” outlined in section two of this paper. However, the EU and the US have increasingly attempted to create a common framework for bilateral cooperation on regional conflicts. Such steps are deemed necessary as violent or frozen conflicts threaten regional stability and global peace and security. Indeed problems in areas such as Kashmir, the Great Lakes, the
Middle East, the Balkans, and the Korean Peninsula impact both directly and indirectly on European interests. Indeed as Javier Solana argues,

They destroy human lives and social and physical infrastructures; they threaten minorities, fundamental freedoms and human rights. Conflict can lead to extremism, terrorism and state failure; it provides opportunities for organised crime. Regional insecurity can fuel the demand for WMD. The most practical way to tackle the often elusive new threats will sometimes be to deal with the older problems of regional conflict (2004: 53).

In 2008 discussions were held in Brussels over the *EU-US Technical Dialogue and Increased Cooperation in Crisis Management and Conflict Prevention Work Plan*. The aim of this Work Plan was to establish a comprehensive bilateral approach to regional conflicts, which built upon ‘cooperation with the UN, other nations, NATO, and other multilateral organizations as appropriate’ (European Commission 2008). The practical modalities of the working plan are as follows:

| Establish Foundations for Analysis and Response | • Regularly update points of contact in EU Troika and State Department for crisis management (e.g., planning, operations, lessons learned);
• Continue periodic videoconferences between relevant EU and U.S. experts on topics of mutual concern;
• Establish regular senior-level consultations on prevention, stabilization, and reconstruction (alternating between Brussels and Washington);
• Improve collaboration between civilian personnel on crisis response, including planning, assessment, and performance measurement methodologies;
• Improve the sharing of analysis and data on risks of instability. |
| Coordinate Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Response | • Identify priority areas on which to focus bilateral efforts to prevent conflicts;
• Exchange early warning data and share information on |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Enhance Capacity</strong></th>
<th><strong>a. Training, Exchanges and Exercises</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross-train EU and U.S. civilian personnel through regular exchanges of participants in official training courses for prevention, mitigation, crisis response;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review, on an annual basis, training courses and exercises to be used to train EU and U.S. civilian personnel;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to invite EU and U.S. officials to participate as observers to each other’s exercises in the field of crisis response;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As a first step, establish enhanced liaison between the EU and the US counterpart units focused on crisis management, and examine possibilities of diplomatic officer exchanges in the longer-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Lessons Learned</strong></td>
<td>• Periodically review civilian prevention, stabilization, and reconstruction missions and discuss lessons learned;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote efforts to develop shared international concepts and terminology to facilitate cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building International Capacity</strong></td>
<td>• Work to expand and complement the growing crisis management and stabilisation efforts of other international bodies, and to promote common aims through the UN,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OSCE, NATO and the G-8;

- Coordinate support for regional and sub regional organizations in areas most vulnerable to instability, to include capacity-building for conflict prevention, crisis management, and peace-building;

- Share information on ongoing and planned capacity building programs to support these regional organizations;

- Based on the UN SG report “In Larger Freedom”, develop shared concepts and practical strategies to strengthen UN peace-building structures;

- Support the consolidation of the Peace Building Commission as an effective body to bring together all relevant actors, to marshal resources, and advise on, and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peace-building that is sustainable and prevents reversion to conflict. Promote the efforts of the Peacebuilding Support Office in the Secretariat to support the Peacebuilding Commission. Support the Peacebuilding Commission’s efforts to integrate system-wide peacebuilding policies and strategies, develop best practices, provide cohesive support for field operations, and sustain the long-term political will necessary for successful peacebuilding;

- Work together in the UN to build consensus with other Peacebuilding Commission members;

- Work together in the UN to ensure that the Peacebuilding Commission is relevant to the UN Security Council and the General Assembly;

- Work with the UN to build support for reform in the peace building sector;

- Support the implementation of UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace
and Security and UNSCR 1612 on Children and Armed Conflict. Share information on steps taken towards this end.

Source: Available from the European Commission 2008

**EU-US Cooperation on Terrorism**

Terrorism is not a new phenomenon for many EU Member States. Indeed the UK, Ireland and Spain have long felt the effects of terrorism on their soil. However since the terrorist attacks of September 11 2001 in the US, the EU has decided to ‘step up its efforts’ (European Commission 2009i). A number of agreements have been concluded between the EU and the US in this field. There has been a particular focus on agreements concerning *Extradition and Mutual legal Assistance*. Most notably under 2003/516/EC: *Council Decision of 6 June 2003 concerning the signature of the Agreements between the European Union and the United States of America on extradition and mutual legal assistance in criminal matters.*

There has also been a bilateral agreement on transferring Passenger Name Records (PNR). The ratification of this agreement occurred on October 19 2006, and was deemed necessary to

Prevent and combat terrorism and transnational crime effectively as a means of protecting their [EU & US] respective democratic societies and common values... [and recognised] that, in order to safeguard public security and for law enforcement purposes, rules should be laid down on the transfer of Passenger Name Record (PNR) data by air carriers to the Department of Homeland Security (European Union 2006a).

With regard to terrorist financing the EU and the US have concluded the *SWIFT Agreement*. This pertains to the *processing and protection of personal data subpoenaed by the Treasury Department from the US based operation centre of the Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication (SWIFT)*(Council of the European Union 2007b).

**EU-US Cooperation on WMD**

The European Union and the United States partnership on countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction has evolved into what both parties term a ‘robust partnership’. In June 2004 both parties issued a joint declaration which agreed to expand their cooperation to prevent, contain, and reverse the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), their related materials and their delivery systems. These commitments built on President Bush’s proposed
seven steps to help combat the development and threat of WMD, the EU Strategy against Proliferation of WMD, and the G-8 June 2004 Action Plan on Non-proliferation. The United States and the European Union also applauded the adoption of UNSC Resolution 1540 and welcomed the G-8 Action Plan. As a result it was agreed that both partners would:

- Work to establish new measures so that sensitive nuclear items with proliferation potential will not be exported to States that may seek to use them for weapons purposes or allow them to fall into terrorists’ hands. In aid of this process, they agreed to refrain for one year from initiating new transfers of enrichment and reprocessing equipment and technology to additional states, while seeking permanent controls to keep this capability from terrorists or states seeking it for nuclear weapons;
- Subscribe fully to the Proliferation Security Initiative Statement of Interdiction Principles, support efforts to interdict WMD shipments, and enhance cooperation against proliferation networks, including in intelligence and law enforcement;
- Seek stronger enforcement of nuclear non-proliferation obligations, including by: making the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Additional Protocol an essential new standard in the field of nuclear supply; creating a new special committee of the IAEA Board of Governors to focus on safeguards and verification; and declaring that states under investigation should not participate in IAEA compliance decisions;
- Support the work of the G-8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction;
- Take concrete action to expand and improve capability to prevent and respond to bioterrorism.

In addition, both the United States and the European Union also committed to and agreed the following:

- To implement fully United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540, to criminalise proliferation, establish effective export controls and protect dangerous materials, and to assist others to do the same;
- To preserve the integrity of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as the cornerstone of the global non-proliferation regime;
- To enhance cooperation to promote the security of radioactive sources and prevent their misuse;
To continue to promote effective export controls backed up by criminal sanctions, and to work to identify, control, and interdict WMD- and missile-related proliferation shipments.

Both parties welcomed Libya’s cooperation in dismantling, under international verification, its WMD and longer-range missile programs. They both share concerns over North Korea’s decision to suspend the Six-Party Talks and urge North Korea to resume these discussions. On Iran, the United States and the European Union share the same goal: an Iran without nuclear weapons. Consequently they have urged Iran to fully comply with its Non-Proliferation Treaty obligations and safeguards agreements3 (DOS 2005).

**EU-US Cooperation on Migration**

In addition to concerns about international terrorism, the EU and the US have agreements through intensive dialogue concerning border control and migration management issues. These have included discussions relating to travel document security, visa policies, and information sharing on lost and stolen passports. In 2004 the *EU-US Policy Dialogue on Border and Transport Security* was established. This forum meets twice a year with the goal of enhancing both parties’ security policies relating to land, sea and air. Both parties stress the importance of a comprehensive and integrated approach to asylum and migration issues based on a commitment to human rights, existing international agreements and support for the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. Of particular concern to both parties is the manner in which illegal migration is linked to international crime, and therefore to drug trafficking and the trafficking of human beings (European Commission 2009y).

**EU-US Cooperation on Human Rights**

For the European Union human rights issues fall under the common foreign and security policy (CFSP), and therefore under the remit of the Troika4. The Troika holds twice yearly consultations with the US to consult on issues of human rights. In recent years the issue of counterterrorism has been prominent on the agenda, and concerns have been expressed by the EU regarding certain US practices and policies in the fight against terrorism; namely the use of harsh interrogation

---

3 These issues are not dealt with in this paper because they fall under multilateralism and not bilateralism. Where the EU does engage with North Korea, Libya and Iran will be dealt with under their own case study sections.

4 The Troika refers to the Foreign Affairs Minister of the Member State holding the Presidency of the Council of the European Union; the Secretary-General/High Representative for the common foreign and security policy; the European Commissioner in charge of external relations and European Neighbourhood Policy.
techniques and the policy of extraordinary rendition. A more long standing issue has been the continued use of the death penalty in the US.

The biannual meetings also provide a forum for open exchanges on country and thematic priorities for the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly and the Human Rights Council respectively. In past years the US expressed growing scepticism and frustration at the work of the Human Rights Council, foreshadowing its decision to withdraw from the Council in June 2008. Furthermore, the EU and the US exchanged information on human rights dialogues and consultations with third countries (Council of the European Union 2008).

**EU-US Cooperation on Energy Security and Climate Change**

Energy security is a key issue for the EU, which estimates that by 2030 it will be dependent up to as much as 90% for oil and 80% for gas. Consequently, developing renewable energy is a central aim of EU energy policy. As a result the EU is intensifying its bilateral cooperation with the US on the use of energy security, energy efficiency and the use of alternative sources though several agreements. In June 2005 this was ratified in the Declaration on energy security, energy efficiency, renewables and economic development, which set tighter goals for energy efficiency and to increase the share of alternative energy used as an important step in addressing the scarcity and unreliability of supplies of conventional energies. In 2007 both parties made a Joint Statement on Energy Efficiency, Security and Climate Change.

At the 2006 EU-US summit in Vienna, the EU and the USA agreed to establish an EU-US High Level Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development to build on existing bilateral and multilateral initiatives and further advance implementation of the G-8 Gleneagles Plan of Action for Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development. At the 2007 Summit, the Joint Statement on Energy Security and Climate Change was adopted, underlining mutual interests is tackling climate change. Activities to reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions will broaden and be reinforced while supporting economic growth. The Commission is committed to achieving a high level of environmental protection, as shown by the environmental agenda set out in the Environmental Action Programme 2002-2012. The EU and the USA maintain regular bilateral contacts on environmental issues in order to promote a better understanding of each other’s policies and legislation (European-Commission 2009g).
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