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Background

The Institute for European Studies is an autonomous department of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB). It was created in 2001 through an initiative taken by the Flemish Government (Decree of 20/04/2001 (GG 13/07/2001), amended by the decree of 07/12/2001 (GG 12/2/2002), amended by the decree of 21/12/2001 (GG 29/12/2001) – coming into force on 01/01/2001).

The Institute for European Studies is an academic Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence and a policy think tank that focuses on the role of the European Union in an international setting. The Institute advances academic education and research in various disciplines, and provides services to policy-makers, scholars, stakeholders and the general public.

While promoting European Studies in general, the IES specifically focuses on the interface between the EU and international affairs and institutions. It explores EU institutions, policies and law within the context of globalization and global governance. The disciplines applied at the IES are a mixture of e.g. law, social/political sciences, economics and communication sciences, and the Institute’s activities focus on the various ways in which institutions, law and politics intersect with each other in the EU, its member states and at the international level.

Research at the IES currently concentrates on five evolving areas:

- EU foreign and security policy
- environment & sustainable development
- migration, asylum and diversity
- information society
- European Economics.

With own resources as well as external funding, these research areas are explored by research projects, conferences, and workshops. These activities regularly lead to high-quality academic publications (books and journal articles).

Fostered by its research, the IES constitutes the focal point for teaching European Studies at the VUB. It coordinates relevant MA programmes and, in particular, hosts the renowned Programme on International Legal Cooperation (PILC).

In addition, the IES co-organises an annual Summer School on the European Decision-Making Process. A training programme including three e-learning modules on EU law; European history, institutions and decision-making; and European information sources on the internet (www.emodules.be) completes the educational portfolio of the IES.

The IES also provides a number of academic services to disseminate its research and promote its education and to stimulate academic and public discussion on topical European issues. The Institute utilizes its central location in Brussels for regularly organising events such as the IES Lecture Series, the IES Policy Forum and other conferences and workshops for academia and/or the interested public. Furthermore, the IES publishes a book series, the IES Working Papers and the quarterly IES Newsletter.

The Institute fosters academic cooperation with a wide range of Universities and other public as well as private research institutions in Belgium and abroad.
2011 has been a moving year in more ways than one, in which the efforts and investments of the past came to full fruition. In the past year, the Institute for European Studies has advanced to full cruising speed, excelling in all its endeavours – not least in academic output. First and foremost, the IES delivered no less than five PhDs, more than doubling the amount of doctorates from the IES since its inception. This, in turn, resulted in a very high publication output, and in an unprecedented number of activities and projects. All this took place in a turbulent year that started with the move to a new and more permanent location; a move that took a lot of energy and resources from all staff, but that nevertheless had a limited impact on the academic output of the Institute. Now residing in the international Karel Van Miert Building of the university, the IES has a larger and more agile workspace at its disposal, allowing for further growth and a better integration of all its activities. This also allows us to host more visiting scholars, as the IES has become an international magnet for researchers throughout the EU and beyond.

Closer to home, the Institute's international standing resulted in a new five-year Government Agreement, and a number of internal reforms that foster the Institute's further qualitative growth. New statutes, further delegation, optimised Service Level Agreements and a long awaited possibility to employ full professors (ZAP) at the Institute not only underline the confidence of our alma mater in the past endeavours of our Institute, but they also pave the way for our continuing success in the future.

The past ten years are therefore only the foundation for the excellence yet to come.
Executive Summary

Ten years after its inception, the Institute for European Studies has come to full fruition. It currently employs 86 people (of which 12 are seconded by the VUB), making it one of the bigger entities of the university. With 27 ongoing projects, the Institute is contributing to a large extent to the output of the social sciences in general and to European Studies more specifically: 2011 marked a total of 5 graduating PhD students, more than 60 graduates in the advanced Master programmes, and over 180 publications by its staff and academic collaborators. In addition, a total of 65 activities were organised over the year. Thus, we can unabashedly state that the Institute has become a driving force behind high-level research, teaching and services in Brussels.

Against this backdrop, the Institute also engaged in one of the biggest and most intrusive endeavours in its recent history. In the spring of 2011, the IES moved to new and more definite premises, installing a more flexible working environment that encompasses all research and teaching activities of the Institute, and allowing for more possibilities and further growth. The new working environment also lays the basis for synergies with other internationally operating institutions in the building (such as Kent University and Vesalius College), and for a more integrated approach of the university’s internationalisation strategy (through a closer collaboration with the International Relations and Mobility Office, also residing in the new building). With the politics and sociology departments under the same roof, there are increased opportunities for further enhanced cooperation with these European and internationally operating research fields.

The new premises also maximised our potential for organising events. With a dedicated event space and classrooms, IES Policy Fora, research colloquia and lecture series have continued to flourish. In 2011, the IES also reformed its E-learning and Training team to become the Educational Development Unit (EDU). This aims at an increased cross-fertilisation between the different learning initiatives at the Institute. With Wednesday Webinars, and selected training initiatives, the unit is well on its way to consolidate a blended learning environment that serves both high level students at the IES as well as specific target groups that wish to further their knowledge in European Studies.

Organisationally, the Institute continued to mature. By the end of 2011, the VUB’s Governing Board decided to grant further autonomy to the Institute, formally allowing it to organise advanced Master teaching programmes (which previously resided under the auspices of the Faculties), while at the same time giving it the right to directly employ full professors (ZAP), also something that previously could only be done through the existing Faculties. The full-professor status, a request of the Institute for many years, is vital for attracting external funding and for promoting PhD students. It was a particular appeal by the Government Audit Committee in 2010 to which the university responded positively and which ultimately resulted in the new status of the IES.

Financially, the Institute for European Studies is doing well. Despite relatively large investments because of the move to new premises, and despite an increased financial share in its teaching programmes and a decrease of VUB (financial) support, the IES was able to close the financial year with a small surplus. Income from externally funded projects increased further, explaining this positive result.

Against this strong academic and financial background, the Institute is well positioned to continue its role as a centre of excellence in European Studies.
In 2011, the IES delivered five PhDs while starting one new PhD research project funded by IES’ own budget. Of the five doctorates, four were in Political Science and one was in Law.

The total number of projects the IES has initiated itself and has been working on in this financial year amounts to 14. With an additional 11 externally funded research projects and two funded teaching projects, the IES worked on a total of 27 different studies.

The IES employed 37.4 full-time equivalents (39.9 including the teaching staff) – in total 84 different people.

40 % of the resources originated from non-governmental sources.

The IES published four new books, while IES staff were involved in the publication of another seven. The IES also published four working papers and 56 scientific articles or book chapters (13 peer reviewed). Additionally, IES Staff published 15 online papers independently. IES teaching staff and associates also published more than 100 academic papers and book chapters.

During 2011, the IES worked on 14 external projects: two FP7 projects funded by the European Commission (INEX and CORPUS), one project by FWO, one VUB-GOA project, and eight consultancy projects of national and international partners.

The Institute continued its inter-university network with the United Nations University, the Universität Wien, the Diplomatische Akademie Wien, the Egmont Royal Institute for International Relations, the Institute for European Environmental Policy and the Brussels Institute for Contemporary China Studies. It also worked together with Vesalius College, Hendrix College, the University of Southern California, Tampere University (Finland), Turku University (Finland), the Erasmus Hogeschool and with the following Belgian universities: ULB, UA, KUL and UG.

The IES organised two summer schools (one on the European Decision-Making Process, and one on European Security Issues), two lecture series (consisting of 10 lectures), 19 research colloquia, 15 policy fora, five training sessions, and four webinars. The total number of organised events amounts to 65.

31 students graduated in 2011 from the LLM International and European Law, while another 27 graduated from the MSc of European Integration and Development. A total of 95 students from 28 different countries commenced their studies in the two advanced Master programmes.
Education
On 17 May 2002, the Flemish Government acknowledged the Institute’s ability to award the diploma of ‘Master in International and Comparative Law’. Following the audit of the programme prior to its accreditation, this Master programme changed its name to ‘Master in International and European Law’. The Programme itself was created in 1971 as a postgraduate LLM programme in international and comparative law and, as such, it is one of the most established of its kind in Europe. Throughout the years it has attracted a steady flow of high quality applicants from all over the world, and, as an internationally oriented Master’s Programme, it has always sought a diverse faculty with a mixture of academics and professionals from a broader European background. Over the years, the focus of the Master’s Programme has gradually shifted from international and comparative law to international and European law. This was an understandable development due partly to the increasing importance of the European integration process, which has steadily deepened and widened throughout the years, and partly to the obvious advantage of the Master Programme being located in the capital of Europe and therefore close to the major European institutions. Internally, the programme may still be referred to with its ‘old’ abbreviation of PILC (Programme on International Legal Cooperation), although with the recently recognised title of LLM, the ‘old’ abbreviation is less frequently used.

In November 2007, the VUB decided that the advanced Master programme of European Integration and Development should also fall under the organisational capacity of the IES. This programme, which had been organised since 2002 by the Faculty of Economics, Social and Political Science, focuses on the integration processes of the European Union, and offers two study paths: one on economic integration, and one on political/social integration. It is geared towards international students but has been fruitfully recruiting from the international community in Brussels and those working with or in the European institutions. Contrary to the LLM, this advanced Master programme is designed as an evening programme that can be taken either full-time or part-time. It is therefore not surprising that a large number of international (working) students from Brussels are interested in the programme. Internally, the programme is referred to as the ‘EuroMaster’.
Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2015

The Strategic Plan 2011-2015 described a number of objectives in the education field that are pertinent to 2011:

- LL.M in International and European Law & Master of European Integration and Development:
  - Issuance of 50 diplomas per year on average (as required by the Government Agreement) while paying the necessary attention to quality control;
  - Ensuring attractiveness of programmes (through programme reviews, enhanced recruitment, quality control, etc.);
  - Ensuring financial viability (through increase in tuition fees, search for external funding, etc.);
- Annual organisation of an IES Summer School and initiation of accreditation within VUB (by 2012); regular review of contents;
- E-learning modules: initiation of accreditation (2011/2012), increase of income to € 20,000 by 2015;

**LL.M. and Euromaster**

This objective stems from the obligation written down in the Government Agreement with the University, in which the IES is to deliver (on average over the five years) 50 diplomas per year for its LL.M International and European Law and its Master in European Integration and Development (combined). In 2011 (following the academic year 2010-2011), the IES delivered 31 diplomas in its LL.M programme and another 27 diplomas in the EuroMaster.

**Ensure the continued attractiveness of the two programmes.**

The IES continued to invest in publicity for the two programmes, and worked together with other departments of the university (and with Vesalius College) in order to be able to actively recruit students. The IES was also active online and in social media, through a renewed web-presence and additional online information for students and alumni. In 2011, the Institute also carried out programme changes that include study options for the students in the LL.M, something the programme thus far lacked.

**Ensure financial viability of the programmes.**

The tuition fees for both programmes were further enhanced, while the scheme for grants (through tuition fee waivers) was further refined. Through the Service Level Agreements with the Faculties of the University, the IES now has a bigger financial responsibility over the programme (directly financing most of the costs), and it has also obtained a tighter control over its overall budget. Current IES financial management of the programmes shows good prospects for their continued financial viability.

**Accreditation of IES Summer School and E-learning**

In 2011, the IES obtained accreditation for both the Summer School and the E-learning modules (making a total of 25 ECTS). The IES modules also serve as a basis for the Certificate in International Relations and Conflict Analysis, organised in collaboration with UCL.
Following the suggestions of the ‘visitation’ committee that audited the programme in 2009, the programme director, Amelia Hadfield, and the programme committee changed the course programme to include a methodological course. Subsequently, an international vacancy was launched, after which the IES appointed a new scholar.

Following the exams in June and September, a total of 27 students graduated from the programme (1 with summa cum laude, 8 with magna cum laude, 11 with cum laude and another 7 passed with satisfactory results), while 6 students continued with the second part of their part-time study programme. 29 students failed and thus had to re-take (at least partly) the course.

For the academic year 2011-2012, 59 students enrolled, of which 22 are male and 37 female. 10 of these students chose to study the programme part-time.
Since 2011-2012, the programme has consisted of two study paths: one in Public Law, and one in Business Law. Before this academic year, students had no optional courses in the LLM. The two study paths provide an answer to a demand that has existed for many years, and that was further suggested by the Audit committee that served as basis for the accreditation of the programme in 2010.

Students in/out

Candidate students for the LLM programme submit their application by 15 February of the year in which they wish to commence their studies. The LLM Academic Board (i.e., the members of the teaching staff) makes a selection of the applications on the basis of academic background, academic letters of recommendation, motivation of the candidate and knowledge of the English language.

In 2010-2011, there were 103 applications. Of these, 64 applicants were originally selected. In the end 35 students enrolled (all new students).

The group was made up of 27 female and 8 male students who came from 24 different countries. Only students with a prior education of ‘Master in law’ (previously: ‘licentiaat’) or an equivalent legal diploma with a minimum of 240 ECTS were accepted. Most of the students (32) were between 22 and 29 years old.

Of the 35 students, 31 students graduated from the programme. Three students graduated with the grade of summa cum laude and nine with magna cum laude. A further eleven students graduated cum laude, while another eight passed satisfactory. Four students had to re-take their year.

73 potential students applied for the academic year 2011/2012. The LLM Academic Board originally selected 56. Of these, 36 students enrolled (32 new students and 4 students who failed the previous year). The group consists of 26 female and 10 male students. 3 students were born before 1980 - all the rest are between 22 and 29 years old.

---

Globalization, international law & sustainable development - Prof. S. van THIEL
International and European protection of human rights - Prof. S. KOVVO
International economic organizations
Prof. F. HOFFMEISTER
International law and Comparative Law
Profs. R. GOSALBO BONO/ A. VOICULESCU
The EU institutional framework and judicial protection in the EU - Profs. Y. DEVUYST

D. ARTS
EU Economic Law - Prof. T. JORIS
International and European Competition law
Prof. J. FAULL
European and international private law
Prof. A. NUYTS
EU External Relations - Prof. B. MARTENCZUK
International and European taxation
Prof. S. van THIEL
Case study on European competition law

Prof. T. JORIS
Case Study on public international/EU law
Profs. S. OBERTHÜR and H. KALIMO
EU environmental law in an international context - Profss. S. OBERTHÜR and H. KALIMO
International and European criminal law
Prof. P. DE HERT
Master thesis in international and European law - Thesis supervisor
a. Tuition Fee

In conformity with the Strategic Plan 2011-2015, the tuition fee for the academic year 2011-2012 for both Master-after-Master programmes rose to €3,500 for the EuroMaster and €4,000 for the LLM.

As legally required, the tuition fee was composed of a fixed enrolment fee (€500 for the EuroMaster and €1,000 for the LLM) and a fee per study credit (€50 per credit). In this way, part-time students in the EuroMaster pay €2,000 per year (500 + 30x50).

b. Trends

In 2011, the Service Level Agreements (SLA) with the Faculty of Law and Criminology (RC) and with the Faculty of Economics, Social and Political Science and Management School Solvay (ESP) entered into full force. The SLAs delegate the academic responsibility for the LLM and EuroMaster programmes to the IES in return for a larger financial input. Next to the running costs, the publicity and recruitment costs and the administrative overhead that the IES already bore to date, the Institute is now also financing the personnel costs for all part-time academic personnel involved in the programme. The SLAs govern the size and distribution of the funds, the human resource implications and the attribution of IES’ scientific output to the faculties.

c. Selection policy

The overall recruitment policy for the LLM and the EuroMaster remained the same, i.e. the aim is for a wide geographical spread of the origin of the students, whilst for the LLM, only students with a law degree are accepted. Only by way of exception and with special motivation from the candidates can the Academic Board deviate from this. It did not do so in 2011/2012. When selecting candidates for both programmes, their command of English (e.g. by presenting TOEFL results), their prior study results (corroborated by letters of recommendation by academics or former employers) and their motivation are taken into account. All the files are prepared by the secretariat and screened by the programme directors and members of the teaching staff, after which the most promising candidates are selected by the respective Academic Boards (endorsed by the IES Executive Board). For the LL.M, we aim for a maximum of 40 students. Because of the different study paths in the EuroMaster evening programme, a larger number may be accepted. Based on previous experience, a greater number of applicants are selected - where possible with regard to quality – as on average 35% of the selected candidates subsequently decide not to register, or cannot do so for administrative or other reasons (e.g. visa, scholarship, etc.).

d. Recruitment and Advertising

As in the past, the IES continued to advertise its advanced master programmes to a large audience through advertisements and specific participations in study fairs. Both programmes figured on all advertising material (programme brochure, advertisements, website, etc.) issued by the IES. In order to streamline its marketing and recruitment activities, the IES employed a communication specialist: in the last quarter of 2011, Marie Tuley started at the IES as External Communication, Marketing and Recruitment Officer. Marie started redrafting and updating all recruitment materials, and was instrumental in writing a communication and recruitment strategy for the IES.

The Institute was also present at The Economist/European Voice ‘European Study Fair’ on 12 February 2011, organised in Brussels at the Crown Plaza Hotel. The Study Fair attracted over 600 interested students. Due to enhanced collaboration between the IES, Vesalius College and the International Relations and Mobility office of the VUB, the Institute was also able to market its programmes abroad, at study fairs in the Netherlands, Germany, Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey and China. It also embarked on a study fair in the UK.
Specifically targeted advertisements were placed in a special study supplement of the European Voice and the Economist. To optimise the costs/benefits ratio, part of these advertisements were shared with other departments of the VUB and/or with Vesalius College.

In 2011, the IES continued to invest in its online marketing strategy. The Institute uses analytical tools to constantly monitor which advertisement investments are worthwhile, thereby successfully adapting the online strategy on a continuous basis.

e. Alumni

Over the past year, the Institute invested a lot of resources into tracing and contacting its alumni. A database of alumni was set up in 2010. Updating this database proved to be an enormous endeavour that finally bore fruit by the end of 2011. To celebrate the 40th anniversary of LLM programme in 2012 an event was planned and consequently all alumni were contacted in the run-up to the celebration.

Through online forms and telephone calls, students of last year’s graduation (2010/2011) were contacted in order to figure out what professional activity they have undertaken since their studies at the IES. 18 out of 31 alumni responded: two are currently still looking for a job and two others continued studying (one in our EuroMaster programme). The fourteen others have jobs in law firms (4), international organisations (amongst which the EU) (5), academia (2) or consultancy firms [PriceWaterhouseCooper, Darts-IT India, EU Issue Tracker] (3).

As the EuroMaster programme is an evening programme, most students already have a job. Of the respondents to our survey, most alumni declared that they were still working at the same organisation as when starting the master programme (of which a number at the European Commission). It is as yet not clear if the programme helped them advance their career at their current employer. This will be subject of another more targeted survey in the course of 2012.
During the period 4-15 July 2011, the EDU conducted the 8th Inter-University Summer School on the European Decision Making Process, which took place for one week in Brussels and one week in Vienna. The Summer School is organised in cooperation with the University of Vienna and the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna. This year, nine students from seven different countries participated. The students had a very intensive week in Brussels encompassing various lectures on the theory and practice of EU decision making given by Christine Neuhold from Maastricht University, the EDU team (Amelia Hadfield, Alina Christova and Alexandra Mihai), Jamal Shahin, Alison Woodward, Irina Tanasescu, Ruben Lombaert and Frank van Loock from the European Commission. This was complemented by visits to the EU institutions.

During the second week in Vienna, the students attended lectures of Hubert Isak, Werner Neudeck, Gerhard Hafner and Stefan Lehne and also visited the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights. The highlight of the Summer School were the two days, during which the students simulated, under the auspices of Alina Christova and Anthony Antoine, Council negotiations regarding a pandemic of avian influenza threatening Europe and a crisis management scenario in a fictional country in Northern Africa. The Summer School concluded with very positive feedback from the participants.
Doctorates

In 2011, four PhD researchers in the European Foreign and Security cluster and one researcher in the Information Society Cluster have successfully defended their PhD theses.

On 7 June, Anna Rudakowska defended her thesis Do values matter in the EU's relations with China and Taiwan? The arms embargo debate (2003-2005). Her promoter was Bruno Coppieters.

The EU presents its external policies as being guided by core values, such as democracy and human rights. This self-representation of the EU as a normative power is put to a particularly hard test by Anna in its relations with China and Taiwan. For a great many scholars, economic calculations constitute the main factor shaping European decisions in this area, while ideational factors may be dismissed as 'empty talk' or mere 'window-dressing'.

On 16 May, Hongyu Wang defended his thesis on European Trade Policy Making as an Exchange of Goods between Public and Private Actors in Multilevel Networks. Hongyu had been a student at the VUB in 2009 and worked at the IES for most of 2010. He defended his thesis at Renmin University (Beijing, China) and obtained a joint VUB-Renmin PhD. His promoter was Bruno Coppieters.

His thesis on trade negotiations and anti-dumping legislation in the EU analysed the institutional power of EU public and private actors with a case study on the EU anti-dumping policy towards Chinese footwear (2005-2009). Dr. Wang now works as a lecturer at Renmin.

On 15 June, Alexander Mattelaer defended his thesis entitled Planning, Friction, Strategy: The Politico-Military Dynamics of Crisis Response Operations. Sparking much interest from military and policy officials, as well as senior academics in the field, and under the auspices of his promoters Gustaaf Geeraerts and Sven Biscop, Alexander successfully defended his PhD on 15 June.

Focusing on crisis response operations by European armed forces, Alexander investigated how strategy is made and how crisis response operations can deliver the desired political effects, as like all military operations, these undertakings are guided by political objectives. However, unlike conventional warfare, their objective is not to defeat an adversary but to install a minimum level of security and stability. Drawing on the work of Carl von Clausewitz and the strategic studies tradition, he argues that strategy is the product of the operations planning process, which represents an iterative politico-military dialogue characterised by omnipresent friction. Planning enables the formulation of a rational intent behind military operations whereas friction provides
IES researcher Sigrid Winkler successfully defended her PhD thesis on 4 July on *A Question of Sovereignty? The EU’s Policy on Taiwan’s Participation in International Organizations* (promoter Prof. Dr. Bruno Coppieters).

Her thesis tackles the question of how the EU deals with Taiwan’s efforts to take part in a number of international organisations, despite the European ‘one China’ policy. None of the EU member states recognise Taiwan as a sovereign country as they all have mutually exclusive diplomatic relations with the People’s Republic of China. While the EU eyes Taiwan’s approaches towards international organisations with the suspicion of trying to establish itself as a fully-fledged sovereign and independent state, Taiwan is also a sufficiently established international trade partner that cannot be left out of the international system without endangering fundamental EU interests. From an EU perspective, Taiwan’s problematic sovereignty is the overarching problem when trying to formulate support for Taipei’s participation in international organisations.

In order to better categorise Taiwan’s international status as well as its foreign policy strategies, Sigrid introduces in her research an innovative tripartite conceptualisation of sovereignty: international legal sovereignty based on the recognition of statehood; domestic sovereignty, understood as a domestic government’s authority and control over its own territory and population; and functional sovereignty, meaning the ability of a non-recognised state to conduct international relations, but usually only on specific issues. Viewing sovereignty from this perspective not only helps to explain the EU’s stance on Taiwan’s quest for greater participation in international organisations – Sigrid also uses it to analyse the factors most likely to shape EU policy on Taiwan’s efforts in several case-studies.

In the case-studies of the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA) and the World Health Organization (WHO), Sigrid studies six factors that shape European policy on Taiwan’s participation in international organisations. Two of these factors are internal to the EU: its own decision-making processes and its interest in Taiwan’s participation in particular international organisations. Four external factors also influence EU policy: the membership criteria of the international organisations in question; changes in the Taiwanese campaign in relation to these organisations; the Chinese position, and the role of the United States.

After her PhD defence, Sigrid stayed at the IES for three further months of postdoctoral research, which she now continues as a recipient Taiwan Fellowship granted to her by the Taiwanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. For this purpose, she has left Brussels and now conducts her work from the Centre for Chinese Studies at the National Central Library in Taipei, Taiwan.
On 4 October 2011, Ben Van Rompuy successfully defended his PhD entitled *Is Economic Efficiency the Be-All and End-All of Modern Antitrust Enforcement? The past, current, and future role of non-efficiency considerations in the application of Article 101 TFEU*.

The European Commission’s recent attempts to redefine the objectives of EU antitrust policy signals how an exclusive economic efficiency approach, which has come to dominate US antitrust law thinking, is gradually taking hold in Europe. Ben’s dissertation examines how this development is affecting the role of non-efficiency considerations (such as cultural policy considerations, environmental considerations, and consumer protection considerations) in the application of Article 101 TFEU.

By tracing the genesis of the exclusive efficiency approach to EU antitrust enforcement - through the unique combination of a theoretical, EU/US comparative, and law in context perspective – his dissertation uncovers several misconceptions that underpin it. An in-depth analysis of the European Commission’s Article 101 TFEU decisional practice related to the audiovisual sector add a vertical dimension to Ben’s research. Two case studies illustrate how the European Commission has taken into account considerations (1) related to the specific characteristics of sport and its societal function and (2) about access to content by final consumers when it enjoyed the exclusive competence to exempt restrictive agreements under Article 101(3) TFEU.

Under the new enforcement regime of Regulation 1/2003, however, Article 101(3) TFEU became a directly applicable legal exception. Since 2004, national competition authorities and national courts can also apply this provision. In order to avoid that parochial considerations would be read in Article 101(3) TFEU, the European Commission issued guidelines that advocate an interpretation of this exception that narrows its scope to an efficiency defence. This is a notable example of how the relatively new slogan ‘the antitrust rules seek to enhance economic efficiency and consumer welfare’ is affecting the substantive interpretation of EU antitrust law.

In his dissertation, Ben argues that a one-sided efficiency based reconstitution of EU antitrust law doctrine is inconsistent with the case law of the EU courts and the demands of the Treaty. Contrary to what the Commission proclaims, the objectives structure of EU antitrust policy is still very much in a state of flux. Furthermore, he challenges the mainstream thinking that the European Commission’s narrower interpretation of Article 101(3) TFEU marginalises the role of non-efficiency considerations. Using rigorous analysis, the dissertation uncovers that there remains ample scope to give weight to non-efficiency considerations. Firstly, the Commission shows great flexibility in allowing firms to ‘translate’ non-efficiency benefits into an efficiency value. Secondly, six alternative methodologies are identified that have been used by the Commission and/or the EU courts to take non-efficiency considerations (surreptitiously) into account. Hence, Ben contends that the key problem lies elsewhere: the Commission’s new approach and the continued presence of alternative methodologies obfuscate the role of non-efficiency considerations. He therefore suggests an alternative approach to resolve the tension between efficiency and non-efficiency values in the future application of Article 101 TFEU.

After defending his doctoral thesis, Ben went to Washington, DC as a postdoctoral visiting fellow at the Georgetown University Law Center. He furthered his research on the evolving role and purposes of EU and US antitrust law in an international context and prepared a monograph based on his doctoral dissertation. For his stay at Georgetown Law, Ben was awarded the Francqui Foundation Fellowship of the Belgian American Educational Foundation (B.A.E.F.). He also served as a consultant on international antitrust matters for the Federal Trade Commission.
The IES constitutes the focal point for training on European integration and teaching of European Studies at the VUB. Through the Educational Development Unit (EDU), the IES provides a number of academic services, stimulating academic and public discussion on topical European issues by drawing on its in-house research expertise.

The EDU supports the Institute for European Studies (IES) by overseeing training, teaching and blended learning at both undergraduate and graduate levels on all aspects of EU integration. The EDU blends its decade of experience in high-quality best practice classroom teaching and training with cutting-edge blended learning in the form of online EU modules. This allows the EDU to expand both its range of teaching outputs, and its regular value-added training to support the full range of IES activities.

In terms of resources, the EDU also captures both the cluster-specific talents of the IES and the policy expertise of the new range of Senior Associates and EuroMaster lecturers to boast new projects like the IES Wednesday Webinars, and strengthen the content of its teaching and training activities. The EDU can therefore offer teaching, training and blended learning on a wide range of EU topics: everything from institutions and decision-making, to law, and public and foreign policy.

EDU outputs are crucial for the IES in terms of acting as a linchpin between policy-makers, scholars, stakeholders and the general public on the one side, and the academic work undertaken by IES scholars on the other. The IES thus provides a working viable form for the cluster content of the IES including environment and sustainable development; EU foreign and security policy; migration, asylum and diversity; information society; and economics.

Teaching

EDU is involved in undergraduate and graduate teaching, from individual lectures and seminars, to term-length modules, an annual summer school and a new post-graduate certificate. EDU teaching is either a permanent feature within the IES, or (increasingly) commissioned by local and international external higher education institutes (HEIs).

- **Hendrix**: The EDU taught a group of 10 students in 2011 for Spring Semester, teaching a 15-week EU REDUX course covering EU institutions, policies and decision-making; overseeing the Orientation week in tandem with Vesalius College, coordinating Final Paper supervision and presentation.

- **Summer School on EU Policy Making**: The IES welcomed nine students in 2011 for two weeks (4 July - 15 July 2011): the first in Brussels with intensive lectures on the EU, plus visits to the EU institutions, followed by another week in Vienna for more lectures and a visit to the EU Agency for Human Rights in Vienna and two simulation games on Council negotiations in the area of foreign policy and health policy. In late 2011, the Summer School received accreditation equivalent to 5 ECTS credits.

- **University of Kent Brussels (UKB)**: The EDU expanded into graduate teaching by offering a 12-week European Public Policy course during autumn 2011. This included presenting 12 lectures, 12 seminar sessions, running a final EPP simulation game as well as offering support for the term essay and final exam.

- **Vesalius College**: Alongside the IES, the EDU successfully assisted Vesalius College (VeCo) in gaining NVAO accreditation for a new MSc in European Union Policy which places the EDU squarely in the role of chief service provider, entailing the offering of EU Redux course, coordinating thesis supervision, providing a brand new ‘IES Lecture Series’ module, and ensuring overall quality assurance for IES-VeCo coordination.
Training

EDU Training involves regular 3-day intensive workshops on the European Union, occasional workshops on related topics (e.g. EU Research Funding), the IES Wednesday Webinar Series on a wide variety of EU topics, and the EDU ‘Decoding the EU’ Webinar Series.

Blended Learning

In 2011, the EDU expanded and upgraded its series of three high-quality EU online modules to five fully-fledged, fully accredited online modules. The content is up-to-date, the audio and visual learning tools allow interactive and creative learning. With future modules on foreign policy, climate change and more in the pipeline, the 5 modules - in tandem with the annual 2-week Summer School - now represent the latest blended learning output of the EDU: Post Graduate Certificate in EU Policy Making.

EDU Grants

Jean Monnet Module: Quo Vadis EU? EU Foreign Policy module taught as a newly permanent 2-term offering within the Euro-Master MSc, includes a weekly lecture and seminar format (3 hours) 4 annual webinars and a final public colloquium both coordinated by the EDU.

EC Lifelong Learning Programme, Jean Monnet Programme 'Learning EU at School': 'Bridging the Gap: Improving EU Teaching'. Piloting its first major Jean Monnet 'Learning EU in Schools' grant, the EDU will spend 2012 engaging with teachers and teacher trainers across western and eastern European teachers to significantly enhance the quality and pedagogy of secondary teaching on the EU. The grant has further strengthened the EDU’s ability to ground its Brussels-based work on pedagogic innovation. Working with a budget of EURO 60,000 for 2012, the grant entails organising the following activities: 2 workshops training teachers on how to teach on the EU in schools; developing an online module and a handbook on the ‘best practice’ skills for teaching EU issues to secondary school pupils; 5 best practice webinars; and 4 two-day workshops held at Belgian-based secondary schools.

PhD Activities

As a direct result of her work, research activities and publications within the EDU, Alexandra Mihai decided in 2011 to undertake a part-time PhD with the VUB. Entitled ‘Teaching Politics and International Relations with Technology? An Analysis of Teaching Practices in Higher Education in the Field of Politics and International Relations’, it will present a series of comparisons between European and American teaching practice in traditional and innovative modes to examine the motivations behind, and uses of technology-driven higher education.
Research
IES Research

In accordance with the *IES Research Strategy* adopted in 2005, research at the Institute focuses on the EU in an international context. It explores EU institutions, policies and law within the context of globalization and international law and politics. Research projects analyse the role of the EU as a global actor as well as the interaction between the internal and external dimensions of EU policies. They also address the inter-relationship between the EU and international organisations.

In implementing its research strategy, the IES aims for an interdisciplinary approach, involving particular legal, economic, social and political expertise. It focuses on forward-looking research that produces results of interest to political decision-makers and the academic community.

While IES research principally embraces a wide range of issues, the Institute focuses its resources on an evolving set of research clusters, which in 2011 included:

- Environment and Sustainable Development,
- European Foreign and Security Policy,
- Migration, Asylum and Diversity,
- Information Society,
- European Economics

These clusters are nurtured by means of launching their own research projects (principally at PhD level) as well as raising funds from external sponsors. One additional unit focuses on educational development through E-learning and training initiatives.

In 2011, the IES launched one new call for PhD projects in the field of Migration, Asylum and Diversity. As a result, one new researcher will start at the beginning of 2012.

Academic Director Sebastian Oberthür and four Senior Research Fellows principally lead research at the IES: Harri Kalimo (Environment & Sustainable Development and Information Society), Eva Gross (European Foreign and Security Policy), Richard Lewis (Migration, Asylum and Diversity) and Amelia Hadfield (Educational Development). Postdoctoral fellows Ilke Adam (Migration), Jamal Shahin (Information Society), Selen Guerin (European Economics) Luis Simon and Alexander Mattelaer (EFSP) assist in the cluster coordination. The cluster structure is subject to revision in the course of 2012.
### Overview of IES Financed Projects and PhD-Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project &amp; Promoter</th>
<th>Start / End</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research cluster Information Society</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online content policy in an EU and international context (promoter: L. Van Audenhove)</td>
<td>Sept 2009 - August 2012</td>
<td>Trisha Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT regulation on the Internet (promoter: Servatius van Thiel / Lieven Denys)</td>
<td>Sept 2009 - August 2012</td>
<td>Marie Lamensch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research cluster Environment and Sustainable Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate policy integration at EU level (promoter: Sebastian Oberthür)</td>
<td>February 2008 - January 2014</td>
<td>Claire Dupont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Liability in the EU: how to fill the gaps (promoter: Paul De Hert)</td>
<td>October 2007 - January 2012</td>
<td>Armelle Gouritin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping in polar seas (promoter: Erik Franckx)</td>
<td>October 2010 - September 2013</td>
<td>Laura Boone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research cluster European Foreign and Security Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Foreign and Security Policy and EU-China relations (promoter: G. Geeraerts)</td>
<td>February 2009 - August 2012</td>
<td>Anna Stahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research cluster Migration and Asylum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Immigration and anti-discrimination policy, and the interaction between these two policy areas (promoter: Patrick Stouthuysen)</td>
<td>January 2008 - February 2012</td>
<td>Hannelore Goeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing the Brain-gain: Cross-border Social Networks in South Asian Migration Trends and Governance Implications in the Global North and South (promoter: Helga De Valk)</td>
<td>October 2009 - September 2011</td>
<td>Neepa Acharya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research cluster EU and China</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The European Union’s Policy towards Greater China (promoter: Bruno Coppieeters)</td>
<td>August 2006 - January 2011</td>
<td>Sigrid Winkler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-private interactions in European Trade policymaking (promoter: Bruno Coppieeters)</td>
<td>February 2010 - January 2011</td>
<td>Honguy Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Values in European Union Policies towards China and Taiwan. (promoter: Bruno Coppieeters)</td>
<td>February 2010 - January 2011</td>
<td>Anna Rudakowska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trade and Foreign Direct investment inflows and outflows in EU (promoter: Luc Hens &amp; Selen Guerin)</td>
<td>November 2010 - October 2013</td>
<td>Cem Tintin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2015

The Strategic Plan 2011-2015 described a number of research objectives:

- Successful completion of at least 10 PhDs (i.e. an average of 2 per year) and launching of at least 12 PhD projects (of which at least 9 on own resources);
- Strengthening IES involvement in national and international research networks;
- Consolidation and strengthening of academic focus areas with thorough review of existing cluster structure;
- Implementation and further development of Guidelines for IES Academic Staff (including guidelines for PhD projects, cluster arrangements at the IES, benchmarking approach for postdoctoral staff);
- Consolidation/increase of external project funding (for research projects and scientific services);
- Fostering cross-cluster collaboration and integration (e.g. by prioritisation of cross-cluster projects);

Successful completion of at least 10 PhDs and launching of at least 12 new projects

The IES was able to award five PhD diplomas in 2011, bringing the total number of IES PhDs to eight. At least three more PhDs are expected to be finalised in the course of 2012. The Institute launched a call for a new PhD project in 2011, and was successful in acquiring an additional PhD project from external resources (FWO).

Strengthening IES involvement in national and international networks

The IES continued its involvement in Belgian and Flemish research networks, i.e. to organise two major international conferences on European Studies. It strengthened its cooperation with the ULB, and was involved in a large number of European projects (in general funded through the European Commission).

Consolidation and strengthening of academic focus areas

Although a revision of the current research clusters is on the agenda for 2012, the IES started preparing this revision through slight modifications in the current structure.

Consolidation / increase of external project funding

In 2011, the IES obtained a record amount of funding through external projects. Over € 650,000 was obtained through grants for research, services and training.

Fostering Cross-cluster collaboration and integration

As a first measure, the call for PhD projects launched in 2011 promoted multidisciplinary research.
# Overview of externally funded projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project &amp; Financing organisation</th>
<th>Start / End</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Compliance Committee of the Kyoto Protocol – German Federal Ministry for the environment, Nature Protection and Nuclear Safety</td>
<td>January 2010 December 2013</td>
<td>Sebastian Oberthür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future of security research – ESF Foresight Report in collaboration with the International Peace Research Institute Oslo</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Peter Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new development cooperation policy with Latin America: focus on social cohesion, regional integration and south-south cooperation – European Parliament DG External Policies of the Union</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Selen Sarisoy Guerin Sebastian Oberthür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Mobility project “Institutionalising EU-Korea Cooperation” – European Commission Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency in collaboration with Institut d’Etudes Politiques de Bordeaux</td>
<td>November 2010 October 2013</td>
<td>Luis Simon Anthony Antoine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance through Regulatory Complexes: The International and European Management of Genetic Resources (promoter: Sebastian Oberthür) - FWO project</td>
<td>October 2008 September 2011</td>
<td>Sebastian Oberthür Justyna Pozarowska Florian Rabitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics Beyond the State III – Representation, coordination and accountability in multilayered settings – Geconcerteerde Onderzoeksactie</td>
<td>January 2009 December 2013</td>
<td>Radostina Primova Ioannis Spyridakis Sebastian Oberthür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Course EC Environmental Law and the Internal Market – European Commission DG Enterprise and Industry</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Harri Kalimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citadel Statement Lecture Series - Coördinatiecel Vlaams e-government (CORVE)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Jamal Shahin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Projects</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad (semester) Programme Hendrix College</td>
<td>January 2011 June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California Summer School</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research cluster:

Environment and Sustainable Development

The Environment and Sustainable Development Cluster covers a wide range of topics with particular emphasis on climate change, various aspects of sustainable production and consumption, energy, biodiversity and the management of genetic resources, trade and the environment, environmental liability and damage, and maritime and marine issues. In doing so, it analyses relevant developments in EU and international law and policy, compares relevant domestic law and policy in the EU and beyond, explores governance arrangements and institutions, and addresses environmental rights.

The cluster consisted in 2011 of two senior researchers - Senior Research Fellow Harri Kalimo and Academic Director Sebastian Oberthür - as well as the Senior Associated researcher Koen van den Bossche. The cluster’s research staff consisted of fifteen people, nine of which were PhD candidates.

Katja Biedenkopf successfully submitted her PhD thesis in November 2011. She studied the external effects of EU environmental policy, focusing on the diffusion of electronic waste policies to the U.S. She got off to a flying post-doc start, as she was chosen for a position at the Free University of Berlin, and from August 2012 she will take up the position of Assistant Professor at the University of Amsterdam. Armelle Gouritin’s doctoral thesis focuses on environmental liability, and she too is aiming to join the ranks of the cluster’s Doctors with her defence foreseen for spring 2012. Claire Dupont’s PhD research, now in its final year and conducted alongside numerous other activities, assesses the integration of climate policy into the EU’s energy policies. FWO-funded researchers Justyna Pozarowska and Florian Rabitz explore the management of genetic resources (access and benefit sharing) - Justyna at the international level (last year) and Florian at EU level (third year). Ioannis Spyridakis and Radostina Primova, who joined the IES in 2009, are both linked to the environment cluster through their PhD projects on policy coordination in the field of energy, which are financed through a concerted research action (GOA) of the VUB (see below). Thuy Van Tran, who also joined in 2009, is researching EU policies in marine environmental protection. Laura Boone’s PhD work focuses on ‘Navigation in the Arctic’. She examines the present-day and future possibilities for (Trans-)Arctic shipping due to climate change, from a legal perspective. As far as non-PhD related research is concerned, Òlöf Söebech occasionally works with the IES, having started her own project on sustainable lifestyles entitled ‘Be everyday’. Her leading role in the development of the CORPUS Web Platform (see below) has now shifted to researcher Alex Daniel. Thomas Sattich has worked as a Visiting Fellow in the cluster throughout the year, analysing the EU’s energy policies. Lisanne Groen, Johanna van Vrede and Veronika Jurcova all helped the cluster as diligent interns during 2011.

Publications

The environment cluster’s research output in 2011 amounted to 1 edited book volume and 17 articles. Four of these articles were in peer-reviewed journals (see the publications list for further details). The cluster also participated in a study for the Development Committee of the European Parliament (see ‘Projects’ below).

Events

The environmental cluster organises a number of recurring and ad hoc events. The IES hosted five Environmental Policy Forums in 2011, which were organised jointly by the IES and the Institute for European Environment Policy (IEEP). The Environmental Policy Forums are a platform for an informed and constructive debate on topical issues of European politics and law among policy-makers, diverse stakeholders and academics. They attract an audience of approximately 25-35 people.

The environmental cluster furthermore co-organised, together with the Fridtjof Nansen Institute (Oslo, Norway), an international workshop entitled ‘Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) Governance after the Nagoya Protocol: Architecture and Actors’, which took place in Oslo in September 2011. This was organised within the framework of the European Concerted Research Action on ‘The Transformation of Global Environmental Governance: Risks and Opportunities (TGE))’ (see below).
Teaching and visibility

The environmental cluster has been continuously active in teaching. Sebastian Oberthür and Harri Kalimo jointly coordinate and teach the course ‘European environmental law in an international context’ as a part of the IES’s master-after-master LLM programme in International and European Law. They also taught a similar course in 2011 to political scientists at the VUB’s sister university, the ULB. Several researchers from the environmental cluster acted as teaching assistants and taught as guest lecturers for classes within these courses, amongst others. Harri’s course ‘EU and the Stakeholders of the Economy’ in the other post-graduate programme of the IES, the EuroMaster, deals with environmental law and policies from the perspective of the internal market and interest representation. Harri also held a two-day high level training session with twenty officials from DG Enterprise and Industry on ‘Environmental law and the Internal Market’. In addition, the cluster’s researchers lectured in the IES’ training ‘EU in close-up’ and made a large number of public appearances as keynote speakers, panelists and conference participants. Koen van den Bossche also lectured on the course on public international law at Vesalius college.

Projects

The environment cluster was involved in various externally funded projects during 2011. The German Environment Ministry continued to support the work of Prof. Oberthür as a member of the enforcement branch of the Compliance Committee of the Kyoto Protocol. In collaboration with the Ecologic Institute in Berlin, Sebastian Oberthür, Justyna Pozarowska and Florian Rabitz also conducted a study on Intellectual Property Rights on Genetic Resources and the Fight against Poverty for the Development Committee of the European Parliament (under a framework contract coordinated by the Ecologic Institute). The IES was also added to the ‘AMI list’ for short-term projects called for by DG Env and DG Clima.

There are also two PhD projects funded by the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO), on ‘Governance through Regulatory Complexes: The International and European Management of Genetic Resources’ (2008-2012), as well as another two within the framework of a concerted research action (GOA) on ‘Politics beyond the State III: Representation, coordination and accountability in multilayered settings’. This GOA project is executed jointly with the politics department of the faculty of economics, social sciences and political science and financed by the VUB (see above under personnel).

Linking the activities in the environmental and information society clusters, the IES Team further developed the online knowledge brokerage Web platform in the FP7 Project CORPUS in 2011, which the IES team had created and launched in 2010. The platform initiates, nurtures and researches the interactions between policy-makers, scientific researchers, civil society and industry in three key areas of sustainable consumption: mobility, housing and food. The site has so far created a very healthy user base of over 650 experts, and registered over 73,000 page views over the first 18 month’s with an average of 500 visits per week.

The cluster continued in 2011 its active collaboration with Yale University School of Forestry and Environmental Studies and its leading role in an INSEAD lead project on individual producer responsibility. The IES is also a member of the European Concerted Research Action on ‘The Transformation of Global Environmental Governance: Risks and Opportunities (TGEG)’ (COST Action ISO802). The COST Action receives funding through the European Science Foundation (ESF) for its networking activities. It became operational in October 2008 and is scheduled to run for a period of four years (i.e. until September 2012). Sebastian Oberthür serves on the management committee of the Action. In addition, Koen van den Bossche was successful in listing the environmental cluster as subcontractor in two FP projects.
The focus areas of the Migration and Diversity Cluster in 2011 included immigrant integration policies (from the European to the local level), return migration, accommodation for minority religions, European identity and racism; intersectionality, i.e. the interrelation between multiple forms of discrimination (race/ethnicity, gender, religion, residence status, nationality, sexual orientation, class or disability) and international criminal law.

The cluster operates under the joint leadership of Post-Doctoral Researcher Ilke Adam with Senior Research Fellow Richard Lewis in a supporting role. During 2011 the cluster included one part time (non-contractual) Senior Research Fellow (Richard Lewis), one post-doctoral researcher (Ilke Adam), one associated research-professor (Alison Woodward), three doctoral candidates (Hannelore Goeman, Neepa Acharya and Mathias Holvoet), two visiting researchers (Karolina Babicka, Charles University Prague, March-September; Medlir Mema, George Washington University, Full Bright Scholar) and two interns (Sara Andersson, January; Sylvia Sanchez Villa, May-July).

Publications

The migration and diversity cluster’s research output in 2010 was in total: two edited book volumes, three articles, six book chapters, one research report and several policy papers and opinion pieces on websites and in the media (see publication list at infra).

Events

The Migration and Diversity cluster hosted two policy fora in 2011. These fora are a platform for an informed and constructive debate on migration and diversity related issues in the EU. A first Policy Forum, entitled, ‘Reasonable accommodation of Religion in the Workplace’ was organised on 29 March 2011, in cooperation with Law faculty of the VUB. The debate was related in the press (MO-magazine). A second Policy Forum, entitled ‘The European Modules on Migrant Integration: A Source of Inspiration for the Member States’, was organised on 21 October 2011. This event was organised in cooperation with the Belgian National Contact Point for Integration and CEDEM (University of Liège) and followed the publication of a draft Commission’s proposal on European modules on immigrant integration. The events attracted a broad public of Brussels based practitioners and researchers.

In 2011 the cluster (Mathias Holvoet and Medlir Mema) also prepared for a Policy Forum series on the International Criminal court, to take place in the early spring of 2012, at the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Court. Ilke Adam also prepared the co-organisation (with ULB) of an international conference on reasonable accommodation for religion in Belgium and Canada (to take place on 26-27 April 2012).

Teaching and Visibility

The migration & diversity cluster has also been continuously active in teaching, both in IES programs and elsewhere. Alison Woodward continued teaching the course ‘Civil Society Representation and Diversity in Europe’, in the IES master on European Integration and Development. Richard Lewis and Hannelore Goeman both taught courses on migration (policies) in the exchange program of the IES with Hendrix College (Little Rock, Arkansas). Ilke Adam and Hannelore Goeman both taught in the University of Kent Brussels and the IES Joint Master’s course on European Public Policy. Hannelore Goeman further lectured on the history of European integration in the IES ’EU in close-up’ sessions.

Outside the IES programmes, Ilke Adam teaches ‘Introduction to Political Science’ (bilingual bachelor’s degree in Politics, ULB) and Alison Woodward, ‘Gender and Diversity in Politics’ (Master in Politics, VUB). Furthermore, all cluster members were involved in promoting and following-up master’s theses of students in the IES EuroMaster and PILC programmes, and the VUB master’s in law and political science.
The cluster members made a large number of public appearances as key note speakers, and paper presenters in several national and international conferences and seminars, (amongst other) at the following venues in 2011: the IPSA-ECPR Joint Conference in Sao Paulo, the ECPR General Conference in Reykjavik, the European Sociological Association Conference in Genève, the Metropolis Conference in the Acores, the EUSA Conference in Boston. Several interviews in the media also contributed to the cluster’s visibility.

Projects

In 2011, three PhD projects were ongoing in the Migration and Diversity research cluster. Hannelore Goeman (4th year) was in the final stage of writing up her PhD on the constitution of a EU policy on immigrant integration. Neepa Acharya, working on a PhD project on return migration of India’s high skilled professionals obtained the ZEIT-Stiftung Ebelin und Gerd Bucerius ‘Settling into Motion’ fellowship in Migration Studies. This grant will provide additional research support for her project, in particular the possibility to start with long-term field work in India, the UK and the US. Mathias Holvoet joined the cluster in 2011 with a PhD project on the concept of ‘organisational’ for the Purpose of the definition of crimes against humanity in the International Criminal Court Statute, financed by a VUB GOA project. In 2011, the IES launched a call for proposals for a new PhD candidate who would join the migration cluster in January 2012. Mathijs Van Dijk was selected for this position, with a project on inter-organisational relations in the EU external governance of migration.

Cluster members actively participated in submitting several collective research grant proposals in 2011. Alison Woodward was successful for a participation proposal for the Flemish ‘Steunpunt Gelijk Kansen Beleid’, and was admitted to a second round for the set up of an Inter-University Attraction Pole.
Researchers that are part of the cluster ‘European foreign and security policy’ develop and carry out projects that concern the role of the EU as a global actor in the areas of foreign and security policy. These projects analyse European foreign policy in terms of decision-making processes, strategy development, evolving civilian and military crisis management capabilities, and EU engagement with the emerging powers (China in particular). Members of the cluster closely collaborate with other universities and think tanks for joint research initiatives as well as the dissemination of results.

The research cluster is led by Senior Research Fellow (SRF) Prof. Dr. Eva Gross, and consists of two postdoctoral researchers (Dr. Luis Simon and Dr. Alexander Mattelaer) and three PhD researchers (Anna Stahl, Amelia Padurariu and Gjovalin Macaj). In addition, the cluster is supported by ten additional researchers from within and beyond the VUB (IES Researchers Alina Cristova, Amelia Hadfield and Peter Burgess; Associate Researcher Joachim Koops, Susan Penksa, Dominik Tolksdorf, Anna Rudakowska, Hongyu Wang and Sigrid Winkler; Visiting Fellow: Stefanie Weil).

2011 was a very successful academic year for four members of the cluster in particular: Alexander Mattelaer, Sigrid Winkler, Anna Rudakowska and Hongyu Wang who successfully defended their PhD theses. Consequently, Alexander Mattelaer became postdoctoral researcher and Sigrid Winkler, Anna Rudakowska and Hongyu Wang all became Senior Associate Fellows.

Publications

With regard to publications, the cluster collectively published four IES books and one IES working paper; two single-authored and two co-edited books; six peer reviewed journal articles; three book chapters and six policy-relevant articles or working papers.

Events

In 2011 the cluster organised a number of events. In addition to the four public PhD defenses, members of the cluster organised two policy fora, one lecture series, and a two-day brainstorming seminar on the European Security Strategy that was co-organised with the Egmont Institute and the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As in years previous, 2011 thus witnessed ongoing and increasing collaboration with other research institutes in the VUB, the Brussels policy community and think tanks such as the European Policy Center (EPC), the Egmont Institute, and the EU Institute for Security Studies.

Members of the cluster were also occupied with the dissemination of research results at academic conferences. Members of the cluster attended the International Studies Association (ISA) Annual Conference in Montreal, the European Union Studies Association (EUSA) Conference in Boston and the University Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES) Conference in Cambridge and presented a number of academic papers. In addition, members of the cluster attended academic and policy-relevant workshops in Norway, Italy, Germany, China, India, South Korea and the United States.

Teaching and educational services

Members of the cluster remained active in the areas of teaching and educational services. In the area of educational services and teaching, Eva Gross convened a postgraduate course at the University of Kent: Brussels School of International Studies (BSIS) on European Foreign and Security Policy. The IES also hosted 8 undergraduate students for a course on ‘Contemporary Issues in European Foreign and Security Policy’ in the framework of the five-week USC summer school programme that was taught by Dr. Luis Simon. Luis Simon also taught a segment on ‘EU foreign and security policy’ for the IES Hendrix programme and delivered a guest lecture at the Belgian Royal Military Academy. Alexander Mattelaer taught a course at Vesalius College and contributed several guest lectures to
the Jean Monnet foreign policy module ‘Quo Vadis EU’ organised by the IES Educational Development Unit (EDU). He also delivered guest lectures at the Belgian Royal Military Academy and the European Security and Defence College.

Projects

The cluster continued its engagement in externally funded projects. In 2011 these included the organisation of a summer school programme for the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California (USC), Los Angeles; and the coordination of the IEKC consortium, which runs from 2011 to 2014, and which aims to promote student and staff exchanges between the EU and the Republic of Korea. In 2011 the IES received three South Korean students and in turn sent three members of staff to Seoul in 2011.

Research

The cluster engaged in a number of timely and innovative research projects. In addition to the four finished and ongoing PhD theses, members of the cluster engaged in research on the European External Action Service; European grand strategy; and transatlantic cooperation in conflict prevention and crisis management.
The Information Society cluster at the IES carries out research on legal and policy aspects of the information society and knowledge economy. Its vision is to provide high-quality research, education and academic services in two central areas:

1. the EU internal market,
2. public service governance,

for digital media services, information and communication technologies and electronic communications in a global context. Topics raised through the cluster’s activities include: public service broadcasting, taxation of digital services, copyright enforcement, public administration reform and participation (eGovernment and eParticipation), research and development policy, innovation policy, competition policy and global governance of telecommunications.

During the course of 2011, the cluster consisted of fourteen researchers. Four of these were senior researchers: Dr. Karen Donders, Professor Dr. Harri Kalimo, Dr. Jamal Shahin, and Dr. Ben Van Rompuy. Junior Researchers Marie Lamensch and Trisha Meyer completed the in-house team. Rami Nisillä, Babacan Tasdemir and Avinash Dadhich were Visiting Researchers during this period. Elena Azcue Fito and Eva Kubrichtova were interns during 2011. Additionally, Professor Dr. Doris Hildebrand (teaching in the IES EuroMaster Programme), Dr. Julia Glidden and Renato Botti (Associate Researchers) contributed to the Information Society Cluster in 2011, providing input for specific activities of the cluster. Dr. Donders, Professor Dr. Kalimo and Dr. Shahin were in charge of cluster management in 2011.

Dr. Karen Donders published a monograph on Public service media and policy in Europe with Palgrave Macmillan in 2011 and, furthermore, published widely on European competition and media policies. She also acted as an advisor to the Flemish Minister responsible for media policy and organised a Jean Monnet conference on 20 years of private television. In July 2011, Karen took up a Postdoctoral Fellowship financed by the FWO in the VUB’s SMIT research environment.

Prof. Dr. Harri Kalimo has continued to work on the EU-funded CORPUS project. In 2011 Harri also taught and became the Programme Director of the IES’s LLM in International and European Law. Dr. Jamal Shahin directs research in the Cluster on public service governance, and focuses on eGovernment, public participation, and global governance of telecommunications in his research. The cross-cluster EUPERFORM research activity also featured heavily in Jamal’s work, as publication of the Special Issue of the Journal of European Integration took place in 2011.

Dr. Ben Van Rompuy finalised his PhD on non-efficiency considerations in the application of the EU antitrust rules. The defence took place in 2011. Ben has been working as a BAEF visiting scholar to Georgetown University in Washington and an antitrust consultant for the American Federal Trade Commission, in so doing, adds to the EU internal market research in the cluster.

Researcher Marie Lamensch, who joined the IES in 2009, has made considerable progress on her PhD, which critically evaluates current taxation legislation for e-commerce.

Trisha Meyer, who also joined the IES in 2009, has continued work on her PhD, which deals with the copyright infringement regimes in France and the United Kingdom, and, in addition, places these regimes within the context of emerging EU policies in this area. Both Marie and Trisha have presented their work at international conferences, and published academic articles this year.

Eva Kubrichtova joined the cluster in September 2011 as an intern, helping out with the lecture series that ran in the second half of 2011. Elena worked with Trisha Meyer at the Institute over the summer, and our Visiting Researchers Babacan, Rami and Babacan further developed their PhD research respectively on Competition law, Information Society policy and R&D policy in the EU.
Publications

The information society cluster’s research output in 2011 was in total 14 articles and one monograph (see publication list at infra).

Events

The information society cluster organised a number of events in 2011. Together with SMIT and IBBT, Karen Donders organised a large conference on ‘20 years of television without frontiers and beyond: private television in Europe.’ The conference, 28-29 April 2011 in Brussels, hosted a number of presentations on the evolution and future challenges of private television (in terms of content, markets and policies) in Europe. This was financially supported by the Jean Monnet programme. Furthermore, the IES hosted two Policy Forums organised by Marie Lamensch (Data Protection) and Trisha Meyer (Intellectual Property Rights). The cluster also coordinated the IES/Citadel Statement Lecture Series in Autumn of 2011 on ‘Government in the EU.’ This ten-lecture series aimed to develop interest in and attention to the European policy debates on eGovernment. It was supported by the Flemish Government’s CORVE (Coordination Unit for eGovernment) and the Flemish Minister Vice President Geert Bourgeois. Work will continue in this field in 2012 with a seminar on Open Data, European governance and local implications, to take place in the first half of the year. All events were well attended, with approximately 30-40 participants at each Policy Forum.

Teaching and Visibility

Harri Kalimo lectured on EU economic and environmental law and policy, EU and US interstate trade law, and interest representation in the IES’s LLM in International and European Law and Advanced Master in European Integration and Development. Jamal Shahin has been an active lecturer in the IES’s EU in Close Up and actively contributed to the organisation of the EDU seminar on social media in the EU institutions. Additionally, he acted as a thesis supervisor in the framework of the IES’s Advanced Master in European Integration and Development and sat on the jury of a PhD at the VUB. He has also been involved in several activities external to the IES in his specific research areas, notably in Oman and Croatia as well as in the European Union’s institutions (see his one page description). Trisha Meyer taught several guest lectures on her thesis topic and has acted as a Bachelor thesis supervisor in the VUB Communications programme. All members of the cluster have been active in participating in international academic conferences.

Projects

The cluster became a member of the EU-funded project ‘eGovPoliNet’. It is one of eighteen consortium members in a project funded by the European Commission under the Seventh Framework Programme. It is designed to set up an international community in ICT solutions for governance and policy modelling. This international community of researchers and practitioners will share and advance research and insights from practical cases around the world. To achieve this, eGovPoliNet builds on experiences accumulated by leading actors bringing together the innovative knowledge of the field. Furthermore, Marie Lamensch worked on a study for the French Prime Minister’s office in the context of a financial transaction tax proposed at the G20 summit in the second half of 2011. The cluster continued to work on the horizontal research project EURFORM, focusing on the role of the EU in the International Telecommunication Union. Finally, Harri’s work in the Information Society Cluster focused on managing the EU-funded CORPUS project in 2011. Linking the activities in the environmental and information society clusters, the IES Team of Harri Kalimo, Ólöf Söebech, Alexander Daniell, Klaas Chielens and Jamal Shahin continued to develop the knowledge brokerage Web platform that they developed and launched a year earlier.
Institute for European Studies

Research cluster:

Economics

The aim of the economics cluster at the IES is to enhance our understanding of the mechanisms of EU economic integration and its impact both at home and abroad. As the world’s largest economic and trading bloc, the EU27 is a powerful economic actor and its economic policies have insurmountable effect on trade and investment with other countries, as well as the development objectives of developing countries. While engaging in research on several aspects of the EU’s external economic actions, the current focus of the economic cluster is the EU’s common commercial policy. Research interests include the impact of the EU’s trade and investment on EU competitiveness and the impact of the EU’s external trade and investment policies on developing countries.

In 2011 the cluster consisted of one post-doctoral researcher and a PhD researcher. The post-doctoral researcher, Selen Sarısoy Guerin, joined IES in 2009 and her research covers several aspects of EU’s trade and investment policy, including bilateral relations with South Korea, India, ASEAN, Japan, Taiwan, Canada, Turkey and the GCC. With the recent addition of investment to the EU competencies under its common commercial policy, her research has expanded to examine the impact of bilateral investment treaties on the EU27. Selen was on study leave at the Research Department of the National Bank of Belgium for the final three months of 2011, where she carried out research on investment behaviour of multinationals and its impact on EU competitiveness. Cem Tinant joined the Economics cluster of the IES as a PhD researcher in October 2010. His PhD thesis is going to consist of four different essays under the theme of ‘Foreign Direct Investment and International Trade within a global and EU context’.

Publications and Conferences

The economics cluster was the coordinator of a study commissioned by the Development Committee of the European Parliament at the beginning of the year. This was an interdisciplinary study on the impact of the EU’s trade, migration, climate change and agriculture policies on the EU’s development objectives (in collaboration with Sevidzem Kingah and Christiane Gerstetter). The study had an emphasis on the EU’s trade policy and its impact on poverty reduction in the least developed countries. Later in the year, the cluster produced a new publication -as part of the IES book series- on the economic aspects of Turkey’s EU membership negotiations, an aspect that is often overlooked in the media. As well as co-editing the volume with Ioannis Stivachtis (Virginia Tech), Selen contributed two chapters on foreign direct investment in Turkey and the future of Turkey’s telecommunications sector. Cem Tinant published a paper in 2011 ‘Analyzing the Structure and Efficiency of Research and Development Activities in Turkey’ in Verimlilik Dergisi (the Quarterly Journal of Productivity). Finally, the cluster contributed a study to the IES working paper series that analysed the impact of international investment agreements and domestic law on foreign direct investment outflows.

Attendance at both Belgian and international conferences provided greater visibility of the cluster as well as providing valuable feedback on current research. Both Selen and Cem were actively involved in networking and presenting their work throughout the year. Selen presented her work at the Third Belgian Trade Workshop at ECARES, ULB and at the Annual European Economic Association Meeting in Oslo. In his first PhD essay, Cem looked into the determinants of foreign direct investment inflows in the Central and Eastern European Countries from an institutional approach. Cem completed and presented his paper, i.e. the first chapter of his thesis, at two international conferences (ETSG Conference, Copenhagen-Denmark and ECEE, Tallinn-Estonia) where he had the chance to collect feedback and to interact with other researchers in the same field.

Events

Selen presented the results and recommendations of the study on policy coherence between the EU’s development goals and its trade, migration, climate change and agriculture policies to the Committee on Development of the European Parliament.
She was also a guest speaker at a roundtable discussion in the European Parliament on policy coherence for development (PCD) and trade organised by MEP Birgit Schneiber-Jastram (CDU), the rapporteur of the Policy Coherence for Development. The cluster also had a successful book launch for the book On the Road to EU membership: the economic transformation of Turkey with a keynote speech delivered by Egemen Bagis, the Turkish minister for the EU and chief negotiator.

**Teaching**

Selen contributes to teaching at the VUB and teaches International Trade Policy and Theory as part of the degree programme of the Master of Science in Management. (When Selen was on leave for research at the Research Department of the National Bank of Belgium this course was taught by Luc Hens). Selen is also an occasional lecturer in EU trade and development policy at the IES.

**Media**

Selen gave an interview to the Deutsch Welle TV on the prospects of the EU-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA). The EU-South Korea FTA came into effect on 1 July 2011. It is expected to have significant income- and welfare effects on the EU. Selen was also interviewed by the TRT1 (main Turkish public TV channel) on the current crisis and Turkey’s EU membership.
IES Research Colloquia

During 2011 the IES organised nineteen research colloquia of own research (progress) by IES PhD researchers and visiting fellows.

As a forum for information and discussion, the IES Research Colloquia are held once or twice per month. Attendance is mandatory for all IES researchers, and invitations are sent to interested parties across the campus (depending on the subject). The IES also collaborates with the Central Doctoral programme of the VUB and of the ULB, who integrate part of the IES methodological workshops into their general programme geared towards all VUB & ULB doctoral researchers.

Research Presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb-2011</td>
<td>The EU's foreign and security policy in Africa in the context of the growing international role of China</td>
<td>Anna Stahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-2011</td>
<td>Climate policy integration in the EU</td>
<td>Claire Dupont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar-2011</td>
<td>Between conflict and co-operation: International change, national grand strategy and the future of CSDP</td>
<td>Luis Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Mar-2011</td>
<td>The evolving international institutional complex for access to and benefit sharing from the use of genetic resources</td>
<td>Justyna Pozarowska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Apr-2011</td>
<td>The diffusion of EU environmental regulation</td>
<td>Katja Biedenkopf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Apr-2011</td>
<td>Climate policy integration in the EU</td>
<td>Claire Dupont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar-2011</td>
<td>Between conflict and co-operation: International change, national grand strategy and the future of CSDP</td>
<td>Luis Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Mar-2011</td>
<td>The evolving international institutional complex for access to and benefit sharing from the use of genetic resources</td>
<td>Justyna Pozarowska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Apr-2011</td>
<td>The diffusion of EU environmental regulation</td>
<td>Katja Biedenkopf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Apr-2011</td>
<td>Climate policy integration in the EU</td>
<td>Claire Dupont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar-2011</td>
<td>Between conflict and co-operation: International change, national grand strategy and the future of CSDP</td>
<td>Luis Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Mar-2011</td>
<td>The evolving international institutional complex for access to and benefit sharing from the use of genetic resources</td>
<td>Justyna Pozarowska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Apr-2011</td>
<td>The diffusion of EU environmental regulation</td>
<td>Katja Biedenkopf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Apr-2011</td>
<td>Climate policy integration in the EU</td>
<td>Claire Dupont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar-2011</td>
<td>Between conflict and co-operation: International change, national grand strategy and the future of CSDP</td>
<td>Luis Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Mar-2011</td>
<td>The evolving international institutional complex for access to and benefit sharing from the use of genetic resources</td>
<td>Justyna Pozarowska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Apr-2011</td>
<td>The diffusion of EU environmental regulation</td>
<td>Katja Biedenkopf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Apr-2011</td>
<td>Climate policy integration in the EU</td>
<td>Claire Dupont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar-2011</td>
<td>Between conflict and co-operation: International change, national grand strategy and the future of CSDP</td>
<td>Luis Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Mar-2011</td>
<td>The evolving international institutional complex for access to and benefit sharing from the use of genetic resources</td>
<td>Justyna Pozarowska</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IES Publications

Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2015

In the field of publications, the Strategic Plan 2006-2010 stipulates the following:

- Publication of 25-30 articles in recognised international journals or major book publications per year, on average (with the share of peer-reviewed publications reaching at least one third by 2015);
- Publication of 1-2 books per year on average;
- Publication of 3-4 IES Working Papers per year on average (pending interim review of Working Paper series).

Articles

In line with the strategic plan, the IES published 56 academic articles, of which 13 in peer reviewed international journals. Another 15 papers were published online or in the media, while associate researchers were involved in another 100 publications. In addition, IES scholars published eleven academic books, of which four in the IES book series. A number of book publications outside the IES series were also peer-reviewed.

Book series

The Institute worked on eleven different books in 2011. Four of these were published in the IES book series with VUBPress. The Institute also started negotiations with an international publisher (Palgrave) to start a peer reviewed book series that would have a wider academic impact.

Working Papers

The IES published 4 working papers in 2011, reaching the Strategic Plan’s benchmarks.

Newsletters

Non-academically, the IES also published four Newsletters in 2011, destined to inform the general public about IES activities and research outcomes.
This book offers a comprehensive analysis of the European Union as an International Actor and of its foreign policy of ‘effective multilateralism’ in both theory and practice. The core argument is that the EU has fostered integrative links - not only between states, but more recently also among international organisations. The study highlights the successes and critically examines the weaknesses of the EU’s effective multilateralism with NATO and the United Nations and offers concrete proposals for strengthening the EU as an inter-organisational security actor and Integrative Power in the short- and long-term.

The first part of this study analyses major theories of multilateralism and takes stock of 40 years of scholarship on conceptualising the EU as a distinct foreign policy actor. In this context, this book introduces the new concept of the ‘European Union as an Integrative Power’ as a core feature of the EU’s nature and impact in international affairs.

The second part of the book examines the successes and drawbacks of the EU’s cooperation with NATO and the United Nations in the field of peace, security and international crisis management. With the help of detailed case studies of the EU’s CSDP operations in Macedonia, Bosnia and the Democratic Republic of Congo as well as the first detailed analysis of the EU’s relations with the Standby High Readiness Brigade for United Nations Operations (SHIRBRIG), this study provides a thorough assessment of the integrative as well as adverse impacts of the EU’s approach to EU-NATO and EU-UN ‘effective multilateralism’.

This book will provide a valuable resource for graduate students, academics and practitioners interested in the EU as an International Actor, ‘effective multilateralism’ and the growing phenomenon of inter-organisational relations.
Enlargement is one of the most established policies of the EU, given the success of the past waves of enlargement. Turkish membership of the EU, after more than forty years of discussion, is today a hot topic that has generated many concerns and challenges, at both the EU-level and in national parliaments. Since the beginning of the accession talks in October 2005, this significant debate among politicians, policy-makers and academicians has mostly focused on economic and political factors as well as concerns about Turkey's large and growing population and its questionable record of human rights and democracy. These concerns are closely linked with the potential impact of eventual Turkish membership on EU decision-making as well as the economic costs on the EU budget and EU's absorptive capacity.

Political concerns about Turkish membership, as well as the economic costs of enlargement for the EU, have already generated a vast body of literature. However, there continues to be a lack of information and understanding regarding the economic costs for Turkey.

This book focuses on the experience of Turkey to date in fulfilling its EU membership requirements and its impact on the Turkish economy. It begins by evaluating the economic dimension of the EU-Turkey enlargement negotiations; it follows this discussion by assessing the current strengths and weaknesses of the Turkish candidature by outlining how well Turkey has fared so far; and finally, it details the implications of the accession negotiations for various sectors of the Turkish economy.

This book is of interest to both policymakers and scholars of the EU enlargement process, as it provides an in-depth stock-taking exercise of the economic transformation of Turkey, much of which currently takes place away from media coverage.
EU-Asia relations have steadily moved up the Brussels policy agenda. The rise of China, and the concomitant geopolitical shift this implies, has posed questions about the strength of the EU’s strategic relationships with individual Asian countries. Beyond developing a strategic approach towards individual countries, an increasing number of security challenges in Asia have direct implications on the EU and require appropriate policy responses.

The case for increasing European engagement is strong, not least because the period since the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty has seen the EU improve upon its policy tools that aim to strengthen the Union’s global reach, as well as its capabilities for policy implementation in pursuit of European foreign policy goals. At the same time, EU-Asia relations remain beset by a lack of strategic thinking as to the EU’s policy interests in Asia and the most appropriate tools to pursue them.

This volume seeks to address this gap, and to do so from two vantage points. First, contributors provide assessments of the EU’s strategic interests in Asia, its capacity for action as well as clarity as to the options to address various policy challenges. Second, individual chapters also address Asian views of the EU and ways in which the EU can and should bolster its bilateral and regional engagement in the field of security. Taking account of EU and Asian interests and perceptions, this book offers concrete recommendations on how to strengthen EU engagement with Asia in a changing global context.
A threat against Europe?
Security, Migration and Integration

By Peter Burgess and Serge Gutwirth

The concept of security has traditionally referred to the status of sovereign states in a closed international system. In this system, the state is assumed to be both the object of security and the primary provider of security. Threats to the state’s security are understood as threats to its political autonomy in the system. The major international institutions that emerged after the Second World War were built around this idea. When the founders of the United Nations spoke of collective security, they were referring primarily to state security and to the coordinated system that would be necessary in order to avoid the ‘scourge of war’. But today, a wide range of security threats, both new and traditional, confront Europe, or at least as some would say. New forms of nationalism, ethnic conflict and civil war, information technology, biological and chemical warfare, resource conflicts, pandemics, mass migrations, transnational terrorism, and environmental dangers challenge, according to many, the limits of our ability to safeguard the values upon which European society is based.

This book will provide theoretical and empirical case detail on several primary issues:

First, one form or another of insecurity motivates the movement of migrants into internal displacement or to sometimes-risky trips to other countries. The correlation between the conditions of economic, health, food and military insecurity can be directly correlated with patterns of migration on a regional and global scale.

Second, some people become insecure while they are on the move. This is particularly the case for irregular migrants. Greater risks are being taken by people trying to move illegally from poorer to richer parts of the world, for example crossing the Mexico-United States border or the Mediterranean from North Africa to Southern Europe. A specific category of irregular migrants for whom this is often the case includes the victims of migrant smugglers and human traffickers. Another category of concern in this context includes those who become stranded in transit countries.

Third, certain migrants are also insecure in their destination countries. This is particularly the case of irregular migrants who work illegally and are often subject to exploitation. Often their jobs are dirty, dangerous and difficult, jobs that nationals are unwilling to take. The victims of human trafficking – an important migrant group – are not free to decide on the activities in which they engage. They are often forced into low-paid, insecure and degrading work from which they may find it impossible to escape and for which they receive trivial or no compensation.

Finally, and more generally, many migrants, including those living and working in a regular manner, experience marginalisation or discrimination.
Publications

BOOKS


PEER REVIEWED ARTICLES


Oberthür, S., Shahin, J. and Jørgensen, K. Introduction: Assessing the EU’s Performance in International Institutions – Conceptual Framework and Core Findings. In *Journal of European Integration*, vol.33, no.6, 599-620


**BOOK CHAPTERS**


Donders, K. and Moe, H. 2011. Ex ante tests in Europe: from diverging perspectives to infinite conclusions. In: *Ex ante tests*
in Europe: from diverging perspectives to infinite conclusions, edited by Donders, K. and Moe, H. Göteborg: Nordicom. 9-16


Annual Report 2011


ACADEMIC ARTICLES


Lamensch, M., Carvalho, F.C. and Van Thiel, S. 2011. The VAT exemption for insurance-related services of brokers and agents: The case of a “call center”. In *European Taxation* 1, Vol.51. p.19


Van Rompuy, B. 2011. The European Court of Justice, holding that Italy failed to comply with a Commission’s State aid decision, rules on the status of protocol on internal market and competition (Commission/Italy). In E-Competitions Bulletin, December 2011-I.

**Online publications**


PUBLICATIONS BY IES Associates, PILC and Euromaster Staff

PEER REVIEWED ARTICLES


ACADEMIC ARTICLES


De Hert, P., Quinn, P. and De Hert, P., 2011. The Patients’ Rights Directive (2011/24/EU) - Providing (some) rights to EU


BOOKS and Monographs


URL: http://www.peterlang.com
CONTRIBUTION TO BOOKS


BOOK CHAPTERS


ONLINE PUBLICATIONS


IES WORKING PAPERS

The IES published four of its Working Papers in 2011, see page 57

OTHER WORKING PAPERS


Babicka, K. and Malmström, C. 2011. There is a need for legal migration to the EU. Accessible at: www.migraceonline.cz. 7/2011.


**MEDIA PERFORMANCES**


1. The Relief of Vienna in Vain: Assessing the Implications of Turkish EU-membership for Council of Ministers’ Decision-making

by Gerben Kristian Wedekind

This research paper forecasts the implications of Turkish membership for decision-making effectiveness and dynamics within the Council of Ministers of the European Union (EU). Effectiveness is determined in this research by ‘passage probability’: the chance that a random proposal as put forth by the European Commission (EC) is accepted by the Council of Ministers. Dynamics are determined by means of the Shapley-Shubik Index (SSI), which plots power values of individual member states by forecasting a number of possible EU enlargement scenarios. This study falsifies earlier research by Baldwin and Widgrén. It finds that the implications of Turkish EU-membership for EU decision-making efficiency are ambiguous and depend on the number of other candidate states entering the EU alongside Turkey, as well as the timeslot - 2014 or 2020 - at which the accession would take place. Moreover, this study asserts that Turkish EU-accession would result in unequal - but generally negative - power changes among other EU member states, although member states with similar demographic weight will experience comparable changes. Finally, it appears that the larger a EU member state is, the more power it loses if Turkey joins the EU.

2. The European Commission and International Trade Negotiations: A Principal-Agent Approach

by Amelia Padurariu

Starting from the concept of delegation of power in external trade policy, this paper aims to investigate the dynamics surrounding the European Union’s position in international trade negotiations. The analysis centres on the role of the European Commission (the agent), which, by means of Treaty-based delegation and as mandated by the Council (the principal), acts as the sole trade negotiator in the international sphere on behalf of the European Union (EU). The broader negotiating process is thus conceptualised as a three-level game, where the Commission holds an intermediary position between the European and international levels and also interacts with the Member States in the Council. After an insight into the European decision-making process for external trade, the paper further analyses the Commission’s role during the multilateral trade negotiations of the Doha Development Round. By applying the principal-agent theory to international trade negotiations in general, and subsequently to the controversial agricultural negotiations, this paper seeks to investigate some of the potential sources of autonomy that the Commission can draw upon while upholding an EU position at the international level, in addition to the ‘hardball’ job of balancing the interests of the Member States with those of World Trade Organisation (WTO) partners. Along these lines, the paper finally aims to contribute to the literature concerning agency autonomy in EU external trade relations but also to provide a better understanding of inter-institutional relations within the EU as they may unfold in practice.
3. Answering the Call of the European Court of Justice and Eurofoods: A Proposed Package of Due Process Rights with a View Toward the 2012 Revision of the European Insolvency Regulation

by Alan J. Stomel

This paper anticipates the 2012 revision of the European Insolvency Regulation, which is the sole Union legislation on the subject of cross border insolvency proceedings.

The paper first describes the historical background of the Regulation. The salient point of the historical discussion is that the Regulation is the product of forty years of negotiation and arises from a historical context that is no longer applicable to current economic realities, i.e. it provides for liquidation, not reorganisation, it doesn’t deal with cross border groups of companies, and it lacks an effective mechanism for transparency and creditor participation.

The paper then reviews the unique hybrid jurisdictional system of concurrent universal and territorial proceedings that the Regulation imposes. It looks at this scheme from a practical viewpoint, i.e. what issues arise with concurrent proceedings in two states, involving the same assets, the same creditors, and the same company.

The paper then focuses on a significant issue raised by the European Court of Justice in the Eurofoods case, i.e. the need to comply with fundamental due process principles that, while not articulated in the Regulation, lie at the core of Union law. Specifically, the paper considers the ramifications of the Court’s holding that “a Member State may refuse to recognise insolvency proceedings opened in another Member State where the decision to open the proceedings was taken in flagrant breach of the fundamental right to be heard.”

In response to the Court’s direction, this paper proposes a package of due process rights, consisting principally of an accessible, efficient and useful insolvency database, the infrastructure of which already exists, but the content and use of which has not yet been developed. As part of a cohesive three part due process package, the paper also proposes the formation of cross border creditors’ committees and the establishment of a European Insolvency Administrator. Finally, on the institutional level, this paper proposes that the revision of the Regulation and the development of the insolvency database not only need to be coordinated, but also need to be conceptualised, managed and undertaken, not as the separate efforts of diverse institutions, but as a single, unified endeavour.

JEL codes: D23; F21; F23; F36
IES Newsletters

Successful PhD Defence: Congratulations Dr. Sigrid Winkler

Successful PhD Defence: Congratulations Dr. Ben Van Rompuy

IES moves to Karel Van Miert Building

Three new PhDs!

Newsletter

Newsletter of the Institute for European Studies

Dissertation: "The European Competition Guidelines for the Audiovisual Sector"

Dr. Sigrid Winkler successfully defended her dissertation titled "The European Competition Guidelines for the Audiovisual Sector" at the Institute for European Studies. The dissertation, supervised by Dr. Sigrid Winkler, examines the application of Article 101(3) TFEU in the audiovisual sector, focusing on the role of non-efficiency considerations. Using rigorous analysis, the dissertation uncovers that there remains ample scope to give weight to non-efficiency considerations in the application of Article 101 TFEU. The European Commission issued guidelines that advocate an interpretation of this exception that narrows its scope to an efficiency-based reconstitution of EU antitrust law. Dr. Sigrid Winkler's research highlights the importance of considering non-efficiency factors in antitrust analysis, especially in industries where traditional efficiency-based competition law may be insufficient.

# Successful PhD Defence: Congratulations Dr. Ben Van Rompuy

Dr. Ben Van Rompuy successfully defended his PhD thesis at the Institute for European Studies. His dissertation, supervised by Dr. Ben Van Rompuy, examines the role of planning in conflict prevention. The dissertation argues that planning enables states to reconstitute their objectives and relationships, which is not always easy to digest by everybody. But with a 'flex office' setup, researchers dispose of an environment for the type of work they are doing. The dissertation is not a preparation phase for the "flex office" but a "talking zone" where phone calls can be held.

# Three new PhDs!

Dr. H. Wong, Dr. A. Rudakowska, and Dr. A. Mattelaer successfully defended their PhD theses – congratulations to Dr. Hongyu Wang, Dr. Anna Rudakowska, & Dr. Alexander Mattelaer!

Dr. H. Wong's thesis focuses on the formulation of a rational intent for the arms embargo debate (2003-2005). The thesis explores the role of planning in conflict prevention, showing how states can reconstitute their objectives and relationships in the context of a "flex office" setup.

Dr. A. Rudakowska's thesis examines the use of informal tools in EU foreign and security policy. The thesis provides an in-depth analysis of how informal tools can be used to achieve strategic objectives in the EU's foreign and security policy.

Dr. A. Mattelaer's thesis investigates the role of the EU's Policy on Taiwan's Participation in International Relations. The thesis provides a comprehensive analysis of the EU's approach towards Taiwan, highlighting the challenges and opportunities for the EU in engaging with Taiwan.

# IES moves to Karel Van Miert Building

In March, the IES moved from Pleinlaan 15 to the newly renovated Van Miert Building. The move involved the transportation of reference materials. A total of 5.6 tons in total (all of which was manually moved from the Pleinlaan 15 building and helped us in front of our doorstep on Pleinlaan 15 and helped us in our new location). The moving activities in both buildings were seen as a preparation phase for the "flex office" that academics in the field, and under the auspices of the cluster on the move: Migration & Diversity, Planning, Economics, and Law in Context. The different aspects were: (1) related to the audiovisual sector adds a vertical modality. In the Flex Office setup, researchers dispose of a "talking zone" where phone calls can be held. (2) Successful Grants: EATS Conference in Ljubljana, US Congress in Washington DC, and Networks, including Networks of the Institute for European Studies.

# Three new PhDs!

Dr. H. Wong, Dr. A. Rudakowska, and Dr. A. Mattelaer successfully defended their PhD theses – congratulations to Dr. Hongyu Wang, Dr. Anna Rudakowska, & Dr. Alexander Mattelaer!
Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2015

The Strategic Plan 2011-2015 described a number of objectives in the field of academic services:

- Organise (bi-annually) an international scientific conference
- Organise the Summer School on the European Decision-Making Process;
- Organise 1-2 IES Lecture Series per year (next one in 2012);
- 4-5 IES Policy Fora for an informed and constructive public debate on topical issues of European policy and law per year;
- IES Research Colloquium (approximately 10-12 sessions per year);

Summer School

The IES organised its 8th annual Summer School on the European Decision-Making Process in July 2011. In collaboration with the Diplomatic Academy and the University of Vienna, 10 students from 6 different countries studied one week in Brussels and one week in Vienna (see the chapter on Education for more details). For the University of Southern California, the IES also organised a five-week summer school on European security issues. Nine USC students attended.

Lecture Series

The Institute organised two lecture series: one on ‘The EU as a Diplomatic Actor: Policies, Processes and Performance’ in the spring of 2011 and one on ‘The Citadel Statement - Making Malmo Real: eGovernment in the EU’. Each lecture series consisted of 10 lectures and attracted students, as well as practitioners and general public.

Policy Forum

The IES organised 15 policy fora on various themes, ranging from environmental issues (5 policy fora), migration and human rights (3 policy fora) to security and defence issues (4 policy fora). In the policy fora, scholars and practitioners in the field met to discuss topical subjects in a closed arena. The environmental policy fora were organised in collaboration with the Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP). Some of the security-related policy fora were organised in collaboration with the Global Governance Institute. With 15 policy fora in 2011, the IES tripled its expectations.

Research Colloquium

A total number of 19 research colloquia were held in 2011. Next to the presentation of research findings by IES researchers, the Research Colloquia also featured ‘methodological workshops’. The workshops continue to foster the improvement of quality of research of IES staff (see also the chapter “Research”).

Study Abroad Programme

As in 2010, the Institute organised a ‘study abroad programme’ in cooperation with Vesalius College, i.e. a semester with specifically designed courses on European Decision-Making for Hendrix College (Arkansas, US).
Academic Services

In 2011, the IES organised a total of 65 activities, amongst which two lecture series (one on the EU as a diplomatic actor, and one on the Citadel Statement), each consisting of 10 lectures, 15 policy fora, 19 research colloquia and several thematic lectures and other events. The Institute also organised two Summer Schools, five training sessions and four webinars, and co-organised another lecture series on European Security in collaboration with Vesalius College.

Lecture Series

The lecture series take place on Tuesdays from 18:00 - 20:00 at the Campus of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussels, in room D.2.01 unless otherwise indicated.

Lectures open to all -- Registration mandatory at: www.ies.be/springlectures2011

For full programme and mandatory registration, visit: www.ies.be/autumnlectures2011
Institute for European Studies

The EU as a Diplomatic Actor:
Policies, Processes and Performance

This lecture series examined the European Union’s ability to influence international negotiations, policies and outcomes in a wide range of policy-fields. Whilst the ‘EU as an international actor’ has become a widely studied focus point for an increasing number of scholars, there is still an acute demand for a better understanding of the actual mechanisms, processes and effectiveness of the EU’s diplomatic approach in the international arena.

To this end, the lecture series sought to shed light on the EU’s effectiveness and actual performance in engaging as a diplomatic actor bilaterally or multilaterally in the fields of international security, human rights, environment and climate change, as well as trade and finance. Particular emphasis was placed on the EU’s diplomatic capabilities for generating effective policy outcomes with and within core international organisations and multilateral fora.

To understand the role of the EU as a diplomatic actor, the lecture series aimed to analyse systematically the relevant internal and external processes of the EU and the Union’s actual effectiveness and impact across the aforementioned four policy fields. Furthermore, the series of lectures examined core processes and dynamics of the EU as a diplomatic actor at the individual, the member state, the organisational, the inter-organisational and the external international levels.

The lecture series sought to assess the EU’s actual diplomatic practice and performance during the last decade. The changes brought about by the Lisbon Treaty formed an important aspect and particular focus, including the roles of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the European External Action Service, as well as other changes relating to the external representation of the EU.
**Programme:**

**Tuesday 15 February 2011**  
Introduction to the lecture series by Joachim Koops, Vesalius College & IES

Inter-organisational Aspects of the EU as a Diplomatic Actor by Rafael Biermann, University of Jena

**Tuesday 22 February 2011**  
The European Union as a Diplomatic Actor in the Post-Lisbon Era by Michael Smith, University of Loughborough and Steven Everts, EEAS, Cabinet of High Representative Ashton

**Tuesday 1 March 2011**  
Evaluating the Impact of EU Diplomacy: Pitfalls and Challenges by Niels van Willigen, University of Leiden and Antonio Missiroli, European Commission, Bureau of European Policy Advisers

**Tuesday 8 March 2011**  
The EU’s Diplomatic Engagement in the Security Council and General Assembly by Edith Drieskens, Clingendael Institute & Leuven University and Fernando Andresen Guimardes, European External Action Service

**Tuesday 15 March 2011**  
The Politics of Visibility: the EU’s CSDP Missions as Public Diplomacy by Joachim Koops, Vesalius College & IES and Gabor Horvath, European Union Military Staff

**Tuesday 29 March 2011**  
The EU as a Diplomatic Actor in the Western Balkans by Dominik Tolskendorf, Vesalius College & Global Governance Institute and Tobias Flessenkermer, European Union Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina

**Tuesday 5 April 2011**  
The EU’s Role and Performance within the G20 in light of the Financial Crisis by Peter Debaere, University of Ghent and Joost Korte, Director, Relations with the Council, European Commission

**Tuesday 12 April 2011**  
The European Union as an International Trade Negotiator by Hubert Zimmermann, University of Marburg and Frank Hoffmeister, European Commission, Cabinet of Trade Commissioner De Gucht

**Tuesday 19 April 2011**  

**Tuesday 3 May 2011**  
The ‘one voice’ problématique: a critical assessment of the EU as a Diplomatic Actor at the UN Human Rights Council by Gjovalin Macaj, VUB Department of Political Science & IES and Joëlle Hironnet, European Union Delegation to the United Nations in Geneva

**Tuesday 10 May 2011**  
The EU as an Environmental Actor by John Vogler, University of Keele and Matthias Buck, European Commission, Cabinet of Environment Commissioner Potoznik (Steven Vanackere has canceled his participation in this lecture)

**Tuesday 17 May 2011**  
After Copenhagen and Cancun: Lessons Learned and Ways Ahead for EU Climate Diplomacy by Robert Falkner, London School of Economics and Baptiste Legay, European Commission, DG Climate Action

**Tuesday 24 May 2011**  
Diplomatic Impact in Reverse: The Influence of International Institutions on the EU as a Diplomatic Actor by Oriol Costa, University of Barcelona

The EU Diplomacy in Global Governance: Lessons and Challenges Ahead by Knud Erik Jørgensen, University of Aarhus
On 15 February, this year’s IES Spring Lecture Series on the ‘EU as a Diplomatic Actor: Policies, Processes and Performance’ kicked off with an introductory lecture by one of the co-organisers Joachim Koops, and with a lecture on interorganisational aspects of the EU as a Diplomatic Actor, delivered by Prof. Dr. Rafael Biermann of the University of Jena, Germany.

Joachim Koops explained the rationale for the lecture series and highlighted the importance of examining in more detail the EU’s actual negotiating processes and overall impact across four broad policy-fields: security, finance and trade, human rights and climate change. Given the seismic changes in international politics in these fields (with the financial crisis, the failed climate deal from the Copenhagen conference and the persisting global challenges of international peace and the promotion of human rights), the EU as a whole is required to tackle these issues in a coherent and effective manner. It was underlined that much conceptual and policy-oriented work remains to be done to delve more deeply into the mechanics, pitfalls and actual processes of the EU as a Diplomatic Actor. Leading into Professor Biermann’s lecture, Joachim Koops highlighted a rather neglected, but increasingly pressing issue in international politics: the need to create coherent cooperation schemes between the EU and other organisations.

Prof. Dr. Rafael Biermann’s lecture focused on this specific aspect of the European Union in international affairs: namely, on the competition and cooperation between the EU and other major international organisations, particularly in the field of international security governance. Biermann highlighted, in impressive detail, the dense network and array of cooperation partners with which the EU has had relations since the end of the Cold War. Organisations, such as the Council of Europe, the United Nations, the OSCE and NATO are not only potential cooperation partners, but also major rivals competing over resources and over the attention of member states. At the end of the lecture it became clear that if the EU wants to play an effective and coherent role in International Diplomacy, it needs to find ways to harness interorganisational rivalries and promote coherent cooperation schemes between itself and other organisation partners.

On 22 February, professor Michael H. Smith from Loughborough University delivered an inspiring lecture on ‘The European Union as a Diplomatic Actor in The Post-Lisbon Era: Robust or Rootless Hybrid?’ Professor Smith first pondered the question of what constitutes a diplomatic actor and the changing context within which these actors operate, before moving to conceptualising the EU as a diplomatic actor. Professor Smith argued that many of the activities of the EU are diplomatic in nature and the EU constitutes a diplomatic system in and for itself, yet the EU continues to struggle with issues of representation, coherence and consistency. The intense internal coordination and diplomacy continues to affect the effectiveness and adaptability of the EU in the world of 21st century diplomacy.

Professor Smith’s lecture was followed by a very stimulating intervention by Dr. Steven Everts from the Cabinet of the High Representative Ashton. Dr. Everts gave an overview of the ongoing efforts in the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty and the creation of the European External Action Service whilst stressing the importance of getting the active support and engagement of all Member States. Dr. Everts argued that it is of vital importance for its success to conceive the EEAS as co-owned and co-shaped by the Member States rather than it having very little impact on issues of external representation. The Lisbon Treaty tried to bring together Defence, Development, and Diplomacy, and one of the key questions posed in the room were: are these 3Ds enough to characterise foreign policy in today’s world? Furthermore, Dr. Everts stressed the importance of identifying key strategic partners for the realisation of EU objectives and established a clear and limited number of priorities in order to be successful in the 21st century.

On 1 March 2011, Niels van Willigen and Antonio Missiroli spoke at the third lecture evening, where the subjects of negotiation and diplomacy were raised. Niels van Willigen discussed an assessment of the performance of the EU on the diplomatic
scene. He presented an approach for evaluating this process. The bulk of his material for the case presented came from research carried out on evaluating the Dutch government’s performance of diplomatic activity in negotiating treaties on landmines. In a rather graphic description, Dr. van Willegen stated that the EU might have a big foot, but suggested that perhaps the foot’s print is small: this can be seen, he stated, in the fact that the EU’s influence in other international organisations has not been consistent.

Dr. van Willigen outlined several pitfalls in evaluating the EU’s performance. The first concerns ‘linear performance measurement’, which often looks at input/output considerations. This does not take into consideration the richness of issues involved in diplomacy. The second pitfall concerns the tendency to collide different foreign policy instruments: economic, military, diplomatic, etc.

Importantly, and of particular relevance to the current political crisis situations, in the context of which many scholars are questioning the role of the EU, Dr. van Willigen states that most diplomacy takes place in non-crisis situations. This also linked to the presentation by Antonio Missiroli, who raised issues of EU representation. He stated that the EU comprises of up to one third of the UN Security Council members and has more than 30% of voting rights in the IMF and World Bank. Benelux countries have more voting rights than China in the IMF/WB. This leads to a perhaps counter-intuitive conclusion that EU is over-represented in International Organisations, but underperforming in them. On the topic of the Lisbon Treaty, it was discussed during the Question and Answer session that the Lisbon Treaty was a response to internal problems and the desire to see the EU more effectively represented in the international arena, rather than being a response to the changing external pressures and environment.

On 8 March, Dr. Drieskens made a presentation with the title ‘EU Representation at the UN in New York: on messengers, messages and audiences’. The presentation focused on the recent reform brought by the Lisbon Treaty with regard to the external representation of the EU, the impact this reform had on the decision-making process in the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Security Council and the EU initiative in search of an enhanced status. Dr. Drieskens came to the conclusion that the EU has given a rather institutional answer to the external challenges it faces, with priority given to form over content (it’s more important who speaks on behalf of the EU instead of to whom and about what) and that the Lisbon Treaty does not support the representation of the EU in the United Nations Security Council.

. Guimarães’ presentation focused on the practical aspects of the EU’s diplomatic engagement in the UN Security Council and the UN General Assembly. He stressed that the external representation of the EU in multilateral organisations is a challenge for the EU, and that it is of crucial importance for the EU to strengthen its position in these forums. The Lisbon Treaty brought a positive change with regard to this question by giving the EU a legal personality. Nevertheless, progress in this area is expected to take place at a very slow pace.

On 15 March 2011, Prof. Dr. Joachim Koops gave a lecture on the public diplomacy of the European Union’s Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions. He explained that the European Union aims to achieve influence and loyalty, both abroad and at home, by means of public diplomacy. An interesting argument that Koops presented for explaining the development of the CSDP during the last decade is the influence of Javier Solana’s public diplomacy approach towards the CSDP: from 1999 to 2009, Solana focused on putting the European Union on the map as a global actor and opted for quick impact and action.

Hungarian Brig. Gen. Gabor Horvath from the European Union Military Staff provided his audience with a military view on the CSDP in practice. His main message about European Union military power was that it needs to be used in a credible way and that the focus is on crisis management. He gave background
information about the internal organisation of the European Union Military Staff and the CSDP missions, including the current operation Atalanta against Somali pirates. In his opinion, the EU will be able to tackle the problem of the Somali pirates more effectively when it adopts a comprehensive approach. He also highlighted the few changes introduced by the Treaty of Lisbon in the military realm, which have not yet been implemented.

On 29 March, Dominik Tolksdorf, Vesalius College and Global Governance Institute, and Tobias Flessenkemper, European Union Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina spoke at the lecture entitled ‘The EU as a Diplomatic Actor in the Western Balkans’.

The challenges with which the EU is confronted in the Western Balkans are multiple. Post-conflict tasks of peacekeeping, political reconstruction, and economic development are but a few. These challenges also present opportunities for the EU. With regard to security issues, the EU has the chance to establish itself as a regional/global actor and regain credibility. For a long time, the EU showed little determination and coherency in its reactions to the violent dismemberment of the former Yugoslavia. This was mainly the result of serious differences among important member states. However over time the EU developed a shared analysis of the problématique in the Western Balkans. This shared analysis was related to important events leading gradually to a common set of EU interests and solutions.

The EU developed a more coherent and comprehensive approach to its Balkan policy by adopting the ‘Regional Approach’ to cooperation with the states in the Western Balkans in 1996, the Stability and Association Process, and the Stability Pact in 1999. Additionally, the political impetus derived from the Thessaloniki agenda was important, as it offered (for the first time) the prospect of EU membership to the countries in the area.

Despite these achievements the problems remain and, in the long-term, the challenge lies in the establishment of functioning democracies. The development of democracy and market economies is seen as the unconditional prerequisite for eventual EU membership (i.e. the Copenhagen criteria). The problems facing the region however with regard to human rights violations, uncompetitive economies, corruption, nationalism and matters of political instability constitute serious impediments for future progress and the attainment of these objectives.

An example is Bosnia-Herzegovina, a country in which a plethora of problems hinder the application of effective policy solutions. The objective of establishing a functioning multi-ethnic state, in which Croats, Serbs and Bosniaks each with different policy preferences co-exist, has been a challenge. The conditionality politics of the EU are not sufficiently adapted to the local contexts; hence they are often ineffective, due to the low degree of policy coherence with the Bosnian policy initiatives. This anomaly and incoherence of the EU conditionality approach remains an important challenge and a domain for further improvement.

On 5 April 2011, the lecture dealt with the EU’s role and performance within the G20 in light of the financial crisis. Following several lectures on the EU as a diplomatic actor in international security issues, this lecture was the first on the second theme of the lecture series, namely trade and finance. After an introduction by Joachim Koops, the two speakers took the floor.

Peter Debaere (researcher at the Ghent Institute for International Studies) gave an introduction to the G20, explained the EU’s representation in the G20, and discussed the contribution of the EU to the G20 and the G20 to the EU. The G20 is a relatively informal forum for negotiating economic affairs. In his discussion on the EU’s representation in the G20, Debaere addressed the critique that the EU is overrepresented in the G20 (G4 - France, UK, Germany and Spain, plus the EU) and offered
two possible solutions: consolidation or coordination. He also pointed to some added values of the EU’s participation in the G20, such as the EU’s substantive expertise on financial and economic matters and institutional experience in cooperating and finding compromises.

Joost Korte (director at the European Commission of relations with the Council) provided a ‘rough guide’ to the role of the EU in the G8 and G20, explaining the differences between the two fora, the EU’s internal coordination processes for these fora and highlighting the agenda points and issues for the next G8 and G20 meetings. Korte shared that 2011 will be an interesting year for the G8 and G20, not in the least because France is presiding over both fora. He explained that the agenda for the G8 summit includes recurrent topics such as political and security issues and the shifting partnership with Africa, but also new challenges with ‘Sarkozy’s signature’ on Internet governance, green growth and innovation. Korte also stated that he did not believe that the EU is overrepresented in the G20. He emphasised that the EU represents a large share in the market economy and the EU is perceived by others as a example of how to manage globalisation.

The lecture ended with an interesting Q&A session. Topics included the role of the G20 in IMF policy, the approach of the G8 and G20 to China, and the representation of the EU and other regional organisations in international fora. There were 30 participants at the lecture.

The eighth lecture took place on 12 April 2011. The title of the Hubert Zimmermann’s presentation was ‘The EU as international trade negotiator: between effectiveness and normative power’. Zimmermann first talked about several case studies that investigated the EU as an informal and formal negotiator. He first explained the normative framework, which put emphasis on the role of EU as a trade bloc. He then explained multi-level governance in the EU (i.e. vertical and horizontal aspects of EU governance). He explained the pre- and post-Lisbon Treaty era in terms of trade negotiations, and he concluded that the Lisbon Treaty raised the influence of EU Parliament, which constitutes the vertical aspect of governance. He claimed that this change would be better for the future of trade negotiations in the sense that more groups would be represented in a fairer way in trade negotiations. Furthermore, he explained the differences among agenda setting, negotiation and ratification phases. He compared the EU with the US as trade negotiators and concluded that ‘effective US trade negotiation is a myth’. He concluded his presentation with a mixed picture for the EU, namely that EU will become more effective and less normative in trade negotiations. The negotiations, however, will not conclude as easily as in the past.

Frank Hoffmeister provided information and practical examples from the Commission where he is actively involved in EU trade negotiations. He outlined case studies in his presentation and provided his personal insights from these experiences. First, he spoke about the difficulties resulting from the lack of a legal framework on the services sector in trade negotiations, and its interrelation with commercial free trade agreements. Second, he described the South Korea-EU Free Trade Agreement talks. In this example, he discussed how a single member country can block the whole trade negotiations and disrupt the process. Finally, he mentioned the problems and complexity of the Doha Round. He concluded his lecture by saying ‘trade is an important area in which the EU can show its influence in the world as a soft power’ and ‘in the post-Lisbon process, the EU has a more powerful hand in negotiations’. The more influential the power of Parliament, the more effective the EU can be, he added.

On 19 April, Dr. Karen E. Smith (LSE) gave a talk on ‘The EU’s human rights diplomacy: practice and challenges’, which was then followed by an intervention of Edward McMillan-Scott, Vice-President of the European Parliament, responsible for Democracy and Human Rights. Dr. Smith’s lecture touched upon a broad range of issues, including the way in which the EU seeks to promote the protection of human rights. In particular, Dr. Smith focused on the possible strategies the EU could follow.
to increase the effectiveness of its actions. Dr. Smith argued that diplomacy alone is insufficient to promote human rights – there is a need for more pressure to change the behaviour of governments to accept and respect human rights. Dr. Smith argued that aid could be used in a more targeted manner in order to force particular governments to change their behaviour. However, she also pointed to the fact that the manifold double standards in which the EU pursues human rights undermine the credibility and hence the effectiveness of its policies.

McMillan-Scott, in his intervention echoed many of the issues raised by Dr. Smith. McMillan-Scott gave an overview of the growing role of the European Parliament in the promotion of human rights – both internally and externally. His main concern was that human rights are at the margins of EU foreign policy, and member states have competing interests with countries that continue to violate human rights, such as China. The lecture was followed by an interesting Q & A session where both speakers responded with enthusiasm to the great interest from the audience.

The tenth lecture took place on the 3 May 2011 and was entitled ‘The ‘one voice’ problématique: a critical assessment of the EU as a Diplomatic Actor at the UN Human Rights Council’. The first speaker of the evening was Gjovalin Macaj from the IES, who is working on a doctoral thesis on the subject, entitled ‘United we fall, divided we stand: the isolation of the EU at the UN Human Rights Council’.

In Macaj’s opinion, the fact that the EU puts a lot of effort into ‘fabricating’ unity among the EU Member States at the UN Human Rights Council is counterproductive and detrimental to the effective promotion of human rights. He identifies four stages where the search for EU unity at the UN Human Rights Council trumps the promotion of human rights: the representation stage, the negotiation stage, the communication stage and the credibility stage. Macaj argues that EU common positions are only a thin cover for the diverging opinions among EU Member States. Furthermore, the EU has to negotiate internally to come to a compromise between the ‘progressive’ and the ‘conservative’ EU Member States. This dilutes the EU message on human rights that it wants voice externally. In addition, this internal EU negotiation is so time-costly that not much time is left to reach out and convince the other members of the UN Human Rights Council. Last but not least, the fact that the EU is presenting itself as united on human rights issues and as the Utopia of human rights is harmful for its credibility. It causes a lack of self-criticism and this gives a pretext to grave human rights violating states to do the same. In his conclusion, Macaj asserts that the EU’s desire for one voice is an approach that is far too defensive and that is contrary to the dynamic nature of the UN Human Rights Council. Instead of one voice, the EU needs to adopt a smart voice.

The second speaker, Joelle Hivonnet, member of the European Union delegation to the United Nations in Geneva, disagreed with some of the critical points raised by Macaj, while agreeing with other arguments he made.

She argued that the EU needs to speak with one voice because it has to become more audible on the world stage. While she agreed that formally the EU tries to speak with one voice at international organisations like the UN Human Rights Council, national EU members can also make separate and complementary comments. Furthermore, informally, much of the human rights advocacy work at the UN Human Rights Council is done separately by EU Member States.

Hivonnet also disagreed with Macaj on his argument that the EU lacks self-criticism when it comes to human rights. She used the EU-Russia Human Rights dialogue as an example. According to Hivonnet, during this dialogue the EU itself will bring up the problems it has had, and continues to have, with its Roma population.

On outreach and communication on human rights, Hivonnet tended to agree with Macaj. The EU has many assets when it comes to human rights. It is seen as a ‘smart power’ and has considerable expertise in the field. However, the EU still has a
lot to learn and needs to adapt itself to the changing world. The EU should act more proactively and needs to learn to build bridges with other countries to counter the often-heard critique expressed by non-EU countries that the EU is unable to value the interests of non-EU countries on human rights issues.

The eleventh lecture in the IES’ Spring Lecture Series took place on 10 May 2011 and was dedicated to the EU as an environmental actor. The speakers were John Vogler, from the University of Keele as well as Matthias Buck, from the European Commission, member of the Cabinet of Environment Commissioner Potočnik.

John Vogler attempted to address the question: what kind of an actor is the European Union on the international stage? He recalled the model of actorness, building on autonomy, volition, recognition, and capabilities in the use of different instruments to achieve goals. These theoretical notions were used as the framework for an analysis of the EU’s position in the international environmental governance.

Vogler analysed the EU presence, defined as the ability to exert influence and shape others’ perceptions and expectations, in the international environmental field. He looked at the internal and external recognition of the European Commission as the EU representation, the special status of the EU as a party to international treaties as well as the influence of the Lisbon Treaty in this respect. Narrowly understood, EU external environmental policy was assessed as very successful, but, at the same time, the EU’s overall input into global ecology (especially in terms of resource pooling and CO2 emission reductions) was found to be negative. With reference to the opportunities, which are changes in the external environment that can support EU involvement in international governance, he pointed to the effects of the Soviet Union collapse as well as withdrawal of the US from the Kyoto Protocol on reducing greenhouse gas emissions as conditions allowing the EU to gain a leading position in international environmental governance. Building on the presence and opportunities factors, Vogler recognised the EU as a successful case of environmental actorness, while also pointing to some challenges for future.

Mathias Buck from the European Commission shared with the audience his practical experience in representing the EU in international negotiations within a framework of diverse multilateral environmental agreements. After analysing how the EU as a regional economic organisation establishes itself internally and externally, he emphasised the EU’s recently granted enhanced observer status to the UN as a step in building EU presence in international environmental governance.

Looking into formal changes in the EU’s international status, he tried to discuss who is the EU today and how does it fit with global environmental governance. He referred to the one-voice problématique, to the issue of competences, to the challenges of achieving policy coherence among different international fora and to the EU legal personality derived from the Lisbon Treaty.

After the presentations, questions were raised regarding informal aspects of the negotiations of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, the influence of the economic crisis on environmental governance, the EU involvement in different regional groups during environmental negotiations, normative aspects related to the EU international environmental policy, enhanced observer status to the UN, the criteria to mandate the Commission to lead the negotiations on behalf of the member states, and current Cabinet involvement in climate change and biodiversity policies and possible competition in this respect.

On 17 May, Robert Falkner of the London School of Economics and Baptiste Legay of the European Commission’s DG Climate Action provided their perspectives and insights into climate change policy. The lecture, with the title ‘After Copenhagen and Cancun: Lessons Learned and Ways Ahead for EU Climate Diplomacy’ focused on the role of the EU in international climate change negotiations.
Robert Falkner provided the first lecture. He took an outsider’s point of view as an analyst looking at the general picture. Falkner asserted that in the 20-year history of climate change negotiations we reached a turning point at the Copenhagen Conference of the Parties. The same people are still at the negotiating table, but the traditional approach of negotiating a global deal has failed.

The context of the climate change negotiations has changed. Many actors have long argued that a global deal is needed. Such a global deal model is based on a comprehensive and specific deal that is universal and legally binding. The UNFCCC responded to two of these three elements. It was not comprehensive but relied on further implementing measures that were to be negotiated. The Kyoto Protocol went from universal to a selective agreement by focusing on industrialised countries only. At the Conference of the Parties in Cancun, universality and the legally binding nature of a potential new agreement was lost. The target of a global deal went out of reach. Only the EU is willing to sign a legally binding deal. The US is structurally unable to ratify a potential new international climate change agreement. China has shown some willingness to reduce its emissions, but it is adamantly refusing to sign up to a legally binding agreement.

Falkner contended that the failure of the process lies in the nature of climate change itself. First, climate change remains highly uncertain. Science is relatively well understood but the economic dimension is uncertain. Benefits and costs are very uncertain. This is difficult especially from the perspective of emerging economies. Second, climate change as a policy problem is very complex. It extends to many other policy areas such as energy, transport and industrial systems. No single approach can address all the measures that should be addressed. Third, traditionally, the dominant mode of international negotiations was that the EU and the US left many of the emerging economies aside. However, as emissions from emerging economies rise and the EU’s emissions decline, this approach is not viable anymore. Future emissions growth migrates to emerging economies. Therefore, they become the key players. The EU is now only one of several key players. As it is achieving reductions, it is driving itself into the margins of the negotiations, Falkner pointed out.

Falkner proposed that there are two alternatives to the global deal model. One is the bottom-up approach, in which each country should do as much as it can and is prepared to do. Experience has, however, shown that a bottom-up approach does not deliver in areas such as innovation. Public investment in technological development of renewables has declined. This approach neglects the need for a certain level of coordination. Therefore, Falkner suggested a mid-way solution between a global deal and a bottom-up approach. He proposed a building bloc approach. This approach includes different deals depending on the partners’ willingness and capacities to agree. The end result may still be a coherent global deal but the way of getting there is different. This mid-way approach is the only approach that is available at the moment, Falkner stressed. It may be a second-best solution but it seems to be the only feasible way.

The EU has long held a global strategy. Falkner underlined that the EU needs to think about how it uses its strategy. Can the EU still play a leading role? The EU set its level of ambition high in the past. Falkner stressed that this needs to continue. He contended that someone needs to set the level of ambition and that it will still fall to the EU to remain the driving force. But he also argued that this will not be the ultimate process through which the negotiations will occur. Falkner claimed that there needs to be a moment for the EU to use its market power and capitalise on the strategic interaction between trade policy and climate change or between energy policy and climate change. The EU needs to be creative about access to technology. Membership and clubs will have to be offered. The EU needs to look not only at the UN process but also at other forums. This is where the interesting debate will have to be conducted.
Baptiste Legay provided an insider’s perspective, since he has been involved in the climate change negotiations on the EU side. He mentioned that the Kyoto Protocol has interesting concepts such as common but differentiated responsibility. The US did not ratify the Kyoto Protocol because it asserted that China was not doing enough. The challenge is trying to get over this debate. The EU went to the Copenhagen negotiations in the hope of sealing a global deal. This hope was probably too naïve, Legay acknowledged. There were very high expectations for Copenhagen within the EU. Post-Copenhagen, the EU tried to find the right balance among all countries. Legay observed that not all countries are equally enthusiastic about getting a global deal. The EU wants a global deal but that’s not the case everywhere in the world. Developing countries prioritise poverty reduction. Emerging economies prioritise economic growth. Legay contended that the role of the EU has always been that of a leader that raises the level of ambition. In the past, the EU has raised the level of ambition by, for example, setting the scene with ambitious scientific figures such as the 2 degree limit. This was ambitious and helped set the scene, according to Legay. Down through the years, this has led to discussions about this limit and led to its endorsement at the Cancun Conference of the Parties. He explained that, at the Copenhagen conference, the EU succeeded in raising the pressure. China is now acting seriously at home. The EU is also setting conditions. For example, the EU promised to move to a 30% emission reduction commitment if other countries also step up. This has not worked because the other countries care less about the EU committing more than about their own domestic economic concerns. Aviation and maritime emissions is an issue area in which developing countries are against any international measures. Still the EU is pushing for this. Legay stressed that this is probably not going to lead to global agreement but the EU maintains pressure.

Legay argued that it is impossible to abandon this ultimate goal of reaching a global deal. The EU has explored possibilities for additional settings and forums, he said. He stressed that a global deal should be the aim. This will not happen in the near future but it should remain the goal. The EU developed a stepwise approach already before Copenhagen.

The two lectures were followed by a lively discussion about the dangers of using trade policy for climate change aims, the role of developing country assistance and the constraints put on the EU’s leadership by the economic crisis.

The IES 2011 Spring Lecture Series ‘The EU as a Diplomatic Actor: Policies, Processes and Performance’ came to a close on 24 May with a lecture on the ‘Diplomatic Impact in Reverse: The Influence of International Institutions on the EU as a Diplomatic Actor’. The two keynote speakers were Oriol Costa, University of Barcelona, and Knud Erik Jørgensen, University of Aarhus.

Before introducing the speakers, Joachim Koops provided a short summary of the entire series, mentioning the main topics that were discussed and the various ideas on EU’s role as a diplomatic actor.

Oriol Costa focused on the impact that international organisations have on the European Union as a diplomatic actor. This influence is considered to be unusually large, especially when compared to the influence they have on the United States, and it is mainly noticed in the positive perception EU has on multilateralism. There is a lot of literature on how international organisations and regimes can influence states, a good example being the Europeanisation of the EU Member States. However, more research needs to be done on the influence of international organisations on the EU itself. The EU is prone to be influenced by international norms and institutions and it is also in a position to bring norms to international fora. The EU should be a particularly multilateralist actor on new issues (expansion of EU sphere), issues in which the actorness and internal competences are less well-established and issues that are prone to be dealt with in a technocratic manner.
Knud Erik Jørgensen’s keynote speech concluded the entire lecture series. Contemplating the last ten years, he looked at how the EU and US approaches to multilateralism diverged, with the US considering multilateralism an inappropriate tool for a strong actor, while the EU perceiving it favourably, also due to its own ‘multilateral genes’. He identified six flows of influence linking the three main actors: the EU, Member States and International Organisations. Research in this field has been very compartmentalised, with the main focus on the influence the EU has on international organisations, but without mentioning diplomacy and global governance. The challenge is to bring all these different bodies of literature together in a coherent manner. Moreover, when looking into the impact of the EU on international organisations, no other big actor is taken into account. Some issues to consider are also the complex nature of the EU and international organisations, as well as the fact that unity might backfire, like in the case of the EU, which can be perceived as one bloc lecturing other states and thus leading to opposition at the UN level. Jørgensen also identified a few challenges facing research in the area of EU’s performance in the international arena. More case studies are needed, as well as more comparative studies (across international organisations, across global actors or across major issues) and a closer look into the politics of multilateral commitments. Moreover, the aim should be to create workshops with the purpose of refining and synthesizing the various findings in order to be then able to feed them back into the literature. Last but not least, a big challenge is to make the research results known and understandable to the larger public.
EGovernment in the EU has reached a crossroads. We have witnessed more than ten years of ministerial activity within a European context, the production of many strategies, visions and policies, and much research has been carried out to show potentials and opportunities for administrations at all levels of governance. Many advances have been made: the European approach to motivating its Member States into enacting public service reform to ensure more effective and efficient public services has seen many positive stories bloom across Europe. And yet, implementation of new methods of working and deployment of services, are not evenly spread across Europe. There are many areas where processes and applications have not developed. Nowhere is this more clearly seen than at the local level, where a large proportion of citizen-government interaction actually takes place.
The Autumn Lecture Series in 2011 was organised by the Institute for European Studies in cooperation with the Citadel Statement Group. It raised a number of timely and pertinent issues relating to the adoption of eGovernment at the local, European and international levels.
Programme:

14 September 2011:
The Citadel Statement
*Keynote by Minister Geert Bourgeois, Vice-minister-president of the Flemish government*

21 September 2011:
Social Complexity, Public Policy and Subsidiarity
*by Gregory Fisher, Synthesis*

28 September 2011:
Electronic Identity Management (eID) at the EU level: a force for integration?
*by Freek van Krevel, Ministry for Economic Affairs and Hugo Kerschot, SSEDIC Network*

11 October 2011:
Perspective of eGovernment in The Digital Agenda: going local and future research
*by Aniyan Varghese, European Commission and Geert Mareels, CORVE*

26 October 2011:
Planting the Flag: a strategy for ICT-enabled local public services reform
*by Martin Ferguson, Socitm and Talal Alrahbi, Oman ITA*

9 November 2011:
eGovernment in the EU: policies, processes and promises
*by Jeremy Millard, Danish Technological Institute and Jamal Shahin, Institute for European Studies*

23 November 2011:
Roundtable: Where Can The EU Go In Its EGovernment Activity Post-Poznan?
*by David Osimo, Tech4i2; Constantijn Van Oranje, European Commission
Wouter Van Dooren, University of Antwerp
Patrick Wauters, Deloitte*

30 November 2011:
The ISA Programme: governance structure and role in the EU integration process
*by Patrick Wauters, Deloitte and Margarida Abecasis, ISA Programme, European Commission*

7 December 2011:
From Electronic Government to Collaborative Governance
*by Matt Poelmans, HEC and Julia Gildden, 21c Consultancy and IES*

14 December 2011:
Conceptualising stakeholder participation in public policy development: the OCOPOMO approach
*by Maria Wimmer, Project Director, eGovPoliNet.*
The lecture series was launched on 14 September 2011 with an introductory lecture by Bart Huybrechts, member of the cabinet of Geert Bourgeois, Vice-Minister-President of the Flemish Government and Flemish Minister for Administrative Affairs, Local and Provincial Government, Civic Integration, Tourism and the Vlaamse Rand. The Flemish Government have made eGovernment services an integral part of their policy making, and due to the fact that they played a leading role in the adoption of the Citadel Statement, the keynote speech of the lecture series on eGovernment in the EU was delivered by the Flemish Ministry responsible for Administrative Affairs and Local and Provincial Government.

The speaker provided the audience with an enlightening insight into the latest policy efforts in use of ICT for public services in Flanders. It was stressed that the overarching goal of the Flemish strategy is to effectively use modern technology to support and improve public administration in local communities. To understand how eGovernment services work in practice, Huybrechts drew on a case-study of digitisation of building permits. However, despite the benefits from the use of online building permits (especially in terms of financial savings and time management), the actual take-up of the e-services was rather low. Delivery of building permits online was shown to have many barriers. The major was a lack of standardisation across different municipalities. However, the realisation of this project was also hindered by the failure to actively engage with citizens, the inability to provide satisfactory levels of protection for users’ data and the difficulty to include remote areas. These key issues of integration, take up and collaboration were addressed throughout the Lecture Series.

Bart Huybrechts also pointed out that the Citadel Statement triggered the development of a number of local, national and European projects on the adoption of eGovernment services. For example, the pan-European project ‘Citadel on the Move’ has been designed to unite local government organisations in order to develop mobile applications on high-speed broadband connection that can be shared by citizens across different EU cities. It was emphasized that although eGovernment services are delivered mostly locally, they must be based on national and European frameworks. To successfully deliver on the objectives of the Citadel Statement, it is essential that national or European bodies provide local authorities with adequate tools and support mechanisms.

The second session of the Lecture Series, given by Greg Fisher on 21 September 2011, tackled the issue of the relationship between complexity of social networks and public policymaking. To overcome the ‘period of austerity’ and stagnation and to restore economic growth, and to simultaneously build confidence in the policymaking process. Fisher suggested that a whole new approach to thinking needs to be developed. He argued that the core of the crisis lies in the complexity of networks. Fisher argued that there should be more interaction between political advisors, policymakers and other academic disciplines, especially social sciences. The balance of power in policymaking needs to be redistributed between various social and political groups to meet the needs of our constantly changing society, which shows one of the key characteristics of complexity: the making of unpredictable choices. There should be a clear division of power; society should be empowered to make mass-micro decisions on local level while the policymakers should focus on macro decisions on the international level.

In conclusion, the speaker asserted that the main problem of current policymaking processes is that there is a mismatch between the theoretical thinking of political economists (who closely cooperate with the policymakers) and understanding how the real world works. The failure to comprehend how social networks function hinders formulation of effective policy frameworks. To design appropriate public policies it is essential to tackle the issue of complexity, and move towards adequate approaches of citizen engagement and participation.
The third session of the Lecture Series on eGovernment focused on challenges to management of electronic identity (eID) in the EU. As a ‘key enabler’, much political emphasis has been placed on having an interoperable system across the EU, where identity can be managed at the EU level. The first speaker, Freek van Krevel provided us with a unique insight into the management of eID in the Netherlands. He explained the situation in the context of the EU’s eGovernment Action Plan. He first emphasised the importance of eID for the implementation of eGovernment services and then pointed to the need of improving security measures under the concept of minimal data sharing. Yet, despite of indisputable importance of eID, the use of eID is largely limited in the EU. Since management of eID varies greatly from country to country. Thus, it was suggested to set up a European agency, which would provide for the development of a sound infrastructure and set up common standards on eID management of eID across the EU. The second speaker, Hugo Kerschot first introduced SEDIC network (Scoping the Single European Digital Identity Community) that provides a platform for all the stakeholders in the eID communities to work together in order to prepare agenda for a proposed Single European Digital Identity. According to his finding, there is a low trust in e-solutions provided by EU governments. This lack of trust undermines the whole European project of transferring public administrations online. To the surprise of experts, citizens place more importance on security rather than privacy matters.

The fourth session held on 11 October 2011, discussed the implications of an EU policy known as the ‘Digital Agenda’ (which is the parallel digital initiative to EU2020) for local government, and we focused specifically the eGovernment aspects of the policy. The first speaker, Geert Mareels expounded on the Belgian and Flemish approach to eGovernment. During the Belgian Presidency of the Council of the European Union in 2010, the Citadel Statement was adopted. Mareels described how the Flemish Region has tried to adopt the principles of the European eGovernment statements and turn them into reality. He emphasized the need for political will and leadership in this transition. He also explained how sharing, building of common framework, and leading by example are crucial elements in turning the Malmö Declaration into tangible reality. The second speaker, Aniyan Varghese spoke of the European Commission’s involvement in eGovernment through policy making with the European Parliament and Council. He also emphasised, that the Commission is actively involved in the implementation of eGovernment through financing and even running research projects on the ground. Dr Varghese expounded on the upcoming opportunities for EU funding on eGovernment research and gave examples of current large-scale eGovernment pilot projects in the EU. For example, the EU STORK pilot project seeks to facilitate identification of citizens through interoperability of eID cards across borders. Both speakers emphasized...
the need for innovative ideas to further develop eGovernment applications.

Key points:
- need to involve citizens in the creation of new models of public administration
- mistakes in administrations could be corrected by citizens themselves if data are open and accessible to all

In the fifth session of the Lecture series, Martin Ferguson and Talal Alrahbi focused on different approaches towards reform of local public services in two countries: the UK and Oman. Martin Ferguson started by describing Socitm’s strategy ‘Planting the Flag’. It sets out guidelines on how ICT can enable public service reform across a whole range of local services whilst delivering significant savings and better outcomes. Despite the UK’s significant efforts to empower local authorities, the results have been often very limited and largely inefficient. It was argued that in the UK there is a significant gap between the central government and citizens. Talal Alrahbi provided us with an overview of the situation of eGovernment services in Oman. He elaborated on Oman’s strategy on implementation of eGovernment services. The aim of the eOman strategy has been to provide better public services to people, which would result in a meaningful information flow between the government and citizens.

Key points:
- significant gap between citizens and government
- reform must be based on collaboration, redesign and innovation
- need to promote use of ICT in a daily life of citizens

The sixth of the Lecture Series on 9 November 2011 provided us with a historical account of eGovernment discourse and shed some light on the future developments in the management of public administration. Both presentations were in the context of the European policy context in the field. The first speaker, Jamal Shahin, captured the changes in the eGovernment policy discourse during the past decade. He argued that, given the complicated and bureaucratic nature of the management of public administration, a number of fundamental questions on the state of public administration and government’s interaction with citizens were raised. Jeremy Millard discussed the 2011-2015 Action Plan on eGovernment. He emphasised that there were clear shifts towards a collaborative approach to the management of public services, open data movement, involvement of private sector in building the infrastructure, etc.

Key points:
- changes in the eGovernment discourse as new challenges were revealed over time
- need to reform the sector as a whole to make it more effective and efficient
- need to form closer links between local, regional and national levels of governments
- move towards collaborative approach to the management of public services

The seventh event in the lecture series on eGovernment in the EU took the form of roundtable discussion in which a number of speakers from academia, industry and the European Commission provided us with the latest developments and trends in this field. The aim of the event was to report and reflect on the Ministerial Conference on eGovernment that took place the previous week in Poznan and consequently, analyse its impact on the eGovernment process in the individual Member States. In the context of the theme of the Lecture Series ‘Making the Malmö Real,’ it was argued that from the Malmö to the Poznan Ministerial Conferences there was a shift in discourse from open government services to the larger, EC-funded large scale pilot projects. The pilot projects (STORK, SPOCS, and others) reveal the technical feasibility of EU-wide public services and thus, support the growth of the digital single market. Yet, one of the key questions still to be address is how to implement these beyond the existing pilots, and how local governments fit in this new paradigm.
Key points:
- eGovernment moved from open government services to the larger, EC-funded large scale pilot projects
- collaborative approach to policy making process is the near future of eGovernment
- challenges to the measurement of public administration management are severe

On 30 November 2011, in the eighth meeting of the Lecture Series on eGovernment services in the EU the issue of interoperability of public administrations across the EU was discussed. First, Patrick Wauters briefly explained the definition of interoperability and then moved on to identify key challenges/barriers that hinder the process of connecting the individual public administrations across borders. Margarida Abecasis introduced the ISA Programme - the Interoperability Solutions for European Public Administrations, explaining that the aim of ISA is to facilitate efficient and effective cross-border electronic collaboration between European public administrations.

Key points:
- barriers to interoperable service are found across political, legal, organisational, semantic and technological spheres
- low levels of take-up of cross border e-services despite the advantages for its users
- need of interoperable services to increase efficiency and effectiveness of public services as a whole
- cross-sectoral interoperability is as important as cross-border interoperability

In the penultimate lecture in the Series, held on 7 December 2011, Julia Glidden and Matt Poelmans started the discussion on one of the key areas in the Citadel Statement: participation and engagement. In the current political environment, where social movements appear to have become big topics of debate in press, the impact of social media tools cannot be ignored. This discussion is not new, but the focus has clearly shifted. Whereas we once talked about technical issues of voting, security issues and methods of authentication, to enable citizens to participate in the idealised 'agora', we now see discussions on how to promote innovation in our societies.

In summary, eParticipation as a political reality did not at all deliver the active participation that was assumed by some political theorists, and even a few politicians. Resistance to change in the institutions thwarted the discussions at an early phase. Now, use of social media in 'collaborative governance', which describes how citizens can provide input and influence the existing systems. Also as citizens build their own systems outside of government and public administration are providing more promising route for discussion. The rise of the open data movements across the world will only help this flourish.

Key points:
- policymaking is more of an issue for the institutions and those who work in them, rather than for citizens
- citizens are naturally inclined to engage, just perhaps not in politics as we currently conceive of it
- some policymakers are trail blazers, unfortunately, the trail they leave behind is very, very long
- engagement is no longer about 'participation', but about collaboration with government

For the closing session of the Lecture Series, held on December 14, 2011, Maria Wimmer delivered a presentation on OPCOMO (Open Collaboration for Policy Modeling), an FP7 project co-funded by the European Commission. Maria Wimmer argued that there is a growing need for transparency, accountability, coherence, participation and openness of government, public administrations and policy making processes. The need to involved citizens in this process is inevitable. It is precisely the citizen engagement in policy making that provides the main rational for the OPCOMO project.

Maria Wimmer elaborated on the challenges of the current policymaking models. Such challenges include the following: ICT support is not equally deployed in policy planning, there is an insufficient management of complexity in policy formu-
lation, development and simulation of policy models created by experts are too complex to be understood by ordinary citizens, and given the lack of open collaboration there are low levels of transparency in the policy making.

Key points:
- government officials have started paying attention to citizens’ calls for higher levels of transparency, accountability, coherence, participation and openness in policy making
- use of web 2.0 plays a key role in collaborative mode of policy making
- simulations can only work as a complement to, and not a replacement for traditional policy making
- role of experts in policy making cannot be replaced by citizens.
Global and European Biodiversity Policy after Nagoya

On 25 January the first Environmental Policy Forum from 2011 took place with Hugo-Maria Schally (Head of Unit, Multilateral Environmental Agreements, Processes and Trade Issues, European Commission, DG Environment) and Patrick Ten Brink (Senior Fellow and Head of Brussels).

In October 2010, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in Nagoya, Japan, adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the Nagoya Protocol on access to and benefit sharing from genetic resources, and a strategy for mobilising financial resources for the effective implementation of the Convention. After the failure of international climate negotiations in Copenhagen in December 2009, the Nagoya conference has therefore been heralded as a major success of multilateral environmental governance. This Environmental Policy Forum aimed to assess the main outcomes of the Nagoya conference with particular emphasis on the Nagoya Protocol, shed light on the role and performance of the EU in the negotiations and explore the future challenges in trying to fully implement the Protocol and the other Nagoya outcomes in the EU and worldwide.

Contemporary European Human Rights Network and Quest of European Standard

The IES and the Fundamental Rights & Constitutionalism Research Group (FRC) co-organised a Policy Forum on 8 February 2011. The guest speaker was Jukka Viljanen from Tampere University, Finland.

The academic discourse over the interpretative framework of the European human rights system requires new perspectives. The Council of Europe was founded on the aim "to achieve a greater unity between its members". In addition to its basic work as ruling over individual human rights applications, the European Court of Human Rights has at same time endeavoured to develop and elucidate the rules of the European Convention on Human Rights and has a harmonisation role within the European human rights system. This idea to decide over European human rights standard was confirmed in the landmark case of Opuz (2009). The Strasbourg Court emphasised the principle that case-law has consequences beyond the respondent state in question. The Court considers whether the national authorities have sufficiently taken into account the principles flowing from its judgments on similar issues, even when they concern other States. The success story of the Strasbourg Court was based on the notion of like-minded nations with a common heritage of political traditions, ideas, freedom and the rule of law and cases that were more like fine-tuning rather than the most severe human rights violations. This has changed in the community of 47 increasingly heterogeneous states and the wide spectrum of violations, including the most severe cases of torture and forced disappearances. The difficulties related to increase of case load (139 000 applications pending, 61 000 new applications in 2010) overshadow the need for doctrinal reform after the enlargement.

Since the Tyrer case (1978) the Court has referred to the Convention as a ‘living instrument’. Is it still possible to keep the Court’s interpretation in light of present day conditions? Does the Court continue to have a harmonising role? And can we
still continue the quest for a European standard in the field of human rights? The Court turned a new page regarding the doctrinal discourse with the leading evolutive approach case of Christine Goodwin in 2002. The continuum on the rights of post-operative transsexuals starting from 1980 had become obsolete due to a continuous finding that in light of present day condition there was no sufficient consensus between Member States on this issue. The Court used the spirit of the Convention and the evidence of international trend based on the NGO report (Liberty) as good reasons to make a departure from the established interpretative continuum.

**The EU’s New Model of Economic Governance**

On 22 February 2011, the IES organised a Policy Forum with Peer Ritter from the Cabinet of Commissioner Olli Rehn and Pablo Zalba Bidegain, MEP about the EU’s New Model of Economic Governance.

The EU leaders are currently seeking ways to come to an agreement over the Commission’s legislative proposals of last September on the issue. The EU’s Stability and Growth Pact needs to be strengthened and the new macroeconomic framework implemented by June in order to have a comprehensive strategy in place. In the euro area, the Heads of State or Government are striving to achieve “a new quality of economic policy coordination” so as to improve Europe’s competitiveness. How should the next round of stability and convergence programmes, or national reform programmes, look like? What level of convergence is required to achieve sustainable economic competitiveness?

**Reasonable Accommodation of Religion in the Workplace**

The Migration & Diversity Cluster of the IES, together with the Fundamental Rights Centre of the VUB Faculty of Law, organised a lunchtime Policy Forum on 29 March 2011, entitled “Reasonable accommodation of religion in the workplace. A legal, sociological and philosophical approach.” Reasonable accommodation is the term used when employers provide facilities for their staff to practice their religion during working hours, for example the provision of halal food in canteens. The concept has become a topic of importance in the current discourse on the integration of immigrants into host societies.

Speakers included Dr. Julie Ringelheim (UCL), Dr. Ilke Adam (IES, VUB) and Prof. Gily Coene (RHEA, VUB). The Policy Forum was chaired by Paul De Hert (FRC, VUB). The presentations and discussions were based on a recently published research report on practices of reasonable accommodation for religion in Belgium directed by Ilke Adam (IES) & Andrea Rea (ULB).
Recalibrating the European Neighbourhood Policy: Whither EU Diplomacy towards the 'Southern Mediterranean'?

This Policy Forum, held on 28 February 2011, assessed the European Union’s response to recent events in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya. It not only examined the shortcomings of the European Neighbourhood Policy thus far, but also assessed the European Union’s policy options for recalibrating its relationship with its ‘Southern Mediterranean’ in geopolitical, cultural and economic terms. The Policy Forum brought together EU practitioners, academics and regional specialists with the aim to provide insights with historical depth and policy-oriented analyses.

Afghan Star · The Documentary

On 2 May 2011, IES, in collaboration with the European Foundation for Democracy, organised a Policy Forum on civil society and democracy in Afghanistan. The Policy Forum, which was chaired by Eva Gross, entailed a screening of ‘Afghan Star - The Documentary’. The screening was followed by a Q&A session with two Afghan speakers – Dr. Wadir Safi, Professor of Law at Kabul University and Mina Wali, Founder and President of the Hope of Mother Foundation. The discussion following the screening focused on the role and availability of education (for women in particular), and the ongoing challenges of corruption and insecurity.

Data Protection in the Days of the Internet

On 20 May, the IES and the Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS) Research Group at the VUB held a Policy Forum on ‘Data Protection in the days of the Internet’. Approximately 60 students, academics, lawyers, business experts and policy makers attended, all of whom demonstrated a lively and critical interest in this crucial topic. The Policy Forum was chaired by Claudia La Donna, EU Affairs Advisor at ‘EU Strategy’ who introduced the Policy Forum with a brief background on the origin and evolution of privacy through to its full recognition as a fundamental human right by the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights following the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon. She gave an overview of the basic principles of the current EU Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC, and stressed the need to review it in light of the rapid changes brought about by the Internet. She raised some of the challenges to ensuring the protection of personal data. The floor was then given to Monika Kuschewsky, Partner at Van Bael Bellis, EU Data Protection practice. She further elaborated on the difficulty of applying basic concepts of the EU Data Protection directive to the Internet. She highlighted the complexity of the landscape.

Marie-Helene Boulanger, Head of Unit, Data Protection, European Commission, then described the main features of the review of the Data Protection Directive that the European Commission is currently carrying out. Boulanger clarified that while key principles remain valid, the EC is trying to find an adequate balance between increasing protection of an individual’s privacy rights without hampering business innovation, reducing administrative burden for companies and increasing cooperation between data authorities and its independence. She also insisted that Internet is not the only reason to update the current legal framework but confirmed that the right to be forgotten and the principle of data accountability will be in the text. The debate which followed was highly interactive with questions on a multitude of topics including how to guarantee the independence from the EC of the Article 29 Working Party in its interpretation of EU data protection law; what the relation-
ship is between data protection and data retention directive; and how to strike a balance between security and fundamental rights protection.

European responses to the crisis in Libya: which way forward for NATO and the EU?

On 15 June 2011, the EFSP cluster organised a Policy Forum on a very timely subject. Chaired by Eva Gross, the event entitled ‘European Responses To The Crisis In Libya: Which Way Forward For NATO And The EU?’ focused not only on the role of NATO, but also on European responses to date. Two renowned academic experts - Prof. Jolyon Howorth (Yale University) and Sven Biscop (Egmont Institute) - and a policy practitioner – . Bert Versmessen, PMG-Chair, European External Action Service – contributed their analyses, including what this means for European states and their commitments to European defense, within NATO and the EU; and also the potential contributions of NATO and the EU not only in Libya, but in the ‘Arab Spring’ more broadly.

IPR in the age of the Internet

On 16 June 2011, the Institute for European Studies organised a Policy Forum on “IPR in the Age of the Internet”. Intellectual property rights (IPR) play a crucial role in our knowledge-based economy and have received a high level of protection and attention in the European Union. Around 30 individuals participated in the event, which brought together two speakers - an EU policy officer and an academic - to discuss the European Commission’s recently launched IPR strategy.

This strategy, published on 24 May 2011, seeks to address key opportunities and challenges for IPR in the Digital Single Market: it sets out an ambitious collection of activities that are underway, or planned, to deal with copyright, IPR enforcement, and interaction with parties outside of the EU. The Commission’s IPR strategy needs to be placed clearly in the context of several key EU broad policy areas, including the Europe 2020 strategy and the Digital Agenda.

Firstly, Elaine Miller, policy officer at DG Internal Market & Services, shared the European Commission’s view on the future of copyright in the EU. She pointed out the difficult position of the European Commission: the general public perception of copyright is negative, copyright is still territorial and the Internet is ubiquitous. The aim of the IPR strategy is to set out a coherent approach to intellectual property rights at a European level, harnessing and reforming the legislation already in place. Miller then expanded on some key actions which the European Commission will take over the next few years: a legislative proposal on orphan works; a proposal for a legal framework to increase transparency and governance in collective rights management and to facilitate multi-territory/pan-European licensing of music; a green paper on online distribution of audiovisual content; the appointment of a mediator to explore ways to harmonise the administration of private copying levies; and the possible review of the 2001 copyright in the Information Society Directive, with the option of moving towards further harmonisation through the creation of an EU copyright code.

Secondly, Prof Tuomas Mylly from the University of Turku, an expert in IPR and Competition Law, provided his comments on the IPR strategy. He argued that a long-term perspective needs to be applied to any new strategy: today IPR regulate core communication processes and interactions between individuals on the Internet. Prof Mylly emphasised that constitutional values, such as the right to communication, are at stake and critiqued the lack of harmonisation of exceptions and limitations to copyright at the EU Level. Furthermore, he questioned the defense of strong IPR by the European Commission, based on rigorous application of competition law. He advocated a utilitarian approach to IPR, similar to the UK tradition, which considers IPR as a temporary monopoly and necessary evil. He explained what a more economic, as opposed to the Commission’s proprietary approach to IPR, could look like. He was, however, particularly positive about the Commission’s openness towards the development of a unitary European copyright title.
Both the presentation and the commentary, and the fruitful debate following the speeches, raised many more topics for investigation, including a discussion on the interests involved in policymaking, and the final ambitions of EU-level copyright legislation. All parties agreed that only open debate and deliberation will lead to a balanced IPR strategy fit for the age of the Internet.

This Policy Forum took place at the same time as the European Commission’s first Digital Agenda Assembly. It was thus an extremely opportune moment to discuss these issues, as reform of copyright is a key action (actions 1-6) in the Digital Agenda. Indeed, copyright needs to be adapted to the digital era so that authors are fairly remunerated and users can make full use of the Internet for creation, distribution and consumption. The interventions during the Policy Forum showed that this is a controversial and complex debate. Given the constraints already in place at the various levels of governance both inside and outside of the EU, there is a long way to go in order to achieve a fair and just framework for intellectual property rights at the EU level.

NATO, CSDP and the future of transatlantic security

On 17 June 2011, the EFSP cluster organised a Policy Forum on ‘NATO, CSDP and The Future of Transatlantic Security’, chaired by Luis Simon. Sarwar Kashmeri (Senior Fellow of the Atlantic Council) presented a summary of his book NATO 2.0: Reboot or Delete. In his book, Kashmeri recommends several dramatic steps as to how future global military forces should respond to common threats: bridge NATO and CSDP; make the EU responsible for its own security; and invoke NATO only in extreme cases, establishing a common global vision regarding the use of force. Alexander Mattelaer took part as discussant.

The EU on the road to Rio+20: towards a sustainable outcome?

The IES & IEEP Environmental Policy Forum on the Rio+20 Conference took place on 23 June 2011. Justyna Pozarowska (Ph.D. researcher, Member of the IES environment and sustainable development cluster) chaired the Forum where three panelists gave their views on the Rio+20 Conference – the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), which will take place in Brazil on 4-6 June 2012 to mark the 20th anniversary of the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), and the 10th anniversary of the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD).

The panelists attending the meeting were: Julius Langendorff (Deputy Head of Unit, Multilateral Environmental Agreements, Processes and Trade Issues, DG Environment, European Commission); Marc Pallemaerts (Senior Fellow and Head of Environmental Governance Programme, Institute for European Environmental Policy; Professor at Université Libre de Bruxelles); and Siobhán Egan (European Economic and Social Committee, member of Group III Environmental Pillar). The speakers elaborated on general expectations related to the Rio+20 Conference and the position and role of the European Union in this process as well as the possible outcomes of the conference. More specifically, the discussions revolved around the European Commission’s Communication “Rio+20: towards the green economy and better governance”, published on 20 June.

Julius Langendorff explained the process of elaborating the EU common position for the Rio+20 Conference. He discussed the background of the conference and its main themes: the green economy and an international institutional framework for sustainable development, the EU’s preparations for and involvement in preparatory negotiations, as well as the main points that are put forward in the Commission’s Communication, adopted on 20 June 2011. He described the Communication as being a tool-building exercise with regards to a range of EU policies related to sustainable development and the Europe
2020 Strategy, as well as a basis for further discussions with EU Member States and the European Parliament. The EU’s consolidated position on Rio+20 is expected by November 2011.

Marc Pallemaerts provided a critical assessment of the European Commission’s Communication. He pointed to certain gaps and challenges that appear both in the European Commission’s Communication and in the UN process on sustainable development, including the Rio+20 Conference. Pallemaerts tried to address these challenges by providing a critical analysis of the ‘sustainable development’ concept and its operationalisation, as well as by pointing out alternative conceptualisations and developments relevant to sustainable development.

Siobhán Egan then presented the EESC’s perspective on the Rio+20 Conference. She stressed that despite the fact that sustainable development has moved up the political agenda, the challenges, the actions do not match especially with respect to climate change, poverty alleviation and biodiversity loss. In EESC’s opinion, the EU should play a leading role in the preparations for the Rio+20 Conference. Egan presented the EESC’s opinion on the Rio Conference (as of September 2010) and the EESC’s current work on a new opinion presenting its expectations regarding the summit and its recommendations for the common EU position for the Summit. She underlined the importance of the social aspects of sustainable development and a fair transition to a sustainable economy; the link between development and the environment; and the need to effectively involve civil society in the move towards a green economy.

All three speakers recognised the importance of the themes that the Rio+20 Conference will address and the urgency of addressing them. After the three presentations, the floor was opened up to the audience and a lively debate followed. The following issues were discussed: sustainable development as a concept and its operationalisation, the EU interests and common position, as well as the external dimension of EU sustainable development policy, and finally, the content of the conference itself.

Nuclear safety after Fukushima - lessons for the future EU energy policy

On 21 September 2011, the Environmental Cluster organised a Policy Forum on the EU nuclear safety debate in the context of the Fukushima accident. The meeting was chaired by junior researcher Radostina Primova and featured three speakers from relevant policy fields: Luc Vanhoenacker representing Framatome, and chair of the European Nuclear Installations Safety Standards Initiative (ENISS) Committee; Magali Smets, deputy director of AREVA representing the nuclear industry; and Eloi Glorieux, energy campaigner at Greenpeace and former MP of the Flemish Parliament.

Luc Vanhoenacker presented an assessment of the various safety standards, which ENISS has so far developed in tandem with the European Commission. ENISS, which represents 16 nuclear power countries within the EU, collaborated extensively with WENRA on harmonising existing national regulations throughout the EU. The presentation included further analysis on technical and practical issues concerning nuclear safety and the conditions for its effective implementation on the basis of ENISS’ three safety pillars: prevention, control, and mitigation. The second speaker, Magali Smets, assessed the risk implications following on from the Fukushima accident. She argued that the nuclear industry is continuously developing safer nuclear power installations, culminating today in the so-called third generation power plants (i.e. GEN3 level). Smets highlighted the importance of promoting cooperation between operators in the nuclear sector in order to ensure better outcomes via best practices and information exchange. Particular initiatives were proposed to include specific budget allocations to ENSREG, a common system of ‘quick response’ and international standard setting.

The third speaker, Eloi Glorieux, referred to the risks in the use of nuclear energy. He drew attention to the costs incurred by EU citizens in a hypothetical nuclear accident scenario. The opaque policies of the nuclear industry were also criticised,
raising issues of accountability and ultimately questions with regard to democratic governance and legitimacy.

**The European Modules on Migrant Integration: a Source of Inspiration for the Member States?**

In 2007, the Justice and Home Affairs Council invited the National Contact Points for integration, supported by the Commission to “examine the added value of developing common European modules on migrant integration”. The recently published draft contains proposals or ‘best practices’ on three such draft modules, namely introductory and language courses, strong commitment by the receiving society and active participation of immigrants in all aspects of social life.

On 21 October 2011, the migration cluster of the IES hosted a Policy Forum on these draft modules on migrant integration and their possible added value for the Member States. The Policy Forum was co-organised with the Belgian National Contact Point for Integration (Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism) and CEDEM, Université de Liège. Invited speakers were Eva Schultz (DG Home, European Commission), Didier Boone (National Contact Point Integration, Belgium), Marco Martiniello (FNRS/CEDEM - Université de Liège), and Sergio Carrera (Centre for European Policy Studies).

Eva Schultz underlined the Commission’s limited room for manoeuvre; it has no specific legal basis to harmonise integration policies but is able “to give support and incentives” in order to exchange best practice.

Didier Boone informed us of the inclusive and bottom-up process which led to the drafting of the modules’ text. Marco Martiniello and Sergio Carrera then critically assessed the added value of the future modules and raised meta-questions preceding the drafting of the texts. Marco Martiniello favoured an EU philosophy of integration, stating that we lack an explicit definition of what integration means. Sergio Carrera was concerned about the possible abuse of the modules by the Member States to legitimise national practice that use compulsory integration courses to limit third country nationals’ rights to family reunification, residence and social security. Questions from the audience mainly responded to the worry of seeing the MS misusing the modules for legitimising national policies. This Policy Forum will be the first of a continuing policy debate in IES on integration policy.

**Transatlantic Cooperation on Access to Sustainably Sourced Raw Materials**

On 25 October 2011, the IES hosted a Policy Forum event, jointly organised by the environment and sustainable development research cluster and the foreign and security policy research cluster at the institute, and in cooperation with the Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP). The event focused on “transatlantic cooperation on accessing (sustainably sourced) raw materials”.

Paul Anciaux of DG Enterprise and Industry at the European Commission opened the discussion with remarks on the general importance of raw materials for the EU, and globally, and provided examples of the myriad uses for these materials in everyday appliances. He spoke of the EU Commission’s ‘Raw materials initiative’, that presented a three-pillar structure for coping with limited access to essential raw materials, namely (1) promoting a fair and sustainable supply from global markets; (2) fostering sustainable supply of raw materials from EU sources; and (3) boosting resource efficiency within the EU and promoting recycling of critical raw materials. The EU has identified 14 so-called ‘critical materials’.

Ashley Miller and Kevin Opstrup from the US Mission to the EU complemented Anciaux’s presentation by discussing the US perspective on accessing raw materials. There is a wide range of activity in the United States’ executive and legislative branches on raw materials policy. For example, the Department of Energy released a study on the domestic impact of potential shortages in access to rare earths for segments of the clean energy sector. This study analysed five rare earth met-
als. In addition, their presentation specifically discussed some of the measures under discussion in the US to deal with materials sourced from conflict regions (so-called ‘conflict minerals’). These are identified by the US as gold, tin, tantalum, and tungsten sourced from the Democratic Republic of Congo and its nine neighbouring countries. Much emphasis on this issue is laid on future reporting measures from companies who are publicly traded in the US and source one or more of these minerals from the region, and public-private initiatives that could help develop conflict-free supply chains.

The speakers addressed several questions from the audience on the public-private partnerships on accessing conflict-free raw materials; on what materials were covered by the raw materials initiatives; and on the environmental credentials of the raw materials initiatives. In answer to this latter question, the speakers highlighted that the increase in global prices place priority on the access to these raw materials, but that the sustainability of this access should nevertheless be ensured. Other questions from the audience addressed the issue of recycling, and how waste materials could be processed to extract reusable raw materials. This specifically addressed the feasibility of a proposed global recycling certificate scheme. A final question highlighted that the EU and the US may diverge on their assessment of the importance of raw materials for the defence industry, on which the US in particular places a great emphasis.

Europe Interconnected: EU’s Ageing Electricity Networks and Renewable Energy

On 7 November 2011 the Environmental Cluster’s long-term associate researcher Thomas Sattich organised a Policy Forum on Europe’s electricity network and its potential contribution to further growth of renewable energy. One of the main challenges in this respect is the structure of the European power transmission system, which has not been designed to enable large-scale use of renewables, but still reflects the carbon and nuclear era.

The meeting was chaired by the Sebastian Oberthür, Academic Director of the IES, and featured three speakers from different branches of the European climate and energy community: Tom Howes, Deputy Head of Unit Renewables and CCS policy, DG Energy, European Commission; Jesse Scott, Energy and Climate Programme Director of demosEUROPA – Centre for European Strategy; Mark Johnston, Senior Policy Adviser WWF European Policy Office.

Tom Howes put the issue of the European electricity network in the broader perspective of European Climate and Energy Policy, i.e. energy efficiency, the development of renewable energy and the internal market for electricity. To make an up-to-date, interconnected European energy system reality, the EU has to tip the balance, both with respect to market failure (by financial incentives) and permit allocations (by reducing administrative barriers).

Jesse Scott highlighted the importance of energy infrastructure regarding EU’s decarbonisation agenda, the Third Internal Market Package and solidarity in energy policy. From a national perspective, she outlined the problems to get particular infrastructure projects implemented, e.g. sensitivity of energy policy (subsidiarity), permitting procedures and access to finance.

Mark Johnston underlined the importance of the implementation of the 3rd internal market package which implies the development of infrastructure to bring a European market for
energy to life. Renewable energy business is keen on new infrastructure, incumbent are rather reluctant. The WWF regards the development of smart grids to be of greater importance than the construction of a 'super grid'.

Q&A brought up questions on the coherence of EU’s climate and energy policy, Carbon Capture Storage (CCS), the varying priorities of different industry sectors, the impact of the financial crisis on energy and climate policy, the connection between the European Emissions Trading System (ETS) and CCS, public acceptance of infrastructure measures (NIMBY), time scheduled financial incentives. All parties considered the event to be a great success.
EDU Events

EU in Close-up & Communicating EU

On 9-11 February the E-learning and Training Unit organised the first 2011 session of the ‘EU in Close-up’ intensive seminar on EU institutions and policy process. As in previous years, the seminar attracted participants from various backgrounds, ranging from the corporate world and non-governmental organisations to international organisations, European institutions and academia.

During the in-depth three-day seminar, topics such as the functioning of European institutions, the inter-institutional decision-making, comitology, and lobbying were discussed in detail by academics and practitioners. The training takes an interactive approach, illustrating the theoretical knowledge with practical examples and case studies.

Moreover, the last session was opened to a larger audience as a stand-alone event ‘Communicating in the EU’ and offered a hands-on guide to deal with the various EU information sources. It featured Leigh Phillips (EUobserver) as a guest speaker who commented on his own experiences with reporting in the EU.

EU 2.0 Communicating for success

Social media has emerged as a new channel of communication and the European Union institutions are starting to use it actively with the aim of engaging citizens. The one day seminar ‘EU 2.0 - Communicating for Success’, organised on 12 April at the IES provided an understanding of the use of social media in communicating EU issues at various levels (EU institutions, trade and business, organisations, NGOs, academia, etc.), an overview of the various social media channels available in order to interact with the EU, and guidance on how to use the social media tools in communicating on EU affairs.

Caroline De Cock, Brussels based lobbyist and author of iLobby.eu, offered an insight into the social media channels used by the EU institutions, such as Twitter and Facebook, underlining the way these tools can serve the purpose of reaching citizens and facilitating their understanding of complex EU structures. The same message was reinforced by the lively panel debate that followed. Lucas Josten, Policy Assistant to Vice-President of the European Commission (EC) Neelie Kroes, responsible for the Commissioner’s social media presence and Antti Timonen, Adviser, responsible for Internet and New Media, Press and Communications Service (EPP Group in European Parliament) offered the institutional perspective on the use of social media, pointing out the strategic increase of communication through the new channels. Adrian Hiel, Communications Officer at International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) and Uzma Lodhi, EU Committee & Communications Manager at British Chamber of Commerce in Belgium explained how they use the various social media tools professionally, to build a public profile but also to gather information, stay connected with members and similar organisations, and even for recruitment.

The afternoon sessions focused on the practical aspects of using Twitter and Facebook in communicating on EU affairs in an efficient manner. Besides getting acquainted with this ‘new wave’ of communication, the participants also received an overview of institutional and non-institutional online information sources, useful for finding and monitoring EU affairs.

Conducted according to a blended learning approach, the seminar was followed-up by two webinars with the aim of building a community where participants and lecturers can exchange their views and experiences.

Reporting on the EU

As part of its ‘Season of Communication’, the IES, in collaboration with the Pascal Decroos Fund, organised a one-day intensive training for Brussels-based and national journalists entitled ‘Reporting on the EU: Issues and Impact’ on 5 May 2011. Developments at EU level have a direct and substantial impact.
at national and local level. Communicating them in a correct, well-informed and unbiased manner is therefore essential. This intensive seminar was aimed at training journalists to report on European Union affairs. The focus was on understanding how the EU works and how to report effectively on the EU’s local and national-level impact.

The morning sessions were dedicated to the main EU institutions as well an in-depth look at the intricacies of the decision-making process. A practical guide on how to find and process EU-related information and a discussion on how EU issues and their impact are presented in the media complemented this. In the afternoon, two journalists, Leigh Phillips (EUobserver) and Annamarie Cumiskey (London Bureau of Investigative Journalism), talked about their experiences on reporting on EU issues. Leigh Phillips discussed his daily routine as a journalist and his information sources. Annamarie Cumiskey presented an investigative journalism project she was involved in that looked at how the EU regional funds are being spent.

EU in Close-up

From 3 to 5 October, the EDU organised another session of the ‘EU in Close-up’ intensive seminar on EU institutions and policy process. As in previous years, the seminar attracted participants from various backgrounds, ranging from the corporate world and NGOs to international organisations, European institutions and academia. During the in-depth three-day seminar, topics such as the functioning of European institutions, the inter-institutional decision making, comitology, and lobbying were discussed in detail by academics and practitioners. The training course takes an interactive approach, illustrating the theoretical knowledge with practical examples and case studies.

Breaking The Silence

Breaking the Silence is an organisation of veteran combatants who have served in the Israeli military since the start of the Second Intifada and have taken it upon themselves to expose the Israeli public and many others worldwide to the reality of everyday life in the Occupied Territories. It endeavours to stimulate public debate about the price paid for a reality in which young soldiers face a civilian population on a daily basis, and are engaged in the control of that population’s everyday life. Breaking the Silence was finalist of the Sakharov Prize in 2010.

The presentation, organised on 14 December, focused on the daily reality in the Occupied Territories as depicted by the hundreds of soldiers interviewed by Breaking the Silence (more than 750 to date), and also examines the moral price paid for the control of a civilian population. The discussion is based on the testimonies of soldiers who served in various areas throughout the West Bank and Gaza, and particularly the experiences of Yehuda Shaul, the founder of Breaking the Silence.

Webinars

Four successful webinars took place in 2011 on various topics regarding EU matters with internal and external speakers: EU competition policy (Doris Hildebrand), Taiwan’s status in international relations (Sigrid Winkler), the role of China as a superpower (Gustaaf Geeraerts) and EU’s foreign policy (Amelia Hadfield, Katja Biedenkopf, Alexander Mattelaer, Alina Cristova). The webinars attracted a total of 49 participants.

14 September: State-Aid: EU Governance in the Crisis

The 2008 financial crisis required the adaptation of the existing EU state aid rules. From October 2008 until today, in numerous cases, these specific state aid provisions guided governments in their support measures to financial institutions. The objective of these interim measures was to guarantee financial stability in the EU.
28 September: Taiwan’s status in international relations

A majority of countries in the world do not recognize Taiwan as an independent state and China claims that Taiwan is a Chinese province. Despite this situation Taiwan has managed to establish itself as an active participant in international relations.

This webinar traced back the origins of Taiwan’s awkward international status, and gave an overview of EU-Taiwan relations in this sovereignty vacuum. Finally, the webinar outlined possible future developments. Particularly interesting are potential changes after the upcoming Taiwanese presidential elections in January 2012, which could result in a great shift in Taiwan’s relations with China and thereby in its international involvement.

26 October: EU-China Relations

China no longer is the developing country it once was. Beijing’s weight in global affairs is mounting by the day as it stands at the helm of the world’s most successful economy and displays ever more financial prowess. China’s economic success story seems to be never ending. In the past 30 years the Chinese economy has quadrupled in size and some expect it to double again over the next decade. China’s military clout is equally on the rise. In 2008 it evolved into the world’s second highest military spender.

30 November: Jean Monnet Webinar: Quo Vadis EU: The dilemma of definitions

This was the first out of four special, free webinars added to the IES Wednesday Webinar Series. Featuring topics on institutions, decision-making and key foreign policy issues and areas, the ‘Quo Vadis EU’ Webinars form the interactive and online component of the IES’s newly established graduate Jean Monnet module, entitled ‘Quo Vadis EU’.
Turkey in Europe

On 9 November, the economics cluster held a successful and well-attended book launch of the recent IES book, *On the Road to EU Membership: The Economic Transformation of Turkey*, an edited volume by Selen Sarisoy Guerin and Ioannis Stivachtis. Egemen Bagis, Turkey’s Minister for the EU and Chief Negotiator delivered the keynote speech.

The status of Turkey within the EU has been a matter of considerable academic and political debate over the past decades. Having formally requested membership in 1987, accession talks have been taking place for almost 25 years. With the creation of a Ministry for EU Affairs, Turkey has enhanced consultations in the past few years, and official negotiations with the EU started exactly five years ago. Although the European landscape is still divided over the question, Turkey aims for effective membership in the foreseeable future.

Turkey’s Minister for European Union Affairs and Chief Negotiator Egemen Bagis therefore accepted to give a keynote speech at the IES on Thursday 9 November. Minister Bagis gave a talk on ‘Turkey in Europe’ and devoted time to questions from the audience. It was a unique opportunity for students, scholars and other interested parties to engage in a dialogue with the Chief Negotiator of Turkey.
In co-operation with the IES, Associate Researcher Joachim Koops organised 6 Guest Lectures by Senior Experts on Topics Related to the European Peace and Security Studies Programme (EPSS).

This year’s focus was on UN Peace Building, NATO’s Intervention in Libya, EU Civilian Crisis Management and the role of the EU in World Politics as well as the capacity of International Organisations to address contemporary challenges.

Programme:


12/10: “Europe in the World: Contemporary Challenges and Potential Solutions” by Steven Vanackere, Deputy Prime Minister & Foreign Minister, Belgium

18/10: “The EU’s Approach to Civilian Crisis Management: Lessons Learned and Ways Ahead” by Mika-Markus Leinonen, Permanent Chair of the EU’s Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM), European External Action Service, European Union

24/10: “Coping with Contempory Challenges: Assessing the Capacity of International Organizations” by Dr. Antonio Costa, former UN Under-Secretary-General and Director of the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), former Secretary-General of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, former Under-Secretary General, OECD

10/11: “European Approaches to Cyber-security” by Col. Christof Tatschl, Head of Cyberdefence, Austrian Armed Forces and Senior Expert, Global Governance Institute (GGI)

15/11: “NATO’s Intervention in Libya: Lessons Learned and Challenges Ahead” by James Appathurai, NATO Secretary-General’s Special Representative for the Caucasus and Central Asia
Teaching Activities

Hendrix Programme
For the third year in a row, a group of U.S. students (from Hendrix College) came to Brussels for a semester abroad with the aim of learning about how the European Union works and experience it first hand through direct contact.

For the first time, the IES joined forces with Vesalius College in order to offer the ten students a comprehensive and enjoyable introductory week that took place from 10-15 January. The students were given an overview of their new surroundings- Brussels and the VUB campus, respectively- as well as introductions concerning their study and internship programmes. A visit to the European Parliament aimed to give them a first taste of how the EU institutions work, while the day-trip to Bruges opened their eyes towards one of the many attractions of their new host country.

Annie, Jess, Al, Zach, Elana, Connor, Will, Dylan, Julie and Emma will be staying in Brussels until the end of May, where they are currently taking courses at the IES and at Vesalius College, as well as doing internships in Brussels-based organisations.

USC Summer School
Now in its fourth edition, the cluster hosted the annual summer programme for the University of Southern California (USC) on ‘Contemporary Issues in European Foreign and Security Policy’. Directed by Eva Gross and coordinated and taught by Luis Simon, the program hosted 7 students this year. Students pursued internships alongside their studies and visited a number of institutions during their stay, including the European Commission, the European Parliament, and Carnegie Europe. This year, students profited from guest lectures from external experts (including Dr. Isabelle Ioannides and Dr. Antonio Missirol, European Commission; Prof. Dr. Sven Biscop, Egmont Institute; Dr. Jakob Skovgaard, Lund University and Prof. Susan Penksa, Westmont College).
Senior Research Fellow Harri Kalimo gave a two-day training programme on the United States internal market to a specialist audience of 20 lawyers of DG Enterprise and Industry. The course explored how commerce is regulated in the federal legal systems of the US and the EU. The comparative analysis provided insights to answer four basic sets of questions: 1) Division of powers: who has the power to regulate ‘commerce’? On what constitutional legal basis? 2) How are the commercial interests to be balanced against other, non-commercial interests? 3) What kinds of instruments and institutions are there for regulating commerce? 4) How is (the regulation of) interstate commerce affected by globalization? The EU and US answers to these questions were assessed both in situations before and after federal harmonisation.

Prof. Kalimo also gave a two-day training programme on the intricate relationship between two core areas of EU law and policy-making: environmental protection and the internal market to a generalist audience of 20 officials of DG Enterprise and Industry. The topic was approached from three angles. First of all, the constitutional structural links between the environment and the internal market were explained. Second, the practical consequences of the interrelationship between the latest environmental policy and internal market rules on the market operators (consumers and companies) at the micro-level were analysed. Third, the course gave instrumentalist, macro-level perspectives on the proper tools of policy making at the environment - internal market interface.
Structure and Organisation
Structure and Organisation

The current Board is comprised of the following members:

Kris Deschouwer
Prof. Political Science VUB
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former Rector of VUB
Jonathan Faull
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Erik Franckx
Prof. of Law VUB
Serge Gutwirth
Prof. of Law VUB
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Members of the Executive Board:

Amelia Hadfield
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Senior Research Fellow IES
Serge Gutwirth
Prof. Law VUB
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Prof. Economics VUB
Caroline Pauwels
Prof. Comm. Science VUB
Harri Kalimo
Prof. Law PILC VUB
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IES President
The structure of the IES remained the same in 2011. The Institute has been autonomous from the VUB Board since 2005 and remains an independent structure within the University, with delegated functions, albeit that the delegation has been amended and enlarged through the signing of service level agreements between the IES and the respective Faculties of the university, and through the adoption of new statutes in December 2011.

The IES Board is responsible for the general policy of the Institute and for the appointment of directors and senior staff. It is assisted by an Executive Board that has a specific role in the coordination of the European teaching programmes of the University, and in the appointment of researchers and teaching staff.

The Academic Director, Prof. Dr. Sebastian Oberthür, along with the Executive Director Anthony Antoine, manages the IES. Both operate under the authority of President Bart De Schutter.

In the area of finance, all accounts and financial transactions are dealt with by the IES itself, as has been the case since 2003. In 2002 the Board of Governors of the VUB ratified the University decree. This provides for de facto delegation of financial policy to the IES.

a. The IES Board

The IES Board is responsible for approving the general strategy, the policy plan, budget and annual report and audit. The Board also decides on the research strategy and on the appointment of senior staff. It is the highest management authority of the Institute.

In particular, and without prejudice to any other of its responsibilities, the Board is competent to define the general guidelines and to approve the general regulations of the IES, to define and approve the policy plan, to define, approve and if necessary adapt the budget, the annual accounts and the annual report, to establish staff training, to appoint directors and senior research fellows, and to take decisions in relation to postgraduate educational initiatives. Following the adoption of the Service Level Agreements between the IES and the faculties, the Institute is now also competent to decide in matters of MaNaMa (Advanced Master) programmes that previously ‘belonged’ to the faculties. To this end, the IES statutes have been amended and adopted by the IES Board (but are awaiting endorsement from university at large).

b. The IES Executive Board

The Executive Board is responsible for management within the financial constraints and the general strategy established by the Board on which the policy plan is based. It executes decisions of principle taken by the Board.

The Executive Board is in particular responsible to consider proposals from the Academic Director, to formulate proposals for the appointment, promotion and, if applicable, renewal of appointments of members of staff, to approve research awards, after positive recommendation by the Research Council or by a committee appointed by it, to appoint researchers, to define the duties of the junior researchers and to consider proposals concerning educational and research matters. The new statutes give it further responsibility to decide on academic matters of the Master programmes.

c. Daily management

Daily management is the responsibility of the Academic and Executive Directors and in accordance with the President of the Institute. Due to the growth of the Institute, there is a growing need for managerial assistance. Following the ‘strategic away days’ of the Institute in September 2011, the position of an assistant director was introduced and discussed at the IES Executive Board. A vacancy was put out for a part-time (50%) position, and the Executive Board of December 2011 selected a candidate who will take up his functions in 2012.
d. Operational Clusters

The IES continued its policy of decentralisation of the academic mid-management. Research clusters have a certain degree of managerial capacity. Members of each cluster meet at least monthly, and their findings / suggestions / activity reports are communicated in overall staff meetings, which take place once per month. Each cluster is headed by a Senior Research Fellow or by another appropriate postdoctoral researcher. All members of the academic staff belong to one or more clusters through which they report or organise their activities. Cluster coordinators meet once per month to discuss academic and organisational issues, and to coordinate activities.

At the end of 2011, the IES knows six ‘clusters’, which are largely content-based:

- European Foreign and Security Policy
- Environment & Sustainable Development
- Migration, Asylum and Diversity
- Information Society
- European Economics
- Educational Development

Following the graduation of a number of PhD students and taking into account a certain equilibrium between the different clusters with respect to size and capacity, the cluster structure is under revision. It is expected that, as planned for in the Strategic Plan, the clusters may be transformed in the course of 2012.

e. Communication

To strengthen the internal and external communication, the IES attracted a Communication Specialist who is responsible for communication, marketing and recruitment at the Institute. Together with the Management Assistant, she sees to the communication between the IES and its researchers, promoters, the faculties and the academic authorities through the publication of internal and external newsletters. The external newsletter is published quarterly (approximately 350 copies) and is distributed to researchers and professors within the relevant departments of the Law and ESP Faculties. The newsletter is also sent electronically to a growing number of interested parties and to IES alumni (over 1 250). The internal newsletter is published on an ad-hoc basis.

In order to enhance research communication within the Institute and partially in order to scrutinise the research at the Institute, researchers give project presentations at the IES Research Colloquia. The researcher(s) involved thus present their findings, so that:

1. the other researchers and IES parties involved have a better overview of the work of their colleagues;
2. the researcher(s) involved are also given the opportunity to present their research in a structured way and
3. to obtain feedback from their colleagues and any promoters present. More information on the Research Colloquia can be read in the chapter on Research (see infra).

f. Education

Educational matters are governed through the Executive Board. The previous IES Statutes envisaged the creation of so-called mixed committees that operate between the IES, the teaching programmes and the respective faculties in order to facilitate decisions relating to the teaching programmes or their academic staff. However, the scope of these mixed committees has been reduced in the new statutes that were agreed to at the end of 2011. In line with the Service Level Agreements, these give most of the decision-making power to the IES Executive Board.

g. New Premises

At the beginning of 2011, the IES moved to new and larger premises, in a newly acquired building of the VUB. The university’s internationalisation policy gave way to the acquisition of a building destined to international services of the
VUB. Thus, the International Relations and Mobility Office (IRMO), the Language Department (ITO), the Politics Department (POLI) and the Department of Sociology as well as Vesalius College all took office in this building. With the move, the IES created more conference space, and saw to it that its two advanced Master programmes could be hosted there. As such, two classrooms and a student secretariat, as well as a new student computer room and other student services (lockers, pigeon holes, meeting rooms, examination and consultation areas) were created so that all student-related services are concentrated in one place. Through the Service Level Agreements with the faculties, the Institute took over the programme support, while the overall student services also remained under IES oversight.

The IES invested in flex-offices for the management, researchers and support staff. Its premises were divided into four large spaces: a ‘silent zone’ - a library-like area where researchers and support staff can concentrate without being disturbed by background noises; a ‘talking zone’ - an open space where phone calls can be made and people can talk freely; a meeting area - consisting of several small and large meeting rooms, adequate for smaller staff meetings or for hosting visitors; and a relaxation area - consisting of a small kitchen and sofas, where informal talks can be held and a light lunch or coffee break can be taken. Following an energy audit, ordered by the Institute, the IES has taken care of a number of sustainable measures that will allow for energy (and thus cost) saving in the near future. It is hoped that all elements of the audit report will be taken into
account by the VUB.

The move to new premises, which involved not only the move of furniture, but also of walls and doors from the previous work space, could only be carried out thanks to the relentless endeavours of the support staff (notably the IT manager and the secretariat). They planned and executed the move with a minimum of inconvenience for the academic staff, who were able to continue working at all times - whether at the 'old' or at the 'new' premises.
Academic Collaboration
Institute for European Studies

Collaboration with other institutions

Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2015

The Strategic Plan 2011-2015 described a number of objectives in the field of academic collaboration:

- Organisation of 1-2 coordination meetings per year with suitable partner institutions in Brussels and Belgium
- Further involvement and active participation in the Brussels University Alliance
- Further expansion and consolidation of existing international networks

Coordination meetings

Together with the European Studies institutes of ULB, FUSL, KUL, UA, Ugl, UG and UCL, the IES held regular meetings to foster synergy and cooperation, organize joint events, and coordinate tender opportunities. These meetings were held on a rotating basis between the different partners and culminated in the organisation of a joint international conference, to be held in 2013.

Brussels University Alliance

Although not actively involved in the academic nor operational boards of the Brussels University Alliance, the IES continued to foster synergies with the Institut d’Études Européennes of the ULB. Several coordination meetings were held, while both institutions exchange PhD-schools and jointly organise conferences and events (the biennial “EU in International Affairs” as one of the highlights).

Expansion of existing networks

Internationally, the IES has been working with many renown universities and institutions, more specifically in the light of EU research projects (7th Framework Programme). Through other activities (education, training, events), the institute also expanded its network with other institutions worldwide.
Cooperation with the VUB

The endorsement of the renewed IES statutes in May 2005 and the subsequent autonomy that was granted to the Board and to the Management of the Institute enabled growth and made it possible for the IES to develop into a multidisciplinary research organisation in smooth cooperation with the VUB. This autonomy has only increased with the adoption by the university of the renewed IES statutes in December 2011. These now allow for more initiatives in the educational field, while further imbedding IES procedures in the overall VUB structures (and vice versa).

In its efforts to build up synergies between the Institute and other VUB research entities working on European issues, the IES has kept good relations with different research departments of the university. The IES notably has strong links with the Politics Department (POLI) and the Faculty of Economics, Social and Political Science (ESP); links that have only tightened since the move of both institutes to joint premises), the Law and Technology Studies Centre (LSTS, Faculty of Law), the International Law department, and the centre for Studies on Media, Information and Telecommunication (IBBT-SMIT, Communications Science Department of the Faculty of Arts and Literature). This is exemplified by numerous shared research projects and joint activities (e.g. lecture series, workshops, colloquia, etc).

In practice, IES researchers benefit from a dual affiliation that fosters transparency and collaboration: they are at the same time members of the Institute and members of their respective VUB research departments.

At a managerial level, a Board consisting of both internal and external members (to the VUB) governs the IES. The internal members are selected by the Rector and endorsed by the University Board of Governors, and tend to come from different faculties. In this way, a cornerstone and seed for collaboration between the IES and the different faculties of university are embedded in the Institute’s structures. To foster transparency, IES decisions are furthermore communicated to the VUB authorities, while important measurements (such as budget and activity report) have to be endorsed by the University Board. Thus far, this collaboration has proved to be very successful.

Cooperation with the Faculty of Law and Criminology and with the Faculty of Economic, Social and Political Science and Management School Solvay resulted in the creation of Service Level Agreements with regards to the two advanced master teaching programmes of the Institute. The agreements stipulate the degree of academic and logistical oversight of the programme by the various parties.

At the VUB and trans-VUB level, the IES enhanced its collaboration with the International Relations and Mobility Office (IRMO) and Vesalius College to engage in joint marketing and recruitment efforts. The IES headed the working group on international communication, marketing and recruitment throughout 2010 and engaged in several joint promotion activities. The cooperation with IRMO furthermore led to the sharing of one member of the supporting staff (at an 80% IES / 20% IRMO-basis).

Cooperation with Vesalius College (VECO) led to enhanced initiatives in the field of student services, marketing and supporting services. Notably, a number of support services, such as financial management, are now shared, while marketing and recruitment initiatives are better coordinated. It also led to academic cooperation as Vesalius College scholars who want to conduct research in European Studies are encouraged to become associate researchers at the IES. VECO and IES also jointly organised a lecture series in 2011, while associated VECO scholars published in the IES Book series.
National Cooperation

The IES collaborates with a number of national partners, such as the Université Libre de Bruxelles, Egmont Institute for International Relations and the United Nations University centre for Comparative Regional Integration Studies in the organisation of various research activities. These partners are the co-organisers of the biennial conference on the EU in International Affairs, and are also involved in broader international networks.

Under the impulse of the Facultés Universitaire Saint-Louis (FUSL), the IES continued its talks in 2011 with the Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KUL), the Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL), the Universiteit Antwerpen (UA) and the Université de Liège (ULg) to organise a joint international conference on EU affairs, whilst triggering other smaller collaboration activities.

In 2011 the IES continued to cooperate with Belgian and Flemish authorities in the organisation of training and lecturing activities, in particular through the organisation of the lecture series on the Citadel Statement - see infra.

International cooperation

The IES has been very successful in international teaching and research endeavours. At the educational level, the Institute set up and developed a structural collaboration with the University of Vienna and the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna to co-organise the joint Summer School on the European Decision-Making Process. It continued to build on this relationship in 2011. Furthermore, contacts with American universities and colleges have led to the continued organisation of a Summer School on European Security (for the University of Southern California) and of the Semester Abroad programme for Hendrix College. Contacts with Renmin University in China led to a first joint PhD in the spring of 2011 (Hongyu Wang). At the end of 2011, the IES also prepared a joint tender for the European Commission with the Technical University of Hong Kong.

Other international research initiatives have been numerous. To start the IES collaborates closely with the Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP, London and Brussels) in the organisation of its Policy Fora and (some of the) lecture series. The IES has also established collaboration with the German-based think-tank ECOLOGIC, the European Institute for Security Studies in Paris (ISS), the Danish Technology Institute (DTI) and the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) - all of which have been involved in collaborative research projects.

In 2011, the IES was also a member of larger international research groups:

- The IES remained a member of the European Concerted Research Action on ‘The Transformation of Global Environmental Governance: Risks and Opportunities (TGE)’ (COST Action ISO802). The COST Action was initiated by the Institute for Environmental Studies at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and assembles researchers and institutes from different European countries. It receives funding through the European Science Foundation (ESF) for its networking activities;
- The IES is member of an FP7 consortium funded by the Eu-
The IES developed and launched an online knowledge brokerage Web platform that nurtures and researches interactions between policy-makers, scientific researchers, civil society and industry in the area of sustainable consumption;

- The IES continued its collaboration with the Ilya Chavchavadze University of Tbilisi following a TEMPUS project and delivers E-learning services to this institution;
- The IES also collaborated with the Monash University (Melbourne) and Tampere University (Finland), where Senior Research Fellow Harri Kalimo organised lectures;
- Collaboration between the IES and the Öko-Institute in Germany led to a contract with DG Environment (EC) on ‘Review of Decision 280/2004 - Monitoring Mechanism Decision - In View of the Agreed Climate Change and Energy Package’. These services were finalised in 2011.
- A framework contract on ‘Development Policy’, in cooperation with the German-based think-tank Ecologic, was forged with the European Parliament (External Policies DG);
- The IES is cooperating with the University of Aarhus, the University of Bologna, the University of Bremen, the Netherlands Institute of International Relations ‘Clingendael’, the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, and the University of Glasgow within the EUPERFORM network (http://www.ies.be/euperform);
- Through an EU-sponsored project on academic exchange, the EU works together with Sciences Po Bordeaux, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies [Graduate School of International Area Studies] (Korea), the Autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB), and the Universita Ca’ Foscari Venezia;
- The IES also continued its collaboration with Yale University School of Forestry and Environmental Studies on a project regarding individual producer responsibility;
- The IES was furthermore active on the same topic in a research team that is led by INSEAD Business School and includes seven academic institutions and ten corporations;
- The Institute is also involved in the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), the European Sociological Association, the International Sociological Association, the UK Political Science Association, the American Anthropological Association, UACES, and Metropolis;
- Throughout 2011, the IES continued to work together with the GRITIM research centre of the University Pompeu Fabra (Barcelona), the Graduate Institute of International & Development Studies (University Geneva), the University of Pennsylvania, the Stanford Center for South Asia, the London School of Economics, the CEMIS research institute of the University of Antwerp, the Ruppin Academic Centre (Israel), and the EU Institute for Security Studies (Paris);
- IES staff holds ties with and gave guest lectures at Kent University, the Belgian Royal Military Academy, the European Security and Defence College, the European Institute of Public Administration, and the NATO Defense College;
- Finally, the IES continued to extend its research and services on e-governance to the Gulf Cooperation Council.
Personnel Management
As indicated in the chapter on ‘Organisation and Structure’, the IES Board is responsible for appointing all Senior Research Fellows (SRFs) and management positions, whilst the IES Executive Board is responsible for the appointment of researchers.

Throughout 2011, the IES Executive Board also advised on the appointment of lecturers in the two Master-after-Master (MaNaMa) programmes. Appointments of administrative staff are undertaken by management, i.e. Prof. Dr. Bart De Schutter (President), Dr. Sebastian Oberthür (Academic Director) and Anthony Antoine (Executive Director) and Prof. Dr. Amelia Hadfield (EuroMaster) and Prof. Dr. Harri Kalimo (LLM).

As in previous years, all recruitment at the IES occurred after external vacancies were published. For the junior researchers, the candidates were ranked by the respective promoters, the Senior Research Fellows and respective VUB-professors and discussed by the IES Executive Board. Interviews were conducted with the most promising candidates.

Although the IES launched a PhD call in 2011, no new doctoral researchers were appointed to the IES in this year. As a result, the selection and availability of the suitable candidate will only lead to his appointment at the beginning of 2012.

Most personnel changes occurred within the Support Staff, where former student, Kristof Rogge, joined as the new Events Manager, following the departure of Lawrence Steenstra. As indicated in the overall strategic plan, the Institute created a new position for an External Communication, Marketing and Recruitment Officer. Following an extensive written and oral assessment, Marie Tuley was selected to join the IES at the beginning of September 2011.
A number of people also left the Institute in 2011:

- Having successfully obtained their PhDs, postdoctoral researchers Sigrid Winkler, Hongyu Wang, Anna Rudakowska, Ben Van Rompuy, Karen Donders and Koen Van den Bossche left the IES to pursue their academic career at other (international) universities. Dr. Sigrid Winkler obtained a scholarship from the Taiwan Ministry of Foreign Affairs to work in the Center for Chinese Studies in Taipei. Hongyu Wang has now become an Assistant Professor at Renmin University in Beijing, China. Anna Rudakowska became Assistant Professor at Tamkang University in Taiwan, while Ben Van Rompuy started a job as researcher at the Asser Institute. Karen Donders obtained a postdoctoral research grant at IBBT/SMIT, and Koen Van den Bossche started as a postdoctoral researcher at the Université Catholique de Louvain-La-Neuve, while also teaching at Vesalius College.

- After several years of research assistance, Olof Soebech left the IES to pursue another career.

- Project researcher Amelia Padurariu also left the Institute to work at the European Commission. She remains a doctoral student with Senior Research Fellow Eva Gross.

- Researcher Neepa Acharya did not formally leave the IES, but is no longer on the IES payroll, having obtained another grant to continue her research.

- Events Managers Marc De Clerck (January) and Lawrence Steenstra (September) left the IES to continue studying, to and pursue a career in private industry respectively.

With these personnel changes, the total number of people directly paid by the IES amounted to 35.3 full-time equivalents (i.e. a decrease of 4). The total number of IES staff, including those not paid directly by the IES (e.g. the President and one Senior Research Fellow, and all VUB-paid teaching and support staff) amounts to 86.

An additional 19 people were associated with the Institute (as either senior associate fellow or visiting fellow), while a total of 5 different students helped with administrative and basic research tasks in 2011. In sum, in 2011, the total number of people associated with the IES rose to 110.

On a more general level, the VUB Board agreed to the request of the Institute to establish a so-called ZAP-contingent for the IES. Since December 2011 therefore, the Institute is permitted to recruit full professors (ZAP mandates), a request that had been endorsed by the Government Auditing Committee in 2010 and which finally came to fruition in 2011. A contingency plan for 2012-2015 also schedules the possible ZAP positions at the IES. The necessary procedural steps will be taken in the course of 2012 to transform (part of) the current staff positions to ZAP positions. According to VUB and IES rules, this will only be possible through external vacancies and thorough scrutiny of the academic files by both the IES Board and the VUB governing bodies.
## Overview of personnel at the IES

### Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fulltime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Bart De Schutter</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Director</td>
<td>Sebastian Oberthür</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Anthony Antoine</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Senior Research Staff

| SRF Sustainable Development    | Harri Kalimo          | 100%     |
| SRF EFSP                       | Eva Gross             | 100%     |
| SRF Migration, Asylum & Diversity | Richard Lewis        | n/a      |
| SR Educational Development Unit | Amelia Hadfield       | 50%      |

### Supporting Researchers

| Postdoc Migration               | Ilke Adam             | 100%     |
| Postdoc EFSP                    | Luis Simon            | 90%      |
| Postdoc European Economics      | Selen Guerin          | n/a      |
| Postdoc Infosoc                 | Jamal Shahin          | 70%      |
| Postdoc Infosoc                 | Karen Donders (until June) | 50% |
| Postdoc 3\textsuperscript{rd} pillar issues | Peter Burgess     | 25%      |
| Project support (Environment)   | Olof Soebech (until February) | 100% |

### PhD-students

| Cluster Env. & Sust. Dev't      | Katja Biedenkopf      | 100%     |
| Cluster EFSP                   | Alexander Mattelaer   | 100%     |
| Cluster Information Society    | Karen Donders (until June) | 100% |
| Cluster Migration & Asylum     | Hannelore Goeman      | 100%     |
| Cluster EU-China               | Sigrid Winkler (until June) | 100% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fulltime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura Boone</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Dupont</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armelle Gouritin</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justyna Pozarowska</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radostina Primova</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florian Rabitz</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioannis Spyridakis</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran Van Tuy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Stahl</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Lamensch</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Meyer</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Van Rompuy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neepa Acharya (until September)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongyu Wang (until June)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overview of personnel at the IES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster European Economics</th>
<th>Anna Rudakowska (Until June)</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cem Tintin</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Assistant</td>
<td>Laila Macharis</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Sterckx (until February)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>Photis Schurmans</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication / Recruitment Officer</td>
<td>Marie Tuley (from September)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Manager</td>
<td>Mark De Clerck (until February)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Steenstra (until Sept.)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kristof Rogge (since Sept.)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Secretariat</td>
<td>Hilde Vanderheyden</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Communication</td>
<td>Klaas Chielens</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Peter Menke</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly employed Teaching Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL.M. International and European Law</td>
<td>Dirk Arts</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youri Devuyst</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Faull</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ricardo Gosalbo Bono</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Hoffmeister</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harri Kalimo</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marc Maresceau</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bernd Martenczuk</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arnaud Nuyts</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sebastian Oberthür</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Servatius van Thiel</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA European Integration &amp; Development</td>
<td>Harri Kalimo</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doris Hildebrand</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manuela Alfé</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela Liberatore</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea Mairate</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irina Tanasescu</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VUB-paid Teaching &amp; teaching support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL.M. International and European Law</td>
<td>Sari Kouvo</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul De Hert</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aurora Voiculescu</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Joris</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA European Integration &amp; Development</td>
<td>Amelia Hadfield</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jef Vuchelen</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leo Van Hove</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alison Woodward</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholliers Peter</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Assurance
Quality Assurance

Quality lies at the core of all IES management and activities.

Ensuring high(est) quality constitutes the most important guiding principle for all decisions by IES Management. Management applies quality control measures ex ante as well as ex post. In attracting academic personnel, the IES applies the highest standards (international vacancy, external scrutiny, interviews / test lectures). Likewise in its financial management, the IES implements both internal and external control (bookkeeping controlled by external auditors); equally in its services, the IES delivers the best possible services and tries to improve them through feedback from its clients (feedback forms after activities).

- **Quality of Services:** for all relevant major activities organised at the IES, an evaluation form is distributed to participants to assess the quality of the rendered services. After each major event/activity, management and organising staff jointly assess the strengths and weaknesses of the outcomes in order to identify potential for improvement.

- **Quality of Personnel:** all personnel are hired through a quality control procedure, which as a general rule, begins after the publication of an external vacancy. In the case of academic personnel, these vacancies are published internationally through relevant Internet and newspapers or journals. The files of candidates are scrutinised by (external) evaluators, with top-ranked individuals invited for an interview with management, senior IES researchers and experts in the field, as appropriate. In the case of recruitment for teaching staff, the incumbents are also subject to a guest/test lecture that is assessed by both colleagues and students.

In 2011, the IES launched two international vacancies: one for an additional researcher in the field of Migration and Asylum, and one for a full-time Communication, Marketing and Recruitment Officer. The Institute further scrutinised the vacancies of the Faculty (of Law / of Political, Social and Economic Science) with regards to the candidates for part-time teaching positions in the IES advanced Master programmes (for those that under the Service Level Agreements are paid by the respective Faculty; other directly-employed teaching staff follows IES procedures through the Board and Executive Board of the Institute).

The IES PhD-research vacancy attracted 65 candidates, with the most promising candidates scrutinised by the Senior Research Fellow and the postdoctoral fellow of the Migration, Diversity and Asylum cluster, together with a senior Associate Fellow of the IES, and the Academic Director. Four candidates were invited for an interview with IES Management and a team of Senior researchers of the IES. The procedure led to the appointment by the IES Executive Board of a Dutch PhD candidate, Mathijs Van Dijk.

The position of External Communication, Marketing and Recruitment Officer attracted 32 candidates. After an initial written evaluation, the five best candidates were the invited for an interview with the IES Executive Director, the Director of Communications of Vesalius College, and the Director of VUB's International Relations and Mobility Office. The procedure led to the appointment of a British candidate, Marie Tuley.

The IES opened an additional internal vacancy for the part-time (50%) position of Assistant Director. It was deemed necessary that the incumbent should be familiar with the IES and its structures, ideally a recently-graduated postdoctoral fellow. The sole candidate, Alexander Mattelaer, was subsequently hired after interviews with IES Management and endorsement through the IES Executive Board. He will take up his function in January 2012.

IES Management further refined the existing guidelines for Academic Staff, in which Quality Control through benchmarking is embedded. All academic staff at the IES are evaluated once per year. Junior researchers report to their cluster coordinator (usually the Senior Research Fellow of the cluster), whilst senior academic personnel reports to IES
Management who, in joint conversation with the incumbent, set the benchmarks for the upcoming year.

Other personnel are evaluated twice per year through an internal assessment procedure. In 2011, two such evaluations took place (one in February, one in September) using evaluation sheets that were created in 2010. The evaluations served as benchmarking for the upcoming six months.

- **Quality of Finances:** The financial officer is supervised by the Executive Director, who in turn reports to the Board of the IES. An external auditor annually controls the overall finances.

- **Quality of Education:** The two programme managers aim at ensuring a good balance between academics and practitioners on their teaching staff. As outlined above, teaching staff is attracted through international vacancies, subject to external scrutiny, interviews and test lectures. Students annually assess the quality of the teacher / course through feedback forms. In 2011, the IES scrutinised the candidates for the course ‘International Comparative Law’ in its LL.M. programme. The international vacancy was launched through the Faculty of Law. The Executive Board gave advice that was sent to the respective Faculty.

The quality of the teachers is subject to student evaluations conducted yearly. Both the Dean as well as the Programme Director of the respective Master programme oversees the follow-up of programme questions relating to teaching, learning and the overall learning objectives of both modules and programmes.

- **Quality of Students:** Students in the Advanced Master programmes and in the IES Summer School are carefully selected, based on their study background and results, their command of English, their suitability and motivation, as well as providing two recommendation letters from current or former professors.

- **Quality of Research:** PhD and senior researchers are appointed after a thorough selection procedure involving an international call for applications, including external scrutiny and interviews (see above). Research progress of PhD students is monitored regularly/continuously by the promoter, the doctoral committee, the responsible senior IES researcher, and the Academic Director in accordance with the IES PhD Guidelines (incorporated in the Guidelines for Academic Staff). In the process of this quality control, junior researchers present a state of the art of their findings once per year at a research colloquium (held biweekly). Senior IES researchers are monitored by the IES Academic Director in the context of establishing and reviewing ‘benchmarks’ (see above).
Financial Report
Institute for European Studies

Financial Report (summary)

2011 marked an unprecedented output for the IES. No less than five doctoral students defended their thesis, while the number of publications in journals and books almost doubled. The IES has in the past invested heavily in its research and teaching potential, and these investments have borne fruit over the past year.

Amid the scientific research undertaken by clusters and individuals alike, the IES performed the greatest logistical operation since its inception by moving from 15 to 5 Pleinlaan. The purchase of a building destined for internationalisation by the VUB triggered the move to new premises from the hitherto privately rented office space to this new VUB building. During the renovation works, the Institute opted for sustainable and energy-saving solutions on all levels, and took into account possible further growth. This resulted in the creation of a flex-office where several rooms were provided which were furnished according to the tasks that the researchers and/or support personnel would perform. Neither staff nor management have their ‘own’ office. This allows for a far more flexible approach to human resource management, while allowing the Institute to host far more visiting researchers and interns. In an overall assessment before the move, private offices had an occupancy rate of less than 50%, which is not surprising, giving the nature of the work that researchers and support staff perform.

The planned move also gave rise to house services that until recently had been scattered. The new office building is now also home to the educational services of the IES which were previously located at different places on campus. The building now houses the secretariat and classrooms for the Master-after-Master programmes, conference rooms, teaching staff and classrooms and student services (study rooms, computer room, lockers, etc.).

It is evident that all these investments (move, flex-office, renovations, bringing together services, expansion of student services, and more) have had a serious impact on the 2011 accounts. However, this shortfall had been previously anticipated for a number of years prior to the move, and the necessary investment facilities were thus established for this purpose. The proportion of externally funded projects in the totality of revenues increased again from 18% in 2010 to over 20% in 2011. Since the signing of the Service Level Agreements between the VUB and the IES, the financial support from the university decreased considerably. Therefore, the overall percentage of funds outside the government subsidy fell from 42% to 40%. Notwithstanding this slight ‘decline’, the IES is firmly committed to its goal of raising substantial ‘matching funding’, and this through externally funded (research) projects (20%), e-learning and training, and the organisation of summer schools and ‘study abroad’ programmes (13%).

With 65% of staff costs (last year 63%), the IES keeps its major expenditures within the budget. In this budget category, the Impact of the Service Level Agreements was much more noticeable this year than in 2010: i.e. labour costs of all part-time teachers in the IES Master-after-Master programmes are now fully borne by the Institute. In 2010, this was only partly the case, whereas previously, these costs were recovered from the university.

With the move to a new location and the alterations that this entailed, the share of equipment costs (investments) rose from 2% in previous years to 9% in 2011.

Despite such outlays, the IES ended the year with a profit of €15,892, which is in stark contrast to the budgeted loss of €173,788. This difference is due solely to a higher yield by externally funded projects. The financial condition of the IES is thus healthy, thanks in large part to provisions made in previous years. More specifically, in the areas of investment (buildings/moving) and in the field of education (higher anticipated contribution of the IES in the Manama programmes and the elimination of funding for these programs), these provisions proved to be necessary.
# Annual Report 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Income</strong></th>
<th><strong>2010 Budget</strong></th>
<th><strong>2010 Accounts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 700000</td>
<td>Government grant</td>
<td>€ 1,859,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 700180</td>
<td>VlM grant</td>
<td>€ 370,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 7023000</td>
<td>Externally financed projects</td>
<td>€ 964,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 704000</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>€ 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 705000</td>
<td>Tuition fees PPL and EUROMASTER</td>
<td>€ 265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 705050</td>
<td>Conference fees</td>
<td>€ 80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 705300</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>€ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 709200</td>
<td>Training &amp; E-learning</td>
<td>€ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 709780</td>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>€ 40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equipment**

€ 162,388  € 80,000

**Running Costs**

€ 1,334,098  € 1,118,233

**Personnel**

€ 2,106,079  € 2,072,760

1. 821900 | Administrative Personnel | € 425,905 | € 501,405 |
2. 822000 | Senior Academic Personnel | € 615,850 | € 585,718 |
3. 823000 | Researchers and Doctoral Students | € 1,017,818 | € 908,611 |
4. 809300 | Pension Fund | € 40,534 | € 39,875 |

**Provisions and Funds**

€ 5,000  (€ 14,095)

1. 108100 | Research Enhancement Fund | € 30,000 | € 30,000 |
2. 109180 | Use of the Res. End. Fund | (€ 25,000) | (€ 44,085) |
3. 108180 | Relaxation provision | € | |

**Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2010 Budget</strong></th>
<th><strong>2010 Accounts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totaal inkomsten:</td>
<td>€ 3,172,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totaal Uitgaven:</td>
<td>€ 3,490,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totaal Voorwaarden 2009</td>
<td>€ 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totaal van het boekjaar</td>
<td>€ (328,580)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Destination of the Reserves**

0.40,068

1. 111100 | Building investment fund | (€ 200,000) | |
2. 111110 | Social fund | (€) | |
3. 111140 | Fund Senior Research Fellows | (€) | |
4. 111170 | Master Programme Fund | (€ 83,050) | (€ 66,831) |
5. 140100 | Use of / addition to the surplus | (€) | |
6. 109000 | Use of / addition to the project reserve | (€) | (€ 140,999) |

**Personnel cost vs. Total cost (%)**

59.99  61.73

**Surplus/Deficit vs. Total income (%)**

-10.86  -1.52
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