



Gesprächskreis
**Partnerschaft mit Russland
in Europa**

Partnership with Russia in Europe

Concrete steps towards cooperation between
Russia and the EU





Partnership with Russia in Europe

Concrete steps towards cooperation between Russia and the EU

9th Meeting of the Working Group
14th-15th February 2011

Moscow-Volynskoe

Content

Vyacheslav Nikonov / Reinhard Krumm Preface	3
Katinka Barysch Report on the 9th EU-Russia Roundtable	5
1. Contemporary unsolved conflicts: Where is there a possibility for cooperation between the EU and Russia?	6
2. EU-Russia Partnership and the Cooperation Agreement after the Treaty of Lisbon: Has there been any progress?	8
3. Euro-Atlantic Security and the Triangular Relationship between Russia, the EU and NATO: What is going to happen with the Euro Missile Defense System? The role of the Treaty on European Security in discussions	11
4. The EU-Russia Partnership for Modernization: realistic steps and actual political, social and economic projects	14
Andrei Zagorski The status of negotiations on a new Russia-EU treaty	16
1. The EU-Russia negotiations were never easy	17
2. The scope of the agreement	19
3. The WTO accession by the Russian Federation	20
4. Energy cooperation	21
5. Institutionalizing EU-Russia external security cooperation	21
6. Other issues	21
7. Outlook	21
Hans-Henning Schröder EU-Russia Partnership and the Cooperation Agreement after the Treaty of Lisbon: Has There Been Any Progress?	22
Programme	25
List of participants	28

Preface

The past few years have seen a distinct improvement in EU-Russia relations. This is partly thanks to the easing of the Russian-US relationship since the reset and the signing of the START II nuclear disarmament treaty, and partly due to the fact that an eastward expansion of NATO is not currently on the table. In addition, Russian membership in the WTO is in reach as never before.

So why not take this opportunity to tackle a couple of long-standing problems? There are security issues: the different options for Euro-Atlantic Security and the triangular relationship between Russia, the EU and NATO, not to mention the unresolved conflicts in the former Soviet Union. Other topics, such as the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement after the Treaty of Lisbon, and the Partnership for Modernization, merit further discussion as well.

These subjects were examined at the ninth Russia-EU-Roundtable “Partnership for Russia in Europe” in Moscow, 14-15 February 2011, under the title “Concrete Steps Towards Cooperation between Russia and the EU.” As during the last conference in Brussels a year ago, one of the main issues in general was the question of visa liberalization between the EU and Russia. This seems to be a core problem and its resolution was described as a necessary step not only towards improving relations but also for transforming them to the next level of mutual understanding.

The Unity for Russia Foundation, Russkiy Mir and the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung as joint organizers are proud to present this report of the ninth round table, on the theme of new ideas for a strong relationship between Russia and the EU. The publication consists of a protocol, written by Katinka Barysch, and two articles on the Russia-EU Treaty: one analyzing the topic from a Russian angle, from Andrei Zagorsky, the other, by Hans-Henning Schröder, looking at it from a German/EU perspective. As with last year’s report, it will be published only in electronic form, in order to present the results quickly and effectively before the next Russia-EU summit in Nizhny Novgorod.

As to how practical and influential our humble thoughts and ideas have been: this will be a topic for discussion at our 10th anniversary meeting, scheduled for spring 2012 in Potsdam.

Vyacheslav Nikonov/Reinhard Krumm, Moscow 2011

Report on the 9th EU-Russia Roundtable

The last FES Russkiy Mir workshop in 2010 in Brussels had mainly discussed the improved atmosphere in EU-Russia relations, and the potential that this may have for reinforced cooperation in the future. The 2011 meeting in Moscow took a more constructive atmosphere as its starting point. Like the previous two meetings, the mood in which the discussions took place was calm and focused. The heated debates and sometimes angry recriminations that had characterized some previous workshops seemed a distant memory. Russian participants still sometimes accused the EU of engaging in double standards or acting arrogantly towards Russia. EU participants still argued that Russia was at times stubborn and short-sighted. But such views surfaced as part of debates about specific issues such as energy or frozen conflicts. They did not replace such debates as was sometimes the case in the past.

The atmosphere at the roundtable clearly reflected the overall improvement in the relationship between Russia and the West that had taken place over the previous couple of years. The 'reset' between Russia and the US had culminated in the ratification of the START 2 nuclear disarmament treaty and reinforced cooperation over international security challenges such as Afghanistan and Iran. With NATO enlargement off the agenda and Ukraine governed by a Moscow-friendly regime, Russia felt more relaxed about developments in the common neighbourhood. NATO and Russia agreed to cooperate on missile defense at the end of 2010. The economic crisis of 2008-09 was a wake-up call for many in the Russian leadership and reinforced Russian calls for the conclusion of 'modernization partnerships' with key European countries as well as the EU itself. Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization once again looked within reach.

The 2011 roundtable focused on the opportunities that might arise from this much improved environment. Participants debated whether there was scope for joint initiatives to resolve the frozen conflicts in the Caucasus, accelerate negotiations on the new bilateral EU-Russia treaty, implement the NATO-Russia agreement on missile defense cooperation and bring to life the EU-Russia modernization partnership. However, despite the more positive atmosphere in EU-Russia relations, participants found little evidence of concrete progress in any of these areas. Long-standing obstacles to cooperation, such as Russia's unwillingness to give the EU a bigger role in its 'own backyard' or to take over EU rules unilaterally, remained to be removed. Although the EU appeared a lot less divided over Russia than it had been a few years ago, intra-EU disagreements about how to deal with its biggest neighbor still resurfaced in the quest for concrete policies. The Russian side complained that it was not always clear what the EU actually wanted from Russia. They also thought that the Lisbon treaty and the establishment of the European External Action Service had as yet not resulted in a strengthening of the EU's foreign policy. West European participants argued that as

long as Russia did not have a clear sense of where it was going it would remain hard to define an effective Russia strategy.

The discussions at the roundtable were also instructive because of what they did not focus on. There was very little debate about internal developments in Russia, such as what the 2011 parliamentary and 2012 presidential elections might mean for EU-Russia relations. It was striking that both EU and Russian participants were almost equally pessimistic about the prospects of significant change within Russia. Participants thought that this would put a natural limit to how far and how far the EU (and NATO) could improve their relationship with Russia.

1st session

Contemporary unsolved conflicts: Where is there a possibility for cooperation between the EU and Russia?

The common neighbourhood will perhaps be the most important test case for the 'new and improved' EU-Russia relationship. And in this context it is particularly the 'frozen' conflicts of Transnistria, Nagorno-Karabakh, Abkhazia and South Ossetia that represent a challenge for the willingness and ability of the EU and Russia to find common solutions.

Participants from Western Europe and Russia agreed that such conflicts threatened the stability in what the EU likes to call the common neighborhood and Russians often refer to as their near abroad. More even than bilateral issues such as trade, or international cooperation on say, Afghanistan, the common neighborhood commands EU-Russia cooperation because "destabilization would have catastrophic effects on both sides", in the words of one Russian academic.

Participants thought that the EU and Russia together had the knowledge and the resources to bring about solutions to at least some of the smoldering conflicts. "Russia has the historical links and the influence. The EU can bring its experience with confidence building measures and constitutional issues such as minority rights protection and federal settlements, as well as financial support", explained one European diplomat.

The ensuing discussion focused mainly on the conflict surrounding Transnistria and the 'Meseberg initiative' launched by German Chancellor Angela Merkel and President Dmitri Medvedev in June 2010. The two leaders suggested that the EU and Russia should establish a political and security committee to reflect the growing importance of security questions in the EU-Russia relationship and the EU's growing strength as a security actor. Many observers interpreted the Meseberg communiqué to mean that the EU would like to see some tangible progress on Transnistria before institutionalizing a security dialogue – a step long demanded by the Russian side. Such progress could, for example, consist in re-starting the 5+2 talks that have been suspended since 2006 or an agreement to replace the existing, largely Russian and Transnistrian 'peacekeeping force' with a broader observer mission involving EU personnel.

Participants from both Russia and Western Europe concurred that among the region's frozen conflicts, the one surrounding Transnistria was most amenable to resolution, especially if the EU and Russia worked together. However, once the discussion moved into the specifics of a possible settlement the optimistic mood gave way to caution and disagreement.

Several Russian participants argued that the 'Kozak memorandum' from 2003 was still the best, and perhaps the only, basis for a settlement of the conflict. Although the EU had at the time rejected Russia's unilateral initiative, West European participants at the roundtable did not immediately dismiss the idea of revisiting some of the aspects of the Kozak memorandum. They drew the line, however, at the prolonged presence of Russian troops in the territory of Transnistria, which was foreseen in the Kozak memorandum but judged to be in contravention of the adapted Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. One participant quoted a Moldovan leader as saying that "until the last Russian soldier leaves, no solution is possible".

One Russian expert argued that Russian withdrawal could make a settlement harder not easier. She explained that the trilateral peacekeeping contingent in Transnistria consisted of 500 Russian soldiers, alongside 300 Moldovan and 400 Transnistrian ones. "If the Russians leave, the Transnistrians will join a paramilitary unit and Russia will lose all leverage over [Transnistrian 'President' Igor] Smirnov". In her view, talk about Russian withdrawal was only sensible if the trilateral peacekeeping force was replaced with an EU-Russia mission.

Participants were unsure whether it made sense to consider progress in Transnistria a precondition for the establishment of a security committee between the EU and Russia. Or whether, on the contrary, such a committee, or a similar 'mechanism' for negotiation, was a precondition for achieving progress on the ground. Participants agreed that the 5+2 talks, which relegate the US and the EU to observer status, had proven inadequate for achieving a solution. It was generally considered desirable that the EU should play a stronger role in conflict resolution – although Russian participants expressed reservations about its ability to do so, especially in view of the current institutional changes in Brussels. Following the entry into force of the Lisbon treaty and the establishment of the new European External Action service, the EU abolished the post of a special representative for the Transnistria conflict and divided his role between the new EEAS managing director for Eastern Europe and the EU Delegation in Moldova.

One Russian participant expressed concern that, since the prospects for a settlement were dim, making Transnistria a test case for a new institution or dialogue could backfire: "If the new EU-Russia security committee achieves nothing, it will only aggravate the frozen conflicts and lead to a deterioration in EU-Russia relations." Another participant pointed out that the mechanism of the Minsk Group – although well established for 15 years – had not achieved progress towards a solution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Participants concluded that a new mechanism for talks was a necessary but not sufficient precondition for progress in Transnistria.

Participants agreed that another obstacle to a negotiated settlement was strong reluctance on the part of the Transnistrian leadership to consider a federal solution short of independence. One Russian participant called the idea that Russia could put pressure on the regime in Tiraspol to engage in negotiations “a myth”. He explained that although the conflict in Transnistria had not evolved along clearly discernable ethnic lines, like the ones in Nagorno-Karabakh or the separatist entities in Georgia, it still involved intractable questions of “identity”. After more than two decades of separation, both the Moldovans and the inhabitants of the separatist republic were said to have their own strong national identity. These identities would neither allow them to merge with Romania or Russia, respectively, or to reintegrate smoothly with each other. Another Russian participant explained that a further obstacle to rapid progress was political instability in Moldova, which had seen three rounds of parliamentary elections in two years.

Although specifics of a possible settlement were not discussed, participants talked about the guiding principles of such a settlement. West European diplomats stressed the principle of integrity of existing borders and the protection of minority rights. One German participant called for lifting the “weight of history” and seeking pragmatic solutions within existing borders. Russian participants thought that the EU was upholding double standards after having recognized Kosovo and other post-Cold War entities. “If the EU’s guiding principle is the recognition of existing borders”, asked one Russian expert, “how come 25 new member states were added to the OSCE in the last 20 years?”

Given the prevailing pessimism about possible solutions in Transnistria – not to speak of Nagorno-Karabakh, South Ossetia and Abkhazia – some Russia participants asked whether it actually made sense to ‘unfreeze’ the region’s conflicts or whether it may not be better to preserve the current delicate stalemate. Other speakers, however, disputed that the conflicts were frozen and the status quo was viable even in the short to medium term. Although the risk of violence was judged to be low in Transnistria, it was palpable in Nagorno-Karabakh and the Georgian separatist regions. “In these conflicts the soldiers are in the trenches”, said one Russian observer. “Either they go back to the barracks or they will start shooting at each other. The situation is explosive.”

2nd session

EU-Russia Partnership and the Cooperation Agreement after the Treaty of Lisbon: Has there been any progress?

Representatives of the EU as well as Russian experts recounted that negotiations on a new bilateral treaty between the EU and Russia (the name is not yet settled) have progressed steadily but slowly. After 12 rounds of talks, the Brussels and Moscow have reached broad agreement in a number of areas, including some related to internal and external security. However, there were still large hurdles to be overcome to finalise talks in the two main areas to be covered by the new agreement, namely energy and trade. Equally important, the roundtable discussion showed that there is still no agreement on what the scope and purpose of the new treaty should be.

Participants concurred that the old Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) – now prolonged on an annual basis – was out of date. It reflected the optimism of the early 1990s when Russia (and the nine other CIS states with which the EU concluded similar agreements) appeared to be on a path towards multi-party democracy and open market economies. Although the first generation of PCAs also regulated a plethora of practical issues, ranging from market access to money laundering, their main character was that of a “road map towards parliamentary democracy”, in the words of one German scholar. With the benefit of hindsight, it has become clear that the political objectives of the PCAs were overly ambitious. Many CIS states exhibited strong authoritarian tendencies, said one West European participant, and the EU was as yet unsure about how to deal with them in a way that was workable but did not compromise the democratic values on which the EU itself was based.

Several participants argued that it was not surprising that Russia today rejected, and the EU re-considered, the overtly political nature of the PCAs. In the negotiations for the new agreement, the focus would be more on practical issues. However, Russian and EU participants offered different interpretations of what this “pragmatization” and “de-ideologization” of the PCA process meant.

Russian participants expressed the hope that the EU had developed greater respect for the principles of non-interference and equality in the negotiations. One Russian expert thought that the EU’s more pragmatic stance simply reflected greater realism about what was achievable in today’s Russia: “We are a young democracy. We take two steps forwards and one step back. A bit like the EU itself.”

Representatives of the EU side refuted the idea that the EU had downgraded the importance of supporting democracy and human rights in Russia. One EU diplomat reminded his Russian colleagues that their country had signed up to democratic values and the protection of human rights in the framework of the Council of Europe and the European Court of Human Rights. Even if the new EU-Russia agreement turned out to be more ‘pragmatic’ and less focused on political issues, the EU would continue to push Russia to live up to its existing commitments in this regard. “We just don’t want to use the new treaty to settle existing disputes about democracy and human rights”, he added. Moreover, participants agreed that the increased role of the European Parliament – “more sensitive to human rights than other EU institutions”, in the words of one Russian expert – in foreign policy making would not allow the EU to downgrade human rights and democracy even if it wanted to.

Beyond the treaty clauses on political objectives, participants also found very practical reasons why the new agreement was progressing so slowly. The most important stumbling block was said to be trade. Early optimism about a rapid conclusion of PCA-2 talks was predicated on the assumption that Russia was about to join the World Trade Organisation, following the WTO accession deal between the EU and Russia in 2004. Since then, however, numerous trade disputes between Russia and the EU, as well as and other WTO members, have slowed down Russia’s accession negotiations. Experts explained that as long as Russia remained outside the WTO, the

bilateral trade negotiations for the new EU-Russia treaty would remain stuck since Moscow would be loath to make market access offers twice.

At the end of 2010, the EU and Russia concluded another agreement to settle outstanding WTO issues, which raised hopes that Russia may finally join the Organization in 2011 or early 2012. While participants agreed that WTO membership was overdue, as well as necessary for progress in the PCA-2 talks, they remained cautious about predicting rapid progress. Outstanding issues included an agreement on the level of agricultural subsidies that Russia would be allowed to dispense and the veto by Georgia (already a WTO member) on Russia's accession. The most complicated issue, however, was how Russia would combine WTO membership and the establishment of a customs union with Belarus and Kazakhstan. The customs union was also identified as a major obstacle to the EU and Russia establishing a free trade area or even a 'common economic space'.

Energy was another area that participants identified as difficult in the treaty negotiations. The EU had initially hoped that the energy clauses of the PCA-2 might be based on the principles of the Energy Charter Treaty. However, Russia had since withdrawn its signature from the Energy Charter Treaty and registered strong reservations about the EU's own policies in this area. In particular, Russian participants said that Moscow was seeking an exemption from the liberalization clauses of the EU's 'third energy package' which mandated all pipeline operators to auction access to their pipelines on the open market. Gazprom feared that such clauses would negatively affect the long-term bilateral gas contracts with big European customers. Gazprom also feared that EU rules on legal 'unbundling' of energy provision, transport and sales would prevent it from owning and operating pipelines on EU territory. EU representatives reassured the Russian side that Gazprom was free to invest in the EU market "just like any other European company" but added that the EU would not make any special arrangements for the company.

There was no agreement at the roundtable on whether it would be better to sign an unambitious agreement in the near future or hold out for a more comprehensive settlement once conditions had improved. Some Russian participants argued strongly that the EU and Russia should drop any pretensions about integration and common spaces and focus on setting up a mechanism for dealing with each other bilaterally. "The integration process with the EU is long dead", claimed one Russian journalist. "EU-Russia cooperation will develop where it is necessary but there is no chance of any common spaces." The new agreement should, in his eyes, reflect this more modest ambition.

On the other hand, West European and some Russian experts argued that it was hardly worth signing a treaty that was less ambitious and comprehensive than the previous one. They expressed hope that other EU-Russia initiatives, in particular the partnership for modernization, would help to improve the rule of law in Russia and hence allow the two sides to gradually converge in the economic (and perhaps political and social systems). In due course, such a convergence would allow for the conclusion

of a more wide-ranging new treaty. One Russian participant, however, poured cold water on the idea of significant change inside Russia: “There is an institution called Putin. Even if Putin leaves, the political system that he signifies will remain until at least 2017-18. So we have plenty of time to work out a new agreement.”

3rd Session

Euro-Atlantic Security and the Triangular Relationship between Russia, the EU and NATO: What is going to happen with the Euro Missile Defense System? The role of the Treaty on European Security in discussions

Participants from Russia and EU countries were in full agreement that NATO-Russia relations had improved significantly since the low-point reached over the Georgia war in August 2008. The NATO-Russia Council had resumed its regular meetings and military cooperation had restarted after a temporary suspension. The most important development underlying improved relations, argued one Western security expert, was that further NATO enlargement was no longer a near or even medium-term prospect. The US-Russia reset, and in particular the signing and, more recently, ratification of the START 2 nuclear disarmament treaty further contributed to improved relations between Russia and the West. Yet, the NATO-Russia agreement at the alliance’s Lisbon summit in December 2010 surprised many. It signified “a degree of understanding that would have been hard to imagine two years ago”, in the words of one NATO official. “We no longer see each other as wild beasts”, he added, “we are partners now.”

While the NATO official called the Lisbon agreement “a milestone”, a Russian security expert referred to it as a “breakthrough”. In Lisbon, NATO and Russia agreed on various concrete steps ranging from extended rights of transit (and re-transit) of NATO military goods destined for Afghanistan over Russian territory to mutual cooperation in rescue-at-sea missions and emergency response. But participants agreed that by far the most momentous part of the agreement was a political declaration to cooperate on missile defense – the issue that had until recently frustrated all other attempts of improving Russia-NATO relations. This agreement could be “a game changer, or a problem for everything else”, said one Russian security expert. A West European participant added that if cooperation on anti-ballistic missile defense (ABM) was successful, it would set a great precedent that NATO-Russia cooperation could lead to better protection of both the EU and Russia.

The NATO official explained that despite Russian demands to get some input into the operation or management of a regional ABM system, the allies could only accept cooperation and coordination between separate NATO and Russian systems. There was no prospect of having a joint system because – the technical problems of merging existing elements and plans aside – NATO was a collective defense organization. It was therefore not possible for NATO to delegate to Russia certain commitments concerning the defense of NATO territory. Russia, the official added, could not accept such a step either.

Most Russian participants appeared to accept the premise that coordination between separate systems was the best that one could hope for. One Russian security expert, however, warned that at present, Russia did not have that much to coordinate since existing elements of missile defense, such as the Moscow regional ABM and space-based defenses were “useless”. “On the whole”, he concluded, “we need a new system”. One participant thought that was a great opportunity for Russia’s military-industrial complex.

Another Russian participant questioned the whole premise of parallel ABM development. Even if Russia and NATO moved towards exchanging data and improving interoperability of their respective systems, politically the Lisbon agreement was taking the two sides into “the worst possible world”. “What this statement boils down to”, he said, “is that both sides will arm themselves as much as they can afford but they won’t really work together.” Another Russian participant warned that ABM may unsettle the system of ‘mutually assured destruction’ that was still the main guarantor of strategic stability between Russia and the US. Since there was no trust between the two sides and the relationship had seen many ups and downs, he strongly counseled NATO and Russia to desist from any moves that might undermine MAD until and unless relations had improved significantly. Other Russian participants did not agree that ABM, especially on a regional basis, would be destabilizing.

Western participants shared at least some of that caution, warning that ABM development and cooperation was only at the start and would be politically and technically challenging. They agreed that it would take time, as well as goodwill on both sides. But they warned their Russian counterparts not to dismiss the initiative before it had got going in earnest. But equally they warned against making ABM cooperation a make-or-break issue for NATO-Russia relations.

Participants from both sides welcomed the idea of a joint threat assessment, also included in the Lisbon agreement. NATO’s own analysis showed that around 30 countries either had developed or were in the process of acquiring ballistic missile technology. Russian participants did not directly dispute that analysis but warned that there were still significant differences in threat perceptions between NATO and Russia. They also pointed out that Russia would remain opposed to any ABM system that would undermine its nuclear deterrence or its second-strike capabilities. START 2 notwithstanding, Russia would continue to rely heavily on its nuclear deterrence in the future. One participant quoted a Russian general as saying that in conventional military terms, Russia was a “dwarf” and that nuclear was the “optimal way of providing deterrence and intimidation”.

One Western security expert drew attention to the fact that the main security challenges for both Russia and NATO were outside the euro-Atlantic space, namely in Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan. In these areas, the two sides had increasingly proven that they could work together. However, several Russian participants warned that Afghanistan was not only an opportunity for NATO-Russia cooperation but also bore the risk for further tensions. They said that the US was building various large-scale military

installations in Afghanistan that might be used to project force into the wider Central Asian region – an area that Russia has traditionally considered its strategic backyard.

Participants briefly discussed the Medvedev initiative for a ‘new European security architecture’ and a ‘European security treaty’. Russian participants showed some understanding as to why the West had reacted cautiously to the initiative, saying the draft treaty had been “raw” and should be seen as “an invitation for talks”. Yet they also insisted that despite improved NATO-Russia relations the bigger question of how Russia fitted into the European and transatlantic security system would not go away. And Russia would continue to insist on legally binding commitments, “not a gentleman’s agreement”. Several participants argued that despite the recent rapprochement, trust between NATO and Russia remained precarious. One Russian participant argued that Russia and the West would continue to see each other as possible adversaries until Russia had developed a democracy and middle class comparable to those found in NATO member-states.

4th session

The EU-Russia Partnership for Modernization: realistic steps and actual political, social and economic projects

Participants discussed the latest big initiative in EU-Russia relations – the partnership for modernization (P4M) – with a healthy dose of scepticism. The partnership goes back to an initiative at the EU-Russia summit in Stockholm in late 2009. In mid-2010, at their Rostov-on-Don summit, the EU and Russia adopted a joint declaration on the launch of the P4M and in December that year they added a more detailed ‘rolling work programme’ to identify possible cooperation projects.

Roundtable participants were not in doubt that the P4M reflected the domestic priorities of the Russian leadership and was therefore more promising than other projects that had less political momentum behind them, such as the four common spaces. However, participants quickly identified disagreements within Russia, as well as between Russia and the EU, about what ‘modernization’ actually meant as a major obstacle to progress.

Russian participants explained that the camp around President Medvedev preferred a wide definition of modernization, one that would entail social, political and well as comprehensive economic reform. Prime Minister Putin and his supporters, on the other hand, pursued a narrower modernization plan that mainly focused on technology transfer, support for innovative industries and other state-led interventions. Most officials and experts in the EU would support the wider concept of modernization. One Russian expert recounted how these different conceptions led to clashing priorities early on in the EU-Russia debates about the P4M: While Russia prioritized the harmonization of technical standards, industrial policy, innovation support, visa-free travel and energy questions, the EU side highlighted the need to strengthen the rule of law and civil society, market integration, cooperation in science and research, and adequate joint financing. Reflecting the lack of agreement, the Rostov communiqué on the P4m

consisted of a long list of 'priorities' that encompassed both the technical, industrial and innovation aspects favored by Moscow and the more systemic (rule of law, market liberalization, social change) aspects highlighted by the EU. The work programme adopted in December 2010 was equally broad and unfocused. Several West European participants thought that this lack of focus would make it difficult for the EU and Russia to achieve concrete progress. Russian participants called on the EU to decide more clearly what kind of modernization it was prepared to support in Russia. West European participants cautioned that even within the EU there were differences about what kind of partnership the Union should develop with Russia. Such political and conceptual differences were holding back the P4M at the EU level.

Meanwhile, the bilateral modernization partnerships that Russia has been concluding with individual EU countries have progressed faster. In 2011, there were eight bilateral modernizations partnerships with another 11 in the works. "Bilateral cooperation works much better than EU-Russia cooperation", concluded one Russian expert. A German politician listed some of the achievements of the German-Russian modernization partnership, which was started in 2008 and focused on selected areas such as energy efficiency, logistics and healthcare. Under the programme, the EU and Russia had already set up a joint energy agency, worked towards turning Yekaterinburg into an energy efficient city, established close cooperation between Russian Railways and Deutsche Bahn that involved the sale of trains as well as training of train managers, and established a joint dialogue on healthcare and demographics.

Many participants thought that the lessons to be drawn from the relative success of some of the bilateral modernization partnerships was that the EU and Russia should forget about definitions and strategies and simply pursue joint projects wherever possible. One Russian participant summed up this preference for pragmatism as "projects are better than political declarations". This 'whatever works' approach would also be in line with Putin's preferred method of modernization that focused on selected projects such as a state institute for nanotechnology or the establishment of a Russian 'silicon valley' in the Moscow suburb of Skolkovo.

However, not all participants agreed. One Russian expert expressed skepticism whether a piecemeal approach to modernization could work. Modernization, she explained, entailed a systemic overhaul of the social and political environment for economic development. Such an overhaul required a comprehensive blueprint, a strategically thinking elite and broad support from society. She detected none of these factors in today's Russia. An EU P4M that focused on only individual projects would therefore be like "drawing a battle scene by starting with the mouth of the commander". Another Russian participant added to the skepticism about whether the current Russian leadership would be capable of working out a comprehensive modernization plan. He said that today's Russia was characterized by inertia and kow-towing to authority, "just like in the 1970s". Yet another Russian expert questioned the whole idea that innovation and "big post-industrial show projects like Skolkovo" should be at the heart of Russia's modernization strategy. Russia, he explained, first needed "re-industrialization", the kind

of broadly diversified industrial development that the developed market economies underwent in the 1970s to 1990s.

Several participants argued that any successful modernization in Russia would at least have to tackle serious shortcomings in the rule of law and the fight against corruption. One participant cited a survey among German businesses active in Russia: while most executives were upbeat about their investments in Russia, they considered corruption the number-one obstacle to doing business in the country.

Participants warned, however, that if the EU prioritized broader and more controversial issues such as the rule of law, it would encounter the kind of resistance in Russia that has frustrated previous cooperation attempts. In particular, they warned that Russia remained opposed to the EU lecturing it on the 'right' path to development. Following the Stockholm summit, President Medvedev had tasked the Russian bureaucracy with analysing in which areas Russia could adopt EU standards and how they needed to be adapted to Russian needs. Since Russia had traditionally rejected the idea of unilaterally taking over EU standards, the EU considered this edict a major breakthrough. However, the work made little headway as Russian officials were asked at the same time to work on the regulations needed for the Russia-Kazakhstan-Belarus customs union. Participants were unsure whether Russia was genuinely willing to take over EU rules and regulations. This long-standing debate about unilateral adjustment versus convergence was also reflected at the roundtable: whereas West European participants tended to highlight areas where Russia could learn from the EU, Russian participants listed areas in which both Russia and the EU faced similar challenges and could therefore jointly look for solution. One German parliamentarian used the Northern Dimension as an example for a successful blueprint for cooperation. Unlike in EU-Russia cooperation, the Northern Dimension treated Russia as an equal participant and did not present with already formulated policies.

Both Russian and West European participants agreed that people-to-people contacts were a crucial element of any successful P4M and that therefore visa liberalization should form part of any work programme. A Russian expert explained that Moscow had already softened its insistence on a move towards visa-free travel and accepted concrete steps towards visa liberalization as an interim step. However, participants agreed that it was still too cumbersome and expensive for Russian scientists, students and business people to acquire visas for the EU. And Western businesses struggled to get work permits and visas for their staff in Russia. Participants agreed that the P4M would not be taken seriously among the people in Russia and the EU as long as these exchanges remained so difficult.

Katinka Barysch, Deputy Director of the Centre for European Reform

The status of negotiations on a new Russia-EU treaty

The current negotiations between the European Union and the Russian Federation on a new Treaty to succeed the 1994 Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) had an unfortunate start.

While the European Union reached the general agreement on the mandate and on the composition of its delegation already in July 2006 , the formal approval of that mandate and, respectively, the formal opening of the talks took another two years due to the reservations expressed by a number of member states.

Removing those reservations resulted in incorporating particular desiderata of individual EU member states into the mandate. Those issues have yet to be addressed when the negotiations over the new treaty have reached a mature state. Otherwise chances for the subsequent ratification of the forthcoming treaty in national parliaments would lower.

Once officially launched in June and July 2008, the EU-Russia talks were again suspended over the Russo-Georgian war of August 2008 and resumed only several months later in December 2008.

By the end of 2010, the delegations met twelve times in formal rounds. The official reports on the proceedings of the negotiations have meantime adopted a routine language which is the best manifestation of the lack of dynamism since the talks had been commenced.

If one compares the Russian report on the most recent (as of this writing), 12th round of negotiations which took place on 17 December 2010 with the one on the 11th round of 12 November 2010 , both establish the constructive nature of ongoing talks and progress achieved on four titles of the forthcoming treaty which are supposed to govern:

- external security cooperation
- freedom, security and justice cooperation
- sectoral (economic) cooperation and
- cooperation in research, education, mass media and youth policy

Both reports refer that the provisions of the trade and investment titles are discussed against the background of the pending accession of the Russian Federation to the world Trade Organization (WTO) as well as the evolution of the trilateral Customs Union of Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan.

Although the language of some parts of the forthcoming agreement reportedly has been finalized or is close to finalization, the remaining open issues are the most difficult ones and will take more time to negotiate.

Since there is no clarity yet on a number of key provisions, it is not surprising that the 13th round of negotiations which was scheduled to take place early in February 2011 was postponed. Neither party seems, at this moment, to push for a speedy finalization of the new treaty while high level bargaining is taking place between the European Union and the Russian Federation.

The EU-Russia negotiations were never easy

The current negotiations between the European Union and the Russian Federation have now lasted for longer than twenty six months and are not yet close to concluding.

Almost twenty years ago, it took the EU and Russia nineteen months to negotiate the PCA from 25 November 1992 when the first round of the official talks opened until 24 June 1994 when the Agreement was finally signed on the Greek island of Corfu.

The negotiation of the first PCA was thus much faster than the current one although this does not imply that it was much easier. In the summer of 1993, approaching the anticipated finalization of the agreement, it halted over the reservations expressed by the Russian counterparts who rejected signing the draft agreement developed on the basis of the EU proposal.

Moscow continuously insisted on extending the most favorite nation and other GATT (WTO) principles to its trade with the EU, sought to commit the European Union to the prospect of establishing a free trade area, and to either lift altogether or to expand its export quota in a series of sectors, including securing its share in commercial space launches or in supplying fuel to European nuclear power plants. It also sought to safeguard terms of trade with the countries acceding to the European Union, such as Finland, from worsening as a result of their accession to the EU.

At the same time, Russia sought to protect its markets from the expansion of European businesses and succeeded in maintaining restrictions in a series of sectors, most importantly in trade with services, particularly in the financial sector, or in transportation.

Confronted with a rigid position of the European Commission, Moscow succeeded in persuading the European Union to revise the mandate after President Yeltsin, visiting Brussels in December 1993, again refused signing the agreement.

The history of the EU-Russian negotiation of the PCA reveals that, although the latter was faster than the current talks, it was not easier when particular economic interest of either party was at stake. The single least controversial issue in the negotiation was to enshrine the commitment of all parties to common values, including respect for human rights and the rule of law.

This is worthwhile to note since current difficulties of negotiating the new EU-Russia Treaty are often reduced to political motives and obstacles generated by a number of new member states, such as Poland or the Baltic states, who seek to promote their particular interest in relations with Russia. Early in 1990s the much smaller European

Union was also splintered on the issue of an agreement with Russia. At that time, it was, in the first instance, France and Spain who vehemently resisted any idea of opening European markets for exports from Russia and/or from other Soviet successor states.

In fact, most of the problems accompanying the current talks, are of structural nature and emanate from the differences in the underlying interest and objectives as formulated by the parties. Of course, the very complex nature of an actor such as the European Union neither accelerates this process, nor makes the negotiation easier. And the EU has become a much more complex partner after it has grown from 12 member states in 1994 when the PCA was signed to 27.

The main issues of contention in the current negotiations:

The scope of the agreement

The one divergence in the starting positions of the European Union and the Russian Federation at the beginning of the talks was the anticipated scope of the agreement.

Moscow preferred a relatively short framework document outlining general principles of cooperation in the subject areas of the EU-Russia cooperation as well as modernizing the major institutions of maintaining the dialogue with the European Union. Detailed regulations would be left to a series of sectoral agreements complementing the treaty.

Brussels was aiming at a comprehensive and detailed instrument which would include directly applicable norms governing practical cooperation with Russia in the relevant subject areas.

The gap in the initial approaches is often overestimated, however. Neither was Moscow principally opposed to the idea of a more detailed treaty, nor did the European Union exclude the option of further specifying its provisions in sectoral agreements. Thus the issue was rather to identify the appropriate balance of the two approaches in the negotiated text.

These diverging approaches reflected, however, a different problem.

The European Union aimed from the very beginning at a comprehensive bargaining proceeding on the basis that “the more issues on the table the easier it will be to reach a comprehensive deal”. In this case, compromises would have to be sought not necessarily within each particular subject area but, largely, by exchanging concessions in different areas.

The intention to leave all or most details for further negotiations regarding individual sectors presumably would make a comprehensive bargaining more difficult due to a compartmentalization of particular issues.

Although, apparently, no one in Moscow has properly calculated which approach would better serve Russian interest, it obviously pursued the second option and was not prepared for a comprehensive deal.

Despite the limited information on details of ongoing talks, the parties appear to be yet far from a clear, not to speak of a common understanding of what balance of their different interests would provide sufficient ground for a new treaty to be considered a good deal by both parties.

This is particularly true as there is a great deal of uncertainty of what solutions would be found on a number of key issues on which the current positions of the European Union and the Russian Federation continue greatly diverging.

The WTO accession by the Russian Federation

Despite the recurring rhetoric, there is a consensus that the regulation of the EU-Russia trade can only be taken to another level after the Russian Federation has acceded to the WTO and after the final terms of its accession have been settled.

Indeed, the unfinished accession negotiations occur to be a major reason for repeated delays in the EU-Russia negotiations schedule: "It would only be logical if we first complete negotiations on membership of the WTO and only then, depending on their results, can we conclude talks on a new basic agreement between Russia and the European Union," said Vladimir Chizhov, Russia's ambassador to the EU and chief negotiator of the new Treaty later in February 2011 – particularly after the 13th round of the negotiations with the European Union was postponed.

Although Russian authorities expect that the accession negotiations can be finalized in April-May 2011, Moscow did not get much closer to the accession over the last two years after, in 2009, it had given the priority to the erection of a customs union with Belarus and Kazakhstan and, for several months, had suspended talks with the WTO.

The issue of the accession can hardly be reduced to mobilizing political will in order to sort out all pending issues with the US , the European Union or Georgia, as is often publicly emphasized.

The erection of the trilateral customs union necessitated a revision of about 30 of the previously negotiated sections of the final report of the WTO group on the Russian accession. About half of this work is still ahead.

Apart from the need to finalize the negotiation on the issues which remained open before Russia entered the customs union, Moscow has recently toughened its position on some of those which were believed resolved before the suspension.

The reduction of quotas on imported meat below the level agreed in 2006 has clearly complicated the recent talks as did the doubling of subsidies to the Russian agriculture to 9 billion US dollars annually until 2012 with a promise of downsizing them to the current level of 4.4 billion by 2017 – despite the fact that even this lower level was disputed by a group of WTO members who felt affected by this policy.

In other words, a quick accession of Russia to the WTO can hardly be taken for granted thus further delaying the finalization of the new treaty with the European Union.

Energy cooperation

In order to be able to go beyond the most general principles of global energy security compiled at the St Petersburg G8 summit meeting in July 2006, Russia and the EU have yet to identify a common ground to govern their energy cooperation and mutual investment opportunities.

Due to the reluctance of Moscow to accept the European Energy Charter of early 1990s as the main instrument for the regulation of energy cooperation, the initially anticipated solution included the possibility of “correcting” the most disputed provisions in the text of the treaty while taking over most of other provisions of the Charter.

However, in 2009, Moscow abandoned the option of a “punctual correction” of the Charter, it withdrew its signature from under the European Energy Charter and adopted another policy – that of either overhauling the Charter or concluding a new international treaty along the lines of a draft circulated by the Russian President in April 2009.

The evolving dispute over the third EU legislative package regulating the European gas market development and particularly providing for an unbundling of the production and retail of gas from its transportation networks (pipelines) has further added to this controversy as it obviously harms the interest of Gazprom.

Institutionalizing EU-Russia external security cooperation

Although the external security cooperation title is widely considered one of the most advanced parts of the work on the new EU-Russia treaty, a Memorandum signed by Chancellor Merkel and President Medvedev in June 2010 in Meseberg, Germany, suggested the establishment of an EU-Russia Political and Security Committee (ER PSC) which would:

- serve as forum for the exchange of views on current topics of international political and security agenda;
- establish ground rules for joint EU-Russia civil/military crisis management operations, and
- exchange views and draft recommendations on specific issues of cooperation, including various conflicts and crisis situations which the EU and Russia jointly contribute to resolve within the framework of appropriate multilateral formats.

Not only the idea of establishing such an institution is yet pending consensus within the EU, it has yet to be properly tested as the Meseberg-initiative was tightly linked by Germany to joining efforts in order to achieve visible progress in bringing the Transnistria conflict in Moldova closer to a resolution. Pending any substantial progress in tackling the conflict in Moldova has obviously tempered the preparedness of the EU to go ahead with institutionalizing joint decision-making with Russia on external security issues along the lines of the proposal despite the insistence of Moscow to proceed as fast as possible without waiting for the conflict to be resolved.

Should there be any progress in this direction, it would further affect the EU-Russia talks on the new Treaty.

Other issues

There are also several issues which remain source of confusion as regards the shape of future cooperation between the European Union and the Russian Federation.

For instance, while the EU seeks to further institutionalize its dialogue with Russia on human rights and the rule of law, and to make it more result-oriented, its efforts are confused with the Moscow's demand for full reciprocity. This is a particularly difficult issue for the EU as it does not feel authorized to commit its member states in policy areas which essentially remain in their jurisdiction.

Another similar example is the long-term objective repeatedly brought up by Moscow to abolish visas in order to liberalize the movement of people across the EU-Russia border.

Whether or not those and other issues and what respective language finally find their way into the new treaty remains open and largely depends on the final deals made on other issues which are more important for either Russia or for the EU.

Outlook

The progress of negotiations is regularly reviewed at semi-annual EU-Russia summit meetings as well as at other senior level encounters. The real bargaining over the most difficult issues, however, takes place outside the formal talks between the delegations.

Only once a basic agreement on those issues emerges would a new dynamic in negotiations be generated when the two delegations are tasked to finalize the details of that arrangement.

It is thus premature to project what of the particularly difficult elements and in what form will be finally included into the treaty, which of them would be treated separately outside the framework of the basic instrument governing EU-Russia relations, and which of them will be left for a future solution.

In other words, the parties have not yet identified the particular parameters of a comprehensive deal to be ratified by the new treaty. While having little or no dispute about most elements of the forthcoming document, they are yet in the middle of the bargaining over the most disputed parts of it.

*Andrey Zagorskiy, Head, Arms Control and Conflict Resolution, IMEMO RAS;
Professor, MGIMO-University, Moscow*

EU-Russia Partnership and the Cooperation Agreement after the Treaty of Lisbon: Has There Been Any Progress?

Notes and Comments

Introduction

The organisers seem to me to have given me the most thankless task – the negotiations on the renewal of the PCA are overshadowed by the “Eastern Partnership”, the discussions about a new security architecture, the Corfu Process and the Meseberg initiative.

Nonetheless, it is right for us to also question the status of the negotiations on the PCA in the context of this conference. This is because, on the one hand, in the context of the PCA, a host of practical questions from the bilateral relationships are addressed – concerning trade, standardization and norms. On the other hand, the PCA must also be seen as a benchmark for the quality of the relationships.

The Idea of the PCA

The partnership and co-operation agreement between Russia and the EU was adopted in 1994 and brought into effect in 1997. It was valid for 10 years and is automatically extended by one year when the term expires, if no other arrangement is made. The agreement with Russia is one of ten made with post-Soviet states. Only with Belarus and Turkmenistan has no PCA been negotiated.

There is also a reason for this. The PCA belongs in the context of the nineties, when it was assumed that democracy would be consolidated and market economies developed in the partner countries. The PCAs served this objective. Co-operation was agreed in many areas, a political dialogue instated and co-operation councils established, which were to monitor the implementation of the PCAs. The co-operation was to extend to the legislative, economic, social, financial, civilian scientific and technological, and cultural areas. As no such prospects were envisaged for Belarus and Turkmenistan, no PCAs were negotiated with these two countries.

- Remark: In retrospect, unlike in Eastern Central Europe, no consolidation of democratic development has occurred in most states in the post-Soviet region. In this respect, consideration should be given to how realistic the objectives of the PCAs actually were and whether they are still an appropriate instrument today.

However, beyond the political present, a host of practical questions have been settled in the context of the PCA: trade in goods (most favoured), free passage over or through their area, exemption from import duties and taxes in the case of transitory import, ban on quantitative restrictions for imports, regulations regarding terms of business and investments, regarding working conditions, the establishment and business activities of companies, the cross-border movement of services, current

payments and capital. Moreover, the PCA provides funding measures in the economic and social area. In addition, it includes regulations for the prevention of illegal activities and for the prevention and control of illegal immigration, with measures in the areas of money laundering and of combating drugs and illegal immigration.

The PCA therefore creates a framework for everyday co-operation in almost all areas. These regulations are essential but require regular adaptation.

This is where stalemates have now emerged. Initially, in 2006 and 2007 during the Finnish, German and Portuguese presidencies, no consensus was reached within the EU on the commencement of official negotiations with Russia. The Georgia – Russia war caused delays. Only under the French presidency were talks able to resume in December 2008. However, it is obvious that no tangible progress has been made to date.

The Treaty of Lisbon placed EU foreign policy on a new foundation through the creation of new institutions and the restructuring of responsibilities. Meanwhile, progress has been made in the negotiations concerning the PCA. There have now been more than 10 rounds of negotiations. In September 2010, the Russian foreign minister expressed his satisfaction with the progress, making the fine distinction of a New Russia – EU Framework Agreement in place of the Russia – EU Partnership and Cooperation Agreement. However, he did also address the problems. A whole range of trade-related matters concerning the accession of Russia to the WTO would undoubtedly be resolvable. The Russia – Belarus – Kazakhstan customs union has created difficulties here, which must be overcome. Russia's endeavours to create an integrated economic area have also failed to simplify the negotiations. Furthermore, there are identifiable conflicts of interest. Russia is criticising restrictions in the EU in the area of investment and particularly the "Third Energy Package", which imposes restrictions on Russian investment in the energy sector in EU member states. Russia is also demanding visa clearance. On the other side, the EU aspires to regulations that can guarantee energy security, to legal security for investors and more.

Framework Agreement Rather Than PCA?

The discussions about the new agreement seem to be pragmatic and interest based and they no longer emphasise the question of democratisation and "values", which formed the core of the PCA in the nineties. As such, the nature of the scope of this agreement is changing dramatically: instead of a route map to the development of a parliamentary democracy based on the model of the EU states, it is about the adaptation of economic and social rules. The PCA has been virtually "de-ideologised".

It is debatable whether this is useful. On the one hand, principles reinforced again in the Treaty of Lisbon are being put aside. On the other hand, the historic situation has fundamentally changed relative to 1994. The euphoria of the initial years has gone. In the majority of the post-Soviet states, no consolidation of democratic development has occurred. Certain regimes display distinctly authoritarian traits. This altered situation must result in a policy change on the part of the EU. It does not appear to me that this

has yet been conceptualised. However, the pragmatic orientation of the negotiations concerning a framework agreement, the Eastern Partnership project and the Meseberg initiative seem to me to be elements of such a policy.

Hans-Henning Schröder, Head of the Research Group Russia/GUS

of the Science and Politics Foundation, Berlin

Program

Monday: 14.02.2011

20.00-22.00

Working Dinner

Speaker: Istvan Ijgyartó, Hungarian Ambassador to Russia

Place: Congress Park Volynskoe, Conference room, building 1

Tuesday, 15.02.11

9.00- 9.30

Registration of the participants

Place: Congress Park main building, 2nd floor, Room Setun

9.30 – 9.45

Opening of the conference

Vyacheslav Nikonov Chairman of the Unity for Russia Foundation and Executive Chairman of the Russkiy Mir Foundation, Moscow

Moscow

Reinhard Krumm, Director of the Office of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Moscow

1st Session

Contemporary unsolved conflicts: Where is there a possibility for cooperation between the EU and Russia?

9.45 – 11.15

Moderator: Vyacheslav Nikonov, Chairman of the Unity for Russia Foundation and Executive Chairman of the Russkiy Mir Foundation, Moscow

Presentation:

- Patricia Flor, Ambassador and Special Envoy for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia, German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Berlin

Comments:

- Alexey Gromyko, Deputy Director of the Europe Institute,

Russian Academy of Sciences; Program Director for European Projects of the Russkiy Mir Foundation, Moscow

- Mark Entin, Head of the European College at the Moscow Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow

11.15 – 11.30 Coffee break

2nd Session

EU-Russia Partnership and the Cooperation Agreement after the Treaty of Lisbon: Has there been any progress?

11.30 – 13.00

Moderator: Reinhard Krumm, Director of the Office of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Moscow

Presentation: Hans-Henning Schröder, Head of the Research Group Russia/GUS of the Science and Politics Foundation, Berlin

Comments:

- Michael Webb, Deputy Head of Delegation of the European Union to Russia, Moscow
- Andrey Zagorski, professor, Moscow State University for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow

13.00 – 14.00

Lunch

3rd Session

Euro-Atlantic Security and the Triangular Relationship between Russia, the EU and NATO: What is going to happen with the Euro Missile Defense System? The role of the Treaty on European Security in discussion

14.30 – 16.00

Moderation: Vyacheslav Nikonov, Chairman of the Unity for Russia Foundation and Executive Chairman of the Russkiy Mir Foundation

Presentation:

- Robert Pszczel, Director of the NATO Information Center in Moscow

Comments:

- Viktor Mizin, Deputy Head of the Institute for International Studies, Moscow State University for International

Relations (MGIMO), Moscow

- Thomas Gomart, chairman of the center for Russia and the CIS at the French Institute for International Relations (IFRI), Paris

16.00 – 16.30

Coffee break

4th Session

The EU-Russia Partnership for Modernization: realistic steps and actual political, social, and economic projects

16.30 – 18.00

Moderator: Reinhard Krumm, Director of the Office of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Moscow

Presentation:

- Sergey Kulik, expert on international development, Institute for Contemporary Development (INSOR), Moscow

Comments:

- Franz Thönnies, Member of the German Bundestag, Committee for Foreign Affairs, Former Parliamentary State Secretary, Berlin
- Alexander Dynkin, Head of the Institute for World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow

18.00 – 18.30

Wrap-up of the sessions and summary of the results

Vyacheslav Nikonov, Chairman of the Unity for Russia Foundation and Executive Chairman of the Russkiy Mir Foundation, Moscow

Reinhard Krumm, Director of the Office of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Moscow.

19.00

Dinner

Working Group
Partnership with Russia in Europe
Concrete steps towards cooperation between Russia and the EU

9th Meeting

List of Participants
Moscow, 14-15 February 2011

Participants from the EU:

1. Katinka Barysh, Center for European Reform, London
2. Thomas Gomart, Chairman of the Center for Russia and the CIS at the French Institute for International Relations (IFRI), Paris
3. Daniel Tarschys, Professor of Political Sciences at Stockholm University, Stockholm

Participants from Germany:

4. Patricia Flor, German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Special Envoy for Eastern Europe, Central Asia and the Caucasus, Berlin
5. Hans-Henning Schröder, Head of the Russian Federation/CIS Research Division, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (German Institute for International and Security Affairs), Berlin
6. Franz Thönnies, Member of the German Bundestag, Berlin

Representatives of the Diplomatic Corps in Russia

7. Robert Pszczel, Director of the NATO Information Center, Moscow
8. Michael Webb, Deputy Head of the Delegation of the European Union to Russia, Moscow
9. Natalia Zabrodszkaya, Program Director, Delegation of the European Union to Russia, Moscow
10. Jaakko Lehtovirta, Advisor to the Ambassador, Embassy of Finland, Moscow
11. Norman Walter, Directory, Policy Department, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, Moscow
12. Piotr Jaśkiewicz, Second Secretary, Embassy of the Republic of Poland, Moscow
13. Istvan Ijgyartó, Ambassador of the Republic of Hungary, Moscow
14. Zsolt Spindler, First Secretary of the Embassy of the Republic of Hungary, Moscow
15. Jan Michalik, First Secretary of the Embassy of the Republic of Slovakia in Russia, Moscow
16. Rastislav Moito, Third Secretary of the Embassy of the Republic of Slovakia in Russia, Moscow

Participants from Russia

17. Nadezhda Arbatova, Centre for European Studies, Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
18. Alexander Ausan, President of the National Project Institute "Social Contract", Moscow
19. Vladislav Belov, Director, Centre for German Studies, Institute of Europe, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
20. Vasily Belosjorov, Head of the International Department of the Ministry of the Russian Federation for Civil Defence, Emergencies and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters, Moscow
21. Igor Bunin, President of the Foundation „Center for Political Technologies“, Moscow
22. Olga Butorina, Head of the Chair for European Integration, Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow
23. Vladislav Bukharin, Advisor, Analytical Department of the Foundation "Russkiy Mir", Moscow
24. Mikhail Bykov, Chief Editor, Journal „Strategy for Russia“, Moscow
25. Alexander Vladislavlev, Charman of the Board, "Unity for Russia" Foundation, Moscow
26. Alexey Volkov, Head of the Department of EU and European Economy, Centre for European Studies, Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
27. Evgeniy Gontmakher, Vice Director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences. Member of the Board of the Institute for Contemporary Development (INSOR), Moscow.
28. Ruslan Grinberg, Head of the Institute of the Economy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
29. Alexey Gromyko, Vice Director of the Institute of Europe, Russian Academy of Sciences. Program Director for European Projects of the Foundation "Russkiy Mir", Moscow
30. Dmitry Danilov, Head of the Institute of European Security, Institute of Europe, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow.
31. Alexandra Danilyuk, PhD-Student, European College at the Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow
32. Alexander Dzasokhov, Vice Head of the Commission for UNESCO Matters in Russia, Member of the Board of the Foundation "Russkiy Mir", Moscow
33. Alexander Dynkin, Head of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
34. Natalia Jevtikheyevitch, Advisor, Foundation "Russkiy Mir", Moscow
35. Valerij Yegosarian, Head of the Centre for International Relations Studies, Institute for Society Projection, Moscow
36. Alexander Efremov, PhD-Student, Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow
37. Andrej Sagorskij, Professor, Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow
38. Vasily Istratov, Vice Executive Director of the Foundation "Russkiy Mir", Moscow
39. Andrey Klimov, Member of the Russian State Duma, Vice Head of the State Duma Committee on International Relations, Moscow

40. Alexander Konovalov, President of the Institute for Strategic Forecasts, Moscow
41. Jevgenij Koshokin, President of the Academy for Labor and Social Relations, Moscow
42. Reinhard Krumm, Head of the Office of the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation in the Russian Federation, Moscow
43. Alexej Kusnetsov, Head of the Centre for European Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
44. Sergej Kulik, Expert on International Relations, Institute for Contemporary Development (INSOR), Moscow
45. Mikhail Margelov, Chair of the Committee on International Relations, Federation Council of the Russian Federation, Moscow
46. Viktor Mizin, Vice Head of the Institute for International Studies, Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
47. Alexander Naumov, Head of the Analytical Department, Foundation "Russkij Mir", Moscow
48. Vyacheslav Nikonov, Chairman of the Foundation "Unity for Russia" and Executive Director of the "Russkiy Mir" Foundation, Moscow
49. Sergey Oznobishchev, Director of the Institute for Strategic Forecasts, Moscow
50. Ljubov Pasjakina, PhD-Student, Chair of European Integration, Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow
51. Dimtriy Polikanov, Vice-President of the Centre for Political Studies, Moscow
52. Leonid Reshetnikov, Head of the Russian Institute for Strategic Studies, Moscow
53. Ivan Safranchuk, Chief Editor, Journal "Big game: politics, business and security in Central Asia", Moscow
54. Boris Serov, Editor of the Web Site www.ruskiymir.ru, Moscow
55. Gennadiy Tolstopyatenko, Dean of the Faculty of Law, Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow
56. Dimtriy Trenin, Director of the Carnegie Center in Russia, Moscow
57. Vitaliy Tretjakov, Dean of the TV University at the Moscow State University (MGU), Moscow
58. Sergey Utkin, Head of the Sup-Department for Political Problems of European Integration, Department of European Political Studies, Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
59. Anna Zibulina, Teacher, Chair of European Integration, European College, Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow
60. Veronika Tschernyschova, PhD-Student, Chair for EU Economy, European College, Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow
61. Nikolay Schmeljov, Director of the Institute of Europe, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
62. Mark Entin, Head of the European College, Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow

Organizers:

63. Sergey Shurygin, Head of Event Department, "Russkiy Mir" Foundation Moscow

64. Natalia Yarchuk, Event Department Senior Manager, "Russkiy Mir" Foundation Moscow
65. Maria Skriabina, Event Department Senior Manager, "Russkiy Mir" Foundation Moscow
66. Margarita Klyuchnikova, Event Department Manager, "Russkiy Mir" Foundation, Moscow
67. Ekaterina Odnostorontseva, Student, Chair of World Politics, Moscow State University, Moscow
68. Pavel Komarov, Trainee, Foundation "Russkij Mir", Moscow
69. Oleg Schotaev, Student, Chair of World Politics, Moscow State University, Moscow
70. Maria Usacheva, Project Manager Foreign and Security Policy, Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation in the Russian Federation, Moscow
71. Felix Hett, Research Associate, Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation in the Russian Federation, Moscow
72. Philipp Stollenwerk, Intern, Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation in the Russian Federation, Moscow

Interpretors:

73. Alexander Dron
74. Valery Kusavljov
75. Sergey Vinogradov
76. Igor Poluyan
77. Evgeniy Filippov

Location of the event:

Moscow (Congress Park "Volynskoe")
Ul. Starowolynskaya, 9
Tel. +7(499)271-28-02
Website: <http://www.president-hotel.ru/volynskoe/index/lang/en>

Contact Information in Russia

Sergey Shurygin
Unity for Russia Foundation
Phone: +7 495 981 5682
+7 495 981 5683
E-mail: shurygin@ruskiymir.ru

Maria Usacheva
Friedrich Ebert Foundation Moscow
Phone: +7 495 937 5323 (ext. 31)
E-mail: Maria.Usacheva@fesmos.ru

Contact Information in Brussels

Daniela Iller
EU Office Friedrich Ebert Foundation
Rue du Taciturne 38
1000 Brussels
Phone: +32-(0)2-2346299
Fax: +32-(0)2-2346281
E-mail: Daniela.Iller@fes-europe.eu

Contact Information in Berlin

Stephan Meuser,
Katharina Gröne
Friedrich Ebert Foundation Head Office
Middle- and East-Europe Department
Hiroshimastr. 28
10785 Berlin
Phone: +49-(0)30-26935-7724
E-mail: Stephan.Meuser@fes.de

Presentations: 10 minutes

Comments: 5 minutes

Working languages: Russian, German, English (simultaneous translation)

© Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Moskau 2011
ISBN