



EUROPEAN **YOUTH** PARLIAMENT
PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN DES **JEUNES**

**64st International Session of the European Youth Parliament in Frankfurt,
Germany**

**64^{ère} Session Internationale du Parlement Européen des Jeunes à Frankfurt,
Allemagne**

DELEGATES' PREPARATION KIT



This project has been funded with the support of the European Youth Foundation of the Council of Europe.



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. The publication reflects the views only of the author, and the European Parliament cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

DELEGATES' PREPARATION KIT

1. Overviews

The overviews are written by the Committee chairpersons to serve as background material. They aim to identify the key issues at stake while synthesising the topic area. The objective is naturally to keep these overviews as balanced as possible, yet they may not receive unanimous consent. It should be noted that the EYP strongly encourages independent thinking so feel free to disagree!

2. Keywords

The non-exhaustive list of keywords intends to facilitate searching for information, may it be documents, news items or articles, at different types of search engines, news websites and encyclopaedias.

3. Research Links

As regards the suggestions for research links, the list is by no means exhaustive. Rather than citing individual links, we have preferred indicating links to websites where several relevant documents and articles can be found. As where has been possible, links to websites in French language have been listed. Please note that the EYP is not responsible for the contents on various websites; the texts reflect the opinions of their authors only.

We wish you successful preparation and interesting reading!

Krista Simberg
President of the Session

Richard Royal
Member of the Governing Body

Jan-Philipp Beck
Executive Director

Committee on Constitutional Affairs 1 (AFCO 1)

More than 150 years after the Paulskirche Assembly and the democratic uprisings across Europe: with a low voter turnout and the democratic deficit on the one hand and the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty for a European Citizens Initiative on the other, how can Europe make the participation of its citizens more effective and influencing?

Overview

The Paulskirche Assembly was the first freely-elected parliament in Germany and is commonly referred to as one of the cradles of democracy in Europe. In session between 1848 and 1849, the Assembly produced the so-called Paulskirche Constitution, fulfilling the demands of liberals and nationalists and providing a foundation of basic rights. Major elements of the text became models for later constitutional constructs still in use in several Member States.

Over a century later, Europe would reach a peak in voter turnout¹. Unfortunately, since 1979², the European elections have shown a seemingly irreversible downward trend* in some, if not all, Member States. In face of this, several aspects must be borne in mind: "Why do we vote?", "How relevant is voter turnout?", "Why do people consciously choose not to vote?" Expert analysts recall an array of factors, ranging from education to wealth and even genetic predisposition. A question to focus on in Frankfurt may then well be: "Is anything missing from the current assessment?".

According to many, the European Union (EU) suffers from a democratic deficit, which is perhaps best exemplified by a Commission that is not elected by the citizens, a Parliament that is perceived as mostly powerless and a Council that combines both legislative and executive powers. Contrarily, others would argue that this is a matter of transparency, for if on the one hand, much effort is put into making documents easily accessible, on the other, they often remain cryptically-encoded messages from a power unaccountable for its actions.

In December 2009, with the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the EU adopted a new consultation instrument, the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI)³, allowing one million citizens from a significant number of Member States to suggest areas of legislation to the Commission. The ECI is currently undergoing a final stage of clarification, but already critical voices have risen, claiming it to be pure 'window dressing', with the unclear minimum number of Member States and citizens from each of them, the uncertainty of the processes of signature authentication and initiative registration and the lack of a binding obligation for the Commission to issue a proposal being the most commonly appointed flaws.

1 The number (usually expressed in percentage) of eligible voters that cast a ballot in an election.

2 Electoral turnout at the European elections in 1979: 63%, 1984: 61% (-2%), 1989: 59% (-2%), 1994: 57% (-2%), 1999: 49% (-8%), 2004: 45% (-4%), and 2009, 43% (-2%).

³ According to Article 11, Paragraph 4 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU): "Not less than one million citizens who are nationals of a significant number of Member States may take the initiative of inviting the European Commission, within the framework of its powers, to submit any appropriate proposal on matters where citizens consider that a legal act of the Union is required for the purpose of implementing the Treaties. The procedures and conditions required for such a citizens' initiative shall be determined in accordance with the first paragraph of Article 24 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union."

With this scenario in mind, one must ask two major questions: “How can the EU be made more accessible and transparent?” and “How can we ensure a greater participation of the citizens in the democratic life of the Union?”

By Tiago Correia Machado (PT)

Keywords: voter turnout; democratic deficit; Lisbon Treaty; European Citizens’ Initiative; democratic legitimacy; political trust; transparency; accountability

Links

1. Official sources

- Europa – the official website of the European Union: glossary entry on ‘Transparency (access to documents)’
http://europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/transparency_en.htm
- Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-making Process, adopted by the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe
http://www.partizipation.at/fileadmin/media_data/Downloads/Zukunftsdiskurse-Studien/Code_good_practice_coe.pdf
- Revised European Charter on the Participation of Young People in Local and Regional Life
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/youth/coe_youth/youth_participation_charter_EN.asp
- Communication and paper of the European Commission on the European Citizen’s Initiative
http://ec.europa.eu/news/eu_explained/091111_en.htm
- Webpage of the Initiative for the European Citizens’ Initiative
http://www.citizens-initiative.eu/?page_id=2

2. News articles

- *Survey Signals Low Turnout in EU Parliament Elections*, an article on voter apathy from the *Spiegel Online*
<http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/0,1518,619104,00.html>

Committee on Constitutional Affairs 2 (AFCO 2)

Is the danger of nationalism arising in today's Europe? How should Europe react to the Hungarian initiative to make minorities in neighbouring states Hungarian citizens?

Overview

In May 2010 an overwhelming majority of parliamentarians in Hungary voted in favor of offering persons with Hungarian ancestry access to Hungarian citizenship without asking them to renounce their held citizenship and without requiring these new citizens to take up residence in Hungary. This initiative addresses more than 2.5 million Hungarian speaking minorities living, mostly, in Slovakia, Romania and Serbia. Concurrently, a response in Slovakia that the country's largest minority could become Hungarian citizens saw a law passed in the Slovak parliament abandoning the previous toleration of dual citizenship; legislators having decided that people who voluntarily acquired another citizenship would lose their claim to Slovakian nationality.

At least seven other EU member states have laws that resemble the new Hungarian one. Also, seventeen EU countries allow for transmission of their citizenship to people born abroad if one or both parents are a citizen. On the other hand, eleven EU countries have laws similar to the new Slovak one. They are broadly hostile towards dual citizenship and withdraw their citizenship from those who acquire another one.

Both Hungary and Slovakia have ratified the Council of Europe's 1997 European Convention on Nationality (ECN). Article 7 of the ECN contains a precise list of valid reasons for withdrawal of citizenship. Acquisition of a foreign nationality is the first reason listed. This problem therefore can be argued to be political, ideological or both, rather than legal. It is argued by some analysts that the Hungarian government's reason for initiating the above mentioned legislation is based on the idea that it will be better for the Hungarians living in Slovakia to have a Hungarian citizenship, not just a Slovak one. This is in itself conceptually problematic as it may indicate that Hungarian nationality is regarded as superior to other (in this case Slovak) nationalities. This written, perhaps there are alternative motives? Could this be regarded to be a step towards post-national conceptions of membership and the opening of new spaces for free movement and multiple identities across the borders of sovereign states? How can we make sense of this conflict where Hungary advocates dual citizenship on purely nationalist grounds whereas Slovakia rejects it invoking the same ideology? Does dual citizenship hold a different meaning for minorities residing in a 'foreign' state?

Is a law that could deprive an ethnic minority of its birthright citizenship politically and morally correct? Is the Hungarian dual citizenship offer legally any more just?

A state that hosts a national, linguistic or religious minority has a special duty to protect these, and one can ask whether that duty to protect at a minimum has to include a citizenship guarantee? In the absence of clear guidance through current international law, what are the principles that the political actors involved in such conflict about dual citizenship should respect? How should the Europe react to the situation? How can such national sentiments affect the European Union?

By Victoria Wilkinson (NO)

Keywords: Nationalism, European Convention of Nationalism, 1997 European Convention on

Nationality, Ethnic nationalism, Minorities, Citizenship, 1995 Framework Convention on National Minorities, over-inclusiveness .

Links

1. *Introductory material*

- <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nationalism/>

2. *Official sources*

- <http://eudo-citizenship.eu/citizenship-forum/322-dual-citizenship-for-transborder-minorities-how-to-respond-to-the-hungarian-slovak-tit-for-tat>
- <http://eudo-citizenship.eu/citizenship-news/306-hungarian-government-proposes-access-to-citizenship-for-ethnic-hungarians-in-neighbouring-countries>
- <http://eudo-citizenship.eu/citizenship-news/310-the-political-context-of-the-hungarian-proposal-qethnic-hungarians-in-transborder-states-may-well-be-the-biggest-losers-and-victims-of-hungarys-dual-citizenship-reformsq>
- <http://eudo-citizenship.eu/citizenship-news/333-romanian-and-hungarian-ministers-of-foreign-affairs-discuss-hungarian-citizenship-law>

3. *News articles*

- <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/10166610.stm>

Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET)

Putting ideas into practice: With the creation of the positions of President of the European Council and High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, how can Europe maximise its influence in world politics?

Overview

After five decades of integration, the European Union (EU) still has a rather complex way of organising its external representation, and it has even been referred to as a ‘patchwork power’⁴ that cannot speak with one voice. Hence, Henry Kissinger’s famous question, “Who do I call if I want to speak to Europe?”, is still highly relevant today. The EU’s representation varies according to issue areas, institutions, interests and identities, and third parties are confused when faced by the many EU representatives and the member states. It could be claimed that the EU is over-represented and under-performing. Now that we have a treaty, a President of the European Council (Art. 15 of the Lisbon Treaty), a double-mandated High Representative (HR) (Art. 18 and 27), and a European External Action Service (EEAS) (Art. 27), it is time to figure out what the practicalities of their diplomacy will be.

There are at least four issues that remain to be solved. First, the division of workload between the different representatives and portfolios must be clarified. Every single time that the EU goes as one entity to global negotiations it gets entangled in institutional quarrels; some say that the EU should abstain at these meetings if a qualified majority has not been reached in advance, while others are of the opinion that the different representatives should have clearly defined and independent mandates. Here, the Belgian EU Presidency will be setting the precedent. They will be able to make their decisions based on the Lisbon Treaty within the room it leaves for interpretation. Second, the parties must figure out how to make the EEAS successful. HR Catherine Ashton’s efforts and the quality of the nominations she makes will set the tone in this matter.

Third, the member states will have to reach a common understanding of the relationship between their diplomatic practices and those of the EU as a whole. Some of the members are also more sceptical in terms of the Common Foreign Policy instruments of the EU, and would rather not compromise their sovereignty. Hence, Council President Herman van Rompuy will have to act as a consensus-builder between the many interests and parties. Most importantly, the positions of third parties will make a big difference. How can we make sure that the global players will recognise the EU’s external representation? In order to be recognised by stakeholders such as the United States, Russia and China, the EU needs to find an efficient and credible way of conducting its diplomacy in the future.

The core of this Foreign Affairs topic does not lie in the institutional complexities, but rather in the diplomatic reality that the EU faces. Now that the institutional arrangements have been made and the Belgian Presidency has put the issue on top of its agenda, it is time to put the ideas into practise and to “turn Europe inside out”. Who will represent the EU at which forum? How can we make the EEAS a successful institution? What is the role of the Member

⁴ Term attributed to Sieglinde Gstöhl in *‘Patchwork Power’ Europe? The EU’s Representation in International Institutions*, Brussels, 2008

States? What is the diplomatic identity of the EU vis-à-vis third parties, and how can it be as convincing as possible on the international arena?

By Cecilia Pellosniemi (FI)

Keywords: Lisbon Treaty, President of the European Council, High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, European External Action Service, Common Foreign and Security Policy, Common Security and Defence Policy, Belgian EU Presidency

Links

1. Introductory material:

- <http://tepsa.be/Whitman%20Strengthening%20the%20EUs%20external%20representation.pdf>
- http://www.assembly-weu.org/en/documents/bref/BACKGROUND_EEAS_Nov2009.pdf
- http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/111298.pdf
- http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/wcm/connect/67fca38042c966ae964df75cb2335b49/TEPSA_Recommendations_Belgian_Presidency.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=67fca38042c966ae964df75cb2335b49
- http://www.eplo.org/documents/EAS_Roundtable.pdf
- http://www.life-peace.org/sajt/filer/pdf/EPLO_Policy_Paper_EEAS.pdf

2. Official Sources:

- <http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/imported/institutions-locked-in-battle-over-external-representation/68111.aspx>
- <http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/imported/a-union-with-one-voice-/67886.aspx>
- <http://www.euractiv.com/en/future-eu/eu-s-new-diplomatic-service-links dossier-309484>
- <http://www.euractiv.com/en/future-eu/stop-turf-wars-over-eeas-top-diplomats-plead-news-485733>

3. News articles:

- <http://euobserver.com/9/30342/?rk=1>
- <http://euobserver.com/9/30330/?rk=1>
- <http://www.upi-fiia.fi/en/publication/109/>
- <http://euobserver.com/18/30110>
- <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/8604643.stm>

Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (AGRI)

With the world demand for food expected to double by 2050, what role should the Common Agricultural Policy play in providing Europe's population in an affordable and sustainable way after 2013?

Overview

By 2050, the global calorie demand is estimated to increase by 65% as the world population rises to over 9 billion. In 1960, farmers needed 1 hectare to feed 2 people, now it is 4 hectares and will be 6 hectares by 2050, requiring 85% of increase in crop production that can only come from intensified agricultural practices.

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was formed in 1963 to increase yields in agricultural production. To ensure self-sufficiency of the European Union (at that point a Community), the CAP instituted a subsidy system that resulted in a dramatic increase in the agricultural production. Through guaranteed minimum prices for its farmers, the CAP instigated interventionism rather than a market-oriented approach to production - through the subsidies it increased the surpluses of food products on the global market. It is claimed by critics that CAP harmed developing countries that wanted to import to the EU, caused international trade conflicts and jeopardised the environment and hindered development of rural areas with small farms.

Since its creation the CAP has been subject to very important reforms to meet the constantly changing conditions: a quota on dairy production, Direct Payments and the Set Aside policy. Further changes included introduction of Rural Development Aid reinforcing the rural economy as well as freezing of subsidy ceiling up to 2013. To improve the quality of agricultural products and develop a market oriented agriculture industry, subsidies were de-coupled (made autonomous) from production levels and made dependent on animal welfare and environmental protection by the condition of Cross Compliance in 2003.

By the end of 2008, the EU agriculture ministers reached a political agreement on the 'Health Check' of the Common Agricultural Policy to "modernise, simplify and streamline the CAP and remove restrictions on farmers". EU abolished the set-aside policy, de-coupled subsidies for further products, increased milk quotas gradually to abolishing them in 2015 and converted the market intervention mechanism into a genuine safety net. Direct payments to farmers were reduced and the funds were transferred to the Rural Development Fund for better water management, protection of biodiversity and production of green energy.

The upcoming CAP reform will coincide with the new EU budget. By 2014, the new priorities of CAP need to be stated. The negotiations for the post-2013 CAP have already commenced, including the size of the future CAP budget, the phase-out or reform of the Single Farm Payment and the strengthening of targeted payments for public goods.

How should EU ensure food security for its population while meeting today's environmental and market demands? Is it possible to achieve this without creating excessive load on the EU economy especially with the recent economic crisis the world has been facing? Do we need a reformed CAP and if so, what tools should it have?

By Buser Say (TR)

Key words: hunger, food and agricultural policy, CAP, sustainable agriculture

Links

1.Intro:

- Wikipedia page on the CAP
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common_Agricultural_Policy

2.Official sources:

- European Commission: Website on Agriculture and Food:
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/food/index_en.htm
- EU legislation on agriculture:
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/food/index_en.htm
- Food Security Analysis for countries in danger by the World Food Programme:
<http://www.wfp.org/food-security>

3.News and other articles:

- Discussion platform on the CAP reform
<http://capreform.eu/>

Committee on Culture and Education (CULT)

The “ignorant” digital citizen – how should Europe act to ensure all of its citizens can realise the full potential of the internet while being aware of its potential perils?

Overview

eDemocracy refers to the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) in political and governance process. The concept is on the rise in modern Europe with Finland and Estonia having the best results in user satisfaction monitoring and users focused portal design. eGovernment services ensure transparent and cheap interaction between government and citizens, simplify the access to government information for the public sector and thus to improve democratic participation, especially of the younger generations. While expanding online services, the governments need to keep in mind the recommendation on eDemocracy from the *ad hoc* committee on eDemocracy of the Council of Europe (CM/Rec 2009).

A digital citizen participates in society and in democratic processes using ICT. In developing countries digital citizens are forerunners for long-term development of democracy; in the EU the significance of democratic online services has gained common recognition. The internet offers a range of possibilities of democratic participation, from information dissemination to citizen deliberation. Internet became a useful asset for political discussion, education and debate for a wide public.

While eDemocracy is developing very fast, there still is a high percentage of European citizens, who do not know about the potential of the internet and do not use it. A possible explanation for this phenomenon is the ‘digital divide’, which is the separation between citizens with and without access to digital services. The digital divide has two main reasons: the unequal access to computer hardware and network coverage and the differences of abilities to use ICT amongst some groups of the population.

As for the perils of Internet use, the EU Directive on privacy and electronic communication requires EU Member States to ensure confidentiality of the communications by prohibiting unlawful interception and surveillance, unless concerned users have given their consent. Nevertheless, there still are a lot of cases of abuses, identity thefts and frauds (EU Directive: Art. 5(1) of Directive 2002/58/EC). Furthermore, the fact that governments know more and more on their citizens may lead to hyper-surveillance and lack of privacy.

European countries lack common policies on eGovernance and exact measures to deal with the dangers of the internet. Digital citizens have to be aware of the dangers of using online services. How can the EU focus on developing more protection of its citizens’ integrity while expanding online governmental processes? How can the EU ensure that digital citizens are fully aware of their possibilities as well as the still persisting weaknesses of online services?

By Alexandra Posner (DE)

Keywords: digital divide, privacy, data protection

Links

1. *Introductory material:*
 - Wikipedia on the “digital divide”:
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital_divide
 - Wikipedia on the “internet privacy” (the ‘further reading’ section is especially recommended):
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet_privacy

2. *Official resources:*
 - Council of Europe platform on eDemocracy:
http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/default_en.asp
 - EU Commission portal on the Information Society:
http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/default_en.asp
 - EU Commission on data protection in the European Union
http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/privacy/

3. *News articles, papers:*
 - The NGO “citizens online”:
<http://www.citizensonline.org.uk/online>
 - EurActiv on EU digital economy plan
<http://www.euractiv.com/en/infosociety/eus-unveils-five-year-digital-economy-plan-news-494346>

 - EurActiv on EU initiatives on internet privacy
<http://www.euractiv.com/en/infosociety/reding-move-swiftly-internet-privacy/article-189204>

Committee on Human Rights (DROI)

In response to recent concerns over Russia's treatment of the Moscow Helsinki Group and Sakharov Prize Winners, how should Europe seek to build future relationships with the continents Eastern giant?

Overview

The Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought was established in December 1988 by the European Parliament as a means to honour individuals, or indeed organisations, which had dedicated their time to the defence of human rights and freedoms. Some past recipients of the prize have been Nelson Mandela, the United Nations and most recently, Memorial from Russia.

The Moscow Helsinki Group is human rights monitoring non-governmental organisation (NGO), founded in 1975. Its purpose was to act as a tool to monitor the then Soviet Union's compliance with the Helsinki Final Act of 1976. The group's goal was to uphold the government to implement the commitment to human rights made within this act. The Moscow Helsinki Group's legal validity was based on the provision in the Helsinki Final Act, Principle VII, which establishes the rights of individuals to know and act upon their rights and duties as citizens.

On December 31st 2009, Lyudmila Alexeyeva was arrested along with various other protesters. The President of the European Parliament stated that "in a democratic country, people should have the right to organise protests, even against governments and authorities. Freedom of speech and expression is one of our basic human rights." It is thus claimed that in the event of the arrest of Sakharov Prize Winners, Russia is in clear violation of such rights.

A challenge for political relations today is recognising the complexities that characterise the European Union's (EU) and Russia's relationship. A history fraught with tension and mutual distrust means that for Europe to intervene in or attempt to dictate any of Russia's activities, including how they treat human rights defenders, is indeed highly controversial. For each to recognise the other's viewpoint is crucial. Long-term and short-term interests must be considered.

Russia's treatment of the Sakharov Prize Winners is simply one example of the wider challenge facing the EU, how best should the EU build future relationships with Russia? What factors should be considered? What issues must be overcome before progress can be made? In Europe it has been argued that we need a unity of purpose. No other country reveals our differences, as does Russia. In its human rights dialogue with Russia, the EU has encountered "zero openness⁵", in the words of one official involved in the bilateral trade talks in 2009. Has the relationship become stale and stagnant beyond repair? Is mutual interdependence or even a partnership of necessity either possible or desirable?

By Anna O'Leary (IE)

Keywords Human rights, Helsinki Final Act, 1976, Memorial, Russia, mutual interdependence

Links

⁵ 'Can and should the EU reset their relationship', Katarina Barysch/Centre for European Reform Policy Brief 22.2.2010

Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs 1 (ECON 1)

Bailouts in Greece, deficits in Portugal, crisis in Spain: In the context of the current debt crisis: how should the Stability and Growth Pact be assessed in order to ensure a fair and secure future for all?

Overview

In May this year the finance ministers of the European Union (EU) agreed upon the largest rescue package in the history of European economic cooperation when they, together with the International Monetary Fund, committed a total of 750 billion euro to avoid a complete collapse of the European economy. The alarming situation triggered discussions upon how to avoid future crises and as to what role the Stability and Growth Pact (SGP) should have when potential reforms are discussed.

The SGP is an agreement between the 16 Eurozone countries on budgetary discipline aiming at ensuring stability within the European Monetary Union (EMU). Adopted in 1997 with Germany as the catalyst for tighter financial bonds, the purpose was that the SGP would ensure that the Maastricht convergence criteria were upheld even when subsequent countries entered the EU. There are two criteria in the SGP that prospective member states have to agree to respect:

1. an annual budget deficit no higher than 3% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)
2. a national debt lower than 60% of GDP or approaching that value

The SGP comprises one European Council resolution and two regulations. This legal basis authorises the Commission to produce recommendations and reports and the European Council to issue sanctions against member states violating the criteria.

So far, it is argued by some economists that the SGP has failed utterly. The sanctions within the pact have not been used against continental giants such as France and Germany when they ran deficits exceeding 3% in 2001-2003. Furthermore, the sanctions were not credible since it made little sense imposing huge fines on countries already suffering. Today only 23 of the EU27 meet the 3% criteria; Portugal and Spain struggling and perhaps on the brink of collapse. Thus, the question of how to proceed in order to avoid future crisis remains as yet unanswered despite 'bailouts' to solve short-term problems

Is the way forward the eradication, modification or continuation of the SGP? The EU seems to agree on the need for increased fiscal co-ordination and tools to strengthening surveillance over budgetary policies, while seeking the way to prevent and correct the excessive sovereign debt and deficit.

The French have proposed a form of '*Gouvernement économique*' with wide powers over taxation and monetary policy, while Germany wishes for harmonisation of budget discipline and fierce punishment of profligacy. To what extent should national budgets be subject to review by the Commission before going to the national parliaments as proposed recently? And is the call for the EU finance ministers to become guardians over each other's fiscal sustainability really a viable solution?; this leads to the Platonist paradox as to 'who will guard the guardians?'

By Philip Danielsson (SE)

Keywords: Monetary Union, Euro crisis, stability and growth pact, debt crisis, Euro group, Euro zone.

Links

1. *Introductory Material:*

- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stability_and_Growth_Pact#cite_note-2

2. *Official Sources:*

- http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/economic_and_monetary_affairs/stability_and_growth_pact/125021_en.htm
- http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/economic_and_monetary_affairs/stability_and_growth_pact/125019_en.htm
- http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/economic_and_monetary_affairs/stability_and_growth_pact/125020_en.htm

3. *News Articles, papers and other material:*

- <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/nov/27/qanda.business>
- <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/consleg/1997/R/01997R1467-20050727-en.pdf>
- <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/consleg/1997/R/01997R1466-20050727-en.pdf>
- <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/nov/27/qanda.business>
- http://www.economist.com/node/16116773?story_id=16116773
- <http://di.se/Default.aspx?pid=209239 ArticlePageProvider>
- <http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/other/reinforcingeconomicgovernanceintheeuroareaen.pdf>
- <http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj28n2/cj28n2-10.pdf>
- <http://www.economist.com/node/21007737>
- <http://www.economist.com/node/21007596>

Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs 2 (ECON 2)

The future of the financial markets in the 21st century: what actions should Europe take in the current process of financial market regulation reforms?

Overview

The future of financial markets depends heavily on the trust towards them. The discussion revolves around the question of the extent to which the financial markets create wealth and thus should be trusted and to what extent they distort the economy and should be regulated.

The idea of financial *laissez faire* states that free trade should also apply to financial sector, especially banking. Any government interventions would restrict growth and make the economy less efficient. Furthermore, it claims that the financial regulations⁶ weaken financial system while unregulated banking is stable. Arguably excessive regulation stifles the decision making in the financial sector (banking, securities⁷, insurance and pension system), too rigid and inflexible legislation on financial markets creates difficulty to adapt to market conditions.

On the other hand, the European Union (EU) has consequently strived for more unification and regulation of financial markets since 2001. It is suggested that the EU believes that the creation of a genuine single market in financial services will benefit consumers, providing cheaper financial products, better return on the savings and easily available risk capital for enterprises, thus boost competitiveness and employment rates.

The EU has aspired to create an integrated securities market and recognised the need for convergence of supervisory practices and regulatory standards. As a result, the Lamfalussy process was launched, with the main aim of speeding up the legislative process on financial regulations. Several committees including Committee of European Securities Regulators (CESR), Committee of European Banking Supervisors (CEBS) and European Banking Committee (EBC) were set up as advisory and consultative bodies to ensure consistent national supervisory practices. Lamfalussy encouraged benchmarking, peer review and the spreading of best practice among the Member States emphasising transparency in the creation of regulations. Even though by 2004 the measures were fully implemented, the policy failed in 2008, as the American credit crunch spread over to Europe.

As a response to the crisis, individual member states started to adopt an interventionist approach, with substantial levy (form of tax) on banking sector imposed recently in the UK Budget, followed by similar plans of France and Germany. The prospective money raised (in the UK –predicted to be over 8bn pounds) will pay for the costs of economic recovery. Earlier this year, the UK introduced a 50% tax on banking bonuses, which is going to affect the biggest financial institutions of the sector. Other countries consider further regulations and interventions.

Is the current trend towards interventionism and away from *laissez faire* a positive phenomenon? Do financial markets create wealth better when regulated or unregulated? Are the Member States with significantly different economic situation ready for common intervention mechanisms?

By Joanna Kulpa (PL)

⁶ Financial regulations may apply to different spheres of financial activities – banking, securities, insurance and pensions. For the sake of Committee Work, we will concentrate on regulations of banking sector and securities market.

⁷ Tradable financial instruments representing money like stock, bonds, options etc.

Keywords: financial markets, financial crisis, regulation

Links

1. *Introductory Material:*

- on laissez faire in banking
http://web.me.com/kevindowd1958/web.me.com_kevindowd1958_Site/Free_banking_central_banking_and_financial_regulation_files/The%20case%20for%20financial%20laissez-faire_1.pdf
- dictionary definition of laissez faire
<http://financial-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Laissez+Faire>

2. *Official Sources:*

- sources from ECON at European Parliament
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/comparl/econ/lamfalussy_process/ep_position/default.htm
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/comparl/econ/lamfalussy_process/ep_position/council_resolution.pdf (especially this one!)
- http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/financial-markets/
- <http://www.cesr.eu/>
- <http://www.fese.eu/>

3. *News Articles, papers and other material:*

- laissez faire responsible for our crisis
<http://mises.org/daily/3165>
- Articles proposed by Rich – I am referring to them
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/8405125.stm>
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/10377429.stm>
- The Global Derivatives Market: A Blueprint for Market Safety and Integrity (White Paper by Deutsche Börse Group)
<http://www.eypej.org/docs/frankfurt/DB-2.pdf>
- The Global Derivatives Market: An Introduction (White Paper by Deutsche Börse Group)
<http://www.eypej.org/docs/frankfurt/DB-1.pdf>

Committee on Employment and Social Affairs 1 (EMPL 1)

With over 20% of young Europeans aged 16-24 unemployed, what more can be done to ensure that this generation of potential workers does not become irreversibly excluded from the labour market?

Overview

One in five people (20.6% for April 2010) aged 16-24 in the European Union are unemployed, a little more than half the level for those aged 25-74 (9.7%). The negative effects of the economic and financial crisis on growth and employment are particularly affecting groups in vulnerable situations or at risk of exclusion such as the young people.

As the financial crisis has forced employers to cut jobs and stop recruiting new workers altogether, youth unemployment has risen from the EU-27 average of 15.3% in 2007. For people just starting their careers, the damage of unemployment may be deep and long-lasting, potentially creating a 'lost generation'. An extended period of unemployment in one's youth can significantly lower income for the few years following unemployment and even depress lifetime income as people often get stuck in jobs that are below their abilities, or come to be seen by employers as damaged goods.

It must be noted that the effects of youth unemployment are not only financial. The problem carries dangerous social effects such as social exclusion, depression, poorer health as well as higher incidences of crime and suicide. Youth unemployment tends to be high among teenagers, minorities, young women with children and the least educated. Youth unemployment cannot be attributed to the onset of the financial crisis alone. The problem is much more far-reaching. Since the turn of the millennium, while overall employment was back on the rise, youth employment was still lagging behind in many EU member countries, and a source of serious concern.

In many countries young people are disproportionately employed on short-term temporary contracts that do not require employers to provide expensive benefits; this is regarded as one of the biggest causes of the problem. A generation of young people tenuously employed, with no benefits, severance pay, or guarantees (the 'IPOD' generation: insecure, pressured, overtaxed, and debt-ridden). Furthermore, it has also been claimed that the lack of correlation between the skills young people are picking up in school and tertiary education and the needs of the labour market also are responsible for the high levels of youth unemployment in the EU.

Schemes such as the 2010, European Progress Microfinance Facility provide possible approaches to this complex topic. 'Hire and Fire' approaches of European employers must be brought into question. Critics have questioned whether removing employment protection legislation will serve to further enhance the lack of guarantees and equality offered to young people entering the labour market.

The European Commission has set out as its goal to achieve 'flexicurity', the combination of flexible labour markets and a high level of employment and income security as a guiding principle to its employment strategy. The flexicurity model also includes a strong emphasis on active labour market policies, along with motivating lifelong learning and training, improving customised support to jobseekers, supporting equal opportunities for all. Knowledge, skills and competences

of young people through education and vocation training is generally an accepted solution. However within the boundaries of this topic, it remains a challenge to examine how realistic implementation of such measures can be.

To prepare for this topic, delegates must be aware of the various potential solutions to the problem of youth employment mentioned in this overview and be able to critically analyse them. Given the major differences in unemployment and labour markets of the EU-27 member states, it is essential that the situation is examined in various countries and analysis on the reasons behind the different levels of youth unemployment from state to state as well as the different methods used to combat the issue in each state is conducted.

By Nassos Stylianou (CY)

Keywords: European Progress Microfinance Facility, Youth unemployment, lost generation, flexicurity, employment protection legislation, apprenticeship, vocational training

Links

1. *Introductory Material*

- http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/3-01062010-AP/EN/3-01062010-AP-EN.PDF
- <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st09/st09018.en10.pdf>
- <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/8/44986030.pdf>

2. *Official Sources*

- <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=101&langId=en>
- <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=836&langId=en>
- <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/10/225&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

3. *News articles, papers and other material*

- <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-01-22/credit-crisis-creates-lost-generation-david-g-blanchflower.html>
- <http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/unemployment-youth.2gy>
- <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/01/business/global/01jobless.html?pagewanted=1>
- <http://euobserver.com/881/29536>
- http://www.etuc.org/IMG/pdf_Newsletter_46-2010_EN.pdf
- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-bwYnTge7sA&feature=channel>
- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KQUxFLmGeEs>

Committee on Employment and Social Affairs 2 (EMPL 2)

United in diversity? : How can Europe combat social exclusion prevalent in immigrant communities and live up to its promise of equal opportunities in the 21st Century?

Overview

Recent polls suggesting dissatisfaction with the high numbers of immigrants arriving to seek work and a “better life”, primarily in the more developed “Western” countries (e.g. 8 out of 10 Italians sought tougher immigration laws in 2009, and over 70 percent thought that immigration had a bad impact on their country) have led to commentators asking to what extent is Europe united in its diversity. Discrimination towards immigrants is commonplace leading to them still being identified as disadvantaged in almost all Member States.

Historically, society and employers have been shown prejudice against newcomers on the grounds of racial and cultural distinctions, different religious beliefs and stereotypes. The social divide is further reinforced by antecedents such as immigrants’ insufficient language skills, host countries’ non-recognition of alternatively acquired academic qualifications and perceived differences in work ethics. Thus, immigrant communities often struggle to find well-paid work relevant to their abilities and education and are forced to take on unskilled jobs in areas such as services and construction and live in poor conditions. Many choose to live, work and celebrate in clusters thus initially making themselves feel more “at home” but in turn, distancing themselves from the local population. These issues combined give rise to social exclusion or the non-integration of immigrant communities.

With factors like the current financial climate and the recent opening of labour markets to new EU members Romania and Bulgaria increasing levels of migration, Europe needs to find solutions fast to avoid further damage to its social unity and economic well-being. 2010 is the final active year of the [EU’s Social Protection and Social Inclusion Process](#). Thus, now is a good time to reflect on its achievements and failures, to further develop ideas gained from it and to inspire new ones. The current [PROGRESS programme](#) exists to raise awareness, provide a knowledge-sharing platform and fund research towards the combating of social exclusion. A somewhat controversial means of ensuring equal opportunities is positive discrimination or intentionally employing a diverse staff. Unfortunately this method is often used for the benefits it will bring to the company e.g. a broader market perspective.

What needs to be thought about is whether enough is being done to tackle the growing issue. What more can and needs to be done to spark social inclusion and provide equal opportunities for all? And also, how much responsibility lies with host countries to facilitate the process and how much with immigrants themselves?

By Lelde Benke (LV)

Keywords: social exclusion/inclusion, immigrant communities, PROGRESS programme, positive discrimination

Links:

1. Official Sources:

- Website of the European Employment Observatory (EEO)
<http://www.eu-employment-observatory.net>
- Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities website of the European Commission
<http://ec.europa.eu/social/home.jsp?langId=en>
- Summaries of EU legislation: Employment and social policy
http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/employment_and_social_policy/index_en.htm

2. News articles, papers and other material

- J. Kopanja, "Across Europe, Governments Impose Restrictions on Immigration"
<http://news.feetintwoworlds.org/2010/04/27/across-europe-governments-impose-restrictions-on-immigration/>
- S. Theil, "The Incredible Shrinking Continent"
<http://www.newsweek.com/2010/02/18/the-incredible-shrinking-continent.html>

Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety I (ENVI I)

From cradle to grave and “downcycling” – How can the EU take action to ensure a truly sustainable combination of production and consumption?

Overview

‘Current developed country patterns of consumption and production could not be replicated world-wide: some calculations holistic suggest that this could require three planets’ worth of resources.’ (‘Securing the Future’, UK Government 2005)

Deriving from the concept of sustainable development, Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) is a global approach to minimising the negative environmental impact of production-consumption systems. SCP aims to maximise the efficiency and effectiveness⁸ of products, services and investments so that the needs of society are met without jeopardising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. SCP builds on three pillars: the economic, the environmental and the social.

Mitigating the environmental effect of human activities has traditionally focused on minimising the effects of individual goods and services, through process reengineering or end-of-pipe solutions, the most common being recycling. However, recycling is only one of the available options in the field of waste management, together with prevention, minimisation, re-use, energy recovery, disposal and land filing. (see <http://scp.eionet.europa.eu/themes/waste> for further explanations on these processes and the differences between them).

If the emphasis seems to be currently put on the end of the production-consumption process (i.e. waste), the ‘SCP approach goes one step further. It acknowledges the influence of the consumer demand on the production (social factor), and therefore as a policy area that can be harnessed to minimise the environmental effects of consumption⁹. Unsustainable patterns of consumption and production magnified by a growing global consumer class are the main cause of environmental problems.

The social component to SCP also refers to the fact that a third of the world’s population does not have the financial possibility to consume enough to meet their basic needs. This draws attention to the need to rationalise the process of production – consumption, taking into consideration the economical factor: the financial ability of the population to consume. ‘Unsustainable consumption and production is not only a threat to the way we live our life now, but by needlessly depleting and spoiling valuable resources, we also threaten the material basis of future generations’¹⁰.

¹¹At the **Johannesburg Summit** in 2002, all governments agreed on a Plan of Implementation that contained a strong focus on SCP. The following year the **Marrakesh Process** was initiated to respond to the specific call of the Plan of Implementation to develop a 10-year framework of SCP

⁸ Efficiency refers to doing things in a right manner. Scientifically, it is defined as the output to input ratio and focuses on getting the maximum output with minimum resources. Effectiveness, on the other hand, refers to doing the right things. It constantly measures if the actual output meets the desired output. Since efficiency is all about focusing on the process, importance is given to the “means” of doing things whereas effectiveness focuses on achieving the “end” goal.

⁹ <http://scp.eionet.europa.eu/themes/scp>

¹⁰ *ibid*

¹¹ **ETC/SCP working paper 1/2010**; David Watson, Ullrich Lorenz, Mikkel Stenbæk Hansen, Jozsef Szlezak, Roberto Zoboli, Michael Kuhndt, Carol Wilson, Oksana Mont, and Dominic Wittmer
European Topic Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production, 14/1/2010

programmes. In the European Union, the European Commission has followed the call made in Johannesburg by proposing an **SCP Action Plan** in 2008' that includes a series of proposals on sustainable consumption and production. They are meant to contribute to improving the environmental performance of products and increase the demand for more sustainable goods and production technologies. It also seeks to encourage EU industry to take advantage of opportunities to innovate.

Today's greatest challenge is to do more with less: our economies have to integrate environmental sustainability with economic growth and welfare by decoupling degradation from production. This is one of the main goals of the European Union, but the consequences of climate change and the increasing demand for energy and resources are challenging this objective. The committee will have to solve a simple equation: how to transform a system that 'takes, makes and wastes' into a creator of goods and services that generates social and economic value.

Food for thought:

Consumer demand → production → consumption → waste management		
Environmental pillar	Economic pillar	Social pillar
Resources (renewable and non renewable)	Costs : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Production - Waste management - Energy used during the entire process 	Needs and demands Influencing customers in making the right decision
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long term thinking in using resources - Responding to current society's needs without tampering with the available resources of future generations - Focusing on the entire process, not only on waste management - Downcycling vs upcycling and their economical effects - Product lifespan - Society's willingness in becoming actively involved in growing sustainability of the production – consumption process 		

By Maria

Keywords: Sustainability, Sustainable development, Sustainable production and consumption, product lifespan, waste management, consumer demand, Johannesburg Summit, Marrakesh Process, EU SCP Action Plan

Links

1. Introductory Material:

- Instruments for Change - Definitions and Concepts of terms related to SCP
<http://www.iisd.org/susprod/principles.htm>

2. Official Sources:

- Eionet – European Topic Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production
<http://scp.eionet.europa.eu/themes/scp>

<http://scp.eionet.europa.eu/publications>

<http://scp.eionet.europa.eu/themes/waste>

- European Union's webpage – Environment
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/escp_en.htm
- European Commission's web pages on the 'Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources'
<http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/environment/natres/index.htm>
- UNEP Center for Sustainable Production and Consumption
<http://www.scp-centre.org>
- Wuppertal Institute, providing best practise examples of products and services following the Factor Four principle
http://www.wupperinst.org/FactorFour/FactorFour_best-practises.html
- World Resources Institute - environmental think tank that goes beyond research to find practical ways to protect the earth and improve people's lives
<http://www.wri.org>

3. News articles, papers and other materials:

- EEA report on sustainable use and management of natural resources
http://reports.eea.europa.eu/eea_report_2005_9/en

Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety II (ENVI II)

Steps following Copenhagen: how should Europe seek to approach the UN Climate Change Conference in Cancún?

Overview

The Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change¹² (IPCC) states that global warming is indisputable, and that most of the warming since the mid-20th century is very likely caused by the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations. There has been a 0.74 °C increase in global average temperature in the last century, and eleven of the twelve years in the period of 1995–2006 rank among the top 12 warmest years since 1850. In the next century, the temperature is estimated to rise 1.1–6.4 °C, depending on the future emission levels. According to the 2006 Stern Review, one percent of global gross domestic product (GDP) per year needs to be invested in order to avoid the worst effects of climate change, and failure to do so could risk global GDP being up to 20% lower than it otherwise might be.

The Kyoto Protocol was the first major attempt to come to grips with global warming. According to a recent report by the World Bank¹³, it has only had a slight effect on curbing global emissions. The Protocol will expire in 2012, and the goal of the UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen in 2009 was to establish a binding climate agreement for the post-Kyoto age. However, the summit fell short of its primary objective. In the non-binding final document of the conference, the parties only recognised that action needs to be taken to keep the increase in temperature in less than 2 °C above the pre-industrial levels.

The Climate Conference in Cancún is the next opportunity to reach a binding climate agreement. The challenges are still many. The division between industrialised and developing countries became evident in Copenhagen, especially on the question of financing the future climate scheme. Furthermore, there is no political or scientific consensus on the best alternative for the new climate framework. Systems such as emissions trading and carbon taxation would give polluters an economic incentive to reduce their emissions. It is argued, however, that market mechanisms are unable to control emissions efficiently. Increased energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources are possible tools but require excessive funding. More experimental techniques to fight global warming include carbon capture and storage (CCS) and geo-engineering. At the same time, some experts argue that the world should already start adapting to global warming, rather than wasting resources in trying to tackle it.

The European Commission has stated its aim at taking a leading role in the upcoming negotiations, and wants them to result in an ambitious, legally binding agreement. In its 2007 climate and energy package, the EU unilaterally promised to cut its emissions by 20% by 2020 and scale the reduction up to 30% should the other industrialised countries join the effort. It recently revised its Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS), originally designed to meet the cuts required by the Kyoto Protocol. The functioning of the scheme is still questionable: for instance, the relocation of production in regions without similar legislation is possible. Also, the EU may need to re-evaluate its negotiation tactics: even though it has tried to show global leadership in climate issues and did

¹² <http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/ar4-wg1.htm>

¹³ World Bank (2010). *World Development Report 2010: Development and Climate Change* The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank

state its ambitions well before Copenhagen, it failed to speak with an effective voice in the conference itself.

What should the new climate deal look like, and what kind of a strategy should the EU adopt in Cancún? Can it expose its fragile economy to effects unilateral action may have? How to balance the needs of industrialized and least-developed countries? Should the world already start adapting to the effects of climate change? In their discussion, the delegates need to carefully examine the advantages and disadvantages of the potential next steps. As the parties of the conference are faced with a considerable challenge, so is the committee in its pursuit of consensus on this complex issue. Accurate and up-to-date information is thus necessary for a productive discussion.

By Jari Marjelund (FI)

Keywords: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), UN Climate Change Conference in Cancún, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), EU climate and energy package, Emissions Trading System (ETS), greenhouse gases (GHG), carbon capture and storage (CCS), carbon tax, geoengineering

Links

1. Introductory Material

- UN Climate Change Conference in Cancún
<http://cc2010.mx/swb>
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
<http://unfccc.int/2860.php>
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
<http://www.ipcc.ch>
- Factsheet on climate change by the European Commission
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/pubs/pdf/factsheets/climate_change.pdf
- Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change
<http://www.webcitation.org/5nCeyEYJr>

2. Official Sources

- Commissioner on Climate Action: Connie Hedegaard
http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/hedegaard/index_en.htm
- European Commission: Climate Action – Energy for a Changing World
http://ec.europa.eu/climateaction/index_en.htm
- European Commission: Climate Change
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/climat/home_en.htm
- European Commission: “Leading global action to 2020 and beyond”
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/climat/pdf/brochures/post_2012_en.pdf
- European Commission: “Building a post-2012 global climate regime: the EU's contribution”
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/climat/future_action.htm
- Summaries of EU legislation: Environment
http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/environment/index_en.htm
- European Environment Agency
<http://www.eea.europa.eu/>

- European Commission: “Questions and Answers on the Communication Towards a comprehensive climate change agreement in Copenhagen”
<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/09/34&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

3. *News articles, papers and other material:*

- Guardian: “Copenhagen climate deal: Spectacular failure – or a few important steps?”
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/dec/22/copenhagen-climate-deal-expert-view>
- Reuters: “Climate finance key for Cancun talks”
<http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6221BZ20100303>
- BBC: “Climate talks eye level playing field”
http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/thereporters/richardblack/2010/06/from_the_un_climate_talks_1.html
- EurActiv: “Mexico outlines road to Cancún climate conference”
<http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-environment/mexico-outlines-road-cancun-climate-conference-news-344830>
- EurActiv: “Brussels to play down ‘carbon leakage’ threat”
<http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-environment/eu-plays-down-carbon-leakage-threat-news-494359>

Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE)

World leader in scientific research and innovation – a common European goal? What should the EU framework look like to enable efficient and successful cooperation in scientific research in Europe?

Overview

In 2000, the European Union (EU) set up an ambitious plan known as the Lisbon Strategy. Ten years later, it is argued by many that this endeavour has turned into one of the biggest failures the EU has seen. The task of this Committee is to assess the current frameworks pertaining to scientific research in Europe and seek to find the best future actions to enable efficient and successful cooperation.

Although lots of historians agree that Europe was the birthplace of modern science, it is no longer the world's leader in this field. The change came gradually and may not have been easy to spot for years. But in today's world, it is not only the USA or Japan Europe has to compete with in the field of Research & Development (R&D): the formerly underestimated "developing countries" (namely China and India) have indeed developed – into a regular competition supported by qualified researchers and skilled workers. Despite our tradition of good and accessible education, many European countries are now facing 'brain drain' and Europe is also failing to keep its own companies at home – statistics show there are more EU-based companies that invest in R&D in the USA than vice-versa¹⁴.

Back in the 2000s in Lisbon, EU member states declared their ambition to stop this trend and get Europe back on top. Turning our continent into 'the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world' was the goal set for a decade. In 2004, a mid-term review established in the *Kok Report* drew clear and alarming conclusions. There had been many obstacles in the way, but the main one was said to be the lack of determined political action and cooperation. But even though there was some response to this biting critique (*Framework Programme 7*), it did not save the whole process. "Even if progress has been made it must be said that the Lisbon Agenda ... has been a failure," claimed the Swedish PM Fredrik Reinfeldt earlier this year.

Certain areas of potential improvement were identified including a single labour market for researchers, European research infrastructures, knowledge sharing, research programmes and priorities or cooperation with private sector.

But there are more questions to ask than just those related to the technical aspects of the internalisation of science. As a side effect of the current economic recession, the public discourse is more open to alternative ways of thinking. A provoking question is hanging in the air: "What is this entire "race for growth" good for?"

By Jonáš Jančařík (CZ)

Keywords: Lisbon strategy, European Research Area, European Institute of Innovation and Technology, R&D, Framework Programme 7

¹⁴ Commission staff working document Accompanying the Green Paper "The European research Area: New Perspectives" {COM(2007)161}, Section 3.3.1. - http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/era_swp_final.pdf

Links:

1. Official sources

- Commission staff working document Accompanying the Green Paper “The European research Area: New Perspectives” {COM(2007)161}, Section 3.3.1.
http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/era_swp_final.pdf

2. News articles, papers and other material:

- Green Paper - The European Research Area: New Perspectives
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2007/com2007_0161en01.pdf
(Although slightly dated now, it offers many important questions that are still to be answered)
- Commission staff working document Accompanying the Green Paper “The European research Area: New Perspectives”
http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/era_swp_final.pdf
(An extensive document that can serve as a factual reference – again, one needs to keep in mind it was published in 2007 already)
- Kok report: Facing the challenge: The Lisbon strategy for growth and employment
<http://www.tlu.ee/files/arts/397/2004-011788399585623a553af35cb9bad692.pdf>

Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE)

Reassessing the Schengen Area: With its extensive and permeable land borders, How to find the best balance between a sustainable migration strategy and freedom of movement in Europe?

Overview

Today, the Schengen Area offers free movement within 25 European countries. On the one hand, the absence of internal border controls within the Area reaffirms the freedom of movement of persons, which is one of four fundamental freedoms set out in the Treaty of Rome (1957). At the same time, immigrants from third-party countries have the ease of possibility to change their country of residence while their residence/work permits may often not allow doing so. This leads to the increase in the number of illegal immigrants in certain Schengen Area member states and the inevitable debate to follow.

This situation calls for the necessity to reassess the Schengen Area in order to develop a sustainable migration strategy while ensuring the right for the free movement of persons.

SCHENGEN AREA AND IMMIGRATION

The Schengen Information System (SIS) is the main instrument for regulating the movements in/out of the Schengen Area. It allows national border control and judicial authorities to obtain information on persons or objects. The regulation of the Schengen Area is covered by the area of freedom, security and justice of the European Union and thus falls under the shared competence between the Union and the member states. This means that the stakeholders in regulating the movement of persons are both national law enforcement agencies and the European Agency for the Management of External Borders (Frontex), which is responsible for coordinating the activities of the national border guards in ensuring the security of the EU's borders with non-member states.

In the case of third country nationals, the entry into the Schengen Area is granted in two cases: either upon obtaining a short-term stay (under 90 days) Schengen visa or a national visa of one of the Schengen Area member states. Only the national visa allows immigrants to reside and work in a Member State.

The citizens of the EU and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA – Iceland, Norway, Lichtenstein and Switzerland) already exercise the right of free movement within the Schengen Area, as set out in the Treaty of Rome and further stipulated by the Directive 2004/38/EC on the right to move and reside freely. Therefore it becomes evident that the Schengen Area above all allows the greater mobility of third-country nationals, who can now travel from one country of the Area to another without having their documents checked. This creates opportunities for certain immigrants or tourists to enter illegally into countries, where they would not be able to immigrate otherwise due to, for instance, the restrictive immigration policy of certain European countries.

It is estimated that there are up to 8 million illegal immigrants currently residing in the EU. An estimated 80% are within the Schengen area. It is likely that over half of illegal immigrants enter the EU legally but become illegal due to exceeding the allowed duration of their stay.

More conservative European Parliamentarians suggest that stricter border control and frequent checks on immigrants can improve this situation. However, many human rights organisations see these measures as excessive and claim they may turn the EU into a police state. Researchers as well as immigrant rights activists consider that this problem can be dealt with by simply facilitating and promoting more ways of legal migration. The committee's proposals will have to take into account national interests of the Member States as well as to ensure the respect of fundamental rights in Europe.

A simple question remains: how can we find the balance between regulating migration and ensuring the freedom of movement in Europe?

By Anastasiia Ivanovyt'ska (UA)

Keywords: migration, schengen, freedom of movement, visa

Links

1. *Introductory material*

- Debate on Schengen Agreement - pros and cons
http://debatepedia.idebate.org/en/index.php/Debate:Schengen_Agreement
- More consolidated and easy to understand information on the freedom of movement, the Directive 2004/38/EC and Schengen Information System (I and II) can be found on Wikipedia
-

2. *Official sources*

- Free movement of persons, asylum and immigration – legislation summary
http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/free_movement_of_persons_asylum_immigration/index_en.htm

3. *News articles*

- Euractiv on Schengen (with extensive background info)
<http://www.euractiv.com/en/justice/schengen-celebrates-prepares-enlargement-news-495182>

Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN)

Balancing the need for individual mobility with sustainability: How should the EU strategy for supporting public and private transport look like?

Overview

Mobility, freedom of movement, interdependence: under various denominations and in many different ways, transport has become a crucial part of our everyday life. From home to office, from work to holidays, from one side of Europe to the other, need and greed for means of transportation has constantly increased through the 20th century in the Western societies.

Since the early 1950s and the development of the European common market, transport has played a very important role in the development of our economic competitiveness. In a globalised and liberalised economy, connections and infrastructures linking producers to consumers are vital because they help offer to meet demand and consumers to choose freely among various products. On the top of being a key economic factor, 'the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the EU'¹⁵ was officially recognised as a fundamental right in the Lisbon treaty. From both an individual and a collective viewpoint it's a matter of equality that every EU citizen has the liberty and the ability to travel, work and live across the continent.

On the other hand, an increase in individual movements may have negative effects and consequences. First of all environmentalists and scientists have argued to attempt to prove the influence of human activity over environmental issues such as climate change. With around 472 cars per 1000 inhabitants and EU27 now representing 11 to 12 % of global greenhouse gas emissions and each EU citizen emitting on average 10.2 t CO¹⁶ every year, Europe has sought to enhance its public transport provision. From a social perspective, several observers have started to criticise the "car civilization"¹⁷ and its consequences: oil dependency, unbalanced urban development or harmful commuting.

Member States have long understood the need for a common transport regulation¹⁸. The main problem is that most infrastructures have been developed under national competences or before EU accession. After an ambitious White Paper published in 2001¹⁹ aiming at 'developing a European transport system capable of shifting the balance between modes of transport', the 2005 mid-review also reassessed the importance of preserving individual mobility. Guidelines for a Trans-European Transport Networks (TEN-T), allowing more efficient and more environmentally friendly transport, were first adopted in 1996 but it took a decade to structure the priorities and actions to be taken. Currently, the Executive Agency²⁰ faces the same questions and the traffic between Member States is expected to double by 2020.

In the upcoming discussions, the committee will have to answer these pregnant but paradoxical

¹⁵ Article 45 Charter of Fundamental Rights http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_en.pdf

¹⁶ Greenhouse gas emission trends and projections in Europe 2009, Report by the European Environment Agency http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/eea_report_2009_9/ghg-trends-and-projections-2009-summary.pdf

¹⁷ Do we live in a car civilisation? <http://www.ired.com/news/mkt/can-cars.htm>

¹⁸ What does the EU want to achieve ? http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/index_en.htm

¹⁹ 2001 EU white paper: "European transport policy for 2010: time to decide" http://ec.europa.eu/transport/strategies/2001_white_paper_en.htm

²⁰ The TEN-T Executive Agency: <http://tentea.ec.europa.eu/en/home.htm>

necessities²¹: How can cars and buses live together? What should the future European transports look like²²? Is it possible to protect individual rights to mobility, social cohesion and economic competitiveness whilst modelling a new way to move?

By Lacina Koné (FR)

Keywords: sustainable transport, public transport,

Links: *[please see references in the footnotes of the articles]*

²¹ European Transport strategies: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/strategies/index_en.htm

²² Can we find innovative transports? http://ec.europa.eu/research/transport/news/article_10367_en.html