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Dear colleagues,

Two years have passed since I assumed the great responsibility of leading European Ideas Network, ambitiously striving to widen the relevance of this distinguished debating forum. There is no doubt that the European Union is at a critical juncture, with defining moments ahead for the European project. We believe that finding solutions for today’s challenges can only be done through an open and pluralist debate. We can thus see how EIN, with its diverse contributors, represents a distinguished forum where this broad reflection can flourish. Therefore, we endeavoured to adapt EIN’s priorities in order to strengthen the internal and external critical thinking needed, and its feedback towards the EPP Group. One of the crucial issues on which we focused our meetings was the growing populist movements across Europe, and the threat they represent for the emergence of real solutions, and also vis-a-vis democratic values.

We particularly focused our contribution on the Future of Europe, not only promoting the internal debate, but also by adding relevant civil society representatives to it, furthering essential external contributions to our own internal reflection. We have of course been promoting a steady debate on the root causes and consequences of the British Referendum and the British peoples’ decision to leave the European Union. Reflecting on demographic changes and issues around immigration have also represented a major facet of our activities during these years, regarding their influence on Europe’s present and future.

As the main theme of our Summer University this year, we also devoted our attention to the Mediterranean’s social, economic and security challenges, and its geopolitical relevance for the EU. During these two years, we did not disregard the crucial debate on terrorism and security threats Europe is facing nowadays, by tracking their causes and considering possible policy responses. With 2015 and 2016 Washington TAG Meetings, we also proceed on deepening our transatlantic strategic cooperation on the crucial worldwide issues that implicate both European and American legislators. The year of 2016 was also the second of our EIN Merit Award Francisco Lucas Pires, attributed to Dr. Hans-Gert Poettering.

In 2017, with your contribution and particularly our WG coordinators MEPs Antonio Tajani, György Schöpflin, Mairead McGuinness, Mariya Gabriel, Markus Pieper, Miroslav Mikošák and Roberta Metsola, we will continue embracing our fundamental role as a place to identify, understand and search for solutions that can improve our project towards a better and united Europe.

Paulo RANGEL MEP
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Background

European Ideas Network

The European Ideas Network (EIN) is an initiative of the EPP Group to bring a range of actors into the generation of policy ideas for the European centre-right. It is a network of over 1000 policy-makers and opinion-shapers from nearly 30 countries brought together to discuss the future policy direction of the European Union and its member states. The network offers a unique forum in which to develop innovative ideas about the policy challenges facing Europe in the years ahead and to evolve practical solutions to help to address them.

Members come from diverse backgrounds, inter alia elected political office, research institutes, political foundations, academia, business, and non-governmental organisations.

In 2016, the agenda and debates of the EIN were characterized by four overarching parameters:

- The on-going efforts to reverse the negative impacts of the immigration crisis and establish the preconditions for long-term decisions in this field, coupled with the rise of nationalist and populist movements in the EU.
- The main focus of the EIN events this year were the political, economic and defence consequences of BREXIT. The new role of the European Council and National Parliaments in the EU architecture was also one of our priorities.
- The important geopolitical challenges faced by European decision-makers. These include:
  - The role of Russia and Turkey as key actors in EU external policy in resolving the continuous uprisings and armed conflicts with tragic consequences for the population, especially in Syria.
  - Mediterranean security as a key factor for the stability and development and EU cooperation with third countries.
- The efforts in the field of enhanced transatlantic cooperation. EIN strongly contributed to the transatlantic debate, not least by the EIN events dedicated to "USA 2016 Presidential Elections. An inside atlantic debate, not least by the EIN events dedicat-

The EIN is working in close cooperation with the European People’s Party and the Martens Centre for European Studies following the recommendation of the EPP Group Presidency. In this context, the EIN managed during 2016 to contribute to the political debate within the EPP Group with a carefully organized series of seminars in strong cooperation with key experts from foundations and think tanks of our political family. EIN also further enhanced its cooperation with leading European think-tanks of the centre right, such as the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, the Schuman Foundation, the International Republican Institute (IRI), the Hudson Institute, the Foundation for Analysis and Social Studies (FAES) and other foundations and think tanks close to the EPP. The network also serves as a framework for national think tanks and political foundations of the centre-right to work together at a European level. Currently 264 such organizations are associated with the EIN in this way.

We also strongly focused on our website (www.ein.eu) and Twitter account in order to communicate and present the EIN events more effectively. Shortly after each Seminar MEP’s are informed about the main conclusions of the discussions through EIN-A4 form.

The key EIN objectives are to:

- Promote new ideas and exchange best practices
- Broaden the vision and experience of policy-makers and opinion-shapers
- Operate on a European-wide basis
- Involve centre-right think tanks and political foundations
- Reach out to people and groups not otherwise involved in political parties (YEPP)

Currently, EIN operates through six working groups on major policy questions and a large annual conference - the EIN Summer University - this year held in June-July. The EIN Working Groups are:

- Future of Europe
  (Chair Paulo RANGEL MEP)
- Immigration
  (Chair Roberta METSOLA MEP)
- Demography
  (Chair Gyorgy SCHÖPFLING MEP)
- Transatlantic relations
  (Chair Mairead MCGUINNESS MEP)
- Human Dignity and Bioethics
  (Chair Miroslav MIKOLASIK MEP)
- SME Circle
  (Chair Markus PIEPER MEP)

Task Forces:

- Mediterranean stability
  (Chair Mariya GABRIEL MEP)
- Security
  (Chair Antonio TAJANI MEP)
- Rethinking European Integration
  (Chair Jacek SARYUSZ-WOLSKI MEP)
- Electoral

EIN organises a number of different types of activity to create a dynamic and lively centre for debate to stimulate fresh thinking and positive responses to the challenges faced in a rapidly changing world:

- EIN Seminars;
- EIN - TAG (Washington);
- Results of the Summer University in Copenhagen;
- Proposed activities for 2017
Results of the programme of 2016

EIN Seminars

In 2016, the EIN organised an active programme of Seminars and breakfast meetings in the European Parliament to offer a forum for both elected policy makers and political researchers in Brussels to discuss subjects of topical interest stimulated by opening remarks by leaders in their field. Throughout the year, the EIN Working Groups also organized numerous seminars.

The format of the EIN Working Group Seminars is as follows: The well-attended meetings begin with a short opening presentation given by one or more experts in the field of the given topic, followed by a discussion between them and the participants.

The following EIN Seminars took place in Brussels and Strasbourg during 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/01/2016</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>A3E</td>
<td>The existing challenges for SMEs in the framework of the Capital Markets Union proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/01/2016</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>SDM S3</td>
<td>Fight against human trafficking in the EU external relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/2016</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>ASH-1</td>
<td>Russia and Turkey as a key actors in EU external policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/2016</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>SDM S3</td>
<td>&quot;EU&quot;: Short for &quot;Ethical&quot; Union? The Role of Ethics in the EU Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/02/2016</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>ASH-1</td>
<td>An EU more inter-parliamentary, intergovernmental or communitarian?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/2016</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>SDM S3</td>
<td>EUROPEAN MIGRATION STRATEGY: REFRAMING THE COOPERATION WITH THIRD COUNTRIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/02/2016</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>6Q1</td>
<td>Meeting with National Parliaments on Brexit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/2016</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>ASH-1</td>
<td>Mediterranean security as a key factor for EU stability and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/03/2016</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>SDM S3</td>
<td>World Down Syndrome Day: Treatment of Genetic Intellectual Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/03/2016</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>SDM S3</td>
<td>6th Week for Life: Demography vs. &quot;à la carte&quot; children: what future for Europe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/04/2016</td>
<td>08:15</td>
<td>SDM S3</td>
<td>USA 2016 Presidential Elections. An inside view of a crossroads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/04/2016</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>SDM S3</td>
<td>Medical, Legal and Ethical Aspects of Neonatal Infanticide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/04/2016</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>ASH-1</td>
<td>The future evolution of the labour force: The end of an era?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summaries of the events are included in Annex A (Page 18).
Further extending its scope, the EIN organized a series of events outside Brussels in cooperation with local think tanks on request of the National Delegations. In addition, the EIN could organize or co-organize, events outside Europe, extending the EPP Group’s network of Centre-right contacts, on an international level.

The following EIN meetings outside Brussels were organized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-16/02/2016</td>
<td>Seminar jointly</td>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>• Overall Eurozone stabilization combined to the development in Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with KAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Digitalisation and wealth creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06/05/2016</td>
<td>Seminars jointly</td>
<td>Madrid, Spain</td>
<td>• Integration, Immigration and European values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organized with</td>
<td></td>
<td>• EU response to international terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAES Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/06-02/07/2016</td>
<td>Summer university</td>
<td>Split, Croatia</td>
<td>EIN Summer University 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15/07/2016</td>
<td>TAG Meeting</td>
<td>Washington DC, USA</td>
<td>Washington TAG Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-14/10/2016</td>
<td>Seminar jointly</td>
<td>Rome, Italy</td>
<td>Future of Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with KAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration and Integration in the EU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summaries of the events are included in Annex B (Page 40).

In 2008, The Trans-Atlantic-Group on counter-terrorism was established under the leadership of Congresswoman Sue Myrick and EPP Group Vice-chair Jaime Mayor Oreja. The main motivation behind its foundation was the evident need for the facilitation of a forum in which Members of the European Parliament, the US Congress and the US Senate could exchange views on current problems in policy-making against post-9/11 jihadist terrorism. Since then, the TAG Group has been enlarging year after year both in members and in areas of interest put on discussion. The TAG gives the opportunity to backbenchers, young MEPs and Members with a specific interest on transatlantic relations to liaise with their American counterparts.

This year’s meeting in Washington, held within the context of EIN meetings organised in the US capital provided a unique experience, which allowed 8 MEPs, 5 Members of the U.S. Congress and Members of the main US political parties representatives to come together. The current format includes a general analysis of the political situation in both sides of the Atlantic with focus on the impact of US elections on transatlantic relations, legislative issues of areas of permanent interest such as security, good governance and international trade. In addition, a number of current issues interests are included in the agenda. The EIN Delegation had the opportunity to visit the US Department of Defence and discuss the major security issues with a key expert from the Pentagon.

The meetings were co-organized by EIN, the Martens Centre, International Republican Institute and the Hudson Institute. The main topics of the discussions were dedicated to: The US Political Landscape, the Republican primaries and the Republican Convention; Socio-economic benefits of digitalization and Freedom of Speech on Internet and its Political Implications; Middle-East issues, Transatlantic cooperation in Middle-East; Briefing on US, EU and Russia

The program of the events is included in Annex C (Page 50).
The EIN summer University was once again the highlight of the 2016 programme of events. This year’s EIN Summer University took place in Split. Here, we have to mention the generosity of the Croatian Delegation in the EPP Group, with Mrs Dubravka ŠUICA MEP, Head of the Croatian EPP Delegation, Mr Andrej PLENEKOVIĆ MEP, Vice-Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mrs Ivana MALETIĆ MEP, Member of the Committee on the Economic and Monetary Affairs in the EP, and Mr Davor Ivo STIER MEP, EPP Group coordinator on Development Committee in the EP, actively participating in the planning of the event. Once more, a big number of participants were present. Among the key speakers were Mr Tihomir OREŠKOVIĆ, Prime Minister of Croatia and Mr Miro KOVAC, Foreign Minister of Croatia. In addition, the list of participants includes Ms Nadia MURAD, Survivor of enslavement and human trafficking, Human Rights Activist; Mr Garry KASPAROV, Russian chess Grandmaster and political activist; MEPs; Members of National Parliaments, key stakeholders and key representatives of European institutions.

The theme for the 2016 meeting was ‘The Mediterranean - Geopolitics and European integration. Challenges and opportunities’ mainly concentrating on the policies that can strengthen the security and stability of the region and to enhance the cooperation between the European Union and third countries.

The Chairman of the EPP Group, Manfred Weber, and Paulo Rangel delivered the Second EIN Francisco Lucas Pires Merit Award to Dr. Hans-Gert POETTERING, President of the EP ret. and Chairman of the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. This award serves as recognition of a personality who was committed to promoting European values.

The international and growing global character of the Summer University was once more reaffirmed and further extended with speakers and participants from countries such as the United States, Russia and Lebanon joining European colleagues for the discussions. This enabled the EIN Summer University to reach important conclusions in a truly global perspective. The 2016 Agenda consisted of five special plenary sessions focusing on areas of current regional, European and International interest. In addition, fifteen roundtables gave the participants the opportunity to reach in-depth, internationally oriented conclusions in strategic areas of European policy. They were: The Mediterranean, Adriatic and Ionian regions (corridors, infrastructure); Economic policy, EU funding and Cohesion policy; the Balkans, Goals and Policies for an enlarged European union; Threat of populism for democracy and rule of law structures; Demography; Human dignity and Bioethics; Transatlantic relations: the inter-dependence of two continents; EU coordinated strategy against terrorism; EU answer to Islamic State; The Future of Europe; EU - Russia, the necessary understanding of two regional and global players; Digitalisation and wealth creation; Immigration; Financial and economic development in EU; Sustainability of the European economic and monetary Union.

The conclusions of the meetings that took place during the Summer University in Split can be found in Annex D (Page 57).

The core activities of the EIN are conducted through a series of policy Working Groups that meet primarily during the year in order to prepare the ground for the annual EIN Summer University. A draft programme for 2017 has been prepared and presented below. As in the previous years, Brussels remains the usual venue for our meetings. However, the EIN remains open to requests from the National Delegations to hold a number of meetings in capital cities other than Brussels so as to further cooperation with think-tanks across the Union. This ensures that the EIN broadens and consolidates the EPP Group’s network of centre-right contacts throughout Europe, giving the EPP Group a unique policy-making advantage over the other political groups in the European Parliament.

**WG 1**
Future of Europe (Paulo RANGEL MEP)

**WG 2**
Immigration (Roberta METSOLA MEP)

**WG 3**
Demography (Mariya GABRIEL MEP)

**WG 4**
Transatlantic relations (Mairead McGUINNESS MEP)

**WG 5**
Human Dignity and Bioethics (Marioslav MIKOLASIK MEP)

**SME Circle** (Markus PIEPER MEP)

**TASK FORCES:**
- Mediterranean stability (Marilya GABRIEL MEP)
- Security (Antonio TAJANI MEP)
- Rethinking European Integration (Chair Jacek SARYUSZ-WOLSKI MEP)
- Electoral

The following EIN meetings out2017 Draft Program of meetings in Brussels and Strasbourg:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2017</td>
<td>16:30 - 18:00</td>
<td>A3E-2</td>
<td>Protection of Human Life in the Era of Commodification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/2017</td>
<td>12:30 - 14:45</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>EIN «Food for Thought»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/2017</td>
<td>16:30 - 18:00</td>
<td>A3E-2</td>
<td>Patents as Biopolitical Devices of Globalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/2017</td>
<td>15:00 - 18:30</td>
<td>A3E-2</td>
<td>Transatlantic relations after the US presidential elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/2017</td>
<td>12:30 - 14:45</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Future of inter-institutional/constitutional issues in light of Brexit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/2017</td>
<td>15:00 - 18:30</td>
<td>A3E-2</td>
<td>World Down Syndrome Day: Treatment of Genetic Intellectual Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2017</td>
<td>16:30 - 18:00</td>
<td>A3E-2</td>
<td>Media, political correctness and manipulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/04/2017</td>
<td>15:00 - 18:30</td>
<td>A3E-2</td>
<td>Future of Europe (Paulo RANGEL MEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/2017</td>
<td>12:30 - 14:45</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>EIN «Food for Thought»</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017 Program of External meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27th and 28th February</td>
<td>1st day:</td>
<td>Madrid, Spain</td>
<td>• EU in the Trump/Putin Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar jointly organized</td>
<td>16:00 - 19:00</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>• Towards an EU Fiscal Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with FAES Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th March</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Political corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar on the occasion of</td>
<td>1st day:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expanding Schengen &amp; increasing the protection of external borders;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the EPP Congress (Mrs</td>
<td>16:00 - 19:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The future of Cohesion policy and CAP after 2020;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METSOLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th and 11th April</td>
<td>1st day:</td>
<td>Sofia, Bulgaria</td>
<td>• EU in the Trump/Putin Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar EIN Task force on</td>
<td>16:00 - 19:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Towards an EU Fiscal Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The future of Cohesion policy and CAP after 2020;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mrs GABRIEL)</td>
<td>2nd day:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd and 4th May</td>
<td>1st day:</td>
<td>Porto, Portugal</td>
<td>Future of Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar WG Future of</td>
<td>16:00 - 19:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (Mr RANGEL) with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto Sa Carneiro</td>
<td>2nd day:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th -12th May</td>
<td>1st day:</td>
<td>Budapest, Hungary</td>
<td>% Europe full?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar WG 3 Demography</td>
<td>16:00 - 19:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mr SCHOPFLIN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd and 23rd of June</td>
<td>1st day:</td>
<td>Dublin, Ireland</td>
<td>• Taxing times in transatlantic relations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar WG 4 Transatlantic</td>
<td>16:00 - 19:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The future of transatlantic alliance after Brexit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relations (McGuinness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09- 10 October- TBC</td>
<td>1st day:</td>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>«Wealth creation for all - How economic and social policies in the EU help to counter economic populism and to strengthen trust in market economies?»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar jointly organize by</td>
<td>16:00 - 19:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Tajani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13/07/2017</td>
<td>2nd day:</td>
<td>Washington DC, USA</td>
<td>Washington TAG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG Meeting</td>
<td>09:30 - 13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/09-29/09/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rome, Italy</td>
<td>EIN Summer University 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex A
Summaries of the events in Brussels and Strasbourg

EIN Seminar on Russia and Turkey as key actors in EU external policy
Chair

- Elmar BROK MEP, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the European Parliament

Guest Speakers

- Steven BLOCKMANS, Senior Research Fellow & Head of the EU Foreign Policy Unit, Centre for European Policy Studies, Professor of EU External Relations Law and Governance, University of Amsterdam
- Ambassador Zoltán MARTINUSZ, Director Foreign Affairs, Enlargement and Civil Protection Enlargement, Security, Civil Protection, Foreign Affairs Council Support, General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union
- Eka TIKHESHELASHVILI, President of the Georgian Institute for Strategic Studies and former Foreign Minister
- Konrad ZASZTOWT, Senior Research Fellow at the Polish Institute of International Affairs

Rapporteur

- Alexander Barkhudaryants, PhD Candidate, Institut Français de Géopolitique (Université Paris VIII)

Russia and Turkey are both former empires characterized by their respective leaderships. Erdogan is on his way to becoming the longest serving and the most influential Turkish leader since Mustapha Kemal Atatürk. The Turkish leader is a deeply polarising figure within Turkish society. At the same time, Russia is an example of how democracy can be replaced with a national autocracy managed by former KGB figures.

For the EU, Russia is an ideological and security challenge. Russia imposes a combination of security-based power and also soft power. Russia is fundamentally interested in cooperation with the European Union, which is Russia’s main economic and trade partner. NATO’s enlargement and military infrastructure deployment next to Russia is considered as its first and the foremost danger.

The Turkish idea of becoming a major power in the Middle East has failed. The alternative is to become closer to NATO and to the EU. The European Union cannot solve the migration question without Turkey and the EU needs Turkey to diversify its energy supply. The framework of the relations between the EU and Turkey has been for a long time the enlargement. There is a need for closer cooperation which does not mean that Turkey will necessarily become a member of the EU.

Five years ago, relations with Russia and Turkey would not have been thus linked. The rising role of Russia, a regional and global player, and Turkey, merely a regional power, leads to the need of reformulating the EU common policy since there are member states that undertake different approaches. Unity of EU external policy is essential.

The differences between Russia and Turkey are no more than similarities. EU has to change and develop a new vision for relations with those two countries.

The EU should be committed to get back to a partnership agreement if Russia respects International law and accept to fully implement the Minsk Agreement. The EU needs Turkey more than ever regarding immigration and security issues but we need a strategic and realistic assessment of the situation.

The ‘EIN-A4’ represents a summary of EIN seminar initiatives. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the EPP Group political line.
Chair
• Paulo RANGEL MEP, EIN Chairman, Vice-Chair of the EPP Group in the European Parliament responsible for Political Strategy and the European Ideas Network

Keynote Speaker
• Alain LAMASSOURE MEP, President of the French EPP Delegation in the European Parliament

Speakers
• Prof. Dr. Christine NEUHOLD, Special Chair of EU Democratic Governance, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASoS), Department of Political Science, University of Maastricht
• Prof. Dr. Wolfgang WESSELS, Department of Political Science and European Studies, University of Cologne, Chairman of the Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA)
• Prof. Olivier COSTA, Director of the Department of European Political and Administrative Studies, College of Europe
• Carlos Fernandez de CASADEVANTE ROMANI, Professor of International Law and International Relations, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, Spain

Rapporteur
• Rui RAMOS, Senior Fellow Researcher at the Institute of Social Sciences, the University of Lisbon

In order to develop the EU democratic system we need to increase the role of the European Parliament in the decision-making process. There is a need for a better cooperation between national parliaments and here we can highlight the importance of the inter-parliamentary conferences. The EP has to propose new ideas about the role of EU Council, European and National parliaments.

There is a different role perception among national parliaments; some of them are using the Lisbon tools very actively. We have more information exchange, more cooperation and coordination after 2009, despite there being a deficit of staff in some Member States.

We have a process of ‘parliamentarisation’ and ‘inter-parliamentarisation’ in the EU at the same time. European elections have become more important, while in some cases they reflect the issues of national elections.

More ministers or prime ministers in the European Council are euro-sceptic. What will happen if the right wing parties do not have a majority in the EP and the EU council at the same time? Euro-skepticism could help the EU to improve its functioning.

Young people do not know a political system other than democracy. They have to know about the situation in the EU 40-50 years ago in order to understand the real meaning and importance of the EU.

We need to focus not only on EU law but also on national law in order to be capable to answer the current problems - migration, populism, nationalism etc. At the same time, we need to focus more on the role of the European Parliament instead of the role of the EU Council.

Many decisions could be and should be taken by the experts but the politicians should decide the very important political choices. Power corrupts but lack of power also corrupts.
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- The migration crisis is mainly a foreign policy crisis, however until now it has essentially been dealt with by the Justice and Home Affairs Council.
- This crisis represents an opportunity for the EU to fix its external political priorities and to work on the Common Foreign and Security Policy.
- This is the hottest topic on the political agenda as it creates a feeling of insecurity for the population and is related to our values of humanitarian solidarity.
- With the refugee crisis, Schengen is clearly at stake and with it, EU’s very foundations.
- The asymmetrical impact of the crisis is a strong obstacle to a coherent response. Achieving solidarity is harder when the interests of the 28 Member States are so diverse. But this year all Member States have discovered that they can all be on the periphery and subject to the problem.
- The EU has tried to take a certain number of decisions (relocation, hotspots and EU-Turkey Agreement) but the implementation of these decisions is missing. We have a clear lack of cooperation. Instead, Member States have resorted to individual action (re-imposing control of their own borders and even building fences).
- The EU needs to go much further and has to be comprehensive by including security dialogue and coordination in the fight against terrorism. It is about working very closely with third countries to dismantle the smuggler industry (migrants, drugs, human trafficking). It is about adopting a comprehensive action and about a long-term cooperation in trying to be more successful with our development policy.
- The technical support that NATO has decided to provide is more than welcome.
- Turkey is playing according to its interests and the EU has to understand this. The EU leverage could be the upcoming Visa Liberalisation. The EU feels the strain of the pressure and we are negotiating from a rather weak position.
- The situation is not going to end soon. If the EU does not solve the problem, this will directly lead to radicalisation.
- Even if a solution is found in Syria, in Yemen and in Somalia, there will still be people who would want to come to the EU. The EU needs to be back on the lead and show that it has regained control of its borders.

The full Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies report is accessible by clicking the following link: www.martenscentre.eu/events/european-migration-strategy-reframing-cooperation-third-countries-0
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EIN - YMN Seminar on EU response on the upcoming UK referendum and possible subsequent events commonly (known as Brexit)
Co-Chair

- **Paulo Rangel MEP**, EIN Chairman, Vice-Chair of the EPP Group in the European Parliament responsible for Political Strategy and the European Ideas Network
- **Esther de LANGE MEP**, Vice-Chair of the EPP Group in the European Parliament responsible for Relations with National Parliaments
- **Tom Vandenkendelaere MEP**, Member of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in the European Parliament

Speakers

- **Prof. Dave SINARDET**, Free University of Brussels, Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences, Department of Political Science
- **Dr Nicholas STARTIN**, Deputy Head of Department of Politics, Languages & International Studies, University of Bath
- **Prof. Richard WHITMAN**, Head of the School of Politics, University of Kent, Director of the Global Europe Centre
- **Duarte MARQUES MP (PT, PSD)**

It is very important that the United Kingdom remains in the EU. However, if they decide to leave, there is no chance for a second renegotiation. There is no way back. The UK will still have to deal with EU because of our common destiny but friendship is one thing, membership is another.

- The EU has given everything that it could give to the British and the EU should now keep apart from this British discussion. The EU presence in the debate would be counterproductive.

- A referendum could give an answer to a question that you did not ask. Indeed, it can produce unexpected dynamics and unexpected results. In addition, there is a tendency for people to focus on other issue than the one originally at stake. The UK referendum is a very emotional one, based on sovereign symbolism (crown, army, pound, financial independence, etc.).

- Why did David Cameron make this decision to go for the ‘nuclear option’? First, a huge split in the Conservative Party. Second, the rise of the UK Independence Party (UKIP). Third, the unique tabloid press extremely hostile to the EU, prepared to picture, and influence this debate with an anti-European propaganda.

- The variables that may affect results of the referendum are immigration, security and the economic crisis.

- We could picture three different following scenarios. One would be a strong vote to remain. In this case, that could change significantly the way UK see the EU. A second would be a narrow outcome, either in or out, leading to a continuation of an uncertainty for the UK and the future of Europe. The third and titanic scenario is one in which the UK population vote to leave by a comfortable margin. In this case, a second Scottish independence referendum would be conceivable.

- This Referendum is a breaking point in Europe history. We are going towards a two speed European Union and not an EU ‘à la carte’, which is unacceptable. Some countries will deepen their integration in a federal path and others take the option to remain with a strong link within the EU but with a moderate degree of integration.
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EU roots are Mediterranean. We have a common past and common interests and that is why we need better cooperation. EU destiny depends closely on the destiny of our southern neighbour.

We need to have a global strategy putting at the centre the individual with his whole dignity. Coordination should be strengthening on intergovernmental, parliamentary and civil society level. We also have to reaffirm Union for Mediterranean role as an intergovernmental body on the bases of co-ownership to enable both northern and southern countries to be involved simultaneously. The ultimate goal is to build bridges across the Mediterranean.

Stability in the Mediterranean is linked to the refugee crisis. Refugees are mixing the issue of fleeing Syria with aspiring to a better like. Europe is the easiest path that will get them to security. We need a transatlantic strategy towards the refugees, as well as a closer cooperation with North Africa and Middle Eastern countries. This is not only a humanitarian issue; it is also a security one. If nobody takes those refugees, there will be no hope for them and subsequently a risk of radicalisation.

We need more education to avoid radicalism. Young people without education, without prospect or feeling of belonging to a society would be easy to be recruited by extremists. We need to give them hope by launching specific projects in education and job creation.

Together, we shall define our priorities and promote regional integration, human development and regional stability. The EU had astonishing success in these fields: decreasing child mortality, increasing literacy, reducing the number of people leaving in absolute poverty. The condemnation of mass murders of religious minorities by ISIS with the vote of a resolution in the European Parliament represents one of these achievements. However, the political reform and state building have not been so successful. The governments in the region have either supported the extremist ideology or tolerated it. The Arab lawmakers should be brought together with think tanks from the Gulf Area to fight against failing states and to prevent the growth of radicalism.

Both sides have the same security priorities in the region. But there is only a consensus in fighting a small part of what is considered as terrorist organisation. We need more cooperation and coordination to ensure Mediterranean stability. The first step for the EU is to not only highlight when southern countries do something wrong but also recognise when progress has been made.

The crisis that we have now is in the South Eastern Mediterranean. There are issues to the East and issues to the South but security is a global concern. We should not look at our neighborhoods in a separated way. We have to open our dialogue with all of them, increase the role of civil society and promote a mutual reciprocal understanding.
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- There is still uncertainty on the final winner on both parties. Nobody in USA understood either.
- There is high probability that, neither Trump (who will certainly be prevented from gaining the Republican nomination in Cleveland, Ohio with over 60% of the Republican Party against him) nor Hillary Clinton (burdened with past history) will be the candidates.
- Trump’s flamboyance and extravagance may look strange to Europeans but until today worked well for him. His simple and direct talk, with common sense solutions, appeals to the lay person. Trump speaks on questions in people’s minds. His main argument is: “I am like them and that is why I am going to destroy them” [The establishment]. He insists that he is the only one able to do it. His success, until today, may originate from a public perception that “Trump is doing something”. Clinton campaigns mainly on domestic policy issues. Her main weakness is that she is seen as representing the status-quo which is now an anathema to US citizens. Polls show that only 24% of Americans believe that their country is on the right track today.
- The two remaining candidates from the Republican Party can still play a role in the final outcome. Ted Cruz is followed by better educated people and has links with the Tea Party movement. He wants to be seen as a critic of Washington despite the fact that he comes from Washington. If the other remaining Republican candidate, John Kasich, is elected, he could probably win against anyone from the Democrats. If Trump loses the Republican nomination and wants to continue, he has very few chances as an independent candidate. On the democratic side, if Clinton fails in NY, we may see VP Biden emerging as a compromise candidate with good chances to win the nomination. Sanders, on the other hand, attacks mainly Wall Street and its institutions. His support comes from young people in bad economic conditions. Democrats appear weak at this moment except Sanders who is seen as a socialist or a kind of a liberal in American terms.
- In an answer to Mr. McALLISTER MEP, it was mentioned the problem with south US border (with Mexico). Trafficking seems to originate in the South Border as a gate for drugs and potential terrorist threats.
- In an answer to Mrs. HÜBNER MEP concerning the TTIP, it was mentioned that Republican Party supports it but there is distrust in negotiations carried by Obama’s Administration. Democrats are divided and against both TTIP and TPP.
- The general feeling in the US, goes against the establishment and it seems that people want some form of insurgency. Two front runners in the Presidential race take advantage of this trend. On the political aspects of the presidential race, some important differences with Europe were mentioned: party structures are weak in America; leadership in the US comes from localities and not from centrally controlled parties; everybody raises his own funds.
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The ageing of our society will reverse the trends of 30 years. Wages will rise, but working people will be locked in political combat with pensioners. Four key, long-running trends in the world economy have continued for more than three decades, and each of them is rooted in demography. Earnings have been slowing, in some cases even falling, in the advanced economies, with very little explanation as to the reasons. Membership of trade unions in the private sector has been falling sharply. Inequality, within countries, though not between them, has risen, with Thomas Piketty famously ascribing this to a tendency for the rate of return to capital to exceed growth. Interest rates have been falling for the last 35 years and this has been often attributed to a decline in investment relative to savings.

Cost cutting measures by de-localizing production has been undermining the lifetime job security that employees of mostly larger international companies have enjoyed. Disruptive technological innovations now also put a lot of pressure on a growing list of service providers such as Cab drivers, hotels, music stores, etc. People employed in these sectors should be very aware of the fact that their job is on the line. This is not the case in every sector and not in every country, but definitely more and more it is the end of the era of ‘job security’.

Technological innovation is often also a source of growth. For every additional high-tech job that is created, approximately four service jobs follow. We increasingly need to make sure people are prepared the day their job gets ‘Ubered’ down the drain. Policy measures should support employees in a way that their labour market transitions pay off. Therefore, when their job is scrapped, the objective is that they do not collapse socially and have poverty knocking the door, but they take their career in their own hands and go out to find a new and better opportunity.

There were huge increases in the available workforce from 1970 until now, but in the future the workforce will decline by a few million each year, while the number of old people will explode. The future will have its own difficulties, but they will not be the same as those in the past.
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The challenge of irregular migration does not begin with the arrival of flows of migrants; rather it begins when they become so desperate that they prefer risking their life for betterment elsewhere.

The importance of identifying the root causes of irregular migration as a measure to solve the overall problem should not be underestimated. Hence, attention to poverty, bad governance, lack of decent living conditions, development, peace, security and justice need to be improved. In this regard policies for development, the reform of economic sectors, climate change and the environment have to evolve. Attention needs to be paid to industrialisation and investment security.

Nonetheless, we still do not know all the causes and reasons why people migrate, and we sometimes assume wrongly, e.g., assumption that increasing development will reduce the number of migrants has been proved to be wrong (i.e., one needs means to travel).

Therefore, we need to find comprehensive solutions to create real opportunities in the countries of origin, especially for young people.

There are no immediate solutions to tackle the problem of irregular migration. Development of long-term policies is vital. Pressures we can exercise in favour of return or readmission policies are no longer effective.

As a matter of utmost importance we stressed the need for Europe to adjust to the new prevailing conditions. African countries do not depend solely on aid from the EU. Therefore, we can no longer buy reforms or put pressure on African countries to attain our objectives. Similarly, we have to adopt new policies in relation to the African countries which are no longer in the category of Least Developed Countries (LDCs).

In a similar manner, it is important to keep in mind that migration is about people’s choice: it is not acceptable to enforce choices on people.

It was likewise asserted that attempts to solve the current migration crisis should be distinguished from the issue of migration in general. While we do not want uncontrolled flow of migrants, Europe needs a skilled and professional work force.

An important tool to solve the problem of irregular migration was stressed in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The need for enhanced scrutiny from the side of the European Parliament was also stressed. This was specifically directed in its coordination with the European Commission, which often refuses to disclose specific information or projects in their preparatory phase.

Current changes in Africa also need to be regarded seriously. With the current demographic explosion in Africa the overall population there will soon reach 2 billion. Therefore, Europe should pursue opportunities for cooperation and closer economic relations. The creation of jobs for young people and the adequate supply of electricity to this growing population is critical. Currently, 80% of Africans do not have access to electricity which accordingly affects their education and job opportunities.

At the moment, Europe does things for Africa. It is time to start do things in conjunction with Africa: it is a renewed relationship based on cooperation that we strive for.
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A lot of good regulations exist in waste business but implementation is quite low.
There are not always environmental but also economic problems due to cost increases.
The circular economy will be a megatrend in market economy. It is about productivity, innovation, entrepreneurship, and is an industrial tool.
The circular economy is not only about waste - before material becomes waste it should be used another way and even used material has a value.
Europe does not have a lot of resources and we need more resources, and more reusing will increase our competitiveness.
The European Commission proposes a circular economy package, a framework in which private sector then devises a strategy of implementation.
Flexibility is needed - if too much overregulation there is a risk of destroying business and can make barriers for single market and also since differences between North and South are huge.
There is a need to find incentives for some Member States and not to create more bureaucracy and red tape for others.
In turn, companies need more long term stability and a level-playing field but also incentives for recycling.
It is important to set targets not only for recycling but also reusing.
There is a need for a clear definition of recycling and prevention with new ideas due to increase of population.
Food waste is important to address. However, it is difficult to quantify as most of it comes from restaurants.
The circular economy is not just about environment but also job creation, stimulating innovation and growth in the digital single market.
The EPP should take the lead on the circular economy theme and claim political ownership.
There is no circular economy without profit and being business oriented.

Conclusions
- Karl-Heinz FLORENZ MEP, Member of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety in the European Parliament
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• Keeping in mind that the Moroccan situation is an exception in the region, notwithstanding the “Arab spring”, most countries kept women’s social and economic conditions much as they were in the past. Even in Morocco, there are still areas excluded for women.
• The European Parliament has an enormous task of controlling the enforcement of the agreements established concerning gender equality, under the Barcelona Declaration and the European Neighbourhood Policy. The programmes already spent EUR 45 million in the region. In Syria, for instance, women received training in media skills in order to know how «to get their voices heard». These investments require the fulfilling of specific goals and the publication of an annual report.
• Regardless the common traces of the Maghreb and Mashreq countries, there are still tremendous development differences between those countries making it impossible to apply a “one-size-fits-all” solution. The process may be enhanced by promoting the access to education by women. The future wives and mothers will leave to future generations a message of modernity, openness and tolerance.
• Strengthen women’s role in society has positive effects both on the economies of those countries and promoting democratic behaviour. Women are the vector of change, the change those countries need and represent the political will to make it happen.
• The seminar then focused on the developments of women’s rights both politically and economically in the Mediterranean region. The interventions were of utmost importance to understand the «cultural revolution» that took place in Morocco in the last decades and the fundamental role of the European Union promoting women’s condition in Mediterranean societies.
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EIN Working breakfast on: «The economic consequences after BREXIT»

European Parliament, Brussels
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- Paulo RANGEL MEP, EIN Chairman, Vice-Chair of the EPP Group in the EP responsible for Political Strategy and the European Ideas Network

Keynote Speaker

- Carlos MARTINEZ MONGAY, Director Economies of the Member States II, DG ECFIN — Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs, European Commission

There is a volatility in the process of Brexit and we cannot predict the real outcome, since the UK economy is one of the biggest and best-organized economies in the world. The existing arrangements for non-EU countries vary and have different aspects. With the Norway model, for example, agriculture and fisheries are excluded from the agreement. The Swiss model consists of bilateral agreements in certain areas while the Turkish model is completely different. Currently, the EU has 50 trade agreements and is negotiating with 60 countries.

- The economic relations between the EU and the UK are very strong. 43% of British exports go toward EU countries and at the same time 53% of UK imports are from the EU (mainly from Germany, France, Netherlands etc.). However, the financial sector and services are much more important for the United Kingdom compared with the EU in total. The financial sector holds a share of 7.6% of the UK GDP.

- The UK’s main macroeconomic indicators published after the referendum are very few. Employment intentions are not clear yet but the course of British Sterling dropped with 17-18% the last year, the expectations for the next 18 months are down with 15%. Inflation rates might be one of the most important indicators, since the British consumers are not elastic to price raises.

- The worst-case scenario was stressed as not being as simple as the ones being considered. There is no guarantee that the UK will immediately be treated as a full member of the WTO.

- Mairead McGUINNESS pointed the need to have an impact assessment sector-by-sector, in spite of the lack of predictability of it.

- Paulo RANGEL stressed the importance of the impact of the financial services to the British economy.

- How will the banks respond to BREXIT? Would they miss their passports? Most banks have branches in EU Member-States, so they would be able to continue working there. There are no expectations that we will watch banks suddenly leave Britain to other Member-States. It might happen in some extent but not on a large scale. Moreover, until there is no accurate information about the modus vivendi after BREXIT the banks will not react.

- In addition, there are still many other variables that need to be considered, such as oil prices or the future of the monetary policy of the ECB.
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Theresa’s May speech to the Tory’s conference tell us that we can be pessimistic about the possibility of reaching a reasonable agreement between the UK and the EU27 but optimistic with the unity of the remaining 27 about UK’s access to common market without accepting the four liberties. The positions so far are very extreme and radical but we have to find a solution.

- The referendum’s role was advisory but with crucial political impact. There is no consensus in Britain about BREXIT, we don’t really know if UK wants to leave the customs union as well. UK is itself a sensitive union: there was no Scottish constituency voting to leave, leading to a possible second referendum on independence. Another problem concerns the Northern Ireland border with the Republic of Ireland. Finally, the legal challenges of the Parliament’s role triggering the Article 50.

- BREXIT is a challenge for the EU institutions and an opportunity to solve the current problems. Referendums are difficult and dangerous tool because people vote with emotions. We have to show that we can make decisions, that we are capable. We need to explain to the people why the membership is so important for their daily life, that in deeper integrated and globalized world, only together the countries can fight for consumer rights, fight against international monopolies. In addition, the EU is as insurance policy and a guarantor of peace.

- We have to protect the EU investments in the UK in the upcoming EU-UK trade agreement. UK decided to leave the EU without realizing the kind of relationship the UK wanted to have with EU, and it has to be them to decide it. The agreement would bring political and legal difficulties. Now is time to solve the question before other major EU problems move the attention from BREXIT to the immigration crisis or the stability of the financial sector.

- Furthermore, from all the possible scenarios discussed in the past few months, there is one that strangely is not in the agenda. The EU could settle an agreement with the UK much like the one settled with Ukraine, a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA). This agreement considers only three of the Internal Markets “four freedoms”, excluding for now the free movement of people.

- Although the Leave Vote itself does not force the treaties to be reviewed, the original text of the treaties will need to be altered. Furthermore, a new decision about the European Parliament’s composition as well as financial provisions will need to be addressed. For this, the unanimity of the Council, a decision of the Parliament and national ratifications. BREXIT is an opportunity for the constitutional reforms in the EU.

- The Labour Party turned even more to the left; much of the former UKIP militants are joining the Conservative Party. This two mainstream parties are being pushed from inside to more radical positions. In the end, the British democracy, admired by many for so long, becomes discredited.
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- European security and defence capabilities are very limited without the US engagement; therefore, NATO remains for the time being the only real defence mechanism in Europe. EU will be weakened after Brexit and this process will be even worse if Trump wins the US Presidential elections. Clinton will be more engaged in NATO partnership. Brexit could also weaken the UK role in NATO and the UK-US special relations, since UK is the largest investor in security and defence in Europe. We need a reassessment of the EU-UK relations and development of new bilateral agreements.

- To build a true EU defence system, the target of 2% expenditures is needed; at the same time, we have to focus not only on the amount of money that we invest in EU security and defence but more on the actual effect and pragmatic results. European countries has significantly increased their expenses for defence for 2016 compare with 2015.

- United Kingdom is a major stakeholder in NATO; we do not have to overestimate the UK capacity as a global actor. We need to answer the question are France and Germany ready to be the engine of the EU security and defence policy. Currently, UK and France account for 40% of the total EU investments in defence even that UK stopped substantially its contribution since 2003 (taken over by France, Germany, Italy and Spain) and was never eager to integrate. Security is not only defence; it is external relations, energy, economy etc. Many issues should be done thru the EU.

- There are 3 major challenges for the European security: Russia, China and Middle East. We should not only focus on the Russian aggression in Ukraine but also on the facts that they are funding some of the radical movements in EU which aim is to destabilize Europe as a union. We should increase our capability for creating peace and stability. Migration and refugee crisis, Brexit, the terrorism threats are real problems, which could be used from our competitors against us.

- There are many uncertainties that will reflect on the future of the European security and defence strategy, the outcome of the US Presidential elections is crucial, but we also have upcoming elections in France and Germany. The results of those elections could be game changing. And finally, Brexit is still avoidable thru the UK parliament.
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This historical moment for Colombia is an opportunity for a permanent peace in the region as long as everybody who was engaged in the plebiscite agreed to the result. Any failure in the implementation of the peace agreement would lead to its re-opening in the future and could be used as a negative argument in the upcoming elections.

The EU stood for the agreement since its very beginning, supporting a view where any peace would be better than no peace at all. The same view was not shared by the majority of the Colombian people, which resulted in a shock for the western world. Therefore, last October’s result was surely unexpected.

The whole process has deeply transformed Colombia; only four years ago, the dialogue would not be possible and today Colombia is on the verge of reaching an agreement that puts an end not only to years of war, but also integrates the FARC members in the society. However, the agreement proposed on October’s plebiscite, although historical, was seen as too indulgent on the perpetrators.

Even though the NO won the plebiscite, the grounds for a new dialogue were established, and the reaction from both parts was extraordinary. To ensure peace, the Colombian people will need to forgive, to make concessions, regarding a common purpose: establish a sustainable peace in Colombia. However, the peace should not be bought at any price. Nonetheless, there is a general positive feeling towards the new arrangement. That idea is easily expressed by the success of the last six weeks: only a Government truly committed to find peace would succeed in such short time.

There were doubts regarding the political future of FARC members. The idea that there was no alternative to the agreement proposed, after four years of negotiations, seems now to have been overcome. Colombia is now moving from a practical agreement to a sustainable one; this new arrangement was said to be more realistic. In spite of the changes, the new agreement has to combine both the general feeling that FARC members should face a fair judgement, but also guarantee a political future for FARC. Peace would only be achieved if FARC hand over the weapons and pursue their politics through political means.

Colombia is key player in the region, geopolitically speaking. It is the most promising country in the region, both politically and economically and, therefore, has an important role to play towards the neighbouring countries, with a particular focus on Venezuela. The European economic and political help was said to be of great importance, a bond that should not be moderated for now.

The ‘EIN-A4’ represents a summary of EIN seminar initiatives. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the EPP Group political line.
Chair

- Paulo RANGEL MEP, EIN President, Vice-Chairman of the EPP Group in the EP and EPP party

Speakers

- Michael C. MAIBACH, Managing Director & Board of Trustees, James Wilson Institute on Natural Rights & the American Founding
- Giovanni GREVI, Senior Fellow, European Policy Centre
- Peter CHASE, Senior Fellow, German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF)

Trump's victory, as Brexit referendum, proved that in both sides of the Atlantic emotions and concerns are similar and have a strong impact on the voters. This result is a victory for the whole Republican Party that won the majority in both Houses.

The clear Trump's message “Make America great again” versus Clinton’s “Stronger together” seemed to convinced the voters. Clinton chose “Identity Politics” rather than focus on jobs, opportunity and a more effective government for all Americans.

There are three key messages delivered by President-elected Trump that will help us to understand the outcome of the elections:
1) The US is a country itself, the “land of opportunities” starts with a land;
2) The Government is failing, and Hillary pretty much impersonates the failure of establishment, as a former Secretary of State and former First Lady;
3) The “American dream” must be kept alive;

Ultimately, Trump reached the main street working people while Hillary lost some of her voting base to the independent candidates. Remarkably, Trump needed roughly the same votes Romney had in 2012 to be elected. Almost every mainstream media predicted a «blue wave» after the elections and an irreparable division in the Republican Party. In the end, Donald Trump won the elections against all the odds.

Obama was a controversial president concerning both the economy and foreign policy. During his mandate, the US grew on average less than 2% and his debt record was the second worst since 1953. In addition, Obama’s foreign policy was, on one hand, soft, creating power vacuums in places as the Middle East and, on the other hand, ideological, with a strong promotion of liberal economics.

Instead of state building, Donald Trump shall emphasise his efforts on fighting terrorism. As such, he calls on NATO to fulfill its role, yet with a stronger European contribution. The European countries should not expect the US to defend them if almost none of them are complying with the agreed 2% to 3% expenditure on defence.

As a process of clash and compromise between Institutions, foreign policy is permeable to inputs from different areas of thought, such as the usual “conservative internationalism” approach of the Republican Party. Nonetheless, the President-elect should trail an eclectic policy, characterized by the absence of a global strategy. Although pragmatic, it should be a “sort of and anti-Kissinger approach”, very much like doing business: a trade-off between what one part wants and what the other has to offer.

Therefore, US foreign policy should follow a certain degree of discontinuity, as in the recently rebuilt relations with Cuba, but also through the intentions of reshaping NAFTA or withdrawing from TPP, decision that might have a positive impact on China’s trade. Regarding the commercial policy, Trump has a highly mercantilist interpretation of it. As regards TTIP, although it is not a political issue for the main street, it should be accomplished through an annual system of sectorial agreements.

On fiscal matters, Trump shall follow an extremely expansionist fiscal policy - very much like President Reagan - with significant support from the Congress. The country needs investment on infrastructures and these could be financed through Public-Private Partnerships, granting major tax credits to the «sponsoring» companies. However, this tax reform is not expected to tackle existing loopholes.
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Welcome and Introduction

- Paulo RANGEL MEP, EIN Chairman, Vice-Chair of the EPP Group in the EP responsible for Political Strategy and the European Ideas Network
- Matthias SCHAEFER, Head of Team Economic Policy, Department Politics and Consulting, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung

Chair

- Godelieve QUISTHOUDT-ROWOHL MEP, Member of Committee on International Trade in the European Parliament

Speakers

- Sebastian PLOCIENNIK, Polish Institute for International Affairs (PISM), European Union Program Coordinator (KAS)
- Jürgen MATTHES, Cologne Institute of Economic Research
- Miguel MARIN, FAES Madrid, Head of Department Economic Policy

- Member States have to look how we are interconnected. The development in each country, for example Greece, is inter-related to the growth of the Eurozone. UK, Denmark, Poland etc., are not in the Eurozone but they are affected and concerned about the crisis in the EU monetary union.
- There is a rise of left front governments in Europe which could put the Eurozone stability in danger (Greece, Portugal and potentially Spain).
- The current Eurozone crises is exceptional, it is deeper and longer than usual. This crisis can be seen as an evidence for the lack of adjustment capacity. The experience about debt is not the same among different MS. We are facing the question: is fiscal integration necessary to deepen the monetary union? The problem for EU countries outside the Eurozone is that joining the Union was easier because of the obvious benefits but it is difficult to explain the advantages of the Euro to the people.
- The consequences of the crisis after 2009 created new dimensions of the Eurozone. We saw that the Euro is not ideologically neutral.
- Eurozone stabilization is more or less crisis driven. The problems of implementation of Eurozone stabilization mechanisms are a major disadvantage for the competitiveness of EU. Market integration is much slower than it should be.
- An excessive credit cycle led to high current accounts deficits and high private indebtedness in periphery countries. The reform period of Germany’s labour market contributed to divergences in competitiveness and current accounts.
- We should not keep the national approach on dealing with those problems on an extra-EU level. Remains of current crisis can and should be tackled but only in a temporary way.
- A limited set of additional reforms are needed but they should be implemented.
- The Eurozone has to avoid strong-bust (credit) cycles in the future (private, government debt etc.). We have to make the banking system more robust in order to tackle the private debt legacy.
- The Troika model was not successful because of the specifics of each country. Since there is no common opinion, we need to accept the differences and to improve the communication between experts, politicians and people needs. We need to create wealth, not only economic growth.

The ‘EIN-A4’ represents a summary of EIN seminar initiatives. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the EPP Group political line.
EIN Seminar jointly organized with Konrad Adenauer Foundation on Digitalization and wealth creation

Chair

- Eva PAUNOVA MEP, Member of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection in the European Parliament

Speakers

- James WATERWORTH, Vice-President, Europe for the Computer and Communications Industry Association (CCIA)
- Stephan LIENING, Senior Policy Adviser, Digital Agenda Working Group, CDU/CSU-Bundestagsfraktion
- Lars ZIMMERMANN, CEO hy.co
- Karim Antonio LESINA, AT&T, Vice President, AT&T International External Affairs

- There is a rising trend of the benefits from digital technologies (in social life, economy, education etc.)
- If growth and productivity matters we then need digitalization of the economy. For the past 100 years, GDP in Europe rose by 500% but the unemployment rate remained stable. Smart politics are very important to create wealth and sustainability for the people.
- The EU has to develop and implement a flexible legal basis that must not be changed every five years.
- We have to establish common values in the transatlantic digital sector. EU has a higher investment rate than the US but less investments in the ICT sector. The corporate tax is 44% in the US and 18% in the UK but taxation is not the only challenge. Capital goes where the best return is, and good regulation attracts investors. The EU must further develop its economic policy for the digital sector. The importance of digitalization is related to the development of European industry. It is important to have not only digitalization but also interconnection because in today’s business world everything is inter-related.
- The real challenge for the digital single market is about political decisions. Regulation is responsibility of the governments but businesses pressure the governments to produce and improve the regulation.
- In the digital world, it is more important to use instead of own something. The EU does not need to copy the Silicon Valley, we need to create innovation ecosystems in different Member States. The most important investor in Silicon Valley is the government but in the EU, companies should also invest in digitalization. The future of digitalization within the EU will depend more on private companies, not from the government. Member States should continue to shape the digital spirit and foster the cultural entrepreneurship.
- The role of education is crucial for the digital sector. The big companies have to retrain their employees every 3-4 years because of the change of technology. Skills are the most important for companies but for customers also.
- We must attract start-ups by opening office spaces for people with ideas. The EU needs to have a definition of a start-up to help their development. Every city wants to be the new tech hub but this is unrealistic since people and their skills are the most important. The biggest start-ups have not been founded by nations, only people can make the difference. The start-up economy is the biggest employer in Berlin, but not in Germany overall.
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Welcome and Introduction

- **Paulo RANGEL MEP**, EIN Chairman, Vice-Chair of the EPP Group in the EP responsible for Political Strategy and the European Ideas Network
- **Javier ZARZALEJOS**, Secretary General, FAES Foundation

Chair

- **Jan OLBRYCHT MEP**, EPP Group Vice-coordinator on Budgets in the European Parliament, Deputy-Head of the EPP Polish delegation

Speakers

- **Alejandro MACARRÓN**, Managing partner, Fundación Renacimiento Demográfico - Demographic Renaissance
- **Allan S. JANIK**, Professor in Philosophy, University of Innsbruck
- **Valenti PUIG**, Political commentator, Futuro Estratégico

- EU countries have to repeat and further develop the debate about the nature of the European values. We cannot predict how successful the integration process of refugees would be and for that reason we need to have a stable system of common values which we have to share with all the people who want to integrate into our societies. Most of the refugees are coming to Europe illegally which is not familiar with our perceptions of order.
- The successful integration is about jobs and economic development, to achieve and maintain peaceful social relations. We need to carefully read the data concerning the profile of refugees and consider how to combine their needs with our society and to avoid social fragmentation, exclusion and polarization.
- It would be a mistake if EU mixes the profiles of economic immigrants and refugees. We have low birth rates in many EU countries for the past decades. The demographic height of Europe was cut in half for the past 50 years and it is getting lower. Despite these facts, for the past 20 years Spain increased its work force by 20% stimulated by immigrants. The next generation of “gastarbeiters” will be much more difficult to integrate, if most of the new immigrants are low-skilled, they will take more than they can give to the society.
- EU needs an efficient and sustainable approach to the integration of refugees, otherwise we will increase the influence of the populist movements. We have to answer to populism with pragmatic and common actions with visible results. We do not have to ignore the complexity of the problem, since everything is connected. Many young people support right wing parties because they lost their jobs but some of those parties are against integration of refugees.
- The major question is who is Pro-European and who is against. If we are Pro-EU, we need to have a common approach.

*The ‘EIN-A4’ represents a summary of EIN seminar initiatives. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the EPP Group political line.*
Welcome and Introduction

• Paulo RANGEL MEP, EIN Chairman, Vice-Chair of the EPP Group in the EP responsible for Political Strategy and the European Ideas Network
• Javier ZARZALEJOS, Secretary General, FAES Foundation

Chair

• Antonio TAJANI MEP, Vice-President of the European Parliament, former Commissioner

Speakers

• Rogelio ALONSO, Professor URJC, Director of the Master program in analysis and prevention of terrorism
• Ribal Al ASSAD, Founder and director, Organization for Democracy and Freedom in Syria
• Eva SAENZ-DIEZ JACCARINI, Universite Paris-8, France
• Jan STEHLIK, Counter-radicalization Task Force, European Values Think-Tank

For the national authorities it is very important and very difficult to have efficient prevention against terrorism. EU have to develop the common approach and global cooperation between all countries and national intelligence agencies, in order strengthen its external borders.

We did not predict the consequences after the Arab Spring. The success of ISIS is a result of our lack of action. Currently, many people in Syria have to choose between the regime of Assad, ISIS or leaving the country. Some of those, who are joining the radical groups, are motivated because of the money and to feed their families. EU have to support the peace process on spot and to encourage the economic recovery and development within the post-war period.

We need to face the fact that we are having also a home-grown terrorism, like the attacks in Madrid in 2004. Some of the terrorists have EU passports. According to the statistical data, 3000 to 5000 foreign fighters came back to EU and it is crucial for us to implement a proper screening process to evaluate the potential risk.

Religion could be used as a motivating factor for the terrorists but many other problems as unemployment, economic issues, anti-Islamism and social polarization also reflect on their behaviour. Since today, most of the radicalization has been spread online, we need to use social networks in preventing young people to be influenced.

In EU, we believe that we are living in post-violence world.

The ‘EIN-A4’ represents a summary of EIN seminar initiatives. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the EPP Group political line.
Seminar of the European Ideas Network
With the support of with Konrad-Adenauer Foundation Office in Italy and the European Foundation Society and Education on Immigration and Integration in the EU
Rome, Italy

Co-Chairs
• Roberta METSOLA MEP, EPP Group Vice-Coordinator in the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs in the European Parliament
• Heinz K. BECKER MEP, EPP Group Vice-Coordinator on Employment and Social Affairs Committee in the EP

Speakers
• Marco RICCIERI, Professor, General Secretary EURISPES - Institute of Political and Social Studies, Rome
• Arije ANTINORI PHD, Department of Communication and Social Research, Sapienza University of Rome
• Tarafa BAGHAJATI, Chair of AMI „Austrian Muslim Initiative“
• Maria ELÓSEGUI, Professor - Philosophy of Law, School of Law of the University of Zaragoza, Spain

Rapporteur
• Miguel ÁNGEL SANCHO, President of the European Foundation Society and Education

The migration policy is a foreign policy crisis. We need to identify the roots causes and to work closely with third countries in trying to bring security for the populations having in mind our values of humanitarian solidarity. To build social cohesion we need dialogue. We have to highlight the importance to recover intercultural dialog. The western culture is not the exclusive owner of their interpretation.

We need to have a holistic approach on migration and for that, the departing point should be solidarity. It is important to distinguish between labour migration where Members States must have the control of their labour markets and the beneficiaries of internal protection that means relocation. A union of shared values must become a Union of shared solidarity.

Strengthen external borders is a pre-requisite if we will save the Shengen zone but Member States must be committed to their obligation at external borders. Integration remains a taboo. The three main political groups in the EP do not mention integration in their policies. We need to tackle this issue and address challenges.

One of the challenges facing especially migrant youth of the second and third generation in the European Union is the question of Identity. Europe as a Union and as a Continent are also facing serious challenges in the point of identity. There is a lack of feeling to belong and to be part of society. We need to promote the concept of multicultural identity.

The today scenario shows a risk of division in our societies. EU must create living conditions and prospects for work in Africa and the Sub-Saharan region. We need a Plan Marshall for these regions.

EU must develop a common approach and global cooperation between all countries to fight against trafficking in Human beings in the Mediterranean area. Terrorist fighters may use migrant smuggler. EU Member states and their partners should target and dismantle complex and sophisticated criminal networks involved in migrant smuggling. The social media has a serious impact in radicalisation.

The question is how to promote within the youth, Muslims or not, the idea of being “United in Diversity”. European Values should be called Universal Values and the right of visibility of religious symbols and manifestation of religion should be part of these values. We need to difference values and lifestyle. European lifestyle is not a value!

Muslism youth in Europe needs to be educated. Equal chances can only be gained with equal access to promotion prospects. The system must provide youth with ways to participate in all sectors of life.

Intercultural education, education for democratic citizenship and human rights education are vital for an intercultural dialogue in Europe. We need to open our intercultural models. The Media should stress the positive contribution of migration in Europe.

The ‘EIN-A4’ represents a summary of EIN seminar initiatives. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the EPP Group political line.
EIN Seminar on: «The future of Europe»

Rome, Italy

Co-Chairs

- Paulo Rangel MEP, EIN Chairman, Vice-Chair of the EPP Group in the European Parliament responsible for Political Strategy and the European Ideas Network
- Antonio TAJANI MEP, Vice-President of the European Parliament, former Commissioner

Speakers

- Francesco TUFARELLI, General Secretary, Automobile Club d’Italia and former Head of Staff of the Minister for EU Affairs (Letta Government)
- Allan S. JANIK, Professor in Philosophy, University of Innsbruck
- Branislav STANICEK, Member, Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London

- Hillary’s victory is arguably seen as better for Europe, on account of the predictability of her actions, while Trump’s victory might distort the international commercial context. Regardless of whether the victory falls to Trump or Clinton, the result was said to be a “dysfunctional coalition” concerning the relationship with the US Congress;
- To tackle the migration crisis and the terrorism related to it, the EU must settle a coherent strategy for Africa and the Middle East, as well as to the Balkans, a European region marked by its strong Muslim roots; Furthermore, the EU must define its approach for those countries; Additionally, the investment in the promotion of stability was said to be urgent both in sub Saharan and Maghreb countries;
- This month’s Tory party conference was said to be decisive for the outcome of BREXIT’s negotiations. After Theresa May’s speech the 27 remaining Member States became increasingly united against the idea of giving Britain an easy way out, something seen as unlikely only two months ago. A “hard BREXIT” on the other hand might create the opportunity the EU needs to begin the construction of a new Europe, more focused on the integration of its Member States;
- Vladimir Putin’s interference with EU’s Member States domestic policies is seen to be of the utmost importance. Russian financing of extremist political parties throughout Europe thwarts the European political scenario, while masking Russia’s own problems through its external policy;
- Europe lacks a true strategy for the future and a few potential paths were presented: a stronger promotion of the SME; the need for reindustrialization, according to the new environmental patterns; the promotion of new competition rules that might strengthen the world’s trade at a level playing field;
- Finally, the importance of reinforcing our collective identity while fighting populism was highlighted. For that, it might be necessary to rethink the way political parties developed in the recent years, becoming definitely a “secular social democracy in a combination of a liberal social order and economic efficiency. The EU needs a new dream.

The ‘EIN-A4’ represents a summary of EIN seminar initiatives. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the EPP Group political line.
Programme
(07/2016)

→ SATURDAY 9 JULY - MONDAY 11 JULY

Arrival of Participants
Contact person: Guillermo MARTINEZ CASAN - EIN Network - Director: +32 473 73 67 88

→ MONDAY 11 JULY

· 19.30
  Working Dinner at Hotel Sofitel Lafayette
  806 15th Street NW,
  Washington, DC 20005

→ TUESDAY 12 JULY

EIN/IRI/TAG meetings
Address:
Room LJ-119, Library of Congress, Thomas Jefferson Building,
10 First Street SE,
Washington DC 20540

· 08.50 - 09.00
  Meeting at the Lobby of Hotel Sofitel Lafayette

· 09.00 - 09.30
  Arrival of Participants
  (transfer by taxi from Hotel Sofitel Lafayette to Library of Congress, Thomas Jefferson Building)

· 09.30 - 10.45
  Welcome and General Discussion on Migrants and refugees;
  Trade relations;
  Terrorism: ISIS and home-grown in US and Europe;
  NATO situation
  - Congressman Sean DUFFY, U.S. Representative for Wisconsin’s 7th congressional district/Co-chair of TAG
  - Paulo RANGEL MEP, EIN Chairman, Vice-Chairman of the EPP Group in the European Parliament/Co-chair of TAG
  - Mairead McGUINNESS MEP, Vice-President of the European Parliament, Chair of the EIN WG on Transatlantic relations

· 10.45 - 11.00
  Break

· 11.00 - 12.00
  General discussion on
  Migrants and refugees;
  Trade relations;
  Terrorism: ISIS and home-grown in US and Europe;
  NATO situation

Annex C
Working meetings of ‘Transatlantic Group’ and EIN/IRI/Martens Centre/Hudson institute

11th - 15th July 2016

Hotel Sofitel Lafayette
806 15th Street NW
Washington DC
• 12.00 - 13.30
Lunch

• 13.30 - 14.45
First Panel Discussion
Meeting with the Democratic Party representatives (Clinton supporters)

• 14.45 - 15.00
Break

• 15.00 - 16.15
Second Panel Discussion
Meeting with the Republican Party representatives (Trump supporters)

• 16.15 - 16.45
Resolutions, Recommendations and next TAG Summit

• 16.45
Adjourn

• 19.50 - 20.00
Meeting at the Lobby of Hotel Sofitel Lafayette

• 20.15 - 22.00
Working Dinner (on personal invitation) - Pan-American/EU cooperation
Venue
Army and Navy Club, John Paul Jones room,
901 17th St NW,
Washington, DC 20006

Welcome by Paulo RANGEL MEP, EIN Chairman, Vice-Chairman of the EPP Group in the European Parliament/Co-chair of TAG and Mikuláš DZURINDA, President of the Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies

Keynote speech
Brexit Europe, The Atlantic and the World - a view from the UN

→ WEDNESDAY 13 JULY

• 10.00 - 10.10
Meeting at the Lobby of Hotel Sofitel Lafayette

• 10.10 - 10.30
Transfer from hotel to Hudson Institute (10 minute walk)
Venue
Hudson Institute,
1015 15th Street, NW 6th floor

Rachel ELLEHUUS, Principal Director European & NATO Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense

• 10.30 - 12.00
Briefing on the Future of Transatlantic Security
Venue
Hudson Institute,
1015 15th Street, NW 6th floor

• 12.00 - 12.30
Transfer from Hudson Institute to IRI
IRI Office,
1225 i (Eye) Street NW, Suite 800

• 12.30 - 13.30
Working Lunch, Impact of US elections on transatlantic relations & ‘Selling Europe’ in Washington, DC
IRI Office,
1225 i (Eye) Street NW, Suite 800
- Jan BRZEZINSKI, Resident Senior Fellow, Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security, Atlantic Council TBC
- Kurt VOLKER, Executive Director, McCain Institute TBC

• 13.30 - 15.00
Welcome by Thomas GARRETT Vice President for Programs, International Republican Institute and Paulo RANGEL MEP, Vice-Chairman of the EPP party, Vice-Chairman of the EPP Group in the European Parliament, EIN Chairman / Co-chair of TAG,
Briefing on US Political Landscape, the Republican primaries and the Republican Convention
- Clark S. JUDGE, Managing Director, White House Writers Group, Inc.
- John C. FORTIER, Director of the Democracy Project, Bipartisan Policy Center
- Karlyn BOWMAN, Senior Fellow, American Enterprise Institute

• 15.00 - 15.30
Break

• 15.30 - 16.30
Briefing on social-economic benefits of digitalization and Freedom of Speech on Internet and its Political Implications
- Abigail SLATER, General Counsel, Internet Association
- Ari GIOVENCO, Director for Trade and International Policy, Internet Association

• 16.30 - 18.00
Free time

• 18.00 - 18.30
Transfer from IRI to restaurant NAME (12 min. walk)
Venue
University Club
1135 16TH Street, NW

• 18.30 - 19.30
Cocktail Reception
THURSDAY 14 JULY

Venue
Hudson Institute,
1015 15th Street, NW 6th floor

- 08.30 - 08.40
Meeting at the Lobby of Hotel Sofitel Lafayette

- 08.40 - 09.00
Transfer from Hotel Sofitel Lafayette to Hudson Institute
1015 15th Street, NW 6th floor (10 min walk)

- 09.00 - 09.15
Welcome by Kenneth WEINSTEIN, President and CEO, Hudson Institute

- 09.15 - 10.45
Briefing on Middle-East issues; Transatlantic cooperation in Middle-East
- Elliott ABRAMS, Senior Fellow for Middle Eastern Studies, Council on Foreign Relations
- Scott MASTIC, Director of Middle East and North Africa Division, International Republican Institute
- Danielle PLETKA, Senior Vice President for Foreign and Defense Policy, American Enterprise Institute TBC

- 10.45 - 11.15
Break

- 11.15 - 12.45
Briefing on US, EU and Russia
- David J. KRAMER, Senior Director for Human Rights and Democracy, McCain Institute
- Hannah THOBURN, Research Fellow, Hudson Institute
- Antonio TAJANI MEP, Vice-President of the European Parliament, former vice-president of the European Commission
- Danuta Maria HUEBNER MEP, Chair of the Constitutional Affairs Committee in the European Parliament, Member of the Delegation for relations with United States in the European Parliament, former EU Commissioner

- 12.45 - 14.30
Networking Lunch (informal)

Venue
Hudson Institute,
1015 15th Street, NW 6th floor

END OF THE OFFICIAL PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS OF THE EIN DELEGATION

OPTIONAL

- 14.30 - 16.00
Briefing on America’s Alliances
- Bob LIEBER, Professor of Government and International Affairs, Georgetown University
- Wess MITCHELL, President, CEPA TBC
- Julianne SMITH, Senior Fellow and Director of the Strategy and Statecraft Program, Centre for New American Security TBC

- 16.00 - 16.15
Break

- 16.15 - 17.15
Wrap up Session
- Roland FREUDENSTEIN, Policy Director, Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies
- Benjamin HADDAD, Research Fellow, Hudson Institute

- 17.15 - 18.45
Free time

- 18.45 - 19.15
Transfer to Restaurant NAME TBC

- 19.15 - 20.00
Cocktail Reception

FRIDAY 15 JULY

- 10.00 -
Optional visit Capitol Hill (please register)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT DELEGATION

Paulo RANGEL MEP, Vice-Chairman of the EPP party, Vice-Chairman of the EPP Group in the European Parliament, EIN Chairman (PT)
Antonio LOPEZ-ISTURIZ WHITE MEP, Secretary General of the EPP party and Secretary Treasurer of the Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies (ES)
Danuta MARIA HUEBNER MEP, Chair of the Constitutional Affairs Committee in the European Parliament, Member of the Delegation for relations with United States in the European Parliament, former EU Commissioner (PL)
Antonio TAJANI MEP, Vice-President of the European Parliament, former Commissioner (IT)
Mairead McGUINNESS MEP, Vice-President of the European Parliament, Chair of the EIN WG on Transatlantic relations (IE)
Mariya GABRIEL MEP, Vice-Chairwoman of the EPP Group in the European parliament responsible for the Working Group on Mediterranean Union, Euromed, Head of the Bulgarian EPP Delegation (BG)
Tunne KELAM MEP, Member of the Delegation for relations with United States in the European Parliament (EE)
Tom VANDENKENDELARE MEP, Member of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in the European Parliament (BE)
Jan OLBRYCHT MEP, EPP Group Vice-coordinator on Budgets in the European Parliament, Deputy-Head of the EPP Polish delegation (PL)

**EPP Group in the European Parliament Staff**

Guillermo MARTINEZ CASAN - EIN Network Director
Dimo IVANOV - EIN Policy Coordinator
Goncalo VILLAS-BOAS - Assistant to Paulo RANGEL MEP
Chiara SALVELLI, Advisor for the Bureau Cabinet of Vice-President Antonio TAJANI MEP

**US LEGISLATORS**

REP. SEAN DUFFY (R-WI)
REP. JIM SENSENBRENNER (R-WI)
REP. MICHAEL MCCaul (R-TX), CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE HOMELAND SECURITY COMMITTEE
REP. WILL HURD (R-TX)
REP. HANK JOHNSON (D-GA)
REP. ED ROYCE (R-GA), CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Annex D

EIN Summer University Split Summaries

Round Table - Mediterranean, Adriatic and Ionian region (corridors, infrastructure)

EIN Summer University 29 June – 02 July 2016, Split, Croatia
Co-Chairs

- Mariya GABRIEL MEP, Vice-Chairwoman of the EPP Group in the EP responsible for the Working Group on Mediterranean Union, Euromed, Head of the Bulgarian EPP Delegation
- Dubravka ŠUICA MEP, Head of the Croatian EPP Delegation

Panellists

- Ribal Al ASSAD, Founder and director, Organization for Democracy and Freedom in Syria
- Georgette LALIS, Principal Adviser to the Director-General, DG ENER — Directorate-General for Energy, EC
- Paul PROSOSKI, IRI consultant

Integration should not only be an EU/ non EU or North/South question, but also a more direct closer for the immediate neighbourhood for the countries involved. Communication and interaction between ruling elites, decision makers and ordinary citizens is an issue that needs to be handled with significant seriousness.

The EU policy in the support security of supply is based on the three following pillars. The first is improving security of supply by creating competitive gas markets. The second is reducing import dependency by modernizing the heating cooling sector. The third is more effective crisis prevention and response based on cooperation and solidarity.

The Adriatic region is a specific part of the larger Mediterranean basin, with its own challenges. Unemployment, security and energy are common challenges for the surrounding the basin.

Women are a major driving force for societal change. Values must be part of reflexions on future political initiatives. Sustainability is an important aspect of every policy initiative that looks for solutions to the problems of the region.

Following the Syrian crisis, many live in poverty in refugee camps in Jordan and Lebanon, which have become recruitment grounds for extremist movements. From an EU perspective, it is a lot cheaper, and the help reaches more people, if it is done locally, and it would also have the added value of cutting the interest of joining terrorist organisations.

The EU has to improve its communications strategy in the Balkans. A large majority of the population has a misconstrued vision of EU actions compared to other regional powers.

The EU vision for a resilient Energy Union with a forward looking climate change policy aims at making sure that citizens benefit from a secure, competitive and sustainable energy system. Energy infrastructure is at the heart of an integrated energy union.

Increased interdependence and trade starts with a strong backbone of gas pipelines and electricity transmission system corridors.
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Despite the disruptions caused by the British referendum on leaving the EU, as well as other political, economic and demographic challenges faced by the EU, the EPP and the governments led by it at various levels in Europe will continue to build upon the achievements of cohesion policy. Between 2007-2013, 594,000 jobs have been created, including at least 262,000 in SMEs. Nearly 78,000 start-up companies have been supported; broadband access has been provided for 5 million citizens, and access to clean drinking water for another 3.2 million - all owing to cohesion policy. These results shall definitely be improved.

EU economic, social and territorial cohesion policy remains practically the entire investment expenditure of the EU towards the objectives of Europe 2020 strategy. Despite the difficulties, such as the differences in funding uptake between Western and Central and Eastern Europe, these objectives (e.g. 75% employment rate among 20-64 year-olds; 3% EU GDP investment rate into research and development; reducing the rate of early school leavers below 10%; fighting poverty and social exclusion, especially among the youth) are being achieved to a considerable extent.

In 2014-2020, a total of 312 billion euro shall be spent on cohesion - more than one third of the entire EU Multiannual Financial Framework for this period. In this current seven-year financial programming period, the EU cohesion policy, firmly linked (through the European Semester and the so-called ex ante conditionality) to the economic policy, and delivered mainly through the European Regional Development Fund, is founded on a focused approach (“thematic concentration”). It is visible through bigger emphasis on innovation (Smart Specialisation), the synergetic connection with research and development policy (Horizon 2020 programme), as well as broadening of support for SMEs (including start-ups and scale-ups) towards further development of productive economy. Infrastructure development continues to be harnessed through the Cohesion Fund.

The growing importance of the digital economy, through completion of the EU internal market, is being reflected by prioritising broadband building, developing better e-services and improving competence. Flexibility, necessary for the EU funding optimisation, has to be embodied by measures such as the Solidarity Fund, for example. Partnership with the citizens in European regions and cities in decision-making is strived for through the multilevel governance principle. This should ensure that their ownership of the policy is bolstered (in fact, ca 40% of the funds are already managed by regions). Last but not least, employment and labour mobility, especially aimed at the young people, is being delivered through the European Social Fund.
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- Brexit will bring substantial negative consequences for the EU enlargement process, since the UK supported enlargement and it is now leaving. The EU must take adequate actions in order to keep its political and economic stability.

- The EU has an interest to invest in enlargement, not only because of security reasons, but also for the stability and fostering economic development. Having the Western Balkan countries as part of the EU is in its (EU) own strategic interest. Since the crisis started, the attraction of EU enlargement has faded, despite this fact it continues to be very important for the non-Member States countries. The EU has to show a strong political will to continue.

- In order to keep the enlargement process, the political will of Member States needs to be sustained, e.g. the Stabilisation and Cooperation Agreement with Kosovo was signed because it was needed as a tool for the rapprochement with Serbia, even though not all Member States recognise Kosovo.

- The methodology of assessing progress achieved by candidate countries needs to be changed, a process is needed which is more transparent and countries need to be awarded for progress, it could be considered to give candidate countries score-cards to measure their progress. The EU should not underestimate the fact that the transformative role of enlargement works both ways.

- The EU has to show the Western Balkans countries its substantial contribution to the development of the region (e.g. in Serbia people are convinced that the biggest financial donor is Russia, while in reality it is the EU). This is also required by the governments. We really need to explain the role of the EU for the economic development and for the opportunities which each candidate Member state will have.

- Turkey was rewarded by the EU with the opening of a new chapter, while Western Balkan countries are not treated in the same way which was considered as double standards in the negotiating process.

- It is important to have partnerships with credible and stable countries in the Western Balkans. The political and economic success of the European Union depends on all European countries.
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• Populism is a political discussion that creates a division between people and the elite. Populism is essentially anti-establishment rhetoric. Populism is linked to nationalism, which is about sovereignty and taking back control.
• Reinforcing the nation state is the wrong answer. We must accept that today most pressing issues (environment, social justice ...) can only be tackled at a higher, e.g. EU level.
• Populism is a structural threat to democracies. Its representatives claim they are neither right or left wing but represent the people.
• Populism promotes a structure that excludes people from processes whereas the democratic structure is an inclusive method. Their political instrument is referenda.
• In the future we will have a dual debate, people demand decisions that shall be taken close to them while at the same time many issues can only be solved at EU level.
• In upcoming elections, people will continue complaining about EU, but there is a danger that one accident happens, which is that the populists win.
• Elections from now on will have at their core European politics. Europe will no longer be a silent topic. It is dangerous to mix Brexit with populism. This is what populists want. Brexit is a big chance that the EU can be more appreciated, e.g. show costs of non-Europe. We must further point out differences with Social Democrats; they have no answers to current problems.
• The question of having a small Europe on small things and a big Europe on bigger things was addressed with the argument that the so called 'small things' have so far been proven as the most successful ones having a positive impact on the EU citizens' everyday lives (i.e. Roaming). Conversely, on the so called 'big things' (i.e. migration), the EU has found it harder to address.
• We must “repolitisise” our political language, democracy is also about to say no when things cannot be delivered.
• Lesson from Brexit: do not constantly blame Brussels; you cannot undo in two months what you have been complaining about during decades. Paradox: people do not trust populists but they vote for them.
• We must show people the consequences of Brexit (students, car industry etc.). It is not time to speak about more or less Europe but finding a firm answer to the Brits.
• The centre should normally prevail in Europe but mainstream political parties should not promise too many things. 20% of the population cannot be reached by the big political groups.
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Migration as a phenomenon always existed and civilizations were affected to various degrees. Numbers matter. A given geographic territory can maintain only a limited number of people. Therefore, significant and rapid increase of inhabitants in many parts of the globe causes migration of people to more developed regions. A global rearrangement will happen as the result of mass movement of people. Migration is closely interlinked also with agriculture and the ability of the land to maintain only a limited number of inhabitants. The huge increase in the last 100 years of the population in the Middle East and Africa and lack of agricultural development and shortage of water has led to an unsustainable situation causing migration to Europe. There, there is less population growth, good agricultural development and sufficient water resources. Different age groups of the population were affected differently during the financial crisis of 2007-2009. Baby boomers lived beyond their means before 2007-2009 (high debts, low savings).

Stagnation is not only economical but also demographic. Possible answers to the situation include the following: investments in infrastructures; growing volume of exports; structural reforms; labour force growth. In Japan there is little growth and a lot of seniors over 65 but nevertheless successful because Japan is rich. If China’s population becomes older before it gets rich then there is a risk of disintegration. Military action would even be possible for demographic reasons. In Germany and Italy right now there is a problem of demography and labour shortages more than other Member States.

The integration of refugees in Europe is extremely complex and have social, cultural and economic aspects. With the case of Germany, more than 74% of migrants are young men. Their level of education varies according to their country of origin. Resources are not unlimited, thus the most recent measures taken by the Federal Government have different levels in order to face the huge challenges, including stricter conditions and severe controls. Germany has difficulty returning failed asylum seekers - 30% are not returned. Technological advancements make the nexus of work forces & immigration even more complicated. The example of biotechnology: longer life expectations combined with the tendency of reduction of work (no repetitive human handwork needed – substituted by machines).

The EU needs to establish a common immigration policy – inspired by or similar to the existing models of the US, Canada and Australia. The question of demography with implications on European regions should be incorporated into EU cohesion policy.
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The aim is to educate on various practical issues, related to the values of the EPP Group. Various current events of concern include efforts of the liberal left to legally define human being and life, sometimes to decide the issues of conscience (abortion, euthanasia) via popular vote. Bioethics is a distinct part of this struggle, related to pertaining issues of biology and medicine.

Also significant is the legalization of euthanasia approved in a number of European states (NL, BE, LU, CH). The switch from protection of life to prevention of suffering, then even in non-terminal cases, not necessarily physical illness cases (depression, autism, osteoporosis, in the future perhaps dementia, coma) is significant. There is also then the question of autonomous will; it is a popular policy. There are ethics issues of medical practitioners to be taken into consideration. There are problems of application of the complex law (“grey zones”).

Palliative care/sedation acts as a humane alternative (further ones can be developed). “Take away the fear of dying” or suffering, being a burden, as the fear replaces the actual disease.

The need is to prevent “osmosis” of these ideas into everyday life by firmly keeping them on the ground of values. Idea of creating “improved humans” - through prolonged life expectancy, higher intelligence and the use of genetics - with a view towards possible “singularity” (catching up of human and artificial intelligence) event. Materialist, and profoundly egoistic (commodification-based) ideas are abroad, which therefore need to be prohibited from further development as they are contrary to natural law.

State is an organization, which has been created in order to serve, and therefore is acting towards achieving the common good (comparative historical perspective of Croatia).

If the state is incapable and/or unwilling to act accordingly, this role reverts to the family, to display solidarity and help to uphold the existing laws (examples of Croatian referendum initiatives and information actions).

There is the controversial 2015 UK (secondary) legislation to enable pregnancy by-passing mitochondrial diseases (no licenses issued under the law as yet). The dilemma is “Does the end justify the means?”: Of the three methods available, all are using chemical reagents not admitted to medical use, require creation and destruction of human embryos. In effect, these are changing human genome, which is prohibited under international law, in order to cure a disease, which can’t be and is thus not cured, thus creating an ethical problem.
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- Cooperation is the EU’s strength, and the EU can react to complexity by staying united but the EU can’t make a difference alone. There are unique bonds based on shared values.
- A solution to get TTIP adopted could be to do it sector by sector, rather than have a long complicated negotiation covering everything.
- Continual internal crisis- we need to show the EU as more effective and credible. This means more jobs, growth. There is a need to reflect over on which level competences should be (EU/ National/ Regional).
- The UK cannot be expected to lead on security issues; following the Brexit vote, they will be inward looking for the coming years.
- France has 11 000 troops patrolling internally; this will lower the possibilities of foreign interventions.
- German leaders have stopped the decline of their defence budget. The German establishment is willing to take more responsibility, unlike the German public.
- Both Clinton and Trump are the most unpopular candidates ever chosen by their respective parties.
- The EU project has lost its appeal, we should not easily abandon this most effective policy.
- We need a new narrative, something that is appealing to our citizens. Many issues that are happening in Europe are much the same as in the US (economic stagnation, not enough jobs, declining incomes, declining manufacturing).
- Agriculture serves as an example. Thanks to heightened efficiency, production has increased and employment decreased. Around 50% of GDP is going via government, before 20%. Generosity is important within society.
- GDP stagnation+ massive immigration gives rise to political confrontation.
- For the coming 18 months several serious game changers. These include the US elections, Italian politics with a populist wave, French elections with a high risk of Front National being in the second round, German elections which might see advances of AFD. If we want things to stay the same, they will have to change.
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Islamic State (IS) distinguishes as the movement of constant change in their propaganda, providing a whole set of solutions on how to produce attacks. IS intensified its propaganda for those that want to act nationally without joining the Califat. The propaganda is based on attacks at all levels, managing to infiltrate EU in different forms.

A new trend in the IS way of operation is the switch from the universal strategy to isolated individual related acts of terrorism. Concerning the structure of the terrorist threat, until recent times the threats were addressed to individual countries. However, after the Brussels attacks, the message was that the city was attacked because Brussels is the capital of the EU. The Internet frontline needs to be better defended. Censorship and removal of extremist content is ineffective. Current government sponsored counter-narratives and counter-extremism efforts are largely inadequate in suppressing IS extremist ideology from spreading online and offline.

Offline de-radicalisation is an important part of the solution as it is much more effective. Other challenges are the disparity of the tools that the EU is using and the lack of collaboration amongst authorities.

There is a solid European paradigm in countering terrorism which has become a global paradigm. There is an institutional acquis (FRONTEX, networks, etc.) to be built upon. Most importantly we have a degree of public acceptance on security which has shifted lately.

The lack of cooperation among MS with regard to exchange of information is an important setback.

The Directive on Fire Arms an important tool to counter terrorism, terrorists should not have access to explosives/weapons, however 10 MS are not implementing this law.

Two main challenges: the economic dimension of security a) how to draw a balance between security and growth; b) information exchange - the importance of inter-operability and interconnection of the information data basis.
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The EU has a great interest in combating ISIS because it is a danger for all of us. The fight against ISIS is complex and occurs at more levels: Military offensive in Syria and Iraq and, counter-terrorism operations in Europe and countries in other parts of the world; Financial measures; Ideological battle, including on Social Media;

- There should be more focus on countries like Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon who play an important role in fighting ISIS. The crisis in Libya is also giving room for ISIS to operate.
- ISIS’s oil infrastructure and other financial institutions closed to ISIS are hit by the actions of the coalition.
- Increased financial and territorial losses might lead to further weakening of ISIS. Its members are becoming disillusioned.
- Europe should help reformist Islamic scholars in their efforts to revise the religious discourse. Careful attention should be paid to the discourse of radical imams in Europe.
- Reflections should be made whether a European Islam is possible or not. Experts are divided on the issue.
- Crimes committed by ISIS are recognized as genocide among others by the EP. ISIS wants to destroy amongst others, the Shia, Yezidi and Christian communities. Parts of these communities feel that they have been abandoned by the international community.
- ISIS treats women and girls as inferior and also enslaves them.
- Further efforts are needed by the International Community to help refugees and internally displaced persons.
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- The name of Brexit was more advantageous than Bremain as it was easier to pronounce. The Brexit campaign was one dimensional on immigration and absurd claims while Bremain was one dimensional campaign on economic aspects. The influence of the tabloid press has been huge on this campaign and issues on how bad EU is linked mainly on migration issues.

- What now for the UK: two cleavages - the generational age and the socio-economic. 16 and 17 year olds are not allowed to vote. 85% of those would have voted in favour. There has been a huge reaction amongst young people. The knowledge deficit played an important role in referendum. There is no citizenship education on the EU in UK. There is a new concept of 'Regrexit'. This is the desire for a protest. There is still a state of shock amongst Brits about the result.

- At this stage there is no clear view if the UK will leave EU and trigger Article 50. Pause and reflection is needed. Access to the single market is the main concern and the key question for UK. The freedom of movement is another important issue. Now there is an opportunity for reflection for the EU to asses where it is going. Do we need more integration and more Europe? A one size fits all Europe might not be the answer. Reform choices are needed.

- The European Commission should be made more transparent. Freedom of movement - are there ways of making it more popular to the general public? We need to communicate the message better concerning the benefits of the EU. The knowledge deficit should be addressed. There are problems with immigration, terrorism and the old cliché that the EU can grow through crisis is redundant. There are currently too many crises.

- Populists have all the answers and there are problems in all European countries because the right answers are missing. The EU is not sending the right signals regarding the fight against immigration. First, show that you are in control and then move onto solidarity. Most of the achievements of the EU are in a way or another under attack. The idea of a second referendum would be dreadful. People are upset with the establishment. Repeating the referendum would be counterproductive. We need to show leadership. Less regulation is needed.

- The idea of a small federal union is not a good idea. There is no appetite for this from Member States. The answer should be together with the 27 remaining Member States. No Treaty change at the moment but consolidation is advisable. People are scared about the future of the EU and we need to address this. There should be a mixture of intergovernmental and community methods. National parliaments should have more power. We need to remind the benefits of the EU in a concerted way at the level of 27 Member States. There are four guiding principles: the status quo is precarious. The only way forward is to qualitatively rethink how the 27 Member States can work together.
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Survey conducted by IRI in Russia found that there is rising discontent. Russians are not enveloped in the invasion of east Ukraine or the annexation of Crimea. For them, the economy is the biggest problem.

- Sanctions are effective and are working. They should remain in place or even be strengthened.
- As long as Putin is in power, there is no future for a united Europe, because he will continue with the policy of creating divisions and chaos. Putin in order to feel secure must look strong because he needs victories, to show to his people that he is dominating. If he looks week, he becomes vulnerable.
- Brexit helps Russia to undermine cooperation among European countries. The Minsk Agreement should be fully implemented and the EU should show that our strategy on Ukraine is maintained. Balance between engagement with Russia and deterrence against it is needed. The Russian regime is not interested in a liberal rules-based order. Grand bargaining with Russia is not an option.
- If the EU is strong, Russia cannot become the third pole of gravity in International Relations. We should speak about Russia and Putin separately.
- There is wide support for Putin in Russia, this issue needs to be understood in order to figure out the reason of this popularity. There are strong anti-American feelings in Russia and a tendency to come to terms with Russia, like it was the case with the USSR in the past.
- For 23 years the issue of Crimea did not exist for Russia, its annexation was a signal sent to the international community that there is a new game and new rules apply. Putin does not want to compromise.
- There is the need to continue supporting the opposition, but there is not much hope for their success in the coming future. Russia understands and respects strength.
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- Legislation can only react towards technical developments. A key question therefore is how can Europe provide an adapted and attractive legal framework?
- Europe must focus on three aspects: shared knowledge; setting adequate standards and invest in digital skills. Europe must demonstrate that it can enhance competitiveness instead of wasting time in the legislative process. Policy makers need to be on the right side of history.
- Technology is driving real progress, there are plenty of opportunities for Europe. In order to facilitate entrepreneurship, we must improve access to venture capital. Europe must develop a mentality not to be afraid of failure.
- Do we really want to establish the Digital Single Market or are we nervous about it? We need to encourage and not block digitalisation. Brexit is a stagnant prospect, a losing situation. Creative talents must be kept in Europe where we need creativity.
- The digital market is moving; consider the rise and fall of Nokia. We are entering a new era; e.g.: services and artificial intelligence oriented, a trend which poses big regulatory challenges. This might be disruptive for some people who shall fall behind. We have to get the rules right and work towards global standards and not only EU wide rules where feasible.
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- Immigration policy does not happen in a vacuum and has direct consequences in other policies. There is EU governance crisis on how to deal with refugee shock. Figures influence perceptions and we should be careful how to use them. Trends change continuously on migration, need to be specific. Some Member States failed to apply EU law.

- There are 4 narratives of migration. The first is that migration seen as a threat to the security and economy of a country. There is little evidence to substantiate that. The second is of migration as a symptom of poverty as with more education, people are more eager to discover opportunities. The third is of migration as an opportunity in long term development linked to circular migration. The fourth is to consider migration as a humanitarian protection to apply to refugees.

- Elements of cultural identity are not innate, they are learned through social processes, and are open and dynamic.

- Multiculturalism emphasizes different cultures existing among members living in the same context. Priority is given to what distinguishes us rather than what unites us.

- Multiculturalism is the relationship and interaction between different groups, individuals and identities.

- Intercultural education is an educational response to the current requirement to prepare future citizens to develop in a society that is practically multicultural and ideally intercultural. The objectives of intercultural education: effective equal opportunities, compensation of inequalities and constructive of collective knowledge.

- Migrants arriving in the EU have a very low level of knowledge on the meaning of citizenship. Citizenship contains in one word all the values of Western democracies.

- We need to make it clear of them what the citizenship means - the rights and duties of the citizens to the very ethos to which the citizens perform rights and duties. Security is the premier demand that needs to be fulfilled and action is needed there. We are convinced that integration is not only a right but also a duty for immigrants.
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The economic and financial development is certainly one of the key factors to find our common path to a successful future of the European Union that is built on credibility and backed up by support from the EU citizens.

Since the sovereign debt and financial crises erupted, the financial services regulation has been renewed, a new supervisory architecture has been set up, regulatory loopholes were closed and the Banking Union has been established. The economic governance framework was substantially strengthened in 2011. Procedures on macroeconomic imbalances were added, and the monitoring capacity was transferred from the Member States to the European Commission. The response of the European Union has been broad and intensive. The EU is at cross-roads to find best equilibrium, between sovereignty of the MS and solidarity.

Implementation of the measures to break the link between the banks and sovereign debt need to be scrutinised closely. The ones who reap the benefits are the ones who have to bear responsibility in case losses.

Deflation is used by MS as a method to restore competitiveness, since due to the Euro, devaluation is not available to the MS. Moderate deflation is not to be considered harmful to the GDP growth and unemployment creation.

Independence of the ECB must be maintained and the successful monetary transmission system must be ensured. EU monetary policy performed by ECB is an instrument that helps to overcome economic and sovereign debt problems many EU MS are still facing. Non-conventional measures performed by the ECB are in no way a replacement for the structural reforms to be done at the MS level.

There are 75 million public servants employed in the Europe, whose job must serve as a catalyst for well-being, competitiveness and excellence of society.

The accounting practices currently used by the public sector are often not in line with ones used by the private sector, which makes interaction of the two sides burdensome. Public and private accounting standards must be synchronised in the interests of the all involved parties.

The longer it will take to determine to begin negotiations concerning the departure of the UK from the EU, the more uncertainty on the investors’ side there will be to make major investment decisions in the UK.

The EFSI is delivering but the EU must do more to further close the investment gap. Public-private partnership should not be neglected in this context.
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• The UK’s exit from the European Union will change the relationship between Eurozone countries and those without a common currency. The latter will be faced with a choice between fast-track adoption of the euro or political and economic marginalisation.

• The recent crisis was exceptional, because several extraordinary factors contributed to its severity that are unlikely to repeat. The remaining crisis legacy is likely to be temporary and should thus be tackled with temporary instruments only, such as the ECB’s unconventional monetary policy. Improving EMU must focus on financial markets.

• Reforms already implemented and yet to be taken can prevent excessive financial cycles in the future so that future crises in the euro area will be less severe. The functioning of the EMU has been improved by recent reforms and need to be enhanced by some additional reforms mainly regarding the financial market.

• Problems might be temporary but they are also recurrent. The key sector is the labour market and specifically the cost of labour. The labour market today is fundamentally different than before 1914. Now there are strong labour organisations, mixed economy compared to a formerly free market economy and an increase in labour costs. The Eurozone is sustainable but there are high unemployment rates in the south and inflation risks in surplus countries.

• European Deposit Scheme must be finalised. Concerning nonperforming loans in Italy Germany needs to be flexible: it should accept the establishment of a bad bank with the assistance of the ESM and the performance of hidden transfers via the EFSI as a temporary one off solution.

The ‘EIN-A4’ represents a summary of EIN events. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the EPP Group political line.