



Transworld Workshop WP 4 and WP 5 EUI, Florence, 9 and 10 November 2012

Report

On 9 and 10 November 2012, the first Workshop on WP 4 (Environment) and WP 5 (Democracy and Human Rights) was held at the European University Institute (EUI) in Florence, by the Transworld teams from the EUI and the Freie Universität Berlin (FBU).

On the first day, **Francesco Francioni** (EUI) and **Thomas Risse** (FBU) introduced the Workshop, stressing that this was an additional event, which was not initially foreseen in the project's planning. It was organised in order to provide an opportunity for all persons involved in these two work packages to have a first discussion on the topics to be covered in the research and to decide on the final work programmes, with a view to ensuring their coherence with the objectives of the Transworld project. To this end, **Riccardo Alcaro** (IAI) presented the project's conceptual framework and outlined the research hypotheses on how the transatlantic relationship can be considered to evolve in the different policy fields. He stressed that the first phase of the project aims to identify how in the various policy areas the EU and the US have adapted to changes at the systemic level and at the agency level; the qualification of their relationship will be considered in more detail after the Elite Surveys.

The rest of the first afternoon was devoted to WP 4. In his introduction, **Francesco Francioni** explained that the number of papers envisaged in WP 4 was relatively large compared to other WPs, because the work was planned from a predominantly legal perspective with the aim to address various specific issues, analyzing both the normative context and the policies adopted by the EU and the US. He recognized that some re-organization might be required in order to further adjust the work to the structure envisaged in the initial description of the project. Subsequently, the

contributors to WP 4 presented the outline of their paper, and in some cases, the first draft (see Annex 1 of the Workshop Programme). Several authors received specific comments from other participants, which will be helpful for finalizing the papers.

Some more general comments and questions concerned the following points:

- *Conceptual distinctions to be made in the papers (where applicable):*
 - (1) Different levels of competence and action;
 - (2) Beyond sovereignty and territoriality: national/international approaches
 - (3) Instruments and toolbox: multilateral/bilateral/unilateral means
- *The relationship between adjustment and mitigation policies in the environmental field.* What conclusions can be drawn from the current analysis?
- *The future of the negotiations on climate change.* Is the focus shifting towards the private sector, away from multilateral negotiations? And if so, how can the interests of weaker groups –such as indigenous peoples- be protected? Would a polycentric approach be more appropriate?
- *Leadership in the field of climate change.* There is no chance that there will be a climate change treaty ratified by the US; so the EU has the capacity to exert leadership; it has interest in doing so, but does it have the experience to do so?
- *The role of NGOs is significant.* This should indeed be considered as part of the research.
- *Using the terms 'EU vision' or 'EU approach' is problematic.* The Commission may have a vision; but the EU as a whole often does not have a common vision. Also at the institutional level of the EU, different views may exist between, for example, the European External Action Service and the Commission's DG for Climate Change.
- *The relationship between environmental concerns and scientific evidence.* The interactions between these two factors, and their influence on policies and attitudes in the US and the EU should be highlighted.

This session of the Workshop was concluded with a proposal on how to re-organize the work plan, to be decided after consultation with the authors concerned, including those who were not present at the meeting.

The second day of the Workshop concentrated on WP 5. Presented papers aimed to analyze human rights and democracy issues from the perspectives of democracy promoters—the EU and the US—at the same time paying attention to the emerging actors and factors within international affairs. The discussion within WP5 started with the presentation of the paper analyzing the state of the art on human rights and democracy promotion and identifying the gaps that should be filled in by TRANSWORLD research. The research design of two other papers envisaged within the TRANSWORLD project was discussed in detail with the participants, whose comments will be helpful for finalizing the papers. These two papers will have identical structures and will deal with EU and US human rights and democracy promotion, focusing on possible policy adjustments given arising challenges to the spread of democracy. The general consensus among the participants was that the nuances of US and EU understandings of human rights and democracy promotion should be underlined and a line should be drawn between promotions of human rights and democracy, even if in practice that line is highly blurred.

In addition to the papers initially envisaged within WP5, FU delegates and partners presented a set of papers that would go beyond the focus on human rights and democracy promoters and would concentrate on specific issues. The papers were in their initial stages of research and were presented to the participants to determine their relevance for the whole project. Most of these papers will be published as a TRANSWORLD working paper series. One of the papers will address current trends and the necessity of setting a new agenda within human rights, while others will *inter alia* look at specific issues of the principle of the Responsibility to Protect, transnational disputes within regulation of Internet privacy seen from human rights perspective, and possible challenges to the spread of democracy.