



TRANSWORLD PLENARY MEETING

25 April 2013

Chatham House, 10 St James's Square, London SW1Y 4LE

Transworld is a project funded by the European Union under the 7th Framework Programme

www.transworld-fp7.eu



Report

The Transworld Project, funded by the European Union (EU) under the 7th Framework Programme, is currently in its second year of activity. The Transworld Consortium held its second plenary meeting at Chatham House, London, on 25 April 2013. The plenary was intended to give the opportunity to present the results so far in the research process by the different Work Packages (WPs) and to discuss them with all partners in the project. The meeting was followed by a public conference on 26 April 2013.

Dr **Paola Subacchi**, Research Director of the International Economics department at Chatham House and head of Transworld WP2, opened the morning plenary session by welcoming participants and presenting a brief outline of the sessions to follow. Dr Subacchi passed the floor to Dr **Nathalie Tocci**, Transworld Project Coordinator and Deputy Director of the Institute of International Affairs (IAI), Rome. Dr Tocci started her presentation by providing information on the project's current status, as well as a brief background of activities and results achieved so far. Dr Tocci referred to the first year of the project as very active and presented the next steps. In 2013 the project aims to move on a more public level through the preparation of transatlantic elite surveys, with the aim to explore perceptions of current realities and policy alternatives, as well as detect future problems and policy visions. The last year and a half of the project will be the time when the results of the surveys, together with the research planned to start in the second year, will be presented. The project has now reached the stage where WP1, tasked with elaborating the conceptual framework for the research, has been completed. WP1 produced six working papers which have put on the table the conceptual building blocks of the project, as well as the historical background of the transatlantic relations. Dr Tocci concluded by stating that the project is currently conducting empirical research focusing on the following four key policy domain areas: economy (including trade and finance), security, environment, and human rights and democracy. Twenty-five papers have already been produced, a number which exceeded initial expectations.

Heino Nau, Project Officer at DG Research of the European Commission in Brussels, referred to the first workshop of WP1, held at the University of Edinburgh, as being very instructive and expressed his hope to receive more detailed insight into the progress achieved so far.

Mr **Riccardo Alcaro**, Project Co-Coordinator and Senior Fellow at the Institute of International Affairs, Rome, continued the discussion by presenting the three Transworld scenarios as follows:



- Structural drift: diverging interests and identities, resulting in incompatible policy goals, means, and action patterns;
- Functional relationship: independent interests and identities, resulting in potentially compatible policy goals, means, and action patterns;
- Enduring partnership: common interests and identities, resulting in shared policy goals, means, and action patterns.

Mr Alcaro went on to present how the main scientific goal of the project, to redefine the Transatlantic Relationship within the four policy domains framework, can be reflected in the structure of the final papers produced under Work Packages 2-5. The structure of the papers will be based on answering a number of key questions:

- What are the main issues in each specific policy domain?
- What are the US/EU policy goals concerning these issues?
- What are the means chosen by the US/EU to pursue such goals?
- Has the US/EU action in the specific policy domain been more transformational or conservative with regard to the status quo of the international system?
- What do goals, means and action patterns tell us about US/EU interests and identities (self-presentation as an international actor)?
- Are US/EU interests and identities structurally divergent, convergent, or independent?

Similarly, the expected outcomes of the final papers will be developed depending on the answers to the following questions and scenarios:

- What is the state of the transatlantic relationship in each specific policy domain?
 - structural divergence (structural drift scenario);
 - structural convergence (enduring partnership scenario);
 - contingent convergence/divergence (functional relationship scenario);
- Redefined paradigm generally expected to be a combination of elements drawn from two of the three ideal-typical scenarios.

Mr Alcaro concluded his presentation by providing specific deadlines of the delivery and circulation of the final papers:

- Papers to be delivered to the EC in month 27, i.e. May 2014;
- Outline to be delivered to IAI by July 2013;

- First draft to be circulated by November 2013;
- Review to be completed by January 2014;
- Second draft to be delivered to IAI by March 2013.

The session continued with a discussion on WPs summaries. **Davide Tentori**, Visiting Researcher in the International Economics Department at Chatham House, provided an analysis of Transworld consortium's **Work Package 2**, entitled '**Trends in the global economy and EU-U.S. adjustment policies**', and focused on the Package's aims and progress achieved so far. WP2 aims to assess whether in the field of international economics the transatlantic relationship is a) drifting apart b) a functional partnership or c) an enduring partnership. The topics covered in the papers focused on long-term trends in the world economy and policy adjustments made by the US and the EU in response to the recent financial and economic crisis, including:

- The review and the analysis of principal trends and leadership challenges within the global economic system;
- The analysis of the EU adjustment policies (related to macroeconomic coordination, intra and extra-EU trade, growth and competitiveness);
- The analysis of US adjustment policies (how to remain the main engine of economic growth and to solve its fiscal problems).

The papers sketched the global economic framework, outlining plausible future scenarios in the changing global economic order, by highlighting the change and discontinuity in current global economic trends. Trade and financial flows, the evolution of the monetary system and the role of the major systemic actors (sovereign states, International Financial Organizations and multilateral fora, such as the G20) were analysed. Mr Tentori also highlighted the importance of China and how it can be considered a third pivotal actor, together with the EU and the US, in the redefinition of the international economic system. Finally, Mr Tentori noted the EU is following a more transformative approach to current challenges and adjustment policies, compared to the US which has adopted a more conservative approach.

Work Package 3 focuses on '**Trends in international security and on EU and U.S. adjustment policies**'. The summary was presented by **Manuel Muñiz**, doctoral candidate in International Relations at the University of Oxford. Mr Muñiz started his presentation by providing a brief timeline of the basic deliverables of WP3 and highlighting the key issues under study, including the following:



- Adjustment to Evolving Security Threats and Domains: international terrorism; Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) proliferation; cyber security, and weak/failed states.
- Adjustment to new forms of war: humanitarian intervention; post-conflict stabilization.
- Adjustment to Rising Powers.

Mr Muñiz noted selection criteria including: importance and significance for 21st century security; adjustment to changing security trends, and novelty.

Mr Muñiz analysed the key issues identified in more detail and offered the following preliminary conclusions:

1. The EU and the US are not identical actors. The EU is only starting to grapple with some security threats - it is mainly internally focused in an attempt to build a common agenda and institutions. In contrast, the US seems more transformative.
2. Cases of convergence include: arguably respect for international law and multilateralism in dealing with terrorism; goals and means for non-proliferation; norms that should regulate cyberspace; how to tackle the development of state capacity, and engaging rising powers in multilateral institutions.
3. Cases of divergence include: use of drones for targeted killing; the extension of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and humanitarian intervention, and the US Pivot to Asia and hedging China's rise.

Francesco Francioni, Professor of International Law at the European University Institute, Fiesole, presented results of the research conducted under **Work Package 4** on '**Trends in Climate Change and EU/US Mitigation and Adjustment Policies**'. In particular, the main challenge faced in the research process was the fluidity and shifting pattern of the US regarding the issue of environmental governance. The EU situation is more stable given environmental policies are already embedded in the national policies of most member states.

Professor Francioni concluded by presenting the research themes of the ten papers produced under Work Package 4: the evolution of the legal framework of environmental governance; the shifting of the attitude of the US; the evolution of the EU legal policy; the impact of the new EU competencies on the issue of environmental governance; climate change; energy; agricultural policy; the EU trade system as a possible model for other countries; the role of Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in environmental negotiations; and the effect of extreme weather conditions in the US.



Christine Bakker, Research Fellow, Academy of European Law at the European University Institute, also commented on the progress of Work Package 4 by providing a summary of the main conclusions. Ms Bakker presented five main issues in key four policy domains noting there is strong transatlantic convergence in meeting general commitment and objective requirements, but there is significant divergence in practice.

The key points are summarised in the table below:

Key issues	EU/US convergence	EU/US divergence
International Environmental Law	Meeting general commitment and objectives	-
Climate Change	Meeting general commitment and objectives	The need for multilateral negotiation efforts
Biodiversity	Meeting general commitment and objectives	A changing attitude of the US
Risk Assessment and Management	Meeting general commitment and objectives	In practice
Institution Building and International Cooperation for Global Environmental Governance	The need for more cooperation, more effective environmental governance and enforcing the existing norms	The means that these goals can be achieved
Level of action (unilateral, bilateral, multilateral formal/multilateral informal)	-	EU foster a multilateral approach; US preserves economic growth and competitiveness
Means to achieve policy goals	The need for more cooperation and for the inclusion of international environmental policies in national policies	The means to achieve these goals

On behalf of Professor Thomas Risse, **Nelli Babayan**, Researcher at Freie Universität Berlin, discussed **Work Package 5** on ‘**Trends in Human Rights/Democracy and EU/US Adjustment Policies**’. Dr Babayan started the presentation by introducing the following deliverables: US human rights and democracy promotion; EU human rights and democracy promotion; human rights and democracy promotion in international affairs; transatlantic tensions on data privacy; R2P, humanitarian intervention and human rights; lessons from Libya to Mali, and the new Human Rights Agenda.

Dr Babayan offered the following preliminary findings:

- Both EU and the US have adjusted their democracy promotion;
Yet:
 - The EU is highly influenced by external developments (e.g. Arab Spring);
 - The US is highly influenced by internal developments (e.g. changes in the Presidency, national security threats, etc.);
 - The EU is not experiencing democracy promotion fatigue, even in the European Endowment for Democracy (EED);
 - The US has been more ‘low-key’ internationally during the Obama Administration.

The final part of the morning plenary session focused on **Work Package 11, ‘Coordination and Management’**. **Maria Cristina Brugnoli**, Project Manager at the Institute of International Affairs, Rome. Ms Brugnoli provided an overall assessment of the administrative, reporting and financial issues relevant to the project and the main deadlines for delivering the Progress Report to the European Commission, including:

- Work Package leaders activity report internal deadline (to IAI): 12 July 2013;
- Individual partner’s activity report internal deadline (document to IAI): 28 July 2013;
- Financial statements (individual) internal deadline (document to be uploaded on the NEF): 10 August 2013;
- Progress Report to the European Commission (summaries of activities performed and financial reports) and financial statements (overall) to the European Commission: August 2013 (M18).

The Project Progress Report is due at the end of each reporting period. The core structure of the Report includes: publishable summary; project objectives for the period; work progress and achievements during the period; project management; deliverables and milestones tables; explanation of the use of the resources; financial statements - Forms C and Summary financial report.

The afternoon session started with a presentation by **Pierangelo Isernia**, Professor of Comparative Politics at University of Siena and Leader of **Work Package 7 on ‘Elite survey’s design and analysis’**, followed by bilateral discussions with the leaders of the other WPs. Professor Isernia offered a detailed explanation of the procedures leading to the development of the draft questionnaire, emphasizing that its main purpose is to cover the various topics of the four key policy areas.

The draft questionnaire was based on the work of previous months as a test hypothesis to track areas of convergence and divergence between the two sides of the Atlantic. The specific steps can be summarised as follows:

- Step 1: making a careful inventory of all available data in the four policy areas;
- Step 2: scrutinising more than 200 surveys to generate the final questions;
- Step 3: tailoring the questions based on different sections, including social demographics, economics, policy debates, main actors in the distribution of powers in the four policy areas, international relations, politics and fiscal debt, China, Iran and North Korea.

Professor Isernia's presentation served as the starting point for a thought-provoking debate on the Elite survey questionnaire. **Pascal Chelala**, Managing Director at the European Omnibus Survey and Leader of **Work Package 8** on '**Elite survey: translation of questionnaire, pre-testing and fieldwork**', pointed out the importance of an accurate and effective tailoring of the questions to the four key policy areas, and stressed the importance of looking at China in more detail. The debate provided participants with the opportunity to express their thoughts and to contribute to the development of the final questionnaire, and final comments were requested by early May.

The main issues of all Work Packages and policy domains were:

- International Security: use of force; Common Foreign and Security Policy; atlanticism index; multilateralism; and threat perception (terrorism, nuclear proliferation).
- Human Rights and Democracy: the definition of human rights (what falls under human rights); infringement of sovereignty versus human rights protection; and the status of civil rights (e.g. improvement or deterioration in the MENA region).
- Global Economy: market regulation; recession vs. economic growth; free trade; and perception of economic dependence between the two transatlantic communities.
- Climate Change: market versus government intervention as a solution to the problem; sources of environmental problems and blame; satisfaction with the performance of actors; and the role of science in problem solving (technical fix).