

Tomasz Stępniewski

ENP or ENPs? The curious web of the European Neighbourhood Policy: the Southern and Eastern Dimensions revisited*

Abstract: The objective of this paper is to examine the European Neighbourhood Policy from the perspective of its functioning and considering possible changes in its logic. Will the changes occurring in the Southern and Eastern neighbourhoods (the Arab Spring and its aftermath and Russia-Ukraine war and its influence upon the Eastern partners respectively) stimulate a fundamental change in the neighbourhood policy, a division into two separate policies (ENPs) or will we be dealing with the same unchanged *status quo*?

Keywords: European Neighbourhood Policy, European Union, Southern Neighbours, Eastern Neighbours, security

Introduction

In the 21st century, the EU started modifying the policy towards its neighbours. There existed several reasons for the modification. First of all, the number of the EU member states changed due to the “Big Bang” Enlargement of the European Union of 2004 and 2007. Secondly, the 2004 European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) was established with extremely heterogeneous members as regards the entities’ political, economic and socio-cultural status. On the one hand, there are

* This research project has benefited from funding under the Polish “National Science Centre” (NCN) grant titled “European Neighbourhood Policy: (multi-level) governance, the reform process and the prospect of enhanced cooperation in the region”, OPUS/HS5, No. 2013/09/B/HS5/04534. This article was written during the Author’s stay at the Harvard University in June-August 2015.

ENP European countries such as Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova. On the other hand, there are non-European countries such as Libya, Jordan. As a consequence, relationships with the neighbouring countries forced the EU to change its politics towards the neighbours. The fact that some programmes and the way they were implemented by the EU in the neighbourhood were ineffective also contributed to the change. Thirdly, relations with the neighbouring countries became problematic due to a series of events in the Southern neighbourhood – the Arab Spring, which destabilised the area of Maghreb and Mashreq. Next, the events in the East of Europe also contributed to the problems. The situation of the EU's Eastern neighbours has complicated in the last two years (2014-2015). The Euromaidan revolution and the war in Donbas have led the EU member states to direct their efforts towards stabilising the situation in Ukraine. As a consequence, discussions of future prospects and the EU policy towards Eastern Europe and the South Caucasus have been set aside. In addition, wars and conflicts occurring in the South of Europe along with the immigrants flooding Southern EU member states have led to the Eastern neighbours and their problems being neglected (despite the fact that Ukraine is consumed in war). Therefore, due to several internal problems present in the EU (Eurozone crisis¹, Brexit, nationalist parties gaining power in the individual member states), the validity of the Eastern policy ought to be revisited. Will the EU decision-makers seek prospects in the Eastern countries or will they merely focus on stabilising the situation in Ukraine and normalising relations with Russia (in mid-term perspective)? The paper will also attempt at indicating required modifications in the logic of the ENP and Eastern Partnership (EaP). As the situation in the Southern and Eastern neighbourhood proves, with no changes in the neighbourhood policy, the EU will be unable to react to conflicts and rapidly changing reality. Both the EU and its neighbourhood are undergoing change. For that reason, the policy of conditionality, which is the basis of the ENP, ought to be modified with the EU's objectives and interests towards the neighbourhood in mind.²

- 1 A. Åslund, *Ukraine Is More Important Than Greece*, "Atlantic Council", July 6, 2015, <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/ukraine-is-more-important-than-greece>
- 2 For more information on the required changes in the ENP see: N. Witney, S. Dennison, *Europe's Neighbourhood: Crisis as the New Normal*, "Policy Memo", June 2015, no. 135, European Council on

The aim of the present paper is an attempt at viewing the European Neighbourhood Policy from the perspective of its functioning and considering possible changes in its logic. Will the changes occurring in the Southern and Eastern neighbourhoods (the Arab Spring and its aftermath and the Russia-Ukraine war and its influence on the Eastern partners respectively) stimulate a fundamental change in the neighbourhood policy, a division into two separate policies (ENPs) or will we be dealing with the same unchanged *status quo*?

1. The European Neighbourhood Policy³

1. Prior to the 2004 Eastern enlargement of the EU, a debate had been held at the European forum on the future neighbourhood policy following the enlargement. The discussion on this subject gained momentum in April 2002, when Denmark and the United Kingdom submitted the first proposal entitled *New Neighbours Initiative*, to offer the countries on the future Eastern border of the EU – Belarus, Ukraine and Moldova – the status of “special neighbours”. Then, as a result of objections raised by France and Spain fearing the marginalisation of the Mediterranean Dimension, countries from outside Europe were also included in that initiative. The first concept of the European Neighbourhood Policy was presented on 11 March 2003 in the Commission Communication: *Wider Europe – Neighbourhood: A New Framework for Relations with our Eastern and Southern Neighbours*, in which the Commission presented the vision of relations with the neighbour states.⁴ The document indicated fourteen states that border the Community: Russia, Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus, as well as participants in the Barcelona process: Algeria, the Palestinian Authority, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Syria and

Foreign Relations, www.ecfr.eu

3 Based on: T. Kapuśniak (Stępniewski), *Wymiar Wschodni Europejskiej Polityki Sąsiedztwa Unii Europejskiej. Inkluzja bez członkostwa? / The eastern dimension of the European Union's Neighbourhood Policy. Inclusion without membership?*, “Zeszyty Natolińskie”, no. 42, Centrum Europejskie Natolin, Warszawa 2010.

4 *Wider Europe – Neighbourhood: A New Framework for Relations with our Eastern and Southern Neighbours*, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, Brussels, 11.3.2003, COM (2003) 104 final, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/como3_104_en.pdf

Tunisia. Then, in 2004, the neighbours of Turkey – which is a candidate country – were also included into that group, namely Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. By this, the ENP was to cover 17 countries in total, with a population of 400 million.

The idea behind the Communication was that the EU should be striving for the development of an area of prosperity and good neighbourly relations – a circle of friendly countries with which the EU has close, peaceful and cooperative relations. It was indicated that all countries should be helped in participating in the Community Common Market through the liberalisation and promotion of the free movement of persons, goods, services and capital. Building on the common values, the EU wanted to create a framework of closer cooperation, even by accepting solutions which are binding under the European Economic Area, though it firmly stated that the neighbourhood policy was not an invitation to join the EU. Cooperation was also proposed under the framework of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Common Security and Defence Policy.

Then, in early July 2003, the Commission published a successive communication: *Paving the way for a New Neighbourhood Instrument*,⁵ which was basically devoted to issues connected with various aspects of the ENP, including the establishment of a new financial instrument: the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI).⁶ The Communication about a “Wider Europe” has become the basis for the formulation of the concepts of the European Neighbourhood Policy of the EU, which was announced on 12 May 2004.⁷ It was point-

5 *Paving the way for a New Neighbourhood Instrument*, Communication from the Commission, 1 July 2003, COM (2003) 393 final, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/como3_393_en.pdf

6 *Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 laying down general provisions establishing a European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument*, Official Journal of the European Union, L 310/1, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/oj_l310_en.pdf

7 *Wider Europe – Neighbourhood: A New Framework for Relations with our Eastern and Southern Neighbours*, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, Brussels, 11.3.2003, COM (2003) 104 final, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/como3_104_en.pdf. For more about the European Neighbourhood Policy and the enlargement of the EU to the East, see: J. Warwick, K.-O. Lang, *European Neighbourhood Policy. Challenges for the EU-Policy towards the New Neighbours*, Opladen & Farmington Hills 2007; L. Delcour, E. Tulmets (eds.), *Pioneer Europe? Testing EU Foreign Policy in the Neighbourhood*, Baden-Baden 2008; Ch. J. Schneider, *Conflict, Negotiation and European Union Enlargement*, Cambridge 2009; K. Weber, M. E. Smith, M. Baun (eds.), *Governing Europe's Neighbourhood. Partners or Periphery?*, Manchester-New York 2007; H. Sjursen (ed.), *Civilian or Military Power? European Foreign Policy in Perspective*,

ed out in the document that there were 14 countries bordering with the Community: Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus, and the members of the Barcelona Process: Algeria, Palestinian National Authority, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Syria, and Tunisia. Subsequently, in 2004, neighbours of Turkey, itself an EU candidate, were included into this group of countries. Those were Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia. As a result, the ENP encompassed a total of 17 countries inhabited by approximately 400 million people. The next step was a package of political initiatives prepared by the Commission in May 2004 – *Strategy Paper* – which was accepted by the Council of Europe and the European Union in June 2004.⁸ The package concerned the following issues: political dialogue and reforms, trade and measures to prepare the partners for the gradual approach to obtaining a share of the internal market of the EU, justice and internal affairs, energy, transport, information society, the natural environment, research and innovation, as well as social policy and interpersonal relations.

It should be noted that Russia did not express interest in participating in the ENP. Another EU-Russia summit took place on 31 May 2003 on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of St. Petersburg, and due to this it had a symbolic dimension. During that meeting, the creation of common spaces between strategic partners under the existing PCA was proclaimed.⁹ The following “common spaces” were agreed: 1) Common Economic Space; 2) Common Space of Freedom, Secu-

London-New York 2007; F. Attina, R. Rossi (eds.), *European Neighbourhood Policy: Political, Economic and Social Issues*, Catania 2004; F. Celata, R. Coletti (eds.), *Neighbourhood Policy and the Construction of the European External Borders*, Springer, Cham-Heidelberg-New York-Dordrecht-London 2015; D. Cadier, *Is the European Neighbourhood Policy a substitute for enlargement?*, 2014, http://www.lse.ac.uk/IDEAS/publications/reports/pdf/SRo18/Cadier_D.pdf

8 *European Neighbourhood Policy – Strategy Paper*, Communication from the Commission, 12 May 2004, Brussels, 12.5.2004, COM (2004) 373 final, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/strategy/strategy_paper_en.pdf

9 During the EU-Russia Summit in Moscow on 21 May 2004 the parties appointed coordinators responsible for the creation of four areas. Cf. A. Bryc, *Stosunki Federacji Rosyjskiej z Unią Europejską*, [in:] A. Czarnocki, I. Topolski (eds.), *Federacja Rosyjska w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, Lublin 2006, s. 202; S. Bieleń, *Tożsamość międzynarodowa Federacji Rosyjskiej*, Warszawa 2006, p. 283; M. Menkiszak, *Rosja wobec Unii Europejskiej: kryzys „strategicznego partnerstwa”*, “Prace” OSW, Warszawa, January 2006; H. Haukkala, *The EU, Russia and the European Neighbourhood Policy: The Case of Moldova*, The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, 12 April, 2005; <http://www.fornet.info/documents/FORNET%20plenary%2005%20Moldova%20Background-paper.pdf>

rity and Justice; 3) Common Space on External Security; 4) Common Space on Research, Education, Culture.¹⁰

As a result, the ENP covered the countries which geographically neighboured the EU but had no previous perspective of membership in the structures of the EU and had established relations with the EU on the basis of the treaties (PCA or association agreements). Taking the treaty regulations with the EU into consideration, the conclusion can be drawn that what the ENP offered the EU's neighbours (including Eastern European countries) was a different form of cooperation and by this the prospects of membership in the EU structures in the future were ruled out. Moreover, due to the lack of a binding agreement (PCA) between the EU and Belarus, the country has not become a member of the ENP, though it has been included in the EU proposal.

The main goal of the ENP is to support cooperation between the EU and its neighbours in economic, political, cultural and security areas. The cooperation should be based on common values (democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights), the development of cooperation based on the market economy, as well as cooperation in combating common threats such as terrorism.

Via the ENP, the EU offers its partners enhanced economic cooperation (with prospects for the creation of a future free-trade area, participation in certain areas of the internal market and economic relations based on the four freedoms which are provided within the EU) and privileged political relations. Despite the ENP being a consistent EU policy towards its neighbours, it should be said that it is based on the principle of conditionality (while the EU uses the "carrot and stick" strategy of reward and punishment). The need for political, social and economic reforms in a given country, as has been postulated by EU decision-makers, is reflected in the EU strategy towards that country. The more willing it is to meet the EU's expectations, the greater reward it gets. As a result, we have to deal with the principle of a differentiated approach of the EU towards those countries, as it negotiates mutual commitments (the respective rights and duties of the coun-

10 See: *EU-Russia Common Spaces Progress Report 2007*, http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/russia/docs/commons_spaces_prog_report2007.pdf

try and the EU). In exchange for the commitments it has assumed, the country obtains financial and technical assistance.

The ENP is being implemented on the basis of Action Plans (APs) which the EU negotiates with individual countries (see the table below). The Action Plans are based on the *Partnership and Co-operation Agreement (PCA)*¹¹ which make the country in question closer to EU standards; they are also aimed to foster the better implementation of these provisions. Action Plans are political documents valid for three to five years and comprise a catalogue of priority issues to be solved in the period for which the plan has been created. APs go beyond the traditional framework of cooperation, laying stress on gradual economic integration and strengthening political cooperation. They offer a comprehensive framework of cooperation between the EU and individual states, in particular in the area of the necessary reforms. The EU supports the implementation of the APs via a new financial instrument which has been in force since 1 January 2007, i.e. the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) and via programmes to increase the country's administrative capacity – the Twinning Programmes and TAIEX. The latter is available to the countries covered by the ENP and to Russia.¹²

Talking about the legal basis of EU relations with its East European neighbours, one should not neglect the debate on the new legislative framework of EU relations with Eastern European countries. There are proposals to meet the expectations of these countries and to offer them opportunities for closer cooperation, and subsequently membership in the EU (at least to Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova). The means to get these countries closer to EU standards would be association agreements (or “enhanced cooperation agreements”), creating mechanisms of support to the adjustment process and rapprochement process, to support the development of economic cooperation and to promote political dialogue, as well as agreements concerning other

11 Since the early 1990s, the EC has based its relations with the countries of Eastern Europe on the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement. PCA has been signed with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. Cf. http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/ceeca/pca/index.htm

12 Cf. TAIEX (*the Technical Assistance and Information Exchange Instrument of the Institution Building*), <http://taix.ec.europa.eu/>

areas. In other words, it is about supporting the integration of Eastern European countries with the EU outside the postulated PCA free trade framework (areas).

It should also be noted that the theoretically consistent concept of the European Neighbourhood Policy encounters numerous obstacles due to its structural contradictions.¹³ The ENP covers a group of several dozen countries of North Africa up to the South Caucasus, with different potentials and aspirations. Some may expect membership in the Union, even if it is to be in the distant future, while the ultimate goal for others is just a free trade area. In this relation, the beneficiaries of the ENP, both in the East and in the South, feel underestimated by the EU. All the more so, that neither the countries of the European Economic Area (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway) which can join the Community any time when they wish nor the candidate countries or countries awaiting candidate status (e.g. Turkey and the Western Balkans) have been included in this group. On the other hand, Russia – the most important neighbour of the Community – has not been included in the neighbourhood programme, simply because it did not want to.

However, a great diversity of countries neighbouring the EU is not the only reason of the failure of the ENP. In practice, despite the declared multidimensionality of the EU external policy, the Mediterranean region has become, in a way, privileged in terms of EU funding. The disparity between the EU financial resources allocated to the Eastern and Mediterranean regions could be seen as early as the years 2000–2003, when a total of EUR 1,332.2 million was allocated to the TACIS programme, whilst EUR 3,716.1 million was spent on MEDA.¹⁴ Similarly, loans offered by the European Investment Bank to Eastern European countries (ca. EUR 500 million) amounted to only 25% of the funding available to Mediterranean countries.¹⁵ Meanwhile, under the *European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights* (EIDHR)

13 G. Gromadzki, *Five Theses on European Neighbourhood Policy*, Batory Foundation Policy Brief, Warsaw, September 2008.

14 *European Neighbourhood Policy – Strategy Paper*, p. 30. In 2000–2003 Russia received EUR 599.6 million, Ukraine EUR 435.6 million, Moldova EUR 46 million and Belarus EUR 10 million.

15 *European Neighbourhood Policy: Funding*, http://www.ec.europa.eu/world/enp/funding_en.htm. Moreover, in 2002 the Facility for Euro-Mediterranean Investment and Partnership (FEMIP), was created which amounted to EUR 6.5 billion until 2007.

EUR 19.3 million was allocated to Russia and western CIS countries in the years 2000-2003, while EUR 41.4 million was spent on projects in the Mediterranean region.

The financial perspective 2007-2013 has not fundamentally modified the distribution of regional support. PHARE and TACIS have been combined and a single European Partnership and Neighbourhood Instrument created. However, at the same time, the resources for the neighbourhood policy have been significantly increased – up to EUR 12 billion (by 32%), which has been an extremely welcome development. Around 93% of this amount (EUR 11.2 billion) will be allocated for the financing of national regional and cross-border programmes. Currently it is known that in the years 2007-2010 Southern states received EUR 3,407.1 million, while Eastern countries only EUR 1154.5 million (see Table 1). It is worth noting that there has been a modification of distribution in the Eastern direction. Over 40% of allocations went to Ukraine (EUR 485 million), Moldova (EUR 209.7 million) and Georgia (EUR 120.4 million), while Russia was ranked fourth (EUR 120 million).¹⁶

In March 2003, the European Commission, in its Communication on Wider Europe,¹⁷ presented the idea of the European Neighbourhood Policy and further initiatives and communications indicated the need for a new financial instrument to be known as the *European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument* (ENPI). Consequently, on 24 October, 2006, the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument was established by Regulation No 1638/2006 of the European Parliament and the Council. The ENPI is the most flexible instrument oriented towards the constant growth and adjustment of Eastern countries to EU policy and standards, according to the priorities which were agreed with in *Action Plans*.¹⁸ It should be noted that the main elements of the ENPI include, first of all, the political and human dimension (democracy and human rights), and, secondly, the economic

16 Cf. K. Dośpiał-Borysiak, T. Kapuśniak (Stępniewski), *Wschodni wymiar w polityce Unii Europejskiej*, "Studia Europejskie", 2008, no. 4, p. 219 et seq.

17 Commission of the EC, the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, *Wider Europe – Neighbourhood*.

18 A. Dumala, *Stosunki Ukrainy z Unią Europejską*, [in:] M. Pietraś, T. Kapuśniak (Stępniewski) (eds.), *Ukraina w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, Lublin 2007, p. 329.

Table 1.
The amount of allocations under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument
in the years 2007-2010, broken down into beneficiary states

	Total (2007-2010) in EUR million
1. Allocations for both dimensions of the ENP – ENP Wide	
<i>ENP Interregional Programmes</i>	260.8
A financial mechanism for countries showing the best performance in implementing reforms and using EU financial assistance (<i>Governance facility</i>) and a financial instrument allocated for investment, supporting loan operations from international finance institutions in neighbour countries (<i>Support for Investment</i>)	400.0
Allocations for both dimensions of the ENP – total ENP Wide	660.8
2. South	
Country Programmes	
Palestine	632.0
Israel	8.0
Libya	8.0
Algeria	220.0
Egypt	558.0
Jordan	265.0
Lebanon	187.0
Morocco	654.0
Syria	140.0
Tunisia	300.0
Total: country programmes for the South	2 972.0
<i>Regional Programmes</i>	333.3
<i>CBC Programmes</i>	101.8
Total South	3 407.1
3. East	
Country Programmes	
Russia	120.0
Belarus	20.0
Armenia	98.4
Azerbaijan	92.0
Georgia	120.4
Moldova	209.7
Ukraine	494.0
Total country programmes for the East	1 154.5
<i>Regional Programmes</i>	223.5
<i>CBC Programmes</i>	175.3
Total South	1 553.3
Total ENPI 2007–2010	5 621.2

Source: European Commission information of 11 October, 2006 on the *Programming of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument 2007-2010*, p. 4. After: J. Kępa, *Przeгляд budżetu Unii Europejskiej w kontekście wzmocnienia „wymiaru wschodniego” Europejskiej Polityki Sąsiedztwa*, Biuletyn Analiz UKiE, 2008, no. 18, p. 55.

dimension (economic, monetary and macroeconomic, infrastructure and economic issues), and thirdly, the security dimension (justice and home affairs, foreign and security policy).¹⁹

The *European Neighbourhood Instrument* (ENI) has replaced the predecessor *European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument* (ENPI) 2007-2013. Now, the *European Neighbourhood Instrument* (ENI) is the key financial instrument of the European Neighbourhood Policy with a planned budget of € 15.4 billion for the period 2014-2020.²⁰

Conclusions: ENP or ENPs – in search of a model for development

Despite its theoretical coherence and dynamics, the European Neighbourhood Policy comes across many hindrances caused by its structural contradictions. First of all, it encompasses a group of several countries from Morocco to Georgia which have completely divergent potentials and aspirations. Some of them still stand a chance of being accepted to the EU, even in the distant future, whereas the others have high aspirations to join the free trade area. Accordingly, addressees themselves, both Eastern and Southern countries, have felt underappreciated by the EU. The fact that countries like Iceland, Lichtenstein, and Norway – if they agree, they can join the EU anytime – were not included in the group dissatisfied the addressees even more. Besides, Turkey and the West Balkan states, which are waiting for a candidate status, were not incorporated into the ENP, either. On the other hand, the EU's most important neighbour, Russia, was not included in the neighbourhood policy at its own clear emphatic request. Following the resolutions of the EU-Russian Summit in December 2003, a rule of strategic partnership going in four dimensions was accepted.

The ENP was repeatedly renamed and reformulated. It started as the New Neighbours Initiative which was transformed into the Wider Europe Programme in 2003, the European Neighbourhood Policy

19 M. Emerson, *European Neighbourhood Policy: Strategy or Placebo?*, CEPS Working Document, November 2004, no. 215, p. 9.

20 Wider: European Union External Action, *Progress reports*, http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/documents/progress-reports/index_en.htm

in 2004, the European Neighbourhood Policy Plus in 2006, the Black Sea Synergy in 2007, the Enhanced European Neighbourhood Policy, and finally the Eastern Partnership in 2008. The reshaping of the ENP neighbourhood policy and its frequent modifications do not make this policy efficient enough. The Arab Spring in the Southern neighbourhood and the war between Russia and Georgia in August 2008, and the current hybrid war between Russia and Ukraine confirm its inefficiency. In 2014, the European Commission reviewed the European Neighbourhood Policy in terms of the EU's objectives and interests in the neighbourhood. The Eastern neighbourhood is undergoing significant strain exerted by Russia. In addition, "insecurity, instability and unfavourable socio-economic conditions in the neighbourhood countries can have negative impacts and reverse past democratic trends."²¹

The ENP is a policy that fails to respond to the challenges of the 21st century and the dynamics of any ongoing transformations in the EU's Southern and Eastern neighbourhoods. The EU cannot establish its relations with several countries of an extremely varied nature using a single policy. Therefore, the ENP should be radically modified. The ENP could exist as a framework for other initiatives. The problem is the word "neighbourhood" in its name as it implies that those who are neighbours cannot be members. Thus, the EaP should probably have the same status as the countries of the Western Balkans.

The European Commission's review of the ENP conducted in 2014 ought to offer changes in the way the ENP functions. Will such changes be presented? According to Richard Youngs, vital changes in the ENP's functioning ought not to be expected.²² Youngs claims that we will be faced with the ENP's emphasis on flexibility and ability to react swiftly to the changes in the Southern and Eastern neighbourhood. Even if the ENP becomes more flexible, it does not mean that it will be changed completely. A further problem, according to Youngs, is the "values vs. interests" dilemma. The dilemma is valid for the whole ENP. Moreover, changes in the EU's neighbourhood

21 *European Parliament resolution of 9 July 2015 on the review of the European Neighbourhood Policy (2015/2002(INI))*, Thursday, 9 July 2015 – Strasbourg, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P8-TA-2015-0272&language=EN>

22 The author participated in the UACES conference in Bilbao, 7-9th September 2015, featuring a plenary session with Richard Youngs.

will definitely affect the Union itself (e.g. problems with immigrants, the situation in Ukraine and its influence upon EU-Russia relationship, etc.). In addition, internal problems are also associated with the EU's external policy and the Union's role as a global actor. The fact that the EU must boost its visibility in the neighbourhood is also noteworthy. The following problem is associated with this particular issue: How can values and interests and effectiveness of the neighbourhood policy be reconciled?

Bibliography

- Åslund A., *Ukraine Is More Important Than Greece*, "Atlantic Council", July 6, 2015, <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/ukraine-is-more-important-than-greece>
- Attina F., Rossi R. (eds.), *European Neighbourhood Policy: Political, Economic and Social Issues*, Catania 2004.
- Bieleń S., *Tożsamość międzynarodowa Federacji Rosyjskiej*, Warszawa 2006.
- Bryc A., *Stosunki Federacji Rosyjskiej z Unią Europejską*, [in:] A. Czarnecki, I. Topolski (eds.), *Federacja Rosyjska w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, Lublin 2006.
- Cadier D., *Is the European Neighbourhood Policy a Substitute for Enlargement?*, 2014, http://www.lse.ac.uk/IDEAS/publications/reports/pdf/SR018/Cadier_D.pdf
- Celata F., Coletti R. (eds.), *Neighbourhood Policy and the Construction of the European External Borders*, Springer, Cham-Heidelberg-New York-Dordrecht-London 2015.
- Delcour L., Tulmets E. (eds.), *Pioneer Europe? Testing EU Foreign Policy in the Neighbourhood*, Baden-Baden 2008.
- Doświadczal-Borysiak K., Kapuśniak T. (Stępniewski), *Wschodni wymiar w polityce Unii Europejskiej*, "Studia Europejskie", 2008, nr 4.
- Dumała A., *Stosunki Ukrainy z Unią Europejską*, [in:] M. Pietraś, T. Kapuśniak (Stępniewski) (eds.), *Ukraina w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, Lublin 2007.
- Emerson M., *European Neighbourhood Policy: Strategy or Placebo?*, CEPS Working Document, November 2004, no. 215.
- European Neighbourhood Policy – Strategy Paper*, Communication from the Commission, 12 May 2004, Brussels, 12.5.2004, COM (2004) 373 final, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/strategy/strategy_paper
- European Neighbourhood Policy: Funding*, http://www.ec.europa.eu/world/enp/funding_en.htm

- European Parliament resolution of 9 July 2015 on the review of the European Neighbourhood Policy (2015/2002(INI))*, Thursday, 9 July 2015 – Strasbourg, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P8-TA-2015-0272&language=EN>
- European Union External Action, *Progress reports*, http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/documents/progress-reports/index_en.htm
- EU-Russia Common Spacer Progress Report 2007*, http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/russia/do
- Gromadzki G., *Five Theses on European Neighbourhood Policy*, Batory Foundation Policy Brief, Warsaw, September 2008.
- Haukkala H., *The EU, Russia and the European Neighbourhood Policy: The Case of Moldova*, The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, 12 April 2005, <http://www.fornet.info/documents/FORNET%20plenary%2005%20Moldova%20Backgroundpaper.pdf>
- Kapuśniak T. (Stepniewski), *Wymiar Wschodni Europejskiej Polityki Sąsiedztwa Unii Europejskiej. Inkluzja bez członkostwa? / The eastern dimension of the European Union's Neighbourhood Policy. Inclusion without membership?*, "Zeszyty Natolińskie", no. 42, Centrum Europejskie Natolin, Warszawa 2010.
- Menkiszak M., *Rosja wobec Unii Europejskiej: kryzys „strategicznego partnerstwa”*, "Prace" OSW, Warszawa, January 2006.
- Paving the way for a New Neighbourhood Instrument*, Communication from the Commission, 1 July 2003, COM (2003) 393 final, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/como3_393_en.pdf
- Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 laying down general provisions establishing a European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument*, Official Journal of the European Union, L 310/1, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/oj_l310_en.pdf
- Schneider Ch. J., *Conflict, Negotiation and European Union Enlargement*, Cambridge 2009.
- Sjursen H. (ed.), *Civilian or Military Power? European Foreign Policy in Perspective*, London-New York 2007.
- Varwick J., Lang K.-O., *European Neighbourhood Policy. Challenges for the EU-Policy Towards the New Neighbours*, Opladen & Farmington Hills 2007.
- Weber K., Smith M. E., Baun M. (eds.), *Governing Europe's Neighbourhood. Partners or Periphery?*, Manchester-New York 2007.
- Wider Europe – Neighbourhood: A New Framework for Relations with our Eastern and Southern Neighbours*, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, Brussels, 11.3.2003, COM (2003) 104 final, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/como3_104_en.pdf
- Witney N., Dennison S., *Europe's Neighbourhood: Crisis as the New Normal*, "Policy Memo", June 2015, no. 135, European Council on Foreign Relations, www.ecfr.eu