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One of the reasons I love EYP is that it will never tell you what to say or to believe. EYP is an open platform for you to share ideas, to discuss how you feel and to learn from those around you. But for us to have those rich, engaging discussions at the session, we must prepare thoroughly. As the old cliché says, “fail to prepare - prepare to fail”. And therefore, to help you prepare academically for the session, my team and I have written this kit. Here, you will find a brief introduction to the EU, followed by detailed overviews of each topic, written by the chairpersons. It goes without saying that your chairs will expect you to have read the overview and to have a solid understanding of what the EU is, what it does, how it operates and how that affects our everyday lives.

However, please do not take this kit as the total of your preparation. This document should only be the starting point for your research. Please read beyond the overview, be inspired to know more about your topic, be curious to explore all the information sources at your disposal. Your chairpersons have included numerous hyperlinks in the text for you to go out there and read about your area of the EU in greater detail. Consider yourself as explorers, starting out on your academic adventure. Please use this document as your map, your reference point. If you sit at your desk and only look at your map, you will only have experienced your bedroom and a long piece of paper. But, if you take your map, go outside, and explore the widths and depths of what the map shows you, your experiences will not only be broader but also richer; the arguments you form will be more resilient, the passion you feel for your topic will be stronger.

Furthermore, do not limit your exploration to your own topic. Yes, your topic should be the area you've explored the most, but please take this opportunity to read and appreciate all 15 topics which will be discussed at the session. We have an opportunity to have our voices heard on topics ranging from gender equality in the workplace to the refugee crisis, from cleaning up the name of sport to the future of the Eurozone. This is your opportunity to stand up and have your views heard; but to do that, you must prepare, prepare and prepare some more.

There's always more to explore!

With all best wishes,

Vivek Gathani (UK), President of Brno 2017 – 85th International Session of EYP
Hello dear delegates,

My name is Laure Steinville, and although born in the North and raised in the South of France, I am currently on an ERASMUS year in Barcelona, Spain, as part of my International Relations degree that I am currently completing at the University of Warwick, in the UK. I have been involved in EYP for over 5 years and am very looking forward to work with and see you all at this anniversary International Session in Brno this summer.

This academic preparation kit contains a lot of information, but my advice to you would be to go beyond that information, and do your own research. Try to explore all the hyperlinks your chairpersons provided you with in the topic overviews, read them carefully, and form your own opinion. The chairpersons spent a lot of time looking for the most relevant, informative, and thought-provoking sources, so please, don’t overlook them!

Laure Steinville (FR), Vice-President of Brno 2017 – 85th International Session of EYP

Dear delegates,

Sooner than you would expect, we will all meet in Brno, filling the city with a great deal of excitement, amazing ideas, and a firm belief in the importance of speaking up. You will have read a bunch of Topic Overviews, prepared many notes, and done your own research. By the time we meet in Brno, you may have even become a true expert on not just your topic but also several others.

..or.. Maybe, just as I did coming to my first summer IS, you will have done enough research to cover the basics (shhh, just keep this from Vivek, will you?). Instead, you will concentrate on other aspects of the session - getting to know the amazing people and cultures around you, honing skills for future sessions as an official, or just having a blast.

Whatever your priorities, make sure you cover all of them - learn, get to know others, develop yourself, and have fun. Your experience will not be complete if you put all your eggs in the same basket but ignore the rest (and believe me, I know a thing or seven about eggs and baskets).

Hugs, high fives and fist bumps,

Dan Grinevics (LV), Vice-President of Brno 2017 – 85th International Session of EYP
Dearest delegates,

My name is Armine and I come from one of the furthest parts of Europe, right on the edge of Europe and Asia, the beautiful country of Armenia.

Whenever I travel (something that I’m lucky to do quite often in EYP) I like to take a good book with me. The fascinating thing about books is that they take you on a journey to discover worlds that enrich your own inner world.

So I’d like you to treat this Academic Preparation Kit just like a book – an opportunity to go on an exciting journey.

On this journey you can go straight to your destination – your own topic – or take a picturesque detour and choose to also explore other realms that are the topics of other Committees, thus enriching your academic travel.

*Scientia potentia est* – knowledge is power. So take a good grip of this opportunity to empower yourselves on this journey.

We’ve put a lot of efforts and love into composing this Kit for you, and we hope you will enjoy reading it.

Have a safe journey in the land of knowledge and see you soon in Brno!

Yours truly,

Armine Khamoyan (AM), Vice-President of Brno 2017 – 85th International Session of EYP
French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman proposes the creation of a European Coal and Steel Community, the first step in the process that led to the European Union. The anniversary of the Schuman Declaration has become the annual celebration known as “Europe Day”.

The Treaty of Paris is signed, establishing The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), with its six members: Belgium, West Germany, Luxembourg, France, Italy and the Netherlands. The aims of ECSC were economic expansion, employment growth, and a higher standard of living, to be encouraged through the common market for coal and steel.

The six members of the ECSC sign the Treaties of Rome, creating the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC or Euratom). With this, the ECSC member states aim to expand their cooperation beyond coal and steel.

The Merger Treaty (Brussels Treaty) enters into force. The Merger Treaty streamlined the work of the European institutions by merging the executives of the three Communities (ECSC, EEC, Euratom), after which, a single Commission, a single Council and a European Parliament began to serve all three Communities.

Denmark, Ireland, and the United Kingdom join the European Communities (EC).

Greece joins the EC.
Portugal and Spain join the EC.

The European identity is formally expressed for the first time. The European flag, adopted by Community institutions, is raised for the first time in front of the European Commission's Berlaymont building.

 Treaty on the European Union (Treaty of Maastricht) turns the Communities into a Union. The Maastricht Treaty was a major EU milestone, setting clear rules for the future single currency, foreign and security policy, and closer cooperation in justice and home affairs. Under the treaty, the name “European Union” officially replaces “European Community/Communities”.

Single market is completed and the four freedoms are established. The completion of the single market implemented the “four freedoms”—of people, goods, services, and capital, enabling EU citizens to study, live, shop, work, and retire in any EU country.

Austria, Finland, and Sweden join the European Union.

Schengen Agreement takes effect, allowing freedom of travel between certain Member States.

Amsterdam Treaty enters into force to reform EU institutions in preparation for the arrival of new member countries, specifically those from Central and Eastern Europe.
Treaty of Nice enters into effect. The Treaty of Nice opened the way for upcoming enlargements by reforming EU voting laws.

2003

In its largest expansion, the EU welcomes 10 new countries: Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia.

2004

Bulgaria and Romania join the EU.

2007

Treaty of Lisbon enters into force. Among its other reforms, the Treaty gave more power for the European Parliament, changed voting procedures in the Council and introduced a citizens’ initiative. The treaty also clarified how legislative power is distributed between the EU and Member State governments in certain policy areas through the system of exclusive, shared and suggesting competences.

2009

A single currency, the euro, replaces national currencies in 12 of the 15 countries of the EU.

2002
EU is awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

Croatia joins the EU.

Brexit. Following the 2016 referendum vote to leave, for the first time a Member State - the UK - triggered a withdrawal process from the Union.

FURTHER LINKS

The History of the EU – [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GfN05WB_rYw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GfN05WB_rYw)
The European Parliament (EP)
The Voice of the People
Members: 751 Members of the European Parliament
Location: Strasbourg, Brussels and Luxembourg

Role

1. It shares with the Council the power to legislate — to pass laws. The fact that it is a directly elected body helps guarantee the democratic legitimacy of European law.

2. It exercises democratic supervision over all EU institutions, and in particular the Commission. It has the power to approve or reject the nomination of the President of the Commission and Commissioners, and the right to censure the Commission as a whole.

3. It shares authority with the Council over the EU budget and can therefore influence EU spending. At the end of the budget procedure, it adopts or rejects the budget in its entirety.

The European Council
Setting the strategy
Members: Heads of State or Government from each Member State, the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission
Location: Brussels

Role

1. As a summit meeting of the Heads of State or Government of all the EU Member States, the European Council represents the highest level of political cooperation between the Member States. At their meetings, the leaders decide by consensus on the overall direction and priorities of the Union, and provide the necessary impetus for its development.
2. The European Council does not adopt legislation. At the end of each meeting it issues ‘conclusions’, which reflect the main messages resulting from the discussions and take stock of the decisions taken, also as regards their follow-up. The conclusions identify major issues to be dealt with by the Council, i.e. the meetings of ministers. They may also invite the European Commission to come forward with proposals addressing a particular challenge or opportunity facing the Union.

The Council of the EU (also called Council of Ministers, the Council)

The voice of the Member States

Members: One minister from each Member State, presidency rotating every 6 months between Member States

Location: Brussels and Luxembourg

Role

1. The Council is an essential EU decision maker. Its work is carried out in Council meetings that are attended by one minister of each of the EU’s national governments. The purpose of these gatherings is to: discuss, agree, amend and adopt legislation; coordinate the Member States’ policies; or define the EU’s foreign policy.

2. Which ministers attend which Council meeting depends on the subjects on the agenda — this is known as the ‘configuration’ of the Council. If, for example, the Council is to discuss environmental issues, the meeting will be attended by the environment minister from each EU Member State and is known as the Environment Council. The same is true for the Economic and Financial Affairs Council and the Competitiveness Council, and so on.

The European Commission

Promoting the common interest

Members: A college of Commissioners, one from each Member State

Location: Brussels
EU INSTITUTIONS

Role

1. propose legislation to the Parliament and the Council;
Under the EU Treaty, the Commission has the ‘right of initiative’. In other words, the Commission alone is responsible for drawing up proposals for new European legislation.
The EC proposes actions at EU level only if it considers that a problem cannot be solved more efficiently by national, regional or local action.

2. to manage and implement EU policies and the budget;
As the European Union’s executive body, the Commission is responsible for managing and implementing the EU budget and the policies and programmes adopted by the Parliament and the Council. Most of the actual work and spending is done by national and local authorities but the Commission is responsible for supervising it.

3. to enforce European law (jointly with the Court of Justice);
The Commission acts as ‘guardian of the treaties’. This means that, together with the Court of Justice, it is responsible for making sure EU law is properly applied in all the Member States. If it finds that any EU Member State is not applying a Union law, and therefore not meeting its legal obligations, the Commission takes steps to put the situation right.

4. to represent the Union around the world.
The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy is a Vice-President of the Commission and has responsibility for external affairs. In matters concerning foreign affairs and security, the High Representative works with the Council.
The scope of EU powers is strictly limited by its competences as defined in EU Treaties. In other words, the EU can only act within the policy areas in which Member State governments have given it the power to act (this is also known as the Principle of Conferral). Competences that are not conferred upon the EU in the Treaties remain with the Member State governments.

EU competences are divided into 3 main categories:

- **exclusive competences**
  
  These are policy areas in which the EU alone is able to legislate and adopt binding acts. If the EU creates legislation in these areas, Member State governments may come up with their own national legislation to implement it, but they may not come up with their own new legislation outside of the EU framework, particularly anything that might conflict with EU law.

  For example, the Common Customs Tariff, which allows the EU-based producers to trade with common tariffs against the rest of the world, is applicable throughout the EU as part of Customs Union legislation and was created as a measure towards fair and equal competition within the internal market.

- **shared competences**
  
  These are policy areas where the EU and EU Member States are both able to legislate and adopt legally binding acts. In addition, in these areas, EU countries exercise their own competence where the EU does not exercise, or has decided not to exercise, its own competence. Following the principles of Subsidiarity and Proportionality (explained below), the EU shall take action only if the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States, and can therefore be better achieved by the EU.

- **supporting competences**
  
  These are the policy areas where the EU can only intervene to support, coordinate or complement the action of Member States. Legally binding EU acts related to these areas must not require the harmonisation of EU countries’ laws or regulations.

**Special competences**

The EU’s **common foreign and security policy** is characterised by specific institutional features, such as the limited participation of the European Commission and the European Parliament in the decision-making procedure and the exclusion of any legislation activity. This policy is defined and implemented by the European Council (consisting of the Heads of States or Governments of the EU countries) and by the Council (consisting of a representative of each EU country at ministerial level). The President of the European Council and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign and Security Policy represent the EU in matters of common foreign and security policy.
EU COMPETENCES

The EU can take measures to ensure that EU countries coordinate their economic, social and employment policies at EU level.

Exercise of competence
The exercise of EU competences is subject to two fundamental principles laid down in Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union, which help avoid over-legislation in certain policy areas.

These are:
Proportionality: the content and scope of EU action may not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Treaties.

Subsidiarity: in the areas of its non-exclusive competences, the EU may act only if — and in so far as — the objective of a proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States, but could be better achieved at EU level.

POLICY AREAS:

Exclusive
- customs union
- the establishing of competition rules necessary for the functioning of the internal market
- monetary policy for euro area countries
- conservation of marine biological resources under the common fisheries policy
- common commercial policy
- conclusion of international agreements under certain conditions

Shared
- internal market
- social policy, but only for aspects specifically defined in the Treaty
- economic, social and territorial cohesion (regional policy)
- agriculture and fisheries (except conservation of marine biological resources)
- environment
- consumer protection
- transport
- trans-European networks
- energy
- area of freedom, security and justice
- shared safety concerns in public health matters, limited to aspects defined in the TFEU
- research, technological development, space
- development cooperation and humanitarian aid

Supporting
- protection and improvement of human health
- industry
- culture
- tourism
- education, vocational training, youth and sport
- civil protection
- administrative cooperation
As the EU passes thousands of laws and regulations every year, it is important to know how legislative proposals become law. Introduced in 1992 and extended in 1999 as the codecision procedure, the main decision-making procedure in the EU became known as the ordinary legislative procedure after the Lisbon Treaty. This procedure applies to around 85 policy areas, whereas exceptions to it are covered by the consent or consultation procedures, also known as special legislative procedures, where the Council is the main legislator. Under the ordinary legislative procedure, the two legislators - the Council of the EU and the European Parliament - are given an equal say on whether a law would be made or not.

ORDINARY LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE STEP BY STEP

Step 1: Legislative proposal
The right of legislative initiative generally rests with the European Commission. In some special cases, EU Treaties also allow the ordinary legislative procedure to be initiated by a quarter of the MS, the European Central Bank, the Court of Justice of the EU, the European Investment Bank, or a European Citizens’ Initiative. The Council and the Parliament can also ask the Commission to submit legislative procedures.

Step 2: First reading
This is where both legislators review the Commission’s proposal. It first goes to the Parliament, which may adopt or amend it. Then it goes to the Council, which may decide to adopt the Parliament’s position, in which case the legislative act is adopted, or amend it, in which case the proposal is returned to the Parliament for a second reading. Most EU laws are passed at this stage.

Step 3: Second reading
Here, the same procedure is followed. The Parliament examines the Council’s position and can either approve the act which turns it into law, reject it which ends the procedure, or amend the law and return a new wording to the Council for their second reading. The Council can then either approve the Parliament’s amendments thus adopting the law, or not approve which results in convening the conciliation committee.

Step 4: Conciliation
At this stage, a committee composed of an equal number of MEPs and Council representatives is convened to agree on a text that would be acceptable to both institutions. If it cannot come to an agreement, the act is not adopted and the procedure is ended. If it does agree, the text is then forwarded to the Parliament and the Council for a third reading.

Step 5: Third reading
Finally, the Parliament examines the joint text one last time. It may reject or fail to act on it, which means the proposal is not adopted and the procedure ends, or approve the text. If the Council does the same, the legislative act is adopted. However, if the Council rejects or does not act on the proposal, it will not enter into force and the procedure is ended.

As with rejections at any other stage of the procedure, a new procedure can only start with a new proposal from the Commission, after which it must follow all the above steps anew.
LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

1. Proposal from the Commission
2. Opinions from national parliaments
3. Opinions from the European Economic and Social Committee and/or the Committee of the Regions (when this is required)

**FIRST READING**
4. First reading by the European Parliament: Parliament adopts a position (amendments)
5. Commission can amend its proposal
6. First reading by the Council (*)
7. Council approves Parliament’s position. **The act is adopted**
8. Council and Parliament disagree on amendments: Council adopts position at first reading

**SECOND READING**
9. Second reading by the Parliament: Parliament approves the Council’s position at first reading — **the act is adopted** in ‘early second reading’ — or proposes amendments
10. Commission opinion on Parliament’s amendments
11. Second reading by the Council (*)
12. Council approves all Parliament’s amendments to the Council’s position at first reading. **The act is adopted**
13. Council and Parliament disagree on amendments to the Council’s position at first reading

**CONCILIATION**
14. Conciliation Committee is convened
15. Conciliation Committee agrees on a joint text
16. Parliament and Council agree with the proposal from the Conciliation Committee, and **the act is adopted**
17. Parliament and/or Council disagree with the proposal from the Conciliation Committee, and **the act is not adopted**

(*) Council adopts in positio by a qualified majority (the majority required for unanimity in a few instances, i.e., 62% of the Council’s members are required). However, if the Council intends to deviate from the Commission’s proposal/position, it adopts (0) position for consideration.
“We cannot afford to be stuck in limbo. The British must not hold the EU to ransom.”
– Guy Verhofstadt, Leader of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Group and Member of the European Parliament

See EU later: With the British government triggering Article 50 on 29th March 2017 to formally start the process of withdrawing its EU membership, what stance should the EU take in Brexit negotiations?
The relationship between the EU and the United Kingdom (UK) has always been complicated. Since the UK’s accession to the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1973, the UK has had numerous opt-outs from several treaties and special statuses during its time in the European project. For instance, the UK decided to stay out of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) when the Maastricht Treaty was signed in 1992 and is not part of the Schengen Area, which abolished border controls and enables passport- and visa-free travel within it. Additionally, the UK has some opt-outs from the provisions of EU treaties: Protocols 19 and 20 of the Lisbon Treaty allows the UK to choose whether to participate in Schengen system. Moreover, Protocol 21 allows the UK not to take part in the creation of the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (AFSJ) and Protocol 30 states that no court may rule that UK law is inconsistent with the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

The UK had a consultative referendum about its EU membership on 23rd June 2016 where 51.9% of the British people voted to leave the European project. It resulted in the UK giving its formal notice to Donald Tusk, the President of the European Council, ‘triggering’ Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) on 29th March 2017, and thereby commencing the formal leaving negotiations.
**Soft Brexit**: A term used to refer to a scenario in which the UK would remain in the European Single Market after its withdrawal from the EU.

**Hard Brexit**: A term used to refer to a scenario in which the UK would leave the Single Market and Customs Union. Additionally, this would call a halt on the EU’s **free movement of people, goods, capital and services**, which are regulated in the **Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union** (TFEU), and pose tariffs on goods.

**Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union** (TEU): It sets out binding guidelines giving the chance for a Member State to leave the EU. It also gives a two-year window for the negotiations, after which EU treaties will no longer apply in the Member State. The Lisbon Treaty is comprised of the TEU and the TFEU.

**European Single Market**, also referred to as the **Internal Market**: The internal market was first an idea as a Common Market in 1950s that developed into a concrete plan of a single market in Single European Act in 1986. The so-called ‘1992 Plan’ was then executed as part of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and has been reformed since. The main idea behind the Single Market is treating the EU as one territorial entity without internal borders, where the flow of goods and services is without any tariffs or barriers.

**EU Withdrawal Bill**: The parliamentary bill that came into force on 16th March 2017, after both chambers of the UK Parliament passed the Bill in order to give the mandate to the UK Government. UK Parliament will be enforcing all the decisions concerning the Brexit negotiations and adopting all existing EU legislation into UK legislation before the Great Repeal Bill.
AFCO I

- **Great Repeal Bill:** A proposed parliamentary bill in the UK intended to repeal the European Communities Act 1972 which gave way for the UK’s accession to the EU in 1973. With the Great Repeal Bill, the UK would leave the European Court of Justice (ECJ) jurisdiction and adopt all existing EU law in its domestic legislation. After the Bill is adopted, the UK may then amend or repeal legislation as necessary.

### KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

- **UK Government:** The UK Government, led by Prime Minister Theresa May, will be the main UK representative in the exit negotiations. Mrs May succeeded David Cameron after a change in party leadership in the Conservative Party following the Brexit referendum. Prime Minister May has said that she will take a tough stance in the negotiations. The Government is currently composed of members of the Conservative Party. Additionally, David Davis, the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union, will be the head Brexit negotiator for the UK. This ministerial post was established for Mrs May’s new cabinet.

- **UK Parliament, also referred as the Westminster:** The UK Parliament is divided into two chambers: the House of Commons, the directly elected lower chamber and the House of Lords, the appointed upper chamber. In January 2017, the Supreme Court of the UK ruled that the Parliament had to be consulted before Article 50 of the TEU could be triggered.

- **EU Institutions:** All the main institutions of the EU are involved in different stages of the Brexit negotiations. The UK informed the European Council of its leave by giving the official notice about triggering the Article 50 of the TEU. The European Council also set guidelines for the Brexit negotiations. The Council of the European Union authorises the opening of the Brexit negotiations and appoints the European Commission as the main negotiator who represents the remaining Member States. European Parliament’s consent is needed by a vote and the negotiations are concluded by the Council of the European Union. The European Parliament’s chief negotiator is Guy Verhofstadt.
WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

The current political status between the EU and the UK is on hiatus, and the EU has already excluded the UK from all European Council and Council of the European Union meetings where matters on Brexit are being discussed. These are known as EU27 meetings.

When the UK published its goals for the exit negotiations, Prime Minister May gave a speech on 17th January 2017 about the UK's future in a global context. The speech was a clear signal for a Hard Brexit, an indication of the UK leaving the Single Market.

The EU’s stance was published in a press release of the negotiation guidelines after the EU27 Summit on 29th April 2017. In an unprecedented move, the 27 Member States accepted the guidelines in only a few minutes and thus indicated their united front for the Brexit negotiations. The guidelines state that the EU and the UK should seek a close partnership, pursuing multilateral goals rather than only trade. Particularly, the EU calls for cooperation in the areas of the fight against terrorism, international crime, security, defence and foreign policy. However, the priorities for the negotiations vary significantly between different Member States. Some are very keen on protecting citizens’ rights, whilst others are keen to pursue a free trade agreement with the UK.

- **European Commission’s Brexit task force:** The European Commission has set up a taskforce on Brexit negotiations, which coordinates the Commission’s work on all strategic, operational, legal and financial issues. The task force is led by Michel Barnier, who is also the chief Brexit negotiator for the EU.

- **27 Member States:** The remaining Member States are closely involved with the Brexit negotiations with their presence in the European Council and the Council of the European Union. Analysis from the Bundestag, the lower Chamber of the German Parliament, indicates that national parliaments of the remaining 27 Member States may have a say concerning in the Brexit negotiations.
AFCO I

KEY CONFLICTS

One of the cornerstones in these negotiations will be the fate of EU citizens in the UK and vice versa. Donald Tusk has stated that securing EU citizens’ rights is the top priority, and MEPs have threatened to block any Brexit deal unfavourable to their citizens. Member States have different priorities for the negotiations, e.g. Spain and Malta are concerned about senior British citizens in their countries and the associated healthcare costs, whereas Poland and Lithuania are interested in the fate of their citizens living and working in the UK.

Another key area of conflict lies in trade. The EU wants the UK to pay for its divorce from the Union with the estimated sum for the bill somewhere around 100 billion euros. As the UK’s departure will affect businesses on both sides, finding a trade deal favourable for both parties is crucial. It can be argued that it is in the EU’s interest to develop its relationship with the UK towards the option of the UK joining the European Economic Area (EEA) as a non-EU member. While EEA membership would give the UK Single Market access, it would also come with the free movement of people. The EU also does not allow “cherry picking” from the Single Market, making the four freedoms a package deal not up for discussion.
Furthermore, the EU wants to discuss the terms of the UK’s departure before reviewing the trade deal, while the UK would rather conduct negotiations in the reverse order. This concerns the financial hub in London – the EU’s main financial centre and one of UK’s economy’s main driving forces. Due to the uncertainty, banks and other multinational corporations in London are considering whether to leave the UK and move their European operations elsewhere in the EU as free movement of capital and Single Market access are crucial for the functioning of financial markets. While the UK has clearly wanted to retain access to free movement of capital, the EU is excluding it from their post-Brexit deal.

On 18th April 2017, Prime Minister May called for early parliamentary elections to be held on 8th June 2017. This motion was seen by some as a tactical move to unite voices in Parliament for Brexit negotiations. The election results are likely to play a key role in the character of the negotiations.

Security matters will also need to be addressed in the withdrawal agreement. Britain’s withdrawal from the EU will undoubtedly alter how the UK cooperates with Europol, the European law enforcement agency. As the UK is currently a key contributor to Europol, it is in both parties’ interest to establish partnerships on counter-terrorism, international crime as well as security, defence and foreign policy.

**THE PRESIDENT’S TOP TIP**

*Watch and read the news! Make sure you stay on top of current affairs as the solutions you propose will be affected by developments in negotiations. These are likely to change weekly in the run up to the session. Oh, and follow Guy Verhofstadt on Facebook; it’s wonderful entertainment!*
Lastly, there may be incentives for Member States to make Brexit as hard as possible for the UK. For example, Spain has claimed Gibraltar, a British Overseas Territory, to be its own. After UK’s withdrawal from the EU, the agreement concerning Gibraltar’s special status will cease. The EU mentions Gibraltar in its main negotiating guidelines but intends to leave this to be negotiated solely by Spain along with a veto power. European leaders have also welcomed a scenario of a united Ireland by allowing Northern Ireland to automatically become a full member of the EU should it join the Republic of Ireland. While this remains an option, negotiations may be difficult and may not get resolved within the two year period.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

- How should the EU approach its relationship with the UK in the areas of security, defence and foreign policy?
- What will be the economic consequences of Brexit for both parties?
- Should the EU take action to protect its economic well-being in light of London’s current status as a financial hub?
- What should the EU do to maintain a united stance in its negotiations despite the different priorities for its Member States?
- How do the domestic political affairs in Britain affect the UK’s stance in Brexit negotiations?
“Europe will be forged in crises, and will be the sum of the solutions adopted for those crises.”
– Jean Monnet, French political economist and diplomat

Rethinking the European Project: With EU membership on the line in several national elections in the year of the 60th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, what reforms should the EU implement in response to the issues highlighted in areas where Euroscepticism is high, such as the Visegrad Group, in order to maintain peace, stability and prosperity in Europe?
On 9th May 1950, Robert Schuman presented his Declaration that laid out the EU’s foundations. On 25th March 1957, the first six countries signed the Treaty of Rome, establishing the European community. Between then and now, the European Union has always been challenged to change its shape and form. Originally, the project was created as a political tool to maintain peace between France and Germany and prevent future conflicts on the continent. Realising the benefits of cooperation and a trade union, it shifted to an economic union, before reverting back to the political ideal.

The Union of 2017 is facing a number of crises, such as the influx of migrants, upcoming Brexit negotiations, a struggling Eurozone and growing anti-EU sentiment among many national parties. The past years have also marked a growing conflict between Brussels and some Member States regarding the fundamental values and principles of the Union, apparent in EU-Hungary relations, triggered by the migrant crisis, or EU-Poland tensions regarding the Constitutional Court and public media reforms in Poland, which resulted in the EU deploying its Rule of Law mechanism for the first time. Additionally, a complicated and time-consuming decision-making process, excessive bureaucracy and democratic deficit in the European institutions are only some of the concerns raised by Eurosceptics.

When set up in 1957, the European project established peace, stability and prosperity as its leading objectives. With a growing number of Europeans feeling unsatisfied about what the Union has to offer, does the current state of the EU allow these values to be upheld?
### KEY TERMS

- **Ever closer Union**: A term mentioned in the [Preamble to the Treaty of Rome](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Preamble_to_the_Treaty_of_Rome) signed in 1957, where signatories stated they were ‘determined to establish the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe’. The term is also used in the sense of promoting closer relations between EU Member States and further integration between them.

- **Europe à la carte**: A non-unified means of integration that allows Member States to select policies and involve themselves fully only in certain areas of integration. The idea includes having a minimum number of common objectives, however, different countries would integrate at different levels (variable geometry) or at a different pace (multi-speed).

- **Multi-speed Europe**: An option for differentiated integration where shared objectives are followed by a group of EU countries both able and willing to advance the integration process, with a view of others following later at different paces of integration.

- **Variable geometry Europe**: An option for differentiated integration based on the idea that since the EU’s membership has grown significantly, there may be crucial differences among countries and that there should be means to resolve such deadlocks at different levels of integration.

- **Enhanced cooperation**: This term describes a mechanism, introduced in the [Treaty of Amsterdam](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Amsterdam), where a minimum of 9 Member States are allowed to establish advanced integration or cooperation in an area within the EU’s structures, without the other EU countries being involved. It allows the countries to move at different speeds and towards different goals within the framework of the Union. It overcomes the paralysis in which a proposal is blocked by a small group of countries who do not desire to be part of the initiative, without, however, allowing for an extension of powers outside those permitted by the EU Treaties.

- **Deepening and widening**: These are the two schools of thought on the EU’s development. Deepening stands for the increased integration of the Union. Widening is related to the idea of the EU’s expansion through membership. After the enlargement of the EU in 2004, it was questioned whether the EU can do both in parallel.
**AFCO II**

- **Opt-out**: The case in which a Member State does not integrate in an EU policy area with the purpose of repositioning itself after a certain period of time, thus allowing others to move further to avoid stalemate. The EU has had several cases of opt-outs, such as the recent example of Poland and the UK opting-out of the European Charter on Fundamental Rights.

- **Euroscepticism**: A social phenomenon based on the criticism of the European Union, its policies and ideals.

**KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS**

- **Eurosceptic parties and voters**: Euroscepticism is a dynamic phenomenon, contributed to by both parties and voters, and by those from both the far-right and the far-left wings of the EU’s political spectrum. While the radical left opposes the EU on the basis of socio-economic concerns, the radical right rejects the EU integration due to sovereignty arguments and cultural claims.

- **Member States**: Presently, the EU is based on the principle of voluntary membership and sovereignty of the rule of law, and the Member States are offered a wide range of mechanisms to defend this, through measures such as opt-outs. Therefore, it is up to them how integrated in the European project they want to be and which path of development is the most beneficial for them. It is important to note that, according to Article 48 of the Treaty on European Union, a significant change to the structure of the EU would require a change to its treaties, which would require unanimous agreement of all Member States (ordinary revision procedure).

- **European Parliament**: Being the only directly elected EU body, it is supposed to represent the voice of the EU’s 500 million citizens. This also makes the Parliament the only European institution that offers both pro-European and Eurosceptic points of view, and through its resolutions and declarations it aims to represent all of the views of European people.
WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

The structure of the EU has continuously been altered and I’d draw your attention to the history of the EU as shown earlier in the booklet. An important step was the unsuccessful attempt to establish the Constitution for Europe in 2004. The project was seen by the critics either as a neoliberal document that would destroy Europe’s social protections, or as a federalist manifesto that would accelerate the drive towards a ‘United States of Europe’. It was rejected in popular votes in 2005 by the French and the Dutch; yet, it did not prevent changes in the structure of the Union, as shortly after its failure, the works on the Treaty of Lisbon began. Having considered previous criticisms, its authors resigned from extreme solutions, maintaining core goals, such as improving decision-making through adopting more democratic procedures within the European institutions. The Treaty introduced this through measures such as sharing legislative power, which is to be exercised by the Parliament together with the Council, or introducing the citizens’ legislative initiative.

• European Council: Comprised of the Heads of State and Government, the European Council is the main decision maker and takes major political decisions regarding the present and future of the Union. According to the Treaty of Lisbon, amendments in the areas of the EU’s internal policies and actions can be passed with a unanimous vote of the European Council, after having consulted the Commission, the European Parliament and, in cases concerning monetary matters, the European Central Bank (simplified revision procedure).
Recent crisis forced decision makers to take further actions and, as a result, **three resolutions exploring the future development of the EU** were approved by the Parliament on 16th February 2017. The resolutions consecutively present the ideas of maximising the usage of the Lisbon Treaty, reforming already existing treaties through implementing additional reforms and, finally, reinforcing the Eurozone. All of these proposals were created as part of the package that aims to clarify the Parliament’s position on the future of the EU.

The latest step was taken during the **EU Heads of State or Government meeting in Rome on 25th March 2017**, with President Donald Tusk reading out his [letter](https://example.com/letter) and all the Member States signing the [Rome Declaration](https://example.com/rome-declaration), setting out a joint vision for the upcoming years.

**THE PRESIDENT’S TOP TIP**

“Know your history! The EU has changed its purpose and aims numerous times since its inception. Stemming from the European Coal and Steel Community, the EU has swung between a focus on economic and political unity. We must learn from the lessons from our past to better shape our future.”

**KEY CONFLICTS**

‘We will act together, at different paces and intensity where necessary, while moving in the same direction [...] keeping the door open to those who want to join later,’ states the **Rome Declaration of 2017**. It seems European leaders have made their decision to move further and forward with the European integration without always waiting for all Member States. It is not, however, clear whether all countries share this view. Although the German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, called for a **relaunch of a multi-speed Europe** and received the support of France, Italy and Spain, some contrary views arose. Viktor Orbán, the Prime Minister of Hungary and Beata Szydło, the Prime Minister of Poland stated they see the future of the EU...
integration more as an inter-governmental cooperation, whereas, for instance, Guy Verhofstadt MEP, the Leader of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Group, presented his idea of EU’s future as a fully fledged federal state.

With such conflicting ideas, it is all the more important to work towards a shared solution. It is a difficult task, since the idea of multi-speed Europe, supported by the majority of strong EU players, appears to be strongly criticised by several Eastern Member States. Recently, Central Europe has seen a rise in Eurosceptic, right-wing populism. Since the victory of Viktor Orbán in Hungary and Jarosław Kaczyński’s party in Poland, the EU has struggled to prevent these leaders from openly undermining liberal democracy. With the EU deploying its Rule of Law mechanism for the first time due to the Constitutional crisis and public media reforms in Poland, people have started questioning whether mechanisms such as the Article 7 of the TEU are sufficient. For some, a multi-speed Europe is the one and only path of advancement for the EU, yet others uphold a completely opposite view, focusing on maintaining an equalised integration rate among all Member States.

Besides deciding on the main path of development and the direction of integration, the Union has to return to its foundations to really understand and successfully address Euroscepticism. One of the major criticisms towards the EU is its democratic deficit, which highlights that the EU institutions and their decision-making procedures suffer from a lack of democratic accountability and seem inaccessible to the ordinary citizen due to their complexity. The Commission is often criticised for having too many commissioners and allowing itself to be influenced by the European Parliament when it is supposed to act as a balance between the Council of Ministers (representing national governments) and the Parliament as the two co-legislators in the system. Since 1979, when direct elections were introduced, the Parliament has been gaining more powers. However, although it is designed as one of the co-deciding bodies, when important decision are made, it is often the national governments, not the EU institutions that have the final say.
The future shape of the EU, its approach to integration, the institutions and decision-making procedures are the fundamental problems to be resolved. If not addressed, it is possible they will cause a further rise of Euroscepticism, which could potentially lead to more Member States leaving or even a total collapse of the EU. Aware of the Union’s various achievements in the past and fearing the danger the status quo can potentially bring, it is high time that we analyse its weaknesses in order to understand how to improve them.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

• What future path of integration and development should the EU take?
• How can the EU balance the needs of the states that call for further integration with those in need of more time or lacking the will to participate?
• How can the EU further ensure its funding values of peace, stability and prosperity in Europe are maintained?
• How should the EU address the key frustrations voiced by Eurosceptics?
We cannot surrender to those who want to weaken or invalidate the Transatlantic bond, without which global order and peace cannot survive. We should remind our American friends of their own motto: United we stand, divided we fall”

– Donald Tusk, President of the European Council

America first: With the election of President Donald Trump raising questions about the future cooperation between the US and the EU on security, trade and the environment, how should the EU proceed in relation to one of its most important bilateral partners whilst upholding its values and ideals?
“From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land. From this moment on, it’s going to be America First. Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families.” – President Donald Trump

The extract above is taken from President Donald Trump’s inaugural speech in 2017. Before the election, it was evident that Trump was a controversial candidate, with his views on immigration, calling NATO obsolete, and encouraging Russia to hack his opponent’s e-mails. Regardless of the controversy, the voters made their choice and on 20th January 2017 President Trump took the seat in the Oval Office with a margin of 306 to 232 electoral votes.

With a new leader in place across the Atlantic, the EU needs to start reevaluating its relationship with the US, as President Trump’s views on many topics differ from what the EU is striving for; with key areas including security, trade and the environment. With regards to security and trade, the EU is rather dependent on President Trump’s decisions due to NATO and current negotiations over the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). As for the environment, the EU has already taken a leading role in the world, however, if President Trump decides to back down from the decisions his predecessor took, the EU would face an even larger burden. Only time will tell how cooperation in those three key areas unfolds. However, within his first 100 days, President Trump has proven to be similar in his style of ruling as he was during the elections – unpredictable and putting America first.
The shared values of the EU and the US: The relationship of the EU and the US is based on shared values of human dignity, freedom, the rule of law, democracy, equality, the market economy, and a strong fundamental respect for human rights, including minority rights.

Bilateral trade deal: The exchange of goods between two parties that facilitates trade and investment by reducing or eliminating tariffs, import quotas, export restraints, and other trade barriers.

Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP): A trade agreement between the EU and the US, which is currently being negotiated. The aim of the partnership is to open up markets for both sides as well as boost economic growth through market regulation, cutting red tape, and making it easier to import, export and invest.

The Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP): An EU policy area, which focuses on peacekeeping operations, conflict prevention, and strengthening international security.

EU 2030 Climate goals: The EU’s climate and energy framework, which consists of binding targets for 2030.

Brexit: Short for British exit, which refers to the United Kingdom’s withdrawal from the EU.
AFET

KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

- **The European Commission**: The executive branch of the EU, which comprises of Commissioners from each Member State and has the power to propose legislation and implement decisions. It acts as the EU’s negotiator for the TTIP agreement.

- **EU Member States**: Depending on the policy area, the EU has the competence to make decisions for its Member States, thus the countries themselves are vocal about which direction the EU should take. A detailed explanation can be found in the EU section of the preparation kit.

- **France**: A Member State which has strengthened the cooperation with the US in the area of defence, while the new President of France is being considered anti-Trump in other areas such as the environment.

- **Germany**: A Member State, which has the largest export of goods in the EU and has taken a clear supportive stance towards globalisation which differs from the US.

- **United Kingdom**: Currently a Member State, which is in the middle of negotiations with the EU regarding their future exit from the Union.

- **The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)**: An intergovernmental military alliance that consists of countries from North America and Europe and is based on collective defence.

- **The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change**: International environmental treaty, which is the basis for the Paris Agreement and the Kyoto protocol.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

The United States of America has been Europe’s ally even before the EU was created and supported Europe after World War II. Through common goals and shared values, the partnership of these two actors has crossed over onto many areas.
When it comes to security matters for the EU, NATO plays a strong role, with most Member States joined in the alliance, with the exceptions of Austria, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Malta, and Sweden. In addition to internal defence, the EU and the US are cooperating in security matters all over the world, for example, the Middle East Peace Process and response to the Horn of Africa crises. Furthermore, EU-US cooperation is strong when it comes to countering terrorism through the EU-US Terrorist Finance Tracking Programme Agreement and the EU-US Passenger Name Records Agreement.

With regards to trade, the two partners are engaged in creating a bilateral trade deal called TTIP. While the agreement has been supported by both sides, it has also received negative feedback from the civil society, NGOs and also Members of the European Parliament due to its non-transparent nature. The EU and the US produce more than 45% of the world’s GDP and are responsible for 1/3 of world trade, thus this deal has a highly important value.

As for environmental action, a common ground is weaker as the EU has pushed for further action towards global climate deals, whereas the US has been reluctant to ratify binding agreements, such as the Kyoto Protocol. Furthermore, the EU has specific goals in environmental protection, such as reducing emissions by at least 40% by 2030, whereas the US has a rather fragmented system in place.

**THE PRESIDENT’S TOP TIP**

“Balance is a key word with regards to this motion. On the one hand, the US is an important trade partner but on the other, security and international relations must be kept in mind. What negotiating power does the EU have to ensure that aims and goals are shared across the Atlantic?”
In the past months, President Trump has given rather mixed signals regarding his attitude towards Europe. During his campaign and first months in the Oval Office, he was strongly in favour of Brexit, criticised the EU for being a “vehicle for Germany”, and suggested that the EU does not “matter” to the United States. While he still continues to root for the UK, he has also praised the EU for handling the “divorce” well and made a statement that the EU is important. Additionally, one should keep in mind that the UK aims to reinvigorate the “special relationship” it has with the US and President Trump seems to have similar plans. With the UK triggering its withdrawal process from the EU, it is even more important for the union to work towards maintaining cooperation with the US.

This being said, President Trump seems to be more eager to trade with the EU than with the UK. The terms of TTIP are still not clear and therefore the EU needs to figure out how to ensure stability and growth in trade if President Trump leans towards the UK. Additionally, President Trump has taken a protectionist stance when it comes to trade in general and the President of the European Commission has voiced concerns regarding President Trump’s views, but also started pushing for concluding a Free Trade Agreement with Japan in 2017.

As for security, President Trump has managed to surprise everyone in his first 100 days. Even though he criticised President Obama for meddling in the Middle East, Trump launched airstrikes in Syria, contradicting his previous election campaign statements. Staying out of the Middle East seemed to also be affected by President Trump’s aim to repair relations with Russia, an election promise that he has stayed true to. However, this direction seems to oppose the EU’s views, as the EU is not backing down from sanctions against Russia before the Minsk Accords are implemented.
Another area of conflict is the environment, where President Trump has appointed Scott Pruitt, a climate change sceptic, as head of Environmental Protection Agency, in addition to stopping financing the UN climate funding and stopping 2 billion dollars to help developing countries deal with climate change. Furthermore, President Trump loosened the rules for stream protection, making it easier for coal companies to dump their waste. This strongly differs from the EU’s standpoint, with internal climate protection goals such as the European Climate Change Programme in place and ongoing cooperation with non-Member States to help tackle climate change. However, even though the EU is leading when tackling environmental issues, it cannot do it alone and needs allies to strengthen the binding international rules.

It is evident that the US has changed its course in regards to security, trade, and environment since President Trump took office. Thus, the EU needs to figure out how to work with the new US leadership in order to make progress in the development of the Union and the world. With Brexit negotiations in their infancy, the US might drift even further away from the Union regardless of the election of President Trump. Despite the differences the EU and the US have, continued cooperation is vital for both partners; however, the EU should tread with caution in choosing the direction this partnership takes.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

• How can the EU ensure safety within its borders when the US’ commitment to NATO is questionable?
• With Britain exiting from the EU and the US reluctant to go forward with TTIP, how can the EU ensure stability and growth in trade?
• Taking into account that the US has different views on climate change, what can the EU do to ensure sustainable environmental protection in the future?
• Bearing in mind President Trump’s ever changing views on different policy fields, what stance should EU leaders adopt when cooperating with the US?
“An athlete cannot run with money in his pockets. He must run with hope in his heart and dreams in his head.”

– Emil Zátopek, Olympic gold medallist

Cleaning the dirt off sport: With FIFA scandals, doping allegations and abusive behaviour in stadia highlighting the shortcomings of the European Council’s previous two Work Plans on Sport, what further steps should the EU take to help to rebuild a positive image of sport?
Sport stars are often viewed as heroes in their countries and across the globe. Unfortunately, cheating and corruption in sports have been known to mankind since the earliest records of sporting achievements. With the FBI uncovering huge corruption schemes within the Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), football players trying to evade taxes, match fixing taking place in even the lower leagues of different kinds of sports in Europe, and violence between fans, it is no surprise that the good name of sport is being pulled through the mud. When it comes to doping allegations, the most recent example is the ban from the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF), forbidding Russian athletes to participate in the Rio Olympic Games last year. Cycling has been strongly tied to doping allegations for more than a decade. In 2012, Lance Armstrong’s Tour de France medals were not reassigned to other cyclists after he was stripped from them as 20 of the 21 cyclists on the podiums between 1999-2005 had also been linked to doping allegations.

Although the EU has been moderately positive in their implementation of the two Work Plans for Sports, it is clear that there are still many issues to be covered: for instance, violence among sport fans remains a recurring issue. Sports lovers are starting to distrust the people running the sport organisations and losing faith in the integrity of sport. Sport provides us with inspirational moments and stories; it champions everyday men and women and provides us with an outlet for our enthusiasm. In recent years, this image has been tainted with corruption, violence and cheating and it falls to us to restore the positive image of sport.
KEY TERMS

• **Match fixing:** This is the act of making sure a certain outcome of a match occurs through dishonest or illegal means.

• **Doping/performing enhancing drugs (PEDs):** These substances enhance a person’s physical abilities.

• **The economic dimension of sports:** This is the effect sports has on the economy and our lives.

• **Antitrust laws or competition laws:** These laws protect individuals or companies from predatory business practices. In sports, they are mostly related to prohibiting the abuse of dominant positions.

• **Integrity:** This concept is closely related to good sportsmanship. Integrity in sports is the idea of fairness, honesty and adhering to moral principles when playing sports.

• **Ethics:** This is the idea that actions can be perceived as being fair and morally right or wrong.

*Lance Armstrong admits to using doping after over a decade of denying it.*
KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

• The Directorate-general of Education and Culture (DG EAC): This is the executive branch of the EU responsible for sports. It carries out any regulations related to sports and also supports certain initiatives promoting physical activities and sports, most notably through the Erasmus+ programme. Some examples of such initiatives are the promotion of good mental health amongst young athletes and social integration through sports.

• The Council of the European Union: This is the main decision making body of the EU where all the ministers of sports or culture come together. Some of its responsibilities are negotiating and adopting EU law, coordinating Member States’ policies on Culture, Youth and Sport, and developing a common foreign policy. Many initiatives, for example the Working Plans on Sports, come from this EU institution.

• The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA): This agency was founded by an initiative from the International Olympic Committee (IOC) with the aim to monitor and support the fight against doping in sports. Their most notable contribution to date is their involvement in the investigation against Russian athletes before the Rio Olympic Games in 2016.

• The International Olympic Committee (IOC): This international organisation is responsible for organising the Olympic Games, which represents the highest level of competition for many sports, as well as upholding the Olympic Charter.

• National sport organisations/athletes: These institutes are also important for our topic as many national sporting organisations work autonomously from the government. So far, national sporting organisations have not had a coherent collective approach towards the issues raised in this topic. Another key group of actors are the athletes themselves, as on one hand, they are the ones directly suffering the consequences of corruption and abusive behaviour; on the other hand, it is the athletes who get directly involved in illegal practices such as doping and match-fixing.
WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

The EU has been trying to address the most pressing issues in the policy field of sport through the implementation of Work Plans for Sports. So far, two Work Plans have been implemented by the Council of the EU, one in 2011 and one in 2014. The latter Work Plan is still in effect until the end of this year, and a third Plan is in the making for the period of 2017-2020. One of the most notable measures within these Work Plans is the creation of expert groups on key areas such as match fixing, integrity, doping, and sports in society.

The EU has actively fought against the use of doping since the 90s. Until 1999, this was with limited success, as there was no international coordination. The creation of the The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) in 1999, in which the EU played a big part, helped create an internationally coherent approach towards tackling the issue of doping. This resulted in the creation of the World anti-doping code (WADC) in 2004, which aims to harmonise...
the fight against doping. Since 2015, the European Commission is in regular contact with the Member States to ensure that they follow this code.

Member States have attempted to implement measures on their own or have allowed national/international sport organisations to solve these problems. For example, violence among sports fans is an issue that is mostly addressed by sport organisations, however, this is not specifically mentioned in with Work Plans for Sport. An effective measure that has been found not only in Europe, but also in the US, is banning the violator from the stadium for an extended period of time. In some countries, such as in The Netherlands, cities have taken precautionary measures by not allowing fans of the opposite team in high profile matches to attend the game.

Corruption in sports has taken many different forms. Two notable examples are the bribing of athletes or officials to fix matches and the rigging of bids for the hosting of international sporting events. The recent investigations of the Swiss government and the Federal Bureau of Investigation into the governance of FIFA has resulted in numerous arrests of high profile officials and the resignation of then FIFA president Sepp Blatter. However, a common strategy between countries in the fight against corruption in all sports is lacking.

Some Member States have taken a collaborative approach to tackling the problem of match fixing. Nordic countries came together in 2012 to analyse this problem and to find appropriate measures. Since then, multiple offenders have been caught and sentenced in Sweden and Norway.

Finally, there have been many initiatives to ban racism out of sports. One initiative, Kick It Out, has been actively promoting inclusiveness and trying to eradicate discrimination in the United Kingdom since the early 90s. The initiative has close connections to the Football Against Racism in Europe network, where Kick It Out plays a leading role. This network was set up in 1999 to counter racism in European football and since then has organised many conferences and campaigns against racism.
KEY CONFLICTS

Despite the EU’s efforts so far, issues relating to corruption, match fixing, doping and violence remain. There are many conflicts in play that make it difficult to find a solution. These conflicts can be divided into the following groups:

- Limited EU competences and intercontinental power,
- Doping detection becoming more difficult,
- Difficulty in investigating match fixing claims,
- Self-regulatory corrupt international sport organisations,
- Violence and racism amongst sport fans.

One of the first issues the EU runs into when dealing with this topic is that the EU only has a supporting competence on matters related to sports, which means it can only support the actions of individual Member States. Sometimes, this has been dodged by arguing that some problems related to sports are in fact related to competition laws, in which the EU has an exclusive competence. However, this idea has not been used yet in relation to the issues relevant to our topic.

Aside from the little legislative power the EU has in this field, most issues raised do not only deal with the EU but reach beyond its borders. FIFA is based in Zurich, while cycling is governed internationally by the Union Cycliste International (UCI), which is also based in Switzerland. That being said, UCI worked closely together with the US Anti-doping agency (USADA) in the past. These examples show just the tip of the iceberg of the complexity of the global network of international organisations and bodies.

With regards to doping, in addition to the use of it being illegal, this practice negatively affects the health of the athlete, damages the integrity of the sport, undermines fair play and leads to fans’ disinterest in sports. Despite such negative consequences, some athletes still turn to doping. Much research has been done on this issue showing that monetary as well as non-monetary reasons still outweigh the negatives for athletes.
Furthermore, doping is getting harder to detect, as substances get more sophisticated and athletes get better at using them without getting caught. To add to the difficulty of detecting PEDs, there is also no clear line between what is considered a PED and what is not. For example, some drugs prescribed to treat certain illnesses are considered PEDs, and overusing some food supplements can result in testing positive in drug tests, even if the athlete had no wrongful intentions. This raises the question if doping-free sports will be feasible in the future.

Furthermore, match fixing has been revealed as an increasingly problematic issue. Interpol released an extensive report on the dangers and difficulties of match fixing, which goes as far as stating that match fixing could be the biggest threat to sports in the 21st century. First of all, it is incredibly difficult to detect when match fixing is taking place by purely looking at the result of match. A curious outcome does not necessarily mean a game was fixed. Moreover, many individuals associated with match fixing are said to belong to the Russian mafia and gambling syndicates in Asia which makes investigating allegations incredibly difficult. Finally, a key reason why athletes in lower leagues agree to cooperate in these schemes is that these athletes do not earn as much as the big sport stars do, which leaves them prone to exploitation.

Another distinct feature of sports is that most national and international sport organisations are self-regulatory. They check and govern themselves by rules set up by the organisation itself. This stems from a time when sports was not as commercial as it is now. Now, sports is a multi-billion euros industry, and some have argued that this immense growth of cash in sports is the main cause of corruption. That is why some people plea for more transparency in the finances of these organisations and independent regulatory bodies.

Finally, despite the measures taken over the past decades against violence and racism amongst spectators of sports by the EU or Member states, it is still an ever-growing issue. The Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) has been actively campaigning against racism with the No to Racism campaign. Yet, football players are still being chanted off the field with racial slurs. This shows the need for more effective measures against these kinds of behaviour.
Cleaning the dirt of sport will require targeted and specific solutions to the aforementioned problems. However, cooperation between Member States and national sport organisations will also play a key role in solving corruption, doping, match fixing, violence and antisocial behaviour. Since the 1920s, Olympic athletes take an oath to compete “for the honour of their countries and the glory of sport”. We now must work together to uphold these promises.

"The policy area of sport is a supporting competence of the EU and, although we may all agree on the sentiment of cleaning up sport, we must think long and hard about what we can actually do to affect the situation. Creating tangible and lasting change will not be easy and we will have to be creative in our approach to working with different stakeholders."

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

- Will doping/PED testing ever be reliable enough to guarantee doping-free sports?
- What should the punishments be for athletes and officials breaking the law?
- What motivates athletes to collaborate with match fixers?
- Is more regulation beneficial or harmful for competitiveness and fan experience?
- Is the amount of money and prestige involved with sports getting out of hand?
“In a world of plenty, no one, not a single person, should go hungry. But almost 1 billion still do not have enough to eat. I want to see an end to hunger everywhere within my lifetime.”

– Ban Ki-moon, Former Secretary-General of the United Nations

Hungry for change: With the UN warning that the world is facing its largest humanitarian crisis since the end of The Second World War and that 20 million people are under the threat of starvation and famine, what more can the EU do to ensure resilience to food crises and help countries achieve food security?
The struggle for securing edible goods is as ancient as human history. While it is easy to refer to episodes of famine and hunger that took place centuries and decades ago, considering this phenomenon to be a thing of the past is still a frequent misconception.

Even though the world is theoretically able to feed all its inhabitants, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) estimates that around 795 million people out of 7.3 billion were suffering from chronic undernourishment in 2014-2016. Moreover, only certain areas of the planet are majorly affected by malnutrition and lack of food, with 780 million of the above mentioned individuals living in developing countries or war zones.

These alarming statistics led the United Nations (UN) to officially declare that the world is facing the worst humanitarian crisis since the Second World War. The European Union’s leading sector of food industry allows Member States to constantly dedicate part of their budget and edible resources to help countries in fighting famine and enhancing food security.

The EU, through the European Commission and Member States’ national initiatives, is the world’s leading humanitarian aid donor. In 2014 alone, the Commission provided 1.273 billion euros in humanitarian assistance to help 121 million people in more than 80 countries, affirming the EU’s commitment to fighting world hunger and its consequences. Even though the EU is the worldwide leading actor in humanitarian aid, it still needs to maintain attention to the needs of populations in distress in order to efficiently help them reach food security and stable food production.
• **Humanitarian emergency**: A single event or series of events that represent or can lead to a threat to the health, safety, security or wellbeing of entire populations.

• **Humanitarian aid**: It entails all the actions that are intended to save lives, alleviate suffering and ensure primary human needs in case of man-made or natural crises and disasters.

• **Food crisis**: It occurs when rates of hunger and malnutrition rise sharply at local, national or global levels. It has to be distinguished from **chronic hunger**.

• **World hunger**: It refers to the scarcity of food and includes malnutrition and undernutrition whenever it is used to refer to the effects on people of not having enough food.

• **Food security**: The condition in which all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe nutrients which meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. According to the different level of food security rated in the **Integrate Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)**, the different areas of the world can be technocratically declared affected by different levels of famine risk.

• **Food loss**: It is used to address all the edible goods not eaten by humans and also not used in any other scope (e.g. usage as biofuels).

• **Food waste**: It is a particular part of food loss that addresses the discarding or alternative non-edible use of food that would otherwise be safe and nutritious for human consumption throughout the supply chain.
KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

- **European Commission**: It provides funding to humanitarian non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Through the established Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP), the Commission puts a particular focus on addressing food insecurity among the poorest and most vulnerable populations.

- **Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)**: It ensures a rapid and coordinated European response to humanitarian emergencies inside and outside the EU’s borders. The ECHO, through its cooperation with NGOs and UN agencies, provides assistance and relief from hunger, famine, and internal conflicts in many of the countries in crisis zones such as Syria, South Sudan, Yemen, and Ukraine.

- **Humanitarian NGOs**: European NGOs are coordinating their common efforts through the Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies (VOICE), which promotes effective humanitarian help since 1992. VOICE is also the main interlocutor with the EU, promoting the values of humanitarian aid. One of the most active NGOs in fighting famine and food crises is OXFAM International.

- **United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)**: This UN agency acts to defeat chronic hunger worldwide by eradicating the causes that lead to it. The FAO tackles rural poverty, one of the main reasons behind famine and hunger in developing areas of the world. It actively engages in strengthening food security through restocking of cattles and crops and delivery of humanitarian food aid.

- **Developing countries**: They are the main recipients of humanitarian aid and are defined as the countries with a Gross National Income (GNI) per capita per year lower than US$11,905. Their local authorities often work closely with NGOs and humanitarian volunteers to improve the living standards of their citizens. For example, in sub-Saharan Africa alone, 50% of the population are suffering from chronic hunger, underlining the need for more consistent humanitarian help in the area.
**WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?**

Food security and sustainable production of edible goods has always been on top of the UN agenda. In September 2015, the UN agreed upon the [2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/), which sets the [Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/) to be met in the next thirteen years. The second of the [seventeen goals](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/) focuses on the ‘Zero Hunger’ aim to fight famine and malnutrition, [double the agriculture productivity of small farmers](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/) and increase investment in rural infrastructures.

Due to the difficulties in coordinating Member States to harmonise their humanitarian aid in crisis areas, the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council of the EU jointly issued the [European Consensus on Development](https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/development-eu/european-consensus-development_en), which identifies guidelines, values, commitments and modus operandi of the development policy implementation. The Consensus is also used by Member States’ [NGOs to work in collaboration](https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/development-eu/european-consensus-development_en) with the country’s government as well as to [cooperate in respect of humanitarian principles](https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/development-eu/european-consensus-development_en). After the UN 2030 Agenda, the Consensus has been revised and a [proposal for a new policy](https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/development-eu/european-consensus-development_en) has been made in order to tackle the new trends and challenges of globalisation.
Moreover, the EU Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2014-2020, supports humanitarian aid programmes by assigning a total of 7.1 billion euros for the entire seven years of the MFF. In addition to core humanitarian aid, the 2017 budget also supports EU Aid Volunteers (EUAV), strengthening the capacity of non-EU based organisations to prepare and respond to humanitarian crises, while increasing the technical capacity of EU-based organisations.

THE PRESIDENT’S TOP TIP

“The committee will need to consider all the possible solutions at their disposal and pick which they feel will create lasting and profound change to the largest number of people. Remember, hunger and famine are not distant concepts, they are happening closer to our door than we might imagine.”

KEY CONFLICTS

Poor local governance is the main issue in the majority of the areas affected by famine and hunger. This generally results in people not having the power to protect their own interests and having to fight constant hunger. In some cases, populations are not even able to afford primary goods, which are therefore exported to boost the country’s economy. In these areas, governments are not able to invest financial and human resources to produce edible goods and secure food for their population. On the other hand, the EU and the United States are considered the main areas responsible for food loss and waste. While edible goods can be delivered to hungry populations, Western countries are now more conspicuously using leftover edible goods as biofuels to reduce the EU’s dependency on oil and gas. This raises moral questions on whether the EU should be prioritising its humanitarian principles or if it should use the wasted food as a renewable energy source.
As outlined by the 2030 Agenda, many developing countries do not have an efficient and productive primary sector in their economies. Unfortunately, these countries are often not ready to invest in rural areas, especially if they do not have stable governments or are still afflicted by internal conflicts. A reduction in local investments for both crops and grassroots farms results in food insecurity in the long term, making entire populations live on the verge of famine.

While the UN reached a consensus on directly eradicating the underdevelopment of rural production and infrastructures to fight famine in the developing areas, there is no common agreement on the means of how to do so. Some countries, such as the US, are still pushing towards genetically modified crops (GMCs), promoting their faster growth and higher nutrients quantity. On the other hand, the latest UN report highlights that sustainable farming techniques lead to a steady relief from chronic hunger, with 70% of the food grown at small local farms and only 30% in GMC farms. The debate lies therefore around the empowerment of individuals in rural areas as a sustainable long term solution.

Additionally, the coordination of humanitarian actions among the different Member States is not easy due to the different approaches that are often taken towards the same issue. Even if the Consensus is aimed at having a more homogeneous intervention, some Member States are less willing to allocate part of their funding to humanitarian help.

Moreover, 88 million tonnes of food are wasted annually in the EU, with associated costs estimated at 143 billion euros. Even though Member States are trying to reduce this number, its presence in all the aspects of the food production chain makes it very difficult to tackle in an efficient way.

There is no common method to solve hunger and famine worldwide. The areas affected by hunger spread from sub-Saharan Africa to Europe itself, and each of these regions has different needs due to the different climates, political situation and soil resources. For this reason, the FAO Zero Hunger programme needs to be adapted to the different countries, and gaining the support of local governments is key to its success.
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

• How can Member States more actively coordinate their efforts in order to offer efficient and steady support to areas affected by chronic hunger?
• How can the EU help boost the agricultural production of developing countries?
• How can the EU promote the importance of rural development as a key factor for reducing famine and work towards stability?
• How can EU NGOs establish longer and stronger partnerships with local authorities in regions affected by hunger?
• How can the EU reduce food waste and food loss to secure edible goods for populations in need?
“There can be no tolerance of those who question the dignity of other people. There is no tolerance of those who are not ready to help, where, for legal and humanitarian reasons, help is due.”

– Angela Merkel, Chancellor of Germany

Huddled masses, muddled laws: Taking into account that current EU asylum policies have been unable to respond effectively to the significant movement of refugees and are under heavy criticism from certain Member States and civil society, what action should the EU take to create workable policies that ensure responsibility is shared while protecting the rights of refugees?
The large masses of refugees streaming into Europe from Africa, the Middle East and South Asia have presented European and global leaders with a seemingly unprecedented challenge. The rapid increase in global migration raises questions concerning security, sovereignty, integration and basic humanitarian concepts that could have long lasting social, economic and political impact on Europe and the entire international community.

It is not the sheer mass of immigration that justifies the widespread use of the word “crisis”, but the prevailing inability of the global community to react effectively and in solidarity. The pan-European migration policy system has proven to be ill-equipped to deal with the number of refugees, leaving certain states feeling overly burdened, particularly by the implications of the Dublin Regulation.

Differing national policies and political stances on how to deal with migration have led to a wide range of opinions on how to adapt and develop the migration system on a European level. Increasing nationalist and separatist tendencies, as well as the rising fear of Islamic terrorism, have further contributed to the growing reluctance of certain states to take an open-door approach.

Meanwhile, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), international organisations (page 9 et seq.) and civic initiatives are continuously drawing attention to the humanitarian grievances refugees are faced with, not only on their journey to Europe, but also within the camps and facilities they are placed in upon arrival.
The European Migrant Crisis: The Migrant Crisis began in 2015, when a rapidly increasing number of undocumented migrants arrived in Europe travelling across the Mediterranean Sea or overland through Southeast Europe. These migrants came mostly from Muslim-majority countries to the south and east of Europe, including Western Asia, South Asia and Africa.

1951 Refugee Convention: Ratified by 145 States in 1951, this convention defines the term ‘refugee’ and outlines the rights of the displaced, as well as the legal obligations of states to protect them.

Refugee: As defined by the 1951 Refugee Convention, a refugee is a person who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable to return to it.

Economic Migrant: A person who leaves their country of origin in search of better social and economic conditions.

International efforts to tackle the issue at its roots are ongoing. Attempts such as brokering peace in Syria through the current Geneva Talks or continuous development projects in areas such as sub-Saharan Africa, have yet to bear fruit.
An Asylum Seeker: A person who has submitted a request for asylum in a country other than his or her own and awaits a decision on his or her application for refugee status under national and international instruments.

Common European Asylum System (CEAS): The CEAS was set up by the EU under the aim of creating a joint standard of handling refugees across Europe. Respecting the Member State’s discretion in asylum policy, it aims to ensure that all procedures within the EU are fair and effective.

The Dublin (III) Regulation: This EU Law, also extending to certain other European states, determines that asylum seekers must remain in the first European country they enter and that this country is solely responsible for examining the applications. It was last revised in 2013 and is one of the central documents of the CEAS.

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR): This is an Agency of the United Nations mandated to assist and protect refugees at the request of a government or by the UN itself. They assist in the voluntary repatriation of refugees, their local integration or their resettlement in third countries.

Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs (DG HOME): The DG HOME is an administrative branch of the European Commission. Its role is to promote European security and, most importantly, to promote a common European asylum and migration policy.

European National Governments: National governments across Europe follow their own refugee policies, subject to the international agreements they have committed to. They have a central role in managing the current migration influx and the integration of those granted asylum.

Third-party Countries: Whilst the EU has been a destination for a large number of refugees, non-EU Members States, such as Lebanon or Turkey, are currently handling far larger numbers of refugees. Furthermore, the conflicts within the main departure states are subject to international negotiations and peace brokerage.
WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

Traditionally, asylum policy does not fall within the competency of the EU. In 1990, in light of the then newly implemented Schengen Area, Member States convened and agreed upon the Dublin (I) Convention (page 14. et seq). Unfortunately, regarding the current situation, not much has been achieved in adjusting this European migration system to successfully face the new and challenging influx. In light of its European Agenda on Migration, the European Commission adopted a first package of proposals in Spring 2016, which included calling for the revision of the Dublin Regulation. Following this, multiple EU bodies and Member States have taken a stance on the reform; however, no concrete steps have been taken. On 28th February 2017, an Interparliamentary Committee Meeting on “The third Reform of the Common European Asylum System - Up for the challenge” took place. The results thereof have yet to be made public.

- The European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE): The ECRE is a pan-European network of over 100 NGOs across 40 countries aimed at the protection of refugees and the advancement of their rights.

- NGOs and civil initiatives: NGOs and other civil initiatives such as the International Red Cross Committee or the International Migration Organisation play an essential role in the monitoring of migration across the globe, their humanitarian treatment upon arrival, as well as their further integration into European society.

- Refugees: Whilst they make up the central aspect of the issue at hand, reaching 21.3 million in number worldwide in 2015, refugees have little to no say in their treatment, distribution and integration within Europe and globally. To a large extent, they are dependent on the will of the international community, the policies of the nation state they are in and its adherence to the international agreements designed to protect their basic human rights.
Besides this main European project, there have been a number of resettlement plans, for example, attempting to introduce a quota allocation system, thereby relieving pressure from the so-called arrival states and distributing refugees across Europe. These proposals were, however, mainly blocked by the Visegrad Group. Further attempts to tackle the crisis have been made through deals such as the EU-Turkey deal, which came into effect in March 2016. This deal mainly obliged Turkey to take back any refugees arriving in Greece in exchange for financial support from the EU. It was, and still is, heavily criticised as leading to basic human rights violations by international organisations such as Amnesty International and Medecins Sans Frontieres.

The Migrant Crisis is of global importance, thus a solely EU-focused stance does not give an accurate depiction of the issue at hand. In September 2016, the United Nations General Assembly hosted a summit aimed at uniting an international commitment towards the managing of the crisis. This resulted in the ‘New York Declaration’, however, no further action has been taken upon this so far.

KEY CONFLICTS

Focusing on Europe, one of the most central conflicts is the implications of the CEAS, and the Dublin System in particular. In establishing this system, the aim was never to create a fair distribution of asylum claims across Europe, but much more to assign responsibilities. With the refugee influx of 2015, it became ever more clear that arrival states such as Greece and Italy – most of which are already in a fragile economic state – are not equipped to handle the situation within the legal framework of the Dublin System, whilst also respecting basic humanitarian concepts and their international obligations towards the displaced. Furthermore, it has become more of a question of whether arrival states should be handling the situation on their own, or whether all European states should carry the responsibility equally and to the best of their abilities.
Willingness to take **collective responsibility and action** towards the management of this novel mass immigration is yet to be established across Europe. We have seen an increasing number of Members States **disregarding the Dublin Regulation** in very different manners. Whilst, for example, **Hungary** refused to take back refugees who had initially passed through without being processed, countries such as **Germany** and **Sweden** opted to process them without actually having the responsibility to do so under current legislation.

Besides the **legal, societal and economic implications** of unequally distributed asylum claims, the **humanitarian implications** are also very prominent. With a death toll amounting to **over 5,000 lives lost in 2016**, and **independent sources reporting dire conditions in migrant camps**, it is no longer safe to say that all European countries are able to fulfill their international duties to preserve the **fundamental rights of refugees**.

When it comes to harbouring refugees, it is still **non-European countries that are faced by the largest numbers**. Although the international community has to a great extent recognised the severity of the situation, there has yet to be a large-scale commitment to the **project of resettling** all those unable to return home, and to supporting those countries currently bearing the largest responsibility.
Regarding the current political developments across Europe and globally, an increase in support for separatist, nationalist and right-wing ideas also poses a threat to finding a sustainable solution. An increasing fear of Islamic terrorism has been cited by several Member States, including Denmark and France, as a reason for stricter immigration policies. Furthermore, it is not only the distribution of refugees which must be dealt with, but also the sustainable integration into European society. Education, cultural exchange, employment and language are vital factors in ensuring a long-term positive outcome of immigration policy.

Finally, in the sense of a long term solution, it is upon the international community to further the attempts to broker peace in Syria and the Middle East, increase development programmes in sub-Saharan Africa and assist in the restoration of security to countries such as Libya.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

- Should the EU move towards a common framework and harmonisation of immigration laws on a pan-European level, or should the current system be upheld with further development of national immigration policies separately?
- Besides the Dublin Regulation, how can greater cooperation between Member States be achieved? How can the EU work closer with third-party countries to ensure responsible sharing?
- What stance should the EU take regarding the issue on a global scale, both concerning the support of non-European states hosting the majority of displaced people as well as the tackling the core issues causing migration in departure countries?
- What measures should the EU take or further develop in order to reduce the death toll amongst immigrants seeking refuge in Europe via routes such as the Mediterranean? Furthermore, how can the EU ensure humane conditions and treatment for refugees within Europe and especially in migrant camps?
- What measures should Europe take to improve the long-term integration of refugees into society as well as to improve their general public perception?
“Anyone who toys with the idea of cutting off bits of the Eurozone hoping the rest will survive is playing with fire”

– Yanis Varoufakis, Former Greek Minister of Finance

A failed project or a phoenix in the ashes: With Eurozone countries having different monetary policy needs, what steps should the EU take to aim for solid growth for all Eurozone countries?
In its 60th year of history the European Union is predominantly being given spotlight as a political union. However, what has been moved from recent spotlight is that the foundation of the EU was based to a great extent on economic reasons, and that the EU is also an Economic and Monetary Union (EMU). The euro, now used by around 340 million people every day, is the most tangible proof of this economic union – the common currency in 19 out of 28 EU Member States. These countries are collectively known as the Eurozone or officially the euro area. The popularity of the euro is marked by the fact that it is now the second most important currency in the world and is even adopted by countries outside of the euro area.

The single currency offers many advantages, such as no exchange rate fluctuations between a number of currencies and reduction of transaction costs, as no other currency is necessary when conducting business or travelling in the euro area. The disadvantages of the euro area, however, include loss of monetary sovereignty and the existence of only one interest rate, which can prove to be problematic when dealing with a diverse range of economies and economic circumstances. Even within a single currency area, considerable diversity can exist, suggesting that a common monetary policy catering to various needs is difficult to implement.
This, in turn, raises the question of whether full control over monetary policy should be given back to Member States or if the euro is a project worth pursuing. How to proceed to foster stable and growing economy?

**KEY TERMS**

- **Monetary policy**: Monetary policy consists of the actions of a monetary authority (usually the central bank) that can alter the size and rate of growth of the money supply, which in turn affects interest rates. Monetary policy is maintained through actions such as modifying the interest rate, buying or selling government bonds, and changing the amount of money banks are required to keep in the vault (bank reserves).

- **Fiscal policy**: Fiscal policy is the use of government spending and taxation to influence the economy. When the government decides on the goods and services it purchases, the transfer payments it distributes, or the taxes it collects, it is engaging in fiscal policy.

- **Inflation**: Inflation is defined as a sustained increase in the general level of prices for goods and services in a country, and is measured as an annual percentage change. As inflation rises, every unit of money you own buys a smaller percentage of a good or service.

- **Deflation** – as the opposite of inflation – means an increase in the value of money, which would lead to a downwards spiral of less demand and higher unemployment. To prevent deflation, the European Central Bank sets a targeted inflation rate of below but close to 2%. In the euro area, consumer price inflation is measured by the Harmonised Index of Consumer Prices (HICP) to ensure comparability between Member States. The HICP is also used in assessing whether a country is ready to join the euro area.

- **Budget deficit**: The budget deficit is the annual amount the government has to borrow to meet the shortfall between current receipts (taxes) and government spending.
**Balance of payments**: The balance of payments accounts of a country record the payments and receipts of the residents of the country in their transactions with residents of other countries.

**Debt-to-GDP-ratio**: This is the ratio between a country’s total government debt and its annual gross domestic product (GDP). The GDP is the monetary value of all finished goods and services produced within a country’s borders in a specific time period.

**Exchange rate**: It is the price of one currency in terms of another currency. The exchange rate of an economy is directly linked to its ability to export and import goods and services from other countries.

**EU Member States**: All Member States are part of the EMU and coordinate their economic policy-making to support the economic aims of the EU. They set their national budgets within agreed limits for deficit and debt, and determine their own structural policies involving labour, pensions and capital markets.

**Euro area Member States**: The euro area consists of those 19 Member States of the EU that have adopted the euro as their currency. Monetary policy in the euro area is in the hands of the independent Eurosystem, comprising of the European Central Bank (ECB), and the National Central Banks of the euro area Member States. The countries have different economies with different monetary policy needs due to differences in growth rates, fiscal deficits, trade balances, and house prices.

**Euro area citizens**: EU citizens, and especially euro area citizens, enjoy more choice and stable prices through the single currency, working, living and travelling abroad.

**European Central Bank** (ECB): The ECB, which is based in Frankfurt, Germany, sets monetary policy, with price stability as the primary objective, and acts as the central supervisor of financial institutions in the euro area. Price stability is essential for economic growth and job creation – two of the EU’s objectives.
• **National Central Banks (NCBs):** A central bank is a monopolised and often nationalised institution given privileged control over the **production and distribution of money and credit.** In modern economies, the central bank is responsible for the formulation of **monetary policy** and the regulation of member banks. However, in the euro area, the tasks of a central bank are largely managed by the **Eurosystem,** mainly the ECB.

• **Businesses within the euro area:** Businesses are the largest sector of an economy. They contribute to GDP, employment and taxes, enabling the government to provide necessary infrastructure. Euro area businesses, much like euro area citizens, are concerned with the euro area’s economy as a whole.

• **International Monetary Fund (IMF):** The IMF is an organisation of 189 countries, working to foster **global monetary cooperation,** secure **financial stability,** facilitate **international trade,** promote **high employment** and **sustainable economic growth,** and **reduce poverty** around the world. Formally introduced in 1945, the IMF is governed by and accountable to the 189 countries that make up its near-global membership. It was created to avoid a repetition of the competitive devaluations that had contributed to the **Great Depression of the 1930s.** One of its aims is to make resources available (with adequate safeguards) to members **experiencing actual or potential balance of payments difficulties** – it often functions as a **lender of last resort.** It was created alongside the **World Bank,** which focuses on financing and investing in developing countries, as well as eliminating poverty.

**THE PRESIDENT’S TOP TIP**

“Not many topics are as clear-cut as this. The first question that the committee will need to answer is “The Euro, yes or no?” This answer may be different for different countries, but it is only once this is answered that delegates can start to think about making changes to the status quo.”
WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

After the Great Depression in the 1930s and the Second World War, the Bretton Woods system was created in July 1944, in which IMF members agreed to keep their exchange rates pegged to the US dollar, and make it possible for members to exchange US dollars for gold. However, the Bretton Woods system collapsed in 1971 as Fort Knox only contained a third of the gold necessary to cover the amount of dollars in foreign hands.

In 1979, a European rather than a global mechanism for stable exchange rates was introduced to tackle the absence of the Bretton Woods system – the European Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM). It aimed to help Europe to become an area of monetary stability before the introduction of the single currency – the euro. More than a decade later, in 1992, the EMU was launched. It refers to the economic and monetary integration of the 28 Member States of the EU and involves three stages: coordinating economic policy; achieving economic convergence (bringing economic cycles of different Member States broadly in step by also allowing weaker members to catch up); and finally, adopting the euro – the EU’s single currency.
In the years that followed, the euro faced various issues, the biggest one being the Great Recession. In order to strengthen the EMU and to tackle existing challenges, the Five Presidents’ Report: Completing Europe’s Economic and Monetary Union, published in June 2015, laid down a roadmap to deepen the EMU in two stages. Stage 1 (by June 2017) tries to use existing instruments and policies, and wants to strengthen cooperation, while stage 2 (by 2025) aims for far-reaching actions to make the convergence process more binding.

KEY CONFLICTS

Advantages and disadvantages of the euro

The euro provides several economic advantages to citizens and businesses of the EU. Travel is made easier by eliminating the need to exchange money, and more importantly, currency-related risks are removed from trade within the euro area. Additionally, a single currency increases competition between Member States as labour and goods can flow more easily across borders. The EMU has led towards macroeconomic stability and helped decrease government debt and deficits with its convergence criteria.

However, these benefits also come with certain risks. The main element of criticism raised is that the monetary policy of the ECB affects the whole euro area, with Member States having economies with different attributes, be it size, growth, growing/declining sectors, or current macroeconomic challenges. The limitations of the one-size-fits-all monetary policy mean that ‘decisions draw on all available information, including that deriving from national indicators, but they cannot be tailored to the specific needs of a single Member State’ (Lorenzo Bini Smaghi, ECB). An example of this is the macroeconomic stability in Germany that was paired with an excessive burst of property bubbles in Spain and Ireland, with property prices falling by 20% and 35% respectively during the crisis. With the bubble growing in Spain until 2008, investments kept rising and would have required monetary policy intervention to raise the interest rate in order to prevent people from taking out loans to make investments; on the other hand, in Germany a higher interest rate would have led to declining investments thus unnecessarily harming a stable economy.
Let’s talk Greece

The Great Recession hit Europe as a whole, but while most countries managed to recover, euro area member Greece faced a sovereign debt crisis in the aftermath of the global crisis. The issue was that devaluing the currency (euro) was not possible and a debt cut would be a violation of the Treaty of Lisbon. Exiting the euro also seemed like a suboptimal turn as there had not been many successful examples of a sovereign reintroduction of a currency for the sole purpose of devaluing it.

What followed instead were painful austerity measures to reduce Greece’s debt, which currently stands at 179 percent of its GDP. This resulted in cuts to pensions and benefits for Greek citizens, as well as efforts to increase the number of citizens who pay taxes. But the measures hit hard: unemployment is currently at 23.5 percent, and the economy has shrunk by a fifth since the financial crisis. After cuts and bailouts in the past years, criticism about admitting Greece to the euro area in the first place was raised.
ECON

Options
There are several directions the future of the EMU could take. The Five Presidents Report calls for a “completion of the EMU”, meaning stronger cooperation – also in fiscal decisions. Another option would also be a change in the ECB’s monetary policy to allow for a falling euro to combat ultra-low interest rates. A split of the euro area with using a “flexible-euro” system, with, for example, a strong northern euro and softer southern euro, is argued to allow for more macroeconomic flexibility. The aforementioned ideas are just a few of the possible scenarios for the future of the euro.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

- How can future crises within the euro area be prevented?
- Is the monetary policy of the ECB in its current state flexible and effective enough to remain globally competitive and allow the euro area as a whole to grow?
- How to (best) achieve solid growth in all euro area members?
- Should the euro area keep its current size and composition of countries or should it be limited down or enlarged in the future?
- Is there a future for the euro as a common currency or should alternatives be sought?
“Clean air and water, and a livable climate are inalienable human rights. And solving this crisis is not a question of politics. It is our moral obligation.”
– Leonardo Di Caprio, UN Messenger of Peace

Solution not pollution: Given that the Air Quality in Europe 2016 Report highlights that 21 out of 28 Member States are falling short of EU targets despite the adoption of the Clean Air Policy Package in 2013, what further steps should the EU take in order to ensure the right to clean air is protected for all its citizens?
Air is necessary for life; good air quality is necessary for a good quality of life. In the EU, 400,000 people die prematurely due to air pollution; this is more than 10 times the toll of road traffic accidents. Studies have identified four common air pollutants: particulate matter (PM), ozone (O₃), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and sulfur dioxide (SO₂). All of these pollutants are responsible for major health issues such as cardiovascular diseases and respiratory failure. Moreover these pollutants have a negative impact on the environment by contributing to climate change, through the depletion of the ozone layer and by being the direct cause of acid rain and eutrophication.

Air pollution is the biggest environmental health crisis we face and reducing it is the responsibility of global and European governance.

Within the EU, the lack of air safety was denounced by the 2016 Report on Air Quality, issued by the European Environmental Agency (EEA). On 15th February 2017, the European Commission sent final warnings to Germany, France, Spain, Italy and the UK for air pollution breaches. EU legislation on ambient air quality (Directive 2008/50/EC) sets limit values for air pollutants, including nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). In case such limit values are exceeded, Member States are required to adopt and implement air quality plans that set out appropriate measures to bring this situation to an end as soon as possible. Ongoing infringement resulted in the European Commission’s final warning: if Member States fail to act within two months, the European Commission may decide to take the matter to the ECJ.

By Stella Benfatto (FR)
Nevertheless, safe air is not only the responsibility of public authorities. Individuals, industries and farmers also have a role to play in when it comes to the aim for cleaner air. Although causes of air pollution are numerous, everyone can make a difference through greener practices in transport, energy, industry and agriculture.

**KEY TERMS**

- **Pollution**: As defined by the Oxford Dictionary, pollution is the presence in, or introduction into, the environment of a substance which has harmful or poisonous effects. More precisely, air pollution occurs when pollutants contaminate air; which brings about changes that affect our normal lifestyles adversely.

- **Ambient pollution**: This refers to outdoor pollution, it is the result of many different causes: technological, biological and human activities.

- **Household pollution**: This refers to indoor pollution. Indoor air pollution is largely the result of human activity, such as tobacco smoking, burning fuel for heat or cooking, the use of cleaning materials and solvents, and even breathing.

- **Air pollutants**: As defined by the World Health Organisation (WHO), these are a substances that may be chemical, physical or biological and that are harmful for the atmosphere. Some of these occur naturally, others are man-made.

- **Air quality**: As defined by the Oxford Dictionary, this term refers to the degree to which the air in a particular place is pollution-free. Generally it refers to air standards which allow the population to live under healthy conditions.

- **Urban planning**: As defined by the Encyclopedia Britannica, this refers to the process of designing and regulating the uses of space that focus on the physical form, economic functions, and social impact of the urban environment and on the location of different activities within it.
• **Carbon footprint:** This term is generally used to describe the level of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions produced by a specific activity. This activity can result from any human activities (transportation, agriculture, households, industries, etc.).

• **Precautionary principle:** This aims at ensuring a higher level of environmental protection through preventative decision-taking in the case of risk. The principle is stated by Article 191 of the TFEU.

### KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

• **The World Health Organisation (WHO):** The authority responsible for public health within the United Nations system. The [WHO Regional Office for Europe](https://www.euro.who.int/en) (WHO/Europe) is one of WHO’s six regional offices around the world. It serves the WHO European Region. It tackles air quality issues and their impact on health.

• **The European Environmental Agency (EEA):** An EU agency whose task is to provide sound and independent information on the environment. It is a major information source for those involved in developing, adopting, implementing and evaluating environmental policy, and also for the general public.

• **National Governments:** Environment and Public Health is a shared competence of the EU, and therefore national governments hold the prerogative to act and legislate in these domains. They also have the power to tackle issues concerning power supply.

• **Local Governments:** These are local authorities of a defined territory or town, such as federal, regional councils, municipalities, etc. These authorities may have more or less delegated power to adopt policies applying to their area of competence. They control and organise services they provide to the local population. They usually have significant information and data to better understand the needs of the population and the issues of the territory, especially when it comes to air quality.
• **The Industrial Sector**: the industrial goods sector is a category of stocks that relates to producing goods used in construction and manufacturing. It includes companies involved with aerospace and defense, industrial machinery, tools, lumber production, construction, waste management, manufactured housing, cement and metal fabrication. With the agricultural sector, it is one of the primary sources of air pollution.

• **The Agricultural Sector**: This sector includes farming, cultivation of the soil for the growing of crops and the rearing of animals to provide food, wool, and other products to the society.

• **Household**: All persons living under one roof or occupying a separate housing unit. Individuals have a key role to play concerning indoor air pollution, by changing their behaviour and habits. They can also contribute to reducing outdoor air pollution by taking part in local initiatives and choosing green transport to limit their carbon footprint.

**WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?**

On 4th November 2016, the [Paris Agreement](#) entered into force. In this document, governments agreed on the need for global emissions to peak as soon as possible. The EU, one of 144 parties, has ratified the agreement.

The [WHO air quality guidelines](#) provide an important legal framework in this area and are designed to offer direction in reducing the impact that air pollution has on our health. The WHO has also defined a partnership with the [Climate & Clean Air Coalition](#) and the UNEP to establish the [BreatheLife global campaign](#) aiming to mobilise cities and individuals to protect our health and our planet from the effects of air pollution.

The EEA and the European Commission’s actions were merged in the [Clean Air Policy Package](#). This package addresses Member States and outlines one major directive: [Directive 2008/50/EC](#) on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe.
In 2008, the European Union Court of Justice (ECJ) contributed to the debate with its Dieter Janecek v Freistaat Bayern judgment. It recognises, under the Air Quality Directive (96/62/EC), that individual citizens have the right to require national authorities to draw up a short term action plan with the aim of maintaining or achieving compliance with the air quality limit values. Further actions and monitoring of air quality progress have been settled by EEA.

Finally, interesting national and local measures in various countries have been initiated to reduce emissions and citizens’ carbon footprint. For example, London’s local and city-wide governments have been carrying out various trials and initiatives to “clear the air” such as hybrid engines or increasing Euro emissions standards. Finally, the BetterPoints smartphone application, which was designed for citizens, has been introduced in large parts of the UK and in Bologna, Italy. It encourages individuals to use eco-friendly transport methods such as walking, cycling or taking public transport and car sharing.

KEY CONFLICTS

When considering economic interests, environmental standards are sometimes depicted as detrimental or as an obstacle to a flourishing economy, despite the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development Rio+20 declaring that States should aim for a national green-economy.

Nevertheless, the market impact of outdoor air pollution is projected to lead to substantial annual global welfare costs and significant economic costs, which are illustrated at regional and sectoral levels. Outdoor air pollution is projected to lead to global economic costs that gradually increase to 1% of global GDP by 2060. Thus, unless more stringent policies are adopted, findings point to a significant increase in global emissions and concentrations of air pollutants, with severe impact on human health and the environment. Stringent measures and concrete actions can only be supported through political and financial engagement. Unfortunately, a serious lack of interest in environmental issues by investors and politicians has been slowing down the process of combatting air pollution.

From a technological standpoint, carbon emissions in power generation and transportation are a major cause of outdoor pollution. The combustion of fossil fuels like coal, petroleum and other factory combusibles is the first source of air pollutants. A transition to green energy still requires research and development, in order to fulfil the power demand of the population. The critical question when it comes to power transition is whether renewable energies may be sufficient to comply with current energy needs.
From a technological standpoint, **carbon emissions** in power generation and transportation are a major cause of outdoor pollution. The **combustion of fossil fuels** like coal, petroleum and other factory combustibles is the first source of air pollutants. **A transition to green energy** still requires research and development, in order to fulfil the power demand of the population. The critical question when it comes to power transition is whether renewable energies may be sufficient to comply with **current energy needs**.

Implementation of eco-friendly transportation relies on a thorough urban planning process. **Green urban planning** is slowly developing throughout European countries. However, the gap in air quality standards between Member States emphasises the key role that local governments play in deciding whether to make the necessary human, technical and economic investment in order to develop urban planning.

Nevertheless, human activities, especially **agricultural practices**, can also be a significant contributing factor. The main sources of pollution are the burning of **agricultural waste**, crops in the field and intensive livestock farming. Furthermore, during **mining operations**, dust and chemicals are released in the air causing air pollution. This is one of the reasons which is responsible for the deteriorating health conditions of workers and nearby residents.

Furthermore, recent studies indicate that some harmful air pollutants can exist in **higher concentrations in indoor** spaces than outdoors. Indoor air pollution is largely the result of human activity, such as tobacco smoking, burning fuel for heat or cooking, the use of cleaning materials and solvents, and even breathing. Thus, reducing indoor pollution strongly depends on individuals’ behaviour and chemicals industry.

**THE PRESIDENT’S TOP TIP**

“Yes, the planet got destroyed. But for a beautiful moment in time, we created a lot of value for our shareholders.” And herein lies the eternal question for the committee, how can we balance our financial desires while protecting our planet and ourselves?”
Taking the above into consideration, air pollution is a technological, urban, agricultural and human challenge. The EU and global governance has provided Member States, industries, farmers and citizens with policies and guidelines but it seems that national and local actors still struggle or refuse to comply with these standards. However, national and local communities have a key role to play when it comes to rethinking their urban and infrastructural organisation.
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

• Realising that air quality is deteriorating and that current measures are neither adapted, nor sufficient to reduce air pollution, what should be the steps to either fight air pollution or build resilience to it?
• How could the rapid development of renewable energies and sustainable fuels be a strength in the process of tackling air pollution?
• How can the EU balance the need for economic growth while fulfilling its commitment to environmental targets?
• Identify examples of sustainable urban planning which could be implemented further in order to improve air quality.
• If you could individually take action to reduce air pollution, what would you change in your everyday life and how could this have an impact on your environment?
“[Feminism is] equality: politically; culturally; socially; economically. That’s it, that simple.”
– Emma Watson, The UN Women Goodwill Ambassador

Girls just wanna have fundamental rights: Given that economic and societal inequality remains between men and women despite legislative measures and promotional work, what further steps can the EU take to reach gender equality in the workplace?
Gender equality became an important focus for the EU when The Treaty of Amsterdam was signed in 1997, introducing the concept of gender mainstreaming along with stressing the incorporation of a ‘gender dimension’ into all EU policies and institutions.

The example of a female nurse being paid less than her male counterpart, despite similar skills and tasks, demonstrates how the gender pay gap (GPG) works. It also touches on gender bias in the setting of wages by employers in which certain fields that were identified as ‘feminine’ may be influenced based on ‘assessing the value of the work that women do’. Moreover, it highlights occupational segregation in which a nurse is more likely to hit a glass-ceiling throughout, and at an earlier stage of her career than the male counterpart.

The gap in the workforce between men and women remains rooted within societal and legislative flaws. Despite new, active legislation such as the Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality 2016-2019 creating a common policy for all Member States, and the Equality and Citizenship Programme 2014-2020, the facts remain: there are more men in administrative positions than women; there is more gender concentration in certain sectors; a large unadjusted gender pay gap still exists; and phenomena such as the glass ceiling remain prevalent in the labour market.
KEY TERMS

- **Gender Pay Gap**: The gender pay gap is the difference between men’s and women’s pay, based on the average difference in gross hourly earnings of all employees.

- **Glass Ceiling**: This refers to a barrier within a hierarchy that prevents women or minorities from obtaining upper-level positions.

- **Gender Mainstreaming**: This strategy towards implementing gender equality involves the integration of a gender perspective into the preparation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies, regulatory measures and spending programmes, with a view to promoting equality between women and men, and combating discrimination.

- **Occupational Segregation**: This term refers to unequal distribution of people across and within occupations and jobs, based upon demographic characteristics, most often gender. Occupational segregation levels range on a scale from **perfect segregation** to **integration**.

- **Gender Stereotypes**: Traditional gender roles and stereotypes continue to have a strong influence on the division of roles between women and men in the home, in the workplace and in society at large, with women depicted as running the house and caring for children while men are depicted as wage-earners and protectors.
KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

- **European Commission**: As one of the key EU institutions, the Commission provides active support and strategies (such as the *Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality 2016-2019* and *Strategy of equal pay between women and men 2010-2015*) for all Member States regarding gender equality. Gender equality is a shared competence between the EU and Member States.

- **Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men**: Comprising of Member State representatives, EU-level partners and NGOs, the Committee assists the European Commission in formulating and implementing EU activities aimed at promoting equality between women and men.

- **Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality 2016-2019**: This action plan is the European Commission’s strategy for equality between men and women, providing a coherent framework for gender mainstreaming and gender equality policies in Member States based on an evaluation of the 2010-2015 strategy as well as public consultations.

- **Directorate General for Justice and Consumers of the European Commission (DG JUST)**: This is the body responsible for implementing the European Commission’s ‘*Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality*’.

- **European Institute for Gender Equality**: This is an autonomous body of the EU, established to raise EU citizens’ awareness on gender equality as well as to contribute to and strengthen the promotion of gender equality, including gender mainstreaming in all EU policies and the resulting national policies, and the fight against discrimination based on gender.

- **Strategy of equal pay between women and men 2010-2015**: This strategy, proposed by the European Commission, analyses the different aspects that come into play regarding equal pay.
“Even when I was a delegate, some 10 years ago, we were discussing gender equality in the workplace. A decade on, society is facing similar problems, despite countless efforts to bridge the gap. Your job, delegates, is to identify why these measures haven’t solved the problem and then to propose solutions which you think will.”
More recently, the EPSCO Council highlighted the importance of ‘equal economic independence for women and men; equal pay for work of equal value; equality in decision-making; dignity, integrity and ending gender-based violence; and promoting gender equality beyond the EU.

Many Member States have adopted policies to work towards achieving gender equality in their respective countries. Some, such as Finland, Lithuania, Estonia, Austria and Luxembourg have put action plans into place which aim to promote equality between genders, combat gender-based discrimination and overcome pay inequality, along with requiring salary reports from companies.

The European Equal Pay Day is an annual event to raise awareness that the wage gap between women and men still exists. On 8th March 2017 (International Women’s Day), Iceland became the first country in the world to prove that they pay employees the same, regardless of gender.
The way our societies are structured with the values we take up from our social environment play a large role in the decisions we make in life (the ‘looking-glass self’ - Cooley, 1902 and ‘the I and Me’ - Mead, 1934). Some of these decisions are also based on stereotypes which are imposed on us about what our gender ‘is naturally best at’. Such stereotypes go so far that women in senior positions in ‘feminine’ jobs are paid less than women in senior positions in ‘masculine’ jobs (STEM) along with the fact that women are still heavily underrepresented in leadership positions in companies across Europe.

Such labels lead us to the relevance of yet another societal problem - women being the main caregivers of a family. A partial reason for the gender pay gap is that some women don’t earn as much because they can’t work as much. Very few men take parental leave or work part-time to support their family as opposed to a majority of women doing so.

Maternity and paternity leave have been a part of Member States’ and EU regulations, since becoming stricter and more specific over the past few decades. The most pressing issues now seem to be the societal gender stereotypes that prevent men from taking paternity leave, and the right for parental leave not being consistent across Member States, which leads to many people - especially women - losing their jobs after taking parental leave.

To understand why there hasn’t been much change in the position of women in the workplace despite many attempts, it is also important to consider that Member States have been rather reluctant in accepting supranational policymaking from the EU. It is not only governments that are involved in the making and implementation of social policy but also employers, trade unions and other public or private employers. As a result, proposals for policy change are difficult to put through due to the range of different positions and personal interests that these external actors take. The institutional dynamics within the EU, domestic policies of Member States and, most importantly, multiple actors at different levels of governance are all important to consider when thinking of gender equality policy.
States can get pressure from supranational bodies (e.g. the European Commission and the European Court of Justice) as well as national-level actors (e.g. national courts and different political parties).

The limited effectiveness of existing legislation can further be considered by looking at Article 23 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights which shows its support for gender equality in the workplace. However, it is not a directly effective measure like Article 141 as it does not include ‘any positive obligation to promote gender equality’. Furthermore, Article II-81.1 which ‘prohibits discrimination on several grounds including sex’ is not as supportive of the issue at hand due to it being subject to a unanimous vote in the European Parliament. This leads to making agreements on proposals regarding the gender pay gap harder to achieve, along with giving the Parliament a weaker decision-making role on the matter.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

• What factors are currently prohibiting gender equality in the workplace?
• Considering all the legislation in place, how can the EU further ensure the implementation of gender equality principles in national social policies?
• How can we adjust women’s access to the labour market to avoid them hitting the ‘glass-ceiling’?
• How can societal change be brought on to combat occupational segregation?
• How can existing legislation and institutional structures be reconsidered in order to ensure that gender mainstreaming and the enforcement of fundamental rights are carried out most effectively?
• What examples of existing good practice of gender equality legislation in the workplace should the EU keep in mind in order to implement more efficient regulations?
“The collaborative economy is an opportunity for consumers, entrepreneurs and businesses – provided we get it right.”

– Elżbieta Bieńkowska, Commissioner for Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs

Sharing is caring: With the collaborative business model firmly establishing itself in European markets, accompanied by concerns over the protection of consumers and providers alike, what stance should the EU take in regulating this new economy?
The collaborative economy is revolutionising traditional business models with innovative and unique approaches. Using the comfort of the internet to connect citizens with each other, people no longer need to own belongings to fulfill their needs – they rent what they need from collaborative platforms, for cheaper prices and with more convenience.

With traditional businesses failing to find solutions to existing problems in their areas, public demand has been very high, particularly among young people, for the innovative collaborative economy models. Sharing platforms have grown exponentially in the last five years, reaching more people every year and generating higher revenues. With such a shift in how businesses operate, it is no surprise that the implementation and regulation of this change has come with its own problems and controversies. There are concerns over the protection of consumers, taxation, service providers’ rights and unfair competition with traditional businesses. On the other hand, there are also disadvantages of regulations, such as increased bureaucracy or the possibility of curbing innovation by over-regulating.

It is an important task for the European Union to balance the interests of all stakeholders here, as they regulate this area of the economy in a way which would be beneficial for users, service providers and fair competition in the market. Bearing in mind the innovative approach of this new sector, it is important to regulate intelligently and balance the conflicting interests.
The collaborative economy (i.e. the sharing economy): According to the European Commission communication, the collaborative economy ‘refers to business models where activities are facilitated by collaborative platforms that create an open marketplace for the temporary usage of goods or services often provided by private individuals.’

- **Collaborative platforms**: These platforms act as a middleman between service providers and users, and facilitate the transactions between them while also receiving a service fee.
- **Service providers**: These are the people who are on the supply side of a collaborative economy scheme. They share assets (i.e. a room in their house) or services (i.e. driving a car) through collaborative platforms.
- **Users**: Users are on the receiving end of the sharing economy model. They request certain services or assets through the online collaborative platforms and pay for the service both to the platform and the service providers.
IMCO

THE PRESIDENT’S TOP TIP

“I am delighted that your chairperson is a trainee lawyer! To regulate or not to regulate, that is the question. Or more accurately, how do we regulate? There is a fine line between under-regulation and over-regulation and your aim, as a committee, is to find the middle ground in this debate.”

KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

• **Collaborative platforms:** They are the most influential stakeholder in this topic. They generate billions of euros in revenues and create their terms of service, which set the rules for both the users and the service providers.

• **Traditional businesses:** These are the companies with conventional business models affected by the services offered by collaborative platforms in a sharing economy scheme.

• **Service providers:** They are directly affected by the decisions taken by both the regulators and collaborative platforms.

• **Citizens:** There is a large demand from the citizens for collaborative platforms. Large companies like Uber or Airbnb get their economic power through their users; so it is fair to assume that their own users can have a large influence on the platforms’ and regulators’ decisions.

• **Legislators:** There are many different levels of legislative bodies that have power to regulate this area. Governance of transportation and accommodation sectors is quite local, thus city councils have their own regulations on deciding the legal framework around collaborative platforms; whereas state-level legislation and EU decisions are also very influential to maintain fair competition in the market.
Lacking specific legislation to regulate the collaborative economy, the main discord on collaborative platforms has been regarding the interpretations of already existing legislation by national courts. Also, Hungary and Denmark have passed legislation which would stop Uber’s services in their respective countries. Rulings from local courts have affected the services that are offered by said companies in Germany, Bulgaria, Italy, Belgium and Portugal between 2013 and 2017.

The legal skirmish is technical and complicated. There are disputes around the classification of what kind of companies collaborative platforms are, in order to determine which laws should apply on them. The European Court of Justice delivered an opinion regarding the classification of Uber, which stated that under the current legislation, Uber is a ‘transport service’.

Deliveroo is a collaborative platform through which users can order food from different restaurants, and service providers deliver the food by cycling. The platform was planning on reforming their payment structure by reducing the delivery payments to the riders. This resulted in weeks-long strike by the service providers. The protest was successful and as a result, company announced that they will not force this new payment structure on their service providers.

There are reports on different collaborative platforms, such as Handy, Deliveroo, Uber or AirBnb, about complaints on unpredictable working hours, being subjected to verbal abuse or lack of dispute settlement mechanisms between users and service providers. Collective action in order to find solutions to such problems has been useful for Deliveroo couriers, and this could be an example on how to solve similar issues.

The European Commission is aware of the need of a unified approach by Member States on creating these regulations. It should not be forgotten that companies like Uber and Airbnb, having an estimated value of close to $100bn, are effective in lobbying and campaigning against any legislation that is brought up which might affect their work.
Having seen the rapid growth of the shared economy, there are debates on regulating how these companies should provide their services. The main focus of legislation is to be on consumer protection, competition rules and liability.

- Consumer Protection

One of the main areas of regulations of traditional business models is about consumer protection. For example; if a person decided to be a taxi driver, he/she would need to go through driver trainings, get a taxi license and have regular checks on the safety of their automobile. Yet, being an Uber driver is more simple than going through the aforementioned procedures. Furthermore, the application of consumer protection regulations of the EU on the collaborative economy is also disputed; depending on the legal interpretations of the terms ‘consumer’, ‘seller’ and ‘producer’. There have also been complaints of discrimination by service providers towards users. Airbnb has introduced a new non-discrimination policy to address such concerns.

Collaborative economy platforms can create problems for the people living in the cities they operate in. With large public demand by tourists for Airbnb short-term rentals, property owners started listing their properties on Airbnb instead of renting them to locals looking for a house; resulting in building onto the existing housing shortages in cities like Berlin or Barcelona.
Competition rules

Some critics claim that collaborative platforms violate competition laws. For example, while a taxi license in Paris costs around €160,000, if one wants to be an Uber driver and has a car, in most cases the only further requirement is a special type of driver’s license which costs less than €1,000. Whereas Uber claims that they are not a taxi company but an information society service operator, critics claim that the service that they give is exactly the same as taxis. As several Member States have restricted Uber’s operations for these reasons, the company has filed complaints with the European Commission against France, Germany, and Spain alleging that they are in violation of article 49 (freedom of establishment) and article 56 (freedom to provide services) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU).

Traditional companies had failed to innovate accordingly to the needs of their consumers, and they are thus losing them to collaborative economy platforms. As a result, there have been large-scale protests in large European cities by taxi drivers which claimed that Uber was stealing their users.

There is also competition between collaborative economy platforms. Successful platforms such as Uber or Airbnb have tried to create a monopoly on the services they offer. If you are an Uber driver, your customers rate you through the app and thus you build yourself a reputation; yet if you want to change platforms, you can not take the reputation you earned with you. Moreover, there have been reports claiming that Uber has been using a secret program to avoid being caught by government authorities where Uber’s legality is disputed.

Liability issues

Sharing economy platforms mostly work on contract-basis with their service providers. The service providers are not employees of the company, but rather contractors. This results in many legal complications: service providers need to insure themselves and although collaborative platforms are making large sums of money through these providers, all the legal liability rests on the service providers.
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

- How can fair competition be ensured in the European market with regards to traditional businesses and collaborative platforms?
- How can the EU protect the rights of consumers who use collaborative platforms to meet their needs?
- How should the rights and duties of the service providers and collaborative platforms be shared between them?
- How can the EU make sure that their regulations will not make innovative companies leave the EU market?
“It is change, continuing change, inevitable change, that is the dominant factor in society today. No sensible decision can be made any longer without taking into account not only the world as it is, but the world as it will be.”

– Isaac Asimov, Professor of Biochemistry and writer of science fiction

Welcome to the future: With self-driving cars looking set to become reality on European roads due to rapid advancements in autonomous technologies, how should the EU regulate this new industry, and what precedent should it set for future legislation on robotics?
Welcome to the world of driverless vehicles. **Autonomous driving** (self-driving) cars, once just a dream of science fiction, are becoming reality. Although not commercially available, autonomous vehicles are now months, rather than years away. Autonomous driving offers many advantages: greater convenience, less stress, lower fuel consumption and the potential to further improve road safety. However, there are certain technological and legal questions that need to be answered for it to become reality.

Technological developments have put pressure on governments to make regulatory changes permitting **on-road testing of autonomous vehicles**. In February 2017, a self-driving Nissan car took to the streets of London for the first European tests of an autonomous vehicle. Ford aims to have its fully autonomous cars on the road by 2021. Being an innovation on a global scale, this technology is fraught with legal challenges as well as the lack of uniform regulation nationally and internationally. Authorities will have to adapt existing rules and create new ones in order to ensure the full compatibility of these vehicles with the public’s expectations regarding safety, legal responsibility and privacy.
KEY TERMS

- **Autonomous vehicle (self-driving car, driverless car):** A fully automated vehicle equipped with the technologies capable to perform all driving functions without any human intervention.

- **Automated vehicle:** A motor vehicle which has the technology to assist the driver so that elements of the driving task can be transferred to a computer system.

- **Intelligent transportation system (ITS):** ITS are advanced applications which aim to make transport safer, more efficient and more sustainable by applying various information and communication technologies. European Commission aims to make more use of ITS solutions to achieve more efficient management of the transport network for passengers and business.

- **Artificial intelligence:** This is the simulation of human intelligence processes by machines, especially computer systems. These processes include learning (the acquisition of information and rules for using the information), reasoning (using the rules to reach approximate or definite conclusions), and self-correction.
KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

- **European Commission**: Every piece of legislation (recommendation, directive, regulation) in the EU needs to be proposed by the European Commission (right of initiative).

- **Member States**: Despite the EU’s efforts to harmonise the regulation of automated vehicles on European roads, many of the EU Member States have begun proactively assessing their current regulations and legislation to determine what additions or modifications are needed to account for automated vehicles on their public roads.

- **World Forum for Harmonisation of Vehicle Regulations (WP.29)**: This is a permanent intergovernmental body, responsible for the harmonisation of technical vehicle requirements. The regulatory framework developed by the WP.29 allows the market introduction of innovative vehicle technologies, while continuously improving global vehicle safety.

- **Transportation stakeholders**: These include vehicle manufacturers, international organisations responsible for transport policies or road vehicle roadworthiness and infrastructure safety, as well as insurance companies.

- **Scientists and academics**: They develop the science and technology that can be used for industrial applications. These new technologies must be checked for efficacy, safety and applicability before being considered for commercial, cost-effective use.

THE PRESIDENT’S TOP TIP

“This resolution will need to propose legislation to help regulate new markets. But one can only propose new legislation if you know what legislation is already in place. Knowledge is power in this regard so follow Dobile’s links and know your beans!”
On an international scale, The Vienna Convention on Road Traffic 1968, a treaty ratified by 73 countries worldwide, is one of the most important sources of legislation. It contains provisions on the behavior of drivers as well as general licensing requirements for cars. Article 8 of the 1968 Convention stipulates that: “Every driver shall at all times be able to control his vehicle.” In 2016, this Convention was amended to promote vehicle automation and technological development. However, even the amended treaty stipulates the need for a driver. For this reason, a working group within the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) is already elaborating on a further update to the Vienna Convention to enable the use of driverless systems in the future.

On an EU level, the European Commission has long been aware of the growing importance of intelligent transportation systems, adopting an Action Plan in 2008 for the development of harmonised standards for implementing ITS. Various directives (such as Approval of Motor Vehicles or Intelligent Transport Systems directives) have been implemented to give the European Commission the power to adopt the necessary regulatory provisions for automated traffic systems and vehicles, and various initiatives (such as pilot platform for automated road transport systems or automated driving applications for autonomous vehicles) aimed at conducting research on the impact of automated technologies. In addition, the High-Level Group for the automotive industry - GEAR 2030 initiative - was established by the European Commission to address the challenges and the opportunities that the European automotive industry will face in the next 15 years. However, a coherent approach towards the industrial deployment of connected (a car that is equipped with internet access, and usually also with a wireless local area network) and automated vehicles is still missing, which is thus individually addressed by the legal systems of the Member States (Sweden, Germany and the Netherlands let BMW, Volvo and their competitors test new inventions in safe environments).
Legal framework for road safety: regulation of automated vehicles faces challenges in establishing rules for technologies not yet applied. **Autonomous vehicle regulation** should ensure safety and prevent, or at least mitigate, market failures. While desirable, early regulatory action carries risks as well. Prematurely **codifying** requirements can freeze unrealistic expectations – high or low – into the law in a way that causes the **legal framework** to lag rather than to lead. In addition, it has to be decided how the safety of automated vehicles should be tested and by whom. The further development of vehicle automation will demand an adaption of driving education and licensing.

Infrastructure and technical standards: an **automated vehicle**, like a human, must collect information, make a decision based on that information, and execute that decision. The move towards autonomous driving may involve different technological configurations and employment of **artificial intelligence**. Some rely on greater **connectivity among cars and between cars and infrastructure** (how cars exchange data with manufacturers, traffic controllers, emergency services). These entail the development of common communication protocols, encrypted security standards and investment in new types of infrastructure or upgrading those which currently exist. Others rely more on vehicle-embarked sensor platforms and require little infrastructure investment. Both models require precise digital representations of their environment, including **high definition maps**.
Big data analytics – moral dilemmas: the new technologies raise questions as to how data privacy and cyber security will be addressed. The programmed algorithms will make decisions in conflicting situations, such as a choice between two unavoidable crash scenarios. The algorithms that control autonomous vehicles will “need to embed moral principles guiding their decisions in situations of unavoidable harm” according to the researchers at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and France’s Toulouse School of Economics. The researchers concluded that if lawmakers were to prioritise pedestrians over passengers when regulating self-driving vehicles, people would be less likely to buy those vehicles. It’s an extremely valid concern, and raises a huge ethical issue. In the rare circumstance that the car has to choose the “best” outcome — what will determine that? How will the decision be taken and what ‘best driving behaviour’ should be reflected by the system?

Liability issues: road safety is expected to significantly improve as automated vehicles should reduce accidents due to human errors. However, in case of malfunction of an automated vehicle (the first fatal Tesla accident involving a semi-autonomous car in May 2016 sparked concerns over driverless car safety and raised the issue of liability), autonomous cars shift the responsibility of driving from humans to autonomous car technology, which raises a need for existing liability laws to evolve in order to fairly identify the appropriate remedies for damage and injury. While for current tests, liability lies solely with manufacturers, it is more difficult to say who will be liable when private automated vehicles are allowed to circulate on public infrastructure. Therefore, should the owner be held responsible for something that might have been the fault of the car’s programming?
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

• Which should be privileged: uniform or flexible regulation of driverless cars across multiple jurisdictions in the EU?
• Should the EU emphasise ex ante (forward-looking rules, provide more certainty but less flexibility) or ex post (backward-looking measures provide more flexibility but less certainty) rules of civil liability?
• How can the EU’s legislation on self-driving cars affect other areas of autonomous technologies?
• What are the perspectives and challenges of vehicle automation?
“Fake news is harming people and spreading hate. It is short-circuiting democracy.”

– Laura Boldrini, former spokesperson for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Believe it or not: Given the recent surge in fake news and with the establishment of the East StratCom Task Force, what further steps can the EU take to protect the freedom of information of its citizens?
Mark Twain is famously cited as having said:
‘A lie can travel halfway around the world while the truth is putting on its shoes.’

There is little to indicate that Twain coined the phrase - ironically, proving the point. The rise of fake news has been dramatic, impacting many recent contentious political events, such as the United States’ presidential election and the Brexit referendum. However, we are not the first generation to deal with fake news; yellow journalism, emphasising sensationalism over facts, is often cited as a factor behind the Spanish-American war of 1898. But while the phenomenon of fake news is not something created by the internet and social media, it has been significantly exacerbated by them, as ability to share things on social media largely contributes to the fast spread of fake news across the social platforms. Expecting everyone to fact-check all their news is not a feasible solution. Further, political news are often subject to the reader’s’ preconceived bias.

Fake news is often created and propagated by websites lacking journalistic integrity in an attempt to lure more viewers through shocking headlines - giving birth to the term clickbait. However, even journalists with professional integrity will sometimes inadvertently propagate falsehoods by citing other articles without thoroughly reviewing the original sources first, giving rise to circulatory reporting. With media consumers valuing swiftness over accuracy, hard facts are often difficult to ascertain during developing events. To complicate matters, the issue of fake news goes beyond poor journalism; fake news is often used as a tool by foreign state and domestic actors in order to shape public opinion and national or international policy.
• **Fake news**: A broad term that can be used to refer to a wide range of different types of mis- and dis-information (see attached picture and hyperlink for an example of classification).

• **Yellow journalism**: Journalism that exploits, distorts, or exaggerates the news to create sensations, with the purpose of generating more sales and ad revenue.

• **Clickbait**: Articles that have overly sensationalist headlines or intentionally withholds information that is necessary to understand the content. Their purpose is to catch the reader’s attention and make them click the article, generating advertising revenue.

• **Circular reporting**: Circular reporting is when one source published false information, and another source publishes the same information by referencing the previous source. In effect, false information can appear to be validated by multiple sources despite not being accurate.

• **Influence activities (information campaigns)**: These are attempts to shape public, media, and political discourse. It is the systematic application of information campaigns to weaken a country’s political, economic, social, cultural, scientific, technological and military structures in order to force contextual or behavioural change. A contextual change means influencing or changing the government or regime itself, through influencing elections or negotiations; whereas a behavioural change is a push to affect specific policies by influencing the media and public discourse.
KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

- **Media consumers**: Citizens are the consumers of media, and so hold the power to decide which news they want to engage with and which they do not. Through social media, they can further influence which articles are given attention by sharing them. They will generally engage with content that confirms or firmly clashes with their bias.

- **Mainstream media outlets**: Large mass news organisations that reflect and shape society’s ideas on a wide scale. With professional journalists adhering to journalistic codes of ethics, they generally seek to provide both accurate reporting and succinct analysis, with a clear distinction between the two.

- **European External Action Service (EEAS)**: This is the European Union’s diplomatic service. It serves under the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and is the department with the competency to take European-level action to combat foreign information campaigns.

- **NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence (NATO StratCom COE)**: An organisation that became operational in 2014. Based in Riga, its purpose is to ‘provide comprehensive analyses, timely advice and practical support to the Alliance.’ It works to counteract information campaigns, primarily from Russia, and has large studies and reports on disinformation activities available to the public.

"A key question to consider here is “who’s job is it to regulate in this field?” If the internet is borderless, how can the EU protect its citizens from fake news given the speed and distance with which news can travel?”
In 2015, the EEAS launched the East StratCom Task Force, a small team of ten communications experts to counteract anti-EU propaganda and dispel disinformation about the EU in the Eastern Neighbourhood. To that end, they publish the Disinformation Review, a weekly blog to dissect fake news stories in detail. However, the EEAS has been criticised for failing to take the problem seriously enough, and the East StratCom Task Force was referred to as ‘the most token of token efforts’ by Ben Nimmo of the think tank European Values.

NATO StratCom COE was established in 2014, and has since been continuously publishing studies and articles pertaining to the information campaigns carried out by Russia and recruitment campaigns by ISIS/Daesh. They work closely with NATO and its allies to counteract pro-Russian and anti-Western misinformation but, as the details of these activities are classified, few specifics are known.

Some Member States have taken to pressuring social media companies into taking responsibility for the content that is shared on their websites, such as Germany which is threatening Facebook with up to €50 million fines for failing to remove hate speech. Facebook is now working with reputable fact-checking organisations to enable users to flag fake news that are being shared on the website. Google has taken to changing their page-rank algorithm to promote credible sources and enable users to report misleading webpages. Both Google and Facebook have attempted to block the ad revenue of fake news sites.

In November 2016, the British intelligence organisation Government Communications Headquarters recently established a new department - National Cyber Security Centre - that will work to protect the integrity of the British parliamentary democracy.

**WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?**

In 2015, the EEAS launched the East StratCom Task Force, a small team of ten communications experts to counteract anti-EU propaganda and dispel disinformation about the EU in the Eastern Neighbourhood. To that end, they publish the Disinformation Review, a weekly blog to dissect fake news stories in detail. However, the EEAS has been criticised for failing to take the problem seriously enough, and the East StratCom Task Force was referred to as ‘the most token of token efforts’ by Ben Nimmo of the think tank European Values.

NATO StratCom COE was established in 2014, and has since been continuously publishing studies and articles pertaining to the information campaigns carried out by Russia and recruitment campaigns by ISIS/Daesh. They work closely with NATO and its allies to counteract pro-Russian and anti-Western misinformation but, as the details of these activities are classified, few specifics are known.

Some Member States have taken to pressuring social media companies into taking responsibility for the content that is shared on their websites, such as Germany which is threatening Facebook with up to €50 million fines for failing to remove hate speech. Facebook is now working with reputable fact-checking organisations to enable users to flag fake news that are being shared on the website. Google has taken to changing their page-rank algorithm to promote credible sources and enable users to report misleading webpages. Both Google and Facebook have attempted to block the ad revenue of fake news sites.

In November 2016, the British intelligence organisation Government Communications Headquarters recently established a new department - National Cyber Security Centre - that will work to protect the integrity of the British parliamentary democracy.
The Czech Republic similarly launched a unit called Centre Against Terrorism and Hybrid Threats in January 2017 that answers to the Interior Ministry.

Some countries – such as Taiwan and Sweden – are introducing curriculum to teach young students media literacy, including how to identify fake news. In March 2017, the European Audiovisual Observatory released a comprehensive study mapping 547 media literacy projects in the EU, with 145 detailed case studies.

**KEY CONFLICTS**

In a liberal democracy, the media has several key functions to perform, most important of which are to enable the people to make informed democratic choices by clarifying complex issues, to provoke public debates, uncover abuses, enable the expression of political pluralism, and to keep politicians attuned to the people. The EU has a set of policies defending media freedom and pluralism, and each Member State has some form of regulations on the media. With fake news becoming an ever more pressing issue, governments are starting to take action to counteract it. However, leaving governments to regulate the media is not without problems, as overreaching government intervention can severely cripple media freedom, potentially damaging a fundamental institution of modern liberal democracies. Examples such as Hungary and Poland, which have both dropped significantly on the Press Freedom Index, shows that it can be dangerous to place too much regulatory power in the hands of the governments, as it opens up for potential abuse of power and corruption.
While some believe that firm EU action is necessary, the different EU institutions have different stances on whether or not they should interfere with media regulation. A policy report on the subject details several legal frameworks that currently exist and are available to use. However, while the European Parliament is firmly in favour of EU-wide legislation and action on the area, the Commission has thus far been very reluctant to act, instead opting to leave media regulation to the Member States and address issues that appear ad hoc by naming and shaming those who are unable to legislate appropriately.

Additionally, there is a fundamental clash for journalists as they are expected to deliver news both quickly and accurately. As proper investigative journalism takes time, and media consumers look for hourly updates on important events, false information will often start to float around in connection to large news events. While several organisations and governments are approaching the problem by implementing fact-checking resources and dispelling false information, some research indicates that activity on social media is often about signifying membership of a group rather than spreading information or gaining truth. As such, some will knowingly engage in fake news, while others will respond by further sharing these news in outrage. Due to the structure of social media, the content will be rapidly spread across the platform. An example of this is the Syrian refugee that took a selfie with Angela Merkel in 2015, which was surfaced in social media posts falsely linking him to terrorist attacks in Brussels and Berlin.
Various institutions have affirmed that Russia is increasingly taking to influence activities and information campaigns - ranging from spreading disinformation regarding their seizure of Crimea, to now allegedly influencing the United States' presidential election. By using so-called agents of influence - disguised to be an independent journalist, researcher, or writer - they can shape public discourse and opinion. These agents of influence can be extremely difficult to distinguish from actual citizens representing similar views. Attempts to act against them are problematic as it is fundamentally undemocratic to persecute citizens due to their political opinions. However, failing to address these information campaigns can allow a foreign state to gain influence over the national agenda and can cause national instability, as seen in Moldova for example.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

• What are the various forms of fake news?
• What further action can be taken to combat fake news in its various forms?
• Should the media be held accountable for dissemination of fake news? If so, which institution or governmental level should be responsible for controlling this?
• With sensationalist content being more profitable and perfectly adapted to the format of social media, how can thorough and reliable journalism be highlighted and given more room on social media platforms?
• How can the EU and its Member States work to root out foreign agents of influence without limiting the civil liberties of its citizens?
“I am angry that the older generation have selfishly voted for a future that I will have to live with. Young people did not vote for this.”

– Abi Kirkby, a 17 year old voter in the UK referendum on membership in the EU

Millennials – The lost democratic generation: With recent election results failing to represent the majority opinion of 18-29 year olds despite a significant increase in young voter participation, how can the EU tackle increasing disillusionment with politics among young people and foster young voter engagement?
Politically, 2016 was a crucial year for the European Union: the Brexit referendum and the United States’ presidential election results set a new course for Europe’s future. While any democratic result should be undoubtedly respected, post-election statistics revealed how big the generation gap is, especially when it comes to millennials.

The results of the British referendum on its membership of the EU (referred to as the Brexit referendum) showed that 51.9% of voters supported leaving the EU, with 48.1% in favour of remaining. However, when we take a closer look, a staggering 75% of people aged between 18 to 24 voted ‘remain’. When it comes to the US presidential election results, Hillary Clinton obtained a 48% of the voters’ support and Donald Trump, 47%. Yet again, 55% aged between 18 to 29 voted for the Democrats while only 37% backed Donald Trump.

Although it is clear that millennials’ values and opinions differ from older generations, shaping up a different vote, youth turnout in past elections also varies. In the Brexit referendum, according to Michael Brutger form the London School of Economics, only 64% of registered voters aged 18–24 went to the polls, when the national turnout was a 72.2%. A similar picture arises with regards to the US general elections: with a general turnout of 57.9%, only 50% of the people aged between 18–29 took action and expressed their democratic opinion.
The demographics of the EU also play a crucial role in many decisions taken nowadays: only 11.1% of the population is aged between 15-24 (Millennials); 34.1% is between 25-49 (Generation X); and 20.1% is between 50-64 (Baby Boomers). Consequently, generation X and baby boomers are being more widely targeted by political parties and organisations as they represent a larger mass of potential voters.

KEY TERMS

- **Generation**: As defined by Oxford Dictionary, it represents all of the people born and living at about the same time, regarded collectively. Currently, five generations make up our society:
  - **Gen Z, iGen, or Centennials**: Born 1996 and later;
  - **Millennials or Gen Y**: Born 1977 to 1995;
  - **Generation X**: Born 1965 to 1976;
  - **Baby Boomers**: Born 1946 to 1964;
  - **Traditionalists or Silent Generation**: Born 1945 and before.

- **Generation Gap**: As defined by Oxford Dictionary, it points out the lack of communication between one generation and another, especially between young people and their parents, brought about by differences of tastes, values, outlook, etc.
• **Demography**: Merriam Webster dictionary defines it as the statistical study of human populations especially with reference to size and density, distribution, and vital statistics.

• **Millennials**: As defined by Margaret Rouse on January 2015, they are individuals who reached adulthood around the turn of the 21st century. The precise delineation varies from one source to another, however. Millennials grew up in an electronics-filled and increasingly online and socially-networked world. As the most ethnically diverse generation, Millennials tend to be tolerant of difference.

• **Voter Turnout**: Voter turnout is the percentage of eligible voters who cast a ballot in an election.

**KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS**

• **Young Voters**: This is a political term used to describe 18 to 24-year-olds and their voting habits.

• **Directorate of Democratic Citizenship and Participation (DDCP)**: Rooted in the European Cultural Convention, DDCP is one of the Directorates of the Council of Europe. The programmes focuses on the emerging generation, enabling children and young people to become engaged and responsible European citizens who advocate human rights and participate fully in democratic life. Although the *Council of Europe is not an EU institution*, the work of DDCP is likely to positively affect young European citizens’ involvement in the EU’s democratic processes, too.

• **European Knowledge Centre for Youth Policy (EKCYP)**: This is an online database intended to provide the youth sector with a single access point to reliable knowledge and information about young people’s situation across Europe. It aims to enhance sharing of information and best practice between the fields of research, policy and practice through the collection and dissemination of information about youth policy, research and practice in Europe and beyond.
• **Pool of European Youth Researchers (PEYR):** This initiative brings together 26 researchers and experts from across Europe who possess a wide range of expertise in different policy areas connected to youth. It is used by both the European Commission and the Council of Europe, but is also open to any other interested stakeholder as a source of expertise and knowledge on youth. Members meet once a year to discuss broader issues connected to youth research and provide input to policy initiatives of the two partner institutions.

• **EU Youth Conference:** This cycle of three events is organised by the EU countries holding the Council of the EU presidency on an 18th month cycle. The Conference’s main objective is to come up with some final recommendations that form the basis of a Council Resolution addressed to EU institutions and national authorities, to be endorsed by youth ministers at the end of the 18-month cycle.

• **European Steering Committee for Youth (CDEJ):** This Council of Europe actor brings together representatives of ministries or bodies responsible for youth matters from the 50 States parties to the European Cultural Convention. It fosters cooperation between governments in the youth sector and provides a framework for comparing national youth policies, exchanging best practices and drafting standard-setting texts.

• **Advisory Council on Youth:** This body, set up by the Council of Europe, is made up of 30 representatives from youth NGOs and networks in Europe which provide opinions and input on all youth sector activities. It also ensures that young people are involved in other activities of the Council of Europe.

• **Joint Council on Youth:** This is the supreme decision and policy-making body for the Council of Europe’s governmental and non-governmental partners in the Youth Department. It is composed of all members of the CDEJ and all members of the Advisory Council.
WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

The European Commission set an Open Method of Coordination (OMC) which fosters the cooperation between Member States on youth policy. Originally created in 1997 as part of employment policy, it was expanded in 2000 to other policy fields such as research, health, education and social inclusion. The aim is to set a joint agenda, exchange best practices and improve the evidence base for youth policy-making. To do so, the involvement of the Education, Youth, Culture and Sport Council (EYCS) is crucial, gathering Education Ministers from all Member States twice a year. EYCS is responsible for initiatives such as the Erasmus+ or Creative Europe, programmes mainly focused on discovering different cultures and building a European cultural identity.

Moreover, the EU Youth Strategy, adopted in November 2009, sets out a framework for cooperation between Member States for issues relating to young people. Established by the European Commission, it approaches youth political engagement through a method called Structured Dialogue. Structured Dialogue is a means of mutual communication between young people and decision-makers in order to implement the priorities of European youth policy cooperation and to make young people’s voice heard in the European policy-shaping process. Its main event is the EU Youth Conference. The EU Youth Report was published on 15th September 2015 in order to evaluate overall progress towards the objectives of the EU Youth Strategy, as well as to define priorities for the next work cycle. The report emphasized the impact of the economic crisis amongst youth unemployment, prioritising job opportunities and social inclusion for the next period that will end in 2018. Measures such as the Youth Employment Initiative are designed to work in this direction.
Agenda 2020 is a medium-term strategic document on youth policy by the Council of Europe. It was unanimously approved by the Youth Ministers of almost 50 European States at the 8th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth in Kyiv in 2008. It sets down the three grand themes that European youth policy will address over the next three years: human rights and democracy; the promotion of cultural diversity; and social inclusion. The measures focus on fostering cooperation between governments on youth policy development (EYCS meetings), international reviews of national youth policies (EU Youth Report) and partnerships with other stakeholders and services involved in areas which are relevant to the Council of Europe youth policy (European Youth Forum). All these measures seem more focused on understanding and taking into consideration youth interests rather than directly involving upcoming generations on the policy-making process.

When taking a closer look at a national level, some Members States have been implementing electronic voting systems, perhaps in the hope to appeal to upcoming generations. For example, in October 2005, Estonia made internet voting available for the local elections. However looking at the statistics, only 6.6% of the users were aged between 18-24. Also, criticism has been raised concerning cybersecurity on this new form of democratic participation.

Think beyond yourself. If you’re reading this, you are probably not the audience that this resolution is targeting. Talk to people you know who are so disillusioned with politics that they are not partaking in active citizenship. What can we do to encourage them to stand up and have their voices heard?
Some argue that voting should be considered not only a right but a responsibility. With the Brexit results, the far-right movement uprising in Europe and Donald Trump living in the White House, Europe’s wish to clarify its uncertain short-term future is absolutely justifiable. However, upcoming generations emphasise diversity as part of the future they want to live in. Following the political developments of 2016, this future may seem further away than ever.

So far, the European Union has failed to tackle the upcoming generation’s political representation, leading to a general disenchantment among millennials. Post-election statistics revealed a big generation gap between EU millennials and older generations. Nevertheless, voter turnout among millennials was astonishingly low, expressing their discontentment with the current political system but also a lack of hope in reversing this situation. Even though new political parties with a clear stand against traditional politics are flourishing rapidly in many EU countries, like Podemos in Spain or En Marche in France, it seems that new voters are too disappointed to even express their opinion. Involving upcoming generations in democratic life and tackling the millennials’ general disenchantment with the current political system is crucial, however, attempts to foster youth involvement in politics must be balanced with the freedom of choice.
It’s interesting to note that despite the low turnout in elections, millennials’ involvement in non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and other political activities is higher than ever. In 2014, 12% EU citizens aged between 15 to 30 have participated in the activities of organisations aimed at improving their local community, yet only 5% of EU’s upcoming generations are affiliated to a political party. This statistic raises some concern, pointing out that millennials prefer to take action and directly change their surroundings rather than taking part in a democratic system with little noticeable actions on a local scale.

The European Commission’s Structured Dialogue so far has been mainly focused on raising awareness on diversity, union and inclusion, a set of values already rooted in the millennial generation. Programs such as Erasmus+ or the European Solidarity Corps have been vastly popular. However it fails to include new generations in daily political activities and keep them involved in the policy-making process. People aged between 18-30 represent 24% of the EU citizens, but if we look at the members of the European Parliament aged 30 or under, only a 1.9% falls into this category, potentially distancing upcoming generations from the EU institutions.

Noting the lack of young political representatives, the European Commission and the Council of Europe have been working on new institutions like the European Knowledge Centre for Youth Policy (EKCYP) or the Pool of European Youth Researchers (PEYR), and trying to bridge the gap created between the EU institutions and the younger generations. However, these agencies only suggest measures but have no legislative power, so it seems that the EU’s approach is to understand young people’s interest instead of involving upcoming citizens in democratic life.

The European Union is facing a critical situation, with Euroscepticism rising, and the future seems everything but clear; however, in the upcoming generations of voters, it could find the support to keep the project alive. Involving millennials in the democratic process might be the key to the European Union’s future. For now, encouraging a generation fed up with the established democratic system is a big stone in the road that the EU will have to smash.
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

• Most EU institutions have taken action to ensure youth representation but there is still a general feeling that younger generations are underrepresented. Why are EU’s actions not delivering the desired results, and how can they be improved?

• What are the key causes behind the youth’s disillusionment with European politics?

• How can the EU ensure that its strategy that not only focuses on understanding youth but also on including millennials in the policy making process?

• Should we only focus on fostering young voter engagement in the existing democratic setup, or does the system need more substantial reform?
“In the matter of taxation, every privilege is an injustice.”

– Voltaire, writer and philosopher

Heaven or Hell: With a recent Oxfam report suggesting that four EU Member States are among the world’s leading corporate tax havens and the EU’s commitment to publishing a tax haven blacklist, what steps should the EU take with regards to tax havens both inside and outside its borders?
In 2014, it was estimated that the European Union (EU) lost out on 28 billion euros in tax revenue directly as a result of tax evasion and tax havens. 28 billion euros represents a loss of 887 euros per second, every second, for an entire year.

Before we begin, a key distinction between tax avoidance and tax evasion has to be outlined. The outright evasion of taxation through under-reporting or failing to report income to the relevant government agency is a crime punishable by law. Tax avoidance is the arrangement of financial affairs to minimise tax liability through legal means. Here is where firms such as Mossack Fonseca enter the picture; their long client list and large fees exist precisely because of their ability to exploit existing tax law to limit the tax bill of their clients. Similarly, the tax planning of multinational corporations is entirely legal too - they argue they are using the system as it exists to gain advantage against their competitors.

Tackling this issue is rather complicated for the EU due to the fact that several of its own Member States are engaged in the tax haven practices that the EU seeks to combat. The first step in this process is the tax haven blacklist, but even the set of criteria for this list is fraught with tension as some Member States, such as Ireland and the Netherlands, seek to keep themselves off the list. This process only became more difficult as a draft of the tax haven blacklist included the United States, a key economic and political partner of the EU.
KEY TERMS

- **Tax Haven**: A country that offers foreign individuals and businesses minimal tax liability in a politically and economically stable environment, with little or no financial information shared with foreign tax authorities.

- **Tax Evasion**: An illegal practice where a person, organisation or corporations intentionally avoids paying their true tax liability.

- **Tax Avoidance**: The practice of using legal means to pay the least amount of tax possible.

- **Transfer pricing**: The price charged by one member of multinational organisation to another member of the same organisation for the provision of goods or services or the use of a property, including intangible property such as brand, patent or technology rights.

- **Direct Taxation**: A type of tax where the incidence and impact of taxation fall on the same entity, thus the burden cannot be shifted by the taxpayer to someone else.

- **Money Laundering**: The process by which criminals disguise the original ownership and control of the proceeds of criminal conduct by making such proceeds appear to have derived from a legitimate source.

Table 1: Offshore wealth and tax evasion: regional estimates (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Offshore wealth ($ bn)</th>
<th>Share of financial wealth held offshore</th>
<th>Tax revenue loss ($ bn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf countries</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Calculations by the author (see online appendix to chapter 2, www.gabriel-zucman.eu)*.
KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

- **European Commission**: The European Commission has come out forcefully against harmful tax practices in its policy proposals. While it has no role in the agreement of legislation, the Commission’s powers to write legislation, and then interpret and enforce it after implementation gives it some weight in the arrangement.

- **European Council**: The European Council will be the main battleground for any EU tax policies. The voting rules of the European Council state that any policy interfering in the tax policies of a Member State require a unanimous vote in the Council with the European Parliament only consulting.

- **The United States of America**: A draft version of the EU tax haven blacklist included the US. While the US has no formal power in the legislative process, its global influence will likely be felt in any EU deliberations.

- **Tax Havens and Offshore Financial Centres (OFCs)**: Given that some EU Member States are included in the list of tax havens, the priorities of these Member States and tax havens outside of the EU’s borders will have a significant influence over the final policy proposal.

"Appeasing all 28 Member States is going to be a tough task for this committee, but what is going to be even more challenging is how to ensure a common stance towards the use of tax havens outside of the EU’s borders.”
WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

Direct taxation has been seen as the sole responsibility of individual Member States, however, the EU has been able to claim competence over the area under the maintenance of the Single Market. This legal principle was enshrined in the Court of Justice of the European Union in which national tax policies were overruled.

In 1997, a legally non-binding agreement was struck in the Council of the EU that formed a code of conduct for harmful tax competition. While it had no legal power, it became an important political tool. It laid down criteria that define harmful tax competition, such as an effective tax rate that is far lower than other Members States’, granting of tax advantages in the absence of real economic activity, or a lack of transparency.
Several proposals have been suggested in the tax conversation, such as the Anti Tax Avoidance Package, however, the most notable and contentious of proposals has been the Common Corporate Consolidated Tax Base (CCCTB). The CCCTB alters the accounting rules by which companies calculate their taxable profits so that they are shared out among the countries in which the company operates according to a fixed formula. The CCCTB does not harmonise tax rates across the EU; instead, it removes incentives for harmful tax competition as it increases transparency and includes strong anti-avoidance mechanisms that make it harder to shift profits across borders. The proposal also seeks to address the issue of hybrid mismatches that allow profits to be shifted to non-EU states when countries have different rules on how to tax certain income or entities.

KEY CONFLICTS

One of the key conflicts is the ethical question of whether the EU should tackle tax havens at all. Current estimates suggest that roughly 200 billion is lost globally every year by governments due to tax havens. Tax havens generate economic activity through the siphoning of funds from other areas, rather than creating activity of their own. This siphoning of tax revenue is even more substantial in the developing world where studies show that developing countries lose 3 times as much to tax havens as they receive in foreign aid. Rather than being invested back into the country this tax revenue siphoned out, maintaining the fragility of many developing nations. On the other hand, tax havens have also claimed, with some credibility, that their tax policies have helped them compete with their larger, more developed neighbours where they would otherwise not have been able to do so. For example, during the economically tumultuous 1980s in Britain, where 1 in every 8 people were out of work, Jersey had only 2% unemployment, directly as a result of the booming finance industry that only existed due to their tax policies.
Another conflict is the difficulty in passing legislation on tax issues. As mentioned above, any tax policy, such as the CCCTB, would require a **unanimous vote** in the European Council to pass. With **some Member States voicing strong opposition to the plan**, it seems unlikely for this measure to succeed on its own merits. Similarly, the publication of a tax haven blacklist poses its own fraught political challenge as any comprehensive list would likely include several EU Member States as well as the US. As the EU’s **largest trading partner** and a key ally in a time of heightened geopolitical tension, alienating the US, which has become **increasingly hostile to the harmful tax practices** adopted by several EU Member States, could be a dangerous move.

The political dynamics both inside and outside of the EU make the creation of a credible blacklist or a comprehensive proposal extremely difficult.

Another conflict that appears in this topic is how can the EU tackle tax havens outside of its own borders? Many tax justice campaigners have called for **global country-by-country reporting** of the tax paid by multinational corporations to be made publicly available, similar to a proposal a year ago from the European Commission that would implement public tax disclosures for large companies operating in the EU. The tax haven blacklist uses the same tactic as country-by-country reporting – **naming-and-shaming** tax havens into reforming their harmful tax practices – but also adds the **possibility of implementing sanctions** on countries on the blacklist. Some have questioned the effectiveness of schemes that rely on public outcry to change behaviours, countering that the public is **already aware of widespread tax avoidance by multinationals**. Tackling tax havens outside EU borders may then rely on ineffective tactics and lack credibility without the threat of concrete action behind it.
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

- Does the EU have the moral authority to intervene in the tax policies of other EU Member States or non-EU members?
- Are aggressive tax practices a legitimate form of competition between nations or are they harmful to the world as a whole?
- How can EU Member States with harmful tax practices be convinced to engage in meaningful reform on cross-border tax issues?
- How can the EU tackle the global issues of tax evasion without alienating key allies such as the US?
- How can tax havens trying to end their harmful tax practices best be supported through that transition?
- How can the EU tackle tax havens outside its own borders should softer approaches fail?
“Counter terrorism has become an area of even higher priority in the EU, re-confirming the need for stronger cooperation and a coordinated international response.”

– Rob Wainwright, Director of Europol

They might have guns, but we have flowers: Having witnessed acts of terrorism in Brussels, Nice, Berlin and London since the launch of the European Counter Terrorism Centre in January 2016, what further steps should the EU take to prevent acts of terrorism within its borders?
On the evening of 14th July 2016, Promenade des Anglais in Nice was more crowded than usual due to Bastille Day celebrations. Among the huge crowd that had gathered to enjoy the annual fireworks display were Timothé Fournier, a 27-year-old Parisian and his seven-months pregnant wife, Anais. Memories of the attack on Charlie Hebdo magazine and the Bataclan theatre massacre were still fresh, but that evening would change the lives of many yet again. Mohamed Bouhlel, driving a 19-tonne lorry, ran over and killed a total of 87 bystanders, including Timothé, who sacrificed himself by pushing his wife out of the truck’s way. The number of terrorist attacks on European soil was considerably low between 1990 and 2011. However, since then, the number of casualties has increased dramatically. Despite the establishment of European Counter Terrorism Centre in January 2016 and engagement of all the major European institutions into tackling the issue of domestic terrorism, the threat of jihadi terrorism in particular has grown exponentially since the outbreak of the Syrian war and the emergence of the Islamic State (ISIS).
Another problem that has been receiving less attention recently is that the European society has become increasingly marginalised and susceptible of far-right and/or far-left views, which became evident in most recent European Parliament elections.

The third set of problems is radicalisation of the EU citizens and their engagement in conflicts in Syria/Iraq and the Ukraine. Studies demonstrate that around one third of European foreign fighters have returned home. At the same time, increasing tensions in the Ukraine and engagement of EU citizens in the conflict might have negative repercussions on trafficking of weapons and explosives.

**KEY TERMS**

- **Terrorism:** The unlawful use of violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political and/or religious aims.
- **Jihadi Terrorism:** Terrorism carried out in the name of jihad.
- **Nationalism:** Ideology based on the premise that the individual’s loyalty and devotion to the nation-state surpass other individual or group interests.
- **Nationalist terrorism:** Terrorism motivated by ethno-centrism and/or nationalism.
- **Left-wing nationalism:** Terrorism carried out by groups adhering to left-wing political views.
- **Right-wing nationalism:** Terrorism carried out by groups adhering to right-wing political views.
- **Single-issue terrorism:** Terrorism carried out with the belief that those would drive the society to change its views towards a particular issue.
- **Organised crime:** Any group having a corporate structure whose primary objective is to obtain money through illegal activities.
- **Domestic/homegrown terrorism:** Violence against the civilian population or infrastructure of a nation - often but not always by citizens of that nation and often with the intent to intimidate, coerce, or influence national policy.
KEY ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

- **European Council**: One of the EU’s key institutions, the European Council has recently demonstrated its commitment towards strengthening Europe’s security and defence as well as reaffirmed its close cooperation with NATO.

- **Council of the European Union Justice and Home Affairs Council (JHA)**: Under Maltese presidency, one of the main priorities of the Council is the effective fight against terrorism and organised crime.

- **European Commission (Commissioner for the Security Union, Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs and Citizenship, Directorate General for Human Resources and Security (DG HR); Directorate General for Migration and Home Affairs (DG HOME))**: The European Commission, through a number of internal actors, is responsible for establishing the framework for combating terrorism.

- **Counter-Terrorism Coordinator**: Established by the Council of the EU, the Counter-Terrorism Coordinator is responsible for coordinating the efforts as well as presenting policy recommendations and proposing priority areas for action.

- **European Police Office (Europol)**: Established as the EU’s law enforcement agency, Europol is actively engaged in preventing and combating acts of terrorism through its European Counter Terrorism Centre (ECTC).

- **Member States**: Despite collective efforts made within the scope of the European Council, national legislation on countering and combating terrorism varies across the EU.

- **Terrorist groups**: Acts of violence solicited by groups that follow different ideological, religious and political lines have sparked controversy and debates on the success of policies countering domestic terrorism.

- **EU residents**: People who reside in the EU suffer most from domestic terrorist acts and have been increasingly fragile during the last 4 years.
WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

In order to effectively fight against domestic terrorism, the Council of the EU, together with the European Council, has adopted the counter-terrorism strategy. The strategy is based on four main principles: prevention, protection, pursuit and response.

In recent years, Europol has become more actively involved in combating terrorism and consequently, the European Counter Terrorism Centre (ECTC) was established in January 2016. It gathers and analyses information from law enforcement from all EU Member States. The Centre is supported by the Secure Information Exchange Network Application (SIENA) and ensures that data from Member States reaches Interpol, and vice versa, without the risk of interception. Other Interpol activities include Terrorism Finance Tracking Programme (TFTP), Europol Emergency Response Team (EMRT), as well as First Response Network, which provide expertise and analytical support during major terrorist attacks or threats.

“It would be easy to say “stop the guns, stop the movement of people and thus stop the violence. But perhaps it would be more beneficial to consider what leads people to commit such atrocities and then consider how best to confront these issues. Remember, we have the flowers.”
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Together with this, a number of EU Member States have recently adopted or amended national legislation on terrorism. Among these, the most dramatic reforms were implemented in France and the UK. For example, the British Counter-Terrorism and Security Act of 2015 was envisaged to:

- enhance the ability to monitor and control the actions of those in the United Kingdom that pose a threat (including The Prevent Duty);
- combat the underlying ideology that feeds, supports and sanctions terrorism;
- enhance the Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures regime, including stronger locational constraints on subjects, and a power to require them to attend meetings as part of their on-going management, e.g. with the probation service or JobCentre Plus;

Nevertheless, following the UK’s decision to withdraw its membership of the EU, there is much uncertainty surrounding how security and defence will be restructured in light of Brexit. The UK has placed a central role in the protection of the EU and the remaining 27 Member States, but this is subject to further negotiations.
Despite all the effort that was put into combating domestic terrorism, statistics show that 2015 and 2016 have had the highest record of civilian deaths caused by terrorist attacks. One of the reasons for this is that there are several conflicts inherent in the problem. For the sake of clarity those are combined into 3 main groups:

• Post-Brexit developments;
• Collisions between actors and overlap of their tasks;
• East-West division and radicalisation of citizens;
• Border security and relations with Turkey.

**Post-Brexit developments**

One of the biggest challenges for the EU is how to move forward in its fight against domestic terrorism in post-Brexit era. Paradoxically, although the UK opposes EU legislation more often than any other Member State, it is also one of the most active members when it comes to counter-terrorism activities, since it has been a driving force in some of the most important steps to fight crime and terrorism: championing an EU-wide counter-terrorism strategy, based on its own model; leading counter-radicalisation efforts in the EU; and coordinating pan-European solutions to security threats. For several years, the British government was pushing for better co-ordinated action in this field. Leaving the EU raises questions about the future collaboration between the UK and Europol, an institution that holds its office on a British soil. The most recent reforms have strengthened Europol’s role in combatting crimes and established the institution as a hub through which the Member States would share information and coordinate their actions.
Collisions between individual actors and overlap of their tasks

The uncertainty of role definition and task allocation when it comes to the EU counter-terrorism efforts is another key conflict in the motion. Firstly, there is no strong division of responsibilities between the different actors involved. This is partly due to counter-terrorism falling under two different types of competences (area of freedom, security and justice falls under ‘shared’, while common foreign and security policy falls under ‘special’). On top of this, Article 4(2) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) stipulates that “national security remains the sole responsibility of each Member States”. Similarly, both Frontex, Europol (via SIENA) and Member States have agreements with third parties on intelligence sharing and cooperation. This leads to a logical question of who takes the lead in EU counter-terrorism efforts: the Council and the European Council (special competences), the Commission (shared competences) or Member States (TEU)?

It is also doubtful whether any of the EU counter-terrorism initiatives were properly communicated to the public or evaluated (only three out of 88 legislative initiatives regarding counter-terrorism included a public consultation; only one quarter of the legally binding measures adopted since 2001 were subjected to Impact Assessments; no ex post reviews or evaluations were carried out).

East-West division and radicalisation of citizens

The European society has become increasingly marginalised and susceptible to far-right and/or far-left views, which has not been reflected in the EU counter-terrorism agenda. Instead, it largely concentrates on the threat of ISIS and radicalisation of young muslims, which is much higher in western countries like France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, or the Netherlands.

In the East, according to reports, far fewer citizens respectively have travelled to Syria or Iraq. Together with this, around a hundred Slovakian citizens reportedly fight in Ukraine. In this sense, the conflict in Ukraine has far more drastic consequences for the East. The main threat there, unlike the West, is associated with radicalisation and involvement of local youth in far-right and paramilitary groups.
Border security and relations with Turkey

Penetration of ISIS fighters into the EU remains a significant problem for the Union. To stop the flow, the Union is collaborating with Turkey and developing policies to stop foreign fighters from travelling to conflict zones. Yet, despite all efforts, Turkey remains the primary transit country for foreign terrorist fighters traveling between the EU and Syria and Iraq, while the EU has not defined a common approach with regard to foreign terrorist fighter returnees.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

• What strategy should the European Council employ in order to combat domestic terrorism more efficiently?
• What further actions should the European Union take in order to prevent its citizens from turning to terrorism?
• How can Europol better coordinate Member States' individual efforts?
• What impact would Brexit have on Europol, should the UK withdraw from the organisation?
• What is the institutional and organisational set-up of police, intelligence and security services, and to what extent are each of those involved in counter-terrorism operations?
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