

## 8<sup>th</sup> German Nordic Baltic Forum 2016

### German, Nordic and Baltic Views on the Future of the EU: Common Challenges and Common Answers

17 – 18 November 2016

*Venue:*

***Institute of International Relations and Political Science of Vilnius University***  
*Vokieciu str. 10, Vilnius LT-01130,*  
*Conference Hall, Room 402*

### PROGRAMME

*Chatham House Rule applies*

*Organised and supported by*

---



**Thursday, November 17, 2016**

12.00 **Registration and lunch**

13.00 -13.30 **Introductions**

**Prof. Dr. Ramūnas Vilpišauskas**, Director, Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University, Vilnius

**Prof. Dr. Mathias Jopp**, Director, Institut für Europäische Politik, Berlin

**Elisabeth Bauer**, Head of the KAS office for the Baltic States and Scandinavia, Riga

**Welcoming Speech**

**Raimundas Karoblis**, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

13.30 -14.30 **Plenary Session**

**"The Future of the EU: Common Challenges and Common Answers"**

**Opening Debate with**

**Raimundas Karoblis**, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

**Thomas Ossowski**, Ambassador and Director for bilateral relations with EU Member States, regional and transborder cooperation, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin

**Moderation**

**Prof. Dr. Gediminas Vitkus**, Lecturer, Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University, Vilnius

14.30 - 15.15 ***Break***

15.15-16.45 **European Asylum and Migration Policy: German, Nordic, and Baltic Answers to the Refugee Crisis**

**Moderation**

**Dr. Funda Tekin**, Institut für Europäische Politik, Berlin

**Input statements**

**Thomas Ossowski**, Ambassador and Director for bilateral relations with EU Member States, regional and transborder cooperation, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin

**H.E. Andris Razāns**, Ambassador, Director for Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Latvia, Riga

**Introduction into the discussion**

**Dr. Viljar Veebel**, Researcher, Estonian Foreign Policy Institute, Tallinn

16.45-17.00 ***Coffee break***

---

17.00-18.30 **Energy Policy and Energy Security: Possibilities for a German-Nordic-Baltic Compromise?**

**Moderation**

**Dr. Anke Schmidt Felzmann**, Researcher, The Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm

**Input statements**

**Rokas Masiulis**, Minister of Energy, Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

**Piotr Naimski**, Secretary of State at the Chancellery of the Prime Minister and Government  
Plenipotentiary for Strategic Energy Infrastructure, Warsaw

**Timo Tatar**, Head of Energy Department, Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communication in Estonia,  
Tallinn

**Introduction into the discussion**

**Per Carlsen**, former Ambassador of Denmark to Latvia, Senior Adviser to the Baltic Development  
Forum, Copenhagen

---

19.00 **Reception**

Upon the invitation of **H.E. Jutta Schmitz**, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of  
Germany to Lithuania, at the Residence

**Friday, November 18, 2016**

09.30 -11.00 **Security Policy and Relations with Russia: Prospects and Challenges in light of the Crises  
in Ukraine and Syria**

**Moderation**

**Gunilla Herolf**, Member, Royal Swedish Academy of War Sciences, Stockholm, Sweden

**Input statements**

**Antti Kaski**, Director Policy Planning and Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, Helsinki

**Nerijus Aleksiejūnas**, Chief Adviser to the President, Foreign Policy Group, Office of the President,  
Vilnius

**Mariin Ratnik**, Security Policy Director, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia, Tallinn

**Introduction into the discussion**

**Dr Flemming Splidsboel Hansen**, Research Coordinator, Senior Researcher, Danish Institute for  
International Studies, Copenhagen

11.00-11.15 **Coffee break**

11.15-12.45 **The Future of the EU: Integration Challenges and Strategies**

**Moderation**

**Prof. Dr. Ramūnas Vilpišauskas**, Director, Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University, Vilnius

**Input statements**

**Sebastian Groth**, Deputy Director of the Policy Planning Staff, Federal Foreign Office of Germany, Berlin

**Per Fabricius Andersen**, Head of Department European Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Copenhagen

**Introduction into the discussion**

**Dr. Karlis Bukovskis**, Deputy Director, Latvian Institute of International Affairs, Riga

12.45-13.00 **Concluding Remarks**

**Prof. Dr. Ramūnas Vilpišauskas**, Director, Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University, Vilnius

**Dr. Katrin Böttger**, Vice Director, Institut für Europäische Politik, Berlin

13.00 **Farewell sandwiches**

## ANNEX PANEL CONTENT:

Thursday, November 17, 2016

15.15-16.45 ***European Asylum and Migration Policy: German, Nordic, and Baltic Answers to the Refugee Crisis***

The year 2015 marked a turning point in the EU's Asylum- and Migration Policy. Almost 1.3 million persons crossed the borders into the EU in 2015. Under this pressure the Dublin-System faltered and the Schengen Area was under substantial strain. Migration pressure varies between Germany, the Nordics and the Baltic States. Sweden has always been the country with the highest number of asylum seekers per inhabitant in Europe (16.7 per 1000 inhabitants in 2015). Germany together with Finland ranked in fourth place (about 5.9) regarding that number. Denmark faced 3.7 and the Baltic States between 0.1 and 0.2 asylum seekers per 1000 inhabitants in 2015. These countries also differ regarding their strategies in order to solve the current crisis. Denmark places emphasis on deterrence by reforming its national asylum policy while Germany is a strong – although lonely? – promoter of a European solution by strengthening the external borders of the Schengen Area and cooperating closely with Turkey. Baltic States are also supportive of the latter solutions, including the containment of Schengen refugee routes to Europe, which are highly volatile. For example, the main route currently used is the Eastern Mediterranean route. However, Syrian refugees also enter the Schengen Area at the Finnish and Norwegian border to Russia.

Thus, we should not lose sight of relevant factors impacting possible shifts of migration routes. These would involve international geopolitical developments, actions taken on EU-level and unilaterally by individual EU member states. The Schengen Area belongs to one of the biggest achievements of European integration and constitutes the framework for the freedom of movement within the single market. The maintenance of the area free from internal border control is only possible, if we ensure secure external borders. At the same time internal reforms particularly of the Dublin-System are required. Otherwise, we risk the future of the Schengen Area and safety of our citizens.

Furthermore, NATO's decision to use naval assets to help Europe in dealing with the migrant crisis deserves consideration. This effort would require close coordination between NATO and the EU.

Possible Guiding Questions:

- ❖ What are possibilities and prospects of the Dublin-System Reform and of establishing a strong and sustainable Common European Asylum Policy?
- ❖ What impact has the refugee crisis on euroscepticism and the rise of right-wing populist parties in Germany as well as the Nordic and Baltic EU member states?
- ❖ How can concepts such as 'flexible' or 'effective' solidarity be framed; what do they imply; are they helpful for reforming the Common European Asylum Policy?
- ❖ What strategy will apply if the EU-Turkey Deal on Migration does not hold?
- ❖ What can the EU do to mitigate humanitarian crises in countries of origin and transit? Do we have the right tools for that? What are the prospects to achieve progress in ending the Syrian civil war, and how to work together with Russia and Turkey in this effort?

**17.00-18.30 Energy Policy and Energy Security: Possibilities for a German-Nordic-Baltic Compromise?**

These days, energy security is an intensely and controversially debated issue in Europe. At the centre of these debates is the project Nord Stream 2 through which gas would be delivered from Russia directly to the EU through the Baltic Sea. The EU is in disagreement regarding this project with Germany being one of its strong promoters and Poland being one of the strongest opponents. The European Commission is demanding a new debate on Nord Stream 2 because one of the crucial questions of energy security is the diversification of energy supply. The Commission's proposals target a solution within the European Union including the usage of Norwegian liquid gas (LNG), several pipelines that connect Finland and the Baltic States and the completion of a LNG-Terminal in Klaipėda. Additional projects are the construction of the Gas Interconnector Poland-Lithuania (GIPL) and the power link NordBalt. At the same time the Energy Union needs further development. The first State of the Energy Union Report shows that much progress has already been made but the year 2016 will be an important year of delivery.

NATO's strategic concept emphasized energy security as one of the tasks of the Alliance. The NATO energy security centre in Vilnius is currently working on the security of critical energy infrastructure, which in the face of hybrid warfare as well as the growing threat of terrorism in Europe is a hot topic among European countries. Protection of critical infrastructure is first and foremost a national responsibility. However, close cooperation among nations as well as NATO's and the EU's roles are crucial to enhance security of critical energy infrastructure.

The discussion of this panel will aim at identifying possibilities for a compromise for providing energy security in Europe.

Possible Guiding Questions:

- ❖ How should the energy supply be optimally diversified?
- ❖ What are key actors and structures for providing energy security and how can they cooperate effectively?
- ❖ What are future prospects of the Energy Union?
- ❖ Regarding energy security, what are preferences of Germany, the Nordic and Baltic countries and how can they be accommodated?

**Friday, November 18, 2016**

**09.30 -11.00 *Security Policy and Relations with Russia: Prospects and Challenges in light of the Crises in Ukraine and Syria***

After periods of complementary interests after the fall of the Berlin wall and a mutually waning interest and enthusiasm about the transformation in Russia and the EU-Russia relations, the prolonged Ukrainian crisis with no solution in sight, in combination with the conflict over Syria, has seriously challenged the EU-Russia relations. In addition, these relations are put under stress due to the implementation of a diverse set of sanctions both on the EU's and Russia's side. Furthermore, there is a deep crisis in Russia's relations with the whole trans-Atlantic community. NATO's practical cooperation with Russia has been stopped. The current crisis in the relationship between Russia and the West is unprecedented since the end of the Cold War, manifesting itself in the clash of different value systems. With this and the outcome of the US Presidential elections EU-Russia relations remain crucial for a peaceful and prosperous development on the European continent. This panel will develop scenarios for future EU-Russia relations while focusing on feasible approaches to these relations.

Possible Guiding Questions:

- ❖ Is there a need for alternatives to the 'Minsk II' procedure and the Normandie format and if so what would they be?
- ❖ Is there a potential for positive incentives towards Russia that would facilitate to promote a continued dialogue and closer ties between European and Russian societies?
- ❖ What role could and should NATO play and in how far can the EU step up its own CFSP/CSDP policies?
- ❖ In how far will external factors play a role in future EU-Russia relations, i.e. the newly elected President of the United States, Donald Trump, and recent developments in Turkey and Russia-Turkey relations?

**11.15-12.45 *The Future of the EU: Integration Challenges and Strategies***

On 23 June 2016 the British population took an unprecedented decision: they voted for leaving the European Union. This is a historic incident in European integration history and both the referendum outcome and the BREXIT as such will affect the European Union. One crucial question is whether other EU countries might be tempted to follow the UK's pattern. Particularly the Nordic Countries with close ties to the UK might reconsider their European vocation. However, one positive effect of the UK referendum is the fact that the future of the European Union is back on the agenda of public and political debates. The referendum outcome represents a moment of opportunity in the sense of debating possible reforms of the European Union and tackling structural questions such as differentiated integration and the question of a Core Europe. Against this backdrop the so-called Bratislava-Process aims to diagnose the present state of the European Union and to define concrete measures to improve its future. The Heads of State or Government promised to "deliver on promises".

We should not underestimate the effects of the result of the Presidential elections in the United States of America on the European Union. Although the political agenda of the President-elect, Donald Trump, is not clearly defined, yet, transatlantic relations will be different in the future. This will include future trade relations (TTIP) as well as security policies. The European Union will have to re-think its foreign and security policy in light of the new role the USA is likely to play. Thus, discussions should also follow-up on the "Global Strategy for the EU" that Federica Mogherini, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, presented in June 2016. Points of discussion can be: Its implications in light of solidarity as key value, capabilities to act as a security provider in the EU's neighbourhood and globally as well as a comprehensive approach to external conflicts and crisis including CSDP.

This panel would also reflect on the subjects discussed in previous panels linking them to possible scenarios of future EU development.

Possible Guiding Questions:

- ❖ How can the future of European integration be framed without the United Kingdom and what effects does this have on Germany, the Nordic and the Baltic countries as well as on single policies (e.g. CSDP)?
- ❖ How will negotiations under Article 50 TEU be structured and how does the envisaged outcome look like?
- ❖ What are the best ways of tackling eurosceptic trends in the European Union?
- ❖ What should the priorities of the EU's foreign and security policy look like considering the result of the US-Presidential elections?

