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To maintain security for its member states and citizens is clearly one of the fundamental purposes of the European Union, especially if security is defined as a low probability of damage to acquired values. The European Union prides itself in being a community founded on shared values among its members, and its European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) frequently refers to a ‘vision of a ring of countries, sharing the EU’s fundamental values and objectives’, while realising that the ‘degree of commitment to common values’ may differ across the different partner countries (*European Commission, 2004).* With its focus on Europe’s evolving security landscape, the Jean Monnet Information and Research Activity *‘****Towards a More Resilient European Neighborhood: Security Cooperation and the Management of Current and Future Threats in Europe’s Strategic Orbit’*** bridges a gap in knowledge and understanding of current and new threats in Europe’s strategic orbit and contributes to development of research-led teaching in European Security Studies by considering theoretical and practical issues relating to security cooperation between the EU and its neighbourhood.

**The aim of this project** was to increase the quality of higher education in the field of European integration in the area of European security and contribute to the development of research-lead teaching in Ukraine by promoting independent and critical thinking, empowerment of the academics as agents of change and applying new research and teaching tools from an interdisciplinary and cross-cultural perspective. As a part of our continuity project ***(Jean Monnet Spring Seminar on European Security, 2008 – p/t)*** this project offered an interdisciplinary program featuring a variety of lectures, seminars, panel discussions, briefings and simulation games in the field of European Security.

The project ***Towards a More Resilient European Neighborhood*** was implemented in Ukraine in the period between September 1, 2013 and August, 31, 2014. The project’s ambition was to contribute to overcoming considerable shortcomings and gaps in EU and NATO member states and the European Neighborhood countries, in particular, in Ukraine, in the systematic study of early-warning, conflict prevention and management tools as well as crisis management and cooperation mechanisms.

During the project implementation in Ukraine we have faced dramatic events and processes, started from the mass protests in Kiev (‘the Euromaidan’), annexation of the Crimea by Russia and war in Eastern Ukraine. Ukraine became the main flashpoint on the map of the Eastern Neighborhood and the main corner-stone and challenge to the European security architecture after the Cold War. Under such conditions, the Informational and Research Activity ‘***Towards a More Resilient European Neighborhood: Security Cooperation and the Management of Current and Future Threats in Europe’s Strategic Orbit’*** aimed at in-depth and broad and theoretically well-grounded understanding of current and future threats and challenges that the EU faces in its neighborhood regions, and is particular well-timed.

 **At the core of the project’s concept** was the spirit of a truly interactive and meaningful collaboration between representatives of academic, policy and civil society communities from EU and NATO member states and the European Neighborhood countries through active exploitation of already existent early warning and conflict prevention systems and creation of new strategic forecasting, analytical scaffolding and preventive mechanisms based on synergy of independent and critical thinking and applying new research and teaching tools from an interdisciplinary and cross cultural perspective.

**The general methodology of the project** has combined research and information activities. The interdisciplinary research *(described in Activity part of the report)* has involved a broad spectrum of international experts and stakeholders of the project through a Delphi, carried out online. The results of the Delphi were analyzed and evaluated in a systematic way by the core experts. The assessment of security challenges and their root causes were used as input for individual case studies, structured comparison and the simulation games.

The development of a comprehensive approach and an effective platform for cooperation between the EU, NATO and Partner countries were discussed at **2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute ‘Enhancing Strategic Analytical Capabilities in NATO Partner Countries: Security Cooperation and the Management of Current and Future Threats in Europe’s Strategic Orbit’.**

It should be noticed that during the project implementation, the concept of the final dissemination activity (Event F3.1) was changed. Owing to changed security landscape (the protracted Ukrainian crisis and war in Eastern Ukraine have been making an impact on the European security architecture and the priorities of both EU and NATO in the area of security) and generous support from the NATO Science for Peace Program, we were able to extend the length of dissemination event to a seven day Advanced Study Institute, which incorporated initially planned four day seminar *‘The ENP at 10: Lessons for Managing Current and Future Threats in the European Neighborhood*’. **2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute ‘Enhancing Strategic Analytical Capabilities in NATO Partner Countries: Security Cooperation and the Management of Current and Future Threats in Europe’s Strategic Orbit’** involved 103 participants from the EU, the USA and European Neighborhood countries of the former Soviet Union and Western Balkans.

**Participants** are junior scientists (PhD holders and PhD students at advanced stage of their research), representing academia, public and semi-public research institutions and think tanks as well as representatives of local, national and international governmental and non-governmental organizations, the mass media and business with a strong background in Political Science and International Relations, including Security Studies, History, International Economics, and Law. The participants of **2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute** have extraordinary motivation, at least few years of teaching and research experience in a relevant field, and a keen interest in learning and sharing knowledge in his or her institutions.

Since 70 of 103 participants of **2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute** represented universities, think tanks and research institutions of Ukraine, with this project we aimed at development of critical thinking and analytical skills of junior faculty from Ukraine by applying a *deep learning* approach and strengthening contacts between academics from EU and NATO member states and Ukrainian academic community and creation of new opportunities for junior faculty to present the results of their research and teaching activity and exchange ideas. The majority of the ASI participants were selected via open competition based on academic quality of applications, geographical and gender balance criteria.

**Key speakers**

The team of key speakers is composed by core group of the project leaders responsible for organization of research (online-based Delphi), discussions, simulation games and small group exercises. The field of expertise covers conflict prevention and management on the Balkans, the Southern Caucasus, Russia, Moldova, Belarus and Ukraine.

In this **2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute** we continue to endeavor to strike a good balance between the theoretical, conceptual, empirical and applied dimensions of the project subject area. This varies across teaching and research activities, but our intention was to show the relationship between different dimensions of the European security and strengthen participants’ overall knowledge and understanding of the problem, analytical capabilities as well as their teaching and research skills. This translated practically into the use of varied teaching formats and methods – from lectures to seminars to simulations and includes modules specifically geared towards development of early warning and conflict prevention skills.

**Scientific content of 2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute**

Research activity

The project started with the research activity and creation of online based forecasting platform aimed at assessment of current and new threats for European security and cooperation challenges between the EU and the European neighborhood. In order to realize the set of the project’s research objectives we created the online based platform which models interactions between major stakeholders, such as governments, nongovernmental organisations, international organisations and academia in order to assess current and new threats for security and discuss the cooperation challenges between EU, NATO member states and Neighbourhood countries, the Delphi conducted between March and May 2014 in two separate rounds with participation of experts, representing EU, NATO member states and Partner countries. We asked selected experts to assess risk/uncertainty/change factors and drivers and explore the impact of these factors on security of EU and NATO member states and Partner countries and regional security. The risks/uncertainty change factors and drivers are identified basing on a wide and comprehensive understanding of security and cover individual, state, regional and global levels and societal, economic, environmental, political and military sectors of security. The information obtained in the Delphi process was analysed by the regional project teams in a greater depth. The results of the Delphi survey and analysis conducted within the regional project teams of experts served as a basis for scenario building processes used in simulation game and case studies that together formed a background for ***7 day 2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute.***

**2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute** brought together stakeholders with a wide range of expertise to offer participants a comprehensive perspective on current and emerging security issues and how to analyze them. Conceptually, the focus was on the place and role of the European Union and NATO in managing international and regional security issues and the different approaches that can be adopted from short-term crisis management to long-term crisis prevention. Empirically, and in line with the dual sponsorship of the ASI, the focus was on NATO and the EU.

With its focus on Europe’s evolving security landscape, the ASI offered an exciting and interdisciplinary program. As is apparent from the following short summaries of the main talks given at the ASI, there was a good mix of partly historical overviews, theoretically grounded analyses, and specific case studies. The participants faced supportive and stimulating environment in which they could explore their research interests. The participants had plenty of opportunities to gain first-hand insight for their field of study. The analytical and critical thinking skills and theoretical knowledge gained in the course developed an understanding of the common challenges and the common future Europeans and their neighbors are facing.

Given the current situation, a significant part of the discussion centered on the ongoing crisis in Ukraine and the deterioration of relations between Russia and the West. This occurred both in the context of direct discussions of these issues, as well as in a more comparative approach, for example in relation to the situation in the South Caucasus and the Western Balkans, using case studies directly relevant to their own experience and current work, offered significant opportunities to employ a lesson-learned approach, assess existing capabilities and capability gaps, and engage in forecasting exercises. These techniques were successfully employed by participants in the simulation game.

***Main Talks /Papers given at* 2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute**

**2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute**incorporated a range of different thematic areas: crisis, conflicts, natural and man-made disasters and other challenges to European security. The institute was designed as a combination of the scholarly and practitioner tracks, organized as interdisciplinary working groups and modules.

***15 May 2014***

***Opening ceremony. Welcome speeches and roundtable ‘Europe’s Evolving Security Architecture’***

*(Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK, Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko, DonSUM, Ukraine, Dr. Michael Gaul, Senior Advisor for Strategy and Projects in NATO’s Emerging Security Challenges Division, representatives of NATO informational center in Kiev, Ukraine and EU Delegation to Ukraine)*

# In their welcome speeches the project directors and distinguished guests reviewed recent developments in European security strategy and policies, elaborating on a number of key priorities: the build-up of civilian and military capabilities as well as the advancement of civil-military cooperation, the need for military rapid response forces, the strengthening of the European Defense Agency (EDA) and the development of a strategic culture in Europe. The speakers emphasized the need for increased EU cooperation with NATO and the UN within the framework of military rapid response. The speakers gave an introductory analysis and assessment of the European Neighborhood Policy as an approach in the EU’s relations with its neighbors, which brings added value by bringing together main policy instruments in a more focused way. Prof. Wolff discussed ways in which the European Neighborhood Policy composes the mutual interest of the EU and its neighbors in sharing a zone of stability, security and well-being.  He mentioned that the ENP is a joint agenda to promote good governance in order to better manage our shared neighborhood. It is designed on the basis of common values and interests, including the need for a joint response to common challenges. In this way, the ENP also contributes to regional and global stability and security. Prof. Malyarenko analyzed transformation of security policy in the 21st century. She reviewed the determining strategies of the cold war-era, emphasizing the importance of new grand strategies in the field of security policy while at the same time pointing out how often policies are not based strategy.

***16 May 2014***

**‘The EU as a Strategic Actor within NATO and Beyond’**

*(Dr. Derek Averre, University of Birmingham, UK)*

The lecture discussed the evolution of the Alliance after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the background of the role of NATO as security provide, culminating in the promulgation of the Strategic Concept in 2010. The speaker highlighted a number of important questions: Did NATO lose its raison d’etre with the end of the Cold War, and if not, how do we understand the key tasks facing the Alliance? What are the consequences of the Libya Operation Unified Protector mission, both for the Alliance and for wider security developments in the Middle East? How will the shift in emphasis from operational engagement to operational preparedness affect NATO’s ability to carry out expeditionary missions in future? Which of the challenges NATO faces in the coming period are key: maintaining cohesion amid member states’ different perceptions and priorities’ ; Afghanistan post-2014 and the surrounding security environment; force projection capabilities; whether there will be a need to switch focus back to territorial defence in view of Russia’s actions in Ukraine; the role of partnerships beyond Alliance membership; ballistic missile defence/arms control; emerging security challenges? The lecture also looked at the evolution and background of the EU as a security provider, the political/security objectives of EU enlargement, the policy of the EU in the shared neighbourhood, the key challenges of the Eastern Partnership and and the current state of relations with Russia. The lecture concluded with some thoughts on the future problems and opportunities facing NATO and the EU in the new Europe.

***The EU as a strategic actor within NATO and beyond***

*(Dr Derek Averre, Centre for Russian and East European Studies,*

*University of Birmingham)*

 This followed on from the theme of the previous lecture but looked more closely at how NATO shares institutional responsibility with EU and OSCE for security governance in the new Europe, the background of EU/NATO security interaction, EU missions to date, and the EU as a security actor since the establishment of the Common Security and Defense Policy. The question was asked whether the EU, commonly seen as a EU as a ‘normative’ or ‘civilian’ power, can be considered as a strategic actor, particularly in its neighborhood, or whether the institutional and political constraints it faces are likely to prevent it from taking its place as a recognized security provider. In terms of the EU’s global role, the question was asked whether the securitization of new areas of international affairs means that the EU will struggle to adjust to ‘new geopolitics’, i.e. new regional concentrations of political/economic influence as the emerging powers take an increasingly activist position on global governance and have divergent positions from those adopted by EU on many issues, producing a pluralist international system. Can Brussels rethink its external strategy and seek shared approaches with other global powers, without accepting constraints on its normative ambitions, in pursuit of larger aim of stability/security? The presence of NATO has absolved the EU from many responsibilities as a ‘security provider’ but is the EU prepared to face up to the costs and risks associated with the conduct of a ‘real’ foreign policy?

**‘Capabilities and Capacities in Context: NATO Evolving Role in the Wider Region’**

*(Dr. Alistair Shepherd, Aberystwyth University, UK)*

This presentation outlined how NATO’s concepts and capabilities have evolved and relate these to the security agenda of Eastern Europe and the Black Sea region. It begins by situating NATO in the wider political and strategic context, focusing on the Lisbon Strategic concept, the draw down in Afghanistan, the US ‘Asian Pivot’, and European capability shortfalls. It then proceeds to explore how NATO’s understanding of security has evolved in the post Cold War and Post-9/11 era, highlighting the much widened range of threats and risks and the challenges this poses for the transformation of the alliance. This is followed by a critical analysis of the capability gap debate, outlining the key issues and shortfalls (as reinforced in Libya in 2011), and also highlighting some the main critiques of the European capability gap discourse. The presentation then turns to assessing the implications of these evolutions in concepts and capabilities for the wider region to NATO’s East. Situating NATO within the matrix of state and institutional actors it compares the enlargement debates of the 1990s in central Eastern Europe with the current partnerships in this region and the longer membership potential. In particular it contrasts Russia’s relative strength and influence on the process then and now. The potential for NATO to contribute to addressing the security agenda of the Black Sea region is final substantive set of issues raised. The presentation concludes with a reflection of the key challenges facing NATO in balancing its ‘global agility’ and ‘regional bulwark’ roles (Flockhart) in the wake of the crises in Ukraine.

‘**The European Security Continuum and the EU as an International**

**Security Provider’**

*(Dr. Alistair Shepherd, Aberystwyth University, UK)*

In 2009 the Stockholm Programme claimed that ‘internal and external security are inseparable.’ This paper examines the implications of the blurring of the traditional internal-external security divide for the EU’s role in international security. The presentation provides an overview of the various conceptualisations of the EU global role from civilian power to ethical power. It then turns to the threats and challenges identified in the various EU security strategies, which appear to increasingly transcend geographic and bureaucratic boundaries, creating a European security continuum, which complicates the conceptualisation and operationalization of the EU as an international security provider. The discussion critically analyses the significant friction that continues to exist in the formulation and implementation of security policy as EU institutions and capabilities struggle to overcome the traditional architecture separating internal and external security. In particular, bureaucratic turf wars and civil-military tensions are substantial hurdles to the EU’s aspiration of being a comprehensive international security provider. In parallel the cross fertilization of internal and external security norms and practices risk complicating existing understandings of the EU’s international security role. Finally, paper returns to conceptualising the EU and argues that if the EU’s efforts to improve internal-external coordination are not considered and implemented carefully its desire for distinctiveness and legitimacy as an international security provider may be undermined.

**‘The New Geopolitics of International Crisis Management’**

*(Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK)*

In light of recent developments, this lecture reflects on whether the international environment has changed significantly enough to consider a new era of geopolitics. It takes account of the proliferation of non-state actors in local conflicts and the multiplication of agendas pursued by state and non-state actors in various crises, the overlapping arenas in which crises are managed from the local to the regional to the global levels. The argument out forward is that while these developments individually have precedents, there is a new quality of international crisis management now in relation to the complexity of the simultaneous threats and challenges confronting crisis managers.

***17 and 18 May 2014***

**Simulation / Wargame ‘Complex Instability Early Warning and Response’**

*(Prof. Chad Briggs, Johns Hopkins University, USA)*

Addressing security challenges to NATO Partner countries requires more than traditional assessments of potential enemy force structure and intentions. As NATO’s experience in Afghanistan has demonstrated, full spectrum security planning involves identification and assessment of a broad array of potential threats and risks, often focusing on bottom-up concepts of human security. NATO Partner countries of the former Soviet Union (FSU) often require similarly broad assessments, in addition to introduction of emerging technological risks from elements such as cyber and legacy risks from CBRN sources. This presentation examines some tools developed in the US military and intelligence communities to assess emerging risks, particularly those developed by the US Dept of Energy and US Air Force. Moving beyond the US Quadrennial Defense Review and NATO Strategic Concept, new tools have been needed to translate full spectrum assessments to joint planning and combatant commands, by identifying critical vulnerabilities in systems, and their potential cascading impacts on related systems. Cyber threats are highlighted in that they can quite easily disable large power systems, undercutting security for large areas without any overt breach of sovereignty or clear measure of deterrence. Cyber and power systems can be related to bio-chem attacks (example of 2001 anthrax attacks in Washington, DC), or conversely energy can severely affect biological systems (e.g. Fukushima). Specific risks from bio-chem technologies were identified (e.g. global pandemics, MERS), nuclear/radiological threats (e.g. portable reactors, dirty bombs), geo-engineering, and overlapping concerns with food security. In order to address complex risks, scenarios are often created to test critical nodes and vulnerabilities in a regional area, with wargames used to train both military officers and civilian responders on potential decisions and resource needs. Such wargames can be used to highlight how decisions to intervene in complex disasters and insurgency situations may overlook long-term stability concerns or legitimacy (e.g. disabling power systems can affect food production and transport). Such full-spectrum planning and scenario training is particularly needed in countries like Ukraine, where complex conflicts cannot be solved solely by application of military force.

***18 May 2014***

**‘The EU’s Neighborhood Policy and the Challenges of the Eastern Partnership’**

*(Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK)*

To maintain security for its member states and citizens is clearly one of the fundamental purposes of the European Union, especially if security is defined as a “low probability of damage to acquired values”. The European Union (EU) prides itself in being a community founded on shared values among its members, and its European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) frequently refers to a “vision [of] a ring of countries, sharing the EU’s fundamental values and objectives”, while realizing that the “degree of commitment to common values” may differ across the different partner countries (European Commission 2004, 5,8). In this sense, the ENP is, if anything, essentially a policy that seeks to achieve security for the European Union, its member states and citizens. Yet, it is equally clear that security for the EU cannot be achieved without stability in its neighborhood (and beyond). In order to answer these two broad questions, lecture proceeded in three steps. First and second, it gave a brief overview of where the ENP comes from and where it is right now. This focused primarily on the accomplishments of the ENP in what is now close to a decade of its existence and assessed the extent to which the ENP has generated policies that have resulted in achieving any of its goals so far. Third, it considered the current challenges that the EU faces in particular in its Eastern neighborhood and outline some possible directions for the development of ENP over the next decade in light of its prevailing mission to create a “democratic, prosperous and stable region” (European Commission 2011e).

**Case study** (small group exercise) **‘The Armed Conflict in the Republic of Macedonia in 2001: from the Escalation of Albanian-Macedonian Conflict to Signing the Ohrid Framework Agreement’**

*(Dr. Annemarie Peen Rodt, Roskilde University, Denmark)*

This case study analyses the nature, structure and purpose of the Ohrid Agreement and the process of negotiations that preceded its signing. Signed on August 13, 2001 by the President of the Republic of Macedonia and the international mediators (Special Representative of European Union in Macedonia and US Special Envoy), it put an end to the ethnic conflict in the Republic of Macedonia, preserved the sovereignty, the territorial integrity and unitary nature of the state, and established certain mechanisms of power-sharing and self-governance. However, the question remains whether the ‘Macedonian model’ of conflict resolution is a success that could or should be applied in other ethnic conflicts.

***19 May 2014***

*Conflict Prevention and Early Warning in the Practice*

**Interactive presentation and small group session ‘Fragile States and Dilemmas of State-building’**

*(Prof. Ulrich Schneckener, Osnabrueck University, Germany)*

By organizing small working groups the session focused on the role and functions of states and discussed the apparent deficits and fragility of states in the region of South Eastern and Eastern Europe. The participants were asked to elaborate on their experiences with state agencies in their home countries and to highlight both problems as well as aspects of stability. The discussion, furthermore, involved a critical assessment of the concept “fragile statehood” and the various “state rankings” conducted by various international organizations or academic organizations based on quantitative methods and indicators/indices (such as Failed States Index, Bertelsmann Transformation Index, State Fragility Index, World Bank Governance Indicators, etc.). The session concluded on the difficulties of international state-building, involving a range of actors and levels.

**Lecture followed by discussion** **‘The Role of Armed Non-State Actors in Fragile States’**

*(Prof. Ulrich Schneckener, Osnabrueck University, Germany)*

The lecture gave a broader introduction into the question of organized violence in conflicts and fragile states. It addresses the specific characteristics of violence and its implications for conflict development and focused in particular on the ambivalent relationship between “state violence” and “non-state violence”. Prof. Schneckener highlighted the similarities and the asymmetries between both spheres of violence and introduced a typology of various non-state armed groups. He emphasized the need for (successful) armed groups to gain legitimacy which in turn poses a number of challenges for non-state actors (compared to state actors). The lecture ended with some thoughts about how to address armed groups in international politics.

**Lecture ‘The Crimea Crisis of 2014: The EU’s Georgia Moment of 2008 Revisited’**

*(Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK)*

This lecture offers an analysis of the EU’s engagement in Georgian in 2008 and Ukraine in 2014 as an example on the basis of which it is possible to assess the EU’s broader role as a conflict manager. Following a brief narrative account of the development of EU-Georgia and EU-Ukraine relations in the context of the unresolved conflicts, the lecture proceeds to the analysis of two sets of factors – those within, and those external to, the EU – that it is argued are crucial for understanding the nature and impact of EU efforts to manage the conflicts in Georgia and Ukraine.

**Case study** (small group exercise) **‘Mass Protests and Revolutions in Weak and Failing States’**

*(Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko, DonSUM, Ukraine)*

This case study focuses on the analysis of the phenomenon of mass protests and revolutions in weak and failing states, with particular focus on Ukraine and other post-soviet countries. State weakness has been analyzed as a precipitative factor for escalation of conflict that creates advantageous conditions within Ukrainian society and provokes an escalation of violence. The link between state weakness and conflict manifests itself in two ways. First, state weakness creates a favorable environment for the transformation of ordinary peaceful competition for political power and resources between different elites into open violent conflict. The second mechanism that links state weakness and conflict is institutional exclusion and the ‘hour glass’ structure of Ukrainian society. Against this background, case study explains the mass protests in Kyiv in 2004 and 2013-2014 and ongoing conflict in Eastern Ukraine as a result of complex interplay between conflicting interests on the local, national, regional and global levels.

**Roundtable on Ukraine**

*(Chair: Prof. Ulrich Schneckener, Osnabrueck University, Germany; participating faculty: Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK, Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko, Donetsk State University of Management, Ukraine, and selected participants from Ukraine)*

The Euromaidan revolution in Ukraine was not simply against the corruption, but for a new national agenda for country. Ukrainian society has demonstrated its commitment not only to street protests, but also to resistance to civil war and external intervention. During the roundtable with participation of the experts, representing major cities around the country we discussed the reactions on Ukrainian crisis and views from the regions and possible settlement of the conflict in the Donbas. The roundtable explored the two different crises at play in Ukraine: the crisis within Ukraine and the larger one between Russia and the West. Ukrainian experts at the roundtable discussed the protracted crisis which undermines country toward political, social and economic collapse.

**May 20, 2014**

**Managing a Local Conflict in a Complex Regional Environment (small group exercise)**

*(Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK)*

This case study analyzes a range of existing proposals that reflect the Moldovan, Russian/Transnistrian and Mediators’ positions to date and proposes a framework in which consensus they exhibit, can be accommodated. The conflict over the Transnistrian in Moldova has made little progress towards a settlement since the original cease-fire agreement of 1992 despite a number of proposals from most of the relevant conflict and third parties. Rather than assessing why negotiations have frequently stalled, this case study proposes content of existing proposals against the background of existing theories of territorial conflict management and proposes a framework for a durable settlement of the Transnistrian conflict within in the current 5+2 negotiation format: a multiple asymmetric federacy arrangement supplemented by central-level power sharing and entrenched in domestic and international law.

**May 21, 2014**

**Concluding Roundtable Discussion** **‘A Synergy of Internal Strategic Analytical Capabilities of the NATO Member States and Partner Countries’**

*Chair: Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK, Prof. David Galbreath, University of Bath, UK, Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko, DonSUM, the project participants*

The project participants and the key speakers discussed new concerns raised by the Ukrainian crisis as well as the political, economic and security challenges for European security. The participants examined existent analytical capabilities and tools, employed for strategic and operative planning, conflict prevention and management and discussed theoretical concepts and concrete mechanisms that could be employed to identify and assess emerging threats. In conclusion, the key speakers and participants discussed the possibilities to use knowledge and skills obtained in their teaching practice.

# PROGRAMME

# May 15, 2014

16.00-18.00 *Opening ceremony, Welcome note*

## Project directors: Stefan Wolff, Tetyana Malyarenko; Michael Gaul, Senior Advisor for Strategy and Projects in NATO’s Emerging Security Challenges Division; Representative of the European Delegation to Ukraine

# May 16, 2014

**10.00.-11.30. Lecture ‘A Strategy for NATO, the EU in the New Europe’**

Dr. Derek Averre, University of Birmingham, UK

***11.30.-12.00. Coffee-break***

**12.00.-13.15. Lecture ‘The EU as a Strategic Actor within NATO and Beyond’**

Dr. Derek Averre, University of Birmingham, UK

***13.15.-15.00. Lunch***

**15.00.-16.15. ‘Capabilities and Capacities in Context: NATO Evolving Role in the Wider Region’**

Dr. Alistair Shepherd, Aberystwyth University, UK

***16.15.-16.45. Coffee-break***

17.00 + **Introduction to simulation game: background and emerging cyber/CBRN risk assessments**

Prof. Chad Briggs, Johns Hopkins University, USA

***20.00 Welcome dinner***

# 17 May, 2014

**9.00.-10.15.**

**Lecture** ‘**The European Security Continuum and the EU as an International Security Provider’**

Dr. Alistair Shepherd, Aberystwyth University, UK

**10.15.-11.30.**

**Interactive Presentation:**

**‘Minorities at Risk: a Risk Assessment Model of Ethno-political Conflict’**

Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK

***11.30.-12.00. Coffee-break***

**12.00.-13.15.**

**Roundtable discussion** ‘How Can We Narrow the Gap between Early Knowledge, Warning and Action?’ Chair: Prof. Stefan Wolff; participating faculty: Prof. Chad Briggs, Dr. Alistair Shepherd, Dr. Derek Averre

***13.15.-15.00. Lunch***

**15.00.-19.00+** Simulation/Wargame ‘Complex Instability Early Warning and Response’

Prof. Chad Briggs, Johns Hopkins University, USA

***20.00 Dinner***

***May 18, 2014***

**9.00.-10.15.**

**Simulation: conclusion and discussion** **‘Post-Wargame *Hotwash* and Debriefing: Lessons for NATO Partner Countries’**

Prof. Chad Briggs, Johns Hopkins University, USA and Prof. David Galbreath, University of Bath, UK

**10.15.-11.30. ‘The End of an Era? Strategic Analysis in Contemporary Europe’**

Prof. David Galbreath, University of Bath, UK

***11.30.-12.00. Coffee-break***

**12.00.-13.15. Lecture ‘The EU’s Neighbourhood Policy and the Challenges of the Eastern Partnership’** Prof. Richard Whitman, University of Kent

***13.15.-15.00. Lunch***

**15.00.-16.30. Case study** (small group exercise) **‘Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Greater Threat Inside or Outside NATO and the EU?’**

Dr. Annemarie Peen Rodt, Roskilde University, Denmark

***16.30.-17.00. Coffee-break***

**17.00.-18.30. Case study** (small group exercise) **‘The Armed Conflict in the Republic of Macedonia in 2001: from the Escalation of Albanian-Macedonian Conflict to Signing the Ohrid Framework Agreement’** Dr. Annemarie Peen Rodt, Roskilde University, Denmark

***20.00 Dinner***

# May 19, 2014

**9.00-10.15**

*Conflict Prevention and Early Warning in the Practice*

**Interactive presentation ‘Fragile States and Dilemmas of Statebuilding’**

Prof. Ulrich Schneckener, Osnabrueck University, Germany

**10.15-11.30**

**Lecture followed by discussion** **‘The Role of Armed Non-State Actors in Fragile States’**

Prof. Ulrich Schneckener, Osnabrueck University, Germany

***11.30-12.00 Coffee-break***

**12.00.-13.15. Lecture ‘The Crimea Crisis of 2014: The EU’s Georgia Moment of 2008 Revisited’**

Prof. Richard Whitman, University of Kent

***13.15-15.00 Lunch***

**15.00-16.30 Case study** (small group exercise) **‘Mass Protests and Revolutions in Weak and Failing States’** Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko, DonSUM, Ukraine

***16.30-17.00 Coffee-break***

**17.00-18.30 Roundtable on Ukraine**

Chair: Prof. Ulrich Schneckener, Osnabrueck University, Germany; participating faculty: Prof. Stefan Wolff, Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko, Prof. Richard Whitman, Prof. David Galbreath

***20.00. Dinner***

# May 20, 2014

**9.30-11.00. Case study** (small group exercise) **‘Managing a Local Conflict in a Complex Regional Environment’**Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK

***11.00-11.30 Coffee-break***

**11.30-13.00. Lecture ‘The Caucasus Region: Current Realities’**

Lawrence Scott Sheets, South Caucasus Project Director, International Crisis Group

***13.00-15.00 Lunch***

**15.00-16.30. Case study** (small group exercise) **‘The Geneva Talks: The Dynamics Behind a Half Decade of Virtual Deadlock’** Lawrence Scott Sheets, South Caucasus Project Director, International Crisis Group

***16.30-17.00 Coffee-break***

**17.00-18.15**

**Case study** (small group exercise) **‘The Russian North Caucasus: Understanding Challenges for Regional and European Security’** Lawrence Scott Sheets, South Caucasus Project Director, International Crisis Group

**20.00 Dinner**

# *May 21, 2014*

**9.00-10.15**

**Concluding Roundtable Discussion** **‘A Synergy of Internal Strategic Analytical Capabilities of the NATO Member States and Partner Countries’**

Chair: Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK, Prof. David Galbreath, University of Bath, UK, Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko, DonSUM

**10.15-11.30 Presentation of joint publication project**

Project directors: Prof. Stefan Wolff, University of Birmingham, UK,

Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko, DonSUM, Ukraine

***11.30-12.00 Coffee-break***

**12.00-18.00 Discussion of the project results and presentations of participants**

***18.00 Dinner and departure of participants***

**Activities**

Jean Monnet Information and Research activity ‘***Towards a More Resilient European Neighborhood: Security Cooperation and the Management of Current and Future Threats in Europe’s Strategic Orbit’*** has been built on existing strengths of International Association for Institutional Studies and its experience to manage EU-funded projects. During implementation of this Jean Monnet project, we established new stable links and collaboration with civil society, local authorities, the mass media, international organizations and academic associations, active in the field of European integration and European security. We also have strengthened contacts with our long-term partners.

**First,** we accepted representatives of local, national governmental and non-governmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations, the mass-media as the project participants (for example, we accepted representatives of local NGOs: ‘Kharkiv Human Rights Group’, ‘Falco centre –Research of North Caucasus”, ‘Eurosecurity –Baltics’; national NGOs: ‘Democratic Initiatives Foundation’, Ukraine, ‘Atlantic Council’, Ukraine, ‘Movement for Defence of Voters’, Russia, Ukrainian Social Investment Fund, Ukraine, Bulgarian Helsinki Committee, Bulgaria and Helsinki Human Rights Group, Ukraine; international NGOs: ‘Amnesty International’, ‘Human Rights Watch’, ‘Open Society Think Tank Fund’, Hungary, International Crisis Group - Caucasus, International Crisis Group - Central Asia and others; **mass-media:** Theconversation.com, Thepointjournal, NewEuropa, LSEBlog, Bloomberg, The Washington Post, BBC, Rayjo.net, and others.

**Second,** in the framework of **2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute** and separately, we organized several events, panels and meetings with participation of representatives of NGOs, the mass-media and public policy groups. Example of the most internationally visible panels and workshops include:

1. *‘Ground Truth Briefing: Ukraine at Crisis Point’ and ‘Ukraine’s Unrest – A View from the Region’* (Tetyana Malyarenko made presentation and was interviews by Kennan Institute, the Wilson centre for International Scholars, Washington DC, USA); <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/ukraine%E2%80%99s-unrest-%E2%80%93-view-the-regions>; <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/ground-truth-briefing-ukraine-crisis-point>;
2. Tetyana Malyarenko and International Association for Institutional Studies played as co-organizers of ‘Policy Development and Confidence Building Workshop for Civil Society Leaders and Policy Makers from the Black Sea Region’ in Central European University, Budapest in cooperation with School of Public Policy, CEU, Budapest, Hungary; <http://www.esiweb.org/index.php?lang=en&id=574>
3. Prof. Wolff and Prof. Malyarenko co-organized and delivered key presentations at ‘Ukraine’s Prolonged Crisis: Security Concerns and Internal Reforms’ in CEU, Budapest in June 2014, <http://www.ceu.hu/event/2014-06-06/ukraines-prolonged-crisis-security-concerns-and-internal-reforms> and international conference ‘Exporting Regimes? Interests and Strategies of Powerful States in the Post-Communist Space’ at Hertie School of Governance, Berlin, Germany <http://www.ascn.ch/en/Events/Conference-Berlin.html>
4. Tetyana Malyarenko and David Galbreath co-organized international workshop for decision-makers and civil society activists at the University of Bath, UK (topic: ‘Constructing the Nation’);
5. Prof. Stefan Wolff participated as an international expert in a number of meetings and special events and negotiations around conflicts in Ukraine, Moldova organized by Department for International Development, UK, OSCE, and NATO.

**Third,** we have established the long-term cooperation with **Theconversation.com** – ‘an independent source of news and views sourced from academic and research community and delivered to the public’. Theconversation.com is a joint project of a number of leading universities in UK, USA and Australia. For Theconversation.com Tetyana Malyarenko and Stefan Wolff wrote more than 20 articles on Russia-Ukraine war and Russia-EU, Ukraine-EU politics and international relations.

**Fourth,** cooperation with the NATO Science for Peace Program for implementation of this Jean Monnet project allowed us to establish contacts with leading international policy experts in European and Euro-Atlantic security.

**Fifth,** we have strengthened cooperation with International Crisis Group**,** an independent, non-profit, non-governmental organization committed to preventing and resolving deadly conflict. Leading experts representing the International Crisis Group taught at the Advanced Study Institute; the key experts of the Jean Monnet project participated in research and consulting activities of the International Crisis Group and committed to Europe report ‘Ukraine Running out of Time’ (report of International Crisis Group on Ukraine).

Also, during the project year 2013-2014 we continue our cooperation with other Jean Monnet projects and Jean Monnet professors, in particular, with Prof. Richard Whitman and Dr. Tom Casier (Multilateral Research group on EU-Russia relations), Global Europe Centre, University of Kent, UK and University Association for Contemporary European Studies; with Jean Monnet Inter-University centre of Excellence, Opatija and Interuniversity Centre Dubrovnik, Croatia, with Institute for the Danube Region and Central Europe led by Prof. Erhard Busek, Jean Monnet Professor ad personam and Chairman of the Institute, with Jean Monnet Chairs and Professors at Georgetown University, Washington DC, USA. The cooperation manifests itself as joint publications, jointly-organized panels and roundtables, consulting projects for national governments and international organizations, exchange visits and guest lecturing.

This project year the particular attention has been paid to collaboration and dissemination of the project result via the web-based platforms (both formal – through the web-site of International Association for Institutional Studies and partner institutions, and informal – through social networks, for example, the project page at Facebook, https://www.facebook.com/2014JeanMonnet personal web-sites of Prof. Stefan Wolff, [www.stefanwolff.com](http://www.stefanwolff.com) personal pages of participating scholars at Linkedin, Academia.edu, ResearchGate, Ukrainian Scholars Worldwide etc.

The web-site of the project has been used for dissemination of the project products. Through the web-site we gave all interest groups, such as the project participants, media, general public free access to the project materials, presentations, participants’ personal portfolios, and consolidated the network of contacts in the field of European Security.

*Main products placed at the project web-site:*

Video- and audio- presentations;

Podcasts;

Interviews with participants;

News and announcements on European integration/security related issues.

**2014 Jean Monet NATO Advanced Study Institute** received very positive media coverage and reporting in several electronic and printed mass media. Interviews with Stefan Wolff, Tetyana Malyarenko, David Galbreath, Chad Briggs and other key speakers and participants were published by international and printed mass media.

**Publications**

The knowledge generated and understanding gained in this project has been disseminated in a variety of different ways.

First, hand book **‘European security in an era of complex challenges’** (Ukrainian-language publication*; 240 pages; 500 copies in hard and paper cover have been disseminated among the stakeholders, including participants of 2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute in May, universities and public libraries in Ukraine and the EU member states as well as for all interested individuals; online version is also available at* [*http://ainstud.at.ua*](http://ainstud.at.ua)*).* A number of presentations of this publication for international academic and policy community was organized in the framework of several international conferences and roundtables, including NISPAcee annual conference in Budapest, Hungary, Donetsk Summer School on European Security in Kiev, Ukraine, international workshop ‘Policy Development and Confidence Building’ in Budapest, Hungary and others. The hand book was placed at a number of academic web-sites, for example, at [www.academia.edu](http://www.academia.edu) and meets a sharp interest from students of International Relations in Ukraine.

Second, **a special issue of conference proceedings** (English-language publication, authors: the key speakers and project participants, in paper cover) was published by Skhidniy Vidavnichiy Dim Publishing House. The conference proceedings is also available online <http://ainstud.at.ua>

# The project team and seminar participants have issued a number of internationally visible publications, such as book chapters and articles in referred journals, for example: Tetyana Malyarenko and David Galbreath – Crimea: Competing Self-Determination Movements and the Politics at the Centre in the Routledge Journal ‘Europe-Asia Studies’ [http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09668136.2013.805964#.VEyajvmsXBQ](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09668136.2013.805964%22%20%5Cl%20%22.VEyajvmsXBQ) *;* David Galbreath (co-authored with A. Lasas, 2013) – Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in Maxine D., Jackie G., and Hiski H (eds) National Perspectives on Russia. European Foreign policy in the Making. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 149-169 (Routledge Advances in European Politics, 94); Stefan Wolff (2014) – Twenty Years on and Twenty Years Ahead in JEMIE – Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe, also available online: http://www.ecmi.de/fileadmin/downloads/publications/JEMIE/2013/Wolff.pdf ; Alistair Shepherd (2014) – Comprehensive or Contradictory? The EU’s Civil-Military Conflict Management Capability in the Routledge journal of European Security, issue 4; Igor Delanoe (co-authored with Sergei Konoplyov, 2014) – Continuities and Raptures: Tracking the US Interests in the Black Sea area in the Context of the Pivot to Asia in Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies, also available online [http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19448953.2014.928539#.VE3hU\_msXBQ](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19448953.2014.928539%22%20%5Cl%20%22.VE3hU_msXBQ); Hannah Shelest (2014) – Moldova: Russia’s next target if the West falters in Ukraine; Igor Delanoe (2014) – Russia’s plans for Crimea: the economic development in Harvard Black Sea Security Program, also available online <http://russiancouncil.ru/en/blogs/igor_delanoe/?id_4=1296> : ; http://www.harvard-bssp.org/static/files/442/black\_sea\_cover-2014\_FINAL.pdf ; Andris Banka (2014) – Baltic Promises in New Eastern Europe, also available online: <http://www.neweasterneurope.eu/interviews/1323-baltic-promises>; Octawian Milewski (2014) The Maidan Uprising, Separatism and Foreign Intervention, Peter Lang, also available online: <http://www.peterlang.com/index.cfm?event=cmp.ccc.seitenstruktur.detailseiten&seitentyp=produkt&pk=81980&cid=448>; Azad Garibli (2014) – Militarization of the Caspian Sea in the Caspian Sea Chessboard: geopolitical, Geo-Strategic and Geo-economic analysis, Milan, Italy; Aleksandr Papko (2014) - Minsk or Moscow – Where is ‘red button’? also available online: [http://www.eesc.lt/uploads/news/id766/Bell%202014%204%20(46).pdf](http://www.eesc.lt/uploads/news/id766/Bell%202014%204%20%2846%29.pdf) and others.

Examples of contribution to and cooperation with the mass media include**:** interview by Prof. Wolff for the Polish radio in Belarus: http://www.radyjo.net/4/91/Artykul/172204 ; Prof. David Galbreath published his article in theconversation: https://theconversation.com/ukraine-gives-nato-a-reason-to-exist-but-big-players-demur-26544 ; Interview by Prof. Wolff for Belarussian media: http://thepointjournal.com/output/index.php?art\_id=305&spr\_change=eng ; publications and interviews by Aleksand Papko (a journalist from Poland and Belarus, the project participant) for Belarussian Radio; Topic: the conflict in Ukraine and European Security: <http://www.radyjo.net/4/91/Artykul/182436>; <http://www.radyjo.net/4/91/Artykul/182436>; <http://www.radyjo.net/4/91/Artykul/182436>; <http://www.radyjo.net/4/91/Artykul/182436>; interview of the project participant Azad Garibli <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vxIsQzGuArs>; a series of publications for theconversation (Prof. Stefan Wolff and Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko) Self-styled people’s governor of Donetsk tells us: these areas have always been Russian<https://theconversation.com/self-styled-peoples-governor-of-donetsk-tells-us-these-areas-have-always-been-russian-29708>; Lack of trust and tit-for-tat escalation brings Ukraine to the brink of all-out war with Russia<https://theconversation.com/lack-of-trust-and-tit-for-tat-escalation-brings-ukraine-to-the-brink-of-all-out-war-with-russia-29707> ; Now Crimea's in the Bag. Where Next for Putin and Russia? <https://theconversation.com/now-crimeas-in-the-bag-where-next-for-putin-and-russia-24521>; Crimea votes to Secede from Ukraine as EU Considers Sanctions Against Russia; <https://theconversation.com/crimea-votes-to-secede-from-ukraine-as-eu-considers-sanctions-against-russia-24426>**;** How can Ukraine, Crimea and Russia Secure a Stable Future? <https://theconversation.com/how-can-ukraine-crimea-and-russia-secure-a-stable-future-23947>; Putin Calling All Shots in Ukraine What Next for Relations Between Russia and the West? <https://theconversation.com/putin-calling-all-the-shots-in-ukraine-what-next-for-relations-between-russia-and-the-west-23867>; Crimea Flashpoint Raises Stakes in Russia's Regional Player Play; <https://theconversation.com/crimea-flashpoint-raises-stakes-in-russias-regional-power-play-23863>; Crimea: the Polarised Peninsula Threatening to Rip Ukraine Apart; <https://theconversation.com/crimea-the-polarised-peninsula-threatening-to-rip-ukraine-apart-23739>; Ukraine a Pawn in High-Stakes Global Game with no Quick Win in Sight for EU, US or Russia; The Conversation; <https://theconversation.com/ukraine-a-pawn-in-high-stakes-global-game-with-no-quick-win-in-sight-for-eu-us-or-russia-23670>; Chocolate King Poroshenko Wins Ukraine Presidency, but Violence Continues; <https://theconversation.com/chocolate-king-poroshenko-wins-ukraine-presidency-but-violence-continues-27203>; Whoever Wins Ukraine Elections Faces an Uncertain Mandate and No Easy Path to Peace; <https://theconversation.com/whoever-wins-ukraine-election-faces-an-uncertain-mandate-and-no-easy-path-to-peace-27145>; Ukrainian Separatists Engaged in High Risk Game as They Press on With Referendum Plan; <https://theconversation.com/ukraine-separatists-engaged-in-high-risk-game-as-they-press-on-with-referendum-plan-26279>; With Geneva Deal Dead Ukraine Could be Pivotal Moment for International Relations; <https://theconversation.com/with-geneva-deal-dead-ukraine-could-be-pivotal-moment-for-international-relations-25921>; All Eyes on Russia as Ukraine Hurtles Towards Civil War; <https://theconversation.com/all-eyes-on-russia-as-ukraine-hurtles-towards-civil-war-25400>; Ukraine Veers Closer to Collapse as Activists in Donetsk Proclaim People’s Republic; <https://theconversation.com/ukraine-veers-closer-to-collapse-as-activists-in-donetsk-proclaim-peoples-republic-25351>

**Others**

Jean Monnet Information and Research project **‘Towards a More Resilient European Neighbourhood: Security Cooperation and the Management of Current and Future Threats in Europe’s Strategic Orbit’** has been built on experience and advantages of three Jean Monnet information and research activities, implemented by International Association for Institutional Studies in Ukraine and led by Tetyana Malyarenko in cooperation with Prof. Stefan Wolff, university of Birmingham, UK. The **first project** (***2008-2009 ‘Europe’s Evolving Security Architecture: Integration, Cooperation or Confrontation?’***) was running for one year; it consisted of web-based learning – Advanced Distance Learning Working Groups, a four day winter institute in Donetsk, Ukraine and a twelve-day summer institute in Yalta, Ukraine. At the core of the second project (***2010-2011 ‘Human Security and Security Strategy: Institutions and Policies in a European Perspective’***) was a set of activities, including international conference that brought together more than 50 participants from the EU, the CIS, the USA and Canada. The third project ***(2011-2012 ‘Ukraine-EU Cooperation in Crisis Management and Disaster Risk Reduction’)*** involved more than 50 participants (international seminar in May 2012) and 18 participants (workshop in January 2012) from the EU, the CIS, the USA and Canada. These projects generated a number of follow-up activities among participants individually and in groups including publications, collaborative teaching and research projects and exchange visits. Moreover, subject-specific expert network was established and consolidated; in integration between professionals in this area with academics has been enhanced to enable better-informed, evidence-based practice of effective and efficient security policy-making.

The great success of Jean Monnet information and research activities on European security in Ukraine, measured in a huge number of applications, geographical coverage of the project participants, representing different academic traditions and research interests within broadly defined field of European Security Studies and contribution that project made to improving the breadth and depth of higher education provision in the area of European Integration/European Security Studies, encourages us to develop ***Jean Monnet Spring Seminar on European Security*** as a continuity project and organise it on an annual base in the future periods. ***The Jean Monnet Spring Seminar on European Security*** concentrates on Europe’s political and social challenges, the EU’s global role and its neighbourhoods. Methodologically, the seminar focuses on non-military threats for European security, identified from a wide ‘people-centred’ approach to security. It will provide a broad and theoretically grounded understanding of new approaches and new challenges to European Security.

As a continuity project, Jean Monnet Spring Seminar on European Security is Ukraine-based event. It has been implemented by International Association for Institutional Studies, in partnership with University of Birmingham and the Routledge Series on European Security..

Advantage: the format of association

Unlike public universities in Ukraine, the format of association can provide a platform for horizontal networking between members of academic communities regardless of the formal status in the university, open exchange of ideas, promotion of liberal European values and cooperation for mutual benefit. In this and its future projects, International Association for Institutional Studies defines its mission in establishing dialogue and networking among academics, civil society and policy communities in the EU member states and European neighbourhood countries.

**Evaluation and self-reflection**

We have established clear indicators of the Jean Monnet project success. *First, it is number of courses taught on European integration/European security* before the project commencement and after its conclusion in the project participants’ institutions. During the implementation of the project, the project participants started teaching of new courses on European integration and European security in their home institutions. The particular progress has achieved in Universities of the Eastern Partnership countries: Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, Azerbaijan and Ukraine. For example, young scholars from Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan have jointly developed new teaching module: ‘De facto entities in the Caucasus and European security’ (including the syllabus, materials for lectures, seminars, roundtable discussions and case studies’. Tetyana Malyarenko has published new teaching case study ‘New wars in Europe’ (in Russian and English). aimed at development of analytical skills of researchers and faculty, specializing in the military (hard) security. Mrs. Maria Chada, a Marie Curie fellow from City University of Dublin has developed new seminar ‘European policy behavior of South Caucasian States’. The materials were disseminated among the project participants with particular focus on dissemination among the participants from Caucasus countries.

*Second, it is number of collaborative teaching and research projects generated.*

The most indicative examples of cooperation include: *Working Group on Good Governance, Human Rights and Development* in the framework of NISPAcee annual conference in Budapest, Hungary (chairs: Tetyana Malyarenko and David Galbreath, the project participants Vladimir Salamatov, Ukraine, Tina Sever, Slovenia, Alex Aleshka, Poland);

*Summer School on European Security* (for students from Ukraine, Belarus and Poland) was organized between 7 and 12 June in Kiev, Ukraine. This 5 day event was organized in cooperation with Ludwig Maximilians University Munich, Germany, DAAD and Kyiv Mohila National University, Ukraine. This follow-up event allowed us to extend the scope of the project directly on the student audience, to attract junior faculty from Germany, Poland and Ukraine to teaching on the Summer School and, thus, to examine knowledge and skills, which they obtained during 2014 Jean Monnet NATO Advanced Study Institute.

NATO Science for Peace Program co-funded our Jean Monnet project (with title ‘*Enhancing Strategic Analytical Capabilities in NATO Partner Countries’*, project directors: Prof. Stefan Wolff and Prof. Tetyana Malyarenko). NATO co-funding allowed us to extend duration of the final dissemination event from 4 to 7 days, invite more participants from the USA, UK and Canada and to provide the participants with more comfortable accommodation, cover airport transfer, coffee-breaks, welcome dinner etc. Have been synthesized both research ideas, we assigned more attention and working time for discussion of the Ukrainian crisis, military (hard) security, development of critical skills of the participants in the form of simulation games, round-table discussion, small working groups, presentation of the research papers.

And, finally, during the project implementation period, we have established long-term cooperation with www.theconversation.com, which provides wide dissemination of the project results among international academic, policy and civil society communities.

*Evaluation of the project by the project participants*

Feedback by the project participants and core faculty was arranged through a number of communication channels such as *formal communications*: (1) letter of motivation, individual report, which each participant should have to submit; (2) participant survey; *informal communications:* (3) open discussion upon completion of each module and seminar; (4) informal network on Facebook, administrated by the project participants.

All participants of the Jean Monnet project ***‘Towards a More Resilient European Neighbourhood: Security Cooperation and the Management of Current and Future Threats in Europe’s Strategic Orbit’*** are young, highly motivated and personally interested in maximizing the return that they get from participation in Jean Monnet project in their scholarly development. It was common for our participants to express the wish to know more about particular subject or to discuss the utility and applicability of particular teaching method, to ask questions or request individual consultations with core faculty. In such conditions, there is no special need to encourage activity among participants. Nevertheless, we employed a number of strategies to develop the potential of the participants through their intrinsic motivation and stimulation of deep approach to learning focusing on their motivation and creation of encouraging learning environment. Intrinsic motivation is stimulated by focusing on subjects relevant to the participants: specific research interests, immediate real world concern, prior experience, future goals.

Ideas and suggestions for further project improvement and development, expressed by the participants

* To intensity collaboration between senior faculty who served as the key speakers and younger scholars, including joint teaching and research projects, joint publications with prominent scholars in the field;
* To strengthen a continuity project – Jean Monnet Spring Seminar on European Security;
* To allow ample time for participants’ questions;
* To widely use opportunities/capacities of distance learning; to place information and the project results online;
* To further encourage the project participants for networking; creation of sustainable academic networks of communication and exchange.

**A summary of the main results**

In this Jean Monnet project we continue to endeavour to strike a good balance between the theoretical, conceptual, empirical, and applied dimensions of the project subject area. This varies across the meetings and activities, but our aim was to show the relationship between different dimensions of European Security Studies and strengthen participants’ overall knowledge and understanding, as well as their teaching and research skills. This translates practically into a continuation of the use of varied teaching formats and methods – from lectures to seminars to simulations – and includes modules specifically geared towards teaching and research methods. Increasingly, our program involves participants into specific collaborative teaching and research initiatives.

In summary, the goals and objectives of this ***Jean Monnet project ‘Towards a More Resilient European Neighbourhood: Security Cooperation and the Management of Current and Future Threats in Europe’s Strategic Orbit’*** achieved.

The project made a contribution to increasing the total number of research projects, courses and hours devoted to European integration and European security in participants’ home institutions and increased the number of publications by participants in the area of European security studies. The project also generated a number of follow-up activities among participants individually and in groups, including individual and collaborative research projects. By mobilizing networks and accessing established dissemination networks we also increased use, beyond participants, of web-based resources created as part of this project.