

**EU Strategic partnerships:
Shallow political summits, active technical dialogues?**

Emmanuel Vivet, Victoire de Lalande

Institute for Research and Education on Negotiation (IRENE), Paris

Abstract

This paper provides a global picture of the structured dialogues that underpin the ten strategic partnerships¹ of the EU. It goes, for each partner, into the details of the bilateral relation, disclosing the list of technical meetings that take place on a regular basis between the European External Action Service (EEAS) or the Commission Directorates, and each individual partner. These official meetings have been established over time.

Individual snapshots are provided for in annex, disclosing the “internal structure” of the ten strategic partnerships. They show, for each partner, how many of these technical dialogues are at work behind the scene, and on what specific issues. From agriculture to human rights to customs or intellectual property rights, the list of dialogues reveals large differences in quantity, frequency and quality between the partners.

After presenting the results of the investigation for the ten partners, the paper discusses the variations between them.

Finally, we argue that the technical dialogues could be used better by the EU in order to run more effective strategic partnerships. Although it is true that political momentum can be key for partnerships to bear fruit and although the wider geopolitical context counts, the work that is carried out at technical level does make a difference, especially for the EU. Such work is not just the consequence, or the mirror, of the political context. It can be a driver of the relation.

This is due to the fact that while the EU lacks some of the tools of a traditional diplomacy (notably military power, visas and the prestige of nations-states), its norm setter’s power as well as its technological collective knowledge make it attractive for third countries to discuss at technical level. Along with the concept of “reciprocal engagement” (Fox and Godement, 2009), we argue that the EU could leverage stronger on this and that an adequate management of bilateral technical groups could improve its international negotiation power.

* * *

1. Availability of information on technical dialogues

A lot of information is available on the bilateral summits of the EU, with analyses on their Joint Communiqués, but such is not the case for the technical dialogues underlying the strategic partnerships. Far from the grand meetings that take place at Commission and European Council presidents’ level, we look into all technical groups that are run at bilateral level, from political, economic, sectoral or civil society points of view.

The research included interviews with a number of diplomats and EU officials, in Brussels² and Paris, and exchanges of emails with the ten EU delegations abroad.

The information found is public. All groups have an official existence and most of them were created or confirmed by leaders through the Joint Declarations of summits. However, no table, except one (EU-China), is available on the EEAS and Commission websites. This is because the EU itself finds it difficult to coordinate internally.

Research on strategic partnerships is not extensive. The European Strategic Partnerships Observatory (ESPO, at FRIDE institute), though, publishes papers on the issue, mostly on the geological aspects of these partnerships. A first list of some of the working groups of the strategic partnerships appears on their website, yet with a different classification than in this paper.

¹ Although some authors limit the list of strategic partnerships to nine, we use, in this paper, the commonly accepted list of ten: Brazil, Canada, China, India, Japan, Mexico, Russia, South Africa, South Korea and the USA.

² 3 Asia officials at the EEAS ; 1 official at the General Secretariat of the Council ; 6 permanent representation delegates of one Member State ; 1 former Asia Group chairman ; 1 retired member of the EEAS.

From the interviews, we found that the names of the technical dialogues are accessible but such is not the case for: their meeting frequency, the levels of representations and the dates of latest encounters, which are less easy to find. This is reflected in the tables attached.

Study results show a general pattern that is repeated for all partnerships while, at the same time, large differences, in the number and frequency of meetings of the working groups.

2. The 3-layer internal structure of strategic partnerships

2.1. Summit level

As far as the general pattern is concerned, we find, for each partner, a bilateral summit, at the highest Commission, Council and Third party levels, which covers the whole bilateral relation. Summits may address any subject. They provide face-to-face discussion between leaders, in order to solve big issues, confirm action from lower levels and launch important initiatives. Summits results in Joint Communiqués or Declarations. Research on such declarations is extensive.

It should be noted, however, that even at this highest level, the frequency varies from one partner to another: the norm is of one meeting per year with the EU (China, India, Japan, Brazil, Mexico and South Africa) but one strategic partner has two (Russia -while this is bound to be revised in view of recent events), one country has one every two years (South Korea) and two countries have no set frequency (US, Canada), waiting sometimes two or three years before a real opportunity calls for such summit. This first observation and the fact that close partners such as the US and Canada do not need regular meetings, can be seen as a signal that summit level meetings do not give the full gist of the bilateral relation.

From a technical point of view, summits create a point of convergence for lower-levels. Their power of attraction on the political-administrative relation is such that a number of issues *make their way to the summit*, as a way to gain visibility. Conversely, diplomats push issues to it so that the summit itself, sometimes a little hollow, may appear to be a success.

2.2. Global picture level

Below the summit are three important gatherings at a relatively high level.

If a partnership agreement (or **Framework Agreement**, or Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA)) has been signed with the partner, the relation encompasses an Agreement Joint Committee, whose role is to manage the agreement; it normally meets at DG or deputy DG level in what used to be the RELEX Directorate of the Commission, and is now run by the EEAS; such Joint Committee may itself have created its own subgroups, as is the case for India, for instance. Such PCA or Framework Agreements encompass around 30 articles and cover a wide range of issues of sectoral nature where cooperation is useful (agriculture, transport, phytosanitary, fiscal etc.).

If the intensity of the trade relation so justifies, a **High level trade Group**, or equivalent, may also have been established. This tendency is a recent one. It can be observed from 2006, with the creation of the *Transatlantic Economic Council (TEC)* between the EU and the United States, to 2008, with the *High Level Economic Dialogue (HED)* with China, now *High Level Economic and Trade Dialogue (HLETD)*; and with the *Permanent Partnership Council (PPC)* set up with Russia in 2003. These groups meet at EU commissioner and ministers of the third party (between 3 and 12 each), in order to address important trade and economic issues for both sides.

Such High Level Groups are quite peculiar. They can be seen as the highest level meetings where the Commission has full freedom to act on the international scene without a mandate. Contrary to summits, where the Council presidency is the leader and contrary to trade negotiations, where a Council mandate frames the discussion, High Level Groups act without primary control of the member states. The Commission does report back to member states but does not need a mandate to open the talks. This particular format has, in the past, raised the eyebrows of the member states and even, in the case of some important strategic partners, triggered internal debates: at the end of 2008, the then 133 Committee and the Asia Group of the Council found that Commission should not negotiate *alone* and such forum and should be accompanied with the Presidency and the incoming-presidency. They therefore decided to change the format of such negotiations.

If a **Free Trade Agreement (FTA)** has been negotiated (South Korea) or is being negotiated (India, Canada, Japan, US) with the EU, then a broad-ranging team of Commission Directors and DG, with numerous trade experts, also regularly meets their counterparts of the third country in order to discuss the implementation/ negotiation of the agreement. This kind of broad-ranging gathering covers many of the existing technical dialogues and sometimes supersedes them.

FTA negotiations play a particular role in this context. From an organisational point of view, they stimulate the strategic partnerships because they move forward the work of sometimes already existing sectoral groups. In that sense, it is true, as some authors argue (see, for Brazil, Gratius³, 2012), that FTA negotiations are a useful, if not necessary, step forward for strategic partnerships.

2.3. Technical level

Below the summit and global pictures levels, technical discussions take place. Interviews with diplomats reveal that within the EU, these technical groups are generally, in their discussions and negotiations in Council, divided into four categories:

- Political (or diplomatic) dialogues,
- Trade and economic dialogues,
- Sectoral dialogues,
- Parliamentary, media and civil society dialogues (or discussions).

Details appear at Annexes 1 to 10.

We find large variations in quantity. With China, 65 bilateral groups, from commissioner's level to experts meeting, exist in addition to the annual summit. With the US, the figure is 48. With Russia, we find 39 bilateral groups. With Japan, we find 31 different bilateral groups. With India, 31 groups exist, even though their actual meeting frequency is very low⁴. South Korea has a relatively low number of technical working groups (14), but this is compensated by the existence of a Joint Committee that runs the Free trade agreement (15 groups). Canada has 28 bilateral groups with the EU, some of them being likely to be integrated in the upcoming FTA. Brazil has 26. South Africa has 24. Mexico has a more limited number (13).

It is clear the bare number of groups does not give the gist of a relation, as some groups may not actually meet or may have a shallow content. However, at this stage of the analysis, counting the number of groups gives some indications.

Not surprisingly, the highest number of groups is found in the economic and sectoral fields, where most of EU internal legislation is passed. If we put trade issues (eg. Macroeconomic dialogue) and sectoral issues (eg. Aviation dialogue) together, we can observe that this joint category generates by far the largest number of groups. For instance, China has 44 such trade & sectoral dialogues, not counting the HLETD and the Joint Committee. Including those, the amount of dialogues in trade and sectoral issues is 68 % in the total of all bilateral dialogues. Other relations give about the same outcome, be it Japan (52 %), South Korea (65 %) or India (64 %).

We believe that those figures are less of an indication about the relation than a mirror of the economic nature of the EU: the EU is sought for what it is good at: technical issues, such as agriculture, food safety, customs, market regulation, science and other technologies such as civil aviation, satellite navigation or high tech. As Renard (2012⁵) points out, "trade and economic concerns dominate the EU's interaction with its strategic partners. This emphasis is not surprising given the EU's competence and comparative advantage and considering that the EU is the major trade partner for most of these then countries": as such, a logical consequence of the dominance of EU competence in economic issues and features the European construction since the early 1960s.

Conversely, political/diplomatic dialogues seem, from the numbers, to be less popular. When it comes to discussing security, defence, non-proliferation or regional issues such as Africa, East Asia or regional crises (Middle East, Iran etc.), dialogues with the EU are less numerous. For China, our initial example, we find 11 dialogues (28 % of the total). For Brazil, 4 dialogues (15 %). For South Africa, 5 groups (21 %). For Canada, we find 9 diplomatic and political groups, representing 32 % of meetings. We find US is an exception, with 20 such groups, representing a higher proportion, with 48 % of the total. To a lesser extent, Russia and Japan (were or) are also such exceptions, with respectively 16 and 12 groups, representing 41 % and 39 % of meetings. These exceptions are probably linked to the close security interests with the US and, on the Japanese side, for the Japanese desire to talk about security issues in East Asia.

³ "If neither of these two options – a free trade agreement or a global alliance – materializes, the strategic partnership that both defined five years ago will become meaningless" (Gratius, p. 8)

⁴ Source: interview with the former Head of Unit in charge of India, EEAS, Mr. J.-C. Rémond, Oct. 2011.

⁵ "The EU strategic partner review : 10 principles"

Finally, civil society dialogues, which encompass parliamentary discussions, as well as cultural affairs, youth affairs, academic and media exchanges are in small numbers. However, the importance of these groups should not be completely underestimated. It is possible that the “soft” subjects at stake allow for more freedom of speech for the participants, with some political messages being passed. For instance, groups on trade unions issues or media exchange could be reasonable a substitute to the too rare Human Rights dialogues with some countries such as China.

Further research would be useful in order to base the analysis not only on the number of working groups at stake between the EU and its third countries partners, but also on their meeting frequency. Some meetings do not take place or are postponed; some groups meet at a too low level. On the contrary, some meet often. This would help to weigh the relative importance of each sectoral or political issue, and better determine the overall quality of the relationship.

This is particularly true on the issue of Human Rights: be it as it may an important issue for the external action of the EU, its partners do not favour such meetings. The track record reveals some reluctance from the third country partners. The existence of the group on paper does not mean that real exchanges take place.

3. The density of the technical relations helps to explain the essence of strategic partnerships

In order to further analyse the relation between the EU and its partners, it is necessary to step a little aside from bare numbers. As a matter of fact, some groups do not meet, or meet at a low frequency. Some dialogues are more formal than others.

Hence, a theoretical analytical tool would be the “density” of a relation, as defined by multiplying the number of groups with their frequency of encounters per year and, perhaps, the contents or quality of agendas. However, as said above, access to the actual (not official) frequency of meetings is difficult and does, in any case, change rapidly. We take this as a concept that can be assessed only in qualitative analysis.

From qualitative data and interviews, we find a fair correlation between the density of the relation and the number of working groups’ maps. This is as if the invisible work accomplished at a lower or technical level explained part of the quality of the relation.

Where, for instance, EU-China and EU-India partnerships seem both bear little fruit, and have summits that end in shallow *Joint Communiqués*, we find a completely different picture, with many working groups and a relatively good frequency of meetings on the Chinese side, but fewer groups and a much lower frequency on the Indian one. In a sense, EU and China disagree, but meet often because they need to. Overall, they may stand for what Giovanni Grevi calls a *partnership of necessity* (Grevi, 2011, *Introduction to the Mapping of Strategic Partnerships*). EU and India relation outcomes are poor, the joint communiqués are shallow (see G. Khandekar, 2011, 2012), both entities may not disagree, but they just don’t meet. Measuring the density of the relation would help to draw a line between different partnerships having the apparent same results.

The same comparison would go with Russia, where discussing with the EU on Energy is a necessity (partnership of necessity). The EU legislation puts pressure on Moscow (Nougayrède, 2013). Here, the lack of substantive outcome from the partnership does not prevent a fairly dense mapping of contacts through the Permanent Partnership Council. More generally, on issues such as the REACH directive, the automotive exports or antidumping measures, third countries need to talk to Europe. *Partnerships of necessity* are based on frequent discussions; they help to structure the interdependence between competing partners and to mitigate the bilateral conflictuality.

We see that strategic partnerships should not just be looked at from the point of view of concrete outcome (largely disappointing, as the literature often suggests), but also from the density of the relation itself. From that density point of view, the EU is more of a partner with China or Russia than with India; the partnership with South Korea surpasses that with Brazil. Brazil and South Africa seem to be on the same level.

Conversely, *partnerships of choice* (Grevi) are relations “where priorities converge naturally” due to common values. However they result in varied outcomes, which the shape of technical dialogues can explain. Democracies like India, South Africa or Brazil are examples. While Brazil is, “of the EU’s ten strategic partners, [...] one of the closest to the Union. [...]”, such values are not sufficient: “The two partners continue to share strong political affinities but they have gradually grown apart over time. They are now at a crossroads between continuing their relationship or getting a divorce” (Gratius, 2012, p.7). Why is this partnership at such low level? The lack of political impulse may be at stake, but it can be argued that the relatively low intensity of technical dialogues, in quantity and frequency, also counts in the disappointing results of the relation. The lack of technical dialogues with South Africa or the lack of meeting frequency with India could also help to explain the current outcomes.

4. Technical dialogues can increase the balance of power of the EU

We look into the current role of technical dialogues and then see if they can be used to increase the EU negotiation power.

4.1. What exact role do the technical dialogues play currently?

Firstly, bilateral technical working groups help to avoid misunderstandings, especially where technical problems have the potential to strain the political side of the relation. For instance, the Commission can explain, in the appropriate working group, the details and exceptions of a new directive that has consequences for big companies of the partner. Explaining, as such, is one first step in the relation.

Secondly, and as far as political working groups are concerned, they are a way for the EU's to put forward its views on global issues, sometimes regional issues. As a matter of fact, European views on the Iranian nuclear program or the fight against Climate Change will be better shared if discussed at all levels, including lower ones, in the diplomatic systems of its partners. There is, as Renard⁶ points out, a way forward in using bilateral channels in order to promote "effective multilateralism". Bilateral relations would then become a tool to promote global agendas.

Thirdly, technical dialogues and political summits interact to move forward bilateral projects. A lot of politically important issues need a sound amount of technical preparation before they can actually be put on track; for instance, deciding at summit level to start negotiations on a Free trade agreement requires months of a "scoping exercise" that need to be done at industry and trade negotiators' level. There is an interaction between the technical negotiation and the political decision to launch important joint projects.

Lastly, a hypothesis would be that the higher the density of the relation, the higher the chances that one of the groups actually delivers results. Although this approach may be contested, the fact that some technical working groups would meet on regular basis paves the way in the long term. For instance, the existence of energy or environment working groups with Japan can lead to increased cooperation after the Fukushima accident, precisely because the communication channels are already in place (2009). Sectoral dialogues give substance to the diplomatic relationship.

4.2. Further analysis: the demandeur point of view

Another way of looking at the structured dialogue's maps is to see which of the two partners has the most interests at stake. Fox and Godement⁷, in their 2009 study on the EU-China relation, believe it is important to look at which is the partner with the stronger requests, in a "demandeur" position. They argue that EU diplomats should not just "engage" third country partners, but also ensure that the engagement is reciprocal. They plea for leveraging adequately the issues where EU is strong, in order to promote its interests, as well as increase its balance the power on the international scene.

Let's take a few examples of *demandeur* situations:

- China wishes to engage the EU on the mitigation of antidumping measures or on the promotion of the Market Economy Status before 2016, whereas the EU is keener on discussing Human rights, Intellectual property rights, Syria or Iran nuclear issues.
- Japan has a long term request in discussing security issues in East Asia and tries to involve its partners into this. With the bilateral FTA now on track, Japan will ask for lower Tariff Barriers. The EU, for its part, is interested in Non-Tariff Barriers but also in promoting aeronautics exports. It would like to discuss more broadly death penalty with Japan.
- The US has had long-standing requests on the EU on exports of a number of Agricultural products (beef hormones, chicken, GMO...) whereas the EU would rather like to discuss Climate change mitigation efforts or Banking standards.

⁶ 2012, *Ten Guiding Principles*, op. cit., p. 4.

⁷ FOX, John and François GODEMENT : 2009, *A power audit of the EU-China relations*, European Council on Foreign Relations, www.ecfr.eu

- India has been, over the years, very willing to discuss Visa facilitation for its citizens to the EU or a possible European support to UNSC reform, where the EU is in a defensive position, and whereas the EU is *demandeur* on the protection of Pharmaceutical property rights in India or Child labour prevention. India would also like to discuss Civilian nuclear issues but the EU cannot, because some member states oppose this, etc.

We argue that this “*demandeur*” analysis could be made for every working group: is the EU asking for the meeting? Is it the other party? The overall balance of strategic partnerships could be considered as the weighed addition of the request of both sides.

This kind of analysis is carried out at the higher levels when it comes to drafting agenda summits. As a matter of fact, these agendas are themselves the result of negotiations, where each party (EEAS on one side, third party Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the other side) insists on having its favourite subjects on the table for official discussion. The same could be argued for Ministerial bilateral meetings or other various Senior officials meetings (SOM) that contribute to build the strategic partnership on a regular basis.

But at lower level, at technical groups’ level, does the Commission negotiate in order to balance Europe’s requests against those of its partners?

It does on well-known and specialised issues, inside the trade system, where it has been active for 40 years. This is because FTA negotiations offer an opportunity to balance the outcome of discussions for many different technical working groups under a single DG TRADE umbrella.

But when the relationship becomes wider, with political, as well as technological and security issues on top of trade matters, internal coordination can be improved. The 35 Commission DGs act, on the external scene, in a relatively autonomous way. This results in non-balanced sectoral dialogues, where the EU may give information requested on one side while not obtaining the desired information on the other side. Example: China will call for a meeting on Antidumping and has happened, at the same time, to cancel that on Competition law coordination.

From interviews led with Commission officials in 2011-2013, we are not aware of any internal coordination carried out on such a simple thing as Commissioners’ visits abroad. So, it seems, any Commissioner can visit China, Brazil or the US in a row. Hence, we can suppose that he or she will represent the interests of his or her field, but not act in a coordinated way with other EU interests.

While the Council has a hard time at harmonising the positions of Member States on global and diplomatic issues, the Commission should also coordinate the balance of its interests among the many working groups underlying the strategic relations.

Some room for manoeuvre could certainly be exploited: while China is *demandeur* for working groups on technological issues such as Galileo, aeronautics or civil aviation, the EU is *demandeur* on human rights, intellectual property rights, competition rules, world monetary order, Iran, African cooperation or non-proliferation, notably. The question is not so much that of the outcome of discussions, but to make sure, very simply, that groups meet on a reciprocal basis between offensive and defensive interests. Should the aeronautics group meet, when the dialogue on competition has been postponed? This is an example from many.

Some authors argue that technical dialogues can offer an opportunity to the EU to enhance its negotiating power and call for more reciprocity in external dialogues. Godement (2012⁸) argues that the EU should leverage its newly acquired competency on Investment, under the Lisbon treaty, against a better access to investment in China. Nougayrède (2012) observes that “Europe, without any aggressivity, is showing to Russia the meticulous, calm and efficient strength of its norm setting power”, and goes as far as suggesting leveraging Russia on Syria: “lacking the common *grande politique* from Member States in order to protect [Syrian] civilians, the EU bureaucracy could pick in its technical toolbox.”

Generally speaking, EU does not enjoy the usual tools of diplomatic action: military power, visa facilitation and general prestige are often out of reach. But on the other side, its knowledge in technological issues and its experience in market liberalisations are of interest for its partners. This is an invitation for the EU not just to “engage” them, but also to negotiate on what reciprocal basis discussions can take place.

⁸ GODEMENT François, "La Chine au chevet de l'Europe ?", *Les Échos*, 05.03.2012

4.3. Recommendations

Considering the above, this paper argues that technical working groups are not just the consequence, but can also be a driver of the relation between the EU and its strategic partners. It suggests the EU should pay more attention to its negotiating positions, especially where it is considered attractive, in the technical side of its diplomacy. Trade, Regulations, High Tech, are attractive to third countries. It should be possible to leverage its defensive against offensive positions, provided this is done with diplomatic caution. The outcome that would be gained from such action would be a higher EU profile in its relations with its ten partners. Such measures would include:

- systematic coordination, at EEAS level, of all visits of Commissioners to the third party territories;
- systematic listing, at EEAS level, of offensive and defensive interests, technical group by technical group;
- systematically leveraging meeting dates of EU bilateral groups: the aim being to ensure that meetings requested by the third party take place in a balanced way with the meetings requested by the EU; for example, offensive interest groups (eg. Competition, Maritime agreements) against EU defensive interest groups (eg Antidumping, Space technologies);
- further down the road would be the leveraging of not just meeting dates, but positions. This requires delicate and smoothly balanced trade-offs. For the EU to increase its negotiating position, a real work should start. It should begin with low-profile subjects (eg. leveraging a small 12 M€ modernization program on aeronautics with India against Delhi's signature on the Horizontal aviation agreement⁹) and move on to more ambitious deals (market economy status with China, arms embargo etc.), to be appreciated on a case-by-case basis along with the Council trade and EEAS working groups.

5. Conclusion

Diplomatic, technical, trade, civil society dialogues between the EU and its partners represent the invisible part of strategic partnerships. This region can however be visited: for each partner, a structured dialogues' map can be drawn; it gives an idea of the technical reality of the relationship.

The quantity, the frequency and the quality of such dialogues explain the internal functioning of strategic partnerships. The actual work that is carried out at a lower level has consequences on the relation with each partner.

For the EU, it is important to be able to assess where the balance lies between requests on both sides. This could lead to a "demandeur" analysis, still to be developed, where the interests of each partner could be measured. The EU, its market and its technological capabilities are true assets and can be leveraged in order to handle the power balance of EU on the world scene.

⁹ As was the case during the 2008 Marseille Summit. Source: coasi chair 2009

References

Books

- Barysch, K. (2004), *The EU and Russia strategic partners or squabbling neighbours*, Center for European Reform, London.
- Delapalme, N. and E. Colette (2007), *Union européenne - Afrique : le partenariat stratégique*, Fondation Robert Schuman, Paris.
- Fox, J. and F. Godement (2009), *A power audit of the EU-China relations*, Policy report, European Council on Foreign Relations.
- Gaens, B., Jokela, J. and E. Linnell, (2009), *The role of the European Union in Asia : China and India as strategic partners*, Farnham, Ashgate.
- Grant, C. (2008), *Can Europe and China shape a new world order ?*, Center for European Reform, London.
- Grevi, G. and G. Khandekar (2011), *Mapping EU strategic partnerships*, FRIDE, November.
- Martiningui, A. and R. Youngs (2011), *Challenges for European Foreign Policy in 2012, What kind of geo-economic Europe ?*, FRIDE.

Articles

- Alves, Ph., Draper, P. and N. Khumalo (2009), "Africa's challenges in International Trade and Regional Integration : What Role for Europe?", *SAIIA EU-Africa project, Occasional paper n.32*, May.
- Atanassova-Cornelis, E. (2010), "The EU-Japan Strategic Partnership in the 21st Century: Motivations, Constraints and Practice", *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, Volume 6, Issue 4, pp. 478- 495.
- Beaufort De, V. and A. Colson (2010), "Quelles évolutions pour la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense (PESD) après le Traité de Lisbonne ?", *Cahiers de la Sécurité*, n°14, pp. 25-30.
- Bergeon, S. (2009), "Le partenariat stratégique «UE-Afrique» face aux «situations de fragilité»", *Studia diplomatica*, v. 62, n°2, pp. 53-63.
- Berkofsky, A. (2012), "Ashton in Japan", *Euro-Asia Centre*, 7 November 2012.
- Brodin, C. (2004), "Union européenne et Amérique latine : entre libre-échange et «partenariat stratégique»", *Questions internationales*, n°9, pp. 85-89.
- Chevallier, R. (2007), "The EU-Africa Summit: strategy and partnership", *FRIDE Comment*, December.
- Colson, A. (2010), "Le Service Européen pour l'Action Extérieure : Structure et Défis", *ESSEC IRENE Policy Brief*, n°1, January.
- Danjou, F. (2005), "Les relations franco-chinoises : contrat, connivence stratégique et passion culturelle", *Défense nationale*, n°1, année 61, pp. 74-82.
- Defraigne, P. (2009), "La Chine forcera-t-elle l'Europe à l'unité politique ?", *Fondation Madariaga - Collège d'Europe*, Bruxelles, 7 July.
- EU-RUSSIA CENTRE, *The EU-Russia Modernization Partnership*, *EU-Russia Centre Review n.15*, October.
- Gratius, S. (2012), "Brazil and the European Union. Between balancing and bandwagoning", *FRIDE ESPO Working Paper 2*, July.
- Gratius, S. (2013), "Europe and Latin America: in need of a new paradigm", *FRIDE Working Paper n.116*, February.
- Grevi, G. (2012), "Why EU Strategic Partnerships matter", *FRIDE Working Paper n.1*, June.
- Grevi, G. and A. De Vasconcelos (2008), "Partnerships for effective multilateralism, EU relations with Brazil, China, India and Russia", *Chaillot Paper n.109*, May.
- Grevi, G. and T. Renard (eds) (2012), "Partners in crisis: EU Strategic Partnerships and the Global Economic Downturn", *FRIDE ESPO Report 1*, November.

- Everts, S. and D. Keohane (2003), "The European Convention and EU foreign policy : learning from failure", *Survival*, v. 45, n°3, Autumn, pp. 167-186.
- Helly D. (2012), "The EU-South Africa strategic partnership: changing gear ?", *FRIDE ESPO Policy Brief 7*, September.
- Khandekar, G. (2011), "The EU and India : A Loveless Arranged Marriage", *FRIDE Policy Brief*, n°90, August.
- Khandekar, G. (2012), "The EU-India summit : on the threshold of change", *FRIDE European Strategic Partnership Observatory Policy Brief*, n°1, February.
- Korski, D, Serwer, D. and M. Chabalowski (2009), "A new agenda for EU US security cooperation", *FRIDE Working Paper n.92*, November.
- La Documentation française (2006), "La Russie : partenaire stratégique de la zone euro", *Problèmes économiques*, n°2903, Juy, pp. 35-41.
- Lazarou, E. (2013), "The sixth EU-Brazil Summit : business beyond usual ?", *FRIDE ESPO Policy Brief 8*, March.
- Lieb, J. (2010), "The European External Action Service and the Member States", *The European External Action Service : Challenges for a New Diplomacy*, conference ESSEC IRENE, Paris, 7 May.
- Pekar Lempereur, A. (2009), "Leading Successful Negotiations on Behalf of Europe : An Analysis of the European Commission High-Ranking Officials Practices", *European Review*, v.17, n°3&4, pp. 541-568.
- Renard, T. (2010), "Strategy Wanted: The European Union and Strategic Partnerships", *Egmont Institute, Security Policy Brief N.13*, September.
- Sidiropoulos E. (2012), "Do South Africa and the European Union need each other?", *SAIIA Diplomatic Pouch*, September.
- Smith, M. (1998), "Competitive co-operation and EU-US relations : can the EU be a strategic partner for the US in the world political economy ?", *Journal of European Public Policy*, v. 5, n°4, pp. 561-577.
- Yakemtchouk, R. (2007), "Gazprom : partenaire stratégique de l'Union européenne", *Revue du Marché commun et de l'Union européenne*, n°506, pp. 146-152.

Newspaper articles

- Bourdillon ,Y., "L'ouverture entre la Russie et l'Union européenne piétine", *Les Échos*, 5 June 2012.
- Godement, F., "La Chine au chevet de l'Europe ?", *Les Échos*, 5 March 2012.
- Kastel J.-B. and N. Lacroze, "Focus de l'UE avec la Chine, l'Inde et le Pakistan", Interview d'Emmanuel Vivet, *Le Taurillon*, 12 September 2010.
- Nougayrede, N., "2013: Le retour en force de l'Europe?", *Le Monde*, 31 December 2012.
- Rankin, J., "A Union with a voice?", *European Voice*, 6 May 2010.
- Sergeant J.-C., "Londres réexamine sa relation avec Washington", *Le Monde diplomatique*, September 2010.
- Sorman, G., "Le siècle de l'Asie ? Ce n'est pas si simple", *Le Figaro*, 18 January 2010.
- Stroobants J.-B., "A Bruxelles, l'UE et la Russie étalent leurs divergences", *Le Monde*, 04 December 2012.

Annex A. EU-China Dialogue Architecture – main elements*

SUMMIT ANNUAL

Presidents of the European Council and Commission

I Pillar - Political Dialogue		II Pillar - Economic and Sectoral Dialogue						III Pillar - People-to-People Dialogue	
High Level Strategic Dialogue (Annual) High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy		High Level Economic and Trade Dialogue Annual EC Vice-Presidents responsible for Competition, for Economic Affairs; Trade Commissioner						High Level People-to-People Dialogue (Biannual) Commissioner for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth	
Regular contacts between HRVP and Chinese Foreign Affairs Minister	Political Directors Dialogue (annual)	Joint Committee Ministerial Senior Officials Meeting (Annual)						Policy Dialogue on Cultural Affairs	Policy Dialogue on Youth Affairs
Meetings between Chinese Foreign Affairs Minister and EU HoMs	Chinese Foreign Affairs Minister and EU HoMs							Policy Dialogue on Higher Education and Vocational Training Affairs, incl Dialogue on Multilingualism	
Meetings of EUSRs and Special Envoys	Political Dialogue on Africa (COAFR Dialogue)	Macroeconomic Dialogue	Trade and Investment Policy Dialogue (TIPD)	Consultation on Competition in Industrial Products and WTO/TBT	Dialogue and Consultation Mechanism on Industrial Sectors	Euro Area Troika (Chair of Eurogroup, ECB and Commissioner for Economic and Monetary Affairs) – China Dialogue Pillar 2			
Security and Defence Dialogue	Dialogue on Non Proliferation and Disarmament	Dialogue/WG on Intellectual Property Rights	Economic and Financial Dialogue	Competition Policy Dialogue	Working Group on Best Practices in Trade Defence Instruments				
	Political Dialogue on Latin America	EU-China Joint Customs Cooperation Committee Steering Group	Joint Follow-Up Group on Drug Precursors	High-level Transport Dialogue Subgroups	EU-China Space Technology Cooperation	European Economic and Social Committee Pillars 2 & 3			
	Taskforce on Cyber Issues	Science and Technology cooperation Steering Committee	Nuclear Energy cooperation Steering Committee	- EU-China Maritime Transport Agreement Implementation Meeting	Information and Communications Technologies Research Dialogue				
European Parliament All 3 Pillars		Dialogue on Energy (including HJME)	EU-China Declaration on Energy Security Working group	- Dialogue (not formalised) on Aviation Routes	Dialogue on Electricity Markets	EESC-China Economic and Social Council Roundtable			
Delegation for Relations with the People's Republic of China		Dialogue on Information Technology, Telecommunications and Informatisation	EU-China Climate Change Partnership and BCN on Climate Change	China-Europe Water Platform Dialogue/WG	Dialogue on Sustainable Tourism				
		EU-China Urbanisation Partnership	High Level Dialogue on an integrated Approach to Ocean Management	Dialogue on Fisheries	Regional Policy Dialogue				
		High Level Dialogue on Migration and Mobility	Policy Dialogue and Cooperation in Health and Safety at Work	Dialogue on Health	Dialogue on Employment and Social Policies				
		Dialogue on Product Safety	Memorandum of Understanding concerning Animal Health Co-operation	EU-China Working Group on Pharmaceuticals					
		Other exchanges (not a regular dialogue)	Disaster Risk Management Project						

Source: European External Action Service

* This diagram is not exhaustive. The scope, nature and number of dialogues changes regularly.

ANNEX B. EU - USA Strategic Partnership Dialogues

First joint mention of a "strategic partnership" not identified. The EU mentions the USA as a strategic partner in the Security Strategy 2003.

Joint Summit, almost annual or on ad hoc basis since 1993 gathering CEU President, COM President, HR and President of the USA (latest 26.03.2014)						
Political/ diplomatic dialogues	MFA meetings (simultaneously with the joint summits)	Ministerial meetings (in the margin of UN General Assembly)	Ministerial meetings on justice and home affairs	Political and security committee	Political dialogues on -Africa ; -Maghreb ; -Asia; -Oceania; -Eastern Europe; Central Asia; -Latin America ; - Western Balkan; -Middle East/Gulf; -Middle East peace process; -OSCE ; -UN; -Consular Affairs -Disarmament/Non-proliferation; -Terrorism; -Arms export -Enlargement; -Human rights	
	Almost annual since 1993 MFAs, DG Trade	Annual National Ministers	Biannual DG HOME and DG JUST Commissioners, National ministers from presidency	Biannual (flexible) EEAS	Biannual EEAS	
Economic and trade dialogues*	Transatlantic economic council	Informal macroeconomic dialogue	High-level regulatory cooperation	High-level meeting on the enforcement of competition laws	Joint customs cooperation committee	High-level working group on jobs and growth
	Annual since 2007 DG TRADE Commissioner	Ad hoc DG EFCIN, DG MARKT	Biannual DG ENTR	Annual DG COMP	Annual DG TAXUD	Throughout the year 2012 DG TRADE
Sectoral dialogues*	Energy council	Joint committee on higher education and vocational education and training	GPS-Galileo satellite cooperation	Steering committee on countering violent extremism	Steering committee on migration and refugee issues	Joint technical working group on nuclear technology research and development
	Annual since 2009 (Working groups meet regularly)	Biennial since 1995 DG EAC	Annual DG ENTR, ESA	3-4 per year DH HOME, EEAS	3-4 per year since 2010 DG HOME, EEAS	Annual Joint Research Centre
	Dialogue on drugs	Working group on cyber-security and cyber-crime	Working group on employment and labor-related issues	Informal financial markets regulatory dialogue	Chemicals regulatory dialogue (trilateral with Canada)	Technical commission on energy efficient labeling programs
Biannual DG JUST, EEAS	Annual (flexible) DG HOME, DG CONNECT, EU Agencies, EU Counterterrorism Coordinator	Annual since 1996 DG EMPL	Biannual since 2002 DG MARKET	Annual DG ENTR	Annual DG ENER	
Consumer product safety cooperation	Transport security working group	Joint committee for air transport and air safety	High-level regulatory trilateral EU-US-China meetings	Joint senior level working group on development		
Several per year DG SANCO	Annual DG MOVE	Biannual DG MOVE	Biennial DG SANCO	Biannual DG DEV		
Parliamen- tary, Media and Civil society dialogues	Transatlantic legislators dialogue		Transatlantic consumer dialogue		Transatlantic business council Ad hoc since 1989	
	Biannual since 1999 Delegations of the European Parliament		Annual since 1998 EU Consumer representatives		Business leaders	

Abbreviations :

COM : European Commission, CEU : Council of the European Union, DG : Directorate General, HR : High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, MFA : Minister of Foreign Affairs. *Part of these dialogues have generated parallel talks in the framework of the FTA negotiations. The Website EPSO helped to fill some missing working group names in this document.

E. Vivet, V. de Lalande, ESSEC IRENE

ANNEX C. EU - Canada Strategic Partnership Dialogues

First joint mention of a "strategic partnership" at the EU-Canada Summit, Quebec, Canada, 17 October 2008.

Joint Summit , almost annual since 1990 gathering COM President, HR and CA Prime Minister, CA Minister of Trade (latest 05.05.2010)						
Political/diplomatic dialogues	MFA meetings Annual since 1990 10-11 April 2013 HR/ CA Vice President	High-level coordination group four per year since 2004 EEAS		START consultations on crisis management since 2008	Political dialogue 2nd semester 2012 + ad hoc: 10.04.2013 EC Pol. Dir./CA Deputy MFA	
	Africa Consultations 12.12.2011, Ottawa 15.05.2012, Brussels	Middle East Bilateral meeting 16-17.10.2012, Ottawa	Asia-Pacific Dialogue (Date to be set)	Arctic Dialogue (Date to be set)	Latin America and the Caribbean region Political consultations 22.11.2011	
Economic and trade dialogues*	Joint cooperation committee Annual meeting Based on 1976 Framework Agreement Director EEAS /CA DG Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Develop. (DFATD - CDN) + Trade and Investment Sub-Committee two per year Head of Unit (HoU) DG TRADE / CA Director DFATD			Regulatory cooperation committee Annual meeting Based on 2004 Framework on Regulatory Cooperation and Transparency Meeting at HoU DG ENTR / CA Dir. DFATD		Joint customs co-operation committee Ad hoc Based on 1997 Agreement on Customs Cooperation and Mutual Assistance on Customs Matters DG TAXUD (+Member States) / CA Border Services Agency
Sectoral dialogues*	Fisheries high-level consultations Annual, since 19997 Director/HoU DG MARE / CA DG Department of Fisheries and Oceans	Agriculture dialogue Annual, since 2007 Dir. DG AGRI / CA DG AgCda	Humane trapping joint management committee Annual Based on 1997 Agreement on International Humane Trapping Standards DG ENV	Veterinary joint management committee Annual Based on 1998 Veterinary Agreement DG SANCO (+ Member States) / CA CFIA	Competition joint cooperation committee Semi-annual Based on 1999 Competition Cooperation Agreement DG COMP (EU) / CA Competition Bureau	
	Wine and spirit drinks joint management committee Annual Based on 2003 Agreement on Trade in Wine and Spirit Drinks Dir./HoU DG AGRI / CA DG AgCDA and/or Dir. DFATD	Air transport Preliminary* JC Annual Based on 2008 Air Transport Agreement Implementation *pending full EU ratification	Energy High level dialogue 1 every 18 months 2007 DG ENER (Dir. or DDG)	Joint science and technology cooperation committee (JSTCC) Annual Based on 1996 Agreement for Scientific and Tech. Cooperation DG RTD / CA Dir. or Dep. Dir.	Environment high-level dialogue 1 every 18 months Established based on exchange of letters on environmental cooperation DG ENV + DG CLIMA	
	Nuclear energy research and development cooperation is covered by a separate agreement between Canada and EURATOM. Regular consultation meetings take place					
Parliamentary, media and civil society dialogues	Inter-parliamentary meetings Bi-annual since 1974 European Parliament delegation	Business information seminar Annual since 1984 Business leaders	Higher education, training and youth – Project Directors Conference 2011 DG EAC	Youth programs dialogue EU Youth in Action (DG EAC) / CA Youth Take Charge		

Abbreviations :

COM : European Commission, CEU : Council of the European Union, DG : Directorate General, HR : High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, MFA : Minister of Foreign Affairs, CA : Canada. *Part of these dialogues have generated parallel talks in the framework of the FTA negotiations.

ANNEX D. EU-Mexico Strategic Partnership Dialogues

First joint mention of a "strategic partnership" at the 4th Mexico-EU Troika Summit, Lima, Peru, 17 May 2008.

Joint Summit , every two years since 1997, gathering COM President, CEU President and President of MX, MX MFA (latest Los Cabos, Mexico, 17.06.2012)				
Political/diplomatic dialogues	Joint council Biennial since 1997 (last 09.02.2012. Often simultaneous to EU-Rio Group Ministerial Meeting) HR, EEAS / MX MFA	Joint committee (JC includes 3 pillars: political, trade and cooperation) Annual since 2000 EEAS Managing Director, DG TRADE / MX MFA	High-level dialogue on human rights 3 rd Oct/2012 EEAS, DG HOME / MX MFA	Political dialogue Not set yet EEAS Pol. Director
Economic and trade dialogues	High Level Dialogue on Macroeconomics Not set yet DG Trade			
Sectoral dialogues	Dialogue on education 1 st Nov/2010 DG EAC / MX Min. Of Education	Dialogue on culture Not set yet EEAS, DG EAC / MX National Council for Culture and Arts	High-level dialogue on security and justice 1 st July/2011 EEAS, DG HOME, DG JUST, DG DEVCO / MX MFA	Dialogue on social cohesion and employment Since 2008 DG EMPL / MX Min. of Social Development
	High Level Dialogue on Environment 4 th March/2013 EEAS, DG ENV / MX Min of environment, National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change	High-level dialogue on climate change 3 rd April/2013 EEAS, DG CLIMA / MX Min. of environment, National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change		Science and technology committee Annual since 2005 DG RTD, DG ENER, DG MOVE, DG CONNECT, DG EAC, DG ENTR / MX MFA, National Council of Science and Technology
Parliamentary, media and civil society dialogues	Joint inter-parliamentary committee Biannual European Parliament Delegation / MX Congress		Civil society forum Biennial since 2002 5 th (Nov/2012) EEAS, European Economic and Social Committee / MX MFA, civil society	

Abbreviations :

COM : European Commission, CEU : Council of the European Union, DG : Directorate General, HR : High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, MFA : Minister of Foreign Affairs, MX : Mexico

E. Vivet, V. de Lalande, ESSEC IRENE

ANNEX E. EU-Brazil Strategic Partnership Dialogues

First joint mention of a "strategic partnership" at the EU-Brazil Summit, Lisbon, Portugal, 4 July 2007.

Joint Summit , annual since 2007 gathering COM President, CEU President, DG Trade Commissioner and BZ President, BZ MFA (latest 24.02.2014)													
Political/ diplomatic dialogues	MFA meeting Annual since 2010 HR, EU Coordinator on Counterterrorism / BZ MFA		High-level dialogue on human rights, peace and migration Annual since 2013 EEAS / HR Secretariat of the BZ Presidency		High-level dialogue on sustainable development Annual since 2006 DG ENV		Disarmament & non-proliferation Annual since 2008 EEAS						
Economic and trade dialogues	Dialogue on trade Annual since 2005 DG TRADE		Dialogue on competition issues (+ad hoc commissions) Annual since 2009 DG COMP		Dialogue on sanitary and phytosanitary issues, Annual since 2008 DG TRADE, DG SANCO		Macroeconomic and financial dialogue Annual since 2009 DG ECFIN, ECB		Industrial and regulatory dialogue Annual since 2009 DG ENTR				
Sectoral dialogues	Joint Committee												
Dialogue on Climate change Annual since 2009 DG CLIMA		Dialogue on energy Annual since 2007 DG ENER		Dialogue on civil spatial cooperation, Annual since 2009 DG MOVE, ESA		Dialogue on social cohesion and employment, Annual since 2008 DG EMPL		Information society dialogue Annual since 2010 DG CONNECT		Dialogue on maritime transport Annual since 2006 DG MOVE		Dialogue on tourism Annual since 2011 DG ENTR	
Dialogue on nuclear issues Annual since 2013 DG RTD		Dialogue on agriculture Annual since 2012 DG AGRI		Dialogue on scientific & technological cooperation Annual since 2009 DG RTD, JRC		Dialogue on education Annual since 2009 DG EAC		Regional policy dialogue Annual since 2007 DG REGIO		Dialogue on financial services Annual since 2009 DG MARKT		Intellectual property rights dialogue Annual since 2008 DG TRADE, ENTR, TAXUD, MARKT	
Parliamentary, media and civil society dialogues	EU - Brazil civil society round table, Biannual since 2009 European Economic and Social Committee				EU-Brazil business summits (simultaneous with Joint summit) Annual since 2007 Business representatives								

Abbreviations:

COM : European Commission, CEU : Council of the European Union, DG : Directorate General, HR : High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, MFA : Minister of Foreign Affairs, BZ : Brazilian

ANNEX F. EU - South Africa Partnership Dialogues

First joint mention of a strategic partnership in the "The South Africa-European Union Strategic Partnership Joint Action Plan", 14 May 2007.

Joint Summit , annual since 2008 gathering COM President, COM President, DG DEVCO Commissioner, DG Trade Commissioner and South African President, MFA, Minister of Trade, Minister of Finance (latest 18.07.2013). (EU-AU summit every three years)							
Mogôbagôba Dialogue , annual since 1993 EEAS MD for Africa							
Political/ diplomatic dialogue	MFA meeting Annual (EU-AU MFA biannual) HR / ZA MFA	Peace and security dialogue Annual since 2009 Senior officials, EU PSC chair / ZA MFA		Dialogue on disarmament and non-proliferation ___ since 2004 ___	Structured dialogue forum on human rights Annual since 2013 EEAS / ZA MFA		
Economic and trade dialogue	Trade cooperation committee Annual since 2001 High level experts and officials, DG TRADE, DG AGRI, EEAS / ZA Department of Trade and Industry			Dialogue on customs DG TAXUD, EEAS / ZA Revenue Service		Macroeconomics dialogue Annual DG ECFIN, EEAS / ZA Treasury	
Sectoral dialogues	Dialogue on education and training Annual DG EAC, EEAS / ZA Department of Higher Education, Department of Arts and Culture	Science and technology policy dialogue Annual since 1997 DG ENTR, JRC, ESA, EEAS / ZA Department of Science and Technology, MFA	High-level dialogue on the environment Annual since 2007 DG ENV	Dialogue on health DG SANCO, DG DEVCO, DG RTD, EEAS / ZA Department of Health	High-level dialogue on migration Incl. Working group on visa and consular Issues Annual since 2009 DG HOME, EEAS / ZA Department of Home Affairs, MFA	Dialogue on transport Annual DG MOVE, EEAS / ZA Department of Transport	Forum on environment and sustainable development (FESD) Annual DG ENV, DG CLIMA, EEAS / ZA Department of Environment, MFA
	Dialogue on employment and social affairs Ad hoc DG EMPL, EEAS / ZA Department of Labour	Dialogue on development DG DEVCO, EEAS, European Investment Bank / ZA MFA, treasury	Dialogue on space DG ENTR	Dialogue on energy DG ENER	Dialogue on crime and justice Ad hoc DG JUST, DG HOME, EEAS / ZA Department of Justice	ICT dialogue Annual DG CONNECT, EEAS / ZA Department of Communication Department of Science and Technology	Energy dialogue Annual DG ENER, EEAS / ZA Department of Energy
Parliamentary, Media and Civil society dialogues	Inter-parliamentary meetings Annual since 1993, and biannual since 2008 European Parliament delegation			Business forum Annual since 2012 Business leaders			

Abbreviations :

COM : European Commission, CEU : Council of the European Union, DG : Directorate General, HR : High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, MFA : Minister of Foreign Affairs, AU : African Union, ZA : South Africa

E. Vivet, V. de Lalande, ESSEC IRENE

ANNEX G. EU-Russia Strategic Partnership Dialogues

First joint mention of a "strategic partnership" at the EU-Russia Summit, Sochi, Russia, May 2006.

Joint Summit , biannual since 1994 gathering COM President, CEU President, HR, DG Energy Commissioner, DG Trade Commissioner and President of the Russian Federation, MFA, Minister for Energy, Minister for Economy (latest 28.01.2014)					
Political/Diplomatic dialogues	Permanent Partnership Council (replaced Cooperation Council in 2003) Biannual since 1998 Includes three formats : - External Affairs , with the HR - Freedom, Security and Justice , with DG Justice - Energy , with DG Energy	Political and Security Committee 4 per year Chairman of the EU Political and Security Committee	Political Directors meeting Biannual EEAS	Round of negotiations on the new framework agreement Monthly since June 2010	Political Dialogues on -Africa, -Asia, -Latin America -Common Neighbourhood - Middle East/Gulf/Maghreb -Western Balkans -UN, -OSCE -Arms export, -Non-proliferation -Counter-terrorism -Combating drug trafficking -Human Rights Biannual EEAS
Economic and trade dialogues		Dialogue on financial and macroeconomic policies Biannual since 2007 DG MARKT, DG for Finance	Dialogue on industrial and enterprise policy Biannual since 2005 DG ENTR	Trade and investment dialogue Biannual DG TRADE	Regulatory dialogue Biannual since 2005 DG Industry, DG ENTR
Sectoral dialogues	Dialogue on consumer policy Biannual since 2012	Dialogue on agriculture Biannual since 2006 DG AGRI	Dialogue on the environment Biannual since 2006 DG ENV	Dialogue on health Biannual since 2009 DG SANCO	Dialogue on transport Biannual since 2005 DG MOVE
	Dialogue on space Biannual since 2006 DG RTD, European Space Agency	Energy dialogue Biannual since 2000 DG ENER	Dialogue on public procurement Biannual since 2006 DG MARKT	Dialogue on fisheries Biannual since 2008 DG MARE	Dialogue on information society Biannual since 2005 DG CONNECT
	Visa-free dialogue Biannual since 2007 DG HOME	Migration dialogue Biannual since 2011 DG HOME	Dialogue on intellectual property rights Biannual DG TRADE	Dialogue on customs Biannual DG TAXUD	Joint committee on science and technology cooperation Annual since 2006 DG RTD
Parliamentary, Media and Civil society dialogues	Parliamentary cooperation committee Annual European Parliament delegation		Industrials' Roundtable Annual since 1997 Business representatives		Civil society forum --

Abbreviations :

COM : European Commission, CEU : Council of the European Union, DG : Directorate General, HR : High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, MFA : Minister of Foreign Affairs. Website EPSO helped to fill in some working group names in this annex.

E. Vivet, V. de Lalande, ESSEC IRENE

ANNEX H. EU - India Strategic Partnership Dialogues

First joint mention of a "strategic partnership" at the Fifth EU-India Summit, The Hague, Netherlands, 8 November 2004

Annual Joint Summit since 2000 gathering COM President, CEU President, HR, Trade Commissioner and Indian President, Prime Minister, MFA, Minister for Trade (latest 10.02.2012. Latest ASEM 11/2013.)							
Political/ diplomatic dialogues	MFA meeting Annual, since 2011 HR / India Vice President	Senior officials meeting Twice per year since 2008 (ASEM Asia-EU Meeting, annual since 1994, EEAS)	Foreign policy consultations Annual since 2011 EEAS Chief Operating Officer		Security dialogue Annual EEAS Deputy SG With annual expert groups : -Counterterrorism -Antipiracy -Cyber security -Disarmament and non-proliferation		Local human rights dialogue Annual (in principle) Head of EU Delegation
	Economic and trade dialogues*	Joint cooperation committee (former High Level Trade Group) Annual, since 1994 Coop. Agr. EEAS Chief Oper. Officer		Trade sub commission			Macro-economic dialogue -- DG ECFIN
Economic cooperation sub commission							
Development cooperation sub commission							
Sectoral dialogues*	High-level dialogue on migration Annual DG HOME	Dialogue on employment and social affairs Annual (in principle) DG EMPL	Dialogue on the environment Annual (in principle) DG ENV	Energy panel Annual in principle DG ENER	Joint customs cooperation committee — DG TAXUD	TBTs and sanitary and phyto-sanitary issues Annual DG TRADE	Science and technology joint steering committee Annual since STT coop. agreement since 2004 DG RTD
	Joint working group on textiles and clothing Annual DG TRADE	Working group on food processing Annual (in principle) 1 session in 2005 DG ENTR	Pharma & biotechnology 4 since 2005 DG SANCO	Steel contact group meeting Annual DG TRADE	Agriculture and marine products Annual (in principle) DG AGRI, DG MARE	Dialogue on higher education since 2011 DG EAC	Joint working group on information society — DG CONNECT
Parliamentary, media and civil society dialogues	Parliamentary visits Latest 2005 European Parliament		Business summit Annual since 2010 Back to back with joint summit Business leaders		India round table Latest 2010 Civil Society		

Abbreviations:

COM : European Commission, CEU : Council of the European Union, DG : Directorate General, HR : High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, MFA : Minister of Foreign Affairs

*Part of these dialogues have generated parallel talks in the framework of the FTA negotiations.

ANNEX I. EU - Japan Strategic Partnership Dialogues

First joint mention of a "strategic partnership" at the 18th EU-Japan Summit, Prague, Czech Republic, 4 May 2009.

Joint Summit, yearly since 1991 gathering COM President, CEU President and Japan Prime Minister (latest 25.03.2013)						
Political/ diplomatic dialogues	MFA meetings Annual since 1991 HR (ASEM Asia-EU Meeting, annual since 1994, EEAS)	Senior officials meetings Biannual EEAS	Human rights consultations (COHOM) Biannual COHOM Chair	Negotiations on a Strategic Partnership Agreement Every two months since March 2013 EEAS Managing Director for Asia & the Pacific	Expert-level political dialogues Annual -Asia -Central Asia & Eastern Europe -Africa -Middle East -Balkans -counterterrorism -disarmament -UN EEAS Political or Managing Directors	
	Joint customs cooperation committee Annual DG TAXUD Director General		High-level meeting on financial issues Annual, 2 sessions: -macro-economic developments -financial services DG MARKT Director General, DG ECFIN Director General	High-level trade dialogue Annual, not held since 2011 (could become part of SOM after FTA scoping process) DG TRADE Director General	Negotiations on the Economic Partnership Agreement Every two months since March 2013 DG TRAE Director for Asia & Latin America	
Sectoral dialogues*	Regulatory reform dialogue Annual since 1994	Industrial policy dialogue Annual DG ENTR Director General	Dialogue on intellectual property rights Annual DG TRADE Director	Regular energy dialogue Annual DG ENER Commissioner	High-level dialogue on climate change Annual DG CLIMA Director	High-level dialogue on competition policies Annual DG COMP Commissioner
	Dialogue on ICT policy Annual DG INFSO Director General	Transportation high-level consultations Annual DG MOVE Director General	Dialogue on employment and social issues Annual DG EMPL Commissioner	High-level dialogue on the environment Annual DG ENV Director General	Agricultural policy dialogue Annual DG AGRI Director General	High-level fisheries consultations Annual DG MARE Director General
Parliamentary, media and civil society dialogues	Inter-parliamentary meeting Biannual EU Parliament delegation		European Economic and Social Committee Annual EESC Member holding the Presidency of Japan Contact Group		Business dialogue round table Annual Business leaders	

Abbreviations :

COM : European Commission, CEU : Council of the European Union, DG : Directorate General, HR : High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, MFA : Minister of Foreign Affairs, SOM : Senior Officials Meeting

*Part of these dialogues have generated parallel talks in the framework of the FTA negotiations.

ANNEX J. EU - Republic of Korea Strategic Partnership Dialogues

First joint mention of a "strategic partnership" at the 5th EU-Republic of Korea Summit, Brussels, Belgium, 6 October 2010.

Joint Summit , every two years in margins of ASEM meeting, since 2001 COM President, CEU President and President of Republic of Korea (latest 28.03.2012).										
Political/ diplomatic dialogues	High-level political dialogue Annual, since 2012 EEAS	MFA meeting Annual, since 2001 HR/VP		Policy dialogue on international development 2 nd session on 26.06.2013 DG DEVCO		Dialogue on disarmament and non- proliferation 1 session so far EEAS		Consultations on human rights (planned) EEAS		
	Middle East informal dialogue 2 nd meeting 01.05.2013 EEAS			North Korea informal dialogue 2nd session on 06.2012 EEAS			Defence policy informal dialogue Latest 14.11.2012 EEAS			
Trade dialogues and sectoral, as included in the FTA implement- ation*	Trade Committee oversees the FTA implementation Annual, since July 2011 DG TRADE Commissioner		<i>7 specialised committees</i>	Trade in Goods DG TRADE	Sanitary and phytosani- -tary measures DG SANCO	Customs DG TAXUD	Trade in services, establis- -hment and electronic commerce DG TRADE	Trade and sustain- -able develop- -ment DG TRADE	Outward proces- -sing zones on the Korean Peninsula DG TRADE	Cultural cooperati - on DG EAC
			<i>7 working groups</i>	Motor vehicles and parts DG TRADE	Pharma- -ceutical products and medical devices DG TRADE	Chemicals DG TRADE	Trade remedy cooperati - on DG TRADE	Mutual recogni- -tion DG TRADE	Govern- -ment procure- -ment DG MARKT	Geogra- -phical Indica- -tions DG AGRI
Other sectoral dialogues*	Consultations on competition policy annual DG COMP		Joint committee for scientific and technological cooperation 4 th session on 26.06.2013 DG RTD		Joint activities follow-up working group 1 st session on 26.06.2013 EEAS		Intellectual property Annual, Since 2011 <i>(is part of FTA institutions)</i> DG TRADE			
Parliamen- -tary, media and civil society dialogues	Leader's Forum Annual since 2011 Business leaders				Political dialogue on university, education and training (planned) DG EAC					

Abbreviations:

COM : European Commission, CEU : Council of the European Union, DG : Directorate General, HR : High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, MFA : Minister of Foreign Affairs

*Part of these dialogues have generated parallel talks in the framework of the FTA negotiations.