
The Eastern Partnership policy and EU Neighborhood Policy in Georgia - Analyzing EU-Georgia relations

ANA KIKADZE

TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

EMAIL: A_KIKADZE@CU.EDU.GE

Abstract: *Focusing on EU neighborhood policy and Eastern partnership policy, this paper aims to showcase the improvements, which was achieved between EU-Georgian relationships. The main ascent will be done on Georgia's perspective. The paper aims to examine how does the EU conducts relationship with Georgia and how will Georgia benefit from this relationship. Furthermore, the following questions will be answered: Why was the Eastern Partnership policy created? What are the main factors that led to its development? What are the main differences between EU Neighborhood policy and Eastern partnership policy?*

Keywords: Eastern Partnership policy, Georgia, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, EU Neighborhood policy

INTRODUCTION

The enlargement of the European Union has highlighted the need of reshaping the EU institutional framework and policies addressing the new neighborhood. In recent years the European Union is identified as security actor.¹ Activities conducted by the Union showcases that EU is not only obsessed by its internal affairs but it also cares about the third countries too.² The relationship between Georgia and EU become significant in 2003. In this year the European Union enclosed Georgia with the European Neighboring Policy. This step can be seen as the new aim of the union to contribute in the conflict of Abkhazia and South Ossetia.³

Despite the fact that in legal literature we cannot find what is the definition of 'conflict resolution' on part of the EU,⁴ it has to mean introducing concrete polices which will be implemented and formulated by the Union that will lead to a achieve mutually acceptable agreements. EU's impact on conflict resolution in Georgia can be seen during the Georgian-Russian war in 2008.⁵ In this paper the EU's involvement and relations with Georgia will be analyzed.

In 2010 European Parliament made a resolution where the importance of a new strategy for south Caucasus was highlighted. It was said that "geopolitical location of the South Caucasus and its increasing importance as an energy, transport and communications corridor connecting the Caspian region and Central Asia with Europe; considers it of the utmost importance therefore that EU cooperation with the South Caucasus be given high priority, not least in matters relating to

¹ Costea, S. (2012). The European Union's Eastern Partnership: the objective of regional cooperation. The Eastern Partnership and the Europe 2020 strategy: Visions of leading policymakers and academics, 51-60.

² Kerikmäe, T.; Chochia, A. (Eds.) (2016). Political and Legal Perspectives of the EU Eastern Partnership Policy. Springer International Publishing.

³ Chochia, A.; Popjanevski, J. (2016). Change of Power and Its Influence on Country's Europeanization Process. Case Study: Georgia. In: Kerikmäe, T.; Chochia, A. (Ed.). Political and Legal Perspectives of the EU Eastern Partnership Policy (197-210). Springer International Publishing.

⁴ Troitiño, D. R. (2013). European Integration: Building Europe. Nova Publishers: New York.

⁵ Chochia, A. (2012). The European Union and its policy towards the neighbors from South Caucasus. L'Europe unie/United Europe, 6, 27-35.

energy; emphasizes the role of the three countries as essential for the transit of energy resources, as well as for the diversification of the EU's energy supply and routes".⁶

"Georgia's relations with the EU has a long story, which as in the case with a majority of other post-Soviet countries started just after Georgia regained its sovereignty after the breakup of the Soviet Union.⁷ The EU was one of the first to assist Georgia in the difficult early years of transformation to a democratic country. The European Commission opened its Delegation in Georgia in Tbilisi in 1995, and the first main document on which Georgia and EU relationships are based on—the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement—came into force in 1999."⁸

In this paper two main policies of the European Union will be analyzed. Firstly, I will talk about the EU's Neighborhood Policy and conclude the main elements and achievements. Later I will answer the following questions. Why was the Eastern Partnership policy created? What are the main factors that led to its development? What are the main differences between EU Neighborhood policy and Eastern partnership policy?

THE EU NEIGHBORHOOD POLICY IN GEORGIA

The European Neighborhood Policy of the European Union included ambitious objectives based on commitments to share values and effective implementation of political, economic and institutional reforms. Among other eastern European Countries, Georgia was also invited to enter into intensified political, security, economic and cultural relations with the EU, enhanced regional and cross-border co-operation and shared responsibility in conflict aspirations. The European Union took note of Georgia's expressed European aspirations. EU welcomed Georgia's readiness to enhance cooperation in all domains covered by the action Plan. The level of ambition of the relationship depended on the degree of Georgia's commitment to common values as well as its capacity to implement jointly agreed priorities in compliance with international and European norms and principles. The pace of the relationship fully acknowledged Georgia's efforts and concrete achievements in meeting those commitments.⁹

"In terms of the failure of the ENP, the deficiencies are well-documented with reference to governance, process and practice. Contrary to the evolution of the southern dimension the EU's governance approach to the east has moved from bilateralism to multilateralism in the EaP, precisely because the EU wanted to inject a more political dimension into the process of transformation. However, the EU's overarching logic, and the underlying principles of differentiation and partnership found in the EU's approach, have been severely undermined by its practice through bilateral and multilateral processes on issues such as visa policy, democracy, energy and conflict resolution. This has meant that the governance and governmentality of the east has more often than not been characterized by imbalance, and has thus been far from adequate in addressing the threats stemming from weak governance, political instability and the frozen

⁶ Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2010-0193+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN> [accessed 05 June 2017]

⁷ Kerikmäe, T; Nyman-Metcalf, K; Gabelaia, D; Chochia, A (2014). Cooperation of Post Soviets with the Aim of not being "Post" and "Soviets". In: N. Šišková (Ed.). From Eastern Partnership to the Association. The Legal and Political Analysis (144–159).. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

⁸ Gabelaia D., Georgia's right to 'European Dream', Political and Legal Perspectives of the EU Eastern Partnership Policy, Tallinn Law School, p211

⁹ European Commission, ENP EU/Georgian action plan, p1 retrieved from https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/georgia_enp_ap_final_en_0.pdf [accessed 05 June 2017]

conflicts, not to mention the competition faced by Russia in its own attempts to reassert control over what it constructs as its own sphere of influence”¹⁰

In 2004 the European Union launched its European Neighborhood Policy. The policy asserts that the EU wants to promote stability, security and well-being of all by the use of incentives in lieu of sections and to foster cooperation in areas of mutual consent and interest. This policy is remarkably balanced in its attention to interest and values, soft in respect of the absence of elements of coercion and rather generous in its offer of material assistance. At the end of 2006 there already were signs of a generalized European Neighborhood Policy among the neighboring countries and in June 2007 the Union acknowledged this by embracing the German EU presidency's plan to revive the policy.¹¹

However, while talking about the good sides of the policy it is important to analyze why not this approach was as successful as the EU's Eastern Partnership policy. Georgia and EU agreed on specific reform steps and requirements in all ENP priority areas. Despite this fact, the policy was partly successful in Georgia. There are some reasons why it was so successful. The first reason was the positive conditionality. Secondly, the formulation of the policy was too vague and not credible enough. For instance the Union did not mention exactly what kind of reforms would Georgia get in case of any legislative reforms. Georgian authorities were disappointed that the security issues were not on a high condition. Finally, Georgia and eastern European countries were disappointed due to the fact that the Policy was building too many distinct nations. The principle of differentiation was also lacking from the ENP.

The Next chapter will analyze the Eastern partnership Policy. Here I will make it clear why this Policy is better and how Georgia benefited from this approach.

THE EASTERN PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Poland and Sweden developed the need of an eastern partnership policy on 23 May 2008. Later the project proposal was sent to all EU member states. It was officially launched on May 7 2008 on Prague summit. The eastern partnership policy aims to cooperate with Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia and Belarus. EAP helps the six countries with harmonization of European standards. Principles of joint ownership, differentiation and conditionality are the main features of the policy.¹²

What are the main elements that EAP aims to envisage? We can divide the approach into three main elements. Firstly, the policy strengthens and intensifies the bilateral relations between the European Union and the partner countries. Secondly, it encourages flagship initiatives designed to increase EU visibility in the region. Finally, the EAP provides various financial sources and partnership instruments, cross border cooperation instruments and bilateral assistance.¹³

“In governance terms, the principles that underpin the EaP remain the same as those of the ENP: it is guided by differentiation, joint ownership, and conditionality the latter related to progress

¹⁰ Christou G.(2011), Multilateralism, Conflict Prevention and the Eastern Partnership, *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 16:207-225, 2011 Kluwer law international BV.,p419

¹¹ The EU as a modest ‘force for good’: the European Neighborhood Policy *International Affairs* 84: 1 (2008) 81–96 © 2008 The Author(s). Journal Compilation © 2008 Blackwell Publishing Ltd/The Royal Institute of International Affairs ESTHER BARBÉ AND ELISABETH JOHANSSON-NOGUÉS, p1

¹² Monacu O. (2009), The Eastern Partnership – A premise for an enhanced EU-Eastern Neighboring cooperation Relationship, *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, Vol. 9, No.4, p48

¹³ Monacu O. (2009), The Eastern Partnership – A premise for an enhanced EU-Eastern Neighboring cooperation Relationship, *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, Vol. 9, No.4 51

and reward conditional on agreement and implementation based on EU norms and values. In addition, the EaP references legal and regulatory approximation but not the wholesale adoption of the EU acquis. There is an aim to facilitate the movement to approximation through institutional and administrative capacity building at bilateral and multilateral levels of governance, and the commitments of partner countries will be reflected not in Action Plans but rather in Association Agreements (AAs; legally binding), which will offer added incentives in the thematically prioritized areas of the EaP. The macro-governance framework, therefore, resembles that of the ENP and points towards horizontal joint structures of governance.”¹⁴ The EaP did not show its visibility directly after it was officially launched. However, after one year the visibility of the policy was clear for the partner countries. The most significant achievement was that by 2010-2013 the budget was increased by a third billion euro. Some scholars see the policy as a new opportunity for the neighbors to sort and reset their relations with EU.¹⁵

How does the policy work? It has two tracks. The first one is bilateral and the second one multilateral. The bilateral dimension supports socio-economic and political reforms in the countries. Programmes contribute the objectives which are focused assistance in the priority areas identified in each country's multi-annual programming document and complementary support for the implementation of agreements with the EU that builds on the experience of the Comprehensive Institution Building programme. The multilateral dimension complements bilateral relations with thematic platforms to exchange best practices on issues of mutual interest and it also initiates the flagship platforms.¹⁶ The key issue for the policy is to cooperate with Society. Civil Society Forum, Neighboring Civil Society Facility and dedicated funding at regional and country level are the good examples to prove this fact.

One crucially important fact is that the member states of the European Union have not officially given the six countries the status of an EU member candidate country. It is obvious that there is a little appetite among the majority of the member states to widen the group of would be member states for a lot of reasons. EaP countries can get advantages that were not offered to the EFTA countries in the context of EEA. During the period of 2014-2020, the European Neighboring Instrument (ENI) is the key EU financial instrument for cooperation with the Eastern Partnership countries. Furthermore, in 2007-2013, the funding came from the European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI). Nearly 2.5 billion euros was spent for the programs which cooperated with European partners in 2010-2013. This cooperation took account 350 million euros of additional funds when the Eastern Partnership was launched.¹⁷ “The Eastern Partnership, initiated by Poland and Sweden, has gradually become an important project for the Eastern part of EU's neighbors. Meant at first to counterbalance the Union for Mediterranean project, initiated for the Southern EU neighbors, the EaP has developed into a separate project, with specific and ambitious cooperation goals, both among EU and the Eastern partner countries. The free trade areas entailed, the visa-free travel perspective, the enhanced bilateral cooperation and the development of multilateral and, most of all, regional components of the initiative are only a few of the main goals the EaP intends to address. The EaP initiative envisages the relations of the EU27 with

¹⁴ Christou G.(2011), Multilateralism, Conflict Prevention and the Eastern Partnership, *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 16:207-225, 2011 Kluwer law international BV.,p218

¹⁵ Korosteleva, E. (2011), the Eastern Partnership Initiative: A New Opportunity for Neighbors? *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 27(1). pp. 1-21. ISSN 1352-3279 p3

¹⁶ European neighborhood policy and enlargement negotiations, Eastern Partnership, European Commission, retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/neighbourhood/eastern-partnership_en [accessed 28 May 2017]

¹⁷ European neighborhood policy and enlargement negotiations, Eastern Partnership, European Commission, retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/neighbourhood/eastern-partnership_en [accessed 28 May 2017]

Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia and Belarus, all the six countries already under the ENP umbrella. The Eastern Partnership has a positive, constructive agenda, meant to support these six countries develop and harmonize with European standards.”¹⁸

Furthermore, the policy makes the access to the European markets easier. Many neighbors compete but the new policy makes EU to give up some strict regulations. Researchers suggest that EU should press ahead with DCFTAs for its eastern and southern neighbors in a way which will bring them into parts of single market. It has to be mentioned that EaP makes traveling for the citizens of the partner countries way easier. For instance EU provides more than two million Schengen visas. The process of obtaining visa is shortened and this does not damage the reputation of the European Union. “Money is a powerful motivator”. Including the overall budget and the part of it devoted to external relations, “there is a scope for increasing the amount spent in regions where the EU has a strong interest in stability, prosperity and political reform, and especially in the neighborhood.”¹⁹

EaP was welcomed in Georgia due to the fact that it was officially launched after the war of 2008. Georgian people saw this step from the European Union as an answer to Russian aggression. However, EU received more attention in 2013, when the Association Agreement (AA) between Georgia and the EU was initiated. Georgia’s effort was finally appreciated by the EU. It can be said that AA made EaP to look more successful from Georgian perspective.²⁰ The next chapter aims to analyze the Eastern partnership policy from the Georgian Perspective. I will conclude the most significant steps that has been made under this policy.

EASTERN PARTNERSHIP POLICY: THE GEORGIAN PERSPECTIVE

The eastern partnership policy is not a product of EU’s internal issues. Increase perception of insecurity, threat and risk resulting from events such as Russian-Georgian war in August 2008, the violence in the Moldovan elections in 2009 and the Ukraine-Russia gas crisis in 2009 led to the development of EaP. The policy added a multilateral dimension for ensuring security to the east, but firstly retained similar Marco-framework and method for engagement, and importantly the same tensions and trade-offs between the normative/duty and risk threat narratives.²¹ For Georgia the threat of military aggression from Russia is a main concern. None ‘froze’ conflicts have seen any movement towards a solution. Conversely, Russia enhanced military support to unilaterally recognized parts of Georgia. Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Georgia sees the eastern partnership policy as added value, but feels that its security concerns are ignored.²²

Georgia seems to be satisfied with the EaP’s bilateral incentives and possibilities for multilateral cooperation. But as a Georgian expert emphasizes, “the region has significant security concerns, that may not be governed solely with the soft measures offered by the EaP. The EU’s response to Russia’s failure to fulfil the 2008 peace accord remains too soft and inconsistent”. The

¹⁸Monacu O. (2009), The Eastern Partnership – A premise for an enhanced EU-Eastern Neighboring cooperation Relationship, Romanian Journal of European Affairs, Vol. 9, No.4,

¹⁹ Grant CH., A new neighborhood policy for the EU, Center for European Policy reform brief, retrieved from http://cerlive.thomaspaterson.co.uk/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/pdf/2011/pb_grant_neighbourhood_11_march11-170.pdf [accessed 28 May 2017]

²⁰Sharashelidze T., The Eastern Partnership, the view from Georgia, retrieved from http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_georgia3025 [accessed 30 May 2017]

²¹ Christou G.(2011), Multilateralism, Conflict Prevention and the Eastern Partnership, European Foreign Affairs Review, 16:207-225, 2011 Kluwer law international BV. P415

²²Shapovalova N. (2010), the EU’s Eastern Partnership: one year backwards, Fride, A European think Tank For global action, p1, p9

policy has a great potential. Political leadership and society of Georgia see no alternative to integration into Western structures. EU integration is priority for society as well as for the government. It even has higher priority on Georgian policy agenda than NATO membership, which is postponed for the foreseeable future.²³ Before the EaP was launched, there were significant developments between EU and Georgian relationship. In 2010, Georgia and EU started to negotiate about the association agreement. Later, they signed visa facilitation agreement. Competition policies and food safety regulations started to harmonize with EU level. Nowadays EaP is still new for the country.

Most Georgian people consider themselves as a part of the European continent. In general, Georgian government officials and lawmakers are showing optimism towards the EaP contrasted with their dissatisfaction of the ENP. Georgian state Minister for Euro-Atlantic Integration, Giorgi Baramidze, stated that the EaP would go “far beyond the current ENP framework. Public officials think that the principle of differentiation is valued more in this policy. Georgia criticized the approach of EU neighborhood policy when it did not differentiate between South Caucasian countries. The EaP in Georgia does not serve only social and economic goals but most likely it serves security issues. On one side, public officials reveal critics towards the policy and say that it misses security and conflict resolution dimensions. They feel that EU is a soft power. However, on the other hand government officials consider that the Eastern partnership policy with its incentives and principles is more credible compared to the European Neighborhood Policy and its shortcomings.²⁴

“Georgian academics agree with decision-makers that the inadequate security and conflict resolution dimension is the major flaw of the EaP. It is emphasized that expanding the security scope of the EaP will be “a decisive” determinant of the EaP’s success in Georgia. This is underlined even by a political scientist from Abkhazia stating that an expanded EaP focus on this issue “is the only way to transform the context of the conflict and make it possible to alter public discourse in Abkhazia and Georgia toward new ideas for conflict resolution.”²⁵

To make it more clear, the Eastern Partnership policy offers to Georgia innovations which are not included in the European Neighborhood Policy. These innovations can be sorted in the following way:

1. Association Agreement, which with the aim of economic integration embraces the Agreement on Deep and Comprehensive Trade with Europe (DCFTA);
2. Pacts on Mobility and Security, which implies simplification of visa regime and cooperation with the EU in combat corruption, organized crime and illegal migration;
3. Comprehensive institution building (aiming to support good governance);
4. Promotion to Energetic security (either in member-state or in the territory of the EU) by financing infrastructure sphere and by other ways;
5. Intensive cooperation in the issues connected with protection of environment and climate;
6. Deepening contacts between people;

²³ Shapovalova N. (2010), the EU’s Eastern Partnership: one year backwards, Fride, A European think Tank For global action gv10

²⁴ Rinnert D. ,Georgia and the Eastern Partnership: Perceptions and Viewpoint from Tbilisi retrieved from <http://centruminicytyw.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/YEaPPublication.pdf#page=65> , [accessed 30 May 2017], p76

²⁵ Rinnert D. ,Georgia and the Eastern Partnership: Perceptions and Viewpoint from Tbilisi retrieved from <http://centruminicytyw.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/YEaPPublication.pdf#page=65> , [accessed 30 May 2017], p78

7. Promotion of cooperation between public civil organizations and the government in partner-states and increase of their inclusion in solution of the mentioned problems.²⁶

I personally think that one of the most important changes which was brought by the Eastern partnership Policy to Georgia, was that the role and the recognition of non-governmental organizations is higher. The EaP has led to increased opportunities for NGOs in Georgia and it has given them new means and ways for empowerment. EU clearly has less direct impact on imposing or supporting democratic change within third countries. The impact of the EaP on NGO empowerment has been strongly influenced by how the other actors involved, in this case the EU and Georgian government, have recognized the role of the NGO.²⁷

As Dali Gabelaia argues in her article, adoption of the law was one of the important and complex requirement. The Problem in this aspect was that Georgian authorities had the wrongful understanding of the essence of the law due to the low level of awareness. Georgian Legislation straggled a lot until it finally adopted the law on prohibition of all kind of discrimination. The issue of protection of minority rights was problematic for Georgian Society from the beginning. May 17, 2013 is a good argument to prove this fact. When the draft law was adopted, it was different from the original one and was criticized by nongovernmental and religious organizations. The main reason of disagreement was between the Orthodox Church and authorities. In the end the law was adopted. While the nongovernmental organizations criticized the draft law for removal of the effective mechanism of enforcement introduced by initial draft. Despite serious turmoil, On May 2, 2014, the Georgian Parliament adopted the law at its third reading.²⁸

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EAP IN GEORGIA

We can divide the implementation of the Eastern partnership policy in Georgia in five main elements: Association agreement, Visa facilitation, Law governance, civil society forums and Comprehensive Institution building program.

The Association Agreement (AA) between EU and Georgia officially began in Batumi, Georgia on July 15, 2010. The ratification of AA replaced the outdated PCA as a legal bases of bilateral relations. By launching AA, EU has expressed that the EaP incentives are credible and achievable for partner countries even though it may take long until the Association agreement is finalized.²⁹ The AAs between EU and Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia are the most ambitious among all EU association agreements with third countries. This agreements contain various novelties. Scholars describe this agreements in three main words: comprehensives, complexity and conditionality. Comprehensiveness means that the agreement are framework agreements which embrace the whole spectrum of EU activities. In order to achieve complexity, they are equipped with multiple specific provisions on legislative and regulatory approximation. And finally, in order to achieve the conditionality the government of Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia are obliged to provide reports to the EU in line with approximation deadlines specified in the Agreements. In

²⁶ Paresashvili N., Abashishvili A., Policy implementation of the eastern Partnership in Georgia, Faculty of Economics and Business, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University Street #2 doi:10.13165/VPA-13-12-4-09, p637

²⁷ The Eastern Partnership: civil society in between the European and domestic level: the case of Georgia, East European Politics, Vol.30, issue 1, 2014, p67

²⁸ Gabelaia D., Georgia's right to 'European Dream', Political and Legal Perspectives of the EU Eastern Partnership Policy, Tallinn Law School, p214-2015

²⁹ Rinnert D., Georgia and the Eastern Partnership: Perceptions and Viewpoint from Tbilisi retrieved from <http://centruminicytyw.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/YEaPPublication.pdf#page=65>, [accessed 30 May 2017] p11

addition to the drafting of progress reports, which is a common practice within the EU's strategy, the monitoring procedure may include the participation of EU institutions, bodies and agencies, non-governmental bodies, supervisory authorities, independent experts and others depending on circumstances.³⁰

The visa facilitation is another key aspect of the Eastern partnership policy. After the war of 2008, EU promised Georgia to grant it with the visa free regime. However, it did not happen until Georgia began negotiation with EaP. Finally, in 2010 Georgia and EU signed visa facilitation agreement which was signed and passed by the European Parliament in December 2010. This agreement contains a visa free reduction for Georgian citizens from 60 to 35 euros as well as some procedural simplifications and a reduction of required visa application document.³¹

“Eastern partners are first expected to sign visa facilitation and re-admission agreements with the EU. EU incentives offered under visa facilitation agreements include simplified procedures and shorter delays for obtaining EU visas, reduced visa fees for short-stay visas As well as simplified criteria for multiple-entry visas for certain categories of persons. While these measures represent tangible progress over the previous schemes, they are less significant for Georgia than for Moldova or Ukraine because of the country's remoteness from the EU. The costs incurred by Georgian citizens travelling to the EU minimize the importance of visa fee reduction.”³²

The year of 2017 is very important year for Georgia as the visa free regime is finalized and the citizens of the country have right to travel in the territory of MS without visas. From March 2008 Georgian citizens entered EU without visas. As part of the EU-Georgia Visa Liberalization Action plan Georgia was obliged to adopt a law on elimination various forms of discrimination. In April 2014, the Government has submitted the draft to the Parliament. The law was adopted on 2 May 2014. Following the signature of the president the law on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination has entered into force officially.³³

Law governance process should be considered in a high level. Harmonization within the EU law is a necessary precondition for Georgian progress of EaP related programs such as Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement. In recent years, some significant laws were passed in Georgia. In my point of view the most important one was the undiscriminating law.³⁴

In 2009, civil society forum was launched. Until today, 62 civil society organizations have become as a part of Georgian Civil Society platform. Another key program within the Eastern Partnership policy is the development of ICB programme in early 2011. the budget of EaP is towered together to this program.³⁵

While talking about the Eastern partnership program it is important to highlight the cost that has been done by the European Union to Georgia. Having outlined first results of the EaP's implementation in Georgia, the following parts of this study aim at revealing more general prospects

³⁰ Kerikmäe, T.; Chochia, A. (Eds.) (2016). Political and Legal Perspectives of the EU Eastern Partnership Policy. Springer International Publishing

³¹ Rinnert D. ,Georgia and the Eastern Partnership: Perceptions and Viewpoint from Tbilisi retrieved from <http://centruminicytyw.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/YEaPPublication.pdf#page=65> , [accessed 30 May 2017] , p11

³²Meandering Europeanization. EU policy instruments and policy convergence in Georgia under the Eastern Partnership, retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/21599165.2013.807804?needAccess=true>, [accessed 30 May 2017] p350

³³ <https://matsne.gov.ge/ka/document/view/2339687> (last time checked 10.03.17)

³⁴ Rinnert D. ,Georgia and the Eastern Partnership: Perceptions and Viewpoint from Tbilisi retrieved from <http://centruminicytyw.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/YEaPPublication.pdf#page=65> , [accessed 30 May 2017] ,p11

³⁵ Rinnert D. ,Georgia and the Eastern Partnership: Perceptions and Viewpoint from Tbilisi retrieved from <http://centruminicytyw.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/YEaPPublication.pdf#page=65> , [accessed 30 May 2017] ,p11

of the policy initiative in the South Caucasian republic. Budget for Georgia increases significantly under the EaP.

“While it received 120 million from 2007 – 2010 via the ENPI, this amount augments by 50% to 180 million from 2011-2013 if reforms will be carried out. All financial contributions to Georgia are delivered within four priority areas Together, the EU and Georgia develop specific bi- and multilateral projects related to these areas. With increasing direct contributions of the EU, the EaP seems to improve financial shortcomings of the ENP. Nevertheless, financial support of 180 million for three years remains a small sum considering Georgia’s enormous domestic reform costs in areas such as the judicial system. Furthermore, the EaP National Indicative Program (NIP) budget appears to be less substantial in light of the EU post-conflict assistance package for Georgia from 2008-2010. At a donor conference following the August war, the EU pledged 483.5 million while the entire aid program amounts to 3.44 billion”³⁶

Governance by conditionality has impacted the practices of policy convergence in Georgia. Imposing strict conditionality and establishing linkages between sectorial require, the Eastern partnership Policy has strengthened the EU’s reach and generated more systematic convergence with Georgia.³⁷

CONCLUSION

To sum up, the ENP raised the expectation that this policy would enable harmonization of the east neighborhood countries of the EU to the Union. The Policy seemed at first glance well placed to allow the EU to temper interests and values with consideration for the well-being of its eastern partners. However, this result was not achieved. For a lot of years EU has gradually showcased it’s willing to be a conflict manager and global security manager. Many efforts of the Union has been ad hoc. The accomplishments in 2008 during the Georgian-Russian war and the recent visa free regime which was granted to Georgian citizens prove that Union sees Georgian’s desire for its Eutrophication.

On the other hand, EaP is more successful instrument. The paper showcased how important this policy is for Georgia. It can be said that Georgian authority’s point of view about the Eastern Partnership policy is divided into parts. The first pars sees and appreciates the increased potential of the EaP compared to ENP while the other group criticizes the Policy.

Finally, I will answer the question which is asked in the first part of this paper. How the EaP does differs from ENP and how can Georgia benefit from the new policy? The missing security and conflict resolution is a major flow of the EaP. The EaP introduce an increased compliance with EU standards in Georgia. However, the conflict resolution issue remains still unclear.

References

Christou G.(2011), Multilateralism, Conflict Prevention and the Eastern Partnership, *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 16:207-225, 2011 Kluwer law international BV. p. 415.

³⁶ Rinnert D. „Georgia and the Eastern Partnership: Perceptions and Viewpoint from Tbilisi retrieved from <http://centruminicyw.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/YEaPPublication.pdf#page=65> , [accessed 30 May 2017] ,p11

³⁷ Meandering Europeanization. EU policy instruments and policy convergence in Georgia under the Eastern Partnership, retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/21599165.2013.807804?needAccess=true>, [accessed 30 May 2017] p352

- Chochia, A.; Popjanovski, J. (2016). Change of Power and Its Influence on Country's Europeanization Process. Case Study: Georgia. In: Kerikmäe, T.; Chochia, A. (Ed.). *Political and Legal Perspectives of the EU Eastern Partnership Policy (197–210)*. Springer International Publishing.
- Chochia, A. (2012). The European Union and its policy towards the neighbors from South Caucasus. *L'Europe unie/United Europe*, 6, 27–35.
- Costea, S. (2012). The European Union's Eastern Partnership: the objective of regional cooperation. The Eastern Partnership and the Europe 2020 strategy: Visions of leading policymakers and academics, 51–60.
- European neighborhood policy and enlargement negotiations, Eastern Partnership, European Commission, retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/neighbourhood/eastern-partnership_en [accessed 28 May 2017]
- Gabelaia D., Georgia's right to 'European Dream', *Political and Legal Perspectives of the EU Eastern Partnership Policy*, Tallinn Law School,
- Grant CH., A new neighborhood policy for the EU, Center for European Policy reform brief, retrieved from http://cerlive.thomaspaterson.co.uk/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/pdf/2011/pb_grant_neighbourhood_11march11-170.pdf [accessed 28 May 2017]
- Kerikmäe, T.; Chochia, A. (Eds.) (2016). *Political and Legal Perspectives of the EU Eastern Partnership Policy*. Springer International Publishing.
- Kerikmäe, T; Nyman-Metcalf, K; Gabelaia, D; Chochia, A (2014). Cooperation of Post Soviets with the Aim of not being "Post" and "Soviets". In: N. Šišková (Ed.). *From Eastern Partnership to the Association. The Legal and Political Analysis (144–159)*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Korosteleva, E. (2011), the Eastern Partnership Initiative: A New Opportunity for Neighbors? *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 27(1). pp. 1-21. ISSN 1352-3279 p3
- Meandering Europeanization. EU policy instruments and policy convergence in Georgia under the Eastern Partnership
- Monacu O. (2009), The Eastern Partnership – A premise for an enhanced EU-Eastern Neighboring cooperation Relationship, *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, Vol. 9, No.4,
- Monacu O. (2009), The Eastern Partnership – A premise for an enhanced EU-Eastern Neighboring cooperation Relationship, *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, Vol. 9, No.4 51
- Paresashvili N., Abashishvili A., Policy implementation of the eastern Partnership in Georgia, Faculty of Economics and Business, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University Street #2 doi:10.13165/VPA-13-12-4-09, p637
- Troitiño, D. R. (2013). *European Integration: Building Europe*. Nova Publishers: New York.
- Rinnert D. ,Georgia and the Eastern Partnership: Perceptions and Viewpoint from Tbilisi
- Shapovalova N. (2010), the EU's Eastern Partnership: one year backwards, *Fride, A European think Tank For global action*, p1, p9
- Sharashelidze T., The Eastern Partnership, the view from Georgia, retrieved from http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_georgia3025 [accessed 30 May 2017]
- The Eastern Partnership: civil society in between the European and domestic level: the case of Georgia, *East European Politics*, Vol.30, issue 1, 2014,
- The EU as a modest 'force for good': the European Neighborhood Policy *International Affairs* 84: 1 (2008) 81–96© 2008 The Author(s). Journal Compilation © 2008 Blackwell Publishing Ltd/The Royal Institute of International Affairs ESTHER BARBÉ AND ELISABETH JOHANSSON-NOGUÉS,
-