University of Peloponnese
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
Department of Political Studies and International Relations

Master Program in
"Mediterranean Studies"

Promotion of Parliamentary diplomacy through the newly established trilateral schemes in the Eastern Mediterranean

Supervising Professor Dr Nikolaos Tzifakis

Panagiota Smyrnioti

Corinth, September 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

AFFIDAVIT

With this Statement:

1. I expressly and unconditionally state that my dissertation is product of my own intellectual effort, does not infringe the rights of third parties and follows internationally recognised standards of scientific writing, faithfully adhering to academic ethics.

2. The opinions expressed are the sole responsibility of the author; the supervisor, the examiners, the Department and the University of Peloponnese do not necessarily follow the opinions expressed and bear no responsibility for any errors and omissions.

…….

(Signature)

ΥΠΕΥΘΥΝΗ ΔΗΛΩΣΗ

Με την παρούσα δήλωση:

1. Δηλώνω ρητά και ανεπιφύλακτα ότι η διπλωματική εργασία που σας καταθέτω αποτελεί προϊόν δικής μου πνευματικής προσπάθειας, δεν παραβιάζει τα δικαιώματα τρίτων μερών και ακολουθεί τα διεθνώς αναγνωρισμένα πρότυπα επιστημονικής συγγραφής, τηρώντας πιστά την ακαδημαϊκή δεοντολογία.

2. Οι απόψεις που εκφράζονται αποτελούν αποκλειστικά ευθύνη του/ης συγγραφέα/ως και ο/η επιβλέπων/ουσα, οι εξεταστές, το Τμήμα και το Πανεπιστήμιο Πελοποννήσου δεν υιοθετούν κατ' ανάγκη τις εκφραζόμενες απόψεις ούτε φέρουν οποιαδήποτε ευθύνη για τυχόν λάθη και παραλείψεις.

Ο/Η δηλών/ούσα

…….

(Υπογραφή)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Nikolaos Tzifakis, for the encouragement and valuable comments during the planning and development of this thesis.

I would also like to thank all my professors of the master's program, whose enthusiasm and expertise made the trip to Korinthos worthwhile.

Finally, I must express my profound gratitude to my family for their patience and support throughout this last year.

Promotion of parliamentary diplomacy through the newly established trilateral schemes in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Key words: parliamentary diplomacy, international parliamentary institutions, trilateral parliamentary schemes of cooperation, regional cooperation

Abstract

Cooperation between parliaments enhances parliamentary diplomacy, which has become an invaluable tool in international politics. Regional cooperation in the Mediterranean is achieved through a network of international and regional parliamentary institutions and various multilateral, bilateral, and trilateral schemes, which have increased during the last decade. Two major events appear to be the main cause of this increase: the Arab Spring uprisings, which threatened stability and security in the region and the discovery of hydrocarbons in the Levantine Basin. The initiation of trilateral parliamentary schemes, namely Cyprus-Greece-Israel, Cyprus-Egypt-Greece and Cyprus-Greece-Jordan illustrates this increase.

This thesis aims to assess the contribution of these newly established schemes in the promotion of parliamentary diplomacy and cooperation. The issue is approached gradually. First, we try to define the term *parliamentary diplomacy* by reviewing existing literature. Then, we briefly describe the IPIs based in the Mediterranean or focus on the area, and we also present the existing trilateral parliamentary schemes. We use the Cyprus-Greece-Israel scheme as a case study since it is the most *advanced* scheme, being established first and having evolved through regular meetings. Finally, the thesis presents some general conclusions on the contribution of the aforementioned schemes in the promotion of parliamentary diplomacy and regional cooperation, mainly based on the opinion of Greek MPs.

Προώθηση της κοινοβουλευτικής διπλωματίας μέσα από τα νέα τριμερή σχήματα στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο

Λέξεις κλειδιά: κοινοβουλευτική διπλωματία, διεθνείς κοινοβουλευτικοί οργανισμοί, τριμερή κοινοβουλευτικά σχήματα συνεργασίας, περιφερειακή συνεργασία

Περίληψη

Η συνεργασία μεταξύ των κοινοβουλίων ενισχύει την κοινοβουλευτική διπλωματία, η οποία έχει καταστεί πολύτιμο εργαλείο στη διεθνή πολιτική. Η περιφερειακή συνεργασία στη Μεσόγειο επιτυγχάνεται μέσω ενός δικτύου διεθνών και περιφερειακών κοινοβουλευτικών οργάνων και διαφόρων πολυμερών, διμερών και τριμερών συστημάτων, τα οποία αυξήθηκαν κατά την τελευταία δεκαετία. Δύο σημαντικά γεγονότα φαίνεται να είναι η κύρια αιτία αυτής της αύξησης: Οι εξεγέρσεις της Αραβικής Άνοιξης, οι οποίες έθεσαν σε κίνδυνο τη σταθερότητα και την ασφάλεια στην περιοχή, καθώς και η ανακάλυψη υδρογονανθράκων στη Λεκάνη της Λεβαντίνης. Η δημιουργία των τριμερών κοινοβουλευτικών σχημάτων, συγκεκριμένα αυτά μεταξύ Κύπρου-Ελλάδας-Ισραήλ, Κύπρου-Αιγύπτου-Ελλάδας και Κύπρου-Ελλάδας-Ιορδανίας αντικατοπτρίζουν αυτή την αύξηση.

Η παρούσα εργασία αποσκοπεί στην αξιολόγηση της συμβολής των νέων αυτών σχημάτων στην προώθηση της κοινοβουλευτικής διπλωματίας και συνεργασίας. Το ζήτημα προσεγγίζεται σταδιακά. Πρώτον, προσπαθούμε να προσδιορίσουμε την έννοια του όρου *κοινοβουλευτική διπλωματία* μέσα από την ανασκόπηση της υπάρχουσας βιβλιογραφίας. Στη συνέχεια, περιγράφουμε εν συντομία τους διεθνείς κοινοβουλευτικούς οργανισμούς που λειτουργούν στη Μεσόγειο ή εστιάζουν στην περιοχή, και παρουσιάζουμε επίσης τα υφιστάμενα τριμερή κοινοβουλευτικά σχήματα. Εστιάζουμε στην περίπτωση του τριμερούς σχήματος Ελλάδας-Κύπρου-Ισραήλ, δεδομένου ότι είναι το πιο αναπτυγμένο από τα τρία, καθώς ιδρύθηκε πρώτο και εξελίχθηκε μέσω τακτικών συναντήσεων. Τέλος, η εργασία παρουσιάζει ορισμένα γενικά συμπεράσματα σχετικά με τη συμβολή των προαναφερθέντων σχημάτων στην προώθηση της κοινοβουλευτικής διπλωματίας και της περιφερειακής συνεργασίας, βασισμένα κυρίως σε απόψεις Ελλήνων βουλευτών.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Abbreviations

AII	Adriatic Ionian Initiative
AII PD	Adriatic Ionian Initiative Parliamentary Dimension
APF	Assemblée Pour la Francophonie (Parliamentary Assembly of la Francophonie)
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
EMPA	Euro Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly
EP	European Parliament
EU	European Union
IAO	Interparliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy
IGO	International Governmental Organisation
IPC	Inter Parliamentary Conference
IPI	International Parliamentary Institution
IPU	Inter Parliamentary Union
MENA	Middle East North Africa
MP	Member of Parliament
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
OSCE	Parliamentary Assembly of the Organisation for the Security and the Cooperation in Europe
PA	Parliamentary Assembly
PABSEC	Parliamentary Assembly of the Organisation of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation
PACE	Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
PAM	Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean
SEECP	Parliamentary Assembly of the South East Europe Cooperation
UfM	Union for the Mediterranean
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States

INTRODUCTION

Parliamentary diplomacy is considered an alternative and multi-faceted form of diplomacy, which has gradually strengthened its position and has become an essential and effective tool of cooperation and communication between states. The traditional role of parliaments, limited to domestic affairs, is challenged as their field of action has broadened. Challenging and pressing global issues need to be tackled and traditional state diplomacy seems, at times, to be inadequate to deal with them effectively. Increased international contacts among parliamentarians pave the way for parliamentary diplomacy and give a new impetus to international affairs. Therefore, parliamentary diplomacy is fostered and, consequently, it alters the way of doing politics and making law (Jancic, 2015), and also challenges traditional intergovernmental cooperation.

Parliamentary diplomacy is exercised through different forms of interparliamentary cooperation. Most parliaments participate in numerous International Parliamentary Institutions, establish Parliamentary Friendship Groups and deliberate on various bilateral and multilateral contacts with other parliaments. The purpose of this thesis is to highlight the contribution of the newly emerged trilateral parliamentary schemes of cooperation in promoting parliamentary diplomacy, and in fostering regional cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The thesis, in the first chapter, will try to define the term *parliamentary diplomacy* by reviewing existing literature. Then it will attempt to identify its strengths and weaknesses compared with *traditional state diplomacy,* in order to determine the reasons for the proliferation of parliamentary cooperation in various schemes. As the main research question is whether, and to what extent the newly-emerged trilateral schemes of cooperation enhance parliamentary cooperation, we will also try to identify the fields in which parliamentary diplomacy can produce tangible results, particularly in the Mediterranean.

In the second chapter, we will attempt to explain the importance of regional cooperation in the Mediterranean Basin, which has resulted in the proliferation of Mediterranean-based or Mediterranean-focused IPIs. Then, we will continue with a presentation of the parliamentary entities dealing with the Mediterranean and a brief

description of their structure, function and objectives in order to detect possible gaps in parliamentary cooperation in the region.

The third chapter deals with the newly established trilateral parliamentary schemes, initiated by Cyprus and Greece in Eastern Mediterranean. In order to identify the main reasons for this initiative, we will use the trilateral parliamentary scheme of cooperation between the parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel as a case study. This scheme is the more *advanced* as it was established first, and has evolved through regular meetings. In this chapter, we will also present a summary of the findings of the interview, which was conducted with members of the Hellenic Parliament and an Israeli diplomat, on the aforementioned scheme and parliamentary diplomacy in general.

In the last part, we will present our conclusions regarding the effectiveness of parliamentary diplomacy in general, and also our conclusions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of multilateral and trilateral parliamentary schemes of cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean.

As the relevant literature is actually non-existent, the development methodology of the thesis is mainly based on primary sources, (minutes of meetings, inaugural declarations, statements and speeches) and reports from MPs of the Hellenic Parliament through non-structured and semi-structured interviews, which record their personal experience and opinions*.

The MPs who were interviewed have participated in the meetings of the Cyprus – Greece – Israel trilateral scheme of cooperation and in different parliamentary institutions, and their choice was made on a cross-party basis. Some of the MPs interviewed had, or currently have governmental positions. The interviews, which were given in writing or orally, in July-September 2019, were structured in two parts: the first regarding the trilateral cooperation with a special focus on the Cyprus-Greece-Israel scheme, and the second, on the role of parliamentary diplomacy.

**Efforts were made to interview Cypriot and Israeli MPs, but this was not feasible*

CHAPTER1: PARLIAMENTARY DIPLOMACY

In this chapter we will try to define the term *parliamentary diplomacy* by reviewing existing literature and also compare it with *traditional diplomacy*, with view to illustrate the reasons for the proliferation of parliamentary cooperation in various schemes. We also deem necessary to cite different opinions on what parliamentary diplomacy is, and how it can contribute to promoting cooperation among states. As our main research question is whether, and to what extent the newly emerged trilateral schemes of cooperation enhance parliamentary cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean, we will try to assess the role of parliamentary diplomacy in the Mediterranean in achieving peace and stability and promoting regional interests.

Parliamentary diplomacy appears to be an alternative and multi-faceted form of diplomacy, which is increasingly establishing its position, as an essential and necessary tool of cooperation and communication between states. Although parliamentary diplomacy is considered a relatively new form of diplomacy compared to traditional diplomacy, it made its first official steps in 1889 with the creation of the Interparliamentary Union. The initial objective of the IPU, which was the peaceful settlement of international conflicts with the assistance of parliamentarians from different countries and the promotion of peace through parliamentary dialogue and diplomacy, still applies (IPU, 2019).

The rise of new challenging fields, such as the globalisation of economy, climate change and terrorism demand expertise in many areas in order to be tackled, and this task is difficult to be dealt with only by means of traditional diplomacy (Stavridis, 2016). In the light of this new situation, the EU has given a new impetus to the role of the European Parliament in the field of foreign affairs through the Lisbon Treaty; parliamentary committees and the plenary can discuss foreign policy issues, a fact that encourages engagement of the EP and accordingly of the national parliaments in foreign affairs. Consequently, diplomatic activity is undertaken by the EP with a view to promoting to third countries the EU's principles, for instance democracy, freedom, respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law (European Union, 2007). National parliaments of the EU member states, encouraged by the EP's initiative, also pursue a more ambitious involvement in foreign affairs and

international relations issues particularly in the Mediterranean, which constitutes its southern border.

1.1 DEFINITION OF PARLIAMENTARY DIPLOMACY, A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Parliamentary diplomacy has not been clearly defined as a term. The difficulty perceived in defining parliamentary diplomacy could be accounted to its multi-faceted and vague nature, its rather recent appearance in foreign affairs issues, and its so-called subordinate standing to traditional diplomacy. Different approaches on this issue have been expressed. In this part of the thesis, we will try to approach different aspects of parliamentary diplomacy and also present how scholars have defined it.

According to *A Dictionary of Diplomacy, Palgrave Macmillan*, diplomacy is, "the conduct of relations between sovereign states through the medium of officials based at home or abroad, the latter being either members of their state's diplomatic service or temporary diplomats." Parliamentary diplomacy, according to the same dictionary, is defined as, "multilateral diplomacy, which takes place in public in the organs of an international organisation and/or dialogue between the parliamentarians of different states" (Berridge and Lloyd, 2012).

Hedley Bull though gives a simpler, yet concrete definition of the term, "diplomacy is the conduct of relations between states and other entities with standing in world politics by official agents and by peaceful means" (Bull, 1977). According to this definition, it is the state, which engages in establishing relations with other states by its official diplomats; thus it renders the executive power the sole acknowledged actor of diplomacy and as the realist school claims, parliaments cannot play a role in foreign affairs (Stavridis, 2002a).

Contrary to this claim and the common belief, national parliaments, additionally to their traditional mission to translate people's mandate into institutionalised legal order or, to provide the appropriate framework for political expression and dialogue, have extended their field of action and interest also in the field of foreign affairs, which, until a few decades ago, was entirely dominated by executive power (Bajtay, 2015).

Parliamentary bodies do not limit their role in foreign affairs to the ratification of international treaties. Parliamentarians also try to promote the positions of their countries, both through their participation in international fora, as well as through the development of bilateral parliamentary relations. The intensification and promotion of parliamentary diplomacy should be among the key priorities of national parliaments as, in this way, they build bridges between peoples and promote their issues abroad. *D. Sioufas,* former president of the Hellenic Parliament, stated during his speech at the 4th Plenary Session of the EMPA that particular emphasis should be put on parliamentary diplomacy, which is de facto an arm of the foreign policy of the country and an important tool for promoting international cooperation and for strengthening the standing of national parliaments (Sioufas, 2008). Thus parliamentarians contribute significantly and substantially to the mutual understanding of the problems and, consequently, to the mutual understanding of the peoples. *Khadija Arib,* President of the House of Representatives of the States General believes that parliamentary diplomacy is pivotal, "We – as parliamentarians – can use diplomacy as an instrument to share experiences and learn from each other. This takes place during organised conferences linked to the Council of Europe, the EU, NATO or the OSCE, for example, as well as through bilateral relations" (Arib, 2016).

According to *Weisglas and de Boer*, 'Parliamentary Diplomacy' is defined as, 'all international parliamentary activities aimed at strengthening understanding between states, mutual assistance with a view to improving government control, more effective popular representation, and consolidation of democratic legitimacy for intergovernmental institutions' (de Boer and Weisglas, 2007). Through parliamentary diplomacy the scrutiny of the government is improved, mutual understanding between countries is increased and better representation of people is guaranteed.

The declaration adopted at the second World Conference of Speakers of Parliaments, in 2005, clearly underlines the importance of the involvement of parliaments in international affairs, "not only through interparliamentary cooperation and parliamentary diplomacy, but also by contributing to and monitoring international negotiations, overseeing the enforcement of what is adopted by governments, and ensuring national compliance with international norms and the rule of law" (IPU,

2005). Parliamentary diplomacy, in addition to enabling two or more parliaments to conduct an on-going dialogue with regard to key international issues, lays the ground for discussions and negotiations according to rules of procedure in international organisations.

Stelios Stavridis and *Davor Jančić* support that traditional diplomacy often proves inadequate to deal with the complexity of international relations; consequently, this has sparkled the appearance of new forms of diplomacy. New challenging problems like terrorism and cyber security, climate change, which combined with on-going conflicts and disputes between states, require special skills in order to be dealt with effectively. Additionally, new actors have emerged in foreign policy, such as non-governmental organisations, civil society, academics, media, foundations which create a new international political and diplomatic environment (Stavridis and Jančić, 2016). Interdependence and interaction between states, combined with the new facts, have urged parliaments to engage in active diplomacy and to claim a central role.

1.2 STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF PARLIAMENTARY DIPLOMACY IN COMPARISON TO TRADITIONAL DIPLOMACY

Traditional diplomacy is exercised by the Prime Minister, ministers and diplomats. According to *David Beetham*, "a diplomat is an envoy of the executive branch and represents the positions of the State, members of parliament, however, there are politicians who hold political beliefs which may or may not coincide with their respective country's official position on any given issue" (Stavridis and Jančić, 2016). Parliamentarians, particularly members of the opposition, often express opinions that do not coincide with governmental positions.

Taking advantage of their weakness of not having the authority to take binding decisions for their country in international fora, and free from the burdens and limitations, which often make governments captive of the rules of the diplomatic protocol, parliamentarians are able to establish better relations and cooperation with their counterparts. Especially in recent years, the increased tendency of globalisation of problems and the inevitable complications that accompany this trend, have given

rise to a new approach towards national parliaments (de Boer and Weisglas, 2007). Parliamentarians have undertaken to fulfil the mandate they have received from the citizens both by exercising their traditional role, but also in the field of foreign policy (Stavridis and Jančić, 2016). Members of national parliaments have taken a more active role in assessing national policy choices in areas where foreign policy issues are important, and which, until recently, have been regarded as an area of exclusive executive activity. *D. Sioufas* during the same event – the 4th Plenary Session of the EMPA, declared that parliamentary diplomacy is stronger than state diplomacy because parliamentary delegations, which participate in international organisations and other parliamentary meetings, consist of members of more than one political party and, consequently, are more pluralistic in comparison with state diplomacy, which strictly follows governmental lines (Sioufas, 2008).

Parliamentary committees, friendship groups and delegations are cross-party and as a result they can voice different opinions according to their political ideologies and beliefs. Different political parties are able to express their positions independently from governmental lines and pressure, and therefore, establish a more open and durable dialogue with colleagues from other parliaments. This is demonstrated in all interparliamentary meetings, bilateral, trilateral, multilateral and mostly in interparliamentary institutions and organisations. In the opposite case though, if parliamentarians chose to follow strict governmental lines, the advantage of pluralism and freedom of parliamentary diplomacy is lost. This is not a common practice in EU member states parliaments but may be demonstrated by parliaments whose members are not democratically elected (Fiott, 2011). Furthermore parliamentary diplomacy appears to be less formal and more flexible compared to diplomacy exercised by the executive power; nevertheless, it is essential in building bridges between parliaments and people (Stavridis, 2018).

1.3 ASPECTS AND FUNCTIONS OF PARLIAMENTARY DIPLOMACY

The policies and diplomatic strategies often followed by governments are rigid as they follow specific paths, based on the principle of giving and taking. Parliamentarians, with their freedom of expression and flexibility, are able to exhaust all the dialogue

options, in order to overcome differences. It would be wrong though, to perceive this difference between traditional and parliamentary diplomacy as a disadvantage to a country's diplomatic activity. State and parliamentary diplomacy can complement each other. Ms *LL.M Ankie Broekers-Knol*, former President of the Senate of the Netherlands, defines parliamentary diplomacy as supplementary democratic activities to governmental efforts in the context of traditional diplomacy. She also underlines the value of these activities by stating that, **"**parliamentarians are ideally placed to build bridges between conflicting parties and that they are not bound by the positions taken by the government. Personal contacts between members of parliament of different states are likely to enhance mutual understanding and to establish alternative channels beneficial for bilateral relations between countries" (Broekers-Knol, 2014).

Parliaments have different paths to communicate with each other. They build different structures depending on the specific issues they have to cope with and their national, regional and international interests. Presidents of national parliaments are usually the most active parliamentarians in the field of parliamentary diplomacy. They participate in numerous international or regional IPCs, they engage in various bilateral and multilateral meetings with a view to strengthening relations with other national parliaments. Parliamentary committees and particularly foreign affairs committees, participate in a number of IPCs and meetings so as to discuss foreign affairs, and international relations issues. Texts adopted during parliamentary meetings and conferences are often communicated to governmental bodies and organisations and may serve as the basis for discussions in intergovernmental meetings ('Rules of Procedure of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the CFSP and the CSDP', 2012).

Another parliamentary structure that is established in most parliaments is friendship groups. Friendship groups of different countries organise meetings, which serve mainly as a link between both parliaments and peoples. Usually, there is no fixed agenda and discussions are held in an informal and friendly way. However, through these usually protocol free meetings parliamentarians develop strong bonds with their counterparts and promote effectively various issues.

1.4 PARLIAMENTARY DIPLOMACY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

The need for communication between the members of the national Parliaments of different countries, and in particular of the EU member states with countries of the MENA region has been the starting point for many initiatives in the past. This communication has been approached both in a structured and organised way and more spontaneously in the form of bilateral meetings. The aim in all forms of parliamentary cooperation is to generate initiatives designed to influence the political decisions of governments, and to pave the way for practical solutions that respond directly and effectively to the needs of citizens. The Mediterranean has been characterised by conflicts and unrest between states and peoples and as this is still the case, it increases the need for more diplomacy, dialogue and mediation.

Parliamentary diplomacy appears, in the case of Euro-Mediterranean relations, as the most flexible mechanism for the promotion of political dialogue with a view to transforming the Mediterranean into a region of peace and prosperity. The idea that parliamentary diplomacy has the potential, not only to guarantee the continuity of the dialogue, but also to act as a deterrent to crises and conflicts in the region, is increasingly gaining ground.

The EU has long supported the establishment of cooperation with the southern coast of the Mediterranean as it is crucial to promote democracy and assure the security of the region. The EU's objective through various initiatives was on the one hand, to create the environment for the infusion of democracy to countries that lack democratic institutions and on the other, to support existing democratic regimes (Stavridis, 2002b).

The efforts to establish cooperation between the southern and northern shores of the Mediterranean were mostly driven by the need to tackle on-going conflicts in the region, namely the Israeli – Palestinian conflict and the Cyprus issue. The fact that MPs from countries which are in conflict with each other, participate in the same IPIs, gives them the opportunity to discuss and negotiate in a multilateral scheme. This potentially can produce better results than under the usually tense environment of bilateral meetings. Furthermore, conflicting states may be found in the same side regarding several regional issues like energy, migration or climate change.

Most Mediterranean countries participate in more than one regional parliamentary institution. Israeli, Syrian and Palestinian parliamentarians participate in both PAM and PA UfM; consequently, these assemblies can provide the ground for parliamentary diplomacy and mediation between countries in conflict (Jancic, 2015). However, collaboration and dialogue between conflicting sides proves occasionally to be difficult. A characteristic incident of difficult communication between conflicting members took place in the second forum of the EMPA, which took place a day after the election of the Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, when Arab politicians used insulting language against him and deviated attention from the topics of the agenda (Stavridis, 2002b). Sometimes it is difficult to have common views and produce positive results between opposing parts, but the main issue is to be able to sit around the same table and engage in a constructive dialogue.

CHAPTER 2: IPIs IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

As mentioned in the first part of the thesis, constructive dialogue between different states and strong, on-going diplomatic links are essential in order to establish collaboration, and work on common goals and interests. The Mediterranean has always been an area of major interest and interests, political, economic and geostrategic. Through history, many peoples have tried to control it, the Phoenicians, the Greeks, and the Romans. Later the Byzantine Empire dominated a big part of it and the crusades from the eleventh to the thirteenth century against Islam deepened the gap between different religions and defined for long the future of the area (Šabič and Bojinović, 2007). Then in the Middle Ages the Muslims spread over North Africa and southern Spain. Behind the apparent religious reasons, which instigated all invasions and conflicts, the common ambition was to conquer the maritime and commercial space of the Mediterranean. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1969 enforced Mediterranean's role as a major commercial and transit route and attracted the interest of non-regional actors as well. Great Britain, the Ottoman Empire, Austria and Russia struggled for securing their access to the Mediterranean Sea and, consequently, for securing their commercial and economic interests (Šabič and Bojinović, 2007).

The Mediterranean, as a region of vivid interaction between different states, is characterised by both collaboration and conflicts. Numerous efforts have been made to enhance cooperation and reduce hostilities. International and regional developments have influenced the initiation and evolution of various initiatives, namely the Cold War and its end, globalisation, the 11 September 2001 and the War on Terror and the most recent and still evolving, the Arab Spring (Cofelice and Stavridis, 2017). Governmental and parliamentary initiatives have emerged in the Mediterranean in order to deal with the challenges of the region.

A first step in order to present international parliamentary organisations, which are either based in the Mediterranean or focus on this area, would be to define the area. All riparian countries are qualified as Mediterranean; yet, Portugal, Mauritania and

Jordan cannot be excluded, although they do not have a Mediterranean coast. In fact they participate in most Mediterranean cooperation schemes[1].

International organisations and multilateral schemes of cooperation cannot be based on purely geographical terms, but they should build on common values of their members and promote coherence and create the sense of 'belonging' (Šabič and Bojinović, 2007). This applies especially in regional cooperation initiatives, which under circumstances can lead to the resolution of the pressing political, economic, environmental issues of the area (Šabič and Bojinović, 2007). The institutional structure of the Mediterranean though, appears quite complicated and fragmented. The presence of international actors together with the inadequacy or lack of will on behalf of regional actors hinder its development and sustainability.

The geostrategic location of the Mediterranean attracts global interest and many actors try to spread their influence. The best way to achieve this goal, besides going to war, is to form alliances with a view to changing the existing balance of power and the status quo of a region. Bilateral relations and large international organisations, either governmental or parliamentary, can be the vehicle for this purpose. There are numerous schemes of cooperation, which have a focus in this area, not all of them locally based. Furthermore, there are international organisations which do not consist exclusively of Mediterranean countries, UfM for instance. Accordingly, the designation of the Mediterranean region based exclusively on geographical features may be naïve if we take into account that, apart from the countries that declare their *mediterraneanism*, there are also actors that historically play an important role in the area.

As *Aliboni* states one of the main reasons for the poor institutionalisation of the region is that, "the main political and cultural initiatives in the Mediterranean are taken by external actors" (Aliboni, 2001). External actors like Russia, the US and the EU have been trying to intervene and secure their interests in many ways, one being the participation in international organisations that are based in the Mediterranean or focus on the area. An example of EU's intervention in cooperation building in the area is the Union for the Mediterranean. The UfM, established in 2008, would bring

[1] Jordan, Mauritania and Portugal are considered as "Mediterranean" in the academic literature but also in the practice of formal and informal international cooperation structures. See for instance the "5+5" that includes both Mauritania and Portugal; the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean (PAM); the MED7 (Cyprus, Greece, Malta, Italy, France, Spain and Portugal).

together only coastal countries of the Mediterranean excluding the rest of EU member states (Gillespie, 2008). However, Sarkozy's initial proposal met Germany's strong opposition which led to the current UfM structure, which comprises all 28 members of the EU, the riparian countries of Southern and Eastern Mediterranean, plus Jordan and Mauritania (Vutseva, 2008).

2.1 PARLIAMENTARY ENTITIES DEALING WITH THE MEDITERRANEAN

Parliamentary diplomacy flourishes in the Mediterranean and this is depicted in the numerous cooperation initiatives that have emerged during the last decades, particularly after the end of the Cold War (Stavridis and Jančić, 2016). According to *Cofelice* and *Stavridis*, "it is possible to identify five different groupings of parliamentary entities dealing with the Mediterranean, on the basis of geographical membership criteria". The following table depicts the current IPIs existence in the Mediterranean (Cofelice and Stavridis, 2017).

Table 2.1
Summary table of international parliamentary entities dealing with the Mediterranean

Universal	Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) 1889 Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) 1911, 1948 Assemblée Parlementaire de la Francophonie (APF) 1967, 1998 Parliamentary Union of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) Member States 1999 Parliamentary Network on the World Bank and International Monetary Fund 2000 Inter-parliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy 2001 Parliamentary Forum for Democracy 2010
Northern	Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) 1949 European Parliament (EP) 1952 NATO Parliamentary Assembly (NATO PA) 1955 OSCE Parliamentary Assembly (OSCE PA) 1990 Inter-parliamentary Conferences [CFSP/CSDP, euro] 2012/2013
Northern-Southern	Parliamentary Assembly of the Union for the Mediterranean (PA-UfM) 1998, 2010 Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean (PAM) 2005
Southern	Arab Inter-parliamentary Union (Arab IPU) 1974 Consultative Council of the Arab Maghreb Union (UMA) 1989 Association of Senates, Shoora and equivalent Councils in Africa and the Arab World (ASSECAA) 2002 Pan-African Parliament (PAP) 2004
Mediterranean-related	Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (PABSEC) 1993 World Hellenic Inter-Parliamentary Association 1996 Parliamentary Dimension of the Adriatic-Ionian Initiative (AII) 2001 Parliamentary Association of the Southeast European Cooperative Initiative (SECI) 2002, 2014 African Parliamentary Knowledge Network 2010

Source: Cofelice and Stavridis, 2017

All of the above schemes are based on multilateral cooperation. According to this table there are five different categories of parliamentary entities dealing with the Mediterranean, on the basis of geographical membership criteria.

The first group comprises parliamentary entities with a universal or non-geographically defined membership whereas, in the fifth group there are non-specifically Mediterranean-centred IPIs, which have a relatively strong Mediterranean dimension though. In the second, third and fourth rows we can see regional parliamentary institutions. The fundamental difference between the second and fourth group with the third is that the latter comprises the only two truly intra-regional IPIs, where parliamentarians from both shores of the Mediterranean sit together. In contrary, the second and the fourth group conceive the Mediterranean as a border since they comprise parliamentary institutions that are established, respectively, in the northern and southern coast of the Mediterranean (Cofelice and Stavridis, 2017).

We have chosen to focus exclusively on the Mediterranean based IPIs, which Greece participates in, so as to demonstrate how and to what extent they provide the platform for regional cooperation and for promotion of parliamentary diplomacy in parallel with the trilateral schemes of the Eastern Mediterranean

2.2 PARLIAMENTARY DIPLOMACY AND THE HELLENIC PARLIAMENT

The institutional role of the Hellenic Parliament in the formulation of its foreign policy is recognised in a number of provisions of both the Constitution (Art.28), and the Parliament's Rules of Procedure (Art.49). The Hellenic Parliament, besides the ratification of international treaties, has taken important initiatives to strengthen its international relations, to defend national issues and generally to promote Greece abroad. *D. Sioufas,* former Speaker of the Hellenic Parliament, considered that parliamentary diplomacy promotes objectives, such as developing closer contact with other parliaments through bilateral meetings which in turn strengthen people to people links (Sioufas, 2017). Through all parliamentary cooperation schemes, Greek MPs not only have the opportunity to tackle issues of global and national interest, but also benefit from the exchange of good practices and ideas with other national parliaments.

Greek parliamentarians participate in all major international assemblies, namely NATO PA, OSCE PA, IPU, PACE, IAO, APF and in the regional parliamentary

organisations PAM, PA UfM, SEECP and AII, which are based in the Mediterranean or have a Mediterranean focus and PABSEC (*Int'l Relations*, n.d.). The Hellenic Parliament together with the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus participates in trilateral schemes of cooperation with the parliaments of Israel, Jordan and Egypt. These trilateral schemes of cooperation are the most recent type of parliamentary cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean (*Int'l Relations*, n.d.). Furthermore, the Vouli ton Ellenon[2] has currently 78 Friendship Groups and also enhances bilateral contacts which are considered of major importance.

2.3 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE MEDITERRANEAN BASED AND THE MEDITERRANEAN RELATED IPIS

The IPIs dealing with the Mediterranean have many things in common, but also several structural differences, which specify their functionality and effectiveness. Not all of them have the same rules of procedures or the same number of members. A fundamental difference between Mediterranean parliamentary entities is their composition. It is of major importance if their members come from both northern and southern coast of the Mediterranean. For instance, PA UfM and PAM are initiatives which bring together countries from both coasts, whereas the AII and SEECP PA gather countries from the northern coast and have mostly regional focus and specific goals.

2.3.1 THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE UNION FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN (PA UFM)

The PA UfM is based on the principles of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership or Barcelona Process (1995) and it aims to contribute to the strengthening of the work of its governmental branch, by promoting dialogue and exchange of views between members, enhancing transparency and democratic processes. The Assembly was established in Athens, in March 2004 and has 280 members. They are parliamentarians appointed by the parliaments of the partner countries participating in the Barcelona process and the European Parliament (PA-UfM, 2018). This constitutes

[2] The Hellenic Parliament in Greek

a huge scheme, which is often described as chaotic and dysfunctional. There is direct connection between the governmental and parliamentary dimension of the UfM. In its recently revised rules of procedure we can read: “the purpose of the Assembly shall be to bring parliamentary support, impetus and influence to the consolidation and development of the Barcelona process” and “the role of the Assembly shall be complementary to the other institutions of the Barcelona process” (PA-UfM, 2018). Regarding its structure there is a bureau, five parliamentary committees and a permanent secretariat.

2.3.2 PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE MEDITERRANEAN (PAM)

PAM is an autonomous parliamentary institution, in which the parliaments of the Mediterranean coastal countries plus Jordan, Mauritania and Portugal participate in an equal manner and it is an evolution of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean. PAM was founded following a Greek initiative in 2005. The main objective of PAM is to forge political, economic and social cooperation among the member states in order to find common solutions to the challenges facing the region, and to create a space for peace and prosperity for the Mediterranean peoples (PAM, 2006). It currently comprises 26 member states, 2 associate partners and 12 observers. It has a bureau, committees and permanent secretariat.

2.3.3 PARLIAMENTARY DIMENSION OF THE ADRIATIC IONIAN INITIATIVE (AII PD)

AII is an informal intergovernmental cooperation — not an international organisation — promoting economic, environmental, social, and regional cooperation of nine countries bordering the Adriatic and Ionian seas. The AII PD, which meets in the form of a Conference of the Speakers of Parliaments, was established in 2001 with the aim of encouraging parliamentary cooperation on all major matters of the region. As stated in its inaugural declaration, “strengthening regional cooperation helps to promote political and economic stability, thus creating a solid base for the process of

European integration" (AII, 2012). The parliamentary branch of this initiative has a permanent secretariat and always meets in plenary.

2.3.4 PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE SOUTH EAST EUROPE COOPERATION PROCESS (SEECP PA)

PA SEECP is the parliamentary dimension of the South-East Europe Cooperation Process, established in 1996 in Sofia, by decision of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the participating countries. The Assembly was established in May 2014 in Bucharest and it is closely linked to the governmental arm (SEECP PA, 2014). The priority of the Assembly is to strengthen stability in the region, to strengthen regional cooperation, always in close cooperation with the EU and to support the process of gradual integration of its member countries. The exchange of best practices with other parliaments particularly on legislative acts in order to conform to the EU *aquis communautaire* is one of its main aims (Vrieze, 2016).There are 13 members, committees and a permanent secretariat whose location is still contested between Ankara and Sofia.

All IPIs presented in the thesis were governmentally initiated and based on specific issues and objectives. As noted in most inaugural declarations, all IPIs are closely linked to the governmental arm and follow closely the governmental lines. The parliamentary dimension though, may have different priorities, but it is arguable whether the parliamentary dimension of these cooperation schemes deviates from governmental lines and establishes additional platforms for communication and cooperation.

2.4 PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Regarding the way they function, IPIs presented in this thesis, despite being linked to their respective governmental branches, have the freedom to choose their own agenda, adopt their own rules of procedure and also issue resolutions, opinions and recommendations, which are not legally binding for their countries, but can serve as a "soft diplomacy" tool (De Vrieze, 2015).

However, none of the parliamentary networks presented has the power of decision making, which is exclusively assigned to the governmental branch. IPIs and parliamentary initiatives are limited to a consultative role and the opinions or resolutions they issue may serve as a basis for discussion. The interaction between the two dimensions is usually linked to the existence of a permanent secretariat. The secretariat in all IPIs plays an important role. As all four international networks presented meet infrequently and parliamentarians appointed by national parliaments are not the same in all meetings, the secretariat is responsible for drafting the agenda and potential declarations, resolutions or conclusions (De Vrieze, 2015). The frequency of plenary and committee meetings is mostly once or twice a year.

In recent years, it seems that there is a proliferation of Mediterranean parliamentary schemes which aspire to contribute positively in regional cooperation. Even in the core of purely European institutions like the CFSP/CSDP IPC such initiatives have started to develop. In 2016 an informal forum was established, the Med Group, which consists of the members of the delegations of foreign affairs and defence committees of the Mediterranean member states[3]. The preparatory meeting, initiated by the Greek delegation, took place during the CFSP/CSDP IPC in The Hague in the context of the Dutch Presidency of the European Council (Hellenic Parliament, 2016)[4]. On the 16th of May 2016 all 7 delegations were invited to Athens for the inaugural meeting, where the Athens Declaration was signed (Hellenic Parliament, 2016)[5]. In this first meeting France and Malta did not participate but agreed to sign the inaugural declaration.

The aim of this initiative was to establish an informal platform through which voices of the European South could be heard in a major EU interparliamentary conference. This informal forum meets regularly in the context of the IPC for the CFSP/CSDP (Hellenic Parliament, 2016)[6]. This initiative does not aspire to be a major actor since MPs and not the same every time and the agenda is usually related to the agenda of the conference. Nevertheless, it is a characteristic example of the proliferation of

[3] Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Spain
[4] Hellenic Parliament (2016) 'The Hague Declaration'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives
[5] Hellenic Parliament (2016) 'Athens Declaration'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.
[6] Ibid

interparliamentary schemes of cooperation which have a focus on the Mediterranean region.

CHAPTER 3: TRILATERAL PARLIAMENTARY COOPERATION SCHEMES

This chapter deals with the initiation of the trilateral parliamentary schemes of cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean. Based on the inaugural declarations, reports drawn up by parliamentary officials and agendas of the meetings, we will try to present their structure, function and objectives. The findings of the interviews conducted with MPs and a diplomat, who have participated in the meetings of the these trilateral schemes, will help us identify the main reasons behind these initiatives, their strong and weak points, and also help us estimate their potential and future role in the area.

3.1 INITIATION OF THE TRILATERAL SCHEMES AND THEIR OBJECTIVES

The trilateral scheme of cooperation between Cyprus, Greece and Israel was the first trilateral initiative in the Eastern Mediterranean; it was established in 2014 at governmental level, soon after the discovery of big quantities of hydrocarbons in the Levantine Basin, in 2009. The environment for the formation of this alliance was favourable for many reasons. The discovery of large quantities of hydrocarbons, which appear to surpass domestic needs, have the potential to change the balance of powers in this volatile area and to transform the geopolitical landscape of the region. These discoveries have generated hopes to the countries of the region to become major energy producers and providers. Those aspirations were boosted by the EU, which had been looking for new sources and diversification of providers (Yorucu and Mehmet, 2018). Furthermore, the volatile situation in the MENA region after the Arab Spring uprisings and all the consequences of the conflicts and the civil wars raised major security issues. The ambitions of Cyprus and Greece to play a role in this field together with the need for security promoted the idea of forming new alliances in the area. On the other hand Israel, which is surrounded by Arab countries, has always sought to create stronger alliances within the EU. This trilateral scheme with two EU member states would serve as a catalyst to this end. Turkey's escalating aggressive attitude also paved the way for regional alliances that could balance Turkey's irredentism (Tziarras, 2019). Geographical proximity and the common cultural

background of the three countries also facilitated communication, and served as a common ground for the initiation of the first trilateral scheme.

This trilateral scheme developed a parliamentary branch as it happens with most cooperation initiatives in order to strengthen and legitimise governmental decisions (Stavridis, 2016). This scheme will be our case study in our effort to prove if, how and to what extent parliamentary trilateral schemes promote diplomacy and regional cooperation.

3.2 TRILATERAL PARLIAMENTARY SCHEMES IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

3.2.1 CYPRUS-GREECE-ISRAEL

The trilateral parliamentary scheme of cooperation between Cyprus, Greece and Israel was first initiated by the foreign affairs committees of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, Vouli ton Ellenon and the Knesset[7], in Nicosia, on the 3rd of March 2016. This first trilateral parliamentary meeting was the cornerstone of all the following trilateral parliamentary meetings. The importance of this meeting was highlighted by the welcome speech addressed by the President of the House of Representatives, *Mr Y. Omirou* (*Omirou*, 2016). Furthermore, the President of the Republic of Cyprus, *Mr Anastasiadis*, received all three delegations at the Presidential Manor in order to present the objectives and the potential of this trilateral cooperation (Hellenic Parliament, 2016)[8].

The joint declaration, issued at the end of the meeting, stressed the importance of this cooperation on numerous areas of concern. The volatile situation of the Eastern Mediterranean, terrorism and the challenges posed by the humanitarian crisis caused by conflicts and instability, were depicted in the joint declaration, which was signed

[7] The Parliament of the State of Israel

[8] 'Hellenic Parliament (2016) 'Report on the 1st Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives

by the three parts (House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, 2016)[9]. It is remarkable that in the preamble of the final declaration, stating the reasons that led to the establishment of this trilateral scheme, the discovery of important hydrocarbon resources in the Eastern Mediterranean was only number eleven. Historical and cultural reasons, alarming threats in the wider area that needed to be addressed, the need for peace, stability and security, and the resolution of the Cyprus issue preceded energy issues; this fact partly contradicts the common belief that the main reason for the initiation of this trilateral scheme was the exploitation of hydrocarbons.

The agenda of this first meeting was devoted on the one hand, to organisational matters and on the other hand, on the purpose and priorities of this trilateral scheme as well as the possible topics for discussion in the following meetings and on parliamentary cooperation (House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, 2016)[10]. In the first meeting, it was agreed that the issues addressed by this trilateral cooperation would be security, migration, economy, energy, trade and tourism, interparliamentary cooperation as such and environmental protection. No rules of procedure or the terms for participation were agreed, but it was decided that the three parts would meet annually and that the Knesset would host the second meeting in Jerusalem. Informally, procedural issues were discussed about the rotating presidency of the scheme, the costs and the secretarial support of the meetings but a more loose approach was decided. The staff supporting the foreign affairs committee of each parliament would be responsible for the secretarial support and organisational matters.

The cross-party representation of the delegations in the first trilateral meeting in Nicosia was praised by the President of the House of Representatives, who stated that, "the wide participation in the meeting reflected the entire political spectrum of the individual national parliaments, which added value to the trilateral cooperation" (Y. Omirou, 2016). *Mr C. Douzinas*, former Chair of the National Defence and Foreign Affairs Committee stated on behalf of the Greek delegation that as parliamentarians,

[9] House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, (2016) 'Joint Declaration of the Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

[10] House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, (2016) 'Agenda of the 1st Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel' European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives

they have the opportunity and the duty to promote issues that are beneficial to the peoples of the region and not to the governments (Hellenic Parliament, 2016)[11].

The second meeting took place on the 9 of May 2017, in Jerusalem. The Speaker of the Knesset, *Mr Yuli Edelstein*, in his welcome address expressed the support of the Knesset to this initiative and highlighted the role that parliamentarians can play in the promotion of regional cooperation and in the achievement of their set common goals (Hellenic Parliament, 2017)[12]. The delegations invited were urged to respect cross-party representation as in the first meeting. The agenda of this meeting was closely linked to the governmental dimension, and as a result it focused on security and energy issues (The Knesset, 2017)[13]. Improvements on organisational matters were also discussed and it was decided that the agenda of each meeting would be agreed by all the parties.

Taking into account that the items on the agenda required in-depth knowledge, experts on energy security and infrastructure security were invited in order to provide the MPs with all the information needed on the safe exploitation and transportation of hydrocarbons, ways of securing infrastructures from physical and cyber-attacks as well as on the need for diversification of sources and suppliers. In the framework of this meeting, issues of regional and global interest were also brought up, and suggestions were made on how to deal with on-going regional conflicts (Hellenic Parliament, 2017)[14]. This second meeting was more technical than the inaugural meeting, and participants were better prepared regarding the issues of the agenda and tried to promote their position as key players on energy matters. The second meeting of members of the foreign affairs committees of the three parliaments did not issue a joint declaration; the hosting parliament though issued a press release, which was agreed by all parts.

[11] Hellenic Parliament (2016) 'Report on the 1st Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives

[12] Hellenic Parliament (2017) 'Report on the 2nd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

[13] The Knesset (2017) 'Agenda of the 2nd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

[14] Hellenic Parliament (2017) 'Report on the 2nd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives

The third trilateral meeting on foreign affairs committee level was held on the 22nd of November 2018, in Athens. The agenda included issues of regional security and energy co-operation, as well as ways to promote the parliamentary relations of the three countries (Hellenic Parliament, 2018)[15]. All parliamentarians expressed their satisfaction about the high level of cooperation and communication and the commitment to further enhance it, with an emphasis on energy. No joint declaration or common press release were issued regarding the Athens meeting (Hellenic Parliament, 2018)[16].

A year after the first trilateral parliamentary meeting on foreign affairs committees level, on the 26th of January 2017, the Knesset hosted the first trilateral meeting of the Presidents of Parliaments of Israel, Cyprus and Greece, following an initiative of the Speaker of the Knesset. The adoption of the 'Joint Statement for Parliamentary Cooperation' has opened another channel for communication between the three parliaments.

As stated in the joint statement, the expansion of the trilateral cooperation between Israel, Cyprus and Greece with the establishment of regional cooperation with countries of the broader region, for the benefit of the people was, also, discussed. Issues regarding the modus operandi of the three Parliaments and in particular, the exchange of best practices over the legislative work and parliamentary control were also examined during the meeting. The three presidents decided that the cooperation between different committees of the three parliaments would provide a platform of in-depth discussion on different issues. The committees proposed would deal with issues such as innovation, water-related issues and resources, agriculture, unemployment and tourism, education and science (The Knesset, 2017)[17].

The second trilateral on presidents of parliaments level was held in Nicosia, on the 2nd of November of the same year. In order to better prepare the issues on the agenda, namely water resources and entrepreneurship, research, innovation and education a

[15] Hellenic Parliament, 'Agenda of the 3rd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel' (2018). European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.
[16] Hellenic Parliament (2018) 'Report on the 3rd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.
[17] The Knesset, (2017), 'Joint Statement of Parliamentary Cooperation'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives

working group consisting of parliamentarians, experts and academics was set up. In the joint declaration, the three Presidents proposed that these issues could be further deliberated by the relevant parliamentary committees (Hellenic Parliament, 2017)[18]. Another innovative point raised in the discussions was the creation of an internet page, where the three parliaments can publicise decisions, initiatives and discussions concerning the trilateral cooperation. The joint declaration provided for the designation of a focal person or group of persons, coming from the respective governments of the three parliaments, in order to provide information and guidance regarding the different aspects of trilateral cooperation between the three countries (House of Representatives, 2017)[19]. This provision is an indication of the close links that presidents of parliaments want to maintain with the government.

3.2.2 CYPRUS-EGYPT-GREECE

The trilateral parliamentary scheme of cooperation between Cyprus, Egypt and Greece had its inaugural meeting in Nicosia, on the 11th of February 2019 (House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, 2019)[20] after six trilateral summits. This parliamentary scheme was initiated by the presidents of the three parliaments, who, through a joint statement issued after the meeting, defined the framework and the fields of cooperation between the three parliaments. In this joint statement, the link with the respective governmental branch is clear; in the first paragraph we can read that the three presidents, "stress the importance of parliamentary cooperation between Cyprus, Egypt and Greece, which complements the close intergovernmental cooperation between the three countries and is based on shared values and principles" (House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, 2019)[21].

The scope of this new scheme is the promotion of peace, stability and prosperity in the region to the benefit of the three countries and their people. The field of cooperation between the three parliaments is based on three pillars, namely education

[18] Hellenic Parliament, (2017) 'Report on the 2nd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.
[19] House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus (2017) 'Joint Declaration of the 2nd Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.
[20] House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus (2019) Joint Statement of the 1st Trilateral Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Egypt and Greece'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.
[21] Ibid

and culture, energy, and tourism. The presidents of the three parliaments have resolved to further deliberate on these matters with the aim of producing tangible results through joint initiatives and actions. This trilateral scheme is currently based on the cooperation between the presidents of the parliaments and not on committee level. This set-up may hinder pluralism as cross-party representation is not provided. However, in the joint statement, there is a provision of possible expansion of the scheme to the level of competent parliamentary committees. (House of Representatives, 2019) [22] . The three parliaments have agreed to extend their cooperation with other parliaments of countries in the region, which share the same principles, but without defining the frame of this cooperation. Thus it is not clear yet if this trilateral scheme will evolve in quadrilateral or multilateral scheme (House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, 2019)[23]. The frequency of the meetings was not discussed during the inaugural meeting, but it was agreed that the second meeting would take place in Athens and the third in Cairo.

3.2.3 CYPRUS-GREECE-JORDAN

The first trilateral meeting on presidents of parliaments level between Cyprus, Greece and Jordan took place on the 15th of April 2019, in Jordan. It took place after the governmental scheme, which was initiated in January 2018. There are many similarities with the Cyprus-Egypt-Greece scheme regarding the structure and the objectives of this initiative. In the joint declaration issued, the link with the governmental dimension is evident in the first paragraph. Important points in this document are the reference to Palestinian-Israeli conflict, the Cyprus issue, and the preservation of the legal and historic status-quo of holy sites in Jerusalem (Jordanian House of Representatives, 2019)[24]. The three presidents decided to further deliberate on energy, tourism and education and culture and on other matters of common interest, with the aim of producing tangible results through joint initiatives and actions. They have agreed to strengthen cooperation between the three parliaments

[22] House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus (2019) Joint Statement of the 1st Trilateral Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Egypt and Greece'. Hellenic Parliament, European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate Archives

[23] Ibid

[24] Jordanian House of Representatives (2019) 'Joint Declaration of the 1st Trilateral Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Jordan'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

both through regular meetings and in the framework of international parliamentary organisations. The possibility of cooperating with other parliaments of countries in the region, which share the same principles was also mentioned ('Hellenic Parliament, 2019)[25].

Regarding the frequency of the meetings and other practicalities, namely coordination, and production of documents were not discussed; however it was decided that the second meeting will be hosted by the Hellenic Parliament and the third by the House of Representatives in Nicosia.

We deem it is premature to draw safe conclusions about how trilateral parliamentary schemes of cooperation function, and if their current structure and objectives can contribute to the promotion of peace and security of the region and in general enhance parliamentary diplomacy. Basically, there is no literature on the subject except some preliminary findings on the governmental dimension of those trilateral schemes. Therefore, we interviewed Greek MPs[26] and an Israeli diplomat[27] on the trilateral parliamentary schemes of cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean with special emphasis given on the Cyprus-Greece-Israeli scheme. This particular scheme was selected because it was initiated earlier than the other two and, since there have been three meetings on foreign affairs committee level and two on Presidential level, it is considered more advanced. Their contribution was invaluable; they commented on many issues and gave suggestions particularly on organisational matters.

[25] Hellenic Parliament, (2019) 'Report on the 1st Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Jordan'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives

[26] The MPs who were informally interviewed on the Cyprus-Greece-Israel trilateral parliamentary scheme of cooperation and on the role of parliamentary diplomacy are: Mr Constantinos Douzinas, former Chair of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs, Mr Dimitrios Emmanouilidis, former Vice-Chair of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs, Mr Ioannis Kefalogiannis, former member of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs and former head of the delegation at SEECP PA, Ms Panagiota Kozompoli, former member of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs and former head of the delegation at SEECP PA and Mr Toskas, former member of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs

[27] Ms Sawsan Hasson, Deputy Chief of Mission of the Embassy of Israel in Athens.

3.3 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS OF THE INTERVIEWS

3.3.1 CYPRUS-GREECE-ISRAEL TRILATERAL PARLIAMENTARY SCHEME OF COOPERATION

Regarding the structure of the trilateral scheme on committees of parliaments level, interviewees expressed their satisfaction as, they believe that the cross-party composition of the delegations enhances communication and better promotes cooperation. However, Mr Toskas suggested that wider engagement of both governmental and non-governmental institutions during the sessions would offer better knowledge on specific issues to the participants, for instance on security of infrastructure or defence capabilities (Toskas, 2019). Mr Douzinas suggested that it would be useful to add sessions to the agenda and also prolong them. He also added that during the meetings people-to-people contacts enhance cooperation; therefore, if participants are the same in every meeting, better cooperation is achieved (Douzinas, 2019). According to Mr Kefalogiannis the agenda of the first meeting was shallow, but this gradually improved during the next two meeting with the employment of experts on different issues as key speakers (Kefalogiannis, 2019).

When asked about the main reason for the establishment of the trilateral cooperation schemes, all interviewees answered that it was mainly the exploitation of hydrocarbons, but not the sole reason. Ms Hasson is of the opinion that the exploitation of hydrocarbons concerns governments; parliamentarians mainly promote cooperation and have a different approach due to the fact that they represent people (Hasson, 2019). The respondents stated that energy issues are very important both for the region and the EU as a whole, but defence and security are equally important for the volatile environment of the Eastern Mediterranean. Mr Toskas said that security and defence issues were the basic reasons for the initiation of the Cyprus-Greece-Israel cooperation scheme and not primarily the exploitation of hydrocarbons (Toskas, 2019). Furthermore, all interviewees stated that the parliamentary dimension of these schemes will prove very important in enhancing peace and prosperity in the peoples of the region. Parliamentary cooperation in fields like economy, trade, tourism, education, research and development can serve this goal.

Concerning the potential of trilateral parliamentary schemes to promote regional cooperation and parliamentary diplomacy, all interviewees were very positive. They

supported that parliamentary diplomacy can become the leverage of regional cooperation, as they all agreed that parliamentarians have the freedom to act independently from governmental lines and formalities, and as a result they built more genuine channels of communication (Douzinas, 2019; Emmanouilidis, 2019; Hasson, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019). According to Mr Douzinas, there is also a drawback in parliamentary cooperation. Based on the fact that parliamentarians are deprived from the authority to reach binding decisions and, consequently, they cannot produce tangible results, he expressed his concern about the influence they have on governmental policies. He also added that parliamentarians should be able to get involved more actively in promoting regional issues (Douzinas, 2019). Mr Toskas pointed out that even parliamentarians, who chose to deviate from governmental lines, should be knowledgeable about the official positions of the state, especially on national issues of major importance (Toskas, 2019).

There are currently five schemes of trilateral governmental cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus-Greece-Israel, Cyprus-Greece-Egypt, Cyprus-Greece-Jordan, Cyprus-Greece-Lebanon and Cyprus-Greece-Palestine. The interviewees were asked if all five schemes had the potential to promote regional cooperation, should they also develop a parliamentary dimension. Three of the interviewees - Ms Kozompoli, Mr Emmanouilidis and Mr Toskas - answered that the region would benefit from the initiation of more trilateral schemes (Emmanouilidis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019). Mr Kefalogiannis pointed out that not all schemes have the same importance and he would not opt for more than the existing trilateral parliamentary schemes (Kefalogiannis, 2019). Mr Douzinas said that parliamentary cooperation can work for the benefit of the people, when parliamentarians are democratically elected and not appointed, which is often the case in countries of the MENA region. Therefore, he explained that promoting cooperation with appointed parliamentarians only promotes parliamentary tourism (Douzinas, 2019). Ms Hasson, when asked about the possibility of the enlargement of the Cyprus-Greece-Israel scheme, she opted for selective enlargement and enhancement of bilateral cooperation among the three countries, but not at the expense of the trilateral scheme (Hasson, 2019).

Regarding parliamentary cooperation, all interviewees agree that it can apply to a wide spectrum of issues of regional importance, namely defence, security, tourism,

research and development, education, energy and foreign policy (Douzinas, 2019; Emmanouilidis, 2019; Hasson, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019). Consequently, involvement of different parliamentary committees is necessary, as according to Mr Douzinas, in this way cross-party representation in guaranteed (Douzinas, 2019). He also indicated that this is not guaranteed on presidents of parliaments level. Ms Hasson though, pointed out that for most parliaments the committee of foreign affairs is the most important and deals with a wide range of issues (Hasson, 2019).

All the respondents said that the parliamentary dimension of the trilateral scheme so far complements the governmental dimension, but this does not mean that it follows strictly governmental lines (Douzinas, 2019; Emmanouilidis, 2019; Hasson, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019). Mr Toskas added that since parliaments have to ratify governmental agreements and treaties, MPs should be aware of governmental priorities and projects. However, since delegations are cross-party, parliamentarians are not expected to agree on every issue, but this constitutes the core of parliamentary diplomacy and the strongest point of parliamentary cooperation (Toskas, 2019). Regarding the agenda, five out of six of the respondents said that it should not be identical to the governmental agenda but may have coherence (Douzinas, 2019; Emmanouilidis, 2019; Hasson, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019). Mr Kefalogiannis and Mr Douzinas pointed out that since parliamentarians do not have executive power, there is no need to deal with the same issues with the governmental dimension (Douzinas, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019).

3.3.2 PARLIAMENTARY DIPLOMACY

In the second part of the questionnaire, the interviewees were asked to comment on the role of parliamentary diplomacy and if it should be limited to low politics. All MPs mentioned that parliamentary diplomacy is a useful tool in a country's foreign policy and the classification of parliamentary cooperation as low or high politics is misleading (Douzinas, 2019; Emmanouilidis, 2019; Hasson, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019). Ms Kozompoli also added that parliamentary diplomacy and interparliamentary cooperation have their own distinct role, which

broadens communication between countries (Kozompoli, 2019). All respondents also agreed on the fact that parliamentary diplomacy should complement governmental initiatives, but Mr Douzinas added that on issues like tourism, health or education parliamentary diplomacy should implement policies to governments (Douzinas, 2019; Emmanouilidis, 2019; Hasson, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019).

When asked if parliamentarians, as direct representatives of their people, tend to promote national interests, the respondents answered that they should work both for the benefit of the region and their country, because most of the times the one complements the other. Moreover, peace and prosperity of a region is a prerequisite for peace and prosperity of individuals (Douzinas, 2019; Emmanouilidis, 2019; Hasson, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019). Ms Hasson and Mr Douzinas insisted on the fact that governments promote national interests whereas parliamentarians seek to promote communication and cooperation with their counterparts and between peoples (Douzinas, 2019; Hasson, 2019).

There was unanimity of opinion among the respondents concerning the importance of communicating resolutions, declarations or conclusions to the governments. Mr Toskas and Mr Kefalogiannis specified that apart from the essential information included in those documents, it is useful to convey the climate and the ambiance of the meetings and exchanged views (Kefalogiannis, 2019; Toskas, 2019). Ms Kozompoli added that they should not only be communicated but also discussed (Kozompoli, 2019). Mr Douzinas said that the aforementioned documents should be forwarded to the competent governmental organisations, but he commented that even when those documents are communicated, nothing changes to the governmental side, “they are just archived”. (Douzinas, 2019).

All parliamentarians who took part in our research have participated in parliamentary networks based in the Mediterranean. When asked to compare the two schemes of cooperation – multilateral IPIs and trilateral schemes – they all agreed that communication is better in trilateral schemes and dialogue is enhanced due to the fact that participants have plenty of time to express their views and elaborate on issues of the agenda. IPIs on the other hand, can be a platform of cooperation among more countries. The existence of a secretariat is also very useful as it offers a more concrete

structure of the meetings and often covers many different regional issues of concern (Douzinas, 2019; Emmanouilidis, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019). Mr Kefalogiannis indicated the fact that usually panels of IPIs meetings gather distinguished experts and academics (Kefalogiannis, 2019). Another important point mentioned by Mr Kozompoli and Mr Douzinas is that MPs participate in numerous schemes and as a result they have the opportunity to communicate with their colleagues in different contexts. It was also mentioned that both schemes equally promote parliamentary diplomacy (Douzinas, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019).

All interviewees have pointed out that parliamentary diplomacy makes it possible to defend a number of different opinions abroad rather than a single position, which is considered an advantage compared to traditional diplomacy, where only official positions are supported. Especially Hellenic Parliament's MPs, who have participated in trilateral meetings, believe that this freedom and plurality of speech is the asset of those cooperation schemes (Douzinas, 2019; Emmanouilidis, 2019; Kefalogiannis, 2019; Kozompoli, 2019; Toskas, 2019). Mr Toskas, who also served as a minister and took part in governmental trilateral meetings between Cyprus, Greece and Israel, supported that despite the fact that no binding decisions were taken during the trilateral parliamentary meeting, the overall result was very satisfying. The exchange of information and views on the topics of the agenda was highly productive (Toskas, 2019).

Table 3.3.2
Strengths and weaknesses of the Traditional multilateral schemes and the new trilateral schemes

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Traditional multilateral schemes	
– Cross-party, pluralism – Promote cooperation – Enhance parliamentary diplomacy – More comprehensive agenda – Communication of resolutions, opinions and recommendations, not legally binding for their countries	– Numerous delegations, less time for discussion – Limited time for discussion – No binding decisions – Limited to a consultative role
New trilateral schemes	
– Touch upon many issues of both low and high politics – Cross-party representation – Plenty of time for dialogue – Promote parliamentary diplomacy	– Not all of them of particular importance for regional cooperation – Limited agenda closely linked to governmental dimension

– Various topics	

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS

Parliamentary diplomacy is exercised in various levels and contexts. MPs get involved in international politics through bilateral or multilateral contacts. It is common that a parliamentarian participates in numerous IPIs, IPCs and Friendship Groups or in less formal schemes like the Med Group[28]. All schemes function in different ways and their agendas often overlap, or treat totally different issues. Any parliament, in order to successfully engage in parliamentary diplomacy and also provide the legitimacy needed for the government to fulfil its engagements, needs to take part in a variety of schemes. *Andrés Malamud* and *Stelios Stavridis* say that a parliamentarian's engagement in international affairs, "can be formal or informal, led by parties or individuals, secret or open, and conducted with or without the blessing of national executives" (Malamud and Stavridis, 2017). The Greek MPs interviewed indicated the importance of various interparliamentary contacts and underlined that the positive outcome of a meeting often depends on the development of interpersonal relations among parliamentarians.

This extensive engagement of parliaments in international politics is depicted in the increase of both international and regional parliamentary cooperation initiatives. PA UfM, PAM, SEECP PA and AII PD were established during the last two decades. Along with the aforementioned IPIs other networks, namely the trilateral parliamentary schemes of cooperation, initiated by the Hellenic and Parliament and the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus as well as the informal interparliamentary forum Med Group, appeared in the last decade. This proliferation of cooperation initiatives shows that parliamentarians acknowledge the need for regional cooperation in order to respond to regional and international challenges.

Many academics and researchers compare parliamentary diplomacy to traditional state diplomacy often with the intention of proving the supremacy of the first over the second or vive-versa. In reality though, the two dimensions of diplomacy are two sides of the same coin as it was shown from the study of the literature and from the findings of the interview. On the one hand, parliamentary diplomacy appears to be more pluralistic, is based on personal contact, enhances genuine communication,

[28] Med Group is an informal forum, established in 2016, in Athens, which consists of the members of the delegations of foreign affairs and defence committees of the Mediterranean member states of the EU.

mutual understanding between counterparts and also ensures better representation of people (de Boer and Weisglas, 2007). Furthermore, parliamentary cooperation and exchange of best practices may result in the improvement of governmental policies (De Vrieze, 2015) or may not according to Mr Douzinas (Douzinas, 2019). On the other hand, the fact that parliamentary schemes of cooperation cannot produce binding documents (declarations, resolutions and decisions) weakens their position (De Vrieze, 2015). However, communication between the parliamentary and the governmental dimension should be promoted both in national level and in the framework of IGOs and IPIs for the benefit of the peoples.

Regarding the emergence of the trilateral parliamentary schemes of the Eastern Mediterranean, we can deduct from the founding declarations, speeches, reports and also from the answers given by the MPs, who were the leading actors of those initiatives that they are essential to regional cooperation. Regional security and exploitation of hydrocarbons of the Eastern Mediterranean are considered to be the main reasons for their initiation, but as indicated from documents issued during the trilateral meetings, other fields of regional interest, namely water resources, tourism, education and research and development are also of great importance (House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, 2017)[29]. Those schemes also touch upon *difficult* issues, namely the Cyprus issue, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict among others.

The fact that delegations on committee level are cross-party guarantees pluralism and gives added value to the trilateral schemes. On presidents of parliaments level though, this does not apply. Presidents, due to their institutional identity, tend to be more bound to governmental lines. Therefore, the argument that pluralism is fostered in trilateral schemes applies only on committee set-ups and not on presidents of parliaments level (Douzinas, 2019). Pluralism is equally ensured in the case of the IPIs, as almost all of them in their rules of procedure require cross-party representation of the national parliaments. The different structure of the different parliamentary networks greatly defines their role and effectiveness. The fact that most IPIs are composed by numerous MPs limits both the time and also the opportunity to

[29] House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus (2017) 'Joint Declaration of the 2nd Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

thoroughly discuss the issues on the agenda (Kefalogiannis, 2019). In contrary, trilateral schemes devote plenty of time for discussions.

The evolution of the newly established parliamentary schemes cannot be foreseen yet, particularly in the cases of Cyprus-Egypt-Greece and Cyprus-Greece-Jordan schemes. These two schemes have met once and only on presidents of parliaments level. Through our interviews we perceived that half of the respondents do not opt for the establishment of more trilateral schemes in the Eastern Mediterranean. Mr Kefalogiannis explained that some of them have no particular importance in regional cooperation (Kefalogiannis, 2019) and Mr Douzinas questioned the legitimacy of some parliaments of the region (Douzinas, 2019).

This thesis has tried to identify the reasons that led to the initiation of the trilateral parliamentary schemes and also the fields in which trilateral schemes may produce tangible results. We have outlined that trilateral schemes promote parliamentary diplomacy and regional cooperation. Still, there is no clear evidence that trilateral schemes can prevail or replace other schemes. Literature, but also the findings of the interview indicated that the lack of adequate exchange of views in larger schemes, the need for establishing stability and providing security in this traumatised by on-going conflicts region, and energy issues led to the initiation of these schemes. We could also add to the above the need to form purely Mediterranean networks without the involvement of external actors and the need to form alliances due to the small size of the countries involved in those schemes. In conclusion, this thesis has demonstrated various traits of the trilateral parliamentary schemes of the Eastern Mediterranean, but further research is needed in order to clearly define their role and potential.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

I. On the trilateral parliamentary scheme Cyprus - Greece- Israel

1. The meetings of the parliamentary dimension of the aforementioned trilateral scheme of cooperation are held on an annual basis. There have been 5 trilateral meetings of Cyprus-Greece-Israel so far; 2meetings of the presidents of the parliaments and 3 meetings of delegations of the foreign affairs and defence committees. Have you attended more than one meeting?
   YES □ NO□

   If yes have you noticed any development between those meetings? If yes, please specify
   YES □ NO□

2. How satisfied are you concerning the structure of the meetings (topics, speakers, time for interventions, visits)?
   not satisfied □ satisfied □ very satisfied □
   Would you change or add anything?

3. The main reason for the establishment of the governmental trilateral schemes of cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean appears to have been the exploitation and transportation of the considerable quantities of energy resources discovered in the Levantine Basin. Do you believe that the parliamentary dimension of those schemes has the same objectives? Please specify.

4. In your opinion, participants work on the establishment of cooperation and the promotion of common interests or on the promotion of national interests?

5. Do you believe that parliamentary cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean complement the governmental schemes? YES □ NO □
   Please explain.

6. Could the trilateral parliamentary schemes become the leverage of regional cooperation? In which domains do you believe that the trilateral schemes can produce tangible results? (Foreign policy, environment, trade, security…)

7. In your opinion the parliamentary dimension of the trilateral schemes in the Eastern Mediterranean should involve different parliamentary committees and which?

8. Do you believe that trilateral schemes of cooperation promote parliamentary diplomacy?

9. On governmental level there are the following trilateral schemes of cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean:

   Cyprus - Greece – Israel ☐

   Cyprus - Greece – Jordan ☐

   Cyprus –Egypt - Greece ☐

   Cyprus - Greece – Palestine ☐

   Cyprus - Greece – Lebanon ☐

   Which of them do you think could be applied on parliamentary level? Please comment, if necessary.

II. On Parliamentary Diplomacy

10. In your opinion, what is the role of parliamentary diplomacy? Is it a useful tool in foreign policy? Should it be limited to matters of low politics or can it play a more important role?

11. Should the parliamentary agenda be based on or directly linked to the governmental agenda?

    YES ☐ NO ☐

12. In your opinion are there areas that parliamentary diplomacy can produce tangible results and which?

13. In your opinion, could the parliamentary dimension establish a more genuine cooperation between the participating countries?

    YES □ NO □

14. Concerning the fostering of dialogue and cooperation between states do you believe that parliamentary diplomacy:

    a) follow governmental policies □

    b) act supplementary to governmental policies □

    c) implement policies to the government □

15. Do you believe that conclusions, declarations and other texts adopted during the meetings should be communicated to governments?

REFERENCES

AII (2012) ‘Declaration of the Adriatic and Ionian Initiative’. Available at: http://www.aii-ps.org/about. Accessed: 11 September 2019.

Aliboni, R. (2001) ‘The Role of International Organisations in the Mediterranean’. ELIAMEP Working Papers. Available at: https://www.eliamep.gr/wp-content/uploads/en/2008/10/op0102.pdfhttps://www.eliamep.gr/wp-content/uploads/en/2008/10/op0102.pdf. Accessed: 26 August 2019.

Arib, K. (2016) ‘Parliamentary diplomacy as a significant cornerstone of (further) democratisation’, *Diplomat magazine*, 3 December. Available at: http://www.diplomatmagazine.eu/2016/12/03/parliamentary-diplomacy-as-a-significant-cornerstone-of-further-democratisation/. Accessed: 31 July 2019.

Bajtay, P. (2015) ‘Shaping and Controlling Foreign Policy - Parliamentary Diplomacy and Oversight, and the Role of the European Parliament’. European Parliament. Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EXPO_STU(2015)549045. Accessed: 29 July 2019.

Berridge, G. and Lloyd, L. (2012) *The Palgrave Macmillan Dictionary of Diplomacy*. (3rd edn). Palgrave Macmillan UK. Available at: https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9780230302983. Accessed: 15 July 2019.

Broekers-Knol, LL. M. A. (2014) ‘The Senate of the Netherlands and Parliamentary Diplomacy’, *Diplomat magazine*, 7 September. Available at: http://www.diplomatmagazine.eu/2014/09/07/senate-netherlands-parliamentary-diplomacy/. Accessed: 29 July 2019.

Bull, H. (1977) ‘Diplomacy and International Order’, in Bull, H. (ed.) *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan Education UK, pp. 156–177.

Cofelice, A. and Stavridis, S. (2017) ‘Mapping the Proliferation of Parliamentary Actors in the Mediterranean’. Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI). Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep09781.

de Boer, G. and Weisglas, F. (2007) 'Parliamentary Diplomacy', *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2(1), pp. 93–99.

de Vrieze, F. (2015) Study on Parliamentary Cooperation Mapping and Analysis of International Parliamentary Institutions and Parliamentary Networks in the Western Balkans and South East Europe. European Commission. Available at: https://library.euneighbours.eu/content/study-parliamentary-cooperation-mapping-and-analysis-international-parliamentary-institution. Accessed: 29 July 2019.

de Vrieze, F. (2016) 'The South-East European Cooperation Process and Its New Parliamentary Assembly: Regional Dialogue in Action', *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 11(2–3), pp. 215–234.

European Union (2007) 'Treaty of Lisbon Amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty Establishing the European Community'. Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:FULL&from=EN. Accessed: 30 July 2019.

Fiott, D. (2011) 'On the Value of Parliamentary Diplomacy', Madariaga 4(7), p. 27.

Gillespie, R. (2008) 'A "Union for the Mediterranean" … or for the EU?: Profile', *Mediterranean Politics*, 13(2), pp. 277–286.

Hellenic Parliament (2018) 'Agenda of the 3rd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Hellenic Parliament (2016) 'Athens Declaration'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Hellenic Parliament (2016) 'The Hague Declaration'. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Hellenic Parliament (2016) ‘Report on the 1st Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Hellenic Parliament (2017) ‘Report on the 1st Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Hellenic Parliament (2017) ‘Report on the 2nd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Hellenic Parliament, (2017) ‘Report on the 2nd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Hellenic Parliament (2018) ‘Report on the 3rd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Hellenic Parliament, (2019) ‘Report on the 1st Trilateral Meeting of Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Jordan’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Hellenic Parliament (n.d.) Int’l Relations. Available at: https://www.hellenicparliament.gr/en/Diethneis-Drastiriotites. Accessed: 2 August 2019.

House of Representatives of the Arab Republic of Egypt (2019) ‘Joint Statement of the 1st Trilateral Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Egypt and Greece’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus (2016) ‘Agenda of the 1st Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus (2016) ‘Joint Declaration of the 1st Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus (2017) ‘Joint Declaration of the 2nd Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus (2019) ‘Joint Statement of the 1st Trilateral Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Egypt and Greece’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

IPU (2005) ‘Declaration of the Second World Conference of Speakers of Parliaments’ Available at: http://archive.ipu.org/splz-e/sp-conf05/declaration.htm. Accessed: 29 July 2019

IPU (2019) ‘IPU moving closer to universal membership on its 130th anniversary Inter-Parliamentary Union’. Available at: https://www.ipu.org/news/press-releases/2019-06/ipu-moving-closer-universal-membership-its-130th-anniversary. Accessed: 30 July 2019.

Jancic, D., (2015) ‘Globalizing Representative Democracy: The Emergence of Multilayered International Parliamentarism’. *Hastings International and Comparative Law Review*, Vol. 38, No. 2, 2015, 197-242. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2659734. Accessed: 29 July 2019.

Jordanian House of Representatives (2019) ‘Joint Declaration of the 1st Trilateral Meeting of the Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Jordan’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Jordanian House of Representatives (2019) ‘Report on the 1st Trilateral Meeting of Presidents of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Jordan’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Malamud, A. and Stavridis, S. (2017) ‘Parliaments and Parliamentarians as International Actors’, in Bob Reinalda (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Non-State Actors*, 101-115, Ashgate Publishing.

Omirou, Y. (2016) ‘Welcoming address by H.E. the President of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Yiannakis L. Omirou’. Speech delivered during the 1st Meeting Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel, Nicosia, 3 March 2016. Available at: http://www.parliament.cy/. Accessed: 17 September 2019.

PAM (2006) ‘Inaugural Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean’. Available at: https://cf5893147ur69.cdnserver.net/pam/downloads/AMMAN_2006_FINAL_DECLARATION_EN_1[2].pdf. Accessed: 19 August 2019

PA UfM (2018) ‘PA-UfM Rules of Procedure’. Available at: https://paufm.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/PA-UfM-Rules-of-Procedure-2018_EN.pdf.j_Accessed: 18 August 2019.

‘Rules of Procedure of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the CFSP and the CSDP’ (2012). Available at: https://secure.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/euspeakers/getspeakers.do?type=082dbcc5420d8f48014247cca6f04248.

Šabič, Z. and Bojinović, A. (2007) ‘Mapping a Regional Institutional Architecture: The Case of the Mediterranean’, *Mediterranean Politics*, 12(3), pp. 317–336.

SEECP PA (2014) ‘Declaration on Inauguration of the SEECP PA', https://www.competition.rspcsee.org/uploads/files/Declaration%20on%20inauguration%20of%20the%20SEECP%20PA.pdf. Accessed: 20 September 2019

Sioufas, D. (2008) ‘Speech of the President of the Hellenic Parliament, during the 4th Plenary Session of the EMPA, 28 March 2008, Athens’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Sioufas, D. (2017) ‘Diakinivouleftiki Diplomatia’ [Interparliamentary Diplomacy], Anihto Parathiro. Available at: https://www.anoixtoparathyro.gr/. Accessed: 1 August 2019.

Stavridis, S. (2002a) ‘“Parliamentary Diplomacy”: some preliminary findings.’ Jean Monnet Working Papers in Comparative and International Politics.

Stavridis, S. (2002b) ‘The Parliamentary Forum of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership: An Assessment’, *Mediterranean Politics*, 7(2), pp. 30–53.

Stavridis, S. (2016) ‘Introduction: Mapping the Complex Parliamentary Field of the Mediterranean—How Many Actors?"’, *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 27(4), pp. 2–20.

Stavridis, S. (2018) ‘Greek parliamentarians and Greek foreign policy (2004-2014)’. 121, Hellenic Observatory Discussion Papers on Greece and Southeast Europe, LSE. Available at: http://www.lse.ac.uk/Hellenic-Observatory/Assets/Documents/Publications/GreeSE-Papers/GreeSE-121.pdf?from_serp=1. Accessed: 29 July 2019.

Stavridis, S. and Jančić, D. (2016) ‘Introduction: The Rise of Parliamentary Diplomacy in International Politics’, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 11(2–3), pp. 105–120.

The Knesset (2017) ‘Agenda of the 2nd Trilateral Parliamentary Meeting of Committees of Foreign Affairs, of the Parliaments of Cyprus, Greece and Israel’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

The Knesset (2017) ‘Joint Statement of Parliamentary Cooperation’. European and Bilateral Affairs Directorate of the Hellenic Parliament Archives.

Tziarras, Z. (2019) ‘The New Geopolitics of the Eastern Mediterranean: Trilateral Partnerships and Regional Security’. Re-Imagining the Eastern Mediterranean Series: PCC Report 3, pp. 5-10.

Vutseva, E. (2008) ‘Sarkozy beaming at birth of Mediterranean Union’, EUobserver. Available at: https://euobserver.com/foreign/26482. Accessed: 8 May 2019.

Yorucu, V. and Mehmet, Ö. (2018) 'Diversifying European Energy: Challenges of Securing Supply', in Yorucu, V. and Mehmet, O. (eds) *The Southern Energy Corridor: Turkey's Role in European Energy Security*. Springer International Publishing (Lecture Notes in Energy), pp. 25–43.

Interviews

Douzinas, C. (2019) former Chair of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs. Interview. Athens, 17 September 2019

Emmanouilidis, D. (2019) Former Vice-Chair of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs. Telephone Interview. Athens, 27 August 2019.

Hasson, S. (2019) Deputy Chief of Mission of the Embassy of Israel in Athens. Interview, 23 July 2019

Kefalogiannis, I. (2019) Former Head of Delegation at SEECP PA and former member of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Parliament. Interview. Athens, 10 September 2019

Kozompoli, P. (2019) former member of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs and former head of the delegation at SEECP PA. Interview. Kalamata, 17 August 2019

Toskas, N. (2019) Former Minister of Public Order and Citizen Protection and former member of the Committee on National Defence and Foreign Affairs. Interview. Athens, 29 July 2019