

EU Public Diplomacy: Adapting to an Ever-Changing World

By Bianca Baumlér



**EU Public Diplomacy:
Adapting to an Ever-Changing World**

Bianca Baumler

**April 2019
Figueroa Press
Los Angeles**

**EU PUBLIC DIPLOMACY:
ADAPTING TO AN EVER-CHANGING WORLD**

by Bianca Baumler

Guest Editor
Vivian S. Walker
Faculty Fellow, USC Center on Public Diplomacy

Published by
FIGUEROA PRESS
840 Childs Way, 3rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90089
Phone: (213) 743-4800
Fax: (213) 743-4804
www.figueroapress.com

Figueroa Press is a division of the USC Bookstores

Produced by Crestec, Los Angeles, Inc.
Printed in the United States of America

Notice of Rights

Copyright © 2019. All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system now known or to be invented, without prior written permission from the author, care of Figueroa Press.

Notice of Liability

The information in this book is distributed on an "As is" basis, without warranty. While every precaution has been taken in the preparation of this book, neither the author nor Figueroa nor the USC University Bookstore shall have any liability to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused or alleged to be caused directly or indirectly by any text contained in this book.

Figueroa Press and the USC Bookstores are trademarks of the University of Southern California.

ISBN-13: Pending
ISBN-10: Pending

About the USC Center on Public Diplomacy

The USC Center on Public Diplomacy (CPD) was established in 2003 as a partnership between the Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism and the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California. It is a research, analysis and professional education organization dedicated to furthering the study and practice of global public engagement and cultural relations.

Since its inception, CPD has become a productive and recognized leader in the public diplomacy research and scholarship community. Having benefited from international support within academic, corporate, governmental and public policy circles, it is now the definitive go-to destination for practitioners and international leaders in public diplomacy, while pursuing an innovative research agenda.

USC received the 2008 Benjamin Franklin Award for Public Diplomacy from the U.S. State Department in recognition of the university's teaching, training and research in public diplomacy.

CPD's Mission

The USC Center on Public Diplomacy seeks to advance and enrich the study and practice of public diplomacy through research, professional education and public engagement.

CPD Perspectives

CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy is a periodic publication by the USC Center on Public Diplomacy (CPD), that highlights scholarship intended to stimulate critical thinking about the study and practice of public diplomacy.

Designed for both the practitioner and the scholar, this series illustrates the breadth of public diplomacy—its role as an essential component of international relations and the intellectual challenges it presents to those seeking to understand this increasingly significant factor in global society.

CPD Perspectives is available electronically in PDF form on CPD's website (www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org) and in hard copy by request.

For general inquiries and to request additional copies of this paper, please contact:

USC Center on Public Diplomacy at the Annenberg School
University of Southern California
3502 Watt Way, Suites 232-234
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0281
Tel: (213) 821-2078; Fax: (213) 821-0774
cpd@usc.edu

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
The First Seeds of a Coherent EU Public Diplomacy	7
Successful EU Public Diplomacy Initiatives in Ukraine, Indonesia and Hong Kong	15
Measuring Public Diplomacy Results	21
Beyond Diplomats: Public Relations and Other Communications Professionals	25
Recommendations for a Stronger EU Public Diplomacy	26
Conclusions	34

EU Public Diplomacy: Adapting to an Ever-Changing World

Bianca Baumlér

Introduction

The actors and tools of public diplomacy are changing fast. With the explosion of social media, low-budget airlines and free virtual communications, more and more non-governmental actors are contributing to international relations and dialogue. People have new tools and spaces to express themselves and expect interactive communications. Simply sharing information about a country in echo chambers no longer works in today's global cacophony. Two-way communications and a true dialogue have become vital for today's public diplomacy.¹

Within this changing world, European Union (EU) public diplomacy has specific challenges. The EU has an image of being old and lost in crises. A Columbia Law professor notes: "most commentators describe the European Union as a power of the past."² An EU-funded study on the foreign perceptions of the EU³ found that people tend to associate innovation with the United States and Asia, and that elites doubt the applicability of EU norms to their local contexts.⁴ There is a "prevailing sense of European decline,"⁵ states one of the architects of EU Enlargement in an "EU Global Expert Opinion" report that contributed to the shape of the *EU Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy* (EU Global Strategy).

The EU's structural and procedural complexities pose another challenge. The EU has an intricate bureaucracy, with convoluted decision-making processes. Indeed the European Commission's complicated websites and procedures have a significant negative impact on the EU's

reputation. Its regulations also seem to put people to sleep—literally. The text of the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which includes a 175-page introduction, is actually one of the bedtime stories of a meditation app!⁶ Moreover, powerful country-specific images such as Italian design, Swedish feminism, Dutch bikes or Estonian digital governance work against the development of a unified global EU image. As a consequence, EU diplomats often find themselves in the position of having to provide basic facts about the EU before being able to engage on the level of policy.

This article explores how the EU's public diplomats (and the consultants that support their work) adapt to this ever-changing (and "brave"?) new world. I describe the progress of EU public diplomacy around the EU Global Strategy. I consider the challenges of EU public diplomacy, focusing on my experience developing EU public diplomacy guidelines in 2016-2017, and managing outreach activities since the launch of the European External Action Service⁷ ten years ago. Before providing concrete examples in Ukraine, Indonesia and Hong Kong, I touch upon EU messaging. I then examine the assessment of public diplomacy and tools to measure results. Next, I describe the challenges and advantages of working with public relations consultants and partnering with local experts and organizations. Finally, I propose eight recommendations to foster a more coherent EU public diplomacy. I base my insights and conclusions on my roles as a EU communications and press officer in Syria and Ukraine (before the wars), and as a public diplomacy consultant supporting EU Delegations (EUDs) across the globe.

The First Seeds of a Coherent EU Public Diplomacy

EU external communications have significantly improved since the launch of the European External Action Service. Its strategic communications team has grown from a handful of people to a full-fledged department, covering languages ranging from Arabic to Armenian. With the support of the foreign policy branch of the European Commission, which focuses on foreign partnerships with “strategic countries” (Partnership Instrument), it is investing significant funds and developing full units that provide EU Delegations with program managers, who handle public diplomacy projects (among others).

The EU Global Strategy⁸ and EU Dialogue

The 2017 EU Global Strategy has taken a tremendous leap in defining the EU foreign identity and its goals. EU public diplomacy has gained a much more prominent role, highlighted as an essential means to facilitate more effective cooperation with partner countries. The implementation of its public diplomacy dimension however remains challenging. The strategy was born from the need to “project a clear vision of what the EU stands for and seeks to achieve in the world.”⁹ Public diplomacy is among the top priorities¹⁰ and is particularly underlined in the report on its first year of implementation.¹¹ It focuses on “channels of engagement” with citizens, in particular with young people. It notes their sense of exclusion, and calls for the EU to involve them in policy-making:

“We finally realize that it is essential not only to communicate the added-value of the EU’s action, but also to open new channels for European and non-European citizens to engage with EU policy-making. Too many young people feel excluded from political processes, and struggle to find a place inside our societies.”¹²

The Global Strategy highlights Europe's experience with its own civil society as a basis to reach out to civil society actors abroad. As public diplomacy scholar Jan Melissen¹³ points out: "Europe is structurally well-placed for successful engagement with the outside world. [...] Within Europe, the diversity and dense texture of civil society permits the development of multi-dimensional networking practices ... based on collaboration with a plethora of nongovernmental actors."¹⁴ Engagement and inclusion are the words that stand out—the purpose of public diplomacy.

The principle of dialogue—of engagement and inclusion—is however missing from the EU's public, online description of its own public diplomacy. The dedicated pages are split between two, albeit tightly linked EU institutional websites. Among its Global Strategy pages, the European External Action Service¹⁵ refers to a range of initiatives that lack a clear public diplomacy focus. The Global Strategy points to existing EU education and research programs Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020, mostly, but not exclusively, focused on intra-EU exchanges. Although they might support a more effective public diplomacy, the highlighted speedy and consistent messaging and factual rebuttals of disinformation do not entail engagement. The hyperlink to public diplomacy events does not work,¹⁶ and the analysis pieces focus on foreign affairs policies rather than public diplomacy. Only two specific projects are noted on the public diplomacy page.¹⁷ While the Ukrainian example, "Stronger Together," is simply a PR campaign, the Young MED program does entail public diplomacy—bringing "together young people from Europe and the Mediterranean to work on concrete policy proposals that address their most pressing concerns."

All public diplomacy links associated with the European Commission's Public Diplomacy unit (the institution with greater public diplomacy budgets) lead to one massive infographic covering general objectives, target audiences,

programs and research. It highlights the €85 million it invests in four large programs, including one dedicated to public diplomacy: *Policy and Outreach Partnership*. It notes three examples: 1) the U.S.: public diplomacy initiatives covering consumers' priorities, climate and energy, radicalization and violent extremism; 2) Russia: dialogue on values, norms and aspirations; 3) Japan: exchange on Human Rights and norms. The "how" remains vague, noting outreach, networking and "people-to-people" activities without further detail. The goals lack principles of engagement, but rather entail self-promotion: 1) to spread EU values and interests, 2) to improve perceptions of the EU and 3) to increase understanding of its views, policies and priorities.

A Coherent Approach Across the Globe

The EU has followed the recommendation to develop a more centralized public diplomacy strategy. With the pilot global *European Policy and Outreach Partnership (EUPOP)*,¹⁸ launched in 2016, the EU took the first steps to build a coherent public diplomacy. The EU Perceptions Study¹⁹ was meant to serve as one of its building blocks. By 2017 six other EU public diplomacy teams began supporting EU Delegations (EUDs) in their outreach to China, India, Russia, South Korea, the U.S., Central and South America. At the same time, a global project supported six more EUDs in Indonesia, South Africa, Singapore, New Zealand, Hong Kong and eventually the countries in the Gulf Cooperation Council. The EUPOP teams offered EUDs with limited in-house budgets, the means to work with public diplomacy and thematic experts, event management and PR professionals, modern communications and data tools.

The EU set common objectives for its public diplomacy efforts. The ultimate goal of EU public diplomacy is to facilitate future cooperation between the EU and its partner countries. The EU highlighted "mutual trust and understanding" as the

foundation for this cooperation. To increase understanding, the EU asked public diplomacy practitioners to create fora to discuss the “European project, principles and policies,” as well as foreign perceptions of the EU. The importance of listening to improve the engagement is implicit.

I helped the EU to coordinate and ensure coherence among the EU public diplomacy consultants and the EU Delegations. We regularly exchanged best practices and agreed-upon common approaches. In 2017, we developed EU public diplomacy guidelines, organized the first meetings of all lead consultants with EU staff in Brussels, and created a harmonized data collection system. The guidelines began with three principles to develop a coherent approach. The first is to listen to the “demand,” developing activities based on audience interests and keeping in mind their perceptions of the EU. To foster results, the guidelines encouraged a series or clusters of activities, in partnership with local organizations and events, rather than one-off EU-only initiatives. To ensure real conversations beyond promotional communications and EU visibility, the dialogue is also meant to focus on EU policy priorities, as well as EU principles and visions—the “idea of Europe.”

To prepare the new impetus and investment in EU public diplomacy, the EU commissioned a study of perceptions of the EU and its policies (EU Perceptions Study)²⁰ in ten of its “strategic partners:” Brazil, Canada, China, India, Japan, Mexico, Russia, South Africa, South Korea and the U.S. The study’s authors found that the EU’s image improves when addressing certain topics. For example, foreign audiences positively view—and discuss—the EU’s leadership for climate change mitigation, human rights issues such as LGBTI, and a strong regulatory position in global trade. At the same time, it identified a sometimes defensive and superior tone that did not sufficiently consider different cultural norms and interpretations of history. The study also notes the need

"[to address the] perception of the EU having a 'hearing problem'."

Audiences and Effective Partnerships

The one-year EU Global Strategy Report called for a focus on "specific key target groups."²¹ The initial target audiences for EU public diplomacy covered an extremely broad range of actors: civil society organizations and activists, think tanks and policy-influencers, specific business/private sectors, students and youth. They also referred to close cooperation with Erasmus alumni, professors, researchers, media and other influencers, such as bloggers, intellectuals and social media groups. EUDs often asked to target "general audiences."

The new EU public diplomacy guidelines set influencers and multipliers—and not general audiences—as the target of activities. The guidelines reflected the insight that very broad audiences cannot be effectively reached with limited human and financial resources. In attempting to attract general audiences, diplomats must necessarily compete with multi-billion-dollar private brand advertising campaigns. Influencers are better placed "to support the achievement of EU Foreign Policy objectives," as noted in the EU Global Strategy. Several EU public diplomacy lead consultants also strongly advised to focus on a smaller number of precisely targeted initiatives, rather than many more general events. The guidelines noted the following questions to better understand and target audiences: who exactly are they and what do they think of the EU? Where do they discuss and engage with others? Which platforms and fora do they spend time in? What influences their attitudes and behaviors? Finally, how can we reach out to and attract them?

The natural diplomatic tendency to focus on government peers rather than non-governmental actors was difficult

to overcome. During the first months of data collection,²² EU public diplomacy activities targeted government and policymakers more than any other audience. Government can be an effective partner for public diplomacy work but should not be the primary target audience.²³

Another challenge to overcome was the tendency to focus on EU visibility through diplomatic receptions and cultural activities with limited audience reach. As described in the EU Global Strategy, EU public diplomacy must aim at deeper engagement beyond simple visibility. Ambassadors, however, often feel the need to promote their country's (and their) image through more top-level exposure. The public diplomacy officers and lead consultants, however, insisted on activities that engaged new and broader audiences through dialogue.

To reach new audiences, the EU successfully partnered with local think tanks, universities and media, with the support of the EU and local consultants. In South Africa, for example, a popular media outlet hosted an EU-South Africa debate and live-streamed it on its Facebook page. In Hong Kong, a Chinese University and a local human rights organization drafted follow-up recommendations emanating from an EU-funded LGBTI conference. In Indonesia, discussions on how to combat hate speech took place at UNESCO and student-led conferences. Such cooperation is usually a win-win situation, in which both the EU and local partners gain in audience reach and standing.

The EU Narrative Abroad: The EU Global Strategy and Beyond

The EU Global Strategy is an essential stepping-stone to establish common messages. It describes EU values and "what the EU seeks to achieve in the world." The strategy sets EU foreign policy priorities that focus on the following:

1) global governance, 2) cooperative regional orders, 3) state and societal resistance, 4) an integrated approach to conflicts and 5) a secure Union. These themes are a foundation on which to build the EU's narrative abroad.

Common global messages are key to a coherent public diplomacy. In addition, the EU Perceptions study recommended fewer messages, adapted to local contexts. For the EU Public Diplomacy Guidelines,²⁴ I extracted one relevant quote for each priority, suggested a simplified "translated" message, which were approved by the EU program manager. Two of the five messages are:

Global Governance for the 21st century:

*"The EU is committed to a global order based on international law, which ensures **human rights, sustainable development** and lasting access to the **global commons** ... with an aspiration to transform rather than to simply preserve the **existing system**. The EU will strive for a **strong UN** as the bedrock of the **multilateral rules-based order** and develop globally coordinated responses with international and regional organizations, states and non-state actors."*

Simplification: We believe in the equal rights of all humans. We believe in a world in which countries talk to each other and are accountable to the same rules.

State and Societal Resilience:

*"The EU will support different paths to resilience, targeting the most acute cases of **governmental, economic, societal & climate/energy** fragility, as well as develop more effective migration policies for Europe and its partners. Strengthening links **with civil society** also enhances state & societal resilience."*

Simplification: We will support countries, both state and non-state actors, in their development desires and plans for the future.

Beyond the Global Strategy, the EU public diplomacy guidelines also included messages extracted from other EU communications such as *10 Priorities for Europe*, the 60th anniversary communication package and speeches by Federica Mogherini, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy / Vice-President of the Commission (HRVP). The following five broad messages emerged:

1. The European Union is a key partner for **peace, stability, economy** and much more.
2. The European Union is a proponent of **multilateralism** for international cooperation and action.
3. The European Union and its Member States are the **first trading partner, first foreign investor, first humanitarian/development donor, first economic and diplomatic presence** and sometimes, the **first security provider** around the globe.
4. The European Union seeks relationships based on **mutual interests and benefits, with rights and duties on both sides. Only by working together across borders**, can we effectively challenge terrorism, violent extremism and ensure cybersecurity.
5. The European Union teams up with partners around the globe to **counter conflicts and crises, support stable and inclusive governance, empower civil society** and promote **economic growth** that benefits everybody. Together, we work toward common aims such as **clean air and water, safe and fair access to resources, and a free and secure internet**.

Several key words and concepts regularly are featured. Foremost, a multilateral, rules-based order and the importance of international cooperation stand out. Second, the EU continues to highlight its prominence in international trade and foreign and humanitarian investment. Also emphasized, are fundamental human rights and the role of civil society in enhancing resilient societies. More recently, the challenge of climate change has been featured. Last but not least, peace and stability remain a recurring theme, particularly after the EU received the Nobel Peace Prize in 2012.

Successful EU Public Diplomacy Initiatives in Ukraine, Indonesia and Hong Kong

Successful public diplomacy inevitably involves a civil society that encompasses organized non-governmental actors hailing from universities, media and NGOs, among others. In the following case studies, I describe three examples of civil society engagement on climate change and human rights. The most effective public diplomacy activities significantly involved local actors and were linked to a larger European or global event. Existing pan-European programs provide easy branding and a strong foundation for public diplomacy. For the EU, it is also effective to focus on environmental issues, capitalizing on the EU's already positive image with respect to this issue. Last but not least, the process of working with local partners to bring such initiatives to life are a significant part of public diplomacy. To organize a larger conference or a road show for EU ambassadors in a small town, EU and partner citizens work together over months to identify local interests, develop a concept, and agree on content and format. The intense joint preparations to set up events and activities are one of the most effective means to develop mutual trust and understanding.

Sustainable Energy Week in Ukraine: Going Local with Civil Society and Musicians

In Ukraine, the EU launched the *Ukrainian-European Sustainable Energy Weeks*, inspired by the EU-based ones,²⁵ which include a three-day policy event in Brussels.²⁶ The pan-European project in Ukraine encouraged Ukrainian public authorities, energy agencies, industry associations, businesses and civil society to promote clean energy practices, through innovative activities ranging from quizzes on energy saving tips to a tour of a power station.

The second Ukrainian edition of *Sustainability Week* launched activities driven by Ukrainian civil society. In 2013, I worked very closely with the highly motivated EU Sector manager for Energy and Environment, the city of Zhytomyr and a dedicated Ukrainian PR company. Jointly, we organized school visits, discussions with the staff of companies committed to energy efficiency, a street festival, as well as performances by well-known Ukrainian musicians. The EU provided marketing and park stands and funded public concerts, in coordination with the municipal government.

We simply opened a space for Ukrainian sustainable energy activists to create their own events, organize contests and eco-friendly games, and most importantly, to talk to people. They shared practical tips on how to save energy and even helped pedestrians and park visitors build a “sun tank,” a very simple device that gathers energy from the sun to use as a battery. Simply serving as a facilitator, we were able to attract a broad range of volunteers and actors to lead the event. Another key to success was collaboration with the mayor and his team. We held numerous joint preparation meetings and meals (with a bit of vodka), in which we learned about each other’s energy efficiency projects, attitudes, event management and political processes. The teamwork of EU and Zhytomyr officials, with the support of our “civic”

PR colleagues, was a fundamental part of EU-Ukraine public diplomacy efforts.

The creative and original press conference in particular attracted good media coverage. EU ambassadors cooked and served eggs with a sun-run frying pan, created energy by riding a special bike, and were “victims” of a climate change quiz—all for the press. Most importantly, the media wrote about the grassroots Ukrainian energy efficiency movements, in addition to the EU ambassadors’ statements. The media pictures showed Zhytomyr and EU citizens dancing together to Ukrainian music calling for a greener planet. Five years later, the annual event continues and grows: over 40 related activities took place all across the country in 2018.²⁷ The *Ukrainian-European Sustainable Energy weeks*²⁸ and the dialogues they inspire have taken on a life of their own.

Short Story Contest for Indonesian Students: Inspiring Creativity and Spinning Off Global Conferences

In Jakarta, the EU invited young Indonesians to express their vision for and concern about marine life through a short story contest inspired by a global “Our Ocean” conference.²⁹ The conference gathered hundreds of countries, international organizations, NGOs and businesses, which made hundreds of commitments to improving the health of the world’s oceans and marine life, ranging from plastic reduction to satellite monitoring.

The contest was launched soon after the conference took place in Malta and a year before it was to take place in Indonesia. The branding, infographics and messaging were simply recycled from the global conference, including its links to UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).³⁰ The “spin-off” served as a multiplier for communications efforts, and global issues received an additional local boost.

Over 250 young Indonesians submitted stories that expressed their sadness, dismay and utopian hopes for their oceans. The topic had real local significance. While many Indonesians might associate Europe with the tourists that contribute to their polluted beaches, EU policies are also known to be “green and clean.” To encourage the use of EU languages, the participants were permitted to submit stories in any one of its 23 official languages. Most were in English, with others in French, Spanish, German and Dutch.

Because a writing contest requires creative effort,³¹ it engages people much more intensively than many other activities. This public diplomacy initiative enabled a thoughtful exchange as young Indonesians shared their ideas and concerns. The participant feedback illustrates this point:

I do really appreciate the EU held this event because it gave public, especially student like me, to express something in our own words. Among those college reports and thesis, I found this very pleasing to give myself a shot in it. Thank you!

A contest participant (who did not win)

In addition, discussions between the jury members, including well-known Indonesian bloggers and EU diplomats, morphed into a mini public diplomacy forum.

The contest also inspired and relied upon synergies with EU cultural institutes, embassies, and Indonesian university departments in foreign languages, communications and environmental studies. Jointly, we addressed all three objectives: to raise awareness about the declining health of our oceans, to encourage writing in EU languages, and to enhance the perception of the EU as a leader in environmental protection. The emphasis was rather on advocacy and self-promotion, but the final results entailed enhanced dialogue.

The EU ambassador invited the ten 12–26-year-old winners³² from five Indonesian cities³³ to receive their prizes (laptops and book shop vouchers) in Jakarta in a joint ceremony with the Minister of Maritime Affairs (which later hosted the 2018 *Our Ocean* conference). The winning stories were collected in a book and published online.³⁴ All participants received a certificate signed by the EU ambassador.

The contest will surely shape the young winners' perceptions of the EU. Online contests offer a good way to reach youth audiences. The younger the participants, the more their engagement has the potential to positively influence their impressions and lay the foundation for future long-term cooperation. Sustainability and repetition are another measure of cooperative success. The *Our Ocean* contest inspired a second writing contest, *Euforia*,³⁵ in which Indonesia's Wikimedia and the EU invited writers to improve Bahasa-language information on the EU in Wikipedia and other online sources. The original *Our Ocean* outreach effort provided a useful precedent.

LGBTI and Religion in Hong Kong: Listening to Local Activists and Facilitating Public Dialogue

Although homosexuality was legalized in Hong Kong in 1991, there was no accompanying legislation against discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status. Religious groups expressed concerns about the possible effects of such legislation, including on their own freedom of religion and expression. In 2012, several anti-LGBTI organizations collected thousands of signatures to block the inclusion of LGBTI people in anti-discrimination legislation. Just a few years later, however, attitudes began to change. The 2015 Hong Kong Pride Parade, with 9,000 participants, was the largest since its first iteration in 2008.³⁶ By 2016, a survey indicated that support

for legislation to protect LGBTI rights had doubled to more than half of those polled.³⁷ Among young people, the figure was 91.8%. Ten newly elected legislators also advocated for the legislation, including one who was openly gay.

Noting the shift in public attitudes, local LGBTI advocates asked the EU Office in Hong Kong to organize exchanges with European peers to include LGBTI activists in Ireland where same-sex marriage had just been legalized. Hong Kong advocates wanted to prove to local audiences that Christianity and LGBTI are compatible and that religious figures can, and do, embrace such broad diversity. In addition, the EU agreed to finance and run a conference on LGBTI and Religion in partnership with the Hong Kong Equal Opportunities Commission and the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Local partners developed the conference concept, approach and goals. With the support of EU member state embassies, they identified relevant speakers from many EU and Asian countries. These speakers were encouraged to connect ahead of the conference to develop a set of talking points that would resonate with local audiences and to build cross-cultural trust and understanding.

Of the participants surveyed after the conference, 95% acknowledged "increased knowledge of LGBTI rights in the EU," while 92% learned more about LGBTI rights in Hong Kong. 94% felt there should be formal legal protection to prevent discrimination against LGBTI people in Hong Kong. The conference also promoted a dialogue between Dutch and Taiwanese LGBTI advocates that resulted in an op-ed in support of gay marriage in a leading Taiwanese media outlet. A significant result of public diplomacy efforts to foster EU-Asian dialogue on an important human rights issue, this op-ed may well have contributed to Taiwan's subsequent decision to become the first Asian country to legalize gay marriage.

Measuring Public Diplomacy Results

"Quantifying reach, and thereby evaluating communication success, is one of the greatest foreign policy challenges of the digital age—[and] applies to all communication platforms."³⁸

These case studies illustrate that shared experiences, understanding and a convergence of ideas emerge from the creation of in-depth dialogue and cooperation. Unfortunately, this process is often sacrificed in the name of efficiency and clear "deliverables."

It is much easier to measure the quantitative results of a public diplomacy event, such as the number of event participants, the volume of likes posted on the event page or the range of post-event media reports. Such numbers have little value if they simply measure how many like-minded people are once again discussing the same topic and reinforcing existing opinions. But how does one measure the cultural learning, mind-shifts and dissolving of clichés that may occur in the process of joint event management, concept development and sustained informal engagement?

Indeed, the biggest challenge in public diplomacy is measuring outcomes. To begin, often there is no clear cause and effect. Public diplomacy activities are only one of many shapers of perceptions.³⁹ Local and global political issues weigh in considerably more than a series of seminars. Influencing perceptions also takes a long time. According to experts, increasing awareness can take one to five years, while shifting attitudes demands five to ten years.⁴⁰ Additionally, documenting changes in awareness, perceptions and attitudes requires considerable resources. Experts recommend that eight to 10 percent of a project budget should be dedicated to monitoring and evaluation. This assessment process not only justifies further

expenditures but also provides a useful tool to fine-tune future programs and improve public diplomacy strategies.

Modern Tools, Realistic Goals and Staff & Leadership Buy-in

Within the EU, measuring results and impact has advanced over the past 20 years. For example, the EU has made an effort to integrate more professional monitoring and evaluation systems. However, many of the tools are now outdated,⁴¹ nor are they adapted to public diplomacy practices and requirements. Indicator-driven and stuck in Logical Framework Matrixes (LFMs), the EU's current monitoring and evaluation system exasperates many consultants working for EU-funded projects. They spend huge amounts of time (usually fee-based) reporting the same, often irrelevant information in multiple forms and tools. They also find that many indicators are not relevant for current public diplomacy initiatives. The expected outcomes are also unrealistic and/or over-ambitious. How can a limited number of activities and experts really change the perception of local audiences and change behavior during the lifetime of a two- to four-year project? From an external perspective, the monitoring and evaluation process also lacks staff buy-in and/or participation.

A former NATO public diplomacy staff member outlined some key elements of a successful assessment process. Based on her experiences at NATO, she recommended the following:⁴²

1. **Invest in staff and especially leadership buy-in.** To ensure the buy-in, the organization should reassure staff that the goal is not to measure staff performance, but program effectiveness. Training and regular staff meetings will also help. A "best champion" among each team's measurement could take the lead in a full-time

position and have direct communications with top management.

2. **Start with a strategic preparation** through conference and workshops involving many teams.⁴³
3. **Use a mixed model of measurement and evaluation**, continuously test new tools and update the strategy.

Tools to Collect Data and Perceptions

The foundation of public diplomacy evaluation is sound and comparable data. The EU developed a simple online tool to document EUD target audiences, their interests and perceptions, and the frequency and means of outreach. To gather the data, EUDs introduced live surveys with a list of standard questions that I developed in coordination with the EU and other lead public diplomacy consultants to be adapted to various themes and policies. These surveys permitted audiences to respond immediately to questions and make comments online via their smart phones. The real-time results offered great points for discussion and instant feedback. For perhaps the first time, the EU was able to collect standardized data from public diplomacy activities on a regular basis across the globe.

Some questions have been raised about the value of these survey results, especially when aggregated across cultures. On the one hand, they can serve as a listening tool. On the other hand, results are not always honest⁴⁴ and cannot always be compared across regions and languages. Participants sometimes provide positive responses out of politeness—more so in some cultures than in others. For example, public diplomacy consultants cited Asian audiences as less critical in their evaluation and opinions. This does not negate the use of surveys, yet it makes them more difficult to compare across regions. Surveying known personalities comes with

hurdles as well. While their opinions are the most influential, they have limited time to share them.

Reporting the results to those who need them is the next step. Many EU public diplomacy consultants have called for one standard, simple online reporting tool that integrates data and indicator checks. This would rid them of multiple reporting obligations: often monthly to the EUD, bi-annual to the main contractor (EUD or European Commission), further data collection, and finally, the obligatory use of a complex monitoring tool focusing on indicators that are often irrelevant to public diplomacy. The bi-annual reports tend to be overly detailed and focus on description of past events rather than analysis. EU staff spends time reviewing them, time that is disproportionate to the report's limited value. The EU could combine the indicator monitoring, reporting, as well as public storytelling (links to videos, articles and participant interviews) into one online tool. This would avoid the duplication of internal reporting and external storytelling, connect reporting with measurement of online dissemination, and facilitate more substantive evaluation. In addition to bringing the public diplomacy work to life, this would enable a significantly better use of both consultant and EU staff resources.

EU public diplomacy consultants also favor more long-term qualitative evaluation options. Although quantitative indicators are easier to compare and to present, qualitative and anecdotal methods such as story-based monitoring must be employed. These assessments can come in the form of general sentiment and attitude studies, including priority and influencer audiences' focus groups. Public diplomacy practitioners can also find valuable approaches to qualitative measurement in a variety of sectors, to include public relations, academia and big data.

Story and social-media based evaluations may also serve a dual purpose. Testimonials, in the form of videos, web or Facebook posts, as well as tweets, can serve as easily quantifiable “reports” on public diplomacy activities. A video may show more about an event or an exchange between people than a detailed report, and the number of views it receives is proof of its exposure. Analytics of social media can go further in examining views and interactions.

Beyond Diplomats: Public Relations and Other Communications Professionals

Some EU staff members question the value of outsourcing some of the work around public diplomacy. Many criticize the high costs of PR and communications agencies and their consultants/experts. The EU Office in Hong Kong, for example, refused to work with professional public PR consultants, insisting that taxpayers’ money should not be used to cover expensive corporate rates. There is also the concern that PR agencies focus solely on corporate visibility promotion and lack necessary substantive knowledge and diplomatic sensitivity to carry out public diplomacy programming. Finally, the EU’s small public diplomacy budgets, long tender procedures and detailed reporting requirements are not necessarily compatible with private sector practices.

Other EU staff members would disagree,⁴⁵ arguing that PR agencies do more than sell merchandise and have already acquired political knowledge and sensitivities through work with governments, election campaigns, NGOs and international organizations. PR companies measure the impact of their work and professional strategies through data-driven approaches. They focus on understanding specific audiences’ needs and interests through detailed market research, focus groups and opinion surveys. Additionally,

with respect to event management, EUDs acknowledge that outsourcing saves on time and limited human resources. Working with PR agencies and professional event managers will improve EU communications standards, especially since global audiences have come to expect the high standards of corporate communication.

Outsourcing public diplomacy to PR professionals also assures more effective interaction with media. An experienced UK diplomat notes: “the danger in the generalist diplomats practicing public diplomacy is that they may seem like dilettantes to those with whom they interact in the media and civil society.”⁴⁶ The diplomat then proposes one possible solution: “to contract people with, for example, media experience to fill particular public diplomacy slots working alongside generalist diplomats.” Beyond media experience, consultants who have engaged in outreach, advocacy, lobbying and strategic communications clearly have a lot to offer public diplomacy practitioners.

Recommendations for a Stronger EU Public Diplomacy

Based on my experience as an EU diplomat and a public diplomacy lead consultant across the globe, I have identified several means to develop a more creative, effective and coherent approach to EU public diplomacy. My recommendations come from over ten years of public diplomacy discussions, research and exchanges of best practices. They are also based on a research of existing public diplomacy scholarship.

1. Create a pool of inspiring speakers
2. Join and support existing fora for dialogue and discussion

3. Motivate audiences through simple application steps and innovative activities
4. Invest in local language learning, scholarship and the development of a public diplomacy community
5. Develop an EU public diplomacy virtual “library” and toolkit
6. Mainstream public diplomacy: all EU staff are “ambassadors”
7. Clarify and streamline bureaucratic and security requirements

1. Create a pool of inspiring speakers

A Chinese student commented: “the EU always seems to send us boring old gray-haired men.” From my public diplomacy experience in seven countries, this seems accurate. This is not the image the EU should be promoting. The gender and generational disconnects also make it more difficult to foster interactive dialogue. Therefore, a network of credible and influential global voices that speak up on behalf of the EU’s general public is essential—both within and outside of the EU. Such networks exist within EU institutions but are not accessible to the public. Event organizers including think tanks have their own speaker networks, which they sometimes protect for their competitive advantage.

A publicly available database or platform could provide vital contact information of EU and non-EU citizens who can speak persuasively and credibly on relevant EU issues. This database could also tap into existing private sector networks. For example, the *Brussels Binder*, a network of female think-tankers and experts created out of the recognition that EU

policy discourse lacked gender diversity, could be a very useful partner. Greater collaboration between public and private sector speaker networks would also facilitate a broad exchange of ideas and expertise on key issues.

2. Join and support existing fora for dialogue and discussion

Seminars, conferences and panels remain classic and potentially successful public diplomacy activities. EU Delegations have a natural tendency to launch their own public diplomacy events in order to assure EU visibility. However, there are numerous local initiatives—often student-led—that would greatly benefit from the EU's financial support and expertise. Cultural events such as film festivals often welcome an EU dimension. Working closely with country, regional and international partners is a win-win situation. The EU reaches new audiences, and local organizations gain visibility and support. Establishing collaborative partnerships with local organizations and detailing clear division of costs and responsibilities can make public diplomacy investments more sustainable.

Finally, joining existing online discussions is also important. Groups and communities with an enormous range of interests populate social media platforms. Some of them might be open to dialogue on EU foreign policies or to acquiring an EU perspective on issues that concern them.

3. Motivate audiences through simplified application processes and innovative activities

Engaging with motivated and relevant audiences who act as multipliers is essential for public diplomacy. Targeting and then drawing them in requires “market” research and understanding the local context. Finding relevant platforms such as reputable university faculties, influential NGOs, online fora and media clubs is an important first step. Means

of attraction depend on the group: students often appreciate technology prizes (e.g., a laptop); specialized groups look for access to peers with relevant expertise; and media outlets seek interviews with the EU ambassador or visiting VIPs.

To activate their motivation and increase the allure of the activity, one might consider adding a small hurdle to participation. Free and one-click registrations rarely trigger participant commitment, and on average half of those who register do not show up. A couple of additional application steps and/or online pre-registration questions might make the activity appear more exclusive. This could range from a full-fledged application processes, a quiz on the EU, to a simple survey on individual background, interests and perceptions. At the same time, it is absolutely essential to avoid the complex procedures that create real hurdles for people and projects applying for EU funding. The additional step could improve audience caliber and interest, and filter out less motivated participants. Limited program participation fees in wealthier countries could also serve this purpose. A more demanding registration process also makes it more likely that participants will engage in pre-post- and live reporting through social media, which, in turn, broadens interaction and extends the reach of discussion. Finally, adding pre-program questionnaires can lead to more complete audience data. If opinion surveys are included, they can then serve as a basis for post-event analysis.

Modern event “tools” such as hackathons, speed-networking, live surveys, initiative marketplaces and open discussion spaces, which demand more interaction, can also improve the level of audience engagement. Government institutions should also not shy away from integrating less cerebral elements, such as drawing, video-making, photography, relaxation, dance, yoga and martial arts. With professional guidance and in the right context, using several senses and unusual interactions in creative

ways will remain memorable and tap into deeper feelings. These activity formats also provide a greater opportunity for audiences to express their interests and needs. The global reach and appeal of such event formats, will, of course, vary across countries and regions and should anticipate the local audience's level of comfort and familiarity with interactive activities.

4. Invest in local language learning, scholarship and the development of a public diplomacy community

Local Language Learning

This recommendation requires little elaboration. Speaking the same language makes all the difference in building trust and understanding. EU diplomats are already required to speak three languages, including one of the three official working languages (English, French and German). Many already speak several languages and are competent language learners. Full-time language training for key staff members does require a significant investment, but, as the UK and U.S. diplomatic services have shown, it is well worth the effort.

EU Public Diplomacy Scholarship

A thriving community of public diplomacy scholars already exists in the U.S. The University of Southern California's Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism, for example, has a renowned faculty of public diplomacy experts and offers academics and the public a unique repository of research on related issues. Among European scholars, Simon Duke,⁴⁷ Shaun Riordan⁴⁸ and Jan Melissen stand out. However, there is more work to be done in the realm of EU-specific scholarship. Most EU public diplomacy publications are over five years old⁴⁹ and thus do not address the most recent and growing digital dimensions of public diplomacy. Current EU public diplomacy scholarship also tends toward

the abstract. Bringing together a multi-disciplinary group of scholars and practitioners could help to integrate relevant research—including social network theory,⁵⁰ behavioral and cognitive sciences—with the actual practice of public diplomacy.

Building the #EUPublicDiplomacy Community

Fostering a community of EU public diplomacy scholars is perhaps one of the most effective ways to generate more innovative and practical research. The EU might consider connecting to existing U.S. public diplomacy communities, such as the U.S. volunteer-driven Digital Diplomacy Coalition (www.digidiplomats.org @DigiDiplomats). Launched in 2012, the coalition already includes 4,000 diplomats, technologists, academics and innovators.⁵¹ An EU branch or dimension of the Digital Diplomacy Coalition would be beneficial to both the U.S. and the EU. EU-specific public diplomacy issues could also be communicated through channels such as @PublicDiplomacy (run by the University of Southern California) and @PublicSphereWB (run by the World Bank).

A fellowship program would also expand and further professionalize the EU public diplomacy mission. The U.S. State Department's Council of American Ambassadors program offers an excellent model.⁵² The one-year part-time fellowship for U.S. public diplomacy officers provides training and enables networking while they work in State Department headquarters. Media/communications executives, cultural actors⁵³ and former U.S. ambassadors lead mentoring sessions with the public diplomacy officers and provide opportunities for structured networking. The fellowship concludes with a two-week seminar at the *USC Center on Public Diplomacy* at the University of Southern California and an article in *The Ambassadors Review*.⁵⁴ If resources do not suffice, a reduced EU version could at

least entail simple training and expert discussions. Such workshops and networking could improve the work of the next generation of EU public diplomacy officers.

5. Develop an EU public diplomacy virtual “library” and toolkit

The EU provides very little public information on its public diplomacy activities.⁵⁵ A virtual library could house personal stories⁵⁶ of successful initiatives and partnerships, as well as relevant policy and strategy documents. The EU could also require that a web article with photos and testimonials be posted for every relevant activity. In facilitating online research, the virtual library would also increase EU presence in global public diplomacy discourse. An associated web hub, meanwhile, would facilitate EU citizen speaker⁵⁷ and program requests. For EU taxpayers, a virtual hub would provide proof of transparency and fiscal accountability and, ultimately, build greater understanding of and trust in EU public diplomacy.

A new and less formal website would also facilitate the online external communication of EU public diplomacy activities, which currently get lost in existing EUD online channels. A web-based repository of public diplomacy activities and stories could serve as a clearinghouse of ideas for EU staff members, consultants and other citizens.

One, dedicated EU public diplomacy web hub could provide basic program development information, including terms of reference, adaptable communications products and information packages on specific topics. It could also process requests for consultants and consolidate the numerous Dropbox accounts, Google drives, Excel files and existing internal communications platforms used by EUDs and their consultants.⁵⁸ Finally, this hub would enable the

recycling of public diplomacy program materials, activities and ideas, saving both time and resources.

6. Mainstream public diplomacy: all EU staff members are “ambassadors”

“In one sense, public diplomacy is the business of all diplomats, since none are immune to the pressures of the information age and need to take media and public reaction into account when formulating and executing policy.”⁵⁹

All EU foreign affairs staff members contribute to the image of the EU abroad through their professional and personal contacts. Therefore, all personnel, from the leadership level to the field missions, should be made aware of and trained in the development and implementation of EU public diplomacy objectives and strategies. Moreover, EU officials must remember that in the public sphere, they represent the EU and are often perceived as “ambassadors” for EU policies. As such, their own ethics and values may influence the nature of their engagement with foreign publics. At the same time, the degree to which the EU can adopt a more dialogue-oriented and open corporate culture will positively reinforce public diplomacy efforts.

7. Clarify and streamline bureaucratic and security requirements

EU bureaucracy and security trigger a serious feeling of inaccessibility, both within and outside of the EU.⁶⁰ The EU’s complicated funding application and contracting procedures frustrate many host country partners. To improve its image, the EU needs to modernize financial regulations and adapt them to local circumstances. As a start, the regulations need to be better explained and communicated. The EU Perceptions Study⁶¹ also recommends that procedural and hierarchical processes can be improved through more flexible and decentralized decision-making. The hierarchy l

have witnessed in EU Delegations, both as staff and as lead consultant, are indeed quite stifling and do not portray the EU as modern and forward-looking.

EU security measures also affect its public image. As a rule, EU Delegations, like most diplomatic institutions, ask every visitor to surrender all personal electronic devices upon entering the office. This necessary requirement can generate questions of trust, and some visitors feel as if they are being treated as a “criminal.”⁶² To overcome this challenge, as many public diplomacy events as possible should take place outside the security perimeter. And when security measures cannot be avoided, program participants and guests must be provided with a respectful explanation for these requirements.

Conclusions

A well-seasoned public diplomacy practitioner described the characteristics required for successful public diplomacy in a 2016 United Nations publication:

“Truth, accuracy, discernment, prudence and tact ... need to be deployed in successful public diplomacy, translating, as they do, into a willingness and capacity to listen to others, and to engage honestly in dialogue with them.”

Honest, discerning and tactful dialogue is a cornerstone of true public diplomacy and an essential soft power tool. They may be difficult to train, but they need to be fostered and promoted. Beyond individuals, a country’s culture, tourism, products and sports, as well as media depiction, also play an essential part of soft power. They are, however, primarily developed by the private sector.

At the same time, “harder” power should not be forgotten. Trade power, for example, can also be used to encourage

dialogue. In most parts of the world, power encourages respect. And without mutual respect, public diplomacy efforts will be lost. An EU legal expert⁶³ links the EU's soft and hard power aspects to the propagation of the "'Brussels Effect,'"⁶⁴ or unilateral regulatory globalization,"⁶⁵ as follows:

*"The EU is often viewed as a power that relies on persuasion to change "hearts and minds" ... steering away from coercion in favor of positive incentives and soft power. ... But normative power is merely one fact of the EU's foreign policy strategy. The Brussels Effect embodies a vast, unappreciated ... aspect of the EU's global role. [If you] ask General Electric, Microsoft, Google, Monsanto, Dow Chemical or Revlon whether the EU is powerful, the answer would be a resounding yes."*⁶⁶

Companies across the globe that want to access the EU's market of 500 million citizens—the world's largest trading bloc—are obliged to follow EU regulations.⁶⁷ EU market and trade leaders are thus unavoidable norm-setters, whose influence can serve public diplomacy to pull in partner influencers and counter the "prevailing sense of European decline"⁶⁸ noted in the introduction.

As a political actor, the EU also has the potential to appeal to foreign audiences, inspire dialogue and prove that it is not "a power of the past." Through public diplomacy initiatives, the EU can acquire status as a major player in shaping global norms in areas such as renewable energy technology, gender equality and LGBTI rights.⁶⁹ With tough, controversial issues, the EU can be a foreign policy institution that provides common solutions to common problems. This is a powerful foundation for dialogue and exchange.

Finally, public diplomacy should serve the diplomacy of foreign relations and focus on its policy priorities. Public diplomacy practitioners have the responsibility to develop

a strategic plan that targets the concerned audiences. They should invest in finding the stakeholders of these specific policies, attracting them to dialogue, gaining their respect, and setting the ground for long-term dialogue and engagement. All diplomats and government officials need to remember to reach out beyond their foreign peers and like-minded communities to address the broad range of audiences whose needs and interests are affected by the EU's policies. People across the globe are finding streets and online platforms to voice their concerns and frustrations.⁷⁰ If we do not listen to citizen concerns, and foster mutual understanding across the globe, many policy objectives will falter.

Endnotes

1. Focusing on listening also reduces the risk of going down the slippery slope toward propaganda. Once the perception that a diplomat is “committing” propaganda is triggered, the resulting credibility loss cannot be underestimated!
2. Bradford, Anu. “The EU as a regulatory power.” *Connectivity Wars: Why Migration, Finance and Trade are the Geo-Economic Battlegrounds of the Future*, edited by Mark Leonard. European Council on Foreign Relations and Stiftung Mercator, 2016, p. 133.
3. Public Policy and Management Institute (PPMI-Lithuania), the National Centre for Research on Europe (NCRE-New Zealand), and Free University-Berlin, Germany. “Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU’s policies abroad” (EU Perceptions Study). European Commission, Dec. 2015, https://ec.europa.eu/fpi/showcases/analysis-perception-eu-and-eus-policies-abroad_en.
4. The study focused on ten of the EU’s “strategic partners”: the U.S., Russia, China, South Korea, India, Japan, Canada, Mexico, Brazil and South Africa and drew conclusions from surveys, focus groups and media analysis (several months in 2015).
5. Leigh, Michael (Senior Fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the U.S.). “EU Global Strategy Expert Opinion No. 20.” EU Institute for Security Studies, 2016, p. 2.
6. The app is the award-winning “Calm” and has around 60 non-fiction bedtime stories, among hundreds more.
7. I do not explore the very significant changes that came with the end of a six-month rotating Member State presidency.
8. *EU Global Strategy*. European External Action Service, last updated 1 Apr. 2019, <https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/en/priorities-eu-global-strategy>.

9. "Enhancing Public Diplomacy." *EU Global Strategy—year 1*. European External Action Service, Jun. 2016, last updated 1 Apr. 2019, <https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/en/enhancing-public-diplomacy>.
10. Public diplomacy thus figures prominently under the official website's top headings.
11. "From Shared Vision to Common Action: Implementing the EU Global Strategy Year 1—A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy." European External Action Service, Jun. 2017, p. 25, https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/sites/globalstrategy/files/full_brochure_year_1.pdf.
12. "From Shared Vision to Common Action: Implementing the EU Global Strategy Year 1—A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy." European External Action Service, Jun. 2017, p. 30, https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/sites/globalstrategy/files/full_brochure_year_1.pdf.
13. Jan Melissen is Professor of Diplomacy at the University of Antwerp and Senior Research Fellow at the Clingendael Institute.
14. Melissen, Jan. "Conclusions and Recommendations on Public Policy in Europe." *European Public Diplomacy: Soft Power at Work*. Edited by Maia Cross and Davis Cross. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, pp. 205-212.
15. "Enhancing Public Diplomacy." *EU Global Strategy—year 1*. European External Action Service, Jun. 2016, last updated 1 Apr. 2019, <https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/en/enhancing-public-diplomacy>.
16. The events page has not worked at least Dec. 2018–Jan. 2019.
17. Information as per Dec. 2018.

18. This project is funded by the European Commission branch of public diplomacy: (Foreign) Partnership Instrument—FPI.
19. Public Policy and Management Institute (PPMI-Lithuania), the National Centre for Research on Europe (NCRE-New Zealand), and Free University-Berlin, Germany. "Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU's policies abroad" (EU Perceptions Study). European Commission, Dec. 2015, https://ec.europa.eu/fpi/showcases/analysis-perception-eu-and-eus-policies-abroad_en.
20. The EU Perceptions Study drew conclusions from surveys, focus groups and media analysis (several months in 2015).
21. "From Shared Vision to Common Action: Implementing the EU Global Strategy Year 1—A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy." European External Action Service, Jun. 2017, p. 30, https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/sites/globalstrategy/files/full_brochure_year_1.pdf.
22. Data collected by the EU Perceptions Study Sep.–Dec. 2017.
23. Working together with governmental actors remains useful for public diplomacy, to reach targeted audiences as well as to facilitate private-public and government-NGO dialogue. Government officials will also often help to attract media—important for reaching larger audiences. Nonetheless, it should be clear that traditional—and not public diplomacy—targets primarily government actors.
24. During the year after the establishment of the public diplomacy guidelines, EU Delegations barely used the messages. This was probably due to the hierarchical structure of EU Delegations. EU public diplomacy officers are sometimes junior staff members.
25. *European Union Sustainable Energy Week*. European Commission, <https://www.eusew.eu/>.

26. On the website, the EU describes it as the “most important European conference dedicated to sustainable energy policy issues.”
27. “2018 Energy Days.” *European Union Sustainable Energy Week*, European Commission, 2018, <https://www.eusew.eu/look-2018-energy-day>.
28. The EU organizers smartly chose to call for activities over the months of May and June instead of limiting activities to the one conference week in June. The local opportunities are much greater with this open approach.
29. *Our Ocean*. European Union, 2017, <https://ourocean2017.org/>.
30. *Sustainable Development Goals*. United Nations, <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300>.
31. We used Submittable, a software package that automatically collects and manages the evaluation of stories: <https://www.submittable.com>.
32. The winning stories’ titles are: *2017, Blue, La sirene d’alarme de l’ocean, Waves of Shard, Children of the Ocean, Useful at First, Useless After, I wish I had fresh fish for dinner, Crooked good, Suddenly all is black, and What happened to the kids?*
33. Fewer than half the winners were from Jakarta—and were flown in.
34. “Our Ocean Short Story Writing Contest: Winners Announced.” EU Delegation to Indonesia, Dec. 2017, https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/37283/our-ocean-short-story-writing-contest-winners-announced_id.
35. “Congratulations to the winners of the EUforia writing competition.” EU Delegation to Indonesia, Sep. 2018, https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/50128/congratulations-winners-euforia-writing-competition_id.

36. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hong_Kong_Pride_Parade#2015
37. Gender Research Centre of the Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Study on Legislation against discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity, and intersex status, 2016. <http://www.eoc.org.hk/eoc/upload/ResearchReport/20161251750293418312.pdf>
38. Bailey, Nicole. "Measuring Public Diplomacy in a time of global information competition." *World Bank Blog: "People, Spaces and Deliberations—exploring the interactions among public opinion, governance and the public sphere,"* Jun. 2015, <https://blogs.worldbank.org/publicsphere/measuring-public-diplomacy-time-global-information-competition>.
39. United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. "Data-Driven Public Diplomacy." U.S. Department of State, Sep. 2014. <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/231945.pdf>.
40. Gonzales, Carissa. "The Evaluation Revolution in Public Diplomacy." *The Ambassadors Review*, Council of American Ambassadors, Fall 2015, <https://www.americanambassadors.org/publications/ambassadors-review/fall-2015/the-evaluation-revolution-in-public-diplomacy>.
41. The EU continues to use indicator-focused Logical Framework Matrices, which many other organizations have given up on decades ago.
42. Maronkova, Barbora. "From Crawling to Walking: Progress in Evaluating the Effectiveness of Public Diplomacy: Lessons Learned from NATO." *CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy*, 2018, http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/sites/uscpublicdiplomacy.org/files/From%20Crawling%20to%20Walking_Maronkova.pdf.
43. NATO organized this conference in the UK in 2007. A follow-up workshop served to develop NATO's Public Diplomacy strategic model: "Evaluation and the New Model Public

Diplomacy.” Riverpath Associates at NATO Public Diplomacy Workshop, 3 Jul. 2007, Belgium.

44. In some cultures, people do not feel comfortable criticizing—neither partner country actors, nor their own. This has been underlined by consultants working in China, Russia and Indonesia.
45. The EUD to Ukraine project “Moving Ahead Together” is led by a PR company, which has been highly praised by one staff member in charge. Others criticize its superficiality and lacking understanding of the EU.
46. Hunt, Alan. “Public Diplomacy—What it is and how to do it.” United Nations Publications, 2016, pp. 136-137, <https://unitar.org/mdp/public-diplomacy-what-it-and-how-do-it-alan-hunt>.
47. Simon Duke was a professor at the European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA), Maastricht, Netherlands, focusing on EU external affairs, and co-Executive Editor of the *Journal of European Integration*. He is the author of the *EU as a Stronger Global Actor: Challenges and Strategic Responses* (Palgrave-Macmillan 2017) and a discussion paper on EU public diplomacy (Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations, 2013). He has a doctorate from Oxford University. <https://www.eipa.eu/speaker/dr-simon-duke/>.
48. Shaun Riordan was a British diplomat (posted in New York, Beijing and Madrid) for 16 years and has taught in Armenia’s Diplomatic Academy. He heads the Business Diplomacy Project and is a member of the Diplomatic Futures Group at the Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Clingendael). Riordan is the author of *The New Diplomacy* (Polity 2003, published in Bulgarian in 2015) and *Adios a la Diplomacia* (Siglo XXI 2005). He is co-author of *Futures for Diplomacy: Integrative Diplomacy in the 21st Century* (Clingendael 2012) and the Clingendael Policy Brief, “Whither Foreign Ministries?” <https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/users/shaun-riordan>.

49. This is based on the bibliography of sources I have collected from numerous online open sources. One of the most recent books dates to 2013: *European Public Diplomacy: Soft Power at Work* by Maia Cross and Jan Melissen.
50. Bailey, Nicole. "Measuring Public Diplomacy in a time of global information competition." *World Bank Blog: "People, Spaces and Deliberations—exploring the interactions among public opinion, governance and the public sphere,"* Jun. 2015, <https://blogs.worldbank.org/publicsphere/measuring-public-diplomacy-time-global-information-competition>.
51. Founded by Scott Nolan Smith, Roos Kouwenhoven, Jed Shein and Floris Winters, it is led by a global board.
52. "Leadership Development." *Council of American Ambassadors*, <https://www.americanambassadors.org/leadership-development/public-diplomacy-fellowship>.
53. Such as the Public Diplomacy Council (<http://www.publicdiplomacycouncil.org/>), the Meridian International Center (<http://www.meridian.org/>), the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (<https://www.wilsoncenter.org/>), as well as arts organizations such as the Smithsonian and the National Endowment for the Arts.
54. The fellows are asked to write an article that proposes means to strengthen U.S. public diplomacy, in consultation with the ambassador-mentor.
55. From conversations with EU staff, this appears to be due to limited resources, not an intentional secrecy.
56. Two good examples are the Deutsche Welle Akademie (<http://www.dw.com/en/dw-akademie/asia/s-12136>) and another EU-funded project, Media4Democracy (<http://media4democracy.eu/contact-us/>).
57. This was already possible on the U.S. Public Diplomacy websites.

58. Several intracoms already exist, e.g. for EEAS Strategic Communications, but access is limited to EEAS staff (excluding—at least until 2017—European Commission staff).
59. Hunt, Alan. "Public Diplomacy—What it is and how to do it." United Nations Publications, 2016, <https://unitar.org/mdp/public-diplomacy-what-it-and-how-do-it-alan-hunt>.
60. I regularly hear professionals from various sectors complaining about EU procedures: humanitarian organizations or start-ups who decide not to apply for EU funding due to its complexity, doctors overwhelmed by EU forms, as well as human rights organizations that risk closure due to financial losses resulting from the insufficient understanding of EU procedures. Even the EU itself recognizes the restrictions imposed through its financial regulations. To support democracy activists in the Middle East, North Africa and Eastern Europe, it created a separate organization and legal entity to enable simple funding of their democracy work: the European Endowment for Democracy.
61. Public Policy and Management Institute (PPMI-Lithuania), the National Centre for Research on Europe (NCRE-New Zealand), and Free University-Berlin, Germany. "Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU's policies abroad" (EU Perceptions Study). European Commission, Dec. 2015, https://ec.europa.eu/fpi/showcases/analysis-perception-eu-and-eus-policies-abroad_en.
62. One EU project leader expressed her joy upon entering the EU Delegation with ease, while security machines were still being set up.
63. Hunt, Alan. "Public Diplomacy—What it is and how to do it." United Nations Publications, 2016, <https://unitar.org/mdp/public-diplomacy-what-it-and-how-do-it-alan-hunt>.
64. Anu Bradford is also the director of the European Legal Studies Centre and has taught at the University of Chicago Law School, Harvard, Brandeis and the University of Helsinki.

65. Bradford, Anu. "The Brussels Effect." *Northwestern University Law Review*, vol. 107, no. 1, 2013.
66. Bradford, Anu. "The EU as a regulatory power." *Connectivity Wars: Why Migration, Finance and Trade are the Geo-Economic Battlegrounds of the Future*, edited by Mark Leonard. European Council on Foreign Relations and Stiftung Mercator, 2016, pp. 133-139.
67. The fact that EU regulations often elevate consumer protection is also important to counter the image of a regulatory imperialist—a negative image even despite the power it emanates.
68. Leigh, Michael (Senior Fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the U.S.). "EU Global Strategy Expert Opinion No. 20." EU Institute for Security Studies, 2016, p. 2.
69. Public Policy and Management Institute (PPMI-Lithuania), the National Centre for Research on Europe (NCRE-New Zealand), and Free University-Berlin, Germany. "Analysis of the Perception of the EU and EU's policies abroad" (EU Perceptions Study). European Commission, Dec. 2015, https://ec.europa.eu/fpi/showcases/analysis-perception-eu-and-eus-policies-abroad_en.
70. The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is just one example where governments might not have sufficiently engaged in public diplomacy to get citizens on board.

Author's Biography

Bianca Baumler is lead consultant for EU-South Korea public diplomacy. She also led an EU-global public diplomacy project covering South Africa, Indonesia, Singapore, New Zealand and Hong Kong. As part of this global work, she helped the EU coordinate its public diplomacy work in the U.S., Russia, China, South Korea, India, and South & Central America, with the aim to develop a more coherent strategy. She has evaluated EU communications in Ukraine and drafted winning project proposals for EU-funded outreach and engagement. As an EU diplomat and press, culture and communications officer, she served in Damascus (2006-2011) and Kyiv (2011-2013). She has thus gained both an internal and external perspective on EU public diplomacy.

Beyond public diplomacy, Bianca has been engaged in supporting democracy activities in the Middle East, North Africa and Eastern Europe as part of the founding staff of the *European Endowment for Democracy*. She began her work with the Middle East and North Africa, managing an EU higher education program. Bianca also volunteers as the European media lead for the first truly pan-European party, Volt, as well as for the *Brussels Binder*, which supports gender equality in European policy debates. She speaks five languages and has degrees from Yale, Sciences Po-Paris and the Free University of Berlin.

Other Papers in the CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy Series

All papers in the CPD Perspectives series are available for free on the Center's website (www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org). To purchase any of the publications below in hard copy, please contact: cpd@usc.edu.

2019/1 The Republic of Korea's Public Diplomacy Strategy:
History and Current Status
by Kwang-jin Choi

2018/6 Public Diplomacy and the American Fortress Embassy:
Balancing Mission and Security
by Mieczysław P. Boduszyński

2018/5 Netwar in Cyberia: Decoding the Media Mujahidin
by Ali Fisher

2018/4 Many Voices, Many Hands: Widening Participatory
Dialogue to Improve Diplomacy's Impact
by Deborah L. Trent

2018/3 Seventy Years of the Smith-Mundt Act and U.S.
International Broadcasting: Back to the Future?
by Emily T. Metzgar

2018/2 Organizing Public Diplomacy: A Layered System
by Barry A. Sanders

2018/1 From Crawling to Walking: Progress in Evaluating the
Effectiveness of Public Diplomacy: Lessons Learned
from NATO
by Barbora Maronkova

2017/3 The Floating Tree: Crafting Resilient State Narratives in
Post-Truth Environments
by Vivan S. Walker

2017/2 Sino-Vatican Faith Diplomacy:
Mapping the Factors Affecting Bilateral Relations
by Juyan Zhang

- 2017/1 Why the Voice of America Remains a Vital Force in the World
by Geoffrey Cowan
- 2016/5 The Reem Island Ghost: Framing State Narratives on Terror
by Vivian Walker
- 2016/4 The Public Diplomacy of Emerging Powers Part 2: The Case of Indonesia
by Ellen Huijgh
- 2016/3 Canadian Public Diplomacy and Nation-Building: Expo 67 and the World Festival of Arts and Entertainment
by Kailey Hansson
- 2016/2 Intersections between Public Diplomacy & International Development: Case Studies in Converging Fields
by James Pamment
- 2016/1 The Public Diplomacy of Emerging Powers, Part 1: The Case of Turkey
by Ellen Huijgh and Jordan Warlick
- 2015/7 Public Diplomacy in Global Health: An Annotated Bibliography
by Tara Ornstein
- 2015/6 Democratization through Public Diplomacy: An Analysis of the European Parliament's Reaction to the Arab Spring
by Michael Reinprecht & Henrietta Levin
- 2015/5 Centers of Gravity in Public Diplomacy: A Case Study of U.S. Efforts in South Africa
by Amelia Arsenault
- 2015/4 Public Diplomacy of Multilateral Organizations: The Cases of NATO, EU, and ASEAN
by Zhikica Zach Pagovski
- 2015/3 Benghazi: Managing the Message
by Vivian Walker

- 2015/2 Soft Power and Public Diplomacy: The Case of the European Union in Brazil
by María Luisa Azpiroz
- 2015/1 Distinguishing Cultural Relations from Cultural Diplomacy: The British Council's Relationship with Her Majesty's Government
by Tim Rivera
- 2014/3 Confucious Institutes and the Globalization of China's Soft Power with contributions
by R.S. Zaharna, Jennifer Hubbert, and Falk Hartig
- 2014/2 De-Americanizing Soft Power Discourse?
by Daya Thussu
- 2014/1 Britain's International Broadcasting
by Rajesh Mirchandani and Abdullahi Tasiu Abubakar
- 2013/6 Public Diplomacy and the Media in the Middle East
by Philip Seib
- 2013/5 Public Diplomacy in Germany
by Claudia Auer and Alice Srugies
- 2013/4 The Syrian Crisis of 1957: A Lesson for the 21st Century
by Kevin Brown
- 2013/3 "Psychopower" of Cultural Diplomacy in the Information Age
by Natalia Grincheva
- 2013/2 Cases in Water Diplomacy
Edited by Naomi Leight
- 2013/1 Considering the "Illogical Patchwork": The Broadcasting Board of Governors and U.S. International Broadcasting
by Emily T. Metzgar
- 2012/10 Engaging India: Public Diplomacy and Indo American Relations to 1957
by Sarah Ellen Graham

- 2012/9 Silicon Valley's Foreign Policy
by Ernest J. Wilson III
- 2012/8 Buddhist Diplomacy: History and Status Quo
by Juyan Zhang
- 2012/7 Public Diplomacy and Conflict Resolution:
Russia, Georgia and the EU in Abkhazia and South
Ossestia
by Iskra Kirova
- 2012/6 Practicing Successful Twitter Public Diplomacy:
A Model and Case
Study of U.S. Efforts in Venezuela
by Erika A. Yepsen
- 2012/5 Media Diplomacy and U.S.-China Military-to-Military
Cooperation
by Thomas A. Hollihan and Zhan Zhang
- 2012/4 The Cultural Awakening in Public Diplomacy
by R.S. Zaharna
- 2012/3 Promoting Japan: One JET at a Time
by Emily T. Metzgar
- 2012/2 Experiencing Nation Brands: A Comparative Analysis of
Eight National Pavilions at Expo Shanghai in 2010
by Jian Wang and Shaojing Sun
- 2012/1 Hizbullah's Image Management Strategy
by Lina Khatib
- 2011/11 Public Diplomacy from Below: The 2008 "Pro-China"
Demonstrations in Europe and North America
by Barry Sautman and Li Ying
- 2011/10 Campaigning for a Seat on the UN Security Council
by Caitlin Byrne
- 2011/9 A Resource Guide to Public Diplomacy Evaluation
by Robert Banks

- 2011/8 Essays on Faith Diplomacy
Edited by Naomi Leight
- 2011/7 A Strategic Approach to U.S. Diplomacy
by Barry A. Sanders
- 2011/6 U.S. Public Diplomacy in a Post-9/11 World:
From Messaging to Mutuality
by Kathy R. Fitzpatrick
- 2011/5 The Hard Truth About Soft Power
by Markos Kounalakis and Andras Simonyi
- 2011/4 Challenges for Switzerland's Public Diplomacy:
Referendum on Banning Minarets
by Johannes Matyassy and Seraina Flury
- 2011/3 Public Diplomacy of Kosovo: Status Quo, Challenges and
Options
by Martin Wählich and Behar Xharra
- 2011/2 Public Diplomacy, New Media, and Counterterrorism
by Philip Seib
- 2011/1 The Power of the European Union in Global Governance:
A Proposal for a New Public Diplomacy
El poder de la Unión Europea en el gobierno global:
Propuesta para una nueva diplomacia pública
by Teresa La Porte
- 2010/4 Spectacle in Copenhagen: Public Diplomacy on Parade
by Donna Marie Oglesby
- 2010/3 U.S. Public Diplomacy's Neglected Domestic Mandate
by Kathy R. Fitzpatrick
- 2010/2 Mapping the Great Beyond: Identifying Meaningful
Networks in Public Diplomacy
by Ali Fisher

2010/1 Moscow '59: The "Sokolniki Summit" Revisited
by Andrew Wulf

2009/3 The Kosovo Conflict: U.S. Diplomacy and Western Public
Opinion
by Mark Smith

2009/2 Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past
by Nicholas J. Cull

2009/1 America's New Approach to Africa:
AFRICOM and Public Diplomacy
by Philip Seib

A note from the Editors: The information, including language translation and transliteration, featured in this report is accurate to the best of the author's knowledge. The statements, analyses and conclusions included in CPD Perspectives are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center or individuals associated with the Center.

CPD | USC Center on Public Diplomacy
at the Annenberg School

