



ORIGINAL PAPER

Common Security and Defense Policy and Kosovo: A critical analysis of the EULEX Mission

Lulzim Krasniqi¹⁾, Jonuz Abdullai²⁾

Abstract:

After the fall of the communist regime in Eastern and Central Europe, a new geopolitical context was created on the European continent and beyond. These changes had important implications for the security and foreign policy dimension of the EU. The political turmoil that erupted in the former communist countries in the early '90s and especially the wars in the former Yugoslavia that began in 1991 highlighted the EU's lack of capabilities to respond to crisis management situations either in its own backyard or in other parts of the world. This was reaffirmed during the Kosovo war in 1998-99, where the EU failed to play any major role in resolving the conflict. Because of changes in the geopolitical landscape in its neighborhood and beyond, the EU began to increase its efforts to empower the foreign and security policy. In this regard, the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX) - which is the subject of study in this paper - is of great significance. This is because EULEX is the largest civilian mission ever launched under Common Security and Defense Policy of the European Union, and is therefore an important exam through which the EU's capabilities in implementing these policies on the ground are tested. Analytical discussion takes place through a mixed methodology where both qualitative and quantitative methods are combined. The study highlights that the EULEX mission has faced significant challenges in terms of efficiency and public image, concluding that the lessons learned from the EULEX mission's work will serve as a valuable experience that can help the EU in its efforts to strengthen the Common Security and Defense Policy further.

Keywords: *EULEX, European Union, Kosovo, CFSP.*

¹⁾ PhD candidate, South East European University, Faculty of Contemporary Social Sciences, Political Sciences specialization, Phone: 00383 44 251 377, Email: lk28371@seeu.edu.mk.

²⁾ Full professor, PhD, South East European University, Faculty of Contemporary Social Sciences, Public Policies specialization, Phone: 00389 784 29 997, Email: j.abdullai@seeu.edu.mk.

Introduction

This article examines the EULEX mission in Kosovo. The paper provides a brief explanation on the evolution of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) under whose mandate the EULEX mission is carried out. The article further highlights that the implementation of the EULEX mission in Kosovo is faced with significant challenges that are related to the aspect of efficiency and public image. Regarding performance assessment, it is important to note that it can be challenging and possibly insufficient to 'measure' the outcomes of the mission's activity from a quantitative standpoint. This is because the 'amount' of activities carried out on the ground - as quantified in EULEX's work reports - does not necessarily reflect EULEX's success or failure in achieving its goals regarding the rule of law in Kosovo. As a result, in order to shed more light on the mission's wider impact, a multidimensional analysis is necessary. This analysis should not be limited to the treatment of activities from a quantitative standpoint, but rather should broaden the scope of research by evaluating the mission's effects on three particular fields (justice, police, and customs), where its work has been concentrated.

While during the Kosovo war (1998-1999) the EU failed to be a decisive actor in the crisis management process, Kosovo now represents an important point. This is because the reflections about the work of the EULEX mission in Kosovo will serve as valuable inputs in the process of strengthening the Common Security and Defense Policy.

The paper is organized as follows: the first part explains the methodology; the second part deals with the review of the literature offering at the same time an interpretation through which it is argued that the process of transformation of CFSP over the years, to a large degree, has been determined by external factors, namely, from the political dynamics outside the EU which had implications in the sphere of foreign and security policy for the European Union. The third part provides an analytical overview of EULEX's work in Kosovo, the mission's interaction with local authorities, challenges, difficulties and achievements. The fourth part brings the conclusions.

Methodology

The analytical discussion is developed through a methodological mix where qualitative and quantitative methods are interwoven. Quantitative data has been gathered from secondary sources. The same serve to strengthen the theoretical arguments built through the qualitative method. Initially, the review of literature was done through which the theoretical framework is outlined, helping explain the context within which the EU's foreign and security policies were designed and evolved, then continuing discussion about the implementation activity of the EULEX mission on the ground - by employing quantitative and to some extent interpretative methods.

Literature review

Common Security and Defense Policy and its evolution

In spite of the enlargement of the EU over the decades, becoming one of the most powerful economies in the world, its role in the sphere of foreign and security policy has been considered weak (Wallace, Polack & Young, 2010; Margas, 2010). With the fall of the communist regime in Eastern and Central Europe, a new geopolitical context on the European continent and beyond was created. These changes had important implications in the security and foreign policy dimension of the EU. The political turmoil that erupted in the former communist countries in the early 1990s

Common Security and Defense Policy and Kosovo: A critical analysis of the EULEX Mission

revealed that the EU is unprepared to be a relevant factor capable of playing any decisive role in foreign policy and crisis management on the international stage.

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union and ex-Yugoslavia, a considerable number of independent states emerged in the neighborhood of the European Union. Most of them will face challenges regarding the consolidation of their democratic institutions and shifting the economic model from planned economy to that of the free market. Simultaneously, these countries expressed their aspirations for deepening the cooperation with the EU with the end goal of becoming full members of the European Union. For its part, the EU welcomed the transformation of these countries from a communist system to a democratic one, and pledged to assist them in the consolidation of democratic institutions and creating free market economies while offering them the prospect of full integration into the EU.

Moreover, the Persian Gulf crisis in 1990 and the wars in the former Yugoslavia that began in 1991 evidenced the EU's deficiency in responding to crisis management situations either in its own backyard or in other regions of the world. This was again reaffirmed during the Kosovo war in 1998-99 where the EU failed to play any major role in resolving the conflict (Hix & Hoyland, 2011: 311). Hence, it was mainly geopolitical dynamics, which made the European Union to finally "take some decisive steps towards developing a credible common security and defense policy" (Wallace, et al., 2010: 435).

After the adoption of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, which entered into force in 1993, the EU countries created the legal framework that paved the way for the creation of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) as well as institutional mechanisms for its implementation (Hancock & Peters, 2003). Establishment of CFSP in 1993 followed by the creation of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), which was ratified in 1999, demonstrated the commitment of the EU states to work together in structuring an integrated policy that will represent the EU's interests at the international arena. This is an important development in the history of the EU, considering the fact that the interests of the member states in foreign and security affairs have been constantly accompanied by considerable divergences (Ginsberg, 2007).

The basic goals of CFSP are the protection and security of the European Union and the promotion of security and cooperation outside the borders of the EU. Through the establishment of CSDP, now the possibility of using military and police power as instruments to implement the policies and interests of the EU in terms of crisis management at the international level is created (Archer, 2008). As a result, in addition to the 'soft' instruments (primarily economic sanctions) available to the EU to exert political pressure, the military instrument has now been added (*ibid.*). Over the years, the EU's defense and security institutional framework is enhanced with additional institutions, such as the Political and Security Committee (PSC), the Military Committee of the European Union (EUMC), the Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM) as well as the EU Military Staff (EUMS) (Margas, 2010: 1). Since the creation of the CSDP, a number of achievements have been marked in the field of conflict management through a considerable number of missions carried out in many parts of the world. However, as Wallace et al., point out: "it still remains far short of an integrated single policy, with integrated diplomatic, financial and military instruments" (2010: 435).

Despite the differences on various issues of foreign policy and global security, including relations with NATO, the European Union, through the CSDP has managed to maintain a solid coordination in the Western Balkans, albeit with significant constraints

(Margas, 2010). This is because the EU considers the peace and stability of the Western Balkan countries to be a priority, as these countries have been offered the prospect of EU membership.

The EULEX mission in Kosovo

As it did during the other wars in the former Yugoslavia in the early 90s, the EU remained non-unique and reluctant to act in the Kosovo war in 1998-1999, despite the fact that Kosovo was an almost forewarned conflict. It was the military intervention led by NATO that forced the Yugoslav army and police forces to end the bloodshed and the mass deportation from Kosovo of the Albanian civil population. Right after the end of the war, Kosovo was placed under the administration of the UN, through Resolution 1244 of the United Nations Security Council, adopted on June 10, 1999. The United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), under the authority of the UN Secretary-General's Special Representative (SRSG), took over the interim civilian administration of Kosovo. NATO was responsible for military security and for this purpose deployed a significant military force consisting of approximately 60,000 troops (EUISS, 2009). Despite significant reduction, approximately 3,770 military troops still remain in Kosovo (NATO, 2022). In this process, the EU was given a role, but within the UNMIK mission. The EU was tasked with the issue of reconstruction, considering its willingness to provide financial support in this area. However, the political ownership of the process of post-conflict management of Kosovo was in the hands of the UN (King & Mason, 2006).

After several years under the UNMIK administration, in November 2005, the UN Secretary General appointed the former Finnish president Marti Ahtisaari to work on exploring possibilities to resolve the future status of Kosovo. This mandate opened a two-year process of intensive negotiations held in Vienna (Austria) between Kosovo and Serbia, mediated by the Contact Group - a political body that included France, Germany, Italy, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States (Weller, 2008). Ahtisaari's plan for the future status of Kosovo, known as the 'Ahtisaari Package,' was revealed in March 2007. This plan recommended 'supervised independence' as the only viable option for Kosovo. The plan was supported by Kosovo authorities, as well as the majority of EU member states and the United States. Serbia and Russia, on the other hand, were opposed to the plan.

On February 17, 2008, the Assembly of Kosovo proclaimed the Independence of Kosovo including all the provisions defined in the Ahtisaari Plan within the new Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo. The declaration of independence was followed by recognition by 22 out of the 27 EU member states.

In parallel with the beginning of the negotiation process for the solution of the future status of Kosovo, the Council of Ministers, in December 2005, welcomed a joint report by High Representative Solana and Commissioner Rehn on the 'Role and future contribution of the EU in Kosovo' (Official Journal of the EU, 2006). This report, among other measures, envisaged the need to prepare for a possible integrated ESDP mission in Kosovo in the field of rule of law. An EU planning team to prepare for the mission's successful deployment was established and sent to Prishtina in April 2006 (ibid.).

Common Security and Defense Policy and Kosovo: A critical analysis of the EULEX Mission

Commencement of the mission

Launching the mission in Kosovo seemed a complicated process because not all EU member states supported Kosovo's independence. Thus, just one day after the declaration of independence by the Assembly of Kosovo, the Council of the EU declared that the member states of the EU "(...) will decide in accordance with national practice and international law, on their relations with Kosovo" (Council of the EU, 2008). This way, the Council clarified that EU member states will build bilateral relations with Kosovo in accordance with their national interests. This approach paved the way for consensus among EU member states, allowing the EULEX mission to be launched on time. However, due to the opposition of five member states to recognize the independence of Kosovo, the EULEX mission is obliged to maintain a neutral status towards Kosovo. As can be seen, the very launch of the EULEX mission exposed the old argument that EU member states still have divergent views and interests on various aspects of foreign and security policy. The EU's neutral stance on Kosovo's status, as with the EULEX mission, became the EU's consistent stance on Kosovo from then on.

The EULEX mission was launched in February 2008, following a decision by all 27 EU member states. The mission's operational phase began in December 2008, and full operational capacity was reached in April 2009. EULEX reported to the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy as well as EU Member States through a unified chain of command (EEAS, n.d.). The mission operates under the general framework of UN resolution 1244.

Purpose, legal basis and structure of the mission

The main purpose of the EULEX mission was to assist and support the Kosovo authorities in the area of rule of law, especially in the areas of police, judiciary and customs. The legal basis of this mission derives from the European Council Joint Action 2008/124/CFSP of 4 February 2008, where it is stated that "*EULEX (...) shall assist the Kosovo institutions, judicial authorities and law enforcement agencies in their progress towards sustainability and accountability and in further developing and strengthening an independent and multi-ethnic justice system and a multi-ethnic police and customs service, ensuring that these institutions are free from political interference and adhering to internationally recognized standards and European best practices (...)*" (Council Joint Action, 2008).

The EULEX mission is conceived to be a collaborative endeavor between the EU and the Kosovo authorities, adhering to the notion of local ownership (EUEA, 2014). Therefore, the field work of the mission was carried out through "*monitoring, mentoring and advising whilst retaining some executive responsibilities in specific areas of competence, such as war crimes, organized crime and high-level corruption, terrorism as well as property and privatization cases*" (EULEX Kosovo, n.d.). In terms of personnel, EULEX consisted mainly of judges, prosecutors, police officers and customs officials. The EULEX mission is the largest civilian mission ever launched under the Common Security and Defense Policy of the European Union (Pond, 2008: 97).

Table 1. Information about the EULEX mission

Full mission’s capacity(2009)	1,900 international staff; 1,100 local staff
EU contributing countries	26 countries, except Cyprus
Non-EU countries	6 countries: Canada, Croatia, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey and USA
Annual budget	111 million euros

Source: Wallace et al., 2010: 447; EUISS, 2009.

EULEX was divided into two divisions: the ‘Executive Division’ and the ‘Strengthening Division.’ The Executive Division had the role of investigating, prosecuting and adjudicating sensitive cases using its executive powers. On the other hand, the ‘Strengthening Division’ was active in exercising the role of monitoring, mentoring and advising local authorities in the fields of police, justice and customs (EULEX Kosovo, n.d). In June 2018, the mandate of the mission was extended until June 14, 2020, though being reduced to a monitoring role and with only some limited executive functions retained (EEAS, 2020).

Performance

The mission has performed a sizable number of tasks related to its executive, mentoring, monitoring, and advising responsibilities since its start. Table 2 below reflects some of EULEX’s performance indicators for the period 2008-2014.

Table 2. EULEX activities (2008-2014)

Executive functions	Monitoring, mentoring and advising functions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Over 566 decisions in criminal matters (corruption, organized crime, and war crimes) have been made by EULEX judges; -250 instances of war crimes were investigated, or lawsuits were filed; -Over 40,000 cases of property conflicts have been resolved; -Supported the restoration of the rule of law in the municipalities of northern Kosovo; -Facilitated the integration of 287 Kosovo Serb policemen in the north of Kosovo under the chain of command of the Kosovo Police; -Copied and certified 12,391 books of the original Civil Registry of Kosovo, which were located in Serbia; -Has supported the Kosovo Police in capacity building; -Has facilitated the implementation of the agreement on freedom of movement reached in the Kosovo-Serbia talks in Brussels, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In order to create an impartial, competent, and accountable judicial and prosecutorial system, EULEX has assisted the Kosovo Judicial Council and Kosovo Prosecutorial Council; -Provided professional support to the Kosovo authorities in drafting over 110 laws and by-laws; -Supported the structural changes in the Kosovo Customs; -Has helped the Kosovo authorities prepare operational and staffing plans for the new high security prison in Podujeva, renovate the Mitrovica Detention Center, and increase prison security and inmate participation through positive activities.

Source: EULEX, 2014; Rashiti, 2019.

Common Security and Defense Policy and Kosovo: A critical analysis of the EULEX Mission

During the period of 15 June 2018 to 14 June 2020, the EULEX mission has monitored “784 court sessions in 214 criminal and civil cases (...), war crimes cases, gender-based violence cases, hate crimes, corruption cases, and cases previously dealt with by EULEX” (EEAS, 2020).

The effectiveness of EULEX has been the focus of several academic, media, and political discussions in Kosovo, throughout Europe, and elsewhere. In this regard, it is important to stress that it is challenging and possibly insufficient to ‘measure’ the outcomes of the mission's activity from a quantitative perspective. Because the ‘quantity’ of activities undertaken on the ground does not necessarily reflect the success or failure of EULEX in fulfilling its objectives regarding the rule of law in Kosovo. The broad effects of this mission in Kosovo merit a multifaceted analysis that should not be restricted to the direct activities of the mission's staff, but instead should look at the overall effects that this mission's work in Kosovo has produced in the areas and responsibilities it has been tasked with.

It is important to note that the Kosovar populace has generally expressed great discontent with the mission's work. This is because of the high expectations raised from the very beginning, given the EULEX's broad executive and even exclusive powers to pursue high-profile cases of organized crime and corruption in Kosovo. In the eyes of public opinion in Kosovo, EULEX has not been successful, because not only has it not prosecuted high-profile cases – as EULEX senior officials promised publicly, but after many years of their engagement in Kosovo, the country's perception of the level of corruption in the public sector remains high, as evidenced by the reports of international and local organizations (Rashiti, 2019: 5). According to Rashiti (2019: 4), the failures of this mission are numerous by adding that finding someone who would deem the EULEX mission successful is difficult. According to Bertelsmann Stiftung's 2018 Transformation Index Report (BTI), EULEX's success in fighting corruption has been weak, stressing that “high-ranking corruption cases in particular were not even investigated, which creates an impression of impunity” (BTI, 2018: 34). Similarly, Mahr (2018: 76) points out that if the local population sees international missions like EULEX as ineffective, then this creates “a sense of disappointment and frustration.” In various reports that measure citizens' satisfaction with the work of the institutions in Kosovo, including the EULEX mission, the latter enjoyed a rather low reputation. According to the study conducted by the Kosovo Center for Security Studies, among other law enforcement agencies in Kosovo, EULEX ranked last with only 22 percent of public approval, compared to KFOR which 60%, or the Kosovo Police with 42% (KCSS, 2012). An illustrative case that tarnished the image of the mission and its credibility was the scandal that broke out at the end of 2014, when a EULEX prosecutor accused a judge of this mission of involvement in corrupt practices with accused parties. A direct confrontation on a Kosovo national television, of the EULEX prosecutor, who accused the former judge of the mission of accepting a bribe from the accused, became a topic of debate and an expression of the dissatisfaction of the Kosovar public with the work of the mission (KTV, 2014). The scandal gained the attention of Brussels, and therefore the EU authorities authorized an investigation process within the EULEX mission (The Guardian, 2014). Accordingly, Eduard Kukan, the Member of the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs, in a statement emphasized, “I am concerned that these accusations have already shaken the credibility of the rule of law mission in Kosovo” (EWB, 2014).

Despite the aforementioned issues with this mission's ability to effectively combat corruption and organized crime, nevertheless it may be stated that Kosovo institutions have had significant benefits from the EULEX mission in some segments. EULEX's assistance has contributed to raising the institutional capacity and improving the performance of Kosovar institutions such as Kosovo Customs, the Police, or the judiciary (see, for example, Kosovo Customs, 2016). EULEX has been active - albeit with limited results - in the process of facilitating the integration of parallel Serbian structures in the north within the institutions of the Republic of Kosovo. The mission has also contributed significantly in providing expertise regarding the drafting of Kosovar legislation sponsored by the Ministry of Justice (Rashiti, 2019: 4), thus helping Kosovo to advance the European agenda regarding justice and the rule of law.

Conclusions

The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) has undergone significant transformations over the years in order to adapt to new dynamics and to position the EU as a significant player in the field of foreign and security policy on the international stage. Reactive behavior has been the main characteristic of this progression, which means that only after the change of the political and security context in the EU backyard and beyond, the European Union took more decisive actions to create the legal and institutional framework pertaining to foreign and security policy. Conflicts in the countries of former Yugoslavia as well as other international crises were the driving force that pushed the EU to work on its transformation from a traditional 'soft power' towards becoming an important factor in foreign and security affairs. Although EU member states still display significant differences on various issues of foreign and security policy, nevertheless important steps have been taken so far in creating the legislative infrastructure – through the Treaty of Maastricht, the Treaty of Amsterdam and the Treaty of Lisbon – along with relevant mechanisms for the implementation of defense and security policies.

The EULEX mission in Kosovo represents an important example that will test the EU's abilities in the implementation of these policies on the ground. The mission's success, difficulties or failures in fulfilling its mandate have already become the subject of discussions within EU institutions and the academic community. As a result, the analytical reflections on the work of this mission in Kosovo will be valuable inputs to the EU's efforts to strengthen the European Security and Defense Policy even further.

Authors' Contributions:

The authors contributed 60:40 to this work: Lulzim Krasniqi 60% and Jonuz Abdullai 40%.

References:

- Archer, C. (2008). *The European Union*. New York, Routledge.
- BTI (2018). BTI 2018 Country Report – Kosovo. *Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung*. https://www.ecoi.net/en/file/local/1427391/488286_en.pdf
- Council of the European Union (2008). External Relations Council meeting. *Brussels, 18 February 2008*, 6496/08 (Presse 41).
- Council Joint Action 2008/124/CFSP of 4 February 2008 on the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo, EULEX KOSOVO, 2008. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32008E0124>

Common Security and Defense Policy and Kosovo: A critical analysis of the EULEX Mission

- Dogana e Kosovës (2016). Dogana e Kosovës shënon zhvillim të konsiderueshëm drejt standardeve të pranuar nga BE-ja. <https://dogana.rks-gov.net/dogana-e-kosoves-shenon-zhvillim-te-konsiderueshem-drejt-standardeve-te-pranuara-nga-be-ja/>
- EEAS (n.d). European External Action Service. https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/missions-and-operations_en#11929
- EEAS (2020). European External Action Service. https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eulex-kosovo/eulex-kosovo-european-union-rule-law-mission-kosovo-civilian-mission_en?s=333
- EUEA (2014). European Union External Action. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2014_2019/documents/sede/dv/sede051114factsheeteulexkosovo_/sede051114factsheeteulexkosovo_en.pdf
- EUISS (2009). The European Union Institute for Security Studies. *Paris*. http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/ESDP_10-web.pdf
- EULEX Kosovo (n.d). <http://www.eulex-kosovo.eu/en/info/whatisEulex.php>
- EULEX Kosovo (2014). Implementation of Rule of Law. https://www.eulex-kosovo.eu/eul/repository/docs/missionaccomplishments_2.pdf
- EWB (2014). Eduard Kukan on accusations of EULEX officials in corruption. *European Western Balkans*. <https://europeanwesternbalkans.com/2014/11/03/eduard-kukan-on-accusations-of-eulex-officials-in-corruption/>
- Garland, W. (2005). Engineering Peace - The Military Role in Post conflict Reconstruction. *Washington D.C., United States Institute of Peace Press*.
- Ginsberg, R. (2007). Demystifying the European Union: the Enduring Logic of Regional Integration. *Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc*.
- Hancock, D., Peters, G. (2003). The European Union. In Politics in Europe, ed. by M. Donald Hancock. *Chatham House, chs. 32 (480-497), 33 (498-508), 34 (509-523)*.
- Hix, S., Hoyland, B., (2011). The Political System of the European Union. *London, PELGRAVE MACMILLAN*.
- KCSS (2012). Kosovo Security Barometer. *Kosovo Center for Security Studies, Prishtina*.
- KFOR (n.d.).<http://www.aco.nato.int/kfor/about-us/history.aspx>.
- King, L., Mason, W., (2006). Peace at Any Price, How the World Failed Kosovo. *Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press*.
- KTV (2014). Rubikon - Maria Bamieh vs Francesco Flori. *Koha Vision TV*. <http://www.kohavision.net/video/rubikon/8491/>
- Mahr, E. (2018). Local contestation against the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo. *Contemporary Security Policy, 39:1, 72-94*. DOI: 10.1080/13523260.2017.1407060.
- Margas, V. (2010). Common Security and Defence Policy and the Lisbon Treaty Fudge: No common strategic culture, no major progress. *Working Paper No. 28, European Policy Institute Networks*.
- NATO (2022). Contributing Nations. <https://jfcnaples.nato.int/kfor/about-us/welcome-to-kfor/contributing-nations>
- Official Journal of the European Union (2006). Joint Report by Javier Solana, EU High Representative for CFSP, and Olli Rehn, EU Commissioner for enlargement, 'The future EU role and contribution in Kosovo', 6 December 2005. Council Joint Action 2006/304/CFSP of 10 April 2006 on the establishment of an EU Planning Team (EUP T Kosovo) regarding a possible EU crisis management operation in the field of rule of law and possible other areas in Kosovo. *Official Journal L 112/19, 26 April 2006*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32006E0304>
- Pond, E. (2008). The EU Test in Kosovo. *The Washington Quarterly, 31:4, 2008, pp. 97-112*.

- Rashiti, N. (2019). Ten years after EULEX. Key principles for EU flagship initiatives on the rule of law. *CEPS Paper in Liberty and Security in Europe*. No. 2019-07.
- The Guardian (2014). EU's biggest foreign mission in turmoil over corruption row. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/nov/05/eu-facing-questions-dismissal-prosecutor-alleged-corruption>
- United Nations Security Council, Resolution 1244, 10 June 1999. <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/doc/1244>
- Wallace, H., Polack, M., Young, A. (2010). Policy-Making in the European Union, 6th edition. *Oxford University Press*.
- Weller, M. (2008). Negotiating the final status of Kosovo. Chaillot Paper no. 114. *EU Institute for Security Studies, Paris*.

Article Info

Received: July 27 2022

Accepted: August 12 2022

How to cite this article:

Krasniqi, L., Abdullai, J. (2022). Common Security and Defense Policy and Kosovo: A critical analysis of the EULEX Mission. *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques*, no. 75, pp. 171 – 180.