CPEC and EU Connectivity

25 MAY 2026

Zarnab Shaheen



CPEC and EU Connectivity

Topic:

CPEC and EU Connectivity: Investigating the potential of linkage of China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) with the EU's Global Gateway Initiative to boost trade and relations between Pakistan and the EU

According to the rising narrative, integrating the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) with the EU's Global Gateway Initiative holds immense potential to transform Pakistan into a strategic trade hub, fostering stronger

economic ties between Europe and Asia, while promoting regional development and global connectivity. Pakistan sits at the meeting point of two large economic stories: the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor, which is designed to connect transport and infrastructure links from the Arabian Sea to wWestern China, and the European Union's search for trusted, high-standard connectivity through Global Gateway. From a distance, the proposition seems almost too tidy to resist: a corridor associated with Chinese infrastructure running across Pakistan toward the Arabian Sea, a European strategy built around connectivity and investment, and a country eager to convert geography into economic leverage. If we draw those lines on a map, and the argument appears to solve itself and Pakistan becomes a bridge. On the one hand, China supplies physical infrastructure. , while Europe supplies markets, standards, and capital hence . The consequence is clear: trade accelerates, and investment follows in Pakistan. Therefore, A a regional hinge becomes a wider commercial gateway. Official Pakistani investment materials present CPEC as a corridor designed to link the Arabian Sea end of Pakistan to wWestern China through highways, railways, and pipelines, while the European Commission describes Global Gateway as an EU strategy to build smart, clean, and secure links and to mobilize up to €300 billion in investment through 2027. If Tthe geometry is simple, whereas the politics, institutions, and business realities are not.

That is where a serious narrative has to begin. The real question is not whether the CPEC-Europe idea sounds attractive; it plainly does. Indeed, Tthe real question is whether projects connected to a politically sensitive Chinese corridor i.e. such as Pakistan can be made credible to European actors whose operating logic is built less on geopolitical issue interests, but rather than on rules, disclosures, due diligence and long-term standards compliance. Global Gateway's own language is crystal clear about what the EU thinks it is offering: democratic values and high standards, good governance and transparency, equal partnerships, clean and green investment, security, and private-sector catalysis. Those are not decorative principles, but they are filters. Therefore, Aany argument about Pakistan using corridor infrastructure to deepen European engagement must therefore be framed conditionally.: this It can work only if Pakistan can present bankable, standards-compatible projects that European institutions, lenders, regulators, and firms can defend on commercial and governance grounds. Otherwise, the proposition remains a map room fantasy and elegant on paper but impractical in practice.

This is also why the old history-first approach had to be cut back. Tthe bilateral history between Pakistan and China matters. It matters diplomatically, symbolically, and strategically. A long recital of past friendship can explain why CPEC exists, yet it cannot explain why European investors would participate in or alongside projects related to it. Europe is not being asked to bless a historical relationship. It is being asked, implicitly or explicitly, to judge whether parts of Pakistan's infrastructure and industrial agenda

can meet the requirements of a rules-based investment environment. That is a very different test. It privileges documentation over sentiment, workflow over symbolism, and delivery over narrative. Once the essay is recentered that way, the subject becomes less about grand alignment between East and West and more about something sharper: whether Pakistan can translate physical connectivity into investable credibility.

The strategic appeal is still real, however, and pretending otherwise would flatten the subject. Moreover, Pakistan's location does matter but so does corridor infrastructure itself. O official Pakistani materials continue to describe CPEC not simply as a single road or port concept, but as a wider development framework encompassing transport infrastructure, energy, industrial cooperation, and special economic activity. This at breadth is why the idea continues to attract policy imagination. If transport networks reduce freight uncertainty, if industrial clusters are connected more efficiently to ports and major domestic markets, if power disruptions are reduced, and if export firms can move goods with greater predictability, geography begins to earn money. When freight uncertainty is reduced, industrial clusters are better connected to ports and domestic markets, power disruptions are minimised, and logistical predictability is enhanced, geographic endowments cease to be a structural liability and become a source of economic advantage. However, infrastructure alone is never destiny. Roads do not generate value merely because concrete has been poured, the value comes later, and only if logistics, customs, regulation, finance, and private-sector capability align well enough for firms to use the infrastructure competitively. CPEC's significance, then, lies less in rhetoric about transformation than in whether it can lower the frictions that make trade expensive, slow, and unreliable. However, physical infrastructure generates value not through its construction but through its use, and competitive use depends on the alignment of logistics, customs, regulation, finance, and private-sector capacity. Assessed on these terms, CPEC's significance is ultimately an empirical question: whether it can lower the structural frictions that make Pakistani trade expensive, slow, and unpredictable.

That possibility matters especially because Europe already matters materially to Pakistan's export economy. This prospect is of particular significance given that Europe already constitutes a substantive market for Pakistan's export economy. Hence, O official EU trade data show that the EU was Pakistan's second most important trading partner in 2024, with €12 billion in goods trade, €2.2 billion in services trade in 2023, and textiles and clothing accounting for 75.8% of EU imports from Pakistan in 2024. The same official trade page also emphasizes that Pakistan is the largest beneficiary of the EU's GSP+ arrangement and that more than 88% of Pakistani exports eligible for tariff reductions entered the EU at preferential rates in 2024. Those figures explain why the question is worth asking in the first place. Therefore, Europe is not an abstract option for Pakistan:; it is already a consequential market. The issue is whether corridor linked

infrastructure can help Pakistan do more than send a heavy concentration of textile products into a preferential market. In relation to this, Tthe deeper ambition would be diversification: more value-added manufacturing, better logistics, more resilient supply chains, and a broader set of sectors capable of sustaining trade and attracting investment.

Thisat is where the corridor story becomes economically interesting. Indeed, Iif infrastructure works as intended, it can reduce the number of small failures that quietly weaken competitiveness long before a container reaches a port. It can and shorten uncertain inland journeys. It can also improve grid reliability for industry. It can , make warehousing and multimodal linkages more rational. It can ,help export oriented firms calculate delivery windows with greater confidence. It can also , shape the geography of industrial clustering, by allowing certain regions to become more attractive for processing, assembly, and services tied to trade. None of it fits comfortably into triumphant speeches. Yet this is what investors and exporters actually notice: not whether a corridor sounds historic, but whether it makes operations less erratic. When official EU trade materials point to Pakistan's infrastructure bottlenecks, high costs of doing business, and complex regulation as burdens on trade and growth, they are identifying precisely the terrain on which corridor infrastructure would have to prove its worth. Nevertheless, the infrastructure bottlenecks, elevated costs of doing business, and regulatory complexity that EU trade assessments routinely identify as impediments to Pakistan's trade and growth represent precisely the structural terrain on which corridor infrastructure would need to demonstrate its economic value.

Still, the impressive move in many essays is to stop there to describe the possible upside and allow optimism to substitute for argument. That is not enough. Infrastructure does not become commercially meaningful simply because governments announce it. It becomes meaningful when the surrounding system stops undermining it. A modern Pakistan China corridor needs customs procedures that reflect efficiency at the border. It needs regulatory stability so investors are not pricing arbitrary policy swings into every decision. It needs an industrial ecosystem competent enough to use the corridor for competitive production rather than symbolic development. It needs financial transparency strong enough to prevent every project from being shadowed by doubts about procurement, debt exposure, or political discretion. Moreover, it needs institutions capable of converting a construction story into a trade story. This is the harder middle of the argument, and it is the part grand strategy language usually skips. Yet it is also where the narrative becomes honest in front of the international markets. Yet infrastructure alone is insufficient. Commercial significance does not follow from governmental announcement; it emerges when complementary institutional conditions are in place. A modernised Pakistan-China corridor requires efficient customs procedures, regulatory predictability that does not force investors to price arbitrary policy risk into their decisions, and an

industrial base capable of using the corridor for genuinely competitive production. It also demands financial transparency strong enough to remove the doubts about procurement, debt sustainability, and political discretion that have long shadowed the project. Most critically, it requires institutions capable of translating a construction achievement into a durable trade outcome. This is the analytically demanding middle ground of the argument and the dimension that grand strategic narratives consistently bypass; yet it is where credibility before international markets is ultimately established.

This pertinently matters because Europe is unlikely to "join CPEC" as a political project. Hence, Tthe more plausible scenario is narrower and more practical. European actors may support, finance, insure, advise on, or invest in selected projects in Pakistan that benefit from corridor infrastructure without embracing the corridor's entire geopolitical symbolism. Thisat is an important distinction because the Global because global Ggateway is sectoral and based on international trading standards. For instance, Iit focuses on digital, climate and energy, transport, health, and education and research. Its principles are also explicitly tied to transparency, governance, security, and private-sector mobilization. Seen through thisat framework, the overlap with Pakistan is not a sweeping strategic merger however, it is , but a portfolio logic. Where corridor linked opportunities can be translated into clean, legible projects that meet EU expectations, there is room for engagement. Where they cannot, European participation becomes far less likely. The question, then, is not *"Will Europe endorse CPEC?"* but "Which corridor-adjacent opportunities can Pakistan redesign in a form Europe can touch?". European engagement is contingent on Pakistan's capacity to structure corridor-linked opportunities into transparent, well-defined projects that meet EU standards; where that capacity is absent, participation becomes unlikely. Therefore, the real question is not whether Europe will endorse CPEC, but which corridor-adjacent opportunities can be sufficiently redesigned to meet the conditions under which European involvement becomes viable.

Official EU materials on Pakistan suggest that this overlap already exists in embryonic form, though not in the dramatic way corridor advocacy often imagines. On the EU's Pakistan country page, the current partnership is defined above all by green inclusive growth, youth skills, governance, migration cooperation, and climate resilience. The same page identifies concrete areas of work: renewable energy in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Gilgit-Baltistan, climate-resilient rural reconstruction after flooding, improved drinking water systems in major cities, greener and more competitive small businesses, public financial management, and the creation of a stronger investment project pipeline. A dedicated Global Gateway flagship page for Pakistan goes further, describing projects that support hydropower, micro-hydro plants, irrigation systems, afforestation, and vocational education and training across vulnerable regions. What this reveals is crucial: the EU is already active in Pakistan through a development-and-investment logic that

favors resilience, skills, governance, and practical infrastructure. However, That this is not the same thing as signing onto the full political mythology of CPEC. It is exactly the kind of engagement that a credible corridor strategy could complement. Such engagement is distinct from an endorsement of the broader political mythology attached to CPEC, and constitutes precisely the form of interest-based participation that a credible corridor strategy could be structured to complement.

SimilarlyIn addition, the same pattern appears in finance. On April 29, 2026, the European Investment Bank's development arm announced €160 million for Pakistan: €100 million for flood-damaged housing reconstruction and €60 million for drinking water filtration infrastructure. The announcement matters not merely because of the amount, but because of its logic. The financing returned the EIB to Pakistan after a decade, and the projects were framed as part of the Global Gateway, which is the EU's external investment strategy for sustainable development. This is revealing. reveals that Europe's development-finance institutions are not leading with geopolitical slogans, slogan, s; but they are leading with housing, water, resilience, and practical social infrastructure. That This tells us something about the kind of story Pakistan can credibly tell to Europe. Hence, while A ambitious corridor rhetoric may attract headlines, but bankable resilience projects, urban water systems, skills development, and green infrastructure are more likely to attract institutions that answer to boards, taxpayers, and increasingly demanding regulatory frameworks. In other words, the most realistic bridge between corridor logic and European finance may be built through what looks, at first glance, less glamorous than a megaproject.

The April 28 and 29, 2026 EU Pakistan Business Forum reinforced that reading. Official EU materials for the f Forum and its launch did not reflect a theatrical pitch about civilizational alignment, but a deliberately commercial agenda: investment showcases, policy dialogue, business-to-government engagement, matchmaking, and sector sessions on agribusiness, digital innovation and fintech, green logistics and connectivity, sustainable textiles, and responsible mining. The event launched the EU Pakistan Business Network, described as a platform bringing together more than 300 EU companies active in Pakistan, and the launch press release said discussions would focus on turning strong trade ties into increased investment flows, technology partnerships, innovation, and sustainable industrial growth. This is the texture of real economic engagement. It is transactional, sector-specific, and structured around reform, projects, and business climate conditions. For a rewritten essay, that matters enormously. It shifts the argument away from a vague theory of East-West synergy and toward the practical sector mix in which that synergy might actually materialize. Such engagement is transactional, sector-specific, and conditioned on reform, project quality, and business environment. Analytically, this distinction is significant: it displaces a generalised theory of East-West convergence in

favour of a more grounded account of the specific sectoral conditions under which that convergence might realistically occur.

Among those sectors, sustainable textiles deserve particular attention. Pakistan already has an entrenched export base in textiles and clothing; with official EU trade data showing show just how dominant that this category remains in exports to Europe. That This concentration is both a strength and a vulnerability. On the one hand it gives It gives Pakistan an established commercial foothold, but it also means the country remains exposed to concentration risk, pricing pressure, and the environmental and labor scrutiny that increasingly shape European supply chains. A more sophisticated essay therefore cannot simply say that Europe buys Pakistani textiles and stop there. It has to ask what kind of textile future Europe will reward. The answer, increasingly, is one tied to energy efficiency, traceability, labor compliance, water stewardship, and upgrading rather than volume alone. A corridor that makes input movement and export logistics more efficient could support that shift but only if the underlying firms and regulatory systems can satisfy the standards logic attached to continued preferential access and responsible sourcing. This is where logistics, industrial upgrading, and compliance begin to merge into a single story. An analytically adequate treatment of this relationship must move beyond the observation that Europe purchases Pakistani textiles and engage with the question of which textile trajectory European markets will continue to incentivise. The answer is increasingly structured around energy efficiency, traceability, labour standards, water stewardship, and upgrading rather than volume. Corridor infrastructure could facilitate this transition by improving input logistics and export efficiency, but only if firm-level capabilities and regulatory systems can meet the standards conditionality governing preferential access and responsible sourcing. This is the point at which logistics, industrial upgrading, and compliance cease to be discrete concerns and become components of a single structural argument.

Digital services and skills provision offer a parallel case. The EU's Pakistan partnership materials emphasize youth skills, vocational training, and support for more competitive small businesses, while the Global Gateway flagship page describes TVET investments intended to strengthen vocational education systems, upgrade schools, and expand centers of excellence, including opportunities relevant to returnee migrants. Meanwhile, T the business forum , meanwhile, explicitly featured digital innovation and fintech. These details carry analytical weight because they expand the argument beyond the physical infrastructure logic that has traditionally defined corridor discourse. Modern connectivity strategy is simultaneously physical, human, and digital in character, and Pakistan cannot credibly address European partners by treating road and port development as the entirety of its case. What is required is a demonstration of how physical connectivity articulates with skilled labour supply, digital infrastructure, export services, and compliance-ready firms. Ultimately, Pakistan's most

compelling offer to Europe may be one that situates a transport corridor, an energy link, a vocational centre, a digital service provider, and an export-capable SME within a single, integrated competitiveness narrative.These details matter because they widen the essay beyond the traditional corridor imagination of roads, ports, and containers. A modern connectivity strategy is not just physical. It is also human and digital. If Pakistan wants corridor infrastructure to matter to Europe, it cannot treat roads as the entire story. It has to show how physical connectivity interacts with skilled labor, digital systems, export services, and compliance-ready firms. The country's most convincing pitch to Europe may therefore be one in which a road, a power link, a vocational center, a digital service provider, and an export-ready SME all belong to the same chain of competitiveness.

This is also the point at which the old factual confusion about GSP+ and Global Gateway has to be corrected with absolute clarity. GSP+ is not a sub program of Global Gateway. They are different instruments with different logics. Global Gateway is a connectivity and investment strategy. GSP+ is a trade preference arrangement. This is also the point at which a persistent conceptual confusion must be corrected unambiguously. GSP+ and Global Gateway are neither interchangeable nor hierarchically related; they are distinct instruments governed by different institutional logics and policy objectives. While the Global Gateway is a strategic investment and connectivity framework, GSP+ is a conditional trade preference arrangement. Conflating the two produces analytical errors with direct consequences for how Europe's economic engagement with Pakistan is understood. Official EU trade pages state that Pakistan has benefited from GSP+ since 2014 and that maintaining it requires continued ratification and effective implementation of 27 core international conventions covering human rights, labor rights, environmental protection, and good governance. The Commission's broader GSP page adds that GSP+ is a special incentive arrangement for sustainable development and good governance, that beneficiary countries must cooperate with monitoring, and that implementation is reviewed continuously through dialogue, visits, and reporting. GSP+ is not proof that Europe will finance corridor infrastructure. It is a proof that Europe links market access to compliance and monitoring. Pakistan's most important existing economic bridge to Europe is already conditional. Any deeper investment relationship would almost certainly be at least as demanding. This demonstrates that Europe systematically conditions market access on compliance and ongoing monitoring. Therefore, Pakistan's most significant existing economic relationship with Europe is already structured around conditionality, and any deepening of this relationship through investment or enhanced trade would in all likelihood be subject to demands at least as stringent.

Once that correction is in place, the constraints section stops being a gloomy add-on and becomes central to the argument. Governance is not a side issue is the issue that determines whether European interest can

survive first contact with project documentation. Global Gateway defines itself around transparency, good governance, equal partnerships, environmental and social standards, and private-sector mobilization. The EU's own Pakistan trade page, in turn, points to complex regulation, infrastructure bottlenecks, and high costs of doing business as existing barriers to trade and growth. Those two texts, read together, give a clear editorial lesson: an essay that wants Europe to care about corridor-linked projects must confront the governance gap directly. That means procurement clarity, stable rules, credible safeguards, predictable implementation, and a pipeline of projects structured at a level that lenders and companies can evaluate without relying on political reassurance. The more opaque a project feels, the less likely it is to travel well into a European decision-making process. With this clarification in place, the governance constraints cease to be a supplementary caveat and become constitutive of the central argument. Governance is not a peripheral concern; it is the variable that determines whether European interest can survive first contact with project-level documentation. Global Gateway is explicitly premised on transparency, good governance, equitable partnerships, and environmental and social standards, while EU assessments of Pakistan's trade environment identify regulatory complexity, infrastructure deficits, and high transaction costs as primary structural barriers. This means that an argument for European engagement with corridor-linked projects must confront the governance gap head-on, addressing procurement clarity, regulatory predictability, credible safeguards, and a project pipeline legible enough for lenders and firms to evaluate on technical rather than political grounds. Projects that cannot meet this threshold of institutional transparency are unlikely to travel well through European decision-making processes.

Corporate compliance sharpens that point even further. The European Commission states that the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive entered into force on July 25, 2024, and that companies in scope must identify and address adverse human-rights and environmental impacts across their operations and global value chains. That is not a technical footnote. It This is a major reason why European firms cannot treat overseas projects as politically interesting but procedurally vague. For Pakistani policymakers and essayists alike, the implication is straightforward: if a project is being pitched to European investors or corporations, compliance architecture is part of the commercial proposition. Labor conditions, environmental effects, traceability, partner risk, and grievance mechanisms are no longer ancillary reputational issues. They are increasingly tied to law, disclosure, and board-level exposure. In practical terms, this means that the more Pakistan wants European participation, the more it must package projects in forms compatible with due diligence, environmental review, and long-term accountability. Europe may still take risk. It is less likely to take unstructured risk. Labour standards, environmental impacts, traceability, partner risk, and grievance mechanisms are now substantively

integrated into legal obligations, disclosure requirements, and board-level accountability. The practical implication is considerable: to the extent that Pakistan seeks deeper European participation, it must increasingly package projects in forms that satisfy due diligence standards, environmental review criteria, and long-term accountability expectations. European partners may remain willing to assume risk, but the threshold condition is that such risk be structured, documented, and institutionally legible.

Security remains the other hard edge of the argument, and serious rewriting cannot blur it. Official British government travel advice continues to warn against all travel to Balochistan and describes high risks from kidnapping and militant activity there. That This matters because security is not just a headline problem; it is a pricing problem, an insurance problem, a staffing problem, and a reputational problem. European actors weigh personnel safety, project continuity, and exposure risk with much less tolerance for improvisation than public rhetoric often assumes. Therefore, any Any corridor narrative that leans on strategic ports or western routes without acknowledging the security environment is incomplete. The lesson is not that European engagement is impossible. It is that security risk narrows the menu of plausible engagement and raises the value of projects that are institutionally manageable, geographically realistic, and easier to monitor. An essay that ignores this ends up sounding not bold, but unserious.

So what , then, should Pakistan actually do if it wants corridor infrastructure to become more useful to Europe? The first answer is conceptual: stop selling the slogan and start selling the shortlist. The practical question that emerges from this analysis is what Pakistan should concretely do if it seeks to make corridor infrastructure meaningful to European partners. The first and most fundamental imperative is conceptual: to replace broad strategic sloganeering with a selective, credible, and well-structured project portfolio capable of sustaining European scrutiny. Hence, Tthe most plausible path is not a sweeping *"CPEC meets Europe"* banner, but a portfolio of discrete, standards-compatible projects, green logistics, sustainable textiles, climate-resilient infrastructure and urban water systems. Sectors such as renewable energy, export-linked skills development, project-preparation and public finance reform, and digital services and fintech are not a scaled-down substitute for a grand connectivity narrative. Hence, they are the concrete operational terrain on which that narrative must ultimately be tested. Their alignment with priorities that recur in EU official frameworks and business-forum agendas suggests not merely compatibility but strategic convergence. Specificity, under these conditions, performs a dual analytical function: it lowers the burden of rhetorical justification while simultaneously raising the threshold of substantive engagement, shifting the terms of the conversation from declaratory ambition to evaluable commitment.Renewable energy. Skills and vocational platforms linked to export growth. Public-finance and project-preparation reforms that make a pipeline easier to finance. Digital services and fintech where connectivity

and skills can reinforce one another. These are not glamorous substitutes for a megaproject narrative; they are the realistic operating units through which a broader strategy becomes believable. They are also strongly aligned with the actual priorities visible in EU official documents and business-forum programming. The more specific the offer, the lower the rhetorical temperature and the higher the credibility.

Moreover, Pakistan would need to present not only projects, but processes. To European partners need to see how procurement decisions are made, how environmental and social risks are assessed, how project preparation is handled, how business climate reforms reduce friction, and how export-oriented firms are being helped to upgrade. The EU's Pakistan country page is striking in this regard because it explicitly ties partnership to governance, public financial management, and the development of a more mature investment project pipeline. That is not incidental language. It This indicates the kind of groundwork Europe sees as necessary for deeper engagement. If Islamabad wants corridor assets to draw wider participation, it will need to do the patient work that converts political ambition into institutional reassurance. That includes making make reforms legible, and not merely announceing them; building continuity, not merely launching initiatives; and proving that project quality is not contingent on a single speech, summit, or memorandum. Credibility accumulates through boring excellence.

Consequently, A a smarter version of the original argument, then, does not ask Pakistan to choose theatrically between China and Europe. It asks Pakistan to make itself intelligible to both without allowing either relationship to substitute for domestic execution. China-linked infrastructure can supply physical assets, routes, and industrial possibilities. On the other hand, Europe can supply market access, development finance, standards pressure, technology partnerships, and a rules-based investment logic that rewards compliance. These are complementary rather than competing contributions, but neither party will perform Pakistan's institutional work as a substitute. The connection between corridor ambition and European engagement will not be forged through declarations about geographic positioning; if it materialises at all, it will do so through improved procurement, disciplined project preparation, regulatory predictability, robust skills systems, credible compliance, and the strategic discipline to present a limited number of well-structured projects rather than an all-encompassing geopolitical vision. The modesty of this prescription is precisely what renders it credible. . These are not mutually exclusive contributions but neither side will do Pakistan's institutional work on its behalf. The bridge between corridor ambition and European engagement will not be built by rhetoric about strategic location alone. It will be built, if at all, by better procurement, cleaner project preparation, steadier regulation, stronger skills systems, more reliable compliance, and a willingness to present a modest number of

defensible projects instead of an all-encompassing geopolitical story. That may sound less grand however, it is also much more plausible.

Maps are enabling conditions, not guaranteed outcomes, and corridor logic alone will not determine Pakistan's relationship with Europe. CPEC creates genuine physical possibilities, and the EU's established role as market, policy partner, and development actor provides a real foundation for engagement. However, neither justifies a triumphalist reading. The defensible conclusion is more demanding: Pakistan can make corridor infrastructure relevant to Europe only by converting geographic position into institutional trust, ambition into compliance, and narrative into proof. On the other hand, Europe needs evidence that Pakistan's projects are transparent, commercially serious, and governable. Where this threshold is met, engagement becomes possible; where it is not, geography alone will not compensate.In the end, the map still matters and so do es the geography and the geopolitical corridor. However, maps are only invitations; they are not outcomes. Pakistan's opportunity lies in refusing both easy cynicism and easy celebration. CPEC does create physical possibilities. European engagement is not a fantasy. The EU is already a major market, a significant policy partner, and an active development and investment actor in Pakistan. Yet none of that justifies a triumphalist conclusion. The honest conclusion is narrower, harder, and ultimately stronger: Pakistan can make corridor infrastructure useful to Europe, but only by translating location into trust, projects into standards, and ambition into proof. Europe does not need CPEC to become "its" corridor in order to engage with Pakistan. It needs to see enough evidence that the projects associated with Pakistan's broader connectivity agenda are transparent, resilient, commercially serious, and governable. If Pakistan can do that, the bridge to Europe will not be built out of slogans but with credibility.

Hence, a deeper economic engagement with the EU will allow Pakistan to diversify its trade relationships, **reduce dependency**, and improve its bargaining power in international trade negotiations. The collaboration could also lead to better governance practices, stronger **environmental sustainability efforts**, and improved infrastructure standards that align with international norms.

Additionally, enhanced connectivity between **South Asia, Central Asia, and Europe** could promote **regional stability, reduce geopolitical tensions, and open new diplomatic avenues**. By capitalizing on this strategic alignment, Pakistan has the potential to establish itself as a **trade and economic hub leading via the CPEC**, bridging the East and the West in the evolving global economic landscape.

DOI 10.69790/epis10.56820