

Towards a new partnership between the European Union and the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries after 2020

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

This is the form to post your contribution on the Joint Consultation Paper issued by the European Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.

Contributor

* You are/represent

- ☐ a public authority / international organisation
- ☐ an association
- ☐ a think tank
- ☒ a civil society organisation
- ☐ a company
- ☐ a citizen

* Your name and/or name of your organisation

ACP Civil Society Forum

* Country of residence or location of headquarters

Belgium

* E-mail

joycenaar@gmail.com

Identification number in the Transparency Register (if applicable)

36703913506-85

* Your contribution

can be directly published with your personal/organisation information. You consent to publication of all information in your contribution in whole or in part including your

- ☒ name/the name of your organisation, and you declare that nothing within your response is unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent publication.

can be directly published provided that you/your organisation remain(s) anonymous. You consent to publication of any information in your contribution in whole or in part - which

- ☐ may include quotes or opinions you express - provided that this is done anonymously. You declare that nothing within your response is unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent publication.

cannot be directly published but may be included within statistical data. You understand that your contribution will not be directly published, but that your anonymised responses

- ☐ may be included in published statistical data, for example, to show general trends in the response to this consultation. Note that your answers may be subject to a request for public access to documents under Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

Common global interests in a multi-polar world

1. To which degree has the partnership been effective in tackling global challenges?

The partnership has not been effective in tackling the global challenges for ACP, which are to industrialise, to process, transport and export its own raw materials and commodities.

2. What would be needed to strengthen results in this respect and on which global challenges could the partnership add most value in the future, in the context of the new SDGs framework and in relevant international fora?

What is needed is a partnership that contributes to the need of ACP Countries to industrialise, to process, to transport and export their raw materials and commodities. The partnership could add most value in the future to the global challenges concerning industrialisation, export, infrastructure, good roads, railways, harbours, transport, electricity, water, agriculture, food security, trade, climate change, decent jobs, income and housing. In all relevant fora, especially UN and WTO.

Human rights, democracy and rule of law, as well as good governance

3. Have the mechanisms provided for in the Cotonou Partnership Agreement (CPA) (i.e. political dialogue, financial support, appropriate measures, suspension of the agreement) achieved meaningful improvements on human rights, democracy, rule of law and good governance, including the fight against corruption? Should the future partnership do more in this regard, and in what way?

These mechanisms in the CPA do not tackle the violation of human rights of ACP nationals and descendants in EU member states, racism and discrimination, corruption. The future partnership should address these concerns in the EU. The European Ombudsman should also be mandated to investigate complaints about maladministration in EU-ACP cooperation.

4. Has the involvement of local authorities and non-state actors (i.e. civil society organisations, the media), national parliaments, courts and national human rights institutions in the partnership been adequate and useful to promote human rights, democracy and rule of law as well as good governance? Could they contribute more and in what way?

Despite the provisions in the CPA the partnership did not involve local authorities and non-state actors, national parliaments, courts and national human rights institutions. For the involvement of civil society organizations in the EU-ACP cooperation the ACP Civil Society Forum was established in 2001 and never funded nor involved. The First ACP Civil Society Forum was organized in Centre Borschette in July 2001, in Brussels, Belgium, by the European Commission, ACP Secretariat and the Belgian EU Presidency. Final Report Outcome of the meetings of the ACP and ACP-EU Civil Society Forum in Brussels from 2nd-7th July 2001 (the document ACP-EU CONFERENCE ON THE PARTICIPATION OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COTONOU AGREEMENT ON 6TH - 7TH JULY 2001 IN BRUSSELS) said that "the process of structured dialogue among all the actors concerned is unprecedented in the history of European cooperation with ACP countries. The fact that the initiative and impetus for organising such a consultation process came originally from both the ACP Secretariat and the Belgian presidency of the European Union has sent a clear signal to ACP civil society actors that the Conference was underscored by a firm commitment to adopt a participatory approach to cooperation". 2001 - 2004: ACP CSF had meetings on financial modalities and the like, none of which materialised.

Set up of a ACP CSF follow-up Committee which worked with the ECDPM on the famous booklet entitled "The Cotonou Agreement: A User's guide for Non-State Actors". It is in permanent distribution throughout the Commission and its Delegation offices.

The documents of the First ACP CS Forum in 2001 and the Non State Actors Guide : 'One of the results of the (July 2001) Conference on the Participation of Civil Society in the implementation of the Cotonou Agreement is the elaboration of the ACP Civil Society Plan of Action. It was organised by the Belgian Presidency and the ACP Secretariat in July 2001 in Brussels. This document was then endorsed during the 27th ACP-EC Council of Ministers meeting in Punta Cana. '. (NSA Users Guide ANNEX

VII ACP Civil Society Forum, page 126 and 127 of the Non State Actors guide, compiled by ECDPM and published by the ACP Secretariat, Brussels, Belgium, copyright 2003).

Non State Actors guide, page 126 and 127, ACP Civil Society Forum

[http://www.ecdpm.org/Web_ECDPM/Web/Content/Download.nsf/0/B6D843028A0F0D0DC1256F70004D5B0A/\\$FILE/NSA%20Users%20Guide%20\(E\)%20Annexes%20IV_V_VI_VII_version%205_CTA.pdf](http://www.ecdpm.org/Web_ECDPM/Web/Content/Download.nsf/0/B6D843028A0F0D0DC1256F70004D5B0A/$FILE/NSA%20Users%20Guide%20(E)%20Annexes%20IV_V_VI_VII_version%205_CTA.pdf)

The 27th ACP-EC Council of Ministers meeting endorsed the ACP CSF Declaration and Action Plan in Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, in June 2004.

The 2nd ACP Civil Society Forum meeting was organized in 2006 in Brussels. The 3rd ACP CSF Forum, organized in Brussels in December 9-11, 2009) at the ACP Secretariat and funded by the European Commission, resulted in the adoption of the 3rd ACP CSF Declaration, official documents from the ACP Secretariat in French and English. Chairman of the 3rd ACP CSF is Mr. Lawman Lynch (Jamaica, Caribbean), assisted by ACP CSF representatives and focal points in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific, ACP CSF legal advisor Joyce Naar in Brussel and ACP CSF Mr. Roosevelt KING as ACP CSF Policy Advisor responsible for the ACP CSF network and Secretariat established a network among the ACP CSF CSOs in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific for information sharing and capacity building. <https://acpcsforum.igloocommunities.com/>

At the request of the ACP Secretariat and European Commission a study was conducted about the ACP CSF and the Final Report of the Study on the ACP Civil Society Forum, Framework Contract BENEf 2009, Lot 7- Governance and Home Affairs, EuropeAid /127054/C/SER/Multi, Specific Contract n°2012/310569, came out in August 2013, Project financed by European Union. The report was never implemented by the European Commission and the ACP Secretariat.

The report recommended that the ACP secretariat and the EC should strengthen ACP CSF.

Despite the report ordered and financed by the Commission and the provisions in the Cotonou Agreement, ACP CSF and ACP CSOs were not equipped with and have not been able to access the resources since 2000. Article 6 of the Cotonou Agreement empowers the ACP CSOs to be actively involved in the programming, implementation and review. Although it is there legally, ACP CSOs have not been receiving funding, whereas they are key for the success of all programming.

5. Are the provisions on peace and security in the CPA appropriate and useful and has the balance between regional and ACP involvement been effective?

The focus should be on Peace and security in the whole world and not only in ACP countries.

6. Should the future partnership provide for more effective joint action on conflict prevention, including early warning and mediation, peace-building and state-building activities, as well as on tackling transnational security challenges? Should this be done in the EU-ACP context?

Most effective will be to prevent and to stop wars in global context.

Sustainable and inclusive economic growth, investment and trade

7. How effective has the partnership been in promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development?

The partnership has not been effective in promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, taking into account that 40 of the 80 ACP countries are still the majority of 50 Least Developed Countries, lacking basic infrastructure, electricity, water, food security, health care, decent jobs, decent income, fair trade, transport, rabours, railways, airways, industrialisation, processing, distribution, marketing, ICT, no equal share in Intellectual Property Rights. The development of agriculture, industrialisation and exports of all ACP countries are hindered by rules, standards, trade and non trade barriers, domestic support and agreements imposed upon them by the economic powers and WTO.

8. Taking into account the new SGDs framework, should the future partnership do more in this respect, and what?

The future partnership should implement the SDGs in EU and in ACP countries on the basis of the commitments. EU has committed in SDG 17.10 to conclude the Doha Development Round and should not go along with those in WTO who want to end the Doha Development Round. All countries are committed through SDG 17.10 to conclude the DDA.

The future partnership should implement all SGDs and regarding Trade SDG 17. 10, 11:

SDG 17.10 Promote a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organization, including through the conclusion of negotiations under its Doha Development Agenda.

SDG 17.11 Significantly increase the exports of developing countries, in particular with a view to doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020.

SDG 17.12 Realize timely implementation of duty-free and quota-free market access on a lasting basis for all least developed countries, consistent with World Trade Organization decisions, including by ensuring that preferential rules of origin applicable to imports from least developed countries are transparent and simple, and contribute to facilitating market access.

9. How effective has the partnership been in supporting macroeconomic and financial stability? In which areas would there be added value in ACP-EU cooperation on macroeconomic and financial stability?

EU should focus on its own economic and financial problems. ACP countries are independent countries.

10. How effective has the partnership been in improving domestic revenue mobilisation, in promoting fair and efficient tax systems and in combatting illicit financial flows? Would there be added value and more efficiency in stronger ACP-EU cooperation on these matters?

There is no added value in stronger ACP-EU cooperation on these matters. ACP countries are independent countries.

11. Has the partnership been able to contribute substantially to mobilising the private sector and attracting foreign direct investment?

The partnership has not been able to do mobilise the private sector and to attract foreign direct investment; the ACP business Forum was established in 2002 but disappeared soon, private sector was not involved, foreign direct investment was not attracted. In contrary EU measures hampered foreign direct investment, such as the blacklisting of the EU of 23 ACP States, among which Mauritius, Seychelles, Barbados and other ACP Countries (14 Caribbean countries, 4 African and 5 Pacific Countries) as among 30 world's worst tax havens, strongly objected by the ACP states, regional organisations and institutions such as OECD:
<http://timescaribbeanonline.com/2015/06/20/oecd-responds-to-eus-blacklist/>
<http://www.jamaicaobserver.com/news/CARICOM--strongly-objects--to-EU-tax-haven-blacklist>

12. How could the potential of the EU and ACP private sector be better harnessed? What should be the main focus of EU and ACP private sector cooperation in a post-Cotonou framework, and what might be the role of ODA in this?

By taking into account the needs of the ACP Private sector, greater in-country cooperation with and assistance to the private sector instead of opting for regional structures, which are too bureaucratic and public service oriented.

13. In this setting, what opportunities do you see for the new, digital economy?

There are important opportunities, participation in the digital economy is for an increasing number of businesses, becoming a matter of economic necessity. Most businesses now realise that to remain competitive and to conduct business efficiently, they must adopt electronic means for business processes. However in EU only two percent of European enterprises are currently taking full advantage of new digital opportunities. The huge potential of the digital economy is underexploited in Europe, with 41% of enterprises being non-digital
http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/digital-economy/importance/index_en.htm
That means that EU will not be able to assist ACP countries to take full advantage of the digital economy.

14. To what extent has the partnership been able to contribute to increase agricultural development and trade?

The Partnership has not been able to contribute to increase agricultural development and trade. The key issues for ACP countries still are:

- Concluding the Doha Development Round and Agenda (DDA).
- Demands to reform agriculture in order to achieve considerable progressive cutbacks in agricultural support and protection by developed countries.
- Meaningful market access through duty-free, quota-free (DFQF) treatment for all goods originating from LDCs.
- "Singapore issues" (investment, intellectual property, transparency in government procurement, competition) are not brought back in the DDA.
- Special and Differential Treatment (S&DT) monitoring mechanism is operationalised with the ability to make recommendations to the applicable technical bodies.
- Demand for effective operationalization of LDC services waiver to permit significant preferential access to LDC services and services suppliers.
- All forms of export subsidies for cotton are eliminated by the rich industrialized countries and additionally offer Duty Free Quota Free access for cotton exports from LDCs.
- Food security and sovereignty concerns are addressed in agriculture and that a permanent solution is sought on Public Stock Holding and extended to all 'developing' countries.
- LDCs retain adequate policy space to design and implement policies for their transformation especially in light of mixed undertakings outside the WTO that are continuously undermining preferences afforded to LDCs.

15. What has been the contribution of the partnership trade preferences to the integration of ACP countries in the world economy and to its development goals?

The Partnership trade preferences should enable ACP countries to export some of their products duty free quota free to the EU markets. But the partnership trade preferences are eroded by trade agreements and deals between EU, Asia, Latin America, US, Canada and other countries. The partnership trade preferences are not contributing to the integration of ACP countries in the world economy and to its development goals due to this trade preferences erosion.

16. Is there still a need for specific provisions on trade cooperation in the post-Cotonou framework, also taking into account the ACP countries which have not signed an EPA? If so, what could/should they cover?

There is a need for specific provisions on trade cooperation in the post Cotonou framework for all ACP countries. They should cover:

- Concluding the Doha Development Round and Agenda (DDA).
- Demands to reform agriculture in order to achieve considerable progressive cutbacks in agricultural support and protection by developed countries.
- Meaningful market access through duty-free, quota-free (DFQF) treatment for all goods originating from LDCs.
- “Singapore issues” (investment, intellectual property, transparency in government procurement, competition) are not brought back in the DDA.
- Special and Differential Treatment (S&DT) monitoring mechanism is operationalised with the ability to make recommendations to the applicable technical bodies.
- Demand for effective operationalization of LDC services waiver to permit significant preferential access to LDC services and services suppliers.
- All forms of export subsidies for cotton are eliminated by the rich industrialized countries and additionally offer Duty Free Quota Free access for cotton exports from LDCs.
- Food security and sovereignty concerns are addressed in agriculture and that a permanent solution is sought on Public Stock Holding and extended to all ‘developing’ countries.
- LDCs retain adequate policy space to design and implement policies for their transformation especially in light of mixed undertakings outside the WTO that are continuously undermining preferences afforded to LDCs

Human and social development

17. Has the partnership delivered on its human development objective in an effective and efficient way, in particular on poverty eradication, and also concerning gender equality and empowerment of women? How could it be improved?

The partnership has not delivered on its human development objective in an effective and efficient way, in particular on poverty eradication, and also concerning gender equality and empowerment of women. The partnership started in 1957 with a trade preferential system and European Development Fund, and 70 years later, in 2015, half of the 80 ACP countries, 40 ACP countries, still are Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Out of 50 LDCs in the World, 40 are ACP Countries!! The partnership has not supported the ACP countries to industrialise, to process, transport and export its own raw materials and commodities, to develop its agriculture and to support its food security in order to have decent jobs and decent income, housing, water, electricity and food for the populations (women and men) of the ACP countries. How could it be improved: by supporting the industrialisation and exports of ACP countries, no more dumping of EU products in ACP countries, by preventing wars and conflicts and not selling arms to ACP countries and other countries in the world, by fair trade

18. Taking into account the new SDGs framework, what are the main challenges related to human development that the future partnership should focus on?

The future partnership should implement all SDGs especially:

SDG 17.10 Promote a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organization, including through the conclusion of negotiations under its Doha Development Agenda.

SDG 17.11 Significantly increase the exports of developing countries, in particular with a view to doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020.

SDG 17.12 Realize timely implementation of duty-free and quota-free market access on a lasting basis for all least developed countries, consistent with World Trade Organization decisions, including by ensuring that preferential rules of origin applicable to imports from least developed countries are transparent and simple, and contribute to facilitating market access.

Migration and mobility

19. Has the partnership been a useful vehicle for discussing migration issues and has it positively contributed? Has Article 13 CPA been fully applied?

We are concerned that ACP has to pay the price for a EU refugees problem which ACP did not cause. EU is using art. 13 Cotonou Agreement to solve their problem with refugees from Syria and Afghanistan. ACP countries and their nationals are the victims! Hiding behind Cotonou has to be rejected since the crisis is one of refugees by a war the West has supported.

20. Should a future partnership do more in this regard, and on which particular aspects should it focus (legal migration and mobility, addressing root causes of migration, return and readmission, tackling human trafficking and smuggling, international protection)?

The future partnership should not impose more commitments on ACP countries.

A stronger political relationship

21. How effective has the political dialogue been and at which level is it the most effective: national, regional and through the joint EU-ACP institutions? Should the scope of political dialogue be widened or narrowed?

Political Dialogue between ACP and EU Heads of States is needed.

22. Would a stronger involvement of EU Member States, associating their bilateral policies and instruments to the political dialogue at national level, enhance the dialogue's effectiveness and efficiency?

Dialogue between ACP states and EU Member States is needed.

23. Has the fact that the agreement is legally binding been instrumental to its implementation as compared to other regional partnerships based on political declarations?

The fact that the agreement is legally binding has not been instrumental to its implementation regarding the involvement and funding of non state actors.

Coherence of geographical scope

24. Could a future framework be usefully opened up to other countries than the current members of the ACP Group of States? Which countries would that be?

A future framework opened up to other countries than the current members of the ACP Group of States would not be useful. The focus should be on intra ACP cooperation.

25. What kind of framework should govern EU and ACP relations? How could an ACP-EU successor framework relate to the more recent EU regional partnerships with Africa, Caribbean and Pacific States? Could a future ACP-EU framework include distinct partnerships with regional partners?

The framework that should govern EU and ACP relations should be more focused on intra ACP cooperation.

26. Is there scope for building in more structured relationships with Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and North Africa?

EU and ACP have structured relations with Asia, Latin America, Middle East and North Africa. They should not bring that into the partnership.

Cooperation tailored more towards groups of countries with similar development level

27. Is the current system of allocation of development resources, based on need and capacities as well as performance, sufficient for channelling funds towards those countries where the highest impact can be obtained? Should allocation of resources continue to prioritise countries most in need, including fragile states?

The system should take into account the needs of all ACP countries.

28. What kind of cooperation could help to cover the specific needs of more developed ACP countries with a view to attaining more equitable and sustainable growth?

Cooperation that is focused on the specific needs such as climate change, industrialisation etc.

Strengthen the relationship with key actors

29. Has the current model of stakeholder engagement been conducive to attaining the objectives of the partnership in an efficient way? Which actors could play a more significant role in the implementation of the partnership? How could this be addressed?

The current model of stakeholder engagement has not implemented the provisions of the Cotonou Agreement. Article 6 of the Cotonou Agreement empowers the ACP CSOs to be actively involved in the programming, implementation and review. Although it is there legally, ACP CSOs have not been receiving funding, whereas they are key for the success of all programming. The question is why these CPA provisions have not been implemented and why stakeholders have not been involved and funded as provided for in the Cotonou Agreement.

30. What could be done to promote effective and efficient involvement of both international and domestic private sector, civil society, social partners and local authorities in the partnership?

In order to promote effective and efficient involvement of private sector, civil society, social partners and local authorities in the partnership, the provisions of involvement and funding need to be implemented.

.

31. Should the partnership be open to new actors as referred above?

The partnership has not been able to involve existing actors (private sector, civil society, social partners and local authorities) and should do that first before thinking about new actors.

32. In this regard, should the possibility of opening up the partnership to 'associated members' or 'observers' be considered?

Opening up the partnership to associated members or observers should be made possible only when the existing actors are really involved and funded.

33. How could a new framework promote triangular and South-South cooperation, including the increased involvement of ACP States as development actors in support of other ACP countries?

A new framework should first promote intra EU and ACP cooperation.

Streamline the institutional set-up and functioning of the partnership

34. Has the joint institutional set-up (with the ACP-EU Council of Ministers, the ACP-EU Committee of Ambassadors, and the Joint Parliamentary Assembly) been effective in debating and promoting common views and interests and in providing political guidance and momentum to the EU-ACP partnership and the implementation of the CPA?

The joint institutions should be more open and transparent. EU ACP cooperation is still the most unknown form of cooperation in EU, ACP and the world!!

35. What is the added value of the joint ACP-EU institutions as compared to more recent regional and regional economic community frameworks for dialogue and cooperation?

They will have an added value if there is more information to the public on what they are doing.

36. What institutional arrangements would most effectively help address common challenges and promote joint interests?

Regular Meetings between EU and ACP Heads of States are needed.

37. Should a higher degree of self-financing of this functioning (ACP-EU Joint institutions and ACP secretariat) by the ACP States be required?

More research is needed about the functioning of the ACP-EU Joint Institutions to answer that question. Who decides, who has the power?

Better adapted and more flexible development cooperation tools and methods

38. Is there added value in having a dedicated financing instrument in support of the ACP-EU partnership? If so, what are the reasons and how would it differ from other external financing instruments funded by the general budget of the Union? Is this instrument flexible enough, especially to address crisis situations? Can this instrument be deployed differently?

More controle and transparency is needed.

39. What is the added value of the EDF's co-management system involving national authorities in the programming and management of aid programmes, as compared to other EU cooperation instruments in non-ACP countries?

Too much influence in independent ACP States

40. Does the current set-up of the programming process and implementation of activities lead to real ownership by the beneficiaries? What could be improved? How can the EU and Member States maximise the impact of joint programming?

No, it doesn't. More involvement of local actors is needed.

41. Does the variety of existing tools adequately support the EU and ACP common principles and interests and are there gaps that should be addressed? How do you assess the effectiveness and efficiency of various implementation modalities?

42. Should a higher degree of self-financing from the ACP States be required for activities to ensure ownership? Would this apply to all countries? On which principles should this be based?

43. How can the expertise of the EU and its Member States be better mobilised, particularly in the middle-income countries?

Contact

✉ europeaid-01@ec.europa.eu
