

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

Jean Pierre Elong Mbassi/ United Cities and Local Governments of Africa

* Country of residence or location of headquarters

Rabat, Morocco

* E-mail

elongmbassi@uclga.org

Identification number in the Transparency Register (if applicable)

★ 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's prime aim was to address poverty alleviation and be instrumental to supporting sustainable development policies and strategies. 20 years of implementation of the provisions of the Cotonou Agreement did not show much evidence that the fight against poverty was being won in the ACP countries, not to mention unsustainable ways of development adopted in most of the countries. One area where the contribution of the Cotonou Agreement has been remarkable is that of democracy and rule of law. The implementation of the provisions of the agreement, in particular the dialogue mechanism, has helped many ACP Countries to embark in, or strengthen democratic processes in their governance systems, and has allowed more participatory approaches to public governance. The clear recognition of non state actors and the private sector as key stakeholders to the agreement has encouraged the creation of an enabling environment towards more liberal societies politically and economically.

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 most is consistency with all development cooperation agendas as stated in the Paris Declaration, the Accra Agenda for Action as well as the Busan Declaration on development effectiveness. Addressing poverty alleviation and sustainable development requires an alignment and coherence of efforts at all levels. It also requires to go beyond global allocations through mechanisms such as budgetary support in order to reach out to the people at the grassroots level that are the targets of the cooperation agendas. This is why it is fundamental to add a territorial approach to the new partnership so that the human dimension of the cooperation is given the appropriate focus because after all, the partnership goal is to participate to the building of a

more peaceful world where everyone enjoys a dignified life. contextual. It is therefore advisable to pursue as suggested the localisation of SDGs and poverty alleviation strategies.

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?

The future partnership should certainly do more in that regard, and more attention should be paid on improving Human rights, the rule of law, democratic approaches, and the fight against corruption. The way to do it is to put more emphasis of the new partnership on multistakeholders political dialogue, more decentralized financial mechanisms, a better definition of common objectives, targets and expected outcomes and results of the partnership and related agreed monitoring and evaluation indicators.

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?

In principle, the Cotonou Agreement acknowledged the role of non State actors and local authorities in the implementation of the partnership. However in practice the main conversation for the definition and implementation of the partnership was held with national governments and regional economic communities. The other stakeholders barely participated in the consultations and/or political dialogues. Despite the fact that the Agreement provides for the inclusion of all stakeholders at all levels from definition to implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the partnership at the risk of suspension, the discussions around NIPs and RIPs were held mainly with the NAO/RAO. After many requests some progress was witnessed with the involvement of CSOs in the monitoring and evaluation process of the implementation of the 9th and 10th EDF. But again in most African countries the discussions around the definition of the priorities of the ongoing 11th EDF did not really include the other stakeholders into the partnership beyond the national governments, let alone local authorities despite the adoption of the 2013 EU Communication on the role of local authorities in development.

Peace and security, fight against terrorism and organised crime

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?

Peace and security are global and contextual by nature. These are typical matters where a regional approach is the most appropriate one. It is therefore advisable to adopt a more continental and subregional approach to peace and security and the fight against crime. In that regard the concept of ACP seems irrelevant.

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?

There are new threats appearing and adding to former ones, with the appearance and extension of Islamist linked terrorism. The fact is also that most conflicts that come to the attention of the international community occur between communities within national borders and few between countries. In other words these conflicts should be addressed primarily inside the communities at the local level before they are transformed into open tensions and violence. Hence the importance to improve joint action on conflicts prevention, including early warning mechanism on conflicts prevention and to have local authorities and community leaders to play a pivotal role in this mechanism. The recent conflict in North Mali has proven that local authorities have been the only authorities that remain in place after the collapse of the State. But at the post conflicts and peace building discussions the local authorities that were the authority keepers were simply sidelined. No surprise then that peace talks did not yield sustained results. Hence the decision finally adopted to base the Algiers Agreement on strong decentralized governance of the Malian State.

Sustainable and inclusive economic growth, investment and trade

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

The partnership was based on the hypothesis of a co-development between EU countries and ACP countries. What was witnessed however during the implementation period of the CPA was the deepening of the development divide between EU countries and ACP countries. The convergence that many experts expected from the improved trade and other relations between ACP and EU did not materialize. To the contrary it is during the implementation of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement that Africa for example witnessed one of the worse economic and financial crisis that the continent faced in its recent history. The ACP countries themselves experienced a huge gap between the have and have not among their populations. The Gini index has worsened in all African countries during the period, and little improvement has been observed in terms of human development index. Of course the CPA is not the only to blame, but one can conclude that it has not been really instrumental to promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development.

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

respect, and what?

As mentioned before, the future partnership should be aligned and consistent with other development and cooperation agendas, including the SDGs. The specific niche of the new partnership should be, at the one hand, to boost the regional dimension of the SDGs through the support and adoption of policies towards the promotion of Global Public Goods at the regional level; and on the other hand, the support to the localization and implementation of development and cooperation policies and strategies on the territories at the subnational level, and the creation of related information and indicators systems to ensure monitoring and evaluation of performances.

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?

The fact that the macroeconomic imbalances of most African countries happened in the midst of the implementation of the CPA is testimony that the partnership did not do much to prevent such imbalances. As per the financial stability many experts think that the previous mechanisms of Stabex and Sysmin were more efficient.

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?

This is the one the area where the partnership was rather weak. The partnership was considered by many decision makers in ACP countries as providers of grants, which many have seen as substitutive to own efforts to raise domestic revenues and enforcement of taxation legislations and regulations. To be honest this feeling was also encouraged by the way the EU used to promote its cooperation agenda. In that regard, the CPA did little to encourage domestic revenues mobilization and to combat illicit flows. The negotiation of the suces d'or of the CPA should take very seriously into account the issue of tax avoidance and tax evasion, and put on top of its agenda the issue of domestic resources mobilization and management as part of the political dialogue between the EU and ACP countries.

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

The partnership has contributed to the acceptance of the private sector as key contributor to wealth and job creation. Concerning the attraction of Foreign direct investment, this stemmed more from macroeconomic and business environment than from the direct impact of the partnership. One can however allude that by contributing to the strengthening of the Rule of Law and more transparent behaviour in terms of public governance and private sector involvement in the development, the CPA has made some contribution to the attraction of FDI.

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?

Private sector development has often been considered in its restrictive dimension of international companies or multinationals. The reality is that the bulk of the private sector as any where else in the world, is composed of SMEs. Very few and effective actions were developed to support SMEs within the CPA. The post-Cotonou agreement should correct this trend and put more emphasis on capacitating SMEs and build their capacity to accede markets, technologies and funding, as well as acquire modern management skills. One area where the post-Cotonou agreement can make a difference is to focus particular attention on those SMEs working in the green and circular economy, with a view to contribute to the adoption and implementation of more energy efficient and low carbon path to the development. Local territories offer the best places where the development of these innovative SMEs must be encouraged. That is why sustainable local economic development programs should form part of the targets of the post-Cotonou agenda, thereby contributing to the operationalization of the territorial approach to the development.

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

The digital economy is the ingredients that science and technology has provided to the nowadays economies. It is just like mastering alphabet. It should not be singled out but be totally in sync with any developmental agenda.

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

Experience of the past 20 years in development has shown the unsuitability of the sector approach to the development. Embarking on reflections such as what to do first is totally irrelevant since the potential for development depends on each local, national and regional contexts. This calls for the need to rethink the sector priorities approach that was at the heart of the CPA processes. I personally do not approve this approach that had lead to dissatisfactions in many countries. The adoption of a more bottom up dialogue system for the definition of priorities has proven to be more appropriate than the measurement of performance based on sector approach. Furthermore the question as formulated tends to link agriculture and trade whilst for the majority of African decision makers today, agriculture is primarily an activity aiming at feeding people. The limitation of the earth ecosystem and the global acceptance of the urgency to adopt low carbon path to the development is in favor of moving the production near to the consumption. This trend will push for the relocalization of this couple on the territories and restart a movement of rebuilding the local, national and regional markets which development potentials will be higher than the promises of the global

markets. This is why the post Cotonou agreement should endeavour to support the emergence and development of local economies that are the cornerstones of efficient local, national and regional markets.

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?

There has been serious debates around the relations between trade preferences and the Integration of ACP countries in the world economy. A lot of controversies are still underway about the impact of the economic partnership agreements on the capacity of African countries to industrialize. Many experts think that the trade preferences are not fair because the departure situation of both partners is very unbalanced. The post-Cotonou agreement should seriously address this imbalance and set targets that allow to bridge the development gap between EU and African countries. This has to do with the concept of co-development that was cited in the CPA but never implemented. There is no way we can talk about universal sustainable goals if this is not translated in the daily reality of African people beyond the rhetoric.

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?

The only way to be in a win-win situation is to rework the concept of co-development and give it a political and empirical definition, which will then authorize a more holistic approach to the content of the post Cotonou agreement.

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?

We said it previously, the CPA did not help much on poverty eradication. In most countries the situation has worsened.

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 SDGs has been welcome as a progress compared to the MDGs. I tend to differ from that opinion, since with the MDGs, the international community had clear objectives, goals and targets to meet within certain deadlines. The formulation of the SDGs is still very vague and can lead to any kind of interpretations when it comes to assessing results. The challenge here is to go beyond statistics and appréciations by experts and the academia. What matters is what happens to people on the ground. It is therefore absolutely necessary to

support the localization of the SDGs at the level of local territories and to build information systems that can help develop dashboards for measuring progress in the implementation of the SDGs.

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?

The issue of migration as provided for by article 13 of the CPA is not commensurate with the reality of migrations flows. The discussion around migration cannot be held outside the whole concept of codevelopment. The trend is however that members of EU tend to tackle the issue of migration exclusively following its security dimension. The result is the difficulty to enter into a true dialogue with a comprehensive strategy to make use of migration as a positive asset in the relations between EU members and ACP countries. The post-Cotonou agreement should endeavour to reconsider the conversation on migration on a different basis.

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 post Cotonou agreement should consider migration within a broader development perspective. It should take as point of departure that migrants move from a local government to settle in another local government. Consequently local authorities should be considered as the frontliners in the management of migration flows. However one should remember that migration movements occur more within Africa than between Africa and EU member states. And that human trafficking is favoured when protection of migrants is not guaranteed. The role of migration in development has been underestimated despite the fact the resources from remittances by migrants represent more than resources from development assistance. The post-Cotonou agreement should do better justice to migration's contribution to co-development between EU member states and African 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?

The political dialogue has been the most effective between ACP governments and EU members at national level. The scope of political dialogue should be widened to all actors as provided for by the CPA and organized at all levels with the relevant organized stakeholders.

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?

What is needed is alignment and coherence of EU Commission policies and EU Member State bilateral policies. This calls for more consistency and complementarity between EU Commission policies and EU Member States policies. Such consistency would then facilitate focus and coordination of interventions in the different ACP countries and avoid useless competition.

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 binding characteristic of the CPA has been effectively instrumental in the progress observed in the political dialogue on Human rights, democracy and rule of law.

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?

I wonder whether it is still logical to keep the ACP concept. There is more coherence in treating the various entities separately than keeping them in the same body which logic is losing signification given the evolution of the world.

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?

Developing separate relations based on geographical realities seems more relevant than keeping the old ACP logic. It is preferable in such circumstances that the post-Cotonou treat Africa as one and avoid dividing the Countries of The Mediterranean face of Africa from the rest of The continent. This interrogates the Cooperation instruments used for the neighboring countries and the EDF.

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

We insist that North Africa is Africa. What happens in the Sahel region shows that the division being introduced between North Africa and the rest of Africa has no real ground against the dynamic of migration, development, and trade observed on the ground.

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?

It is necessary to clarify why the EU Commission and Member States want to continue to cooperate with ACP Countries in a post-Cotonou agreement. Such cooperation should not simply be a prolongation of business as usual. There should be a serious political discussion with ACP Countries on the way development resources should be allocated. Any focus on priority countries should result from the definition of the goals of the cooperation and that of the political dialogue between EU Commission, EU Member States and 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?

I don't understand the meaning of this question.

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?

Stakeholder engagement provisions at the CPA is quite correct in principle. It is the practice of stakeholder engagement that was not adequate in many countries, partly because the needed enabling environment was not in place, and not really part of the dialogue between EU Commission and ACP countries.

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?

The response to this question is the organization of structured multistakeholders dialogue.

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

The partnership should be as wide and open as possible.

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

There is no need to open up to associated members or observers. All that is needed is the true involvement of the four main stakeholders which are the national government, the local authorities, the civil society organizations and the private sector.

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?

The reflection on co-development must include all kind of cooperation arrangements, including triangular and south/south cooperation among ACP countries, but not only.

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 institutional set-up was appropriate for the CPA. For the post-Cotonou agreement the same arrangement would not be the best mechanism for the post Cotonou agreement. For Africa the best option would be to work with the African Union institutions.

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?

Our preference goes to the African Union and RECs architecture.

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

For Africa the best system is to use the African Union institutions and the existing arrangements of the Join Africa Europe Strategy.

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

N/A

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?

The proposal of a dedicated financing instrument in support to Africa-EU partnership funded by the general budget of the Union.

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?

Co-management of the EDF has proven important for the planning and programming, monitoring and evaluation of EU cooperation with the ACP countries.

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?

The current set up of programming and implementation of activities could have lead to real ownership if it was enforced as provided for in the CPA. Joint programming is the appropriate mechanism if it is inclusive.

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?

There is need to take stock of the evaluation of the different instruments to know if they addressed adequately the common principles and interests of ACP-EU cooperation. The implementation modalities that privileged the budgetary and sector support has not yield the needed results for cooperation effectiveness and efficiency.

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?

Ownership is about self reliance. Self financing from ACP countries should be built around the domestic resources coming from internal and external taxation. There is a common fight that the ACP Countries and the EU Commission and Member States should initiate for combat tax avoidance and evasion, and at the same time improve transparency and integrity in financial management.

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

Through Middle and long term decentralized cooperation programs

Contact

✉ uropeaid-01@ec.europa.eu
