

## 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

Professor Pervez Ghauri

\* Country of residence or location of headquarters

United Kingdom

\* E-mail

p.ghauri@bham.ac.uk

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?

Marginally, as there are so many conflicts of interest

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?

A fairer relationship between developed and the developing world. A proper governance and control of multinational enterprises as they exploit resources and consider profit maximization as their main goal. Unfortunately, governments and international organization seems to safeguard the interest of these multinational enterprises coming from the developed world.

## 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?

Yes, in theoretical terms it does provide, however, in practical terms it is not happening. These rules and regulations are not evenly or fairly followed or implemented. The governance from organizations such as WTO has not been very effective.

Future partnership has to be on equal terms and not biased towards the developed world.

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?

Yes, the role of local authorities and social organization is crucial in this respect and this has not been happening very much. Most of these rights; human rights, democracy, governance etc., are defined according to what the Western world believes and need to be looked at with a more open mind. The socio-political organizations should be included as they can and should contribute more.

## 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?

The provision as adequate but these have not been effective.

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?

YES, should be done in EU context

## Sustainable and inclusive economic growth, investment and trade

---

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

Not very effective.

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

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?

Yes, more equal treatment of countries and regions and better governance

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?

It has been effective to some extent, but more needs to be done through ACP-EU collaboration

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

Not substantially

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?

This can be done by building networks between partners from different countries involved, that are supported by the respective governments and the private sectors.

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

If developed and developing countries are sincere and honest towards each other, this can be done as there are several opportunity. Thanks to the digital economy, distance does not matter much and each region and country has something to offer.

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

There is some progress but at the same time some progress is going towards the wrong direction; e.g. genetically modified crops, control of seeds etc.

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?

Yes, it has useful but implementaion is rather weak and selective.

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?

Yes, the agreement should incluce other countries, particularly developing countries. Otherwise they will suffer even more that what they do now.

## 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?

As a whole this has been achieved to great extent. However, if we take away the 'China effect', the progress is not very good. Most other countries still suffer from all the things mentioned above. China has done a remarkable job.

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

sustainable environmental stability including water resources and education

## 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?

I am not aware of this

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)?

Yes

## 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?

Yes, it should be widened to include other countries as well as to look at the issues with different perspectives.

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?

Agreements at bilateral levels normally benefit one or two countries and are not effective in general.

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?

Yes,

## 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?

Yes, other developing countries of Asia and Africa

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?

Yes

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

Yes, definitely.

## 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?

Yes, we have to use some priorities for most in need

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?

A better partnership between the governments and the private sectors particularly multinational enterprises

## 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?

Local governments and social institutions

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?

More control and regulations that are equally enforced in all countries

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

Yes

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

Yes, this is a good idea.

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?

Encourage countries to have bilateral relationships in regions

## 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?

Yes

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?

There is a value added if it is rightly implemented and enforced

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

Creating more institutions will not be very efficient, existing institutions should handle this.

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

Not sure

## 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?

Yes, as dedicated resources will be spent on particular issues and particular regions as otherwise the general funds are spent on general issues.

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?

Not sure

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?

Not sure

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 has to be very goals and objectives that will help to assess the effectiveness on yearly basis

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?

Many countries would be unable or unwilling to self-finance

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

This can be done by building teams from different countries for different goals.

### Contact

✉ europeaid-01@ec.europa.eu



