

# 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

Cities Alliance hosted by United Nations Office for Project Services  
(UNOPS)

\* Country of residence or location of headquarters

Brussels

\* E-mail

wcobbett@citiesalliance.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?

no comment

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?

The Cities Alliance Secretariat is welcoming the endorsement of a unique universal development agenda under the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). We particularly welcome the needed shift of thinking towards an acknowledgment of Cities and Urbanisation as a key driver of development. This is embodied not only in Goal 11 but across many Goals and targets of the SDGs. According to our own calculations, up to 65% of the SDG targets are at risk should cities not be assigned a clear mandate and role in the implementation process (Cities Alliance 2015). As the international community is preparing a New Urban Agenda to be ratified at the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development, to take place in Quito, Ecuador, from 17 - 20 October, 2016, we perceive that regional partnerships, such as between European Union and the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries, should pro-actively engage on promoting the role of urbanization and cities for

development.

The acknowledgment of cities is a needed response to the realities of the urban millennium, particularly in the most rapidly urbanising region of Sub-Saharan Africa, whose cities will accommodate around 300 million new inhabitants over the next 20 years. This acknowledgment by national government is much needed since according to some estimates, around \$20 billion of local investment is required for the cities of Sub-Saharan Africa, an investment deficit that by far exceeds local financial capabilities.

Using the momentum of urbanisation effectively requires coordinated approaches not only between different tiers of government (national, regional and local), but also between governments and civil society organisations as well as the private sector. Recent experiences of the Cities Alliance suggest that one of the promising ways to make such an actor-oriented coordination approach work is to create policy-oriented debates around key issues and opportunities of urbanisation and inclusive cities. Creating the platforms at the local, regional and national level on which stakeholders convene, discuss and develop a common understanding on the contours of a National enabling environment for cities provides the space to create the broad-based partnerships that are needed to clarify roles and responsibilities and also to institutionalise the commitment that is required to become effective. A mechanism for coordination might be therefore seen in the establishment of a distinct participatory multi-governance process to develop a national policy, such as through National Urban Fora (NUF) . National Urban Fora usually provide a platform for dialogue and cooperation between different involved stakeholders (e.g. citizen groups, civil society, planning commission, ministries and municipal associations). Making the best use of these new governance platforms requires the recognition of a number of principles, such as to ensure that conflicting interests, particularly between national and local actors, are being able to be expressed, and marginalized interest groups and representatives are being heard. Opportunity should be given to all stakeholders to articulate their demands or to be held accountable for their actions.

Against this background, the Cities Alliance Secretariat would like to urge this regional partnership to foster and promote national approaches to highlight and pro-actively expose the value, experience and role of partnerships between national governments, local authorities and community/citizens organisations in achieving sustainable development and poverty reduction in cities of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. Global examples also indicate that these kind of partnerships are the most effective when each level of government is involved according to their distinct comparative advantages and the added value they can provide. In most cases, effective coordination mechanisms are required to harmonize efforts across them. There are relevant experiences of multilevel governance for development focusing

on the establishment of national fora to place development in cities at the top of the development agenda and make informed decisions as regards policy and reforms.

## 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?

no comment

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?

With the political, social and economic role of cities growing increasingly important, governance has emerged as a major issue. While many national governments publicly articulate their support for decentralisation, the practice is often very much weaker than the rhetoric. Where decentralisation is enacted, local governments are expected to play a crucial role in the urbanisation process. How effectively they are able to do so, however, depends largely on:

- a) A more comprehensive approach to local government support and capacity building, including the development of planning capacities and land administration system, as well as the design of appropriate schemes and instruments to strengthen participatory governance
- b) Strengthening national associations of local authorities so that they can play a positive role in representing the local government sphere, facilitate the exchange of learning and knowledge between local governments, and seek international support and learning
- c) The transparency of the policy framework and on how much operational autonomy they are allowed by national governments. The recent, second assessment of the institutional environments of Local Governments in Africa jointly carried out by Cities Alliance and United Cities and Local Governments in Africa in 50 out of 54 African countries shows that the general trend is one of improvements in the enabling environment for cities and local authorities. However, this does not in any way predict the preservation of this environment. In Africa, a clear majority of countries still need to make major progress in implementing structural reforms.

## 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?

no comment

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?

no comment

## Sustainable and inclusive economic growth, investment and trade

---

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

It is estimated that a third of the urban population in Sub Sahara Africa, an estimated 800 million people live in slums. Despite this very visible reality, government institutions know very little about the land and services needed in these settlements, very little about concrete contributions of the those households living in slums providing basic services to their neighbourhoods and very little about the contribution of the informal economy to whole city economy. Cities Alliance extensive experiences in working in informal settlements suggest to further promote and establish a consensus on key principles shaping policy frameworks for a successful slum upgrading strategy:

1. Accept and acknowledge slums and their importance.

Achieving a city without slums begins with a shared understanding that slums and their residents are an integral part of the city, and that slum residents are citizens with a right to the city and to its services.

2. Political will and leadership makes slum upgrading possible.

Both national and local governments must provide the vision, commitment, and leadership required to sustain nationwide upgrading. Government authorities at all levels and other stakeholders make and uphold the commitment to upgrade slums because is in the best interest of the city and nation.

3. Include the slums in the city's plans.

Create a strategy and plan how to transform slums as part of the core business of managing and improving the city and its economy. An

effective tool to define these plans is to carry out a City Development Strategy (CDS) to identify city priorities, lead to producing a workable plan for the upgrading programme. Strategic Urban Planning tools, such as City Development Strategies (CDS) can help a city harness the potential of urbanisation, combining under a common framework urban strategic planning, economic growth and inclusive local governance. There is a wealth of methodologies to build these partnerships and allow cities to take greater control of their economic development process at the local level, and several initiatives are dealing with the informal sector in innovative ways to engage them in the formal economy, as opposed to traditional top-down and sectoral policies for economic development.

#### 4. Mobilise partners.

Partnership is important to successful upgrading. Successful slum upgrading is a highly participatory endeavour. It is also very comprehensive and complex, needing coordinated inputs from many local government agencies as well as those from outside the public sector.

#### 5. Provide security of tenure.

Secure tenure is at the very centre of slum upgrading. Without some form of tenure security the situation of slum residents and their neighbourhoods is uncertain: they could be removed at any time. People who fear eviction will not invest in their houses, or neighbourhood. They will invest, however, once they have a sense of permanence and realise that they can sell their house and recoup their investment. Furthermore illegality and informality make them susceptible to exploitation, corruption and extortion.

#### 6. Plan with, not for, the slum communities.

Residents are the main partners of slum upgrading programmes. Because their futures are directly affected by the decisions, and because they can help in the upgrading process, it is necessary that they be fully informed and actively involved.

#### 7. Ensure continuity of effort over time and institutionalise the programme.

Upgrading is an incremental, but sustained process. When slum upgrading is treated as core business of a local government, it produces cohesion, coordination, and increases efficiencies in service provision.

#### 8. Allocate budget, design subsidies, mobilise public and non-public resources.

Stable and consistent national and local budgetary allocations are needed for slum upgrading. Large-scale upgrading programmes need central government support backed by corresponding national budgetary allocations, subsidy policies and human resources.

#### 9. Find alternatives to new slum formation.

Upgrading existing slums and preventing new slums are twin objectives of

Cities without Slums policy. Until land and housing policies are changed to eliminate barriers for the poor, new slums will continue to occur. Therefore, cities need to introduce proactive measures for producing viable alternatives to slums. In the experience of the Cities Alliance, proactive policies are significantly more cost effective and socially acceptable than retrofitting services after the fact, which is the current default policy.

10. Invest in community infrastructure.

It is important to invest in a community infrastructure that helps build community cohesion. Investing in infrastructure demonstrates a government's commitment to an area and brings dignity back to a neighbourhood. If a government invests poorly, people will not respect the infrastructure.

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

See Answer to Question 2

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?

no comment

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?

no comment

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

no comment

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?

no comment

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

no comment

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

no comment

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?

no comment

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?

no comment

## 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?

See Answer to Question 2

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

See Answer to Question 2

## 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?

no comment

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)?

no comment

## 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?

no comment

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?

no comment

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?

no comment

## 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?

no comment

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?

no comment

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

no comment

## 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?

no comment

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?

no comment

## 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?

No comment

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?

See Answer to Question 4

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

No comment

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

no comment

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?

no comment

## 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?

no comment

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?

no comment

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

no comment

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

no comment

## 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?

no comment

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?

no comment

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 comment

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?

no comment

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?

no comment

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

no comment

## Contact

✉ [uropeaid-01@ec.europa.eu](mailto:uropeaid-01@ec.europa.eu)

---