

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

World Bank Group

* Country of residence or location of headquarters

Washington, USA

* E-mail

infobrussels@worldbank.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?

This could best be answered by the partners themselves. While the partnership has recognized the importance of a range of issues on development (e.g. climate change), it would be useful to examine whether the partnership has led to collective action to address global challenges.

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?

Overall the paper seems to ask the right questions, and identifies several clear areas of priority for the WBG as well including climate change, gender, energy and food security, the private sector, building resilience, sustainable use of the oceans.

As the joint consultation paper notes, the global situation has changed radically since the Cotonou Agreement came into being, and any future framework would need to be sufficiently flexible to a) reflect the diverse circumstances and needs of the ACP countries; b) respond to changing circumstances and emerging challenges; and c) support other global agreements such as the SDGs or decisions of COP 21.

It would also need to correspond with and complement other cooperation frameworks such as the Africa- EU strategic partnership, the joint Caribbean-EU partnership strategy and the strategy for a strengthened partnership with the Pacific Islands. It would be important to ensure

synergies and avoid overlapping with other frameworks. The management burden for all members and notably ACP countries should be considered.

The paper indicates that the framework should be based on strong common interests and shared values. While flexibility is important, the range of priorities to be finally considered should allow for the partnership to be manageable in order to achieve results.

There could be a utility in differentiating between political and developmental aims. The framework could usefully endorse certain political objectives and encourage actions to achieve them without necessarily indicating that it will bring resources or technical expertise to bear on every issue.

The nature of the framework probably affects its ability to deliver results. Amendments to the Cotonou Agreement have resulted in a comprehensive document that admirably seeks to cover a wide range of important issues. As the Agreement is legally binding, the right balance between the range of issues covered and concrete implementation actions should be sought. It would be important to focus on issues where the specific partnership can bring add value.

Experience suggests that new global challenges are likely to evolve in response to changing circumstances. Some, like climate change and food security, are long-term and could usefully be included, but it would need to be determined what the partnership could realistically do to address them. One option would be to shift the focus slightly, from global challenges themselves to approaches to address them, which would allow for greater emphasis on linkages among security, political dialogue and development.

Overall, the consultation paper addresses key development issues that are central to the ACP and EU partnership, but it does not make specific reference to the crucial issue of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), and the linkages between DRR and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA). Natural disasters and climate change have significant impacts on the most vulnerable populations and ecosystems around the world. As per a recent UNISDR report climate-related disasters now account for over 80% of disaster events globally and contribute enormously to economic losses and short and long-term population displacement triggered by disaster events. Mainstreaming DRR and CCA in development planning can reverse the current trend of rising disaster impact.

As outlined in the ACP Compendium of Risk Knowledge (2015), ACP states are highly vulnerable to natural hazards and climate change, and climate-related disasters (such as floods, storm surge, tropical cyclones, drought etc.) have considerably increased in ACP countries over the last decade. It is therefore crucial that efficient and effective climate and disaster risk reduction and management of post-disaster recovery is mainstreamed throughout the overall development strategies in ACP countries. Considerable contribution to

this objective has been achieved through the 9th and 10th EDF Natural Disaster Facilities, but also through the GCCA. It would be important to ensure that DRR remains a priority in the post-2020 partnership between the ACP group of States and the EU, and thus outlined as a cross-cutting development priority, along the climate change adaptation (CCA).

On page 3, the 3rd paragraph mentions vulnerability of Pacific and Caribbean countries to external shocks and natural disasters. Africa should also be mentioned, since the continent is particularly exposed to cyclones and storms, droughts, floods, landslides, extreme temperatures, earthquakes, tsunamis and volcanic eruptions. Recurrent disasters are keeping the African poorest population in poverty, jeopardizing development investments and food security.

Collaboration to support greater economic, social and environmental resilience more broadly across the Caribbean is important.

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 emphasis on human rights etc. in the ACP and the mechanisms provided have probably helped promote and support improvements, and should be maintained in the future partnership, which should encourage adoption and implementation of international principles. However, it has to be recognized that progress will not be uniform. While member states may agree to certain provisions, their commitment to implement them will vary depending also on the capacity of countries to implement. Measures to prevent backsliding could be useful.

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?

Undoubtedly the involvement of a broader range of actors has been helpful, but the extent to which they can effectuate meaningful change is dependent on the circumstances in individual countries. Continued involvement of such actors helps to empower them.

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?

Provisions are useful and should be continued. ACP support for peace and security should reinforce regional commitments—the balance will be determined by specific circumstances.

The nexus between disaster, fragility and conflict should be highlighted here. Many natural disasters occur in fragile states and conflict affected situations. IPCC projections show that climate related disaster vulnerability will be felt most in fragile and conflict affected states (they will be least likely to be able to respond and adapt to climate change). The partnership between ACP and EU should therefore recognize the importance of strengthening the cross-fertilization between humanitarian, disaster and conflict management actors.

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?

These are complex issues that require action on multiple levels. It would be useful to take lessons learnt from how relevant provisions have been implemented so far (taking into account the significant difference in implementation capacity among member countries). It would be necessary to determine what could realistically constitute more effective joint action on each level before deciding whether they should be pursued. The EU-ACP could promote better information sharing and best practices to support regional efforts. Closer collaboration between EU member states and ACP countries on certain issues, for example stepped up support to combat transnational security challenges in Africa, could be helpful but it is not clear whether they all share the same perspective.

Sustainable and inclusive economic growth, investment and trade

7. How effective has the partnership been in 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?

Natural disasters can have a serious impact on economic growth and investment. To preserve economic growth, the new ACP-EU partnership should particularly mention the importance of financial resilience, which will help ACP countries mitigate the socio-economic, fiscal, financial and physical impacts of disasters.

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 partnership has been useful in encouraging macroeconomic and financial stability and adoption of necessary reforms. The EU has a strong tradition of engagement on public financial management in the region. This could be expanded to support initiatives that foster stronger fiscal discipline and develop mechanisms that may help ACP countries move towards a more counter-cyclical fiscal policy stance. Such a policy approach could enable countries to build necessary buffers during periods of relative prosperity to protect against negative external financial or environmental shocks when they occur.

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?

The partnership has been useful in encouraging domestic resource mobilization, effective tax regimes and measures to combat illicit financial flows. It could encourage stronger measures to close financial loopholes, to combat illicit financial flows and money laundering. In the Caribbean there is also an opportunity for engagement on debt management capacity building, promoting fair and efficient tax systems and social protection and safety nets.

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

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?

The private sector has the potential to significantly strengthen the future relationship between EU and ACP countries. In recognition of this, the EU-ACP partnership has in recent years focused more heavily on

helping to create a favorable environment for the private sector to thrive in ACP countries, including by helping to create a more amenable investment climate, facilitating trade flows, and through deploying new instruments such as blended finance to catalyze private sector investments in areas that will increase the availability of public goods. The WBG welcomes that for the first time the ACP Group has a private sector strategy. We fully support the need to further focus on improving the investment climate, supporting SMEs, and access to finance.

As ACP countries become more economically prosperous in 2020 and beyond, an even sharper role of the private sector in supporting economic growth in ACP countries has the potential to further strengthen ties between EU member states and their ACP counterparts. Direct collaboration with private sector companies in areas that do not directly increase the availability of public goods but nevertheless have a strong impact on inclusive economic growth can bring tangible benefits to both EU-based companies and the ACP countries where they may be looking to invest. Such collaboration could, for example, take the form of advisory support to EU-based companies looking to diversify their production base and deepen their value chains in ACP countries, or to EU-based financial institutions hoping to expand their customer base into growing ACP markets.

While the economies of ACP countries vary, many face a number of similar challenges. These include the high cost of electricity and energy; vulnerability to economic shocks, climate change, natural disasters and oil price volatility; and infrastructure gaps. Smaller island-based economies, notably in the Pacific and Caribbean regions, face additional unique challenges of achieving economies of scale and attracting foreign direct investment. In such smaller and more shallow ACP markets, changes to approved EU-supported projects are often needed to adapt to local conditions as programs progress. A more flexible framework for collaboration that is focused on the private sector to address the common challenges faced by many ACP economies has the potential to strengthen economic links between and boost prosperity in both the EU and ACP countries.

In the area of infrastructure where the ACP faces a considerable gap -- in Africa alone, it has been estimated that \$95bn in investments a year will be needed -- it will be important to leverage the private sector's expertise, financing, and interest to make progress on this issue. To date, the EU has mainly tackled support to infrastructure through the public sector, although there are examples emanating of successful PPPs across the ACP. The EU could play a key role in helping to address the infrastructure gap adding to its tool set, also offering PPP transaction advice to governments in the ACP. In addition, to help build a pipeline of bankable projects support to project development facilities will also be key.

There is scope for new approaches, using development assistance to leverage resources from the private sector, providing guarantees, adopting blending arrangements, and expanding use of PPPs. While the post-Cotonou framework should set realistic aims in this regard and not raise expectations that it cannot meet, it could encourage adoption and

use of such approaches and mechanisms. Sharing of good practices and reforms that have encouraged expansion of the private sector, as well as EU assistance to meet outstanding constraints, such as poor provision of energy and infrastructure, would also be important in encouraging private investment and opportunities. Collaboration and synergies with European and International Financial Institutions so as to crowd in knowledge, expertise and experience on the ground should be further sought.

In the Caribbean region that suffers from mistrust between the private and public sectors and where elite capture has been highlighted as a significant constraint, public private dialogue to identify and implement key policy and regulatory reforms deserves more focus. The World Bank, together with the Caribbean Development Bank and InterAmerican Development Bank, is actively supporting the Caribbean Growth Forum (CGF). The CGF provides a platform for private sector and civil society to shape national reforms and help track the implementation of actions needed to spur sustainable growth and opportunities for all in the Caribbean, at the national and regional levels. We would welcome further EU engagement in building the capacity of institutions (public and private) to continue developing the social capital that will help set and implement a more focused reform agenda.

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

There are significant opportunities for the digital economy and expansion of technology. The new framework could acknowledge this and encourage sharing of best practices as well as innovation. It could for instance support efforts where digital platforms are used to provide services such as e.g. banking, crop insurance, etc.

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

The paper recognizes its importance for development in ACP countries and that the challenges that poor farmers face. Currently, governments, donors, and the private sector are again investing billions of dollars in Africa's agriculture. A thorough bottom-up update is needed to guide these investments, establish baselines, and ground the agricultural policy dialogues. In the context of the specific partnership, agricultural development in the ACP countries should also be seen in relation to EU agricultural policies including on access of agricultural products from ACP countries to the EU market.

There is a continuing need to accelerate progress in boosting agricultural productivity and output in Africa. Supporting smallholders among others through investment in improved technologies, rural financial services, and better access to markets is vital. Equally important is the push to boost agribusiness investments and improve land and water management by adopting modern irrigation practices, preventing conflicts over water resources and implementing climate-smart agriculture solutions. In this context, the WBG welcomes the establishment of AGRIFI and stands ready to cooperate in this important area.

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?

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 importance of regional integration should be stressed as an underpinning factor. For most of the ACP countries regional integration is crucial for trade and development and in building the capacity to benefit from trade preferences. Regional integration among the ACP countries figured highly in the CPA and the initial dialogue over the EPAs. It would be important to create synergies with the EU's initiatives and support to deepen regional integration. It would overall be useful to take lessons learnt from the utilization of EPAs. This is an area where EU-ACP framework can play a major role.

The paper finds that the significant barriers to intraregional trade deserve more attention. The incidence of barriers to regional trade fall most heavily, and disproportionately, on the poor and on women, and is preventing them from earning a living in activities where they have a comparative advantage—catering for smaller, local markets across the border.

The African market remains highly fragmented; preventing enormous opportunities for cross-border trade from being exploited and in turn generating new jobs. Effective regional integration is more than simply removing tariffs—it is about addressing the barriers that undermine the daily operations of ordinary producers and traders of both goods and services. Action is required at both the supra-national and national levels. Regional communities can provide the framework for reform but responsibility for implementation lies with each member country.

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?

It has probably helped support poverty reduction and has focused attention on the need for gender equality and the empowerment of women. EU support for this could be enhanced; the role the actual partnership could play could be further clarified.

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's support for human development should be based on what it can best deliver. For African countries for example, expanding coverage of basic health, water and sanitation services are priorities, as is improving the quality of education to equip students with the skills they need to enter the workforce.

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?

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)?

Migration and forced displacement are complex issues and drivers differ across countries. More attention to building an adequate evidence base to inform strategies and actions of the specific partnership and understanding within its members is important.

The WBG's starting point is its twin goals: eliminating extreme poverty by 2030 and boosting shared prosperity, measured as the income of the bottom 40%. While poverty is likely to fall to under 10% globally (GMR 2015/16), moving the world closer to the historic goal of ending poverty by 2030, absolute numbers remain high with almost a billion people still living in extreme poverty. Against the background of serious risks immediately ahead (natural disasters, conflicts, a slowing global economy) eliminating the last part of poverty still remains an ambitious goal. A disciplined and systematic approach on the humanitarian-development nexus is needed.

Forced displacement today is a global problem. It tends to be protracted and has significant costs, necessarily over the short term and potentially over the long term. However, under certain circumstances it can also result in long term gains to both displaced persons and their hosts.

Migration is positive, as underscored by its inclusion in the SDGs (Goal #10). There is a need to have more open policies for migrants so they can move and have a better life. Migrants contribute to growth. However, many home countries do not capture this potential. It is important to help countries to capture private initiatives in the country of origin and design financial instruments that go beyond remittances and savings.

Policy responses and development solutions will vary from country to country and more data and research is necessary to fully understand the issues at hand.

Developing countries need increased attention and support to address the migration and forced displacement flows. The World Bank Group, with its unique knowledge about countries and expertise in mobilizing innovative development financing, is well positioned to provide support on multiple fronts and is open to explore further opportunities for collaboration and synergies with the EU and 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 is useful if it brings greater understanding and encourages adoption of practices that support human rights and political inclusion. Multiple levels of political dialogue can be encouraged under the framework, but institutional requirements should be minimized.

Some challenges to be addressed are neither technical nor financial. Under some circumstances, budget support and technical assistance may be necessary but, in isolation, insufficient. Targeted advocacy and awareness-raising campaigns around issues of transparency, accountability, and good governance may reap greater development dividends than financial assistance alone. In this regard, enhanced strategic engagement with civil society and the media in the region could help promote development outcomes beyond technical or financial interventions.

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?

Closer alignment of EU member states bilateral policies and instruments would probably be helpful.

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 legally binding character of an Agreement may some time lead to a minimalist approach, however sets a framework for members to meet obligations. Differences in capacity need to be taken into account—some countries face a greater burden of implementing even basic provisions.

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?

This would have to be examined keeping in mind that the ACP group already brings together a diverse set of countries. Additional countries would potentially dilute the utility of the framework and make common ground harder to find.

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?

There seems to be a multiplicity of overlapping frameworks. It would be important to seek for complementarities and avoid duplication to the extent possible.

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

Regional partnerships could be formed with all of these regions based on common interests, but criteria for membership would need to be determined – there is significant diversification among the countries including on income levels. It would be necessary to determine the purpose of such relationships.

While the paper refers to the importance of strengthening relationships with key actors including parliaments, civil society, private sector, and regional organizations (PIFS), it does not specifically mention anything about strengthening partnerships with MDBs/IFIs. Broadening the EU-WBG partnership on some issues, such as migration/forced displacement, may be useful to explore, as well as taking into account other initiatives in some of the ACP countries such as the g7+.

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 EU, Member States and ACP countries need to determine the priorities of the framework. Need, capacity and performance are rarely aligned – the neediest countries tend also to have the least capacity and the poorest performance.

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?

Probably a greater focus on private sector to create employment and economic opportunities, coupled with specific attention to disadvantaged groups.

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?

Broad stakeholder engagement is useful to build support for the partnership and to encourage the involvement of different groups. However, this does not always lead itself to efficiency. Different actors bring different strengths and their willingness to engage in the partnership probably depends on their perception of underlying added value.

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?

These are an enormous range of actors. There is a utility in exchanging information, building networks and communities of practice, and supporting collaboration around specific issues, but establishing formal structures or mechanisms of engagement should probably be avoided. Through its capacity to engage emerging actors at the political level, the EU could play a key role in integrating emerging global actors with the traditional development partners' community.

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

Bringing in new actors is likely to increase complexity. Manageability needs to be borne in mind.

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

This too would probably make the partnership more unwieldy. Perhaps rather than formal structures, it would be possible for the partnership to promote various options (including use of technology) to share views on specific issues. Different groups could be invited to participate without becoming part of an institutional structure.

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?

This should be an integral element of the new framework. It could also be linked to other EU programs to maximize the utility. The EU already successfully promotes South-South exchanges, which could be used more in ACP countries.

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?

This should be examined taking into account that it is not easy to define common views and interests given such as large and diverse range of countries.

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?

In case all frameworks are to co-exist, it is essential that they are aligned and mutually reinforcing.

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

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

While self-financing is important, several ACP countries are among the poorest in the world and face considerable resources challenges.

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?

This should be considered taking into account the need to simplify procedures, increase efficiency in the delivery of support, notably in crisis situations. There is generally need for greater coordination between EU, bi-lateral donors and multi-lateral financial institutions. A synergistic approach by development partners could limit redundancies among individual programs, allow for the capitalization of results and increase impact.

Across the Caribbean in general there is an opportunity for enhanced coordination among external development financiers to support country priorities, including climate- and disaster resilience and reduction of fiscal deficits.

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?

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?

Complex processes and administrative requirements (that are not always adapted to the local context) often result in lack of understanding of each partners' processes and decision-making rules. Simplified or more flexible financing requirements would promote harmonization and alignment, make joint programming easier, and improve the efficiency of providing development assistance. Focus on results at the programming stage should be further explored.

Better coordination and complementarity between the EDF and MSs bilateral policies, instruments, and strategies could enhance the EU's impact and aid effectiveness. Coordination with MDBs is also key.

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?

The paper refers to the need to reflect on the right mix of implementation modalities and the increase of EU resources through blending to further leverage resources. The implementation of the ambitious 2030 Agenda demands equal ambition in using the “billions” in ODA and in available development resources to attract, leverage, and mobilize “trillions” in investments of all kinds: public and private, national and global, in both capital and capacity. This will require making the best possible use of each dollar from every source, drawing in and increasing available public resources as well as private sector finance and investment. The role of MDBs in this respect is crucial to enhance the leverage and multiplier effect of available financing, technical assistance, and knowledge; and provide policy solutions and innovative financing responding to the specific needs of the countries, partners, investors and global challenges.

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?

While self-financing may help promote ownership, least developed ACP countries and particularly those countries coming out of conflict do not have resources. Middle income countries could probably make a contribution, but principles and levels would need to be agreed through a process of consultation.

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

It might be possible to implement a pilot project to test this out, by first focusing on a limited number of priority sectors identified by ACP countries and requesting the EU and Member States to indicate the support they could provide. However, such initiatives are often management intensive. It could perhaps be easier to identify a list of priorities and ask the EU and member states to include assistance in their ongoing programs with ACP countries and indicate this on an annual basis.

Contact

✉ europeaid-01@ec.europa.eu