

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

Fundación Universidad de las Américas, Puebla (UDLAP).

* Country of residence or location of headquarters

Mexico

* E-mail

annek.kurjenoja@udlap.mx

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 just in its initial phase, has permitted to find parallel initiatives and projects related to areas of interest in common

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?

1. In order to strengthen the results more effective networks should be created on a transdisciplinary basis; 2. a) to perceive the global sustainability in a holistic way; b) explore the impact and consequences of the use of high technology to the polarization of societies and social margination; c) innovate in the field of finding sustainable combination of high and low technologies in order to create more sustainable communities.

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?

All those themes are very complicated to resolve (if they can be totally resolved anyway). What is first needed is a profound understanding of the grass root historical, societal and political situation of each region, community or group in conflict.

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?

It seems that the non-state actors through an effective use of social media has impulsed many important changes worldwide and surely their impact as socio-political pressure to Nation-states will be growing (with positive but also with questionable results).

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?

–

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?

–

Sustainable and inclusive economic growth, investment and trade

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

The partnership is just establishing its first goals in the promoting of those issues.

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

It could promote more directly the different sources of collaboration, as well as the different resources to maintain it effective.

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 collaboration is just beginning, so there is no answer to that question yet.

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 collaboration is just beginning, so there is no answer to that question yet.

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

The collaboration is just beginning, so there is no answer to that question yet.

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 collaboration is just beginning, so there is no answer to that question yet.

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

There are very many opportunities but great dangers also; the use of digital technology tends to increase the social marginalization and the disconnection of some groups of citizens from the societal functions and services or limit their participation to them. In the developing countries the danger of polarization because of the indiscriminate application of digital technology might cause even more profound gap between the digitally able and disable population.

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

–

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?

–

Human and social development

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

The partnership is just beginning, so there are no concrete results yet. On the other hand, I insist, is important to understand the reasons of the problems in human and social development and surely not think that these issues are mainly related to economic development and/or application of digital and high technology. It seems in Europe the economic and digital development is high, meanwhile the presence of human values is many times questionable. In many of the developing regions, local cultures value sometimes the human much more although they might discriminate women. So a equitative exchange of knowledge, values and strategies could work in order to improve the human and social development.

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

Erradication of poverty and and socio-economic and digital margination between regions, communities and individuals through identification of current and especially future dangers that detonate them.

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?

It will be, as the migration and mobility are one of the main issues in the proposed research collaboration. But the idea is to understand all kinds of phenomena of migration and mobility, not only those related to poverty or environmental phenomena; the mobility of the Creative and Digital Class individuals impact strongly some regions of the world and their local development.

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)?

It should distinguish the character of the migration in different regions and the real impact of it—we should remember that a lot of prosperity of the world has historically been created through migratory movements (and still is). On the other hand, other kind of migratory movements (crime, terrorism, extremism, etc.) surely diminish the security in some regions and this kind of dangers should be identified and combatted. But there is also the migratory movements of people with high expertise in different areas benefitting the receiving countries, the effect that is no much investigated—and what is the impact of this kind of mobility to the countries and regions losing their best brains.

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?

I am not an expert in political issues, but I suppose the nearer collaboration should also be favorable, especially in order to find new and unthinkable areas of opportunity.

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?

Yes, surely, and without traditional fixed ideas.

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?

-

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 do not know now about the countries, but I consider that generally it is always useful to look for new opportunities, they might appear in unexpected places and in unexpected ways-it is important to eradicate the prejudices about the character of different countries and regions.

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?

-

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

My relation is with Latin America (Mexico) and I could say that the interest to this regions has recently surged. There has of course always been some EU countries with strong relation with Latin America because of colonial, industrial or commercial reasons but always seeing the continent as a servant of European Interests. The recent development of the region has changed this

situation and made of it a new focus of interest for the Europeans. But, the vision of the Latinamericans of themselves and there role in the world is changing also and this fact should be strongly taken into account in creating relationships with Latin American region.

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?

Surely the focus on the fragile states is important, especially in some regions (no all the regions are the same). On the other hand, big countries have so many different territories with quite a different level of development-even inside a single urban area there might be drastically contrasting levels of develoment-maybe we should not only focus on countries but also on regions and microregions.

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?

We should first try to undertand, what is sustainable develoment for the local community itself-the idea of development might not be the European one. There might be a range of models for sustanable development for different regions according to their local historical, demographic, cultural and socio-economical conditions and ideas.

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?

-

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?

On the local level especially, it would be important to identify which are the really impostant stakeholders (a real grassroot, bottom-up view).

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

Of course it should. If we want to talk about a real development, so we must be open minded and capable to identify all the possible effective ideas and opportunities.

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

It should.

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?

Maybe first creating effective networks of different kinds related to common interests and issues.

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?

Maybe not.

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?

Talking mainly of economy may ignore other factors that finally impact also the economy.

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

An equitativa collaboration on the bottom-up and transdisciplinary basis, with the participation of different kind of stakeholders.

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

It might be, when possible. The locally existing funding systems should be evaluated in order to be able to support really valuable initiatives, projects and ideas in an effective way, without political or bureaucratic restrictions.

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?

–

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?

–

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

–

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

Yes, in countries that are capable to provide funding. Principles: The locally existing funding systems should be evaluated in order to be able to support really valuable initiatives, projects and ideas in an effective way, without political or bureaucratic restrictions.

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

In an equitable collaboration with the local expertise that know better the local conditions. Now, what could be interesting is what that local expertise could give to the European Union countries on a knowledge exchange basis. We should not forget that many of those countries have also production of new knowledge related to the development that could benefit the European Countries.

Contact

✉ uropeaid-01@ec.europa.eu
