

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

Sale Juliet - United cities and Local Governments of Africa

* Country of residence or location of headquarters

Accra, Ghana, West Africa Regional Office

* E-mail

jmekone@yahoo.com

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 created awareness of the key role of local authorities in development in their own right. This most local authorities did not seem to know themselves given the "marginalisation" they suffer from other forms of governments.

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?

For results to be strengthened, there is the need for more capacity building of the local authorities and also the equipping of the local authorities with tools and material that can enable them meet up with their mandate. This implies that there is the need for capacity building, development tool and equipment for them to be able to work effectively.

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?

To an extent. There is more to be done in all these directions. Political dialogue was quite understood but the local authorities still don't seize the opportunities available. There is a timid approach to that. Good Governance went a long way to curb corruption at the local level. There is more awareness of the governance processes and procedures at the local level.

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?

The role of the civil society cannot be over emphasised. Working in partnership with the local authorities has enabled the local authorities achieve some of their missions because they acted like watch dogs.

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?

Not quite. This still has to be reinforced.

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?

In Africa for example, it is believed that the local authorities play a major role as guarantors of peace and security. Once this role is not fully played there is insecurity lingering around. Early warning can only be effective if it is implemented at the local level. There is the need for the local authorities to be very involved in any peace initiative as well as any aspect of early warning. Mediation takes place between peoples. These peoples are at the local level recognised by the local authorities. The people can have confidence in a mediator they know then a stranger. It is imperative to involve local authorities in any peace initiative and also in any mediation that will take place.

Sustainable and inclusive economic growth, investment and trade

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

The local authorities were put into competition amongst themselves to get funding from the EU for development purposes. This made it challenge for them to get funding for development. Bearly a few could get funding therefore it is difficult to assess the impact in promoting sustainable and inclusive development.

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

It is a necessity for the partnership to do more to ensure sustainable development. It s also important that the EU puts the funding at the disposal of the local authorities for capacity building as well as implementation of the SDGs. There is also theneed for tools and equipment which if the local authorities are supported to have, they will do more to ensure sustainable development. The localisation of the SDGs means local authorities must have the needed capacity and tools and methodology to implement the projects at the local level. The importance of this support cannot be undermined.

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?

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?

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?

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

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?

Human development should also focus on the youths and the street children. The unemployed youths and street are breeding grounds for ISIS and other terrorist movements. A lot of resources go into fighting terror but if the issue is handled before these children are taken away, the rate of terrorism will be minimised. In another way, migrants are basically the youths. A lot of resources is also channeled to this area of which if the youths are trained to be self-reliant (small project development and entrepreneurial skills) with some minimum kick-off capital and monitoring mechanisms in place, they will not leave their countries in search of greener pasture elsewhere.

The women are the bread basket of Africa. This group also needs a lot of awareness-raising of their role and some entrepreneurial skills to be able to better transform their produce and market them. Local economic development should be encouraged for a more sustainable development. Local economic development is very necessary in Africa.

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

Capacity building for local officials
Capacity development for local officers
Capacity development on the localisation of the SDGs
Resource mobilisation for the implementation of SDG projects
Entrepreneurial skills for the youths and the women

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)?

Strengthening the capacity of the youths, the street children and the women to be self-reliant so as to be responsible individuals in their society.

A stronger political relationship

21. How effective has the political dialogue been and at which level is it the most effective: national, regional and through the joint EU-ACP institutions? Should the scope of political dialogue be widened or narrowed?

The political dialogue is not very effective especially when it comes to the relationship between the national government and the local government. There is still dysfunctioning in the area of linking the national development budgets to the local. (National budget and local budgets).

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?

There is the necessity to create awareness more at the national level for openness to the political dialogue. Also national governments should respect engagements taken like the transfer of resources to local level.

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. More still has to be done in this area.

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?

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?

Africa, Caribbean and Pacific though may have similar challenges, they do not have same specificities. It may be necessary for the partnership to be distinct.

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

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 but it depends on where exactly the resources are channelled. The needs are most felt at the local level. It is at the local level that we see and know poverty, it is at the local level that the youths revolt or express frustration. It is at the local level that the solutions can be fought to improve the lives of the population. Resources channeled elsewhere other than the local level will be to delay the process. For effectiveness and efficiency, resources for the ACP partnership as well as the SDGs must be channelled to the local level. Development agenda that is not localised will be dreaming of the achievement and not actually achieving.

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?

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 authorities. Channelling the resources to the local authorities directly for capacity building, creation of tools as well as equipping the local authorities for effective implementation of the partnership agreement.

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?

Local authorities should be supported directly. Resources should be channelled to the local authorities directly. Their various associations can come up with programmes to support the local authorities.

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

To local authorities as key partners in development in their own right.

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

Perhaps not necessarily. If associate partners and observers will not implement projects and programmes to alleviate poverty then it should be given a second thought.

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?

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?

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?

It is important for the regional economic communities to integrate local authorities in the development agenda. Local authorities are key partners in development, poverty is felt mostly at the local level, development must take place at the local level therefore political dialogue that will bring together the regional economic community and the local authorities will add value to the implementation of global development agendas.

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

The EU through the regional indicative programmes as well as the regional economic communities where the local authorities are key partners in the discussions and implementations of the development agendas.

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

Most often the local authorities are required to address issues. The financial resources are not available therefore it becomes a challenge for them. Any joint initiative should consider how to channel the resources to the local authorities for implementation

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?

Presently, the local governments do not know exactly what they can get from the EU and how. They are aware of the recognition of their key role in development by the EU. They complain that they do not get direct support from the EU. This situation needs to be looked into. Local authorities should be aware of their relationship with the EU. The EU Communication on local authorities does not seem to be respected therefore it is important for the EU to open up this special relationship it has developed with the local authorities. Some special funding mechanism must be in place for the local authorities. The EU can champion the capacity building of local authorities for the implementation of the SDGs since the EU has recognised the key role local authorities play in development. For this to be effective, the EU can fund the capacity building of local authorities in the ACP group of countries for the implementation of the SDGs and other global agendas.

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?

There was the MDGs for 15 years and we know the results in most of the ACP countries. Now is the SDGs and no one will deny the fact that if we do not change the strategy of the management and funding systems, we will be heading for a repeat of the SDGs. We need to involve not only national authorities but also local authorities in the programming and management of aid programmes.

40. Does the current set-up of the programming process and implementation of activities lead to real ownership by the beneficiaries? What could be improved? How can the EU and Member States maximise the impact of joint programming?

The beneficiaries of any aid programme or cooperation is the population. For the population to claim real ownership of the aid programme, the aid must trickle down to their level. as at now this is not what happens. The Local Authorities must be on board when the aid programmes are designed, programmed and implemented. If this does not happen, the EU has no way to be sure that the population claimed ownership of the aid programme. If the local authorities are they to inform the EU of their needs and aspirations then can they claim ownership. The EU spends lot of funds to support ACP countries but because the programmes do not come from the beneficiaries, there is no recognition of the efforts of the EU nor are they even aware. The joint programming must involve local authorities. Also the funds must be channelled to the local governments or their representative associations who understand their needs and are in permanent contact with the local authorities.

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?

Implementation tools can only be effective if the local authorities are involved in the designing the programmes. The funding must also be available to the local authorities and not just the national authorities. One can only talk of Effectiveness and Efficiency of the modalities of implementation if local authorities that are the custodians of the beneficiaries of the partnership are involved in the whole process.

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?

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

Contact

✉ europeaid-01@ec.europa.eu

