

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

SOLIDAR

* Country of residence or location of headquarters

BELGIUM

* E-mail

barbara.caracciolo@solidar.org

Identification number in the Transparency Register (if applicable)

31087615802-06

* 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?

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?

In line with the spirit with the Agenda 2030, the post 2020 EU-ACP relations should have a stronger focus on the promotion of sustainable development - reinforcing the linkages between the economic, environmental and development dimensions - and the respect of human rights in line with the Agenda and the EU Action plan on democracy and Human rights.

The fight against raising inequalities between and within countries should have a more prominent role in these future relations including support to policies enhancing the redistribution of wealth such as universal social protection systems.

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?

Not completely.

Mechanisms are in place but there are many problems to improve the situation relating to human rights, democracy, rule of law and good governance, including the fight against corruption. Indeed, corruption is diverting

resources from public to private interest, depriving people from accessing their human rights such as the right to health, education, social security and so on.

To improve the respect of human rights obligations, Human Rights Country Strategies should be developed with the involvement of civil society.

The EU should promote policy coherence regarding trade in natural resources coming from ACP countries.

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?

There is a need to invest more in strengthening the capacity of local civil society organization to monitor the implementation of human rights.

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?

EU is supposed to play role in peace and security which means

- Tackling the roots causes of insecurity (the promotion of a human right based approach)
- Fulfilling its role and take sanctions in case of violations
- Promoting policy coherence regarding arms trade from EU

Sustainable and inclusive economic growth, investment and trade

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

According to the CPA Economic and trade cooperation shall aim at fostering the smooth and gradual integration of the ACP States into the world economy and the ultimate objective of economic and trade cooperation is to enable the ACP States to play a full part in international trade.

Contrary to the consultation paper, we don't think that economic performance

in the ACP region has been remarkable, creating larger domestic markets and providing for new economic opportunities. On the contrary we observe the following structural problems in the economy of a majority of ACP countries:

- Growing inequalities between and within countries
- Lack of people access to national social protection floors despite EU and ACP states having adopted the ILO Recommendation 202
- International labour standards not enforced and respected
- Raw material extraction not environmentally and socially sustainable and growing instability related to social and economic conflicts related to the use of natural resources
- Illicit financial flows depriving ACP economies of great share of potential domestic resources
- Economies vulnerable to external shocks and markets due to their high dependency on a few commodities and raw material extraction
- Many ACP countries lagging behind the MDGs targets, poor quality and coverage of public services

By promoting an economic development model almost exclusively based on international (or rather ACP-EU) trade and extractive industries, the CPA did not substantially contribute to sustainable and inclusive economic development.

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

In line with the spirit of the Agenda 2030, the future EU-ACP relations should better integrate all the three dimension of sustainable development.

Stronger focus on redistributive policies enhancing social investments and supporting the set up and scale up of universal social, protection systems.

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?

Though access to quality public services and national social protection floors should be ensured through domestic resources mobilization, ODA can contribute as catalyzer to capacity development for fair distribution of existing resources.

However, a number of challenges appear: ODA being used to work on migration, recent EU trends show ODA drop.

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 CPA should focus more at inequality rather than simply to poverty reduction.

19. Has the partnership been a useful vehicle for discussing migration issues and has it positively contributed? Has Article 13 CPA been fully applied?

Article 13 has contributed in a very limited way to the discussion on migration issues. This is mainly due to its narrow focus on legal residents, migrants legally employed in EU and ACP countries, returns and readmission of nationals illegally present on the territories of EU and ACP countries “without further formalities”.

20. Should a future partnership do more in this regard, and on which particular aspects should it focus (legal migration and mobility, addressing root causes of migration, return and readmission, tackling human trafficking and smuggling, international protection)?

Yes, the partnership should indeed do more in this regards. More particularly,

- Focus should be on protecting human rights of all migrants, independently from their status, in line with Agenda 2030 paragraph 29 which states “We recognize the positive contribution of migrants for inclusive growth and sustainable development. We also recognize that international migration is a multi-dimensional reality of major relevance for the development of countries of origin, transit and destination, which requires coherent and comprehensive responses. We will cooperate internationally to ensure safe, orderly and regular migration involving full respect for human rights and the humane treatment of migrants regardless of migration status, of refugees and of displaced persons. Such cooperation should also strengthen the resilience of communities hosting refugees, particularly in developing countries. We underline the right of migrants to return to their country of citizenship, and recall that States must ensure that their returning nationals are duly received...” ; Agenda 2030 target 10.7 on fair, safe and responsible migration; the EU Action Plan on Democracy and Human Rights, adopted in July 2015, as well as with relevant UN and ILO Conventions (namely the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families entered into force in 2003).

- The respect to the principle of non-refoulement should be explicitly mentioned.

- Focus on South -South migration should be strengthen

- Building on the reciprocity principle, EU should ensure that people who migrate to Europe have access to their fundamental economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to health, the right to an adequate standard of living, including housing, water, sanitation, and food; the right to education; the right to social security.

- Policy coherence for development should be ensured

At the same time, EDF resources should not be used for reception of asylum seekers in Europe nor for fighting people smugglers, nor for financing border control reinforcement by African 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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

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

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

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?

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?

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?

Needs to maintain the Agreement provision on civil society participation (regardless the new configuration) as a way to ensure that all, including the most vulnerable communities, are heard.

The current legal enshrinement of civil society as an actor in the Cotonou agreement is something specific to EU-ACP compared with other strategies and financial instruments. CSOs should be engaged in the process from the beginning: this includes political dialogue, programming of funds, implementation and review of programmes. In terms of programming, there is a specific civil society envelope within the development cooperation pillar of Cotonou which brings added value to ensure empowerment and effective engagement. The revised partnership needs to include formal mechanisms and

sufficient resources that guarantee CS participation at all levels. In addition to keeping specific financial envelopes targeting civil society, concrete mechanisms to further participation should include: structured dialogue during or in advance of meetings of joint institutions, in line with what currently happens with the ASEAN and EU-CELAC relations; regular consultation with civil society throughout full process of identification of policies and implementation of programmes (this should applied both at EU and ACP level, as the EU has a role in promoting these regular contacts and in encouraging that these take place at the partner country level). Elements to ensure transparent and inclusive consultations at partner countries' level with CSOs can also be included in CSOs roadmap, in order to ensure EUD engagement.

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?

Policy coherence for development (PCD) is one of the existing gaps under the partnership. This principle is taken forward in current article 12 of the Cotonou Agreement. PCD (or in fact shifting to policy coherence for sustainable development - PCSD) is identified as an important mechanism for improving the delivery of sustainable development and for the promotion and protection of human rights. The EU has to consider the impacts of all its policies on the achievement of sustainable development in and by other countries. Implementation of this principle is still weak and more political commitment required at all levels and in all parts of EU institutions and Member States. There have been several examples of incoherencies between EU policies and development objectives, which include financing for development (and concurrent illicit financial flows); food and nutrition security; and climate change and natural resources. PCSD must hence be scaled up in the future partnership. A proper mix of aid modalities and their compliance with principles of transparency and access for all actors hence needs to be ensured throughout all mechanisms.

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?

