

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

International Disability and Development Consortium (IDDC) - EU TG

* Country of residence or location of headquarters

Brussels - Belgium

* E-mail

s.neyens@light-for-the-world.org

Identification number in the Transparency Register (if applicable)

26634082731-16

* 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 preamble of Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development is very clear in stating that "eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, including extreme poverty, is the greatest global challenge and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development". This is also one of the objectives of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement, namely the one on poverty eradication, sustainable development and the gradual integration of ACP countries into the world economy. When looking at poverty eradication, the partnership did not truly live up to its commitment. Poverty, defined as an average daily consumption of \$2 or less has decreased over the years. However, progress has been uneven across regions and countries, leaving significant gaps. Millions of people have been left behind, especially the poorest and those disadvantaged because of their sex, age, disability, ethnicity or geographic location. More than one billion people in the world, or 15 % of the population, live with some form of disability. 80 % of all people with disabilities worldwide live in developing countries and an overwhelming majority of them lives below the poverty line. Disability and poverty reinforce and perpetuate one another. People with a disability are among the poorest of the poor and face multiple barriers that stop them from realising their rights, while people living in poverty are more at risk than others of acquiring a disability. People with a disability have limited access to health care and education, have difficulty finding employment, face high levels of stigma and discrimination and are commonly denied their rights. These factors all contribute to economic vulnerability and social exclusion. In turn, poor households rarely have access to adequate food, shelter, hygiene and

sanitation facilities, potable water and preventative health care services, elements that exacerbate poverty and increase the risks of disability. Women and girls with a disability, along with the elderly, are particularly vulnerable to poverty. They also face multiple layers of stigma and discrimination, as recognised by the 2011 Resolution by the ACP - EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly on the inclusion of persons with disabilities in developing countries. This resolution specifically states that women and girls with disabilities are particularly vulnerable and are three times as likely to experience gender-based violence as women without disabilities; the resolution also recalls the dangerous trend whereby this violence is likely to go unreported.

One of the current key challenges is thus the growing inequality both between and within countries and the fact that the more marginalised parts of the population live in poverty with limited access to basic social services and employment. People with disabilities, for example, experience exclusion from all aspects of life, including work, public services, transport, communication, education and information. One third of all out of school children has a disability and, due to many barriers (inaccessible work spaces, negative attitudes, limited access to education, ...), the labour market force participation rate of persons with disabilities is low. Women and girls with disabilities face even more challenges as they are often subject to multiple discrimination. An effort of the ACP - EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly to tackle inequality and promote the inclusion of persons with disabilities was the adoption in 2011 of a joint resolution on the inclusion of persons with disabilities in developing countries. Despite strong language and an obligation to report every 2 years on good practices and progress, persons with disabilities are still confronted with discrimination, inequality, and poverty in ACP countries. Furthermore there was no compliance with the reporting commitment, as progress was discussed once in 2013 and only by a limited number of countries. It thus seems to be rather an commitment which is not supported by any implementation plan nor reporting system. In order to enhance the inclusion of persons with disabilities, a stronger resolution with a stronger commitment, implementation plan and adequate resources is required.

Another global challenge addressed in the Cotonou Agreement is climate change. Although the commitments in the Cotonou Agreement have contributed to putting climate change on the political agreement of the partnership, more needs to be done, especially to include the concerns of the most marginalised in society in all climate change policies and programmes. Persons with disabilities are disproportionally affected by (likely to face heightened risk associated with) environmental hazards and the impacts of climate change.

2. What would be needed to strengthen results in this respect and on which global challenges could the partnership add most value in the future, in the context of the new SDGs framework and in relevant international fora?

The new SDG framework, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, clearly states that the eradication of poverty in all its forms and dimensions, including extreme poverty is the greatest global challenge and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development and attributes great value to the idea that no one should be left behind. It is important to recognise that any future ACP - EU partnership will have to be framed within the context of the new Agenda 2030. The new partnership should respect all Agenda 2030 objectives (eradication of poverty, protect the planet, provide a life of dignity for all) and principles (leave no one behind approach, inclusion, participation, universality, human rights, accountability,...) and should contribute to its implementation at all levels. Furthermore the 11 references to inclusive development in the Agenda 2030 should be recognised, respected and taken into account by the new ACP - EU partnership. The new ACP - EU partnership should be supportive of a development model that is people and planet centered, addresses all dimensions of sustainable development, is respectful of human rights and ensures that no one, including the most marginalised one, is left behind.

With this in mind, the revised partnership will have to rethink the economic relationship that the partnership will put in place and adopt measures of economic progress that better reflect people's well-being, by focusing on inequality and inequity. This means that all relevant indicators should be disaggregated by disability and that specific disability indicators should be foreseen to measure inclusiveness of key basic social services, such as education and health. The partnership should further define a set of interventions that promote equitable access to resources and services, with a focus on basic social services for all, in addition to inclusive growth with decent jobs and livelihoods for all people, including persons with disabilities.

This also means that with regard to climate change, the new ACP -EU partnership should ensure the inclusion of the rights and needs of persons with disabilities in all policies and actions. Data regarding climate change and environment sustainability must be disaggregated in relation to disability and new datasets on persons with disabilities should be produced. The future partnership should also be compliant with the recently adopted Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (www.unisdr.org/files/43291_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf). IDDC recommends therefore that:

- Governments should disaggregate data by sex, age and disabilities and provide evidence of support specific to persons with disabilities in times of emergency and rebuild phases. They should also ensure that the voices of persons with disabilities are included in the development and implementation of national and local plans in the disaster management cycle.

- DRR and Preparedness Measures for Disasters must ensure the development of local DRR mechanisms such as committees and action plans are inclusive of women, men, girls and boys with disabilities. They also must ensure there is a direct link between emergency response and these development initiatives so that the risk of any affected population falling back into poverty can be minimised.
- Agencies responsible for humanitarian financing must develop specific target indicators on disability inclusion in humanitarian action and document good practice of disability inclusive financing with a view to sharing among humanitarian donors.
- All humanitarian actors must ensure that persons with disabilities are included in responses to new and emerging crises.

The EU, as the biggest aid donor and a leader actor in the international forum, can promote institutional and societal changes. The partnership with ACP countries is a strategic opportunity to boost this change and to create inclusive societies in ACP countries.

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?

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 participation of civil society in decision making processes is essential to promote human rights, democracy, good governance and rule of law. CSOs are crucial to identify where efforts should be prioritised and reach out to people who are most excluded or difficult to reach. CSOs provide practical solutions to local and global challenges and pilot important innovative projects that can be scaled up afterwards. CSOs often build or contribute to multi-stakeholder partnerships to implement certain programmes or projects jointly. And they play a convening role in bringing different actors to the table to explore

solutions and bridge cross-sectoral gaps. Disabled People Organisations (DPOs) represent 15% of the world population (namely the 1 billion people with a disability). When involving civil society it is then essential that all civil society is included. DPOs are often not included in consultations or are not able to participate due to accessibility restraints, negative attitudes, ignorance,

The Cotonou Agreement is unique in the sense that it recognises multiple stakeholders such as civil society (CS), as key actors of the partnership – no other legal bilateral agreement includes such clauses. However, despite this recognition, there are no formal mechanisms for CS participation. According to article 8 of the CPA, representatives of civil society should be included in the political dialogue whenever relevant. The Council of Ministers and the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA) are expected to contact and consult regularly representatives of the ACP-EU economic and social partners and other representatives of civil society, in order to obtain their views on the attainment of the objectives of the partnership. In practice, civil society rarely takes an active role in political dialogue. Invitations to attend meetings of the Council of Ministers remain occasional and the inclusion of civil society to the JPA is rather limited to the role of observer.

In addition, following the CPA principles of ownership and participation, among others, civil society, should play a key role in development cooperation. The CPA states very clearly that civil society should be fully involved in the implementation and monitoring of aid and consequently foresees that capacity-building should be provided where appropriate. The EU, namely EU Delegations (EUDs), should not only seek regular exchanges of information but also involve DPOs in the programming and evaluation phases of the EDF.

The future ACP – EU partnership should recognise DPOs as key partners and the current provisions on civil society participation should be maintained. Because of the importance of the involvement of CSOs, including DPOs, to promote human rights, democracy and the rule of law, the future ACP – EU partnership should hence include the following elements:

- Particular attention should be given to the inclusion of marginalised communities, including minorities, people with disabilities and children and youth. This also means that particular attention should be paid to accessibility of meetings and information as to allow and support the participation of persons with disabilities.
- Investment in capacity building of EU delegations for the application of the Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy. This would imply reinforcing capacity-building for the EU Delegations while adding part on the inclusion of marginalised groups, including minorities, persons with disabilities and children and youth. Such capacity building should always start from a Human Rights Based Approach.

- Institutionalise a dialogue with ACP civil society, including DPOs, on a regular basis in a way to ensure local communities, including persons with disabilities, are heard and monitoring mechanisms are in place. DPOs have a large experience in promoting the rights of persons with disabilities and their technical assistance can be valuable; eg before launching a call for proposal DPOs should be consulted.

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?

Our vision of sustainable and inclusive economic development starts from people's rights, needs and aspirations and is based on a wide range of economic, social and environmental policies that respond to them;. A sustainable economy is viable and socially equitable, and includes everyone, also the most marginalised. It is inclusive, underpinned by gender justice, resilient to shocks and stresses, and brings benefits to all, including persons with disabilities. It is also an economy that is environmentally sustainable, and does not undermine the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

This vision is not reflected in the CPA; for which Economic and trade cooperation should 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. This will not lead to poverty eradication or the reduction of inequalities, neither within nor between countries.

When taking this broad definition into account, we can thus conclude that the partnership has definitely not been effective in promoting sustainable and inclusive economic growth. This holds especially true when taking into account the situation of persons with disabilities. Despite the fact that persons with disabilities constitute a significant proportion of the world's population, 15%, they face barriers in accessing employment as a combination of lack of access to education and vocational training, misconceptions about the abilities of persons with disabilities, and disability-based discrimination. When successful in obtaining employment persons with disabilities are acknowledged to have a high retention rate as well as lower absenteeism. Even so, when they are employed, they are likely to be in low-paying jobs, at lower occupational levels and with poor promotional prospects and working conditions. This is particularly true for women with disabilities. As a result of the higher rates of unemployment, under employment and labour market inactivity among persons with disabilities, between 3 and 7% of a country's national GDP is lost. Furthermore the exclusion of persons with disabilities from key spheres of life such as education, employment and health, not only creates an untenable economic burden for governments but also carries substantial costs to society and to persons with disabilities and their families. As a consequence of their exclusion from economic activity, persons with disabilities are more likely to find themselves in poverty. This situation is perpetuated by the fact that persons with disabilities are generally excluded from economic opportunities and, when they are included they earn much less than those without disabilities, yet their expenses (such as the costs of disability) are more.

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

Inclusive economic development with decent work is a prerequisite for eradicating extreme poverty. The challenge for the 2030 Agenda is to build on progress made in previous years in terms of improving livelihoods of all people, including persons with disabilities. Past assumptions (higher levels of output automatically lead to the number and quality of jobs, needed for economic transformation and social inclusion) were not true for many of the poorest people, including persons with disabilities. A combination of productive capacities, private sector investments and entrepreneurship, supported by strong government institutions helped foster economic growth and structural transformation in those developing countries most able to make a significant dent on poverty rates. Now, well-designed labour market policies and programmes are critical to sustain incomes and livelihoods, improve job quality and productivity, and support progress in the fight against poverty. For the future EU-ACP partnership to continue this progress and to ensure it is inclusive of everyone, there needs to be a combination of policies that promote economic development through productive investment and private sector expansion and, at the same time, ensure that the generated jobs are decent, meaning that jobs provide those who can access them with a genuine chance to lift themselves out of poverty and avoid regression. Equality of opportunity without discrimination on the grounds of gender, age, disability, ethnicity, religion or other protected grounds is essential for ensuring sustainable and inclusive economic growth. This creates the need for governments and donors to ensure that investments made for implementing the 2030 Agenda are inclusive of persons with disabilities.

Article 27 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities calls for just and favourable conditions of work for persons with disabilities; access to vocational and rehabilitation training; promotion of self-employment and entrepreneurship; and protection from exploitation and forced labour. This means there must be targeted support to enable persons with disabilities to take up employment (e.g. accessible infrastructure and transport and reasonable accommodation), at the same time, inclusive mainstream initiatives to promote the full and productive employment for persons with disabilities must be created.

Measures to include persons with disabilities in employment opportunities benefit both society and the economy. Many States have therefore taken (legislative and policy) measures to make workplaces accessible for persons with disabilities. Other measures included building ramps, accessible toilets, elevators and providing communication support for persons with hearing and visual impairments. Article 9 of the CRPD on accessibility applies to workplaces and requires prospective employers of persons with disabilities to consider access requirements. It is applicable not only to government funded

bodies and workplaces but also places obligations on private sector employers.

Social security and income-maintenance schemes are particularly important for many persons with disabilities, given their overall low participation in the labour force and their susceptibility to poverty. Yet, most of the limited social safety net programmes that have been developed in poor countries have given little attention to persons with disabilities. Furthermore, while richer countries have in place a range of long-term and short-term social protection, there is a failure to recognise the direct and extra costs incurred by persons with disabilities as part of such social protection programmes. Article 28 of the CRPD recognises the right of persons with disabilities to enjoy social protection without discrimination on the basis of disability. It requires that governments take appropriate steps to safeguard and promote the realisation of this right, including through measures to ensure access by persons with disabilities, in particular women, girls and older persons with disabilities, to social protection programmes and poverty reduction programmes. It also recognises that governments must create an environment where persons with disabilities can take up employment opportunities without fear of losing their social security. The challenge is to ensure that persons with disabilities are afforded the opportunity to access employment and livelihood opportunities and where necessary social protection.

Equality, human rights and sustainability should be core principles for promoting decent employment and universal social protection, which contribute to inclusive economic development. Public investment in creating decent employment as well as universal social protection systems for all is fundamental. Such measures will combat poverty and exclusion, promote social justice and cohesion and strongly benefit persons with disabilities

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?

Private sector investment does not automatically lead to poverty eradication, or to the eradication of inequalities. A future ACP – EU partnership needs to ensure that support for private sector contributes to poverty eradication and rising equality in ACP states. It should for example contribute to a higher level of decent work, including employment for persons with disabilities. Unfortunately persons with disabilities still face significant challenges at the labour market.

ODA should always contribute to the development of a country and improve situation for the citizens. There can be investment in private sector, but only if these conditions are respected. Using ODA to support multinational companies is not acceptable, but support to Small and Medium Sized Entreprises can be helpful.

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?

When countries are not ready for trade liberalisation agreements, this has an adverse effect on economic and social development, and the poorest people are at particular risk. Since persons with disabilities are amongst the poorest and most marginalised, the risks associated with trade liberalization agreements such as the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) affect them particularly acutely.

In addition, where trade agreements include provisions on intellectual property, persons with disability are likely to be affected disproportionately. This is because of the crucial role that technology can play in breaking down barriers for persons with disabilities: whether through assistive technology that enhances physical access (e.g. mobility aids), through technology that enhances access to communication (e.g. innovations in accessible ICT), or through medical technology and services that help persons with disabilities manage health conditions associated with their disability. The importance of technology for persons with disabilities is recognized in human rights treaties and international development instruments and including Article 9 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

IDDC therefore recommends the following:

- The Post-Cotonou framework should include specific provisions on trade. The purpose of these provisions should be to ensure that EU-ACP trade agreements are consistent with the wider principles of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement – sustainable economic, social and cultural development, and poverty eradication – which are central to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. As such, provisions on trade should make explicit that, wherever permissible under international trade rules, the EU will not impose reciprocal obligations on ACP countries.
- We also recommend that, in the provisions on trade, the EU should make a commitment not to impose TRIPS-plus intellectual property rules, where these would impinge on the rights of persons with disabilities to benefit from basic assistive or medical technologies. Such technology includes, but is not limited to, the technologies covered by the Marrakech Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons who are Blind, Visually Impaired or otherwise Print Disabled; technologies/services specified by the World Health Organisation's Essential Medicine List and forthcoming Priority Assistive Products List; and technologies needed to comply with International Telecommunications Union standards and guidance on accessibility (www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Digital-Inclusion/Persons-with-Disabilities/Pages/Persons-with-Disabilities.aspx).

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 CPA aims amongst others to reduce inequalities of access to basic social services. However, it has not managed to deliver on this specific objective, especially not when considering the demands and needs of persons with disabilities.

Equal access to education is problematic for children with disabilities. Around 90% of children with disabilities in developing countries does not attend school. Poverty, social stigma, inadequate basic services, negative attitudes, and inaccessible infrastructure and learning are major barriers.

Equitable access to comprehensive and quality health care: persons with disabilities have higher health care needs (treatment of impairment, rehabilitation, higher risk for secondary conditions, malnutrition, ...), but face many barriers to access quality health care, including: higher costs, distance and access to transport, inadequately trained medical staff,...

HIV/Aids: Persons with disabilities are at higher risk of exposure but rarely included in the national response to HIV/AIDS. Low literacy levels and lack of accessible HIV prevention information make it difficult for persons with disabilities to acquire knowledge. Women and girls with disabilities face unique challenges due to the heightened risk of gender-based violence and lack of access to reproductive health care services.

Accessible WASH services: Article 28 CRPD specifically includes a duty for state parties to ensure access to clean water services, but in many contexts persons with disabilities continue to be excluded. Lack of accessible WASH facilities in school and the workplace, are important barriers for many persons with disabilities and are extra problematic for girls and women with disabilities.

Inclusive social protection systems in line with article 28 CPRD: Social transfers can reduce vulnerability and enable greater participation in economic and social life. However, the inclusion of persons with disabilities in social protection schemes remains a challenge.

This clearly shows that although the objective of human development is very relevant, the partnership has not delivered on it. IDDC therefore suggests the following for the revised ACP - EU partnership:

- The human and social development objective should be retained and all efforts under this objective should reach the most marginalised in

society, including persons with disabilities, in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the CRPD. Agenda 2030, the overarching development framework under which all development relations (including the one between ACP and EU) should fall, clearly adopted an inclusive approach on all human and social development issues and contains a commitment to leave no one behind. It is up to EU and ACP countries to adopt this approach and include these commitments in their future relations.

- Adopt a clear definition of Human Development. The EC- EEAS Joint consultation paper narrows it down to a result of economic progress. There is need for a broader definition, in line with Agenda 2030, including aspects of inequalities, empowerment and human rights, especially the rights of persons with disabilities in line with the CRPD.

- A Human Rights Based Approach, with clear attention for marginalised groups such as persons with disabilities and double discrimination, should underpin the revised partnership.

- Disability as a cross-cutting issue in all human and social development policies and actions in the revised ACP-EU framework. For example: Education: promote inclusive education, including support and training for teachers,... . Health and social protection: The Post-Cotonou framework should support Universal Health Coverage. Health systems should deliver inclusive and accessible services . This requires the provision of rehabilitation services, and social protection measures that include disability related extra costs such as assistive devices and technology, support services and additional healthcare costs.

- Accessibility is a prerequisite for inclusion. This means that information should be accessible to all (thereby thinking of braille, easy read formats, ...); public services (schools, health centres, WASH facilities, ...) should be universally accessible, thereby taking into account the Universal Design rules; Policies are communicated in accessible ways

- The revised partnership agreement should have clear mechanisms in place to involve Civil society and DPOs in achieving human development and the SDGs. In the design, implementation and evaluation of all policies and programmes DPOs should be involved.

- Need for monitoring and evaluation in the area of Human Development, including the collection of disability disaggregated data

- Special attention for women and girls with disabilities under all human and social development as they are often confronted with multiple discrimination.

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 new partnership can only succeed in fostering human development if it adapts an integrated approach and leaves behind silo investments in different sectors. We strongly recommend to retain the human development objective in the future ACP – EU partnership and keep the current sectors as they are all included in Agenda 2030. However IDDC would also like to add some specific recommendations:

- Agenda 2030 contains a commitment under SDG 10 (reduce inequalities within and among countries) to empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of their age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic status. Since the revised ACP – EU partnership will have to be framed within Agenda 2030, it is essential that this commitment to empower and promote the social economic and political inclusion of all becomes an objective under the human development part of the partnership.
- This would also mean that with regard to education there is a clear commitment in the revised partnership to work towards quality education for all, including children and persons with disabilities via the promotion of inclusive education, which is also confirmed by SDG 4 (target 4.5 ensure equal access to all level of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous people and children in vulnerable situations).
- With regard to health, one of the main challenges that the future partnership should focus on is to foresee universal health coverage for all, including for persons with disabilities. Health systems should deliver inclusive and accessible services . This requires the provision of rehabilitation services, and social protection measures that include disability related extra costs such as assistive devices and technology, support services and additional healthcare costs.
- the revised partnership should also retain its focus on social protection, especially in the light of the Agenda 2030 poverty eradication objective
- Inclusive and sustainable economic growth, that contributes to poverty eradication, foresees in decent work for everyone and does not undermine the ability of future generations to meet their own needs, is also a commitment in the Agenda 2030 and a challenge for the revised ACP – EU partnership. It is essential in this regard to focus on decent work for all women and men, including for persons with disabilities, and to promote the principle of equal pay for work of equal value.
- Agenda 2030 clearly states that in order to help with the measurement of progress and to ensure no one is left behind, quality, accessible, timely and reliable disaggregated data will be needed. This

includes data disaggregated by gender, age, religion, ethnicity, disability, The ACP - EU partnership could support statistical capacities in developing countries to collect such data.

- Leave no one behind approach: The revised ACP-EU partnership should not focus on poorest countries but on poorest people. The 2010 World report on disability is very clear that persons with disabilities are often among the poorest of the poor. They should therefore be included in all human development efforts. This also requests a participatory approach and thus the involvement of DPOs to implement the Agenda 2030.

- The rights of persons with disabilities and the inclusion of persons with disabilities should be mainstreamed throughout the future ACP -EU partnership. This is the only way to ensure persons with disabilities are included.

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)?

The current Cotonou Partnership Agreement fails to take into account the rights and needs of migrants with disabilities. This despite the fact that wars, conflict and environmental disasters that cause people to migrate are also a major cause of impairment and impoverishment, whilst the forced migratory passage impacts disabled people as they flee or attempt to reconstruct their lives in other places. In addition, persons with disabilities are among the most neglected during flight, displacement and return. Due to communication or physical barriers, negative attitudes or other obstacles, persons with disabilities face many hurdles in accessing assistance and protection. They may also face a heightened level of disability during displacement, because of changes in their environment or lack of appropriate care and services. Moreover, they are often seen as passive recipients of aid rather than active participants. A big challenge is the lack of data available on migrants with disabilities.

We would therefore recommend the following:

- The future ACP – EU partnership should keep in mind the specific needs of migrants with disabilities and ensure their rights are respected.
- In all future dialogue on migration between the ACP and the EU, migrants with disabilities should be kept in mind and their needs and rights addressed.
- All the rights in the UN Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities also apply to migrants with disabilities.
- Take into account the specific needs of girls and women with disabilities as they are extremely vulnerable to physical and sexual violence.
- There is a big problem with regards to data on migrants with disabilities. The collection of disability disaggregated data is therefore essential and should be supported.

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?

Development resources should be allocated to the people most in need. Currently GDP per capita is used as the main criteria to allocate development resources. However, GDP per capita fails to measure existing inequalities and vulnerabilities and therefore does not provide a clear picture of the country concerned. A focus on GDP per capita will always hurt the poorest and most marginalised in society.

It is therefore thus important to channel resources not only based on GDP per capita. An alternative would be to use a combination between GDP/capita; the human development index (HDI), a summary measure of average achievement in key dimensions of human development. it's different dimensions (health, education, standard of living); and a measure to capture inequality within the country, for example the GINI coefficient.

However, in case of differentiation it is important that the overall level of ODA for ACP countries is not reduced, even if the number of beneficiary countries reduces. In addition, when graduating countries should be subject to a transitional phase, including impact assessments of the effects of such graduation and thereby taking into account the effects on the poorest and most marginalised, such as persons with disabilities, in society. In this regard it is essential to include civil society, and more specifically DPOs in this process.

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?

As mentioned already under question 4, the CPA is unique in its recognition of the role of non-state actors, such as civil society. Due to its different roles, the inclusion of all civil society is essential to obtain the objectives and to implement the partnership. Civil society is essential in ensuring that all aid beneficiaries can both participate and benefit from sustainable development, amongst others by reaching out to the most marginalised groups, such as persons with disabilities.

However we also noticed that in the current partnership, despite all these commitments, challenges to include civil society remain. This holds especially true for organisations from and for persons with disabilities (DPOs). Although persons with disabilities constitute a considerable part of the population (given the fact that 15% of the world population has a disability and that 80% of all people with disabilities lives in a developing countries) and they are amongst the poorest and most marginalised in society, they are often not included in consultations due to many barriers (lack of accessibility, discriminatory attitudes, ignorance, ...).

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?

It is essential that the future partnership ACP – EU partnership also formally recognises the importance of the involvement of CSOs, including DPOs, and it should hence include the following elements:

- CSOs should also be given a formal space close to institutions of the partnership, regardless their configuration after 2020.
- Particular attention should be paid to accessibility of meetings and information as to allow and support the participation of persons with disabilities.
- EU Delegations (EUDs) have a role to play in supporting Civil Society space and an enabling environment. DPOs should also included in all EUD efforts and consultations. Investment in capacity building of EU delegation on the inclusion of marginalised groups, such as persons with disabilities, is therefore essential. Such capacity building should always start from a Human Rights Based Approach.
- Institutionalise a dialogue with ACP civil society, including DPOs, on a regular basis in a way to ensure local communities, including persons with disabilities, are heard and monitoring mechanisms are in place. DPOs have a large experience in promoting the rights of persons with disabilities and their technical assistance can be valuable; eg before launching a call for proposal DPOs should be consulted.

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

The objective/aim of the new partnership should always stay the interest of all people in ACP countries, including the poorest and most marginalised, improving their living conditions and ensuring respect for human rights. Under no condition should this be abandoned. If the partnership is opened to other actors the same principles have to be respected.

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?

ACP-EU partnership is one of the kind, so it is valuable to have dedicated financing instruments targeted to this partnership and its objectives.

However, whatever is decided on the financing instrument of the future ACP - EU partnership, it is clear that disability should be adopted as a cross-cutting issue, similar to gender. Currently this is already the case for the DCI and the IPA. This of course also means that the inclusion of persons with disabilities should be part of all monitoring and evaluation under the future instrument. Including disability as a cross-cutting issue in the future instrument for the ACP-EU partnership contributes to the inclusion of persons with disabilities in all EU development programmes, which is in line with the EU's commitments under article 32 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the recently adopted Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities ("The Committee recommends that the European Union adopt a harmonised policy on disability-inclusive development and establish a systematic approach to mainstream the rights of persons with disabilities in all European Union international cooperation policies and programmes"). In order to achieve the full inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities, it is often necessary to also provide specific support in parallel, to ensure that they are empowered to participate on an equal basis with others. This combination of 'disability inclusion' with disability specific projects, or components of projects, which aim to empower persons with disabilities in particular, is called the 'twin track approach'. Some of the funding under the new instrument for the ACP -EU partnership should therefore be specifically dedicated to promote the rights and improve the living conditions of persons with disabilities.

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?

The future ACP - EU partnership should maintain the legal enshrinement of civil society as an actor, such as in the Cotonou agreement. It 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 be 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.

In practice this means that all civil society, including the most marginalised groups such as persons with disabilities, should be included in the programming process. Persons with disabilities are frequently overlooked in programming, in part because they are rarely given a voice in the development discourse at national or international levels and in part because the societies in which they live frequently prevent them from enjoying their rights more broadly. A recent IDDC study has also showed that considerable challenges in this regard still exist. One example relates to the accessibility of EU delegations, which are key actors in organising consultations during the programming process. Despite the EU's ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, there are still EU delegations which are not accessible to persons with disabilities. This is extremely problematic when consultations with civil society, for example on the programming process, are organised.

In order to maximise the ownership of the programming process and the inclusion of all civil society, including persons with disabilities and their representative organisations, we would therefore recommend the following:

- Regular consultation with all civil society, including DPO, throughout the full process of identification of policies and implementation of programmes (this should be 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).
- All EU delegations should receive a training on the inclusion of persons with disabilities.
- Information on consultations with civil society, amongst others on the programming process, should also be made available by delegations in accessible and alternative formats to reach out to disability rights representatives.
- Providing that accessibility is a pre-condition for people with disabilities to be able to participate meaningfully and be included, buildings, conference venues, offices, rest rooms, documentation,

information and other facilities need to be accessible. Accessibility and reasonable accommodation measures should be put in place in delegations to secure the effective participation by all persons with disabilities in the programming process.

- Elements to ensure transparent, inclusive and accessible consultations at partner countries' level with DPOS can also be included in the 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?

According to the Cotonou Partnership Agreement, the objectives of this ACP-EU partnership is poverty eradication and sustainable development. Common principles are ownership, participation (including from civil society), dialogue and accountability.

As already addressed in question 2, it is important to recognise that any future ACP - EU partnership will have to be framed within the context of the new Agenda 2030. This would mean that the new partnership, including the variety of existing tools, should respect all Agenda 2030 objectives (eradication of poverty, protect the planet, provide a life of dignity for all) and principles (leave no one behind approach, inclusion, participation, universality, human rights, accountability,...) and should contribute to its implementation at all levels.

Furthermore both the EU, the majority of its member states and the overwhelming majority of the ACP countries have ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). We therefore urge the EU and the ACP countries to keep the objectives of the CRPD in mind when developing a new partnership. In addition the general principles of the CRPD should be reflected throughout the revised ACP - EU partnership, including in its development cooperation tools. These general principles are listed in article 3 of the CRPD:

- respect for inherent dignity, individual autonomy including the freedom to make one's own choices, and independence of persons
- non-discrimination
- full and effective participation and inclusion in society of all people, including persons with disabilities
- respect for difference and acceptance of persons with disabilities as part of human diversity and humanity
- equality of opportunity
- accessibility
- equality between men and women
- respect for the evolving capacities of children with disabilities and

respect for the right of children with disabilities to preserve their identities.

Finally, when talking about tools, principles and gaps it is also important to mention the principle of Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD) and its mainstreaming throughout the new ACP – EU partnership. This principle is taken forward in current article 12 of the Cotonou Agreement. 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 is 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; trade and climate change and natural resources. PCSD must hence be scaled up in the future partnership.

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

✉ europaaid-01@ec.europa.eu
