

## 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

Oxford University

\* Country of residence or location of headquarters

UK

\* E-mail

xiaolan.fu@qeh.ox.ac.uk

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 full effects of an Europe-ACP partnership in tackling global challenges is yet to be seen because such a partnership is not explicit so far.

### 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 partnership could definitely add more value in the future especially addressing some areas of the SDGs such as poverty reduction, sustainable and inclusive economic growth, climate change, and global governance and partnership. In order to strengthen the results, we need to 1) make the partnership more explicitly, 2) more engagement between the public/state between Europe and ACP, more collaboration, 3) give and encourage the private sectors to play a greater role, 4) actively contribute to and lead the technical facilitation, knowledge transfer and local capabilities upgrading.

## 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?

Needs rigorous evaluation and empirical evidence.

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?

## Peace and security, fight against terrorism and organised crime

---

5. Are the provisions on peace and security in the CPA appropriate and useful and has the balance between regional and ACP involvement been effective?

6. Should the future partnership provide for more effective joint action on conflict prevention, including early warning and mediation, peace-building and state-building activities, as well as on tackling transnational security challenges? Should this be done in the EU-ACP context?

## Sustainable and inclusive economic growth, investment and trade

---

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

The EU-ACP partnership

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

The EU-ACP partnership has a lot to offer in promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development (SIED). Sustainable and inclusive economic development means economically and environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive development. In order to achieve this, technical assistance, knowledge transfer are key to local capabilities upgrading

and in providing important tool to address the challenges that hinders sustainable development. The EU's advantage in technology and managerial knowledge, in green technology, and in economically more advanced status gives EU a strong advantage in partnering with ACP in promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development. Therefore, taking into account the new SDGs framework, the future partnership, with no doubt, should do more in this respect.

However, the benefits derives from greater trade, investment and aid engagement which may brought about by the partnership do not become true without condition. The future partnership needs to do more in creating or improving the complementary conditions and institutional environment that are needed to enable the partnership to deliver the promises that it entails.

The areas that can be done more includes:

1) Make greater engagement in trade and investment between EU and ACP in addition to development aid.

2) Help the firms in ACP to join and upgrade in global value chain (GVC). Moreover, according to a research led by Oxford University, UNU-MERIT and CSIR (Ghana), more of the African firms are part of a regional or national production network while only a very small proportion of the African firms are able to join a global value chain. Firms and industries benefited from forming such production network which enabled them to produce products which are much more sophisticated and that individual firms would not be able to produce otherwise. This has important implications for production diversification, structural change and upgrading (Fu et al., 2014).

3) In order to benefit from the partnership for SIED, local absorptive capabilities is crucial. In order to develop such capabilities, improved education and training of youth and local workforce is in great need. The research in this area (eg. Fu et al, 2014) indicates that the lack of skills remain an important constraint for local firms in innovation and in absorb foreign technologies for local needs and development. The partnership could do more in help local education system in terms of quality and accessibility.

4) Evidences from research suggest that the gains from MNEs in terms of technology transfer is positive but yet not as significant as what the theory suggests and what people normally expect. An EC FP7 funded project carried out at Oxford University as part of a large project MNEmerge finds that there are significant knowledge transfer to local employees and manager through training, team working and other type of informal proximity engagements with the local employees. However, the inter-organisational knowledge transfer to other local firms is uneven and limited in general: those a few local firms that are selected into the MNE's supply chain benefits, but the most of the local firms do not have direct close engagement with MNEs and the knowledge transfer to them is limited (Fu, et al., 2015). Therefore, future partnership can do more to encourage MNEs to build up linkages, and more proactively

transfer knowledge to local firms and community to assist local capabilities building.

5) The developing countries benefits from an economy that is open to trade and investment. However, the worries against openness do exist at various levels in the society as the negative side of foreign competition is over-estimated and exaggerated. The partnership can help to communicate the idea more to ACP countries through dialogue and develop institutional arrangement to support the commitments to openness, while also develop a viable development strategy and industry & education policy to support local industrial capabilities building.

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?

The partnership can deliver its human development objective through aid, trade, FDI as well as international cooperation. Private sector engagement, EC MNEs in ACP countries, may contribute to poverty eradication and gender equality and empowerment of women through contribution to economic growth, corporate social responsibility, and for profit activities in the Bottom of Pyramid. An EC FP7 funded project carried out at Oxford University as part of a large project MNEmerge finds MNE activities in Africa has positive impact on local employees technological and managerial knowledge, in their career development, as well as aspirations for future management and entrepreneurial activities in their own right. This project is also studying the impact of EC MNEs in sanitation and renewable energy in South Asia and Latin America. Results will come out shortly next year.

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

## 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)?

## 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?

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

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

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](mailto:europeaid-01@ec.europa.eu)

---