

**FICHE CONTRADICTOIRE (version 24/10 – 13:50)**  
**Evaluation of EU regional level support to Central Asia (2007-2014)**  
 (\*For details on the recommendations please refer to the main report – page 68 - 73)

Recommendations	Response of EU services	Follow-up (one year later)
<p><b>Recommendation 1: Sharpen the focus of EU support to better reflect CA’s position in Asia and Eurasia.</b></p> <p>Adjust the CA regional strategies and programmes to better capitalise on CA’s emerging economic opportunities in Asia.</p> <p><u>Possible actions include:</u></p> <p><b>[i]</b> Include when relevant CA countries in EU’s regional programmes for Asia or establish inter-regional CA-Asia programmes (e.g. on PSD and trade).</p> <p><b>[ii]</b> Include CA countries in EU-Asia dialogue when relevant.</p> <p><b>[iii]</b> If feasible and appropriate vis-à-vis EU’s political priorities, include (by 2020) CA in the strategy and programmes of the Asia Region instead of having CA as a separate region – but at the same time maintain the possibility of having programmes and dialogue with a CA-specific focus (as EU is also doing in other sub-regions), as well as opportunities to learn from EU MS (especially those in Eastern Europe) and ENP East countries.</p>	<p><b>Partially Agreed</b></p> <p>[i] On an ad-hoc basis develop appropriate programmes and dialogues when needed with Asia and Neighbourhood countries</p> <p>[ii] include relevant Asian countries (e.g. Afghanistan) in CA dialogue on an ad-hoc basis</p> <p>[iii] Although it is useful for CA countries to learn from Asian countries (especially in economic cooperation and transfer of technologies or areas like migration and security), CA countries are more culturally, politically and economically (with the exception of China) linked to the Eastern Partnership countries and Russia than with any of their Asian neighbours. Moreover Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan are member of the Eurasian Economic Union and therefore are subject to a specific regulatory environment that ties them closely to Russia, Belarus and Armenia.</p> <p>Therefore, at this stage, EU intends to maintain the current specific institutional geographical set up and develop appropriate programmes and dialogues when needed with Asia and Neighbourhood countries.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 2: Enhance the interstate dimension in regional programmes</b></p> <p>In the regional programmes, increase the prominence of actions which promote active co-operation between two or more CA countries.</p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p> <p>This approach has been followed as a trigger to gradually involve all CA partners on a demand driven basis allowing countries to move forward on agreeable subjects, with encouraging success based on better regional ownership and therefore</p>	

<p><u>Possible action include:</u></p> <p><b>[i]</b> Analyse pros and cons of regional/interstate versus country-specific approaches in various sectors and for various interest groups in CA and the EU, based on lessons from the regional and bilateral programmes.</p> <p><b>[ii]</b> Engage more strongly in trans boundary or interstate issues and opportunities, where countries have similar interests (e.g. SME co-operation and exports, migratory species and trans boundary ecosystems) – and try to involve other countries than KG and TJ in such non-controversial themes, which are of interest to them (e.g. KZ-UZ on saiga antelope conservation).</p> <p><b>[iii]</b> Investigate, in co-operation with EUSR, UN partners and GIZ, opportunities for supporting strengthening and reforming IFAS under the Turkmen chairmanship. This should be initiated immediately, this window of opportunity is opening right now and only for a limited period of time.</p> <p><b>[iv]</b> Enhance the focus of EU assistance on the specific context and capacities of CA in supra-regional education programmes, avoid over-ambition, ensure approaches are realistic, and secure involvement and commitment of decision makers.</p> <p><b>[v]</b> Consider using the Rule of Law Initiative (or BOMCA) to provide advisory support for the introduction of solutions for addressing border disputes (e.g. international arbitrary procedures, mediation processes, practices of the International Court of Justice in settling interstate disputes).</p>	<p>sustainability.</p> <p>[i] -</p> <p>[ii] will be explored on an ad-hoc basis</p> <p>[iii] Currently, some CA Countries (e.g. Kyrgyzstan) do not support the current IFAS set-up. EU will promote political dialogue to ensure CA shared views on IFAS and their stronger funding while taking into account that CA countries might not have the required administrative capacity or political willingness to do so.</p> <p>[iv] To be supported through the education Platform</p> <p>[v] Given the sensitivity of the issue, an appropriate set up should be considered aiming at integrating technical and political dimensions.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 3: Establish an EU-CA high-level dialogue and platform on private sector development</b></p> <p>Enhance the EU-CA and regional dialogue by introducing an EU-CA high-level dialogue and platform, building on the experience from the regional PSD/SME programmes.</p> <p><u>Possible actions include:</u></p> <p><b>[i]</b> Analyse/verify the interest in CA for establishing a new high-level dialogue and platform.</p>	<p><b>Partially Agreed</b></p> <p>While it is unclear how the EU may be a major actor in promoting private sector development between Central Asia Countries Europe and the wider Asia, it is one of the major items raised on a regular basis by CA ministers.</p> <p>Therefore the EU will explore the opportunity of establishing such a platform, while also being</p>	

<p><b>[ii]</b> Engage in discussions with different DGs about the feasibility and capacity to initiate a new high-level dialogue and platform.</p> <p><b>[iii]</b> Assess the feasibility of transforming/elevating the current dialogue under the regional programmes into a full-scale EU-CA high-level dialogue with a supporting platform.</p> <p><b>[iv]</b> Investigate whether the policy dialogue under CAI can be enhanced to function as a platform and facilitate EU-CA high-level dialogue, which has a clear nature of being an EU dialogue and not mainly an OECD dialogue (as is currently the case).</p>	<p>prepared to step away from this plan if it proves to be unfeasible.</p> <p>[i] interest confirmed already confirmed in various meetings with CA partners</p> <p>[ii] -</p> <p>[iii] -</p> <p>[iv] -</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 4: Enhance the profile and regional ownership of the EU-CA high-level dialogues and platforms</b></p> <p>Pursue a more consistent high-level representation in the high-level conferences and enhanced continuity in the participation in the platforms.</p> <p><u>Possible actions include:</u></p> <p><b>[i]</b> Continue supporting the EU-CA dialogues for one more phase with a clear objective to see if the dialogues and platforms can move beyond the diplomatic function and towards more tangible agreements and co-operation. If the dialogue does not evolve further, then consider phasing out the dialogue processes.</p> <p><b>[ii]</b> Discuss with the EUSR, how/whether the role of his office can be enhanced, e.g. in terms of aligning EUSR and DEVCO work-streams, and in terms of mobilising EU Member States as well as high-level representation and seniority and continuity in technical working group participation.</p> <p><b>[iii]</b> Discuss with EU Member State Chairs how their role could be further utilised/enhanced and how the value of Member State chairing can be maximised.</p> <p><b>[iv]</b> Engage EUDs in dialogue with CA governments on the importance of ensuring the right level of, and continuity in, participation in technical working groups.</p> <p><b>[v]</b> For the environment high-level dialogues and technical</p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p> <p>[i] The second phases of the 3 regional platforms are ongoing and their performance will be assessed. It is important to implement by adequate instruments under EU or EU MS responsibility the follow-up of the platforms and sectorial ministerial meetings.</p> <p>[ii] Coordination of work streams are common practice between DEVCO , EEAS and the EUSR (or his support staff).</p> <p>[iii] The present arrangement does not foresee a regular rotating EU MS Chairmanship of the platforms. This results in a loss of dynamism and also potentially alienates EU MS that may want to become more actively involved in the management of platforms. A revision of the Chairmanship mechanism will thus be envisaged.</p> <p>[iv] – [v] on going</p> <p>[vi] In addition to Germany, WB, DFID and USAID should also be mentioned. EU will promote increasing donors' coordination.</p> <p>[vii] See Recommendation 2 - [iii] comments.</p>	

<p>working groups, invite participants from line, sector and planning ministries, which have a strong influence and/or dependency on environmental resources and integrity.</p> <p><b>[vi]</b> Enhance co-ordination and co-operation with dialogue efforts led by other parties (e.g. Germany’s Berlin Process). Joining forces, especially with dialogue efforts pursued by EU MS, could potentially be a means to strengthen the dialogue while sharing the financial burden and workload.</p> <p><b>[vii]</b> As part of assessing the scope for supporting EC-IFAS (see recommendation 2), consider if the EU-CA environment dialogue can gradually be transferred to be hosted and led by EC-IFAS.</p> <p><b>[viii]</b> Focus high-level dialogues and platforms on a few, carefully selected topics, which are not too sensitive and which are of interest to the CA countries. For example, the Rule of Law Platform could focus on options for enhancing the business environment in CA.</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 5: Seek to establish an integrated approach to EU support for CA</b></p> <p>Establish modalities and practices to maximise synergies between dialogue and programmes, and between regional and bilateral action, in order to ensure that EU support is integrated, comprehensive, and coordinated.</p> <p><u>Possible actions include:</u></p> <p><b>[i]</b> Establish internal strategic sector groups for provision of oversight of regional programmes and dialogues – DEVCO HQ, all EUDs in CA, EEAS, EUSR, and other DGs (as relevant) should participate.</p> <p><b>[ii]</b> Enhance linkages between platform service contracts and other regional programmes through:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a) Joint activities and coordinated efforts, where regional programmes engage in more comprehensive capacity building and pilots/demonstrations of concepts promoted under</p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p> <p>[i] on going</p> <p>[ii] on-going, see recommendation 4-[i] above</p> <p>[iii] Not relevant in view of the time needed for this approach to deliver a diagnostic. Evaluations and ROM results from on-going Platforms will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>[iv] –</p> <p>[v] Among other organisational options to be considered as far as time and human resources in delegations allow. Stronger information sharing and coordination is needed both at HQ and Delegations level.</p> <p>[vi] ongoing notably through CAEP</p>	

<p>the platforms (e.g. of Strategic Environmental Assessment);</p> <p>b) Involvement of the same key stakeholders in platforms and regional programmes.</p> <p><b>[iii]</b> Test on one platform the use of one of the existing regional programmes for platform facilitation and assess the pros and cons of this vis-à-vis service contracts (see recommendation 3).</p> <p><b>[iv]</b> Ensure to the extent possible/feasible (taking staffing and financial constraints into consideration) that EUDs participate in high-level conferences, technical working group meetings and programme-based dialogue events.</p> <p><b>[v]</b> Use EUDs as the default entity for managing regional programmes (unless they are supra-regional). Consider: a) evolving a selected EUD into the focal point for all regional programmes, and b) including the other EUDs in programme steering committees (e.g. as observers).</p> <p><b>[vi]</b> Explore potential for cross-sector engagement and collaboration between regional programmes (e.g. linking Erasmus+ to the programmes in the other sectors explore synergies between research, education and application).</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 6: Enhance efficiency and EU visibility through integrating EU support with implementing partners' long-term programmes.</b></p> <p>Reduce transaction costs and enhance EU visibility by co-funding larger regional programmes of international implementing partners as much as possible, instead of establishing separate but interrelated EU programmes.</p> <p><u>Possible actions include:</u></p> <p><b>[i]</b> Provide in the environment sector co-funding with shared log frames and reporting with existing regional programmes implemented by the same international partners (but funded by other donors), instead of establishing separate projects. Ensure that the EU is specifically accredited for its funding contribution.</p>	<p><b>Partially Agreed</b></p> <p>Experience of co-funding with other Donors has sometimes resulted in a loss of visibility for the EU.</p> <p><b>[i]</b> This could be explored through EU Joint Programming roadmaps which are being prepared in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan.</p> <p><b>[ii]</b> Joint implementation is always envisaged when programmes are prepared, notably on the basis of the value added of donors in a specific sector. If value added for the EU is not considered sufficient, such approach is abandoned.</p>	

<p><b>[ii]</b> Investigate if other donors (especially EU MS) have regional programmes in the same sectors as the EU, or are interested in engaging in such regional programmes, and assess whether there is scope for pooled funding/joint programmes. This could either be to attract other donors to co-fund EU's regional programmes (e.g. BOMCA and CADAP), or for EU to cofund their programmes.</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 7: Enhance the focus on impact and sustainability in border management and higher education programmes</b></p> <p>In the border management programmes, discontinue the current output-oriented focus and enhance the focus on impact, outcomes and sustainability; in the higher education programmes, manage ambitions and keep them realistic.</p> <p><u>Possible actions include:</u></p> <p><b>[i]</b> Carry out a comprehensive outcome-impact evaluation of BOMCA</p> <p><b>[ii]</b> Redesign BOMCA 9 with a strategic focus on achieving outcomes and sustainability (backed with a comprehensive analysis of training needs vis-à-vis institutional needs and gaps, equipment needs, and maintenance capacity)</p> <p><b>[iii]</b> Focus border management efforts on KG and TJ, and on supporting the implementation of their integrated border management strategies and action plans</p> <p><b>[iv]</b> Explore opportunities for more realistic programme and project designs in higher education.</p> <p><b>[v]</b> Introduce outcome-oriented reporting against defined indicators and ensure that CA partners provide monitoring data.</p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p> <p>These dimensions of the quality of a development action are already taken into account and the EU will continue to take them into consideration.</p> <p>[i] The current agreed priorities for assistance to border management are migration management systems and upgrading border services training institutions. Following the latest specific BOMCA evaluation, the focus of assistance was shifted from output-oriented to outcomes and sustainable impact.</p> <p>[ii] ongoing</p> <p>[iii] Latest political developments among the 5 CA countries should be considered.</p> <p>[iv] on-going</p> <p>[v] log frames are now systematically reviewed to this end in DEVCO Quality Support Groups</p>	