

FICHE CONTRADICTOIRE

Evaluation of the EU Joint Programming Process of Development Cooperation (2011-2015)

For details on the recommendations please refer to the main report – page 69-77

Recommendations	Response of services	Follow-up (one year later)
<p>Improve and update the intervention logic</p> <p>R1. The Commission and EEAS should review the intervention logic of Joint Programming to update its strategy, in consultation with EUD and MS HQ and field staff (as to reflect a shared vision). The <u>desired impact</u> “increased EU aid effectiveness” in the initial intervention logic should be reformulated as “better EU contribution to development” and the two primary <u>expected outcomes</u> from JP should be “better coordinated and more strategic EU-MS aid” and “joint EU-MS positions and messages”. An additional <u>output</u> could be added: “comprehensive and coherent EU approach”. EU and MS should also clarify how they expect JP to contribute to aid effectiveness principles over time and who are the main target beneficiaries of JP at different levels. This update should be reflected in texts and guidance.</p>	<p><u>Partially agree</u></p> <p>We agree to have "<i>more coherent and strategic EU and MS development cooperation</i>" and "<i>joint EU-MS positions and messages</i>" as important expected outcomes needed to achieve the desired benefit.</p> <p>However, we consider that improving aid effectiveness with Joint Programming remains an important outcome towards which we have to engage more actively as the evaluation has demonstrated that this requires time and efforts to become a reality.</p> <p>JP has the potential to increase country ownership, alignment to national priorities and strategies, predictability, transparency and focus on results but also to create more inclusive processes.</p> <p>ACTION 1: Review the intervention logic, with the caveat that we should not reduce our level of ambition while strengthening our aid effectiveness commitments, in line with the new Consensus on Development¹.</p> <p>ACTION 2: Include conclusions of this review into the HQ guidance level (for example in the Operational Manual on JP).</p>	<p>ACTION 1 (completed)</p> <p>The new European Consensus on Development clearly guides the EU and the Member States to improve effectiveness and impact of their development cooperation through greater coordination and coherence.</p> <p>ACTION 2 (completed)</p> <p>In the new “Joint Programming Guidance”, there is a chapter on broadening the scope of Joint Programming to include strategic issues and cross-cutting priorities, translating the calls in the 2016 Council Conclusions and the Global Strategy for a larger scope of Joint Programming. This Guidance will also clarify how the Joint Programming Facility with the pool of senior experts can support field staff and to best utilise the collective comparative advantages that Europeans have. This should always be referenced in the Terms of Reference of experts when undertaking missions.</p>
<p>R2. The EU and MS should define more precisely the overall scope or perimeter of JP and how this translates into its guidance, as well as the specific scope and focus of JP in a given country.</p> <p>JP should take into account broader funding and strategic issues.</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>ACTION 1: Update Guidance, in coordination with Member States, to better assist Delegations in identifying at the local level, from the very beginning of a process what is the JP ambition, added-value and expected benefits in a specific context. This should better take into account broader funding and strategic issues.</p>	<p>ACTION 1 (completed)</p> <p>The new European Consensus highlights that Joint Programming is flexible allowing actors at the country level to determine the ambition of JP in the country context and to set out the expected benefits. The new Guidance extensively deals with all stages</p>

¹ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/05/pdf/European-consensus-on-development/>

	<p>At country level it should focus on what EU and MS do best/is most needed/is not well covered by others.</p>	<p>ACTION 2: In cases of fragility, explore how to increase coherence between Joint Programming and other non-programmable tools and processes (i.e. Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace, Emergency Trust Fund, humanitarian aid, security missions).</p> <p>ACTION 3: in case of countries in transition to higher income levels, explore further if JP can accompany this transition as part of a wider relationship going beyond external assistance.</p>	<p>of the Joint Programming process and offers advice and good practices.</p> <p>ACTION 2 (ongoing) On fragility, the Consensus asks Joint Programming to “<i>pursue enhanced coordination and synergies, in fragile and conflict-affected countries, including through Joint Programming processes and joint conflict analysis.</i>” Based on feedback received by the field, the coordination with humanitarian aid, non-programmable and other instruments is good, but remains ad-hoc. The new Guidance includes a chapter on Joint Programming in fragile contexts drawing on experiences to date in a range of fragile countries such as Mali, Myanmar etc. <i>(completed)</i></p> <p>A study is underway on Joint Programming in fragile contexts and conflict affected countries including as case studies Burundi, Egypt, Myanmar and Central African Republic. <i>(in process)</i></p> <p>Further efforts needed to include the development-humanitarian nexus in the joint analysis and joint response stages of Joint Programming, as is currently undergoing in Palestine, Lebanon and Jordan.</p> <p>ACTION 3 (ongoing) On Middle Income Countries (or Most Advanced Developing Countries), the 2016 Council Conclusions calls for ways in which Joint Programming can accompany countries in transition to higher income levels, as part of a wider relationship going beyond external assistance. Joint Programming has progressed in MiCs in</p>
--	---	---	---

			<p>countries such as Egypt, Georgia, Moldova. <i>(completed)</i></p> <p>A study is to be commissioned to reflect on how JP can assist in managing the process of phasing out bilateral aid and transitioning to new development partnership in such contexts. <i>(planned)</i></p>
<p>Keep JP strategic, flexible and pragmatic</p>	<p>R3. JP process and products should be enhanced allowing more flexibility and ease adjustments over time, ensuring frequent exchanges at strategic level, defining the specific focus of JP at the start of each country process and fostering JP uptake (using existing platforms to provoke dialogue/foster common responses, considering the use of joint result monitoring).</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>The recommendation to enhance JP processes and products in coordination with Member States to allow more flexibility, coincides with our assessment.</p> <p>ACTION 1: Expand/support the use of country-based joint results and monitoring frameworks. They are crucial in this context as a way to bring analysis to the dialogue.</p> <p>ACTION 2: Ensure regular reviews/updates in the joint programming group on changes in context, needs to refocus messages and emerging and evolving strategic issues.</p> <p>ACTION 3: Encourage regular reviews/updates of the Joint Programming in-country documents to align with the partner country's own development strategy and strengthen synchronisation.</p> <p>ACTION 4: Update the Operational Manual annually to ensure it adjusts to, and reflects a flexible approach.</p>	<p>ACTION 1 <i>(completed)</i></p> <p>The new Consensus prioritises the use of results frameworks by stating that <i>Joint monitoring and results frameworks will be core elements of the joint response</i> and that the SDG indicators will facilitate a common EU results-oriented approach that favours harmonised results reporting at partner country level. The new Guidance explicitly sets out expectations related to the use of joint results frameworks.</p> <p>A study has been finalised on the use of Joint Results Frameworks in Joint Programming Documents. The study was disseminated to EU Delegations and Member States to help strengthen the quality of joint results frameworks at country level. Since 2017, 5 JRFs have emerged.</p> <p>ACTION 2 <i>(recurrent)</i></p> <p>The network of Joint Programming focal points in the Member States meets biannually securing a frequent exchange of views.</p> <p>There is regular reporting to CODEV on the progress of Joint Programming globally, as tasked by the 2016 Council Conclusions. Furthermore, updates on Joint Programming are available in the Joint Programming group in capacity4dev. Updates will also be provided in the open</p>

			<p>access public website (JPtracker) that will be launched in the summer.</p> <p>Joint Programming also features in the vast majority of EU Regional Seminars, which helps to sustain momentum.</p> <p>In the field, EU Delegations take on the horizontal, coordinating role of the Joint Programming process.</p> <p>ACTION 3 (completed)</p> <p>The new Guidance encourages the monitoring and review process of their Joint Programming Documents to be developed and specified, while promoting further aligning to national development cycles. Recent examples include Palestine’s Joint Strategy written at the same time as the National Development plan, Joint Programming Mid-Term Review in Mali and the annual Joint Programming progress report in Cambodia.</p> <p>In addition, reviews or updates of Joint Programmes will involve the identification of synergies and joint implementation potentials.</p> <p>ACTION 4 (ongoing)</p> <p>The new Guidance is non-prescriptive and provides a menu of options and things to think about when developing a Joint Programming process, recognising that Joint Programming is country-tailored and flexible. (completed)</p> <p>The Guidance will be disseminated to EU colleagues and Member States representatives (HQ and field) in mid 2018. Feedback and comments from practitioners will be taken into account in a first revision round in 2019. (in process)</p>
--	--	--	---

R4. Use JP process to improve EU collaboration as a group on the ground, identifying the key capacities and interests of the EU and MS for JP to see how they can complement and provide mutual benefits. Use the JP process to build a more joint vision/ response to country challenges both internally and in its dealings with the partner country and external actors. EU and MS should deliver as much as possible joint messages and speak with one voice and further the pragmatic ways for joint implementation. EU should better inform MS of what it plans to do. Within this process, participation by all MS should be facilitated, allowing them to fill various roles and responsibilities.

Agree

The evaluation shows that and we agree that JP improving EU collaboration on the ground is an important outcome that needs to be nurtured and supported; JP can be an important instrument for policy dialogue when supported by leadership and responsibility by the EU and MS alike.

Through JP, the EU and MS build more joint visions and responses to partner country's challenges and develop joint messaging increasing their speaking with one voice.

ACTION 1: Encourage EUD and MS embassies to sharing information and develop joint messaging and common approaches (possibly by including these initiatives in regular reporting).

ACTION 2: EU Delegations to take measures to increase the understanding and visibility of how European development partners jointly work (i.e. joint communication, joint messaging, etc.)

ACTION 3: Improve /encourage systematic use of knowledge-sharing platforms (capacity4dev/ Brussels-based and regional workshops) to ensure a continuous stream of information, coherent guidelines and instructions (both ways HQ-field-HQ).

ACTION 1 (completed)

The new Guidance includes extensive reference to activities to encourage a joined-up approach at country level. Specifically there are chapters looking at joint policy dialogue and joint visibility.

ACTION 2 (completed)

On visibility, the new Guidance includes a specific chapter on visibility activities as well as points on ways to increase the understanding of Joint Programming by national stakeholders (such as through meaningful consultation and publications/ brochures in local language).

Some Joint Programming Documents such as Ghana include a specific section on joint visibility or in Cambodia a section on which European partners take the lead in each sector. The European group in Palestine has a dedicated budget for joint visibility activities from the ENI Global Allocation.

The EEAS is now including a section in the EU Delegations website on Joint Programming where public information about the process is provided. (*recurrent*)

ACTION 3 (recurrent)

The Joint Programming group in capacity4dev is a very interactive platform with 280 members. A range of training videos, in the form of interviews with staff from EU Delegations, are uploaded here.

A new public access website for Joint Programming, the *JPtracker*, will be up and running by end of June. This will ease the dissemination of information and increase transparency.

			<p>The Joint Programming team has organised 7 workshops (back-to-back to the EU Regional Seminars in all regions) with EU Delegations and Member States local staff in 2017/8. Additionally, there have been 3 Joint Programming meetings with the Member States network of JP focal points in 2017/8 (so far). These events are geared towards knowledge sharing.</p> <p>A global learning even on Joint programming is planned before the end of 2018 to bring together colleagues from different regions as a complement to the regional workshops. (<i>planned</i>)</p>
	<p>R5. JP supporting services (guidance pack, experience-sharing, technical assistance) should be continued and consolidated, adding clarifications when needed and/or further disseminating them to EU and MS staff in the field and HQ. Ensure institutional memory with regard to JP exercises, in country offices and at HQ.</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>We recognise that the initial costs of JP are high even if the return on investment is recognised to be good when a certain level of collaboration is reached.</p> <p>It is considered key to involve Member States as well here, so as to spread guidance and bridge the gap between capitals and the field.</p> <p>ACTION 1: to continue, adapt and consolidate our supporting services as well as the provision of technical assistance. Consider widening offer with online training (webinars, etc.).</p> <p>ACTION 2: continue providing regional meetings for knowledge-exchange facilitation.</p> <p>ACTION 3: Guidance pack will be supplemented with an Operational Manual and be widely disseminated to HQs and the field.</p> <p>ACTION 4: EU Delegation to consider joint (EU and MS) handover files to address institutional memory.</p> <p>ACTION 5: Supporting services will be maintained and Training and regional meetings will be organised for knowledge-exchange facilitation, including to secure institutional memory at country level.</p>	<p>ACTION 1 (<i>ongoing</i>)</p> <p>A team of 4 Technical experts are under contract to provide Joint Programming assistance to Delegations through missions as needed. (<i>recurrent</i>)</p> <p>A training for EU staff has been designed and will be piloted on 25th September 2018 to complement the existing training videos with EU staff members posted in the capacity4dev JP group. (<i>in process</i>)</p> <p>Webinars to accompany the roll out of the Joint Programming Guidance are planned (<i>planned</i>).</p> <p>At the partner country level, EU Delegations also organise specialised workshops (ie joint results in Palestine) (<i>planned</i>).</p> <p>ACTION 2 (<i>recurrent</i>)</p> <p>The Joint Programming team has organised 7 workshops (back-to-back to the EU Regional Seminars in all regions) with EU Delegations and Member States local staff</p>

			<p>in 2017/8. Additionally, there have been 3 Joint Programming meetings with the Member States network of JP focal points in 2017/8 (so far). These events are geared towards knowledge sharing.</p> <p>ACTION 3 (completed) The new Guidance is a comprehensive and consolidated reference document which includes the existing Guidance pack. The Guidance will be disseminated to EU colleagues and Member States representatives (HQ and field) in mid 2018. Feedback and comments from practitioners will be taken into account in a first revision round in 2019.</p> <p>ACTION 4 (completed) Handover files - to retain institutional memory - are referenced in the new Guidance. An example exists currently in Cambodia and Palestine is planning to adopt this practice.</p> <p>ACTION 5 (recurrent) To support institutional memory, the inclusion of questions on progress in taking forward Joint Programming have been included in the External Assistance Management Report for the first time in the exercise of 2018 (reporting on 2017).</p>
<p>Clarify and reinforce the role of all stakeholders</p>	<p>R6. Clarify roles and ensure both political and cooperation actors are engaged throughout the process. Ensure the political dimension is explicitly part of JP, along with the aid / development dimension. Continuously engage the two parties.</p> <p>Define respective roles. EU HQ should engage with</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>We agree with the recommendations that JP happens at country level but HQs support and mandate is essential and should be unequivocal.</p> <p>ACTION 1: EU Heads of Cooperation to involve Heads of Mission and Political advisors early on in the process, as well as at strategic moments in the JP process such as when JP strategic expectations are defined, commitments are made, revisions to JP and evaluations.</p>	<p>ACTION 1 (completed) The new Guidance highlights the importance of better involving staff across the EU Delegations (Political, Trade, and Cooperation) and provides a range of suggestions on how this can be done.</p> <p>ACTION 2 (recurrent) Concrete advice and opportunities for</p>

	<p>MS HQ and EUD with MS Ambassadors.</p>	<p>Ensure engagement of both levels (political and cooperation).</p> <p>ACTION 2: Geographical services and joint programming teams to continue and strengthen support, and provide clear guidance, to Delegations on how to advance joint programming (i.e. Operational Manual, etc.)</p> <p>ACTION 3: the Joint Programming network, gathering focal point in each MS, will continue meeting at least 2 a year to provide common guidance to field offices.</p>	<p>exchange of experiences is offered via the Joint Programming workshops at the EU Regional Seminars with the participation of EU Heads of Delegations and Cooperation and Geographical colleagues. (<i>recurrent</i>)</p> <p>The new Guidance includes recently agreed approval procedures for Joint Programming Documents, notably when they do not replace the NIP/MIP/SSF. (<i>completed</i>)</p> <p>Future studies on Joint Programming are in the pipeline to analyse how Joint Programming can support Agenda 2030 and how like-minded partners can be included in Joint Programming (<i>planned</i>).</p> <p>ACTION 3 (<i>recurrent</i>)</p> <p>The Joint Programming focal points network continues to meet twice every year. These meetings are complemented by regional JP workshops that take place in Brussels, such as the West Africa (June 2017) and the Central Africa (April 2018) allowing MS focal points to easily join. Additionally, there is an interest by EU Member States to host Joint Programming meetings, such as the one in Paris in February 2018.</p>
	<p>R7. Deepen the dialogue with national stakeholders. Consider each milestone in the JP process as an opportunity for strategic dialogue with national stakeholders (line and technical ministries; Parliament; civil society; the private sector; diaspora when applicable...). When there is already a well-established forum for strategic dialogue, consider how JP can bring value to it. In parallel, continue emphasising good practices in aid transparency and aid predictability.</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>The involvement of National governments and National stakeholders is crucial to ensure country ownership for sustainable results. The evaluation gives some suggestions that are welcome. We will pursue work on this aspect.</p> <p>However, ownership can also come with time after local partners have realised the positive contribution of JP. JP can therefore be pursued notwithstanding possible initial lack of interest by partners.</p> <p>Sequencing (gradual approach) of engaging with the different actors in the partner country should also be</p>	<p>ACTION 1 (<i>completed</i>)</p> <p>The new JP Guidance includes a chapter on consultations with stakeholders both state and non-state as well as a range of suggestions as to how best consult with civil society organisations, including making linkages with existing EU and Member States agreements through the Enabling Civil Society Roadmap process.</p> <p>ACTION 2 (<i>recurrent</i>)</p> <p>The new Guidance emphasises the importance of joint policy dialogue and</p>

		<p>considered;</p> <p>Also, national stakeholders should be involved in Joint Programming, <i>but the key question is at what stage</i> (for example, when developing results frameworks or when agreeing on strategic objectives);</p> <p>ACTION 1: Strengthen/improve guidance on how to engage partner country stakeholders (civil society organisations, private sector, government, etc.) in the joint programming process.</p> <p>ACTION 2: Increase use of existing channels, platforms, and opportunity for joint messages in policy and political dialogue (incl. Article 8).</p>	<p>provides some suggestions on how this can be organised and structured, such as through the use of joint policy briefs developed in Cambodia and Laos through the Joint Programming process (<i>completed</i>). Continual efforts to share good practice will further promote country level reflections on opportunities for joint messaging (<i>recurrent</i>).</p>
	<p>R8. The incentives for investing in JP should be improved. MS Embassies/field offices to discuss the benefits of JP with the top leadership at HQ and with Ambassadors upstream. This could enable some MS to play an active role in leading parts of JP. MS to clarify who is the go-to person/unit at HQ for support, and to clarify their role. EU and MS to recognise and reward staff efforts on JP, e.g. by reflecting them in job descriptions. EU and MS to examine to what extent JP documents may replace or integrate bilateral programming documents.</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>As JP is time consuming in particular in the first phase and leads important and positive returns at a later stage, it deserves to be supported and incentivised. We should consider how to provide incentives to make joint programming the preferred approach.</p> <p>ACTION 1: Better integration and more coherence of Joint Programming guidance in future overall programming guidelines</p> <p>ACTION 2: Encourage Delegations to allocate sufficient manpower to Joint programming while being helped by Technical Assistance (HQ and locally hired).</p> <p>ACTION 3: Strengthen training including through Regional seminars, including clarifying roles.</p> <p>ACTION 4: Replacement will be pursued wherever possible and further guidance to be developed in the Operational Manual insisting on the need for early involvement of headquarters, including line DGs, before validation by Heads of Mission.</p>	<p>ACTION 1 (<i>completed</i>) Recent revisions to the DEVCO Companion and in particular the chapter on programming have helped to better integrate Joint Programming into future programming guidance.</p> <p>ACTION 2 (<i>recurrent</i>) Advice is routinely offered to EU Delegations on ways to strengthen their local capacity to coordinate/lead a Joint Programming process. This is addressed with the Delegations before and during each JP expert mission as well as being highlighted in the new Guidance. Existing Terms of Reference for local support contracts are shared between Delegations. In addition the JP team uses the DEVCO Senior Active programme to mobilise retired EU staff to support partner countries where their specific experiences can provide added value.</p> <p>ACTION 3 (<i>recurrent</i>) The Joint Programming team has organised 7 workshops (back-to-back to the EU Regional Seminars in all regions) with EU Delegations and Member States local staff</p>

			<p>in 2017/8.</p> <p>ACTION 4 (completed) The new Guidance provides clarifications on the procedure to replace a MIP/NIP/SSF with a Joint Programming Document. This includes the organisation of a country team meeting to ensure the involvement of HA and line DGs before the document is finalised at the country level. So far, the EU has undertaken 3 replacements, notably in 2018 Palestine and Senegal.</p>
--	--	--	--