



**Evaluation Study
on
The EU Institutions & Member States'
Mechanisms for Promoting
Policy Coherence for Development**

**Appendix III
Country Profiles
on Policy Coherence for Development**

**Client: The Evaluation Services of
- French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, lead agency
- Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands,
and the European Commission**

May 2007

Study Team Members

James Mackie (Team Leader)	ECDPM
Gwen Corre	ECDPM
Marie-Laure de Bergh	ECDPM
Niels Keijzer	ECDPM
René Madrid	Particip GmbH

Advisory Group:

Paul Engel	ECDPM
Jean Bossuyt	ECDPM
José Antonio Alonso	ICEI
Christian Freres	ICEI

Contact Details

European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM)

Onze Lieve Vrouweplein 21
6211 HE Maastricht
The Netherlands
info@ecdpm.org
<http://www.ecdpm.org>

PARTICIP GmbH, Consultants for Development

& Environment
Headquarters:
Hildastrasse 66,
D 79102 Freiburg, Germany
Brussels Branch:
Avenue des Arts 50 (5th floor), B 1000
Bruxelles, Belgium
info@particip.de
<http://www.particip.com/>

Complutense Institute of International Studies (ICEI)

Complutense University of Madrid
Finca Mas Ferré, Building A
Somosaguas Campus
28223 Pozuelo de Alarcón
Madrid
Spain
icei@sis.ucm.es
<http://www.ucm.es/info/icei>

Table of contents

<i>Introduction</i>	2
<i>AUSTRIA</i>	4
<i>BELGIUM</i>	6
<i>CYPRUS</i>	8
<i>CZECH REPUBLIC</i>	10
<i>DENMARK</i>	12
<i>ESTONIA</i>	14
<i>EU INSTITUTIONS</i>	16
<i>FINLAND</i>	21
<i>FRANCE</i>	26
<i>GERMANY</i>	29
<i>GREECE</i>	32
<i>HUNGARY</i>	35
<i>IRELAND</i>	37
<i>ITALY</i>	39
<i>LATVIA</i>	42
<i>LITHUANIA</i>	45
<i>LUXEMBOURG</i>	47
<i>MALTA</i>	49
<i>THE NETHERLANDS</i>	51
<i>POLAND</i>	55
<i>PORTUGAL</i>	57
<i>SLOVAKIA</i>	60
<i>SLOVENIA</i>	63
<i>SPAIN</i>	65
<i>SWEDEN</i>	69
<i>UNITED KINGDOM</i>	72

Introduction

This appendix to the final report presents separate Country Profiles on the different EU Member States and Institutions' approaches towards the promotion of Policy Coherence for Development, which were developed during the desk phase of this evaluation.

As was indicated in the Terms of References for this evaluation study, a key objective of the desk study for this evaluation concerns providing a '(...) *deeper insight of the existing PCD mechanisms, by building on the scoping study.*¹ *An elaboration of the analytical and comprehensive overview will allow for a better international comprehension and comparison. This phase will also lead to the final selection of the mechanisms for the case studies.*'

Using the approach outlined in the Inception Report, a series of PCD profiles for each Member State have been prepared, as well as a separate profile for the EU institutions. All Country profiles follow the same format and provide information in the following areas:

1. List of policy statements and principal sources (government documents)
2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?
3. Indication of when PCD became an issue
4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?
5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD
6. List of identified PCD mechanisms
7. External opinions
8. Feasibility of the Mechanisms under 3 for Study
9. Narrative from the Scoping Study (when not integrated in overall sections)
10. Contacts

The Country Profiles were created through a two-step approach:

- A first version of the Profile was developed by the evaluation team. This was done mostly on the basis of public documents, as well as through drawing from previous research done in the context of the Scoping Study on Coherence. The latter source often contained a wealth of useful information which had earlier been verified with key EU officials, albeit slightly dated in places;
- As a second step, these draft Country Profiles were then sent to selected officials in the European Union governments and Institutions for the purpose of verifying, adapting and where possible expanding the analysis. For this exercise, we contacted both the European Heads of Evaluation and Permanent Representatives by email, while copying their direct assistants. Some of these officials responded directly to our request, others put us in touch with their respective 'focal points' on PCD.

During the exercise, especially the second step proved to be extremely beneficial and productive, with responses from all but one member state. Through the communications, we received many relevant documents which were not yet available on governmental websites, and received a large amount of rich information detailing the respective EU member state or institution's approach towards promoting PCD.

However, one consequence of this two-stage was that the evaluation team was to some extent dependent on the good will and availability of the officials of the different EU Member States and Institutions. Although the respondents were encouraged to be as complete and detailed as possible, and if necessary were reminded several times of the importance of their comments for the evaluation, we were in the end dependent on their willingness to identify all the mechanisms they had in place. As a result in a limited number of country profiles where the officials were less keen to engage with the study, we tend to have relatively less information on that country's approach to promoting PCD. Although this represents a

¹ Scoping Study on 'EU Mechanisms Promoting Policy Coherence for Development' (commissioned by the French Cooperation in 2004 in preparation for the present evaluation study)

methodological limitation of the approach we used, efforts were made to minimise this limitation through consistent follow-up and in the end a very high response rate from officials of the EU Member States and Institutions was achieved. Thus it is felt that the quality of the profiles, presented in this second volume of the desk report, provide a sufficiently solid representation of the bulk of the mechanisms to promote intra-governmental PCD currently in place in the EU, upon which it is possible to draw certain conclusions.

The result of the exercise is brought together in this report. Besides providing a collection of inputs upon which to formulate responses to the various evaluative questions the CPs were also of crucial importance in the identification of the country case studies, which will be done during the next phase of this evaluation.

The different Country Profiles are analysed and compared with the results of the Scoping Study in section 3 of Volume I of the Desk Study. In the annexes to the same volume, a summary table is provided which shows all 85 mechanisms which were identified.

AUSTRIA

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Austria: Federal Act on Development Cooperation (amended 2003)
http://www.bmaa.gv.at/up-media/269_joint_act.pdf
2. Three-Year Programme 2005-2007
http://www.bmaa.gv.at/up-media/2204_3_year_programme2005_07.pdf

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

Three overall goals in the **Federal Act on Development Cooperation (FADC)** are: poverty reduction, safeguarding peace and environmental protection. The **2004-2006 Three-Year Programme** refers to MDGs as key international reference point for Austrian aid.

On coherence, the FADC includes in Section 1, specific clause: *“The Federal Government, in the fields of policy it pursues that may have effects on developing countries, shall take into consideration the objectives and principles of development policy”*. This is referred to in government texts as the “Coherence Clause”. The Three-Year Programmes will refer to coherence continuously; the first to include a specific chapter on this will be the **2006 report**. The **2004 report** includes 3 Cs section which only cites Austrian government’s commitments to these principles, although several sections (i.e., trade) mention areas in which Austria will make efforts to increase development policy coherence. The **2005 report** outlines the need for greater coherence on the national as well as international level.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2002 (signing of the Federal Act)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

Within the Foreign Ministry the **Department for Development Cooperation and Cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe (Department VII)** is responsible for development policy. In particular, the competences of division VII.4 encompass PCD.

A limited role related to coherence could be ascribed to the **Advisory Council for Development Cooperation**, a non-standing body of external specialists which provides input to Three-Year programmes.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

(Summarises key points for PCD from the Scoping Study’s country research tables)

The Foreign Ministry is in charge of providing overall guidelines for development policy and executes the coordination for PCD with other ministries, although a number of other ministries are engaged in development activities as well.

The FADC (Section 6) established the Austrian Development Agency (ADA), a “limited company” whose sole owner is the Federal Government, represented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and with the responsibility for the operational aspects of Austrian development co-operation. In principle it is not involved in development policy matters so it is not that relevant to coherence issues.

6. Coverage of the three principal types of PCD mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ²	Actors involved: ³
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Federal Act	Group 2	PM, Pol
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - Inter-ministerial Private Sector and Development Platform Joint working group with Ministry of Finance	Group 4	PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment None Identified		

² Please refer to page 17 of the inception report, where four groups of PCD mechanisms are distinguished based on four characteristics: political competence, technical competences, PCD only or PCD&other.

³ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Policy Makers; Pol = Politicians; Acad = Academics; others

7. External Opinions:

OECD/DAC (2004) Peer Review of Austrian Development Cooperation:

The 2004 DAC Peer Review of Austria mentions that there is some inter-ministerial co-ordination on a large number of development-related subjects, including debt reduction, environment and conflict-prevention (OECD 2004: 42). The DAC Peer Review commends Austria for its clear political commitment to policy reduction and the need for policy coherence, but also mentions that the MFA requires more staff and analytical capacity to deal with policy coherence issues in a systematic manner. There is also a need to stimulate the debate on 'sensitive' coherence, a clear and time-bound agenda (what should be achieved on PCD, and when?). Finally, due to its leading role in Austria's Strategy for Sustainable Development and responsibility for agriculture, the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management could be a special partner for the MFA in the work on PCD. This could take the form of a partnership, departing from a common understanding of coherence issues, and collaborative efforts to improve (PCD OECD 2004: 44-46).

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

In section 1.5 of its **Federal Act on Development Cooperation (DCA)**, which was amended in 2003, it is mentioned that: *'The Federal Government, in the fields of policy it pursues that may have effects on developing countries, shall take into consideration the objectives and principles of development policy'* (2003: 1). The wording is similar to the coherence clause that is included in the Treaty on European Union, which concerns the policies of the EU.

The country's three-year plans (renewed annually), in which the national advisory body on development cooperation plays a key role, include a section on policy coherence for development and provide a starting point for more work in this area. The country's current **Three Year Programme of 2005-2007**, for example, mentions on page 8 that: *'(...)dialogue will be stepped up between the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, which is in charge of bilateral development cooperation, and the departments responsible for other aspects of the coherence agenda policies (such as trade and investment, climate, agriculture, international finance architecture and debt relief).'*

As a follow-up to the 'coherence requirement' of the DCA, an inter-ministerial Private Sector and Development Platform was created in 2003. This Platform is *'(...) supported substantively by the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs and substantively and administratively by ADA'* (BMAA 2005: 24). Most of the other references in the Three Year Programme refer to other types of coherence, including inter-governmental coherence (EU level) and multi-lateral coherence (in particular the UN).

In April 2006, in the context of the Austrian Presidency of the EU, the national NGDO platform organized an international conference on policy coherence for development in Vienna, focusing on the EU-level, but also analysing various member states's policies on this issue, signalling a clear interest by civil society actors. (www.eu-platform.at)

9. Contacts

Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Division VII.4 (General Affairs)
Josef Muellner, Head of Division
Ursula Werther-Pietsch
A-1014 Vienna, Austria
Tel: +43-501150-4527
Fax: +43-501159-4527
abtvi4@bmaa.gv.at

Mr. Anton MAIR
Head, Evaluation and Control
Unit,
Department of Development
Co-operation,
Ministry for Foreign Affairs - VII
6,
Ballhausplatz 2,
A-1014 Vienna,
Austria

Tel: 0043 5 01150 4463
Fax: 0043 5 01159 4463
E-m: anton.mair@bmaa.gv.at

BELGIUM

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Policy Outline of Development Cooperation (2004)

http://www.dgdc.be/en/the_minister/political_note/index.html

2. Law on Belgian International cooperation (1999)

http://www.dgdc.be/en/dgdc/policy_documents/law_belgian_international_cooperation.pdf

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

In its **1999 Law on Belgian International Cooperation**, reference is made to neither coherence nor consistency. However, in Article 3 of the Law, a 'softer' PCD-oriented objective is stated as follows: *'Federal cooperation promotes synergy with municipal, provincial, regional, Community-based and European cooperation in order to benefit from the wider effects which, in the long term, favour those populations receiving assistance.'*

Belgium's 2004 Policy Outline for Development Cooperation sets out the clear aim of increasing coherence between development and preventive diplomacy and conflict prevention (within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs); between development and debt policy (within the Ministry of Finance); and between development and peace-keeping (within the Ministry of Defence). The Council of Ministers decided to establish an inter-ministerial working group in 2000, but that has not been made operational. Within the development sector, Belgium also aims for more coherence across indirect, bilateral and multilateral cooperation and has expressed the intention to establish a consultation mechanism to increase coherence between policy and operations. Development cooperation is federalised, meaning that regional as well as national governments have development policies. There is no communication as yet between the various governmental levels that could promote coherence across the levels.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

1999 (Law on Development Cooperation)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Belgian Parliament** sets overall development policy within a broad legal framework. Development cooperation is embedded in the **Ministry of Foreign Affairs**. It has a separate minister and a directorate specifically for development cooperation. This directorate is responsible for the execution of programmes in terms of financing and preparation. Besides the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the **ministries of Finance and - to a lesser extent- Defence** also play active roles in cooperation. A public company, fully owned by the government, the **Belgian Technical Corporation (BTC)**, executes programmes. Another public company, **BIO**, supports private sector initiatives by taking equity or stock.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

Development cooperation is one of the policy areas currently being de-federalised, or shifted to regional governments. The Flemish government already has a development cooperation unit in its external relations department. However, no policy dialogue is yet under way between the regional and federal levels. The Inter-Departmental Committee on Central Africa has met on a weekly basis for the past few years. It is managed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Development Cooperation and Defence are permanent members and represented at the political (cabinet) level as well as at the administrative level. Depending on the agenda, other ministries (e.g. Finance, Internal Affairs, Justice) or the Cabinet of the Prime Minister join. These meetings are essentially a forum for information exchange. While they might lead to coordinated activities, they are not considered a mechanism to promote policy coherence from a development perspective. Due to its short-term perspective (the meetings are weekly), discussions tend to be fact-based rather than policy oriented

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation⁴		
	Particular Characteristics	Actors involved:⁵
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Reference to coherence in Policy Outline for Development Cooperation (2004)	Group 2	Par, Cab, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - Inter-Departmental Committee on Central Africa	Group 4	PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:
<p>In its 2005 OECD/DAC Peer Review, Belgium is recommended to further advance on PCD per three specific recommendations:</p> <p>a) <i>Belgium is encouraged to finalise and implement its long-term, cross-cutting, strategic note regarding the coherence between the development assistance approaches and other sectoral policies with an impact on the developing countries, including trade, international investment and migration policies.</i></p> <p>b) <i>Belgium should consider strengthening its interministerial information and co-ordination mechanisms, taking due account of the specifics of the institutional system and providing for means of arbitration between the federal and federate authorities.</i></p> <p>c) <i>Belgium should make use of the work done in the OECD to continue and step up its efforts to promote compliance with the code of good conduct for multinational enterprises, in particular by bolstering the activity and resources of the NCP' (OECD/DAC 2005: 14, 15).</i></p> <p>In a 2005 communique by the DAC Chairman on Belgium, which is released in the same year as the Peer Review, he mentions: '(...) an important challenge for the coming years will be to bolster policy coherence by better structuring of interministerial co-ordination mechanisms at the different levels of authority and by developing long-term, cross-cutting strategic thinking' (OECD/DAC 2005: 1).</p>

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):
<p>The Inter-Departmental Committee on Central Africa has met on a weekly basis for the past few years. It is managed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Development Cooperation and Defence are permanent members and represented at the political (cabinet) level as well as at the administrative level. Depending on the agenda, other ministries (e.g. Finance, Internal Affairs, Justice) or the Cabinet of the Prime Minister join. These meetings are essentially a forum for information exchange. While they might lead to coordinated activities, they are not considered a mechanism to promote policy coherence from a development perspective. Due to its short-term perspective (the meetings are weekly), discussions tend to be fact-based rather than policy oriented.</p> <p>Within the development sector, Belgium also aims for more coherence across indirect, bilateral and multilateral cooperation and has expressed the intention to establish a consultation mechanism to increase coherence between policy and operations. Development cooperation is federalised, meaning that regional as well as national governments have development policies. There is no communication as yet between the various governmental levels that could promote coherence across the levels.</p>

9. Contacts	
<p>Ludo Verryken, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ludo.verryken@diplobel.fed.be</p> <p>Paul Frix, Focal Point on Policy Coherence for Development, Directorate General for Development Cooperation/Ministry of Foreign Affairs, paul.frix@diplobel.be</p> <p>Myriam Bacquelaine, Permanent Representation Belgium with EU, myriam.bacquelaine@diplobel.be</p>	<p>Dominique de Crombrughe, Special Evaluator, dominique.decrombrughe@diplobel.fed.be</p> <p>Eddie Boelens eddie.boelens@minfin.fed.be</p> <p>Philippe Gerard Philippe.gerard@diplobel.fed.be</p>

⁴ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁵ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

CYPRUS

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Bilateral relations with regions and countries

<http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa.nsf/FPBilatrelationsCountries?OpenForm>

2. Medium-Term Strategy for Official Development Assistance 2006-2010

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

Although the term coherence is not referred to in Cyprus' **Medium-Term Strategy for Official Development Assistance 2006-2010**, the Strategy mentions that Cyprus seeks to '(...) align its policy direction with those of the European Union'.

The Strategy further mentions that the country's development assistance policy focus has shifted from '(...) an emphasis on creating a favourable environment for bilateral business contacts to the promotion of the Millennium Development Goals, with special emphasis on the elimination of poverty and diseases, the upgrading of living standards and the improvement of social conditions.'

Page 9 of the Strategy clearly states that:

'Given the inexperience of the country in large-scale aid delivery, as well as the limited number of personnel allocated for this task, it is pertinent to make use of the already established delivery mechanisms of multilateral donors such as international organisations, or of civil society groups based in Cyprus but having international experience such as the Red Cross or the Medecins du Monde. Alternatively Cyprus should opt to form alliances with other countries with more experience in development assistance and with established aid delivery networks.'

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

PCD has been discussed at the time of the preparations of the **Official Development assistance strategy** in September 2005.

In the strategy, although not explicitly referring to PCD, it is mentioned that:

'At a time when domestic economies are interwoven with the global economic system, it is pertinent for the developed countries to adopt fully inclusive and equitable policies in their external relations as a means to achieving sustainable economic growth.'

On page 10 of the document, it is noted in the strategy that *'complementarity, coherence and coordination of action are the underlying principles of European development assistance and all EU Member States have pledged adherence to these principles'*. It does however not mention a clear and direct commitment that Cyprus will ensure that its domestic and foreign policy take account of development objectives. It is however currently in a process of transition that may allow it to further this goal at a later stage.

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The policy making mechanism that has recently been put in place for the Official Development Assistance issues is one that retains a high degree of centralisation in the decision making phase even though it allows for a more decentralized approach in the aid delivery arrangements. The mechanism comprises of a **Coordination Body (CB) headed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs** and having the **Minister of Finance and the Permanent Secretary of the Planning Bureau as members**. The CB is responsible for the setting up of targets (quantitative, territorial and sectoral) on the basis of international obligations and national priorities.

A second body, the **Consultative Body, headed by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)** and comprised of **representatives of the Ministries of Finance, Commerce, Industry and Tourism, Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment, Labour and Social Insurance, Education and Culture and the Planning Bureau, as well as representatives of the civil society**, will assume a consultative function to the CB. The Planning Bureau has the administrative and implementation functions for the decisions of the CB while the MFA represents the Republic abroad and is responsible for the publication of the Cypriot official development assistance policy.

Although both Bodies' mandates do not explicitly refer to and require them to promote PCD, they are important instruments in the formulation and coordination of policies, and may work to promote PCD once the need for them to do so has been decided upon.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The institutional architecture is institutionally equipped to promote PCD because it brings all governmental and non-governmental actors under one body, the Consultative Body where policy directions are discussed and policy proposals are being put forth.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁶	Actors involved: ⁷
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Medium Term Strategy		Coordination Body (Headed by the Foreign Affairs Minister. Members: the Minister of Finance, Permanent Secretary of the Planning Bureau)
6.2 Administrative/Institutional		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

None available

8. Contacts

Mr. Petros Mavrikios Attaché Department of Economics and Development Cooperation Ministry Of Foreign Affairs Tel: ++357 22 401186 Mail: pmavrikios@mfa.gov.cy	Mrs. Emmanuelle Lambrinides Senior Co-ordination Officer Directorate for International Economic Relations, Technical Assistance and Administration Planning Bureau 29 Vyronos Av. 1096 Nicosia Tel: ++35722602868 / Fax: +35722666810 mail: elambrianides@planning.gov.cy	Petros Attas Coordination Officer Planning Bureau Tel: +35722602863 Fax:+35722666810 pattas@planning.gov.cy
---	---	--

⁶ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁷ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

CZECH REPUBLIC

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. The Concept of the Czech Republic Foreign Aid Program for the 2002 – 2007 Period
<http://www.mzv.cz/servis/soubor.asp?id=1560>
2. Development Cooperation Programmes for the 2006 – 2010 Period (with priority countries – Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, Mongolia, Serbia, Vietnam, Yemen and Zambia) approved by the Czech Government in the decision no. 664 of June 1, 2005.

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

The **DPS (Development Policy Statement)** of the Czech Republic implies the “Principles for Czech Republic Development Cooperation after the EU accession”, which was approved by the Czech Government by the **decision no. 302 of March 31, 2004**.
Moreover, the government has discussed the concept of coherence in the “**Aid Program for the 2002-2007 Period**” and the “**Competency Act**”.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2002 (Foreign Aid Programme)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Ministry for Foreign Affairs** is the responsible body for ensuring the completion of aid coordination objectives. It is fulfilling this role in cooperation with the **Development Centre** (hosted by the Institute of International Relations, Prague).
MFA is coordinating the work of line-ministries, which are implementing development projects according to multiyear programme approved by the Government. The preparation and supervision of the programme lies within the MFA too.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

(Summarises key points for PCD from the Scoping Study’s country research tables)

The Czech Ministry for Foreign Affairs coordinates development aid by convening regular inter-departmental meetings of representatives of the individual departments engaged in assistance projects.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁸	Actors involved: ⁹
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Concept of Foreign Aid Programme for the period of 2002-2007	Group 2/4	PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - Inter-Ministerial Working Commission	Group 4	PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - Development Centre	Group 4	PM

7. External Opinions:

None available

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

The Czech Republic has been reorganising its foreign affairs policy and institutional set-up for its accession to the EU. The country’s **Concept of Foreign Aid Programme for 2002–2007** names poverty eradication as the main objective of foreign aid, in tandem with efforts of the international community. It argues for a “multi-dimensional approach” taking into account economic, social and environmental factors. The Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs coordinates development aid by convening regular inter-departmental meetings of

⁸ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 (‘Type of Mechanism’ and ‘Particular Characteristics), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁹ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

representatives of the individual departments engaged in assistance projects. One main advisory body exists within the Ministry. This is the Development Centre, an expert institution with several supporting functions: cooperating with relevant departments and institutions to implement foreign cooperation projects, coordinating the work of other governmental and non-governmental institutions and overseeing research related to foreign aid. Promoting coherence for development is not clearly spelled out as one of the Czech Republic's objectives; rather, policy coherence seems to be understood as consistency of development activities with foreign policy objectives and with other trade-related interests.

9. Contacts

<p>Kateřina Beckov Permanent Representation of the Czech Republic to the European Union External Relations - COEST</p> <p>15, rue Caroly, 1050 Brussels Tel: (0032) 2 2130 166 Fax: (0032) 2 2130 184 Katerina_Beckova@mzv.cz</p>	<p>Dagmar Kubinova Dagmar_Kubinova@mzv.cz</p>	
--	--	--

DENMARK

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Denmark: The Government's priorities for Danish Cooperation with Africa 2005-2009
<http://www.um.dk/NR/ronlyres/952F5A8D-7865-4054-93B5-52F82ACC6A00/0/PolicyonAfrica.pdf>
2. Priorities of the Danish Government for Danish Development Assistance 2006-2010 (2005)
<http://www.um.dk/NR/ronlyres/A8318B35-D44F-407E-B090-70249E59F842/0/globalisationengelsk.pdf>
3. Act on International Development Co-operation as published in Act no. 541 of 10 July 1998 (Amended 2002) – Unauthorized English translation.
<http://www.um.dk/NR/ronlyres/2C33CB87-5DA1-47B2-A2D7-7F51D7C711DA/0/EngelskversionafLovomUdvibistand1998.doc>
4. Danish Strategy for Trade, Growth and Development (2005)
<http://amq.um.dk/en/menu/PoliciesAndStrategies/TradeAndDevelopment/>

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

In its **Act on International Development Co-operation**, which was published in 1998 and last amended in 2004, no reference is made to either coherence or consistency. It did however place the responsibilities for both multilateral and bilateral development assistance (and the goals to promote economic growth, as defined in section 1) on the Ministry of Foreign affairs, under the management of the Minister for Development Co-operation (section 20).

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

1998 (adoption of the Act on International Development Co-operation)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

Denmark pursues coherence through its compact and concentrated institutional set-up and through formulation of integrated policies, as well as through cross ministerial coordination structures.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

Danida (the South Group) is responsible for the overall management of Danish development cooperation and for relations with the UN-system (source: organisation Manual for the Management of Danish Development Cooperation, January 2006).

One of the ways through which Denmark aims to promote coherence for development is through the formulation of integrated policies, such as the aforementioned **New Africa Strategy (2004)** and the **Strategy for Trade, Growth and Development**.

In the 2005 Danish Strategy for Trade, Growth and Development, it is mentioned that in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs a project group will be established to ensure greater coherence in trade and development policy. The project group will cover both the Danish context and the EU's trade and development policy vis à vis Africa. The project group will also include external members (MFA 2005: 51). The strategy also prioritises the strengthening of the capacity of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) to work in an integrated manner with trade and sustainable development (MFA 2005: 50).

The project group has been functioning since 2001 and meets irregularly but frequent to ensure a consistent and coherent policy line in relation to trade policy and development. Besides meeting when relevant, the project group's members also consult informally on a daily basis. Due to its institutional status it is lacking a formal mandate, but it is known to have been effective in pursuing greater coherence and consistency between trade and development. The MFA Department of International Trade Policy and Business also works on promoting coherence between these two policy areas. Its formal decision-making structure in relation to trade policy includes consultations with the civil society, including the development community.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ¹⁰	Actors involved: ¹¹
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements		

¹⁰ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

¹¹ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

- New Africa Policy (2004) - Danish Strategy for Trade, Growth and Development	Group 2 Group 2	Par, Cab, PM, CS Par, Cab, PM, CS
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - Department for Development Policy	Group 4	PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

OECD/DAC Peer Review (2003)

*(...) Danida needs to play a stronger leadership role among Danish institutions in analysing and promoting the development coherence of policy decisions. It could play a **more proactive role** in substantive interchange with civil society and in supporting the coherence initiatives of Parliament. More proactive leadership will require reinforcement of Danida capacity to work in the policy coherence area' (OECD/DAC 2003: 46).*

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

Denmark pursues coherence through its compact and concentrated institutional set-up and through formulation of integrated policies. Its New Africa Policy is a joint initiative of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Integration and Development and is based on the development plans of African countries. The target is multidimensional: to contribute to sustainable economic growth; to further regional cooperation; to assist African countries in resolving conflicts; to promote human rights, democratisation and good governance; to improve social conditions (particularly through education, health and HIV/AIDS programmes); and to enhance the possibilities for African exporters to sell their goods competitively on the world market.

The outline of the new policy is based upon an analysis (**An Analytical Overview on Africa**) that seeks to integrate development, foreign affairs, security and trade policies. In the lead up to the policy's formulation, all interested parties (both within and outside of government) had an opportunity to participate in a month of debate underlying the analysis; and there was a public hearing on the policy (10 December 2004). People could also submit comments electronically, to be incorporated into debate and in the final analysis that served as the basis for the policy statement. The final version of the policy will be submitted to the Parliament.

Obviously this policy cannot yet be evaluated on its results or impact. But an evaluation could assess how the different policy areas were integrated into one policy, how different stakeholders were involved and how their involvement influenced the policy formulation process.

The only administrative mechanism that the Scoping Study identified in Denmark is the Department for Development Policy in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Yet for this department coherence is only a small part of a much broader mandate, and the focus is exclusively on coherence of instruments and policies within the development sector, not beyond.

9. Contacts

Erik Rasmussen Head of Section Department for Development Policy Ministry of Foreign Affairs Asiatisk Plads 2 DK-1448 Copenhagen K Tel +45 3392 1336 Email eriras@um.dk		
---	--	--

ESTONIA

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Estonia: Principles of Development Cooperation (2003)
http://www.vm.ee/eng/kat_178/3815.html
2. Procedure for the provision of development assistance and humanitarian aid Regulation of the Government of the Republic No. 124 (2003)
<http://web-static.vm.ee/static/failid/377/Procedure.pdf>

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

Although there is no explicit reference to PCD in its **Principles of Development Cooperation**, the document does mention that: *'Estonia observes the UN Millennium Declaration adopted in 2000 and the principles for humanitarian and development aid established by international organisations, primarily by the UN, the OECD and the EU.'*

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

Not yet an explicit issue.

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

As is mentioned in its Principles of Development Cooperation: *'The implementation of the principles of Estonian development co-operation is organised by the **Ministry of Foreign Affairs**.'* However, the document also refers to the roles that are played by several other stakeholders: *'**Civil society organisations** play an important role in Estonian development co-operation by participating in policy formulation, preparing and implementing concrete projects and presenting the subject matter to the Estonian population. In addition to civil associations, the partners in Estonian development co-operation may include **private businesses and other volunteers** whose background, relevant preparedness and achievements meet the requirements for development co-operation projects.'*

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

According to the **'Procedure for the provision of development assistance and humanitarian aid'** which was approved by the Government on May 21st 2003, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs distributes development assistance and humanitarian aid in co-operation with relevant institutions and persons.

Furthermore, the document mentions that:

The development co-operation project required for the allocation of development assistance and humanitarian aid (hereinafter project) will be approved or rejected by the Minister of Foreign Affairs based on Estonia's principles of development co-operation, on the possible effects of the project on the development of the recipient country, on the cost of the project and on the recommendations from the Development Co-operation Commission.

Although a Development Cooperation Commission:

1. assesses the submitted projects based on Estonia's principles of development co-operation, on the possible effects of the project on the development of the recipient country, on the cost of the project;
2. can make suggestions to improve the project;
3. and proposes to the Minister of Foreign Affairs either to approve or reject the project;

PCD is not an explicit part of its mandate, nor of the principles of development cooperation. The Commission includes representatives of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ¹²	Actors involved: ¹³
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - None Identified		
6.2 Administrative/Institutional		

¹² For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

¹³ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

None Identified		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:
None available

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):
Estonia adopted a set of principles on development cooperation in 1999 (revised in 2003) promoting a holistic approach. This means all policies which could influence the situation of developing countries are to be considered together. However, the scoping study found no mechanism to promote or monitor the implementation of the principles.

9. Contacts
No contacts

EU INSTITUTIONS

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. The 'Maastricht Treaty' (the treaty on European Union) (1992)
<http://www.eurotreaties.com/maastrichteu.pdf>
2. The Treaty of Amsterdam (1997)
<http://www.eurotreaties.com/amsterdamfinalact.pdf>
3. The Cotonou Partnership Agreement (2000 – revised 2005)
http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/cotonou/pdf/agr01_en.pdf#zoom=100
4. The European Community's Development Policy – Statement by the Council and the Commission, November 2000
http://ec.europa.eu/comm/development/index_en.htm
5. The EU Consensus on Development (2005)
http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/c_046/c_04620060224en00010019.pdf
6. EC Communication, COM (2005) 134, *Policy coherence for development – Accelerating progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals* – 12 April 2005
http://ec.europa.eu/comm/development/body/communications/docs/communication_134_en.pdf
7. GAERC conclusions, 23-24 May 2005
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/gena/85008.pdf
8. EC Commission Staff Working Paper, SEC(2006) 335/1, *Policy coherence for development – Work programme 2006-2007*, 7 March 2006
<http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/recherche.cfm?CL=fr>
9. GAERC conclusions, 10-11 April 2006
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/gena/89219.pdf
10. GAERC conclusions, 16-16 October 2006
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/gena/91351.pdf

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

The 2000 **Development Policy Statement** reiterates the objectives of Article 177 and 178 EC¹⁴ and highlights the need for improved coherence among the EC/EU policies. In theory, the legal texts and the policy statement refer to all internal and external policies of the European Union.

The **Cotonou Agreement** has an even stronger coherence Article (12): The EC is legally bound to inform the ACP states of all its policy intentions if it affects the poverty objective of the CPA and the different countries: *'towards this end, the Commission shall communicate simultaneously to the secretariat of the ACP States its proposal for such measures. Where necessary, a request for information may also take place on the initiative of the ACP States. At their request (ACP), consultations shall be held promptly so that account may be taken of their concerns as to the impact of those measures before any final decision is made'*.

Although the **new Constitution** is not adopted, it might however be useful to keep an eye on the legal provisions: Consistence (Art. III-115; Art III-292(3);) has basically replaced the term coherence. It means that the external and internal policies should be consistent rather than coherent with the development objectives of poverty eradication.

What is new in the 2005 **European Consensus** is the inclusion of different articles (35-38 and 109) which are specifically about coherence. Article 35 connects the need for policy coherence for development to achieving the Millennium Development Goals: *'It is important that non-development policies assist developing countries' efforts in achieving the MDGs. The EU shall take account of the objectives of development cooperation in all policies that it implements which are likely to affect developing countries. To make this*

¹⁴ The development objectives of the European treaties are stated in Article 177 of the TEC: (i) Sustainable economic and social development of developing countries and more particularly the most disadvantaged among them; (ii) the smooth and gradual integration of the developing countries into the world economy and (iii) the campaign against poverty in the developing countries, while **Article 178 of TEC states: The Community shall take account of the objectives referred to in Article 177 in the policies that it implements which are likely to affect developing countries.** (Article 130v & 178, Treaty on the European Union 1992, 1997 and consolidated TEU 2002)

commitment a reality, the EU will strengthen policy coherence for development procedures, instruments and mechanisms at all levels, and secure adequate resources and share best practice to further these aims.' The other three articles contain more concrete commitments on issues including trade capacity building, removing trade distortions, security and development, and the environment. Article 109 states that the Commission and Member States will prepare a rolling Work Programme on the implementation of the May 2005 conclusions on policy coherence for development, building on the **EC Communication on Policy Coherence for Development** (COM(2005) 335) and indicates that the Commission will reinforce its existing instruments such as the impact assessment and explore new instruments to be put in place in order to implement PCD commitments. In its **May 2005 conclusions, the GAERC** took note of the Communication and asked for some follow-up, notably through a bi-annual reporting on the implementation on the commitments contained in the Communication.

Following these commitments the EC prepared a **work programme for 2006-2007** defining concrete steps in order to promote PCD within the twelve policy areas defined in the EC Communication. The **GAERC conclusions in 2006** (both in April and in October) took note of the work programme and made some specific recommendations in order to better integrate development concerns in the Council decision-making process.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

1992 (Maastricht Treaty)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

There is no single body, unit and/or person responsible for coherence in the European Commission. Several of mechanisms and processes include various elements of coherence (see below). The EU institutional context is complex and it is thus important to introduce it:

European Commission Directorates General dealing with external relations

DG Development: is responsible for i) development policy and promoting development goals within other Community policies and ii) relations to the ACP. In other words, it is in charge of app. 3 billion euro annually (app. half of the total external EC budget). The Commissioner for Development is also responsible for ECHO.

ECHO: is responsible for the EC's humanitarian assistance (and soon all food security/food aid/food management programmes).

DG Relex: is responsible for relations to all non-ACP and non-candidate countries. It is headed by the Commissioner for External Relations.

AIDCO/EuropeAid: is in charge of the implementation of programmes (the whole project cycle besides programming). Aidco is under the responsible of the Board which consisted of all the external (RELEX) Commissioners.

DG Trade: DG trade is responsible for trade relations to third countries.

DG Enlargement: Is responsible for all candidate and potential candidate countries.

The European Parliament

Different standing committees deal with external relations in the European Parliament besides the Committee on Development (DEVE): the Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET), the Committee on International Trade (INTA) and indirectly the Committee on Budget. None of these committees have a specific PCD mandate listed under their powers and responsibilities, but obviously the DEVE Committee is following this issue, and 'coherence' is often mentioned in the reports addressing development issues in relation to other policies (immigration, agriculture, trade, etc.).

The European Council

The recently carried CEPS study on PCD in the EU Council (CEPS; 2006) indicates that 'decision-making in the Council must navigate the nine sector-divided ministerial formations and numerous subordinate bodies where the majority of decision are taken. The study looks at the twelve thematic areas identified in the May 2005 Council Conclusions on PCD: trade, environment, climate change, security, agriculture, fisheries, the social dimension of globalisation, employment and decent work, migration, research and innovation, the information society, transport and energy. PCD varies according to which Council working party, Coreper and Council formation are in charge. The GAERC is recognised as an important advocate for PCD despite uneven contribution to this matter.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The European Commission

CSPs/RSPs

A first programming framework common to all regions where the Commission operates has been developed and applied in 2000-2001. This framework contains a requirement to look at the policy mix aspect. Each CSP should thus include a section concerning the EU policy mix. This consists of identifying linkages between external assistance and other Community policies, resources and instruments in fields such as trade, fisheries, agriculture, conflict prevention, food security, and the Common Foreign and Security Policy (EC Guidelines, 2001). In 2006, the Commission has published a new common programming framework that explicitly includes a section on the impact of other policies on development goals¹⁵. PCD is also included as an issue to assess in geographical evaluations of CSPs/RSPs. The CSPs/RSPs could thus be considered as a PCD mechanism in itself. However the new common programming framework is only being applied to ACP programming, currently under-going. There is probably not enough material to assess it at this stage since it would be interesting to have the whole cycle included : programming, reviews and evaluations or at least part of it.

Country teams

In relation to the CSPs, the Commission establishes country teams that undertake all programming and reviews with regard to a specific country or region. This is a technical forum that brings together all DGs and EC officials concerned with cooperation in a country. Their task is to coordinate the Commission's interests and ensure policy coherence. They do the coherence analysis for their country of concern and are thus the primary instrument for ensuring that the European Union adheres to a consistent and coherent policy towards third countries.

Impact assessment

An impact assessment process was set up by the Commission in 2002 within the framework of the "better regulation" package and the **European Sustainable Development Strategy** which instigated several concrete actions to simplify the regulatory environment and improve the way the Commission designs policy. Replacing previous single-sector impact assessments, the new process provides the European institutions with an integrated methodology by which to assess policy impact. As now designed, the impact assessment process functions as a tool for improving the coherence of measures under preparation. *'It associates all relevant Commission services to the analysis, and consults potentially affected stakeholders as regards different scenarios for the policy goals to be achieved'* (COM/2005/0134 final). Through the impact assessment process, the Commission identifies the likely positive and negative economic, environmental and social effects of proposed policy actions, and outlines potential synergies and trade-offs in achieving competing objectives, thus enabling informed political judgments to be made about the proposal. The process takes place in two stages. First a preliminary assessment is completed. Then, if necessary, an extended impact assessment is done. Preliminary assessment is required for all proposals submitted in the context of the annual policy strategy or work programme that the Commission adopted the year before. Key elements of the assessment process are thorough consultation with different stakeholders and coordination across the different Commission services. The assessment process was expected to be fully operational for 2004/05. Commission services are currently improving the process. The last two Council conclusions refer to impact assessment as the European tool for promoting policy coherence for development and called on the Commission to further reinforce it.¹⁶ This mechanism is currently being assessed.

European Commission working groups

Within the Commission, informal working groups exist for all geographic areas and on many thematic topics. These may take the form of informal inter-service (i.e. inter-DG) groups, for instance in the area of trade and development. Proposals that can have an impact on development are discussed in this context before being circulated among all DGs through the inter-service consultation. An inter-service working group has been formalised very recently (September 2006) in order to follow up on the EC Work programme on policy coherence for development 2006-2007. The EC work programme and the bi-annual reporting will in themselves constitute a mechanism once there is a sufficient basis to assess them.

The inter-service consultation

The inter-service consultation process is the institutional consequence of the principle of collegiality of the European Commission. All decisions are taken by the European Commission as a collegial body, which means that all DGs have to be involved in the decision-making process. EC proposals (draft Communications, etc..) are thus circulated to the other DGs through the inter-service consultation, which

¹⁵ COM(2006) 88, *Increasing the impact of aid – A common framework for drafting country strategy papers and joint multiannual programming*, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0088en01.pdf

¹⁶ *Presidency Conclusions of the Brussels European Council*, 16 and 17 December 2004

http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf and

External Relations Council Conclusions: Accelerating Progress towards Achieving the Millennium Development Goals, Brussels, 24 May 2005,

http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/gena/84945.pdf

allow other DGs to make comments, observations and eventually negative opinions if they disagree with the proposals. This consultation is made at the technical level. If disagreements remain, they are thus solved at the political level among Commissioners. This mechanism is used by each DG to promote its own goals and policy and thus by DG Development to promote policy coherence for development although there is no specific mandate for it.

The Committee on Development and Cooperation of the European Parliament

The Committee on Development and Cooperation of the European Parliament is responsible for promoting, implementing and monitoring the development and cooperation policy of the Union, matters relating to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement and relations with other relevant bodies. It also organises the European Parliament's involvement in election observation missions, when appropriate in cooperation with other relevant committees and delegations. Though it has no specific institutional mandate to promote policy coherence for development, it does refer to coherence issues in various debates and reports.¹⁷

The EU Council

Since EU policies and generally (co)-decided in the Council, the institution is of vital importance for ensuring policy coherence in general and PCD in particular. A recent study has analysed whether the policy-making process in the EU Council allow for "development related" inputs and where these processes are found to be wanting through studies conducted in each of the twelve thematic areas identified in the May 2005 Council conclusions¹⁸. Some recommendations of this study have been taken into account in the GAERC October 2006 conclusions.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation		
	Particular Characteristics¹⁹	Actors involved:²⁰
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements A - Maastricht Treaty (art. 177 and 178) B - EU draft constitutional treaty (art III-316) C - Development Policy Statement and its successor: the EU Consensus on Development. D - Commission's communication (2005) 134 on policy coherence for development E - European Council conclusions	All Group 2	EC, EU Member States, EU Council, ACP countries
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - CSP/RSP (new) B - Country teams C - Inter-service working group (new) D - Inter-service consultation E - Development Committee (European Parliament)	A-D: Group 4 F: Group 2	EC, PM, Par
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment A - Impact assessment (already being done)	A : Group 4	EC

7. External Opinions:

The **2002 DAC/Peer Review** makes three general recommendations on PCD in the EU institutions:

- *Review the coherence of internal Community policies with development objectives. The Country Strategy Paper (CSP) offers a context in which to do this, but the analytical capacity and resources for such work are lacking both in the field and in Brussels;*
- *Propose initiatives for approval by EU Member States for strengthening the positive impact of internal Community policies on development policy;*
- *Make full use of the policy coherence mechanisms by providing stronger linkages and feedback between*

¹⁷ In particular, the Report on the Commission communication to the Council and the European Parliament on the European Community's development policy, *The European Community's Development Policy*, Committee on Development and Cooperation (2001).

¹⁸ CEPS, *Policy coherence for Development in the EU Council – Strategies for the way forward*. Brussels, 2006.

¹⁹ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

²⁰ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

the CSP process, Interservice Quality Support Group, Evaluation unit, and Court of Auditors'
(OECD/DAC 2002: 17).

8. Contacts

Francoise Moreau, Head of Unit,
Forward looking studies and policy
coherence, DG Development,
francoise.moreau@cec.eu.int

Virginia Braunstein, Forward looking
studies and policy coherence, DG
Development,
Virginia.braunstein@cec.eu.int

Guido van Hecken, Official at
the EP Secretariat, Deputy
Head of the Development
Committee,
guido.vanhecken@europarl.europa.eu

FINLAND

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Finland's Development Co-operation in the 1990's. Strategic goals and means, August 1993;
2. Decision-in-Principle on Finland's Development Cooperation, 12 September 1996;
3. Finland's Policy on Relations with Developing Countries, 15 October 1998;
4. Decision-in-Principle on Operationalisation of Development Policy Objectives in Finland's International Development Cooperation, 22 February 2001;
5. Government Resolution on Development Policy, 5 February 2004
http://global.finland.fi/english/publications/pdf/dev_policy2004.pdf

Each of the above development policy statements or outlines is building on the earlier documents. The overall goals of Finnish development cooperation stated in 1993 in the first strategy paper are still valid.

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

Finland's development co-operation strategy of 1993 already acknowledged the lack of coherence between policies as a major obstacle to the development of relationships between the OECD and developing countries. In the first Decision-in-Principle of the Government on Development Cooperation of 1996, policy coherence is explicitly stated as a means to attain the overall goals of development policy and development cooperation. In this paper, development cooperation was stated as an integral part of Finland's foreign policy and international relations. The objective of Finnish development cooperation policy is a coherent whole in which the objectives of the various policy sectors are in harmony. This view pertains also to the implementation of the EU procedure, meaning that political issues, trade policy and development cooperation were to be treated as a single entity. At this point, the Government also listed measures by which the coherent policy would be attained. This objective was translated into **Finland's Policy on Relations with Developing Countries**, adopted by the Government in October 1998. This document leaned also on the work and expertise of the Advisory Board for Relations with Developing Countries, the predecessor of the current Development Policy Committee. - Moreover, the Decision-in-Principle on Development Cooperation of 1996 stated that to enhance the effectiveness and quality of development cooperation, multilateral and bilateral development cooperation constitutes a coherent entity in support of the overall goals. The **Decision-in-Principle of 2001** extended the coherence approach also to the training of young diplomats (Training Course on International Affairs, KAVAKU). Similarly, in-service training in integrated policy and development cooperation has regularly been offered.

The most recent paper, the **Government Resolution of 2004** treats Policy coherence as a requirement to achieve the objectives which are included in the MDGs, Monterrey, Doha, and Johannesburg.

This implies that:

1. There is a need for better cooperation among authorities;
2. Development policy perspective should be included in all the programmes and reports in which Finland's policies in issues affecting development are defined (Government of Finland 2004: 7).

The development policy goals for 2004 include:

1. improve cooperation within the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) and among the authorities to promote coherence;
2. consolidate Internal systems within MFA for implementing and monitoring development policy (Government of Finland 2004: 7).

To support the policy making and oversight of implementation of development policy, the Government established an Advisory Board for Relations with Developing Countries (TALKE, later KESU) as early as 1979. The Board was nominated by a Government decision usually for a 3-year period. The mandate was broad - to participate in the discussion of all issues of development cooperation and policy. The current Development Policy Committee (DPC) is a successor arrangement to this Board. Among the five objectives of the current DPC that run until 2007 is the improvement of quality and impact of development cooperation as well as the creation of an operational culture promoting consistency for different sectors of policies. The membership of the Board and the current DPC comprises parliamentarians, academics, media, NGOs. Representatives of ministries have served the Board and now serve the DPC in the capacity of special advisors, but not as actual members.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

Promotion of coherence as a means to address difficult development issues was first acknowledged in the **Strategy paper of 1993**. In the **Decision-in-Principle on Finland's Development Cooperation of 1996** policy coherence was stated as an explicit goal. (pls. see also item 2. above).

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **MFA** prepares and implements foreign policy, including development policy and the coordination it necessitates. In doing so, it works together with other key actors, including **various other ministries, government agencies, the private sector, NGOs and civil society at large**. The **Department for Development Policy of MFA** is responsible for coordination of the development policy sector of foreign policy of Finland. There are different levels of management coordination and inter-departmental groups, to ensure coherence and coordination of development policy and development cooperation. The Department for Development Policy has the responsibility to coordinate and compile the report to the Government on the implementation of the development policy against the Government resolution of 2004.

In addition, the **Development Policy Committee (DPC)** promotes coherence of development policy in Finland (and ensures that the UN millennium development goals are supported by Finland's development policy), and reports independently annually to the Government on the implementation of Finland's development policy and the factors affecting it. To achieve its objectives, in promoting PCD, the DPC may organise seminars, such as the one in March 2006, during which coherence issues were addressed.

<http://global.finland.fi/kesu/english/pdf/VSLseminaariENG080306MUJSTIO.pdf>

The **Government Secretariat for EU Affairs** coordinates the handling of issues relating to the European Union in the ministries, thereby enhancing coherence and effectiveness of the Finnish EU policy in general, not specifically of development policy only. This Secretariat works together with the ministries, and is responsible for preparing the broad thrust of Finnish policy on the EU and ensuring that decisions by individual ministries cohere and adhere with Finland's general policy objectives. It also handles key institutional issues relating to the general development of the Union and has special responsibility, under the supervision of the Prime Minister, for preparation and political coordination of issues to be placed before the European Council. - The Government Secretariat for EU Affairs also serves the Cabinet Committee on European Union Affairs and the Committee for EU Affairs.

The **Committee for EU Affairs** (chaired by the head of the Government Secretariat for EU Affairs, who is the State Secretary for EU Affairs) serves as an advisory and mediatory body in the coordination of EU affairs. It discusses broad issues involving several ministries and also those issues that have not been resolved in the sub-committees.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs prepares and implements the Government's foreign policy – including policy towards developing countries - and brings together the expertise of different national players to facilitate the formulation of coherent policies. There are a number of theme-specific inter-ministerial and other working groups and committees. Currently there are groups dealing with security and development, immigration, trade and development etc. Ad hoc working groups and committees are established in accordance with the need, for instance, to prepare positions to international conferences and events. Such committees may also be established and mandated by an administrative decree of the Government or by decision of MFA.

As stated above in item 4, the Department for Development Policy shoulders the principle responsibility for development policy formulation, reporting, monitoring and evaluation of the implementation. Funds appropriated annually by the parliament for the implementation of Development Policy are distributed between all those departments, which have responsibility for the implementation, namely the Global Department, the Department for Europe, Department for External Economic Relations, Political Department, Department for Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Department for the Americas and Asia, as well as Department for Africa and the Middle East. All these departments implement the integrated and coherent approach to different policies. Overall budgetary responsibility of development cooperation funds rests with the Department for Development Policy.

The Inter-departmental Committee (KEPO) serves as the coordination body to ensure coherence and coordination between departments. KEPO is chaired by the Director General of the Department for Development Policy. There is also an internal coordination mechanism within the Department for Development Policy, the Management Group (KEO JORY), chaired by the Director General of the Department.

At country level, embassies of Finland make their annual plans and annual reports, which are discussed in interdepartmental ad hoc meetings. KEO JORY and KEPO also discuss the mandates of discussions with partner countries, as well as mandates for country-level joint donor assessments and programming approaches.

The Inter-departmental Quality Group serves as a pre-screening body of development projects, programmes and sector and general budget support contributions, a procedure which ensures coherence and compliance to the development policy of Finland, the internationally accepted development frameworks and the development goals of the partner country. The group is chaired by the Deputy Director General of the Department for Development Policy, and the representation is similar to KEPO. The role of this group is advisory and its statements are recommendations. Yet, in practice, funding is rarely approved against the opinion of the Quality Group.

The evaluations, be it at the project/programme level carried out by those departments which use development cooperation funds, or be it at the level of the wider independent evaluation function of the Department for Development Policy, also serve to ensure coherence and compliance and adherence to the Finnish Development Policy, the internationally acknowledged development frameworks and in country-specific cases, to the policies of the particular partner country. The results of evaluations are fed back in the planning of development cooperation and in the wider policy outlines on different themes and sectors. The Department for Development Policy manages the handling of the results of these evaluations. The findings and recommendations are discussed in a wide theme-specific ad hoc working group and formulated into recommendations for decision-making in KEO JORY and forwarded through KEPO to the implementing departments.

The DPC may, either on their own initiative or against a specific request, formulate an independent statement on any of the issues falling under their area of competence and pertinent to the development policy or its implementation.

As stated in the **2001 Decision-in-Principle**, "*the MFA promotes active dialogue with the Government and Parliament on international development issues to strengthen parliamentary oversight.*" The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Parliament has a specific sub-committee for development policy and development cooperation affairs.

The Academy of Finland has a special committee on development research. MFA allocates part of the research funding to the Academy. MFA renders also direct support to research initiatives on topics relevant to issues and needs of development policy.

Responsibility for the preparation and monitoring of affairs relating to the European Union, like EU Development Policy, and the determination of Finland's positions on EU issues rests with competent ministries. However, a coordination system has been established to ensure that Finland can present a coordinated position, in line with its overall EU policy, on issues under consideration in the European Union at each stage of preparation. The coordination system involves competent ministries, the Cabinet Committee on European Union Affairs (EU-MINVA), the Committee for EU Affairs (EUAK) and its EU sub-committees. Development policy issues are discussed in the sub-committee for foreign affairs and at times in sub-committee 133 for EC's common commercial policy.

The Government Secretariat for EU Affairs serves as the secretariat for the Cabinet Committee on European Union Affairs and the Committee for EU Affairs. The Permanent Representation of Finland to the European Union in Brussels also participates in the preparation of EU affairs. In the discussion and coordination of EU affairs particular attention is attached to the timely supply of information to and involvement of the Finnish Parliament (The Grand Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Parliament) and the Provincial Government of Åland.

In important development policy issues, different formats of civil society events are organised taking the shape of invited comments or statements, hearings, internet discussion fora, or representatives of civil society may also be invited to participate in a number of preparatory committees and working groups. - Such working modality not only ensures the views of the civil society being heard and taken into account, but also ensures that the civil society in their own development cooperation programmes, funded oftentimes by the MFA, will take into account the official Development Policy.

	Particular Characteristics²¹	Actors involved:²²
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements A - Development policy 2004 focuses on coherence B - Development issues discussed in other policy documents (e.g. Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2004; Government Report on the Human Rights Policy of Finland 2004; Finland's Trade Policy 2005; Government Paper on Global Governance and Finland 2005)	A: Group 2/1 B: Group 2	Par, Cab, PM, CS, NGOs, Acad.
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - Inter-Ministerial theme-based groups at ministerial and civil servant level ²³ B - Cabinet Committee and Government Secretariat for EU Affairs C - Integrated bilateral negotiations with partner countries ²⁴	A: Group 4/3 B: Group 2 C: Group 4/3	Par, Cab, PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - Development Policy Committee - Independent Evaluations	Group 4/1	PM, CS, Par, NGOs, PS, Acad. External experts, MFA and a great variety of stakeholders

7. External Opinions:

A **DAC/Peer Review which was published in 1998** commends the then three-minister structure (Minister for Foreign Affairs; a Minister for European Affairs and Foreign Trade; and a Minister for International Development Co-operation who was also Minister for the Environment), for the possibility of improving coherence and cooperation between environmental and development cooperation programmes supported by Finland (OECD/DAC 1998).

OECD/DAC Peer Review of 2003 noted extensive changes in both the Finnish policy and structures (including that of the MFA and minister port-folios) since the previous Peer Review. It encouraged Finland to adopt a clear policy with commitment to PCD (done in 2004) as well as to enhance its analytical capacity.

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

In 2004, Finland approved a **new development policy** committing it to the UN's Millennium Declaration and its central development objective, the eradication of abject poverty. This means that all of Finland's developing country-oriented policies were, from that point onwards, to be aimed at poverty eradication. To achieve this goal, the Finnish government considers policy coherence a prerequisite, in national policies as well as in multilateral and EU policies. This implies the inclusion of the development policy perspective in all of the programmes and reports that define Finland's policies affecting development.

An advisory group, the Development Policy Committee (DPC), assesses the implementation of development policy, with a special emphasis on achieving policy coherence. The DPC is concerned with both internal (type 1) coherence in the Finnish development sector and with intra-government (type 2) coherence with other policy areas that may impact on the situation in developing countries. The country's view to achieving the UN Millennium Development Goals is particularly important in this regard. The DPC can execute or commission studies and reviews on policy coherence. It meets monthly to discuss the link between a selected topic and development policy. The November 2004 meeting, for example, focused on institutional mechanisms for policy coherence, following up on the May 2004 OECD seminar on this same topic. DPC members represent political parties, the private sector, the agricultural sector, trade unions, NGOs and academia. To help the committee

²¹ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

²² Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

²³ In Finland, foreign trade policy is within Foreign Affairs Ministry so intra-ministerial coordination on trade and development is very important.

²⁴ Finland negotiates with its long-term partner countries with a broad agenda that incorporates political issues, trade and development cooperation as well as multilateral policy formulation and compliance.

execute its tasks, the government has also nominated representatives from all ministries and the Central Bank to serve as permanent experts. Thus, the Committee can be considered a coherence-building forum among the ministries as well as civil society. The DPC drafts an annual statement to the government on development policy and its implementation and makes recommendations. It also contributes statements for policy preparation throughout the year.

Finland is an active participant in international discussions on coherence. In the European Union, it participates in the EU Policy Coherence for Development Network and in EU expert meetings on trade and development and on environment and development. Its activities in the United Nations include the Committee for Sustainable Development and the UN Forestry Forum. Strengthening cooperation between the OECD's Trade Committee and its Development Assistance Committee is one of Finland's recent priorities, and the country has been active in developing the OECD's inter-agency work on sustainable development. Finland strives to promote greater participation of various stakeholders, especially NGOs, in decision-making processes. Nationally, Finnish governmental decision-making builds on broad participation by various groups. A Finnish-Tanzanian initiative, the Helsinki Process on globalisation, promotes these principles in international decision-making as well.

9. Contacts

Suvi Virkkunen
Adviser for PCD, MFA
tel. +358-9-16055157
suvi.virkkunen@formin.fi

Pekka Puustinen
Head of Unit - Sectoral Policy,
Dpt for Dev. Policy, MFA
tel. +358-9-6410
pekka.puustinen@formin.fi

Aira Päivöke
Head of Unit - Evaluation
Dpt for Dev. Policy, MFA
tel. +358-9-16056246
aira.paivoke@formin.fi
Lauratuulia Lehtinen
Adviser to DG of Dept for
Development Policy, MFA
tel: +358-9-16056 516

Eeva Rask
Secretary General of DPC
tel. +358-9-16056450
eeva.rask@formin.fi

Gunvor Kronman
Chair of DPC
tel. +358-40-7451738
gunvor.kronman@hanaholm
en.fi

Satu Mäki
Special Adviser of the
Minister for External trade
and Development
tel. +358-9-160556306
satu.maki@formin.fi

Tytti Nahi
Advocacy officer
KEPA
tel. +358-9-584233
tytti.nahi@kepa.fi

Liisa Jaakonsaari / Raili
Lahnalampi
Chair/Counsellor
Foreign Affairs Committee of the
Parliament
liisa.jaakonsaari@eduskunta.fi
raili.lahnalampi@eduskunta.fi

Markku Keinänen
Head of Unit - General EU affairs
tel. +358-9-160 56546
markku.keinanen@formin.fi

Jonna Laurmaa
Government Secretariat for EU
Affairs
jonna.laurmaa@vnk.fi

FRANCE

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. French Foreign Ministry website

<http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/>

2. 2005 Cross-cutting document on the French Policy for Development presented to the Parliament with the 2006 financial bill

<http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/IMG/pdf/DPTapd-2.pdf>

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

France has not explicitly declared policy coherence for development to be a government objective but has explicitly mentioned it in its **2005 cross-cutting policy document on the French Policy for Development** and has inserted it in its analysis, which is an important step forward. So far, the driving force behind achieving policy coherence for development came primarily from presidential initiatives.

OECD DAC recommended France to draw up a policy document setting out strategic directions for the entire co-operation system²⁵. A first yearly **cross-cutting policy document has been prepared in 2005** to accompany the 2006 budgetary discussions. This is an important step forward towards presenting a more unified vision of French development policy, which has not been the case so far partly as a consequence of its institutional setting (see below).

There are several official key principles that guide French development policy such as giving priority to Africa, focusing on global public goods and the regulation of globalization, focusing on sustainable development, focusing on democratic governance, supporting cultural diversity and 'La Francophonie'.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

PCD explicitly became an issue in 2005 when it was mentioned for the first time in the 2005 cross-cutting policy document on the French Policy for Development.

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The French institutional architecture dealing with development matters is composed by:

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, MAE), the **Ministry of Economic Affairs, Finance and Industry** (Ministère de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie, MINEFI) and the **French Agency for Development** (Agence Française de Développement, AFD) are all responsible for development policy.

The **MINEFI** is responsible for macroeconomic and financial aid. An internal reform has been implemented very recently to enhance coherence of its action regarding developing countries as international affairs and development cooperation services and multilateral trade services are now in the same directorate general.

In 1998, the creation of the **DGCID** (Direction Générale de la Coopération Internationale et du Développement or Directorate General for Development and International Co-operation) as one direction of the MAE had the aim to enhance coherence and effectiveness of France's development action by overcoming the separation of geographical division of development cooperation between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of co-operation. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is "chef de file" on cooperation issues.

In addition, the **French Agency for Development** (AFD) is active in foreign aid. The AFD's supervisory board includes representatives of the MINEFI, the MAE, the State Secretariat of Overseas Territories, parliamentarians, persons appointed for their expertise and AFD staff. Nonetheless the agency does not seem to have a specific role related to coherence.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

(Summarises key points for PCD from the Scoping Study's country research tables)

Since 1998 France has, through a process of reforming its institutional framework for

²⁵OECD DAC's 2004 peer review of development cooperation, pp. 10-12 and 52

development cooperation, established some mechanisms that could be used for policy coherence for development if mandated to do so. Interestingly, France seems to have strongly increased its focus on internal (type 1) coherence between the different actors managing French ODA, especially through the creation of a number of different mechanisms. The focus on policy coherence for development has significantly increased in 2005 while being mentioned in a cross-cutting document of French Policy for development.

The major formal mechanisms for promoting dialogue and co-ordination between the different actors involved is the Comité Interministériel de la Coopération Internationale et du Développement (CICID), which is an inter-departmental Working Group that is chaired by the Prime Minister and its members are all Ministers participating in international cooperation and a representative of the Presidency. The MAE and MINEFI hold a joint Secretariat. One of its missions is to ensure coherence among the geographical and sectoral priorities of the different cooperation instruments²⁶. The CICID has recently created (i) a strategic orientation and programming conference (Conférence d'orientation stratégique et de programmation – COSP), which aim is to coordinate the action of the different ministries in terms of development cooperation, (ii) an interministerial mission called “Official Development Assistance”, which groups the programmes financed by MAE and MINEFI and prepares a cross-cutting policy document “French policy for development” to be presented to the Parliament with the annual financial bill in order to give an overall and coherent view of French ODA and (iii) sectoral strategies and partnership framework documents with partnership countries. The creation of an interministerial mission for ODA provides a unique opportunity to consolidate the goals of French cooperation and planning process through budgetary reorganization and the drafting of a cross cutting document.

Moreover, the General Secretariat for European affairs - Secretariat General des affaires européennes (SGAE) falls under the Prime Minister’s authority. It is responsible for coordinating the French position on European issues and the OECD. It is thus the guardian of coherence and unity in the positions France expresses within the EU and the OECD. It is important to notice that its aim is to promote an overall coherent position and that development issues are not more taken into consideration than other issues.

Finally some informal networks have been created about a year ago to work on themes such as trade and development and migration and development following an initiative of the Ministry for foreign affairs. Officials from different ministries are part of these networks and some experts attend when necessary. These networks allow for an informal dialogue to take place on these issues.

6. Coverage of the three principal types of PCD mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ²⁷	Actors involved: ²⁸
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - 2005 Cross-cutting document on the French Policy for Development	Group 2	PM, Par
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development B - Inter-Ministerial Committee for European Economic Cooperation C – Interministerial mission “Official Development Assistance” * PCD is not mentioned explicitly in any of these mechanisms	Group 4 Group 4 Group 4	PM PM PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None identified		

7. External Opinions:

²⁶ Memorandum de la France présentée à l’occasion de la revue par les Pairs, pp 31-32

²⁷ Please refer to page 17 of the inception report, where four groups of PCD mechanisms are distinguished based on four characteristics: political competence, technical competences, PCD only or PCD&other.

²⁸ Please use abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

The 2004 OECD DAC Peer Review recommends France to:

1: Make policy coherence for development an explicit goal of the French government and specify the institutional arrangements to be used – in particular co-ordination mechanisms and arbitration procedures.

2: To ensure that the interests of developing countries are taken into account more systematically in the policies pursued by France, initiate a more rigorous debate by identifying the practical objectives to be achieved at ministerial level and within the administration (OECD/DAC 2003: 14).

8. Contacts

Ministère des Affaires Etrangères : Claude Fandre, François Pacquement	Ministère de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie : Daniel Kamelgarn	Agence Française de Developpement : Jean-Marc Châtaignier
--	--	---

GERMANY

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Germany: Poverty Reduction – A Global Responsibility. Program of Action 2015 (2001)
http://www.aktionsprogramm2015.de/www/images/download/ap2015_engl.pdf
2. BMZ Spezial (2004) 'Towards Halving Poverty. Second Interim Report on Implementation of the Programme of Action 2015'

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

The German government advocates coherence and consistency between all policy fields (development, security, foreign trade, international finance or agricultural policy) with regard to the objective of poverty reduction and will work towards that goal at the European level, within the framework of the OECD, and elsewhere:

Federal Ministry for Economic and Development cooperation (2001) Poverty Reduction – A Global Responsibility , Program of Action 2015, The German's Government contribution towards halving extreme poverty worldwide

http://www.aktionsprogramm2015.de/www/images/download/ap2015_engl.pdf

The country also points at necessity for industrialized countries to pursue a coherent overall strategy free of in-built contradictions:

http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/aussenpolitik/aussenwirtschaft/entwicklung/entwicklungspol_html

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

April 2001 (Program of Action 2015 approved)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)** is the lead ministry for the implementation of the Program of Action 2015

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

(Summarises key points for PCD from the Scoping Study's country research tables)

The BMZ is a separate Government Department, allowing it to advocate for PCD at a high political level.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ²⁹	Actors involved: ³⁰
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Programme of Action 2015	Group 2	Par, Cab, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - Policy coherence dialogue between DGs of ministries (as part of the Programme of Action 2015) B - Inter-departmental committees (export, security) C - Task Force 2015 D - Specific divisions in BMZ, especially division 310 which focuses specifically on AP 2015 and division 03, which is in charge of reviewing legislative proposals as regards their compatibility with development considerations	A (group 1) B (group 3) C (group 4) D (group 3 and 4)	PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - BMZ Dialogue forum	Group 1	PM, NGOs, PS,

²⁹ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

³⁰ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

7. External Opinions:

Ashoff, G. (2002) 'Improving Coherence between Development Policy and Other Policies. The Case of Germany.' GDI Briefing Paper

Ashoff concludes that more research needs to be done on the effects of other policies to identify policy incoherencies and potential synergies. There is thus a need for the further development of the analytical competencies of BMZ, so that it can adequately play its PCD promoting role. It should act both as an investigating body, and as an advisor. Finally, civil society, media and political parties' initiatives are extremely important to further PCD.

Ashoff, G. (2005) Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development: Justification, Recognition and Approaches to Achievement. DIE Studies No. 11 German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn.

According to Ashoff, within BMZ, besides the heads of Directorates-General 2 and 3 and the official responsible for coherence in Division 03 (parliamentary and cabinet affairs), there are two other Divisions who are concerned with coherence issues (excluding certain Divisions and commissioners who work on specific dossier-related coherence issues). They are:

1. Division 04 (principles, conception and political planning of development policy);
2. Division 300 (Action Programme 2015, cross-divisional questions of principle).

In this context, Ashoff recommends for a coherence unit which is mandated to manage the various coherence-related work done by these different divisions (Ashoff 2005: 107, 108).

OECD DAC Peer Review (December 2005)

Although concerted steps have been taken to further intra-governmental policy coherence for development in Germany, a DAC peer review from December 2005 advises it to take further steps in improving its strategic clarity on PCD, as well as further operationalising the BMZ agenda on policy coherence from 2004. It advises BMZ to do so mainly through a networking approach, to look beyond its own organisational boundaries and supplement its level of skill and resources to implement its vision. These networking efforts could include relationships with other bilateral efforts or those of the EC (OECD 2005: 47 – 51).

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

Germany advocates coherence and consistency in policy related to development, security, agriculture and international trade and finance vis-à-vis the objective of poverty reduction. It works towards this goal at the European level, within the framework of the OECD and elsewhere. To support its commitment to the UN Millennium Declaration and Millennium Development Goals, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) formulated the **Programme of Action 2015**. With its adoption by the Cabinet in 2001 this programme became a whole-government project. Programme of Action 2015 is a framework for poverty reduction containing 10 areas of emphasis and 75 concrete actions. Implementation of these actions is seen as the common responsibility of the entire government, with BMZ playing a coordinating, monitoring and catalytic role.

Coordination is achieved through regular coherence talks at the directorate-general level, as well as through various other inter-departmental meetings and committees. The Programme of Action 2015 requires that all government policies be consistent with the overall objective of poverty reduction. It mandates the BMZ to approach other departments and, where necessary, require them to adjust policies to bring them into line with the plan.

A policy coherence unit within the BMZ (Division 310) is responsible for coordinating and monitoring the 75 actions of the Programme of Action 2015, and for communicating with focal points and contacts for the programme in each government department. As a result of the action programme, especially the regular coherence talks, the BMZ and other departments are now much better informed about coherence and inconsistencies. The BMZ has set up a rolling priority agenda to address specific coherence issues within the next two years.

The programme also gives high priority to the mobilisation of political and public support for greater coherence through awareness campaigns. With the same purpose, BMZ established a high-ranking Dialogue Forum that has been functional since 2002. This is a forum of civil society, media and private-sector representatives that aims to raise public awareness of the Programme of Action 2015 and to craft broad alliances for the programme's implementation.

9. Contacts		
Uwe Gehlen, Head of Division Poverty Reduction, Action Programme 2015, Coherence, BMZ, Germany (gehlen@bmz.bund.de)	Michaela Zintl, Head of Evaluation Division, BMZ, Germany (zintl@bmz.bund.de)	Guido Ashoff, Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) / German Development Institute (GDI), Guido.Ashoff@DIE-GDI.DE
Friedrich Kitschelt, Head of Division European Union, BMZ, Germany (kitschelt@bmz.bund.de)	Maria Tekülve, Evaluation Division, BMZ, Germany (tekuelve@bmz.bund.de)	

GREECE

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Hellenic Aid Action Plan for coordination and harmonization (2004)
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/43/35/33981897.pdf>
2. Annual Report of the Greek Bilateral and Multilateral Official Development Cooperation and Assistance – Year 2003
3. Annual Report of the Greek Bilateral and Multilateral Official Development Cooperation and Assistance – Years 2004-2005

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

The **Hellenic Aid Action Plan** states that: the final objective of the Action Plan is to support intensive Greek efforts for the fulfilment of the MDGs and especially to poverty eradication. Three main areas for aid effectiveness are identified:

- the alignment of Greek development policies, practices and procedures with partner's priorities;
- the coordination and agreement with other donors, in particular, through the search of co-ordination, coherence and complementarity of policies and actions, always in a spirit of responsibility, transparency and efficiency to achieve common long-term objectives and
- coordination, coherence and complementarity concerning priorities, practices and procedures within the Greek System, in order to enhance the efficiency of Greek assistance and adjust our procedures

It is also noted that '(...) it is important to follow a coherent approach in all phases of the development cooperation process (strategic planning and programming, implementation, monitoring and evaluation) and put the focus on results for both partner countries and development agencies' (Hellenic Aid 2004: 4).

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2004 (publication of the Action Plan)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Ministry of Foreign Affairs** is responsible for direction and coordination of development assistance, since 2002.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

A deputy Minister for International Economic Relations and Development Cooperation was appointed in the MFA with two basic competences: international economic relations and international development.

The Directorate General of International Development Cooperation Department (Y.D.A.S.) - Hellenic Aid- is a decentralized body for planning and coordination of ODA and responsible of ODA budget. Multilateral contributions are, still, directly managed by each ministry.

Implementation mechanisms are diversified among several agencies – ministries, other public bodies; development NGO; universities; local foundations and churches associations.

An important role in the formulation of Greece's development policies is played by "EOSDOS", the Government Inter-ministerial Committee for the Coordination of International Economic Relations. EOSDOS is attended by the Minister of Foreign Affairs as chairman and the Ministers of Economy and Finance, Development, Merchant Marine, Transportation and Communications as well as other Ministers as members, according to the issue discussed.

This decision-making and coordinating Body, in addition to its competences concerning international economic and commercial relations of Greece, determines the strategy framework and the priorities of our development policy, as well as the financial recourses for its long term implementation, so that Greece's international commitments can be fulfilled. EOSDOS at the same time specifies and coordinates those policies, which may have an impact on the achievement of development goals.

Further, there are inter-ministerial coordination meetings that take place in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, aiming at strengthening coherence in the policy formulation of specific issues. Inter-ministerial meetings, for example, that took place in 2004-2005 discussed migration, human security, trafficking and environmental protection and resulted in the designing of special actions which specially promote the notion of coherence of policies.

The External Affairs and Defense Committee of the Greek Parliament is regularly informed about development cooperation issues by the **HELLENIC AID Annual Report**, or through ad hoc thematic meetings, while Members of Parliament have the possibility to submit questions on various aspects of development cooperation. These questions receive formal written answers, and subsequent discussion in Plenary may follow, if required. As regards policy coherence, Parliament votes on legislative texts, which take into account and promote coherence between policies.

Finally, HELLENIC AID is in regular contact with the Greek civil society, and uses the possibility to exchange views also about policy coherence with its representatives. The Greek NGOs, being members of our civil society are well aware of these issues while they are implementing projects and programmes on behalf of HELLENIC AID.

As is mentioned in the **2002 DAC Peer Review**: *'Greece has structures in place that could be adapted to support a more systematic approach to addressing policy coherence issues, once a high-level commitment to improving policy coherence has been communicated throughout government.'*

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ³¹	Actors involved: ³²
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Hellenic Action Plan (2004)	Group 4	PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

OECD/DAC Peer Review (2002), page 51:

'Greece has structures in place that could be adapted to support a more systematic approach to addressing policy coherence issues, once a high-level commitment to improving policy coherence has been communicated throughout government. The Parliament's Standing Committee on Defense and Foreign Affairs could vet legislation. The Interministerial Committee and the Monitoring and Administrative Committee provide fora, at the political and official levels, for exchanges, consultations and decision making, if their mandates were extended to cover co-ordination for policy coherence and the membership of the Interministerial Committee were expanded to include all key ministries for development co-operation.'

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

Greece, in its **Hellenic Aid Action Plan (2004)**, seeks coherence and complementarity with other donors and within the Greek development system. The country's Inter-Ministerial Committee for the Coordination of International Economic Relations is co-chaired by the ministers of Foreign Affairs and National Economy. Other ministers involved are those of Development, Finance, Merchant Marine and Transport and Communications.

During Greece's first **five-year programme for development cooperation (1997–2001)**, representatives of implementing ministries and agencies met in the Monitoring and Administrative Committee. This is a formal decision-making body charged to ensure that all approved projects and programmes fall within the geographic and sectoral scope of bilateral development policies and priorities. The Committee also manages implementation of the bilateral aid budget, including re-allocations of funds across activities and agencies.

Hellenic Aid, Greek's international development cooperation department, convenes frequent ad hoc executive-level inter-ministerial meetings on various issues – such as environment, water and poverty – for further coordination, cohesion and planning. These meetings give special consideration to sectoral analyses prepared by the DAC, the EU and other multilateral agencies. The Greek National Advisory Committee on NGOs is to address implementation issues of a systemic nature but has not yet been very active.

³¹ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

³² Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

9. Contacts

Paraskevi Kyriakopoulou Director Adj. Of YDAS-1 Directorate for Humanitarian and Food Aid HELLENIC AID Ministry of Foreign Affairs Tel.:30 210 368 3669 Fax: 30 210 3683666 e-mail: pkyriakopoulou@mfa.gr		
--	--	--

HUNGARY

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Hungarian Policy For International Development Cooperation (2003)
http://www.mfa.gov.hu/kum/en/bal/foreign_policy/international_development/idc.htm
2. Brief Summary of International Development Co-operation Activities (2006)
http://www.mfa.gov.hu/NR/rdonlyres/A009E6A9-64DB-4C29-9413-141C9B045A4A/0/nefe_osszefoglalo_en_2006.pdf
3. Hungary's Report on the Millennium Development Goals: Taking stock
http://www.mfa.gov.hu/NR/rdonlyres/BD4210FB-2191-4AAE-BB8C-08CA33471BCC/0/taking_stock.pdf

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

There is no mentioning of coherence in the context of Hungary's Foreign Affairs or of its development policies. They only mention coherence in the context of distribution of their aid assistance to "a selected number of countries" with respect to their policy objectives and the practice of development cooperation.

Still, they acknowledge the international community members' work towards the 3Cs in their DC programs and intend to do so as well.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

In the **2003 Hungarian Policy for International Development Cooperation**, it is mentioned that Hungary's selection of partner countries will '(...) ensure coherence between our political, security and economic objectives on the one hand, and the practice of development cooperation on the other. The programs are intended to contribute to the sustainable social and economic development of the partner countries and to the reinforcement of bilateral relations equally.'

Whereas this is a clear reference to the importance of coherence, it cannot be considered a reference to policy coherence for development, as the 'direction' of the coherence is not clear (e.g. the programs are to contribute to development policy and foreign policy objectives at the same time).

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Ministry of Foreign Affairs** acts as the decisive stakeholder in the development of Hungarian IDC policy, in interdepartmental co-ordination and in the operation of the delivery mechanism, while the **International Development Co-operation Department** created in November 2002 within the MFA is responsible for planning, managing and organising IDC activities.

The **IDC Interdepartmental Committee** with the participation of cabinet ministers established by a Government Decision in June 2003 is primarily responsible for determining partner countries and IDC sectors and to decide on the main strategic issues. The **Interdepartmental Expert Group** of delegated representatives of the line ministries assists it.

The **IDC Working Committee** in the MFA is meant to harmonise the IDC programmes and projects with the foreign, security and external economic policy objectives.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

Prior to 2003, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was responsible only for humanitarian aid and a small budget managed under its Administrative and Legal Department.

HUN-IDA (Hungarian International Development Assistance) was established in 2001 by TESCO, the state agency responsible for managing the aid provided by the Republic of Hungary in the past decades.

The MFA:

- draws up the annual plan for the delivery of International Development cooperation (IDC)
- acts as the interdepartmental co-ordinator
- informs the Foreign Affairs and Budget Committees of the Parliament about the IDC activities
- is responsible to harmonise, with the active participation of the line ministries, all Hungarian development activities and to assist in the efficient use of central IDC resources

The delivery mechanism is made up of three main elements;

- 1.) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs determines the policies and priorities within which development programs and projects will be delivered. Furthermore, it approves the selection of individual programs and projects for their inclusion in the Hungarian IDC budget and supervises their execution on the basis of decisions taken by the IC.
- 2.) The implementing agency reviews and assesses project proposals from a technical and financial point of

view. Moreover, it prepares invitation for bids from Hungarian organizations, evaluates proposals received, recommends the selection of successful bidders to the IC and monitors the execution of projects.

3.) The executive (management) organisation executes the project as approved by the IC.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the line ministries are not engaged in the actual delivery of IDC programs and projects. Instead, they retain the services and competencies of profit-oriented and not-for-profit members of the private sector to deliver specific IDC initiatives in international development programs.

Additionally, other institutions (universities, research groups, private persons) may also be involved in the arrangement of the programs.

Implementing agencies, supervised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, organise the execution of IDC programs in the recipient countries while the businesses and NGOs are commissioned to deliver the programmes.

The institutions which have been described here (IDC Interdepartmental Committee, the Interdepartmental Expert Group and the IDC Working Committee in the MFA) are formal structures that can make binding decisions and their mandate is of political nature. Although their mandates does not explicitly refer to and require them to promote PCD, they are important instruments in the formulation and coordination of policies, and may work to promote PCD once the need to do so has been decided upon.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ³³	Actors involved: ³⁴
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - None Identified		
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - None Identified		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

None available

8. Contacts

László Vizi Director General Department for International Development Co-operation, MFA Nemzetközi Fejlesztési Együttműködési Főosztály <NFETitkarsag@kum.hu>		
--	--	--

³³ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

³⁴ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

IRELAND

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Irish Aid – White Paper on Overseas Development Assistance
www.irishaid.gov.ie/about_white_paper.asp
2. Department of Foreign Affairs Strategy Statement 2005-2007
foreignaffairs.gov.ie/aboutus/strategy/part4.asp
3. Strategy Document of the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment
www.entemp.ie/publications/trade/2005/development.pdf

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

Ireland's **White paper on Development Policy (September 2006)** sets out the policy for the future direction of the Irish Aid programme. Part VI of the White Paper, 'A Coherent Approach to Development', outlines the need for coherence between development and other policies to maximise their positive impact on developing countries and to minimise their possible negative impacts.

In the White Paper Ireland has pledged to work to ensure coherence across the wide range of development assistance instruments employed and to minimise and eliminate inconsistencies and contradictions. Ireland has also undertaken to be a strong advocate of greater policy coherence within the European Union.

A significant step in this direction has been the decision to establish an Inter-departmental Committee on Development, chaired by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to strengthen coherence in Government approaches to development

The Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment strategy document, 'Trading for Economic and Social Development' also explicitly acknowledges the increasing importance of coherence between development objectives and other areas of external policy and underlines the need for policy and operational coherence to maximise effectiveness.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

The **report of the Ireland Aid Review Committee in February 2002** highlighted the need for ongoing coherence between Irish development policy and other aspects of Irish foreign and domestic policy as a fundamental tenet of effective development policy.

Policy coherence was the theme of the inaugural Advisory Board for Irish Aid Development Forum held in March 2003. The Advisory Board subsequently commissioned research into Coherence between Ireland's official development cooperation activities and other policy areas, in particular agricultural trade and support policies.

The results of this three-year project can be accessed at [Institute for International Integration Studies - TCD](#)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

Irish Aid takes the lead in ensuring coherence in all aspects of development policy as well as between development and other domestic and foreign policies.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

(Summarises key points for PCD from the Scoping Study's country research tables)

Development policy is the responsibility of the Minister of State at the Department of Foreign Affairs for Development Cooperation & Human Rights. Development Policy issues are represented at Cabinet level by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Irish Aid, a Directorate within the Department of Foreign Affairs, coordinates development policy and liaises with other Government Departments to ensure that all aspects of Irish foreign and domestic policy are consistent with its Development Objectives.

Coherence meetings are held twice-monthly within Irish Aid.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ³⁵	Actors involved: ³⁶
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - White Paper on Irish Aid (September 2006)	Group 2	PM, CS, Acad, PS
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - Inter-departmental Committee on Development, chaired by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to strengthen coherence in Government approaches to development - Parliament's Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs - Inter-departmental trade and development coordination committee - Coherence meetings within Irish Aid	Group 1 Group 2 Group 3 Group 3	Cab, PM Par PM PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - Technical and Specialist Section within Irish Aid (which includes a coherence unit)	Group 3	PM

7. External Opinions:

In November 2003 the **OECD Development Cooperation Directorate (DAC)** welcomed the creation of a unit responsible for assessing Policy Coherence for Development issues and disseminating the results of analyses conducted: *"This should enhance Ireland's capacity to address the effects of broader government policies on developing countries"*.

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

9. Contacts

Tom Sneyd Director EU Multilateral Policy Irish Aid	Gerard Considine Senior Development Specialist Irish Aid	Lesley Ní Bhriain Multilateral EU Policy Irish Aid
---	---	--

³⁵ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

³⁶ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

ITALY

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Italian Cooperation Guidelines on Poverty Reduction (2004)
http://www.esteri.it/eng/4_28_66_71_52_37_13_2.asp

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

In the **Development Cooperation Overview on the website** of Italian's Foreign Ministry, some reference is made to PCD:

'Italian Cooperation initiatives are carried out in harmony with other sectors of our foreign policy. The most important of these are peacekeeping initiatives, conflict prevention and peace-building activities, and the coordinated management of migration.'

(http://www.esteri.it/eng/4_28_66_71.asp)

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2004 (Publication of the guidelines)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

Italy has no office or unit specifically responsible for ensuring policy coherence for development within the Italian administration. Its institutional arrangements related to policy coherence for development are limited, primarily to very broad policy debates in the **Council of Ministers** and in the **Inter-Ministerial Committee on Economic Planning** (the "CIPE").

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The Directorate General for Development Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGCS) is responsible for the implementation of Italy's development policy.

(http://www.esteri.it/eng/4_28_66_71_44.asp)

Its diverse tasks and responsibilities are mentioned on the MFA's website, but do not include the responsibility to promote PCD.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ³⁷	Actors involved: ³⁸
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Policy debates in the Council of Ministers	Group 2	Cab
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - Inter-Ministerial Committee on Economic Planning (CIPE)	Group 4	PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

OECD DAC Peer Review (2004)

The Peer Review concludes that: *'While Italy regularly considers coherence issues in preparation for major international events, it does not yet have a formal policy for Policy Coherence for Development (PCD), nor does it have specifically allocated analytical talent.'*

Based on the review's findings, two general recommendations to further advance on PCD are made:

1. *'Policy coherence should be an explicit goal of the Italian government. This should include a specific public statement on coherence for development, including reference to themes of special interest such as foreign direct investment (FDI) or untying;*
2. *Italy should mobilise expertise and analytical capacities both within and outside government to identify policy areas incoherent with its development co-operation objectives. This could include special resources or a unit of government that is dedicated to this task alone. Consultation with civil society and*

³⁷ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

³⁸ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

the research community would strengthen these actions' (OECD/DAC 2004: 13).

The **OECD Journal on Development's Development Co-operation Report 2005** draws similar conclusions for the Italian government:

'The ministries of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Treasury maintain regular contact and on occasion have co-ordinated on ad hoc policy issues as they arise. The Italian government does not have a specific statement on policy coherence for development, nor has it regularly mobilised the expertise and analytical capacities within and outside of government that would be necessary to address such issues more systematically at the national and European levels' (OECD 2005: 88).

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

Italy regularly considers coherence issues as part of its preparation for major international events, but it has no specific policy statement or document on policy coherence for development. One of Italy's few public policy documents on cooperation deals with poverty reduction. It is based largely on the DAC doctrine, but the extent to which it is actually applied is unclear. With regard to the Millennium Development Goals, NGOs have complained that the Italian government has no specific strategy for helping developing countries achieve the goals. In fact, there seems to be no systematic institutional concern for this matter as yet, although the situation may change with the new government elected in May 2006.

Italy appears to view the concept of coherence in various ways. The dominant view is intra-institutional coherence (i.e., within the Foreign Ministry), although there are also efforts to achieve what might be called "vertical coherence" between the central government's cooperation and that carried out by decentralised administrations (regions and municipalities), as part of what is called "Sistema Italia". More generally, there is a noticeable lack of strategic policy guidelines in the Italian system, which seems to be driven by responses to crises and politically motivated initiatives, reflecting its "flexible" approach. The Italian government sees as a major constraint in progress towards greater policy coherence for development the fact that many policy areas depend on decisions taken in wider EU fora.

The CIPE is the organism in which broad debates occur in relation to policy coherence, although it does not have a specific mandate to take action in this regard. There is little coordination between ministries on policies affecting developing countries, although various ministries consult fairly regularly on environmental issues. In the Central Technical Unit (UTC) specialists on environmental matters maintain contacts with colleagues in other ministries, for instance, regarding implications of the Kyoto Treaty. However, these exchanges seem limited to coordinating the Italian position in multilateral fora. In the Italian Committee for Development Cooperation ("Comitato Direzionale"), which is the approving body of the Directorate General for Development Cooperation, exchanges of views on policy coherence also take place considering that in the "Comitato Direzionale" other Ministries, such as the Ministry of Economy and Finance and the Ministry for International Trade, are represented.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Economy and Finance have increasing ties because of joint programmes, but these do not necessarily aim at greater policy coherence for development. For this there is a general lack of specialised staff and analytical capacity, together with weak political commitment to make major advances in this area.

The Italian Parliament and NGOs could potentially deal with the coherence issue. But parliamentary debates have as yet been limited to discussing reports, and have not ventured into broader concerns such as coherence. Italian NGOs have focused mostly on advocating for increased aid and improved aid management. Also, their orientation has been more towards humanitarian aid. An exception is a campaign by "Sbiamoci", a platform of diverse societal actors interested in Italian aid policy. This platform has cited various policy incoherencies – several of which also came to light in the DAC Peer Review of Italy's development cooperation programme in late 2004. Inconsistencies regarded particularly immigration, international military operations and commercial interests. In general, this platform worries that development cooperation may be used to further other foreign policy interests.

The new government which came into power in May 2006 is likely to give more priority to development issues than the former government. However, it faces a serious challenge in reforming the aid administration in the short to medium term, which may mean that broader policy issues –such as PCD— are not given sufficient attention, although it is still too early to precisely determine future developments.

9. Contacts

Mr. Counsellor Antimo CAMPANILE Head of the Evaluation Unit		
---	--	--

Directorate General for Development Cooperation antimo.campanile@esteri.it Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Piazzale della Farnesina 1 00100 ROME Italy		
---	--	--

LATVIA

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Basic Principles for Development Cooperation Policy
<http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/DevelopmentCo-operation/BasicDocuments/BasicPrinciples/>
2. Development Cooperation Policy Programme of the Republic of Latvia 2006 - 2010
<http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/DevelopmentCo-operation/BasicDocuments/Programme/>
3. Development Cooperation Policy Plan for 2006
<http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/DevelopmentCo-operation/BasicDocuments/PolicyPlan-2006/>

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

In its '**Development Cooperation Policy Programme of the Republic of Latvia 2006 – 2010**', the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs stresses that:

*'Latvia as EU member state will ensure the coordination, complementarity and coherence of its development cooperation policy with the development cooperation policies of the EU and other EU member states. Latvia will offer its experience in implementing reforms to help implement, through utilizing EU initiatives, political and economic reforms in regions where it is needed.'*³⁹

In the rest of the programme, as well as in the **Basic Principles for the Development Cooperation Policy of the Republic of Latvia from 2003**, no further reference is made to policy coherence for development.

Furthermore, in its **Basic Principles for Development Cooperation Policy**, a clear reference is made in its 'situation description' to the need to harmonise its development policies with EU defined priorities:

'Development Policy is an indispensable part of the body of the EU normative acts related to foreign relations. Article 3 of the EU foundation agreement stipulates that the development policy is one of the instruments for attainment of the EU common objectives. Development policy is further regulated by Articles 177-181 of this Agreement, stipulating policy objectives and tasks, procedure of acceptance as well as duties of the member states in implementing EU development policy. In accordance with the Foundation Agreement of the European Union, namely the Article 180 thereof, it is the duty of the EU member states to partake in the implementation of the EU development policy as well as to harmonize their own development policies with the EU development policy.'

In addition to that, the **annual Development Cooperation Policy Plan for 2006** states that:

'The Plan 2006 continues the activities started in 2005, in terms of implementing the bilateral development cooperation program in order to ensure in the foreseeable future the performance of Latvia's commitments as an EU member state, which were decided upon in the Council of European Union's External Relations Council conclusions of 24.05.2005, "Accelerating Progress towards Achieving the Millennium Development Goals". For 2006 Latvia sets as priorities two of the areas outlined in the conclusions of the Council:

- *-Gradually increase funding for objectives of development cooperation⁴⁰;*
- *-Improve the quality and effectiveness of the assistance provided, promoting the good practice of donors, coordinating and harmonizing their activities and improving the economic sustainability of the increased funding for the objectives of development cooperation to the recipient countries.'*

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2006 (publication of the Policy Programme)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

While the Basic Principles refer to the responsibilities of the Government of Latvia, the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs makes this more explicit:

*'The **Ministry of Foreign Affairs** has been appointed the responsible institution; however, successful implementation of the development co-operation policy is possible only if NGOs, the private and academic sectors, and society at large work together with governmental institutions.'*

<http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/DevelopmentCo-operation/#3>

³⁹ Development Cooperation Policy Programme of the Republic of Latvia 2006 – 2010

<http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/DevelopmentCo-operation/BasicDocuments/Programme/>

⁴⁰ The European Union's External Relations Council conclusions of 24.05.2005 stipulate the objective to increase funding for development cooperation, with the collective EU target of 0.56% of GNI by 2010, ensuring that each EU member state reaches at least 0.51% of its GNI, taking into account that Member States which have joined the EU after 2002, Latvia among them, reach at least 0.17% of their GNI.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is the central institution for formulation of the Development Cooperation Policies, and for the coordination of development cooperation activities. In 2003, the Consultative Council in the Development Cooperation Policy Issues was established, which consists of line ministries, municipalities, non-governmental actors, academic sector and private sector representatives. The Consultative Board is a forum for discussing development cooperation priorities and strategies, as well as a forum for exchange of relevant information among stakeholders.

(Summarises key points for PCD from the Scoping Study's country research tables)

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁴¹	Actors involved: ⁴²
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements A - Basic Principles for Development Cooperation (with reference to the need to 'harmonise' with EU development policy objectives) B - Development Cooperation Policy Programme of the Republic of Latvia 2006 – 2010 (refers to coherence) C- Annual Development Cooperation Policy Plans	A – Group 2 B – Group 4 C – Group 4	Cab, Par, PM, CS, NGOs, Acad
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - Consultative Council in the Development Cooperation Policy Issues	Group 2	Cab, NGOs, Acad, PS, municipalities
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

None available

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

The '**Development Cooperation Policy Programme of the Republic of Latvia 2006 – 2010**' policy statement represents an important commitment of the Latvian government to ensure inter-governmental policy coherence for development, which automatically requires the government to take action on intra-governmental coherence (as its development policy has to be coherent with the European Consensus on Development). In order to promote coherence, the Consultative Council in the Development Cooperation Policy Issues serves as an important forum for discussing the policy priorities.

A comparison of the various policy documents on the website of the ministry of Foreign Affairs also shows a rapid evolution in these policy documents (and hence a lack of coherence). In order to take concrete measures to further policy coherence for development, it will be important for Latvia to revise its basic principles for development cooperation policy, since these still explicitly mention that Latvia's development policy should be in service of its own development.

⁴¹ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁴² Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

9. Contacts

Secretariat of the Consultative Council: Contact person: Ms Zane Ivanova Head of Bilateral Assistance Coordination Division Development Cooperation Policy Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Latvia Tel.+371 7016297; Fax:+371 7321588; E-mail: Zane.Ivanova@mfa.gov.lv		
---	--	--

LITHUANIA

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Agreement between Political Parties of the Republic of Lithuania on the Main Foreign Policy Goals and Objectives for 2004-2008
http://www.urm.lt/popup2.php?item_id=255
2. Resolution of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania on Directions in Foreign Policy, May 1 2004
http://www.urm.lt/popup2.php?item_id=8500
3. Programme of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania for 2004 - 2008 (Foreign Policy Chapter)
http://www.urm.lt/popup2.php?item_id=256
4. Resolution of the Republic of Lithuania No. 561 of 8 June 2006 "On the approval of the Development co-operation policy guidelines of the Republic of Lithuania for 2006-2010" (see attached file No.1).

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

Among the **Directions in Foreign Policy** which were **adopted in May 2004** by the Republic, the following references to Development Cooperation are made:

- 'to continue to be an active member of the international community, effectively contributing to the response to crises, crisis management and peace keeping operations;'
- 'to take an active part in developing and implementing the policy of the European Union, strengthening the economic and social coherence and world influence of the European Union;''

Further operationalising these and other directions, the Political Parties agreed on the following general objectives on the Republic's foreign policy:

'The political parties declare that the long-term priority of the Lithuanian foreign policy is to ensure, through diplomatic means, a secure environment for the democratic development of the state and the nation in the face of new possibilities and threats by exploiting the advantages of good bilateral relations cultivated by Lithuania, by capitalizing on the country's membership in NATO, the European Union and other international organisations and by strengthening Lithuania as a pro-active and respectable modern nation.

The political parties are unanimous in their belief that Lithuania can achieve this goal by becoming a dynamic and attractive centre of interregional cooperation, which spreads the Euro-Atlantic values and the spirit of tolerance and co-operation across the borders and unites cultures and civilisations.'

Even though reference is made to the international efforts to '(...) eradicate poverty and to head off other modern threats', no explicit reference is made to the principles of the European Union's development cooperation of the Maastricht Treaty.

In the **Governments programme for 2004-2008**, reference is made to the MDG's.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

Not yet an explicit issue.

In order to ensure that development concerns remain on the radar screen of parliamentarians, it is important to keep them well-informed. Information is provided directly by responsible diplomats from the MFA, NGOs' and media.

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

According to the Ministry's mission, which is mentioned on the website:

'Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Lithuania is the central institution of the Republic of Lithuania implementing Lithuania's foreign policy and co-ordinating activities of other public institutions in the foreign policy field.

The mission of the Ministry is to represent the legitimate interests of the Republic of Lithuania and its citizens in international organizations and worldwide.'

'MFA is responsible for decision making and implementation of development cooperation policy.'
(<http://www.urm.lt/index.php?999533462>)

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The Minister of Foreign Affairs is responsible for the initiation, implementation and co-ordination of the development co-operation policy.

Lithuania's EU decision making in the field of development co-operation is the following:

- Electronic intergovernmental co-ordination of positions for GAERC, COREPER and WPs;

- Commission of the MFA for the Development of Foreign Co-operation and Aid Policies.

There is a recognition of the necessity to establish intergovernmental working party on development co-operation policy issues.

The procedure for Project selection and implementation is co-ordinated by the Commission of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the Development of Foreign Co-operation and Aid Policies. (In detail – see attached file No.2).

Although they lack a formal mandate which explicitly refers to PCD, there are a number of regular meetings in which issues related to policy coordination are discussed and addressed. These may later

- MFA undersecretaries' meetings;
- DG's of the MFA meetings;
- Meetings among MFA officials and representatives from private sector and NGOs;
- Commission of the MFA for the Development Foreign Co-operation and Aid Policies.

There are also informal meetings between experts from the MFA and think tanks, NGOs and the private sector, with the purpose of sharing knowledge and analysis on PCD related issues.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁴³	Actors involved: ⁴⁴
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements		
6.2 Administrative/Institutional		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment		

7. External Opinions:

None available

8. Contacts

Mr. Laurynas Jonavicius (MFA; Development Assistance Division) Tel. +3705/ 2362 581 Laurynas.Jonavicius@urm.lt	Mrs. Irena Urbutyte (MFA; Development Assistance Division) Tel. +3705/2362 572 Irena.Urbutyte@urm.lt	
---	--	--

⁴³ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁴⁴ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

LUXEMBOURG

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Luxembourg's Declaration on the policy for development cooperation and humanitarian action (2004)
http://www.gouvernement.lu/gouvernement/cooperation/cooperation_2004_1/index.html

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

Policy coherence features prominently in **Luxembourg's 2004 Declaration on Policy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action**. In the second section, the Declaration focuses on coherence in general, the WTO and Doha Round, and on 'la question agraire'.

Policy coherence was also one of three priorities for development cooperation during Luxembourg's recent presidency of the EU Council. In this context, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, organised a seminar - planned together with representatives of the Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Agriculture - on policy coherence in relation to achieving food security. Its conclusions and recommendations were posted on the Luxembourg EU presidency website and distributed to the ministers of Agriculture, Cooperation and Humanitarian Action and Foreign Affairs and Immigration.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2004 (Declaration)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Ministry of Foreign Affairs** has political responsibility for Luxembourg's development cooperation programme. It is, at the same time, the principal actor within the government in this field since it administers some 85% of Luxembourg's ODA. Within the Ministry, operational responsibility lies with the **Development Cooperation Directorate**. The **Inter-Ministerial Committee for Development Cooperation** coordinates and exchanges information on the major orientations of development cooperation policy. Within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, cooperation with Central and Eastern European countries is the responsibility of the Directorate for International Economic Relations.

Lux-Development, which is the Luxembourg agency responsible for implementing bilateral development cooperation, formulates and executes the projects put forward by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the basis of mandates which are regularly reviewed as part of an effort to strengthen monitoring and evaluation.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

(Summarises key points for PCD from the Scoping Study's country research tables)

The country has an Inter-Ministerial Committee for Development Cooperation, coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and consisting of nine line ministries and the Inspector of Finance. The Committee meets bimonthly. Its role is advisory; policy coherence is not a specific institutional objective, though it has looked at policy coherence for development in relation to the EU Common Agricultural Policy.

In 2004 a policy coherence desk was established in the Development Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs following a recommendation by the **OECD/DAC Peer Review**.

6. Coverage of the three principal types of PCD mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁴⁵	Actors involved: ⁴⁶
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Declaration on the policy for development cooperation and humanitarian action (2004)	Group 2	Par, Cab, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - Inter-Ministerial Commission for Development Cooperation	A & B: Group 4 C: Group 3	PM

⁴⁵ Please refer to page 17 of the inception report, where four groups of PCD mechanisms are distinguished based on four characteristics: political competence, technical competences, PCD only or PCD&other.

⁴⁶ Please use abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

B - Inter-ministerial working groups between Foreign Affairs and Agriculture, Environment and Health C - Policy Coherence Desk (2004) in Development Cooperation Directorate		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

In the **2003 DAC Peer Review of Luxembourg**, two general recommendations regarding PCD are made:

1. *'Luxembourg should make more effort to analyse the effects of its various policies on developing countries, which requires strengthening the capability of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to carry out the analytical work required.'*
2. *'The mandate of the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Development Co-operation could be extended to give it a more active role in promoting debate on policy coherence for development'* (OECD/DAC 2003: 11).

The Policy Coherence Desk can be seen as one of the follow-ups which Luxembourg made on these recommendations.

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

Policy coherence features prominently in Luxembourg's most recent **Declaration on Policy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action (2004)**. The country has an Inter-Ministerial Committee for Development Cooperation, coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and consisting of nine line ministries and the Inspector of Finance. The Committee meets bimonthly. Its role is advisory; policy coherence is not a specific institutional objective, though it has looked at policy coherence for development in relation to the EU Common Agricultural Policy.

In 2004 a policy coherence desk was established in the Development Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs following a recommendation by the **OECD/DAC Peer Review**.

Policy coherence was also one of three priorities for development cooperation during Luxembourg's presidency of the EU Council. In this context, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, organised a seminar - planned together with representatives of the Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Agriculture - on policy coherence in relation to achieving food security. Its conclusions and recommendations were posted on the Luxembourg EU presidency website and distributed to the ministers of Agriculture, Cooperation and Humanitarian Action and Foreign Affairs and Immigration.

9. Contacts

Marc LEMAITRE, Conseiller de légation, Deputy Director, Directorate for Cooperation and Humanitarian Action, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
marc.lemaitre@mae.etat.lu

Georges TERNES, Secrétaire de légation, OECD – DAC Desk officer, Directorate for Cooperation and Humanitarian Action, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
georges.ternes@mae.etat.lu

MALTA

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Strategic Objectives of Malta's Foreign Policy - Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2006a)
<http://www.foreign.gov.mt/showdoc.aspx?id=210&filesource=4&file=Strategic%20Objectives%20of%20Malta's%20Foreign%20Policy.pdf>
2. Malta's Overseas Development Policy and a Framework for Humanitarian Assistance Discussion Paper (2006b)
www.foreign.gov.mt/showdoc.aspx?id=210&filesource=4&file=Dev%20Policy_Discussion%20Paper_Website.pdf
3. (A Policy document which elaborates Strategic Objective 18 of Malta's Foreign Policy which states that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will: "Elaborate and action a Policy and Work Programme of humanitarian and development assistance, based on the value of solidarity.")

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

In both documents that have been studied during this evaluation's desk study phase, no explicit references were found to the need for the promotion of policy coherence for development (PCD) in Malta's policies which are likely to affect developing countries. However, in both documents references are made to documents in which the need to promote PCD takes a central place:

- The **2005 EU Consensus for Development** (Malta has actively participated in the formulation of this strategy)
- The **2005 Revised Cotonou Partnership Agreement** (CPA), in which article 12 refers to PCD
- The **2000 Millennium Development Goals** (2006b: 4, 13)

In addition to these references, both documents clearly acknowledge the 'nexus' between Development and Migration, and the need to tackle migration in a multidimensional manner. As is mentioned in the strategy document:

'Malta will continue to raise international awareness in the European Union and its Member States and in the international community as a whole, on illegal immigration and human trafficking and smuggling. It shall continue to call for effective action to combat illegal immigration in a holistic and thorough manner. Malta will continue to work towards resettlement of refugees and persons with valid humanitarian status and the repatriation and reintegration of illegal immigrants. Malta will also continue to support development action in the countries of origin, and increased development assistance for those countries that honour their international obligations to accept back illegal immigrants. In the context of the European Union, Malta will continue to seek more rigorous application of Article 13 of the Cotonou Agreement and related articles.' (2006a: 13)

'The MFA's role of coordinating the organisation of humanitarian assistance will be carried out in conjunction with the Civil Protection Department, concerned line Ministries and Government Agencies as well as Non-Governmental Organisations as required' (2006a: 24).

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

PCD has not been explicitly referred to in official policy documents. However the need for policy coordination on humanitarian assistance and migration is indicated in the MFA's strategy.

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **MFA** is the main responsible ministry to achieve the goals that have been defined for Malta's foreign policy, including its development policy. However, on several field it shares some of this responsibility with other Maltese stakeholders, as indicated in section 2 of this profile.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is responsible for elaborating a Policy of Humanitarian and Development Assistance.

6. Coverage of the three principal types of PCD mechanisms / Characterisation		
	Particular Characteristics ⁴⁷	Actors involved: ⁴⁸
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements		
6.2 Administrative/Institutional		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment		

7. External Opinions:
<p>In a report from 2006 by the Maltese NGO 'Koperazzjoni Internazzjonali', it is mentioned that Malta is currently the only EU Member State without a development policy: <i>'Even if the government publicly promised to publish its 'Humanitarian Aid and Development Policy' at the beginning of 2005, yet till April 2006, this Policy has not been published. Besides, according to the answer given to Parliamentary Request 17864, the policy is still being formulated. However, NGOs and other CSOs don't know anything about it and have not been consulted, for instance to help set priorities'</i> (Kopin 2006: 2).</p> <p>However, since the publication of this report, a discussion paper was published by the MFA which is introduced on page 4 as a '(...) Policy document [which] elaborates Strategic Objective 18 of Malta's Foreign Policy¹ which states that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will: "Elaborate and action a Policy and Work Programme of humanitarian and development assistance, based on the value of solidarity" (2006b: 4).</p> <p>http://www.kopin.org/Kopin's Report on Malta's National Development Policy.pdf</p>

8. Contacts
No contacts

⁴⁷ Please refer to page 17 of the inception report, where four groups of PCD mechanisms are distinguished based on four characteristics: political competence, technical competences, PCD only or PCD&other.

⁴⁸ Please use abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

THE NETHERLANDS

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. 'Policy Coherence for Development – Progress report', (2006a)
2. 'Working on Policy Coherence for Development – The Dutch Experience', (2006b)
3. Netherlands: Millennium Development Goal 8: Developing a Global Partnership for Development – Progress Report (2004) (2006 MDG-8 report is forthcoming, to be published end of September 2006)
http://www.undg.org/documents/4532-Netherlands_-_MDG_8_Develop_a_Global_Partnership_for_Development_-_Report.pdf
4. Dutch Aid policy on Coherence (website)
http://www.minbuza.nl/en/developmentcooperation/Themes/poverty_coherence/policy_coherence_for_development.html
5. Policy note 'Aan elkaar Verplicht' (2003)
6. 'Memorandum on Coherence between Agricultural and Development Policy', February 2003
7. Main goals of Dutch foreign policy (website)
http://www.minbuza.nl/en/static/foreign_policy/policy_areas/goals_dutch_foreign_policy/index.html

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

Among the eight overall goals of Dutch foreign policy, the fourth goal explicitly refers to PCD:
'The Netherlands seeks to promote coherence between trade and development policy'

In the second goal, a strong reference is made to the relation between security and development:
'Security and stability are preconditions for sustainable development, including effective poverty reduction and the creation of equitable and democratic societies.'

Another reference to the impact of Western policies on developing countries is also made in the sixth goal, that focuses on the environment:
'Developing countries especially are suffering from the damage caused by patterns of production and consumption in the Western world.'

Finally, the MFA is clearly mandated in the third goal to take a lead in policy coordination between ministries on the EU level:
'To achieve Dutch objectives, policy has to be coordinated quickly and effectively among all the ministries, and negotiators have to be appropriately instructed. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is primarily responsible for performing these tasks and strives constantly to improve the coordination of Dutch EU policy.'

Source:

http://www.minbuza.nl/en/static/foreign_policy/policy_areas/goals_dutch_foreign_policy/index.html

In the description of the Dutch aid policy, it is clearly mentioned that promoting PCD entails:
'(...) systematically taking into account the interests of developing countries in decision-making in the Netherlands, the EU and during international negotiations regarding policy areas that may not seem directly relevant for developing countries, such as agriculture, trade, food security, the environment, peace and security, and finance.'

Source:

http://www.minbuza.nl/en/developmentcooperation/Themes/poverty_coherence/index.html

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

PCD became an issue for the Dutch Government in 2002, the year in which the **Memorandum on Coherence between Agricultural and Development Policy** was issued, and in which a separate coherence unit was set up in the MFA.⁴⁹

Before that time, the need for PCD was recognised and some action towards promoting it was taken, but it is generally agreed that it became an explicit and operationalised issue in 2002 (MFA 2006a: 7).

⁴⁹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2006) 'Policy coherence for development: Progress Report' Den Haag: Ministry of Foreign Affairs – DGIS coherence unit

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Ministry of Foreign Affairs** coordinates and carries out Dutch foreign policy. Among the five Directorate Generals, the **DG for International Cooperation** (DGIS) is responsible for development cooperation policy, its coordination, implementation, and funding. While in the foreign policy goals, the focus is mostly on coherence between Dutch and EU policy on developing countries, on the whole PCD is organised institutionally, and not on the substance of specific policy areas (MFA 2006b: 3).

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The MFA comprises 3 Ministers:

- Minister of Foreign Affairs
- Minister for Development cooperation, with full cabinet status
- Minister for European Affairs

For formulating the Dutch input in EU decision making and taking the development perspective into account in non-aid policies, key interdepartmental coordinating structures include: CoCo, BNC, Coreper instruction meetings, preparatory meetings for Cte 133 (IRHP), CSA and other.

In its **PCD Progress Report to Parliament**, which was published on **17 March 2006**, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs lists three 'pillars' of the Dutch policy to promote policy coherence for development:

- I. An intensive and proactive approach to a limited number of current coherence issues;
- II. The screening of new EU policy for its effects on developing countries; and
- III. The promotion of international cooperation and awareness.

(2006a: 8)

The MFA has recently published a brochure on the Dutch experience with '**Working with Policy Coherence for Development**' which describes the Dutch approach towards promoting PCD, with particular reference to the work of the Policy Coherence Desk. The document refers to seven elements play an important role in the Dutch practice of promoting PCD:

1. Commitment (recognition of the importance of PCD at the highest level of government, and political backing on specific issues);
2. Capacity (to analyse and act on non-aid policy issues that may have an effect on developing countries);
3. Competence (PCD issues should be managed by officials who are sufficiently high-ranking);
4. Coordination (close coordination of efforts with non-aid ministries on PCD issues, preferably through informal exchanges and a formal presence in existing coordination structures);
5. Concrete Targets and Activities (formulate and focus on specific targets and dossiers, to avoid that PCD becomes an abstract 'umbrella' target);
6. Cooperation (strategic use of development cooperation funds to help facilitating policy goals identified as part of PCD work, including supporting development policy goals in fisheries agreements and trade capacity building);
7. Coalition Building (building coalitions on the national, EU and international levels may also contribute to promoting PCD, such as through the informal EU network on PCD).

(2006b: 4,5)

Advisory Bodies of the MFA include: Advisory Council on International Affairs (AIV)

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁵⁰	Actors involved: ⁵¹
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements A - Dutch foreign policy (promotes coherence between development trade, agriculture, product standards, fisheries, migration, etc.) B - Memorandum on coherence between agriculture and development policy C - Annual budget memoranda and that on the state of the (European) Union	A: Group 2 B: Group 1 C: Group 2	Par, Cab, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - Directorate General for European Cooperation (DGES) B - Inter-departmental coordination mechanisms on EU policies (e.g.	A (group 4) B (group 4)	PM

⁵⁰ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁵¹ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

trade at the Ministry of Economic Affairs) C - Policy Coherence Unit to represent interests of developing countries in national policy formulation (focus on trade, agriculture, TRIPS, fisheries, product standards) D - EU Coordinating Committee E - EU screening committee F - Informal EU policy coherence for development network	C (group 3) D (group 4) E (group 4) F (group 3)	
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - Advisory Council on International Affairs	Group 4	Acad, NGO

7. External Opinions:

Picciotto R., 2004, 'PCD: A Background Note' for International Development Committee (of UK HoC) Meeting, 12 October 2004

Picciotto mentions Holland as one of the best examples on countries effectively promoting PCD.

Ecorys (2005) 'Evaluatie van de DGIS Coherentie Eenheid – Eindrapport'.

This mid-term evaluation of the Policy Coherence Unit (PCU, see 6.3) concludes that it concerns a 'winning combination' of enabling conditions and a strong team. One of the two relative weak points concern the lack of effectiveness and impact as a result of DGIS activities on relevant international negotiations.

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

In the Netherlands foreign policy has as one of its aims to promote policy coherence between development and relevant non-aid policies, in particular, those related to trade, agriculture, product standards, fisheries, intellectual property rights, migration, security and environment. In May 2002, the Dutch created the formal Policy Coherence Unit (PCU) from a Ministry of Foreign Affairs ad hoc working group on various specific coherence dossiers. The PCU, headed at the director level, is situated within the Directorate-General for Development Cooperation (DGIS), which itself is part of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The PCU has three main duties: raising awareness of the need for policy coherence for development, both nationally and internationally; intervening on a regular basis in national policy formulation to tackle concrete policy incoherencies; and working closely on coherence issues with line staff and management divisions in Foreign Affairs and other ministries.

The PCU's primary task is to intervene in the formulation and implementation of non-aid government policies taking the perspective and interests of developing countries as its starting point. Acknowledging that most key policies are already within the purview of the European Union, the PCU places particular emphasis on EU policies. The unit participates in national EU coordinating mechanisms, such as the high-level inter-departmental EU coordinating committee (CoCo) that prepares the instructions for Council meetings in Brussels and the inter-departmental committee (BNC) that screens all Commission proposals. The **BNC-fiche** that is drafted to formulate an initial Dutch position on all new Commission proposals includes since May 2003 a separate paragraph on the impact on developing countries. If agreement cannot be reached at the level of officials, the Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation may intervene directly at the highest political level to improve coherence. To heighten its effectiveness, the PCU concentrates on a rolling agenda of a selected number of focal areas: trade (top priority), agriculture (top priority), trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS) (with an emphasis on health), sustainable fisheries, product standards and market access, and migration.

In **2002** the Dutch ministries of Trade, Agriculture and Foreign Affairs prepared a **policy memorandum** that was approved by the full Cabinet and sent to Parliament. The memorandum sets out coherent Dutch positions on EU farming reforms (covering proposed revisions to the Common Agricultural Policy), on the WTO negotiations on agriculture, on use of development assistance to strengthen agriculture in developing countries and on product standards. The memorandum additionally focuses on three specific and highly supported commodities: cotton, rice and sugar. It sets concrete goals for progress on these, for example, in terms of improving market access, reducing price support, reducing peak tariffs and phasing out export support.

To foster implementation of the PCD goals, project teams within MFA are established that often work closely with the other ministries involved (mainly Agriculture and Economic Affairs/Trade). Several discussion papers have been produced, for example, on cotton subsidies, EU sugar reform, TRIPs & Health, the development dimension of the WTO Doha Round, etc. These papers sketch options in the face of current development challenges and are being used in exchanges with other departments (to strengthen Dutch positions from a development perspective) and colleagues in other member states. Sometimes these

discussion papers have been transformed into official Dutch positions.

The Netherlands has furthermore initiated an informal policy coherence for development network. This is a virtual network joining counterparts in DGIS, with the European Commission and ministries of Foreign Affairs and Development Cooperation in other European countries. It serves as a platform for consultation and exchange of impact research and position papers on issues relevant to policy coherence for development. As such, the group helps to inform national positions on current dossiers in Brussels and multilateral negotiations such as the Doha round in the WTO.

In its **PCD Progress Report to Parliament**, which was published on **17 March 2006**, it is mentioned that the ministries in the Hague have developed and are now using a method of working together in which they take account of development interest in many areas of policy when preparing the Netherlands' contribution at international level (it now occurs systematically in determining Dutch positions in the EU). The Minister for Development Cooperation, responsible for policy coherence on development within the government, can also intervene when necessary when the Cabinet is finalising positions and instructions (2006a: 7, 8).

9. Contacts

Otto Genee (DGIS/CE)
otto.genee@minbuza.nl

Stefan van Wersch (DIE/EX)
[stefan-
van.wersch@minbuza.nl](mailto:stefan-van.wersch@minbuza.nl)

POLAND

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Annual Report (2004)

http://www.mfa.gov.pl/files/docs/develop_ang.pdf

2. Strategy for Development Cooperation (2003)

http://www.msz.gov.pl/publications/2003/cd3/6_Publications%20and%20analyses/6.4_031021_StrategyforPoland'sDevelopment.htm

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

Poland's **Strategy for Development Cooperation (2003)** refers to a "comprehensive approach" to development cooperation issues and to "striving for coherence" of development policies with other spheres of life. Coherence is thus not put forth as an objective, but rather as an influencing factor. Yet in terms of objectives, development cooperation is aimed to serve "the basic goals of Poland's foreign policy". These goals are internal, however, and not development driven:

'Development co-operation, as an integral component of Poland's foreign policy and external relations of Poland, serves to achieve the basic goals of Polish foreign policy: ensuring the security and stability of the State and its citizens, protecting its interests and developing economic co-operation with countries on all continents.'

In the **Polish Annual Report of 2004**, an explicit reference is made to 'Policy Coherence for Development' as one of the principles of Poland's Development Cooperation. It defines PCD as:

'Synergy of activities carried out in the areas of development co-operation pertaining to the competences of particular ministers' (page 12).

The document also mentions that Poland, since it joined the EU in 2005, is *'(...) bound by the goals and principles of development assistance provision, as laid down in the *acquis communautaire*.'* As one of the three principles, it refers to: *'Coherence of EU policies with the goals of its development policy'* (page 13). During the document search, no official documents were found in which these principles that are referred to in the Annual Report are described.

The 2003 Strategy for Development Cooperation is still considered a cornerstone of the country's development policies, and inter alia defines the basic principles of Poland's aid programme. However, Poland is currently embarking on the preparation of a new Strategy for the years 2007 onwards, in response to both internal (Government, changes in focus of ODA) and external changes (new aid modalities, EU Consensus, EU Membership). It is expected that in this new Strategy, the provisions concerning PCD - considered as one of the objectives of the aid programme - will be more prominent in order to enable the MFA to meet new requirements. In addition, the new strategy is expected to enable the MFA to establish a functioning coordination mechanism to promote PCD, based on the best practices.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2003 (Strategy Document)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

As is mentioned in the 2003 Strategy Document:

'Development co-operation is an integral part of the foreign policy of the RP, and the minister in charge of foreign affairs is the body competent to conduct policy in this area on behalf of the Republic of Poland.'

The Minister of Foreign Affairs will conduct the policy of development co-operation through his subordinate Ministry of Foreign Affairs, including the Department of International Development Co-operation.'

The Minister of Foreign Affairs is the co-ordinator of development co-operation implemented by other ministries and institutions. He will perform this function through the National Co-ordinator for International Development Co-operation (in the rank of Under-secretary of State).'

As is stipulated in the **2003 Strategy**, the **MFA** (Development Co-operation Department set up on 1st September 2005) is responsible, within its mandate, for ensuring PCD. At a higher level a Deputy Minister responsible for ODA programme holds a function of **National Co-ordinator for International Development Co-operation**.

While the internal logic of development activities and a sense of direction have been ensured, a formal, institutionalised co-ordination inter-agency mechanism within the state administration that would ensure PCD is still lacking.

As an intermediate arrangement the National Co-ordinator or, alternatively, the Director of Development Co-operation Department periodically convene meetings with the representatives of other ministries and relevant bodies to jointly examine ODA issues and discuss policy options.

In addition to this, the ODA issues are often the main subject of discussion between the MFA and NGOs within the framework of the Advisory Council to the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Co-operation with NGOs

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The Department of the UN System and Global Affairs has been substituted on 1st September 2005 by the newly created Development Co-operation Department as the main institution responsible for ODA in the MFA. A special post for PCD has been set up in the Department, which is directly subordinated to the Director.

The Ministry of Finance is responsible for the financial aspects of cooperation. Line ministries also develop their own cooperation activities and report these ex post to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

6. Coverage of the three principal types of PCD mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁵²	Actors involved: ⁵³
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements A - 2003 strategic plan (refers to coherence as an influencing factor on development cooperation) ⁵⁴	A – Group 2	Cab, Par, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - None Identified		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

None available

8. Contacts

Pawel Bagiński, PhD
Head of Development Policy and Programming Unit
Development Co-operation Department, MFA
Phone: (+48 22) 523 9406
Fax: (+48 22) 523 8074
PAWEL.BAGINSKI@msz.gov.pl

⁵² Please refer to page 17 of the inception report, where four groups of PCD mechanisms are distinguished based on four characteristics: political competence, technical competences, PCD only or PCD&other.

⁵³ Please use abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

⁵⁴ Poland also prepares annual plans for development co-operation (foreign aid) and annual reports on development co-operation, both of which have referred to PCD (such as the aforementioned 2004 annual report). Furthermore, direct references to Poland's development cooperation are to be found in some other key policy statements, including the annual statement on Foreign Policy by the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

PORTUGAL

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Strategy paper: "The Portuguese Cooperation at the beginning of the XXI century", officially approved by the government through the Council of Minister's Resolution n.º43/99 of April 1999.
2. Law decree that creates the Portuguese Institute for Development Assistance (IPAD): DL n.º 5/2003, of January 13th 2003.
3. Portugal: A Cooperação portuguesa no limiar do século XXI: documento de orientação estratégica, (2003)
4. Uma visão Estratégica para a Cooperação Portuguesa, Council of Minister's resolution nº 196/2005, of April 22th 2005.

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

The most significant strategy paper on development cooperation produced in the last few years - "**The Portuguese Cooperation at the beginning of the XXI Century**" - includes several references to coherence, such as:

- "Coherence with other policies affecting the receiving countries" as one of guiding principles of the Portuguese cooperation policy
- The importance of coherence of the cooperation policy itself, that is to say, coherence between its objectives and its programmes
- The need of sectoral coordination to improve policy coherence at this level

The legislation associated to cooperation's institutional framework also mentions coherence as an objective of the government. These references appear, for instance, in the law decree that reformulates the Inter-ministerial Commission for Cooperation (DL n.º 127/97, May 24th 1997) and in the law decree that creates the Portuguese Institute for Development Assistance (DL n.º 5/2003, January 13th 2003).

Furthermore, there seems to be a considerable commitment of the Government to development issues, particularly through the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Though there are no specific statements on Policy Coherence for Development, this subject is mentioned in several speeches and documents.

The **new strategy (2005)** includes a reference of coherence: '*assure policy coherence between development cooperation and other national policies that have effects on ours partners' developing countries*' (pp.39-40).

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

1999 (publication of the strategy paper)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The definition and management of the cooperation policy falls under the competences of the **Ministry of Foreign Affairs**. Aware of the need for a more coherent framework equipped with mechanisms for effective coordination, control, information and evaluation, Portugal created one main body for development cooperation within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the **Portuguese Institute for Development Assistance (IPAD)**. IPAD was established in January 2003 through a merger of the Institute for Portuguese Cooperation (ICP) and the Portuguese Agency for Development Assistance (APAD).

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

Portugal has a highly decentralised development cooperation system, spread among all the ministries and several other public entities, such as universities, municipalities and State enterprises.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is the Government's department responsible for the formulation, coordination and execution of Portugal's external policy. As an important component of external policy, development policy falls under the competences of this Ministry. Within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, many competences related to cooperation are delegated in the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs acts more at the development policy's strategic definition level.

IPAD is a public institute with administrative autonomy, superintended by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. IPAD is responsible for the supervision, direction and coordination of Portugal's cooperation policy and official development assistance (ODA). IPAD is also responsible for the planning, programming, monitoring

of the execution and evaluation of the results of the cooperation and ODA programs and projects by other State bodies or other public entities. Another goal of IPAD is the centralization of all the information on cooperation projects carried out by private entities.

Apart from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, virtually every ministry has its cooperation programme and budget. All the ministries are represented at the Inter-ministerial Commission for Cooperation. This Commission coordinates development cooperation initiatives carried out by the different public entities. It is a discussion forum to address policy coherence and helps to supervise the planning and decentralised execution of development cooperation policy. Has played a key role in sensitizing ministries on IPAD's role and the new financial planning system linked to programming. Besides, the annual Integrated Programme for Cooperation and its corresponding budget gather information on the financing and programmes spread among these entities.

The new strategy creates a new mechanism of coherence, coordination and complementarity – the Council of ministers for cooperation. Twice a year, the Council of ministries will discuss cooperation issues.

Apart from the government's coordination effort, there is not a specific mandate to promote coherence. The Portuguese Government acknowledges that policy coherence deserves deeper attention and a growing awareness of national structures other than IPAD.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁵⁵	Actors involved: ⁵⁶
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Reference to various types of coherence in 1999 strategic plan	Group 2	Par, Cab, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - Inter-Ministerial Commission for Cooperation and its Permanent Secretariat B - Inter-Ministerial Commission for European Affairs	A: Group 4 B: Group 4	PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

In **Portugal's DAC peer review**, of which the main findings and recommendations were communicated on the **27th of April 2006**, the country is advised to endorse policy coherence for development as a government objective in the context of a multi year, results based action plan and adjusted policies and practices which reflect a poverty reduction focus. More concretely, the country is advised to issue a high level communication linking policy coherence and poverty reduction.

Further to the above advice, the DAC peer review advises that the role of institutions such as the Council of Ministers for Co-operation and/or IPAD should be clarified. The latter institute should be strengthened in terms of its analytical capacity and human resources, specifically with a view to improving policy coherence for development. Accordingly, line ministries should commit to supporting IPAD's enhanced functions in this regard (47-51)

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

Portugal's **1999 strategy paper, Portuguese Cooperation at the Beginning of the 21st Century**, makes reference to coherence between development objectives and other policies that affect recipient countries. It also mentions internal coherence within cooperation policy and coherence across development sectors.

The Inter-Ministerial Commission for Cooperation (the "CIC") is a formal mechanism to promote coordination and policy coherence for development. It is composed of representatives of all the ministries and from other public and private entities, such as the Camões Institute (an agency created by the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to deal with language and cultural affairs in its external policy), The CIC should meet ordinarily twice a year, with extraordinary meetings called at the discretion of its president, who is a member of government in charge of cooperation affairs, usually the Secretary of State of Foreign

⁵⁵ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁵⁶ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

Affairs and Cooperation.

In view of CIC's fragilities, a permanent secretariat was created within it to make it more operational and effective. This secretariat has a light and flexible structure, being made up of representatives of all the ministers and a few secretaries of state. Its mission is to monitor planning and execution of development cooperation policy. The secretariat meets monthly. Meetings are usually called and chaired by the president of the Portuguese Institute of Development Assistance (IPAD), which also provides technical and administrative support. The meetings are used to discuss the cooperation in each partner country but can also be thematic in nature.

When the secretariat was created, it was to work as a coordination forum for sectoral programmes and policies. In reality, it seems to serve more as a conduit for information from the sectoral ministries to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs than as a forum for debating development policy coherence. In fact, none of Portugal's mechanisms have assumed clear responsibilities for monitoring or promoting policy coherence for development. It is therefore unlikely that an evaluation of them would add significant value in improving development policy coherence.

9. Contacts

Instituto Português de Apoio ao
Desenvolvimento (IPAD)
Telephone: (+ 351) 21 317 67 00 / Fax:
(+351) 21 314 78 97
E-mail:
cooperacao.portuguesa@ipad.mne.gov.pt

IPAD
E-mail:
manuela.afonso@ipad.mne.gov.pt

SLOVAKIA

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Medium-term Strategy for Official Development Assistance (2003-2008) (2003)
<http://www.slovakaid.mfa.sk/en/index.php/article/articleview/30/1/2>
2. 2006 National Programme
<http://www.slovakaid.mfa.sk/en/index.php/article/articleview/87/1/2>
3. Guidelines for the Provision of Official Development Assistance
<http://www.slovakaid.mfa.sk/en/index.php/article/articleview/33/1/2>

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

The **Medium-term Strategy for Official Development Assistance (2003-2008)** mentions that the basic motives for providing development assistance by the Slovak are: *'(...) shared responsibility for the global development, moral obligations- MDGs and Monterrey Consensus- and promises resulting from the membership in international organizations'*. However, it also states that: *'Development assistance is a standard tool of foreign policy and it contributes - with political, diplomatic and economic tools - to the accomplishment of foreign policy goals.'*

Criteria for the establishment of territorial priorities for Slovak Assistance are: Political-economic criteria (coherence with the foreign policy of the Slovak Republic, possibility to use the comparative advantages and the Slovak potential in the given country, economic co-operation and mutual trade); logistical and practical criteria and general criteria set out by the donor community.

Regarding Slovakia accession to EU, it is stated: *'Yet it is assumed that development aid will be stable, open for the participation of the governmental and non-governmental sector, co-ordinated with the development aid of the EU and respecting the "three C of Maastricht" (Co-ordination, Complementarity, Coherence).'*

In the **National Programme of Official Development Aid 200** it is stated that: *'To achieve coherence between trade policy and ODA is an important intention of the EU (Barcelona criteria) and Slovakia is also expected to take the particular steps accordingly.'*

In the **National Programme of Official Development Aid 2006** it is stated that: *'Intensify the efforts at ensuring – through the ODA Coordination Committee – the coherence between development policy and other State policies is one of 17 key priorities.'*

In **Country Strategy Paper of Slovak Aid to Serbia and Montenegro (2003)** is stated that: Slovak Aid wishes to ensure that it acts positively to enhance donor co-ordination, information sharing and policy coherence in all its activities in Serbia and Montenegro Union.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2003 (publication of the Medium-Term Strategy)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Ministry for Foreign Affairs** prepares and implements foreign policy. Since April 2002 it is also the coordinator of **Slovak Aid**, and manages the development budget and coordinates other key parties (line ministries, private sector and NGOs) by three mechanism:

1. Co-ordination Committee for Development Assistance, established by the Government resolution No. 223 of 7 March 2001 and No. 332 of 3 April 2002 to allow line ministries and institutions be a part of evaluation and implementation of ODA programme 05T.
2. Steering Committee for Trust Fund/ Bratislava –Belgrade Fund, consisting of different departments of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, representatives of fund (either Administrative and Contracting Unit Trust Fund, or Administrative and Contracting Unit Bratislava – Belgrade Fund), NGDO Platform representative and SME & enterprise sector representative. All of them evaluate project proposals and are involved in the projects selection. In case of trilateral co-operation with CIDA or ADA, they are also involved in project selection process based on coherence between their policy priorities and Slovak Republic policy priorities.
3. Inter-ministerial coordination Commissions for European Affairs (KEU1 a KEU2).

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The MFA manages bilateral ODA – programme ODA 5T. There are following line ministries involved directly in inter-ministerial programme ODA 05T: Min. of Finance, Min. of Environment, Min. of Agriculture. Other

ministries deliver ODA within their own budget: Min. of Defence, Min. of Economy, Min. of Education and some other state entities like Nuclear Regulatory Authorities, Slovak Office of Standards, metrology and testing etc.

All ministries delivering ODA within or without Programme ODA 05T are members of the Co-ordination Committee for Development Assistance, which meets regularly once at the beginning of the year to evaluate delivering ODA in relevant previous year and on ad-hoc basis to discuss policy and technical issues if needed. Every ministry has a sector co-ordinator responsible for ODA, nominated by minister of particular ministry.

The Ministry of Finance is responsible of contributions to international financial institutions but it does not plan development assistance programmes.

The ODA programme is co-ordinated from the policy level of view by MFA in co-operation with other ministries and permanent missions in the field. The technical part of the programme is managed by Administrative and Contracting Unit Trust Fund/ Bratislava-Belgrade Fund. The implementation of the projects is done by contractors.

There is no governmental agency responsible for the implementation of ODA Programs due to the fact that in 2003, there had existed neither management nor implementation capacities in Slovakia for the provision of assistance to developing countries. This is why in its start-up phase the new mechanism had to largely rely on the experience of traditional donors (the UNDP, the CIDA). After three years of mostly extensive developments in this area, the establishment of a development agency became important. The most appropriate model for the Slovak conditions is the one where programme management is ensured by the MFA SR, and project management by a separate agency, which should be established until end of 2006 year.

Since the provision of assistance abroad is a particular and specific matter, it calls for the adoption of a separate law. The law is being drafted by the MFA SR in co-operation with other sectors and foreign donors, and should be ready for the review process by the end of 2006.

The administrative infrastructure for the management of ODA is currently made up of the Department of the Official Development assistance (ORPO) – around 9 people - devoted to ODA within the Section for International Organizations and Development Assistance of MFA that have received some assistance and capacity building from UNDP, CIDA.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁵⁷	Actors involved: ⁵⁸
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - None Identified		
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - None Identified		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:

None available

8. Narrative from the 2006 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

The coordination between the MFA SR and other sectors is arranged by the ODA Coordination Committee (an advisory body to the minister of foreign affairs), and of inter-ministerial coordination Commissions for European Affairs (KEU1 a KEU2). Based on **Slovak Government's Resolution No. 332/2002 of 3 April 2002**, the MFA SR acts as coordinator for the provision of Slovak official development assistance (ODA). In practice this means that the MFA SR coordinates the 05T inter-ministerial programme put in place in 2003 on the basis of a methodological instruction of the MF SR concerning programme budgeting. Participants of the programme in 2006 are the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of

⁵⁷ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁵⁸ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Ministry of Education. Relevant ministries draw the funds for attaining the goals of their sub-programmes from their budget chapters within the limits of approved expenditures for the year concerned.

In 2006, the MFA SR strength its co-operation with the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of the Interior, and with the Administration of State Material Reserves in the implementation of humanitarian activities, with the Ministry of Education in connection with development education, with the Ministry of Economy in the harmonisation of trade negotiations with the WTO, as well as with other sectors and State institutions. Because the Slovak ODA is also evaluated on the basis of the volume of ODA expenditures, it is necessary to improve the recording of assistance provided by individual sectors.

Intensify the efforts at ensuring – through the ODA Coordination Committee – the coherence between development policy and other State policies is one of key priority of Slovak ODA in 2006.

9. Contacts

Martina Steliarova Department of Development Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic Hlboká cesta 2 833 36 Bratislava tel. ++421/2/5978 2745 fax ++421/2/5978 3579 e-mail : martina_steliarova@foreign.gov.sk		
---	--	--

SLOVENIA

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Ministerial Overview Development Cooperation 2002-2004 (2005):

http://www.mzz.gov.si/fileadmin/pageuploads/dokumenti/eng_mednarodno_humanitarno_sodelovanje.pdf

2. Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

<http://www.mzz.gov.si/index.php?id=6&L=2>

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

As is mentioned on the **website of the Slovenian Ministry of Foreign Affairs**, the general objective of the Slovenian Development Cooperation activities is: *'(...) contribute to diminishing the developmental lagging behind of developing and transition countries by assisting them in their sustainable economic and social development.'*

(Source: <http://www.mzz.gov.si/index.php?id=65&L=2> accessed July 11 2006)

In the report '**Slovenian International Development Cooperation 2002-2004**', which was published in 2005 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, some reference is made on page 27 to multilateral coherence:

'Slovenia supports effective coordination and coherence of multilateral programmes.'

A second reference is included on page 31 of the document, in regards to the Slovenian Development Cooperation's policies and operations in South-Eastern Europe: *'Slovenia supports the development of the Western Balkans by coherent foreign, development, security and economic policies.'*

On the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, some more information can be found on how Slovenian Development Cooperation positions itself internationally:

'International development assistance is an integral part of Slovenia's foreign policy and should contribute to foreign policy objectives, such as promotion of human rights, ensuring global security as well as social and economic well-being of developing and/or transition countries.'

'Slovenia is committed to implementing the goals of the international community in the development cooperation field, in particular the Millennium Development Goals. Slovenia will harmonise its foreign policy interests with those of other Member States and formulate the implementation of European policy in this area together with other members even after its integration into the EU, where development cooperation is one of the priorities of the European foreign policy.'

(Source: <http://www.mzz.gov.si/index.php?id=65&L=2> accessed July 11 2006)

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2005 (reference in the Report Slovenian International Development Cooperation 2002-2004')

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (MFA) was made responsible for co-ordinating Slovenian development and humanitarian assistance.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) was made responsible for co-ordinating Slovenian development and humanitarian assistance.

In April 2002, the Government appointed a national co-ordinator for development and humanitarian aid and the MFA set up the Office for International Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance headed by the national coordinator and a staff of two officials.

Up to twelve line ministries are responsible for cooperation with multilateral institutions in their respective areas of competence.

Competences within the framework of the **Stability Pact** are, also allocated among various ministries – economy, education, interior- although the MFA is responsible for overall coordination through the appointment of a national coordinator. The Ministry of Economy has taken the responsibility for the preparation and implementation of a large majority of development cooperation projects falling under the Stability Pact.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation		
	Particular Characteristics⁵⁹	Actors involved:⁶⁰
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - None Identified		
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - None Identified		
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - None Identified		

7. External Opinions:
None available

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):
In 2002 the Slovenia Ministry of Foreign Affairs was made responsible for coordination development and humanitarian assistance. A national coordinator was appointed and the Office for International Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance was created within the Ministry. Projects are identified and prepared by twelve line ministries, which meet in an inter-ministerial commission.

9. Contacts		
Mr. Setinc Head of ODA division Ministry for Foreign Affairs Prešernova cesta 25 SI-1001 Ljubljana P.P. 481 Slovenia phone: + 386 1 478 21 71 fax: + 386 1 478 21 44 Mail contact: Ana Kalin, MFA Ana.Kalin@gov.si	Mrs. Marija Adanja, Ambassador. Head of ODA division Ministry for Foreign Affairs Mail contact: Mrs. Urška Potočnik Urška.Potocnik@gov.si Phone: 00 386 1 478 1255	

⁵⁹ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁶⁰ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

SPAIN

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. International Development Cooperation Act 1998
2. Spain: Plan Anual de Cooperación Internacional (2002)
<http://www.mae.es/documento/0/000/000/500/plan2002.pdf>
3. The Master Plan for Spanish Cooperation 2005 - 2008
http://www.mae.es/NR/rdonlyres/00C3BE46-A90C-4582-83EE-5699398FE8C6/0/Plan_Director_Ing.pdf
4. Country Strategy Papers (Documentos de Estrategia País) 2005-2008 – The development strategies with each country take policy coherence as one of the main principles for their elaboration
<http://www.maec.es/es/MenuPpal/Cooperacion+Internacional/Publicaciones+y+documentación/#sec6>
5. “Report on the respect of the Policy Coherence principle” (18.july.2006) elaborated by the Development Cooperation Council (2006) to submit to the Parliament
6. Project proposal of External Debt Management Act (in course); the proposal promotes coordination and coherence among the different sectorial initiatives of the Government in the framework of the objectives of Development Cooperation Policy.

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

According to the Act:

- The fight against poverty “no matter what form it takes” is the central and key objective around which Spanish cooperation must revolve (Articles 1 and 3).
- According to Article 4 of the Act, entitled “**the Principle of Coherence**”, “*the principles and aims that have been mentioned in the preceding the articles (those that are inherent to cooperation) will inform all the policies that the Public Administration applies within the frameworks of their respective powers and that might affect developing countries*”.

According to the Master Plan:

- The MDGs are Spanish cooperation commitments “central but not the only ones”
- The fight against poverty is the major objective around which Spanish cooperation revolves, and it is an essential priority in the aid policy
- There is a need to improve the levels of coherence, not only at the centre of the policy concerning aid for development (especially among the financial resources and non-reimbursable aid) but also with respect to the rest of the public policies (trade, agricultural policy, immigration / emigration and social security).
- Policy coherence is a central element for aid effectiveness (and quality of aid)

The Master Plan contains a series of specific measures that are aimed at improving consistency where the aid policy is concerned. However, the Master Plan is not as precise with regard to coherence between the development targets and the rest of the public policies, which, nevertheless, constitute a mandate of the International Development Cooperation Act. Nevertheless, in most sectors of the Master Plan, policy coherence is mentioned as an important issue.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

1998 (signing of the International Development Cooperation Act)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

In its 17th Article, the International Development Cooperation Act empowers the **Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation** with “*management of the international cooperation policy for developing and coordinating the different bodies that constitute the General State Administration which, within the scope of its jurisdiction, takes actions in these matters adhering to the principle of unity of action when acting abroad*”. Although it is not expressly stated, it is to be understood that it is duty of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation to guarantee the coherence that is established as a requirement in the International Development Cooperation Act

Within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, it is the **Secretariat of State**

for International Cooperation (SECI), delegated by the Ministry, who is responsible for coordinating the aid for the development policy, through the Directorate General for Planning and Evaluation of Development Policy, with a view to ensuring that Spain takes part of the international aid for development organisations and for establishing Spain's policy where drawing up the community development policy is concerned.

The **Interministerial Committee for International Cooperation (CICI)** is a technical body whose function it is to liaise the different government departments that constitute the General State Administration in matters concerning cooperation with a view to development. The CICI has the mandate to coordinate the different bodies of the Administration in the implementation of this policy. Although it has no express mandate to do so, the role it plays is that of monitoring the extent to which the different resources, programs and activities of Spanish cooperation are consistent with each other. There is also an **Interterritorial Committee** whose function it is to "coordinate, arrange and collaborate" between the different levels (State, Regional and Local) of the Public Administration in matters concerning the cooperation for development policy. Given the particularity of Spain's Development Cooperation system, in which there is a multiplicity of public institutions, the Inter Committee, through its coordination function, plays an important role in the promotion of the coherence of Development Policy.

The **Development Cooperation Council** acts in the capacity of an advisory, consultative and participatory body to the Administración General del Estado; it is made up of representatives of the different departments of the Administration and of the various participants from civil society that are involved in the cooperation for development (NGOs, Universities, human rights associations, trade unions, company organisations and independent experts). The new regulations that govern the Development Cooperation Council (December 2004) require this body to carry out the tasks involved in monitoring the extent to which the development policy is coherent.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation is the department that is responsible for drawing up and implementing the contents of Spanish foreign policy. The cooperation for development policy also forms part of the foreign policy, and it falls within the jurisdiction of the Secretariat of State for International Cooperation (SECI) to draw up, programme, monitor and evaluate this policy. Furthermore, it is the Spanish International Cooperation Agency (AECI) that is responsible for managing the programs for non-reimbursable aid and the microfinance support programme.

However, one major aspect of the cooperation for development policy is managed from other Governmental Departments. To be specific, the aid that can be paid back through commercial credit (FAD credit) is managed from the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Secretary of State of Trade and Tourism); and the actions that are taken to relieve foreign debt are carried out by the Treasury and Department of Economic Affairs.

Other Governmental Departments are also involved in making a contribution to the cooperation for development policy, albeit to a lesser contribution. The Department of Employment and Social Affairs, de Department of Education and Science de Defence Department and de Department of Health are among the more outstanding ones.

All the Central Government Departments that have powers in matters concerning cooperation form part of the Comisión Interministerial de Cooperación Internacional (CICI). As a general rule, this Committee may carry out the task of promoting and monitoring coherence within the development cooperation policy, but so far the scope of its functions has been much more limited, merely involving a certain amount of coordination with respect to the activities that are promoted by the different departments that constitute the General State Administration.

The powers in other areas that are of relevance to the development policy (trade, emigration / immigration, agriculture, fishing or social security) are split between different departments that form part of the General State Administration. These policies are drawn up, implemented and monitored with considerable freedom of action where the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is concerned (and from the State Secretary for International Cooperation), and they are not subject to any control regarding the effects or impact that the decisions taken could have upon the developing countries. There is no specific mandate to enhance the coherence of the public policies in this broader sense, other than the coordination activities carried out by the Government.

The Development Cooperation Council is responsible for the task of monitoring the extent to which

the development policy is coherent. The Governmental Departments responsible for those aspects that are most relevant to the development policy are involved in this activity, together with the main participants in the aid system. However, the actual effective powers of this body are extremely limited, because it is merely an advisory body. Regarding PCD, from 2004 this Council has the mandate to elaborate a report on the respect and accomplishment of the policy coherence principle, which is submitted to the parliament.

Finally, the renaming of the former Ministry of Foreign Affairs as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation means that the matters concerning International Cooperation for development have more direct access to the Cabinet and Cabinet Meetings.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁶¹	Actors involved: ⁶²
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements A - Master plan for Cooperation 2005–08 B - Article 4 of the International Development Cooperation Act (1998)	A: Group 2 B: Group 2	Par, Cab, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation B - Inter-Territorial Committee for International Cooperation C – The Cooperation Council	A: Group 4 B: Group 4	PM PM, NGOs, PS, CS, Acad
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - Development Cooperation Council	Group 4	PM, NGO, Acad

7. External Opinions:

OECD/DAC Peer Review (2002). From the conclusions on the OECD/DAC website:
'Spain has integrated policy coherence for development into its legal framework. The Law states that the principles and objectives of Spanish development co-operation should be reflected in all other policies affecting developing countries. It emphasises consistency with the objectives of sustainable development and poverty reduction in the promotion of political, economic and cultural relations with developing countries. However, the debate in Spain on policy coherence appears less advanced than in some other DAC Members. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) should be given a stronger role and the necessary analytical capacity to engage in policy debate with other ministries and actors, including civil society and regional governments in areas such as trade, technology transfers, agriculture and fisheries (e.g. EC international fisheries agreements), where development objectives may conflict with domestic interests.'

"Report on Policy Coherence. Recommendations for Spain in Economic matters", Olivé, I y A. Sorroza (Coord.) (2006), Real Instituto Elcano.

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

Spain's **International Development Cooperation Act (1998)** includes an article called "The Principle of Coherence"; and coherence is taken up again in the new **Master Plan** of Spanish Cooperation for the period 2005–2008, adopted in February 2005. This plan was elaborated through a collaborative process with a large number of actors participating in the drafting process through workshops dealing with policy coherence for development. Chapter 8 of the new master plan is devoted to the quality of aid and policy coherence. To prepare this chapter and propose initiatives on policy coherence, an informal group was created with representatives from three key state secretaries: the Secretary of State for International Cooperation (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation), the Secretary of State of Economy (Treasury Department) and the Secretary of State for Tourism and Trade (Industry, Trade and Tourism Department).

Spain has two additional coordination mechanisms: the Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation (the "CICI") and the Inter-Territorial Committee. The CICI is a technical body that coordinates the efforts of different governmental departments with regard to development

⁶¹ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁶² Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

cooperation. The Inter-Territorial Committee coordinates, makes arrangements and collaborates among the different levels of government administration in matters concerning cooperation for development policy. Both the CICI and the Inter-Territorial Committee take part in drafting and approval of annual plans for international cooperation. Furthermore, the Spanish development cooperation planning cycle envisages that the different governmental departments with powers in matters concerning development aid participate in drawing up the country plans and sectoral strategies that are inherent to Spanish cooperation.

The Development Cooperation Council is an advisory body in which different governmental departments take part, alongside various other participants in the aid system (including non-governmental members). One of Council's new purposes is to monitor the coherence of the country's development policy. In December 2004, the DPC was mandated to elaborate an annual report on policy coherence for development to be submitted to the Spanish Parliament.

Spain is thus moving ahead, taking steps towards increased policy coherence for development.

9. Contacts

Belén Sanz Luque
 División de Evaluación
 DG Planificación y Evaluación
 de Políticas de Desarrollo
 Secretaría de Estado de
 Cooperación Internacional
 Tel: + (34) 91 379 93 23
 Fax: + (34) 91 431 17 85
belen.sanz@mae.es

Ms. Milagros Hernando,
 Director General for
 Planning and Evaluation of
 Development Policy
 SECI

SWEDEN

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Government Bill 2002/03:122 - Shared Responsibility: Sweden's Policy for Global Development (PGD) (2003)

<http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/45/20/c4527821.pdf>

2. Government Communication 2004/05:161 - Sweden's Global Development Policy

3. Government Communication 2005/06:204 - Sweden's policy for global development

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

The **Government Bill** proposes more active and deliberate efforts to strike a balance between different policy areas in order to improve coherence.

The Policy states that all policy areas share the responsibility to contribute to the overarching goal to contribute to an equitable and sustainable global development. This does not replace specific objectives formulated in different policy areas. The policy for global development gives all policy areas the assignment of formulating and implementing policy in a way that utilises every opportunity of *simultaneously* contributing to equitable and sustainable global development.

Furthermore, the policy should be characterised by two perspectives: a rights perspective and the perspectives of poor people on development.

Government's assessment as stated in the Bill:

'(5.1.) Sweden should pursue a coherent policy for global development, based on a holistic view of what drives development and of the measures that are required to achieve equitable and sustainable development on a global scale. It should embrace all areas of policy and of political decision-making.

(5.5.): Coordination and coherence between different policy areas should be improved in order to make policies better able to promote development.

Conflicting objectives should be identified, and should be the focus of well-informed and well-considered strategic choices.'

In addition, the Swedish Government:

1. Calls for greater coordination and coherence between a number of policy areas (areas of state and government affairs and policy, both at the national + international levels of the EU and the UN);
2. Demands for the establishment of linkages between policy areas (trade, security, agriculture, public health) and global development.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

2003 (publication of the Government Bill)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Minister for International Development Cooperation** is responsible for coordinating Swedish development policy as well as coherence among the policy areas for development at the Government Offices. The **Department for Development Policy** at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs is responsible for the coordination of Sweden's Policy for Global Development. All policy areas and ministries share the responsibility for the implementation of global development policy.

(The **Prime Minister's Office** is responsible for coordinating Sweden's EU policies and determines overall political priorities for Sweden's actions in the EU, as well as coordinates the work of Ministries in EU Council of Ministers according to those priorities.

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs contributes to realizing the Governments overall foreign policy objectives.

The MFA is responsible for six main policy areas:

- International law and human rights;
- Global development and development assistance;
- Trade, investment and promotion of Sweden;

- Trade policy;
- Migration and asylum policy;
- Foreign and security policy.

The MFA is managed by three Ministers:

- The Minister for Foreign Affairs and Head of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs is Jan Eliasson.
- The Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Development Cooperation, Carin Jämtin
- The Minister for Migration and Asylum Policy, Barbro Holmberg
- In addition, the Minister for Industry is responsible for international trade issues, joint with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

The Swedish government has decided to give the Minister for Development Cooperation the responsibility to coordinate the implementation of the Policy for Global Development (PGD). For this reason a special Department has been set up, the Department of Development Policy. The role of this department is to facilitate the implementation of the PGD.

However, as stated above different policy areas are responsible for their own part of the PGD. Through the system of joint preparation the Department of Development Policy can make sure that developmental aspects are taken into account. The joint preparation imply that civil servants are instructed to consult with colleagues at other Ministries if there is any reason to believe that they might have an input or interest in the matter at hand.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁶³	Actors involved: ⁶⁴
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Policy for global development (Cabinet)	Group 2	Par, Cab, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional - Department for Development Policy	Group 4	PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - Special unit for follow-up and review of, and reporting on Policy for Global Development - A project for information on Policy for Global Development to be established.	Group 4	PM

7. External Opinions:

As emphasized in the **2005 OECD/DAC Peer Review**, the PGD asks the Swedish government to play a proactive role in favour of policy coherence in multilateral contexts, such as those afforded by the EU (in the Cotonou Partnership Agreement or the Lisbon process) and other specialized fora (Doha, Monterrey, Johannesburg). The government, moreover, supports ongoing efforts to develop an international "coherence index" that can be used to support Swedish and international efforts towards more effective policies. A group of NGO's has put together an evaluation of the PGD *in practice* where the coherence between different policy areas are evaluated in relation to the overarching goal; to contribute to an equitable and sustainable global development.

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

Sweden adopted its **Policy for Global Development (PGD)** in **December 2003**. The PGD establishes integrated policy-making as the institutional basis for achieving policy coherence for development. The policy sets out equitable and sustainable global development as the overall goal and commits the government to work towards this goal and the Millennium Development Goals. It requires government agencies to take an active and deliberate stance to balance different policy areas in order to improve coherence.

The PGD puts Sweden on course to pursue a coherent policy for global development based on a holistic view of what drives development and of the measures required to achieve equitable and sustainable development on a global scale. Development objectives, it states, should embrace all

⁶³ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁶⁴ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

areas of policy and political decision-making; and coordination and coherence between different policy areas should be improved to enhance development outcomes. It also stipulates that Swedish actors be involved to a greater extent in development cooperation.

The whole government is made responsible for attaining Sweden's global development objectives. Conflicting policy areas are to be identified and then made the focus of informed and considered strategic choices. Responsibility for implementing the policy is shared by all policy actors and ministries. A special unit (a secretariat) set up in the Department for Global Development of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will assist in annual follow-up studies and in reviewing operational targets to measure the progress and outcomes of the integrated policy.

The PGD does not propose concrete measures as regards organisation and general conduct of global development policy (these aspects are to be considered at a later stage). Instead what it proposes is "results-based management", including periodic general assessments of poverty-reduction impact of domestic and external measures in specific countries and regions, and monitoring and evaluation.

The PGD also mentions the possibility of establishing of a citizen's forum with representatives from the parliamentary parties, the government, other authorities, NGOs, the private sector, researchers, groups of experts and other interested parties with the aim of promoting a broad public debate on the Swedish development policy.

9. Contacts

<p>Turid Tersmeden Department for Development Policy, Ministry for Foreign Affairs turid.tersmeden@foreign.ministry.se</p>	<p>Georg Andrén, Head of the unit for Policy Coherence at the department for Development Policy georg.andren@foreign.ministry.se</p>	<p>Elenore Kanter, Desk Officer, Department of Development Policy Office: + 46 8 405 3722 Elenore.kanter@foreign.ministry.se</p>
---	--	--

UNITED KINGDOM

1. List of Policy Statements and Principal Sources (Government documents):

1. Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century. White Paper on International Development (1997)
<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/whitepaper1997.pdf>
2. White Paper on International Development (2000)
<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/whitepaper2000.pdf>
3. United Kingdom's International Development Act (2002)
<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2002/20020001.htm>
4. Eliminating World Poverty: a consultation document (2006a)
<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/wp2006-consultation.pdf>
5. White Paper: Eliminating World Poverty: making governance work for the poor (2006b)
<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/wp2006/whitepaper-printer-friendly.pdf>
6. International Development (Reporting and Transparency) Act (2006)⁶⁵
http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2006/ukpga_20060031_en.pdf

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?

DFID recognises that policy coherence is of central importance to global development:

Memorandum submitted by the Department for International Development, replying to questions raised by the Committee on the **2003–04 DFID Winter Supplementary Estimate and Resource Accounts 2002–03** <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmintdev/749/749.pdf> p. 92

A coherent international approach, with agreed policies to support development and effective collaboration between institutions and nations is a requirement to achieve the MDGs.

For DFID, strengthening the international system means ensuring that the policies and programmes of all parts of the system work coherently in helping to bring about poverty reduction.

(Propose to delete this as the WP is out and this is obsolete information)

In the **White Paper** a reference is made in paragraph 1.12 to the need for coherence (without explicitly mentioning the term) in the UK's external policies:

'Our development assistance and other international policies must work in tandem to promote development' (DFID 2006b: 18).

On page 20 of the White Paper, this reference translated into a clear commitment to report on the effectiveness of the UK's policies in reducing poverty and supporting sustainable development. It does not become clear from the document whether this only refers to policies which are intended to meet these objectives, or that coherence and synergies with other policy fields are also to be taken into account:

'The UK will (...) report annually to Parliament on the effectiveness of UK policy and expenditure in helping to reduce poverty and support sustainable development, in line with the International Development (Reporting and Transparency) Bill currently before Parliament' (DFID 2006b: 20).

Finally, in paragraph 28 of chapter 8 reference is made in a footnote to the Council's call upon *'(...) EU MS and Commission to strengthen policy coherence for development'* (DFID 2006b: 89).

In the summary document of the submissions to the White Paper's consultation, it is mentioned that: *'A number of you thought that the UK should adopt the approach taken by the Swedish Government whereby different government departments produce reports on policy coherence for development. But a few of you thought there was a risk that policy coherence could dilute DFID's poverty focus'* (page 12).

<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/wp2006/summary-responses-consultation.pdf>

The new **International Development (Transparency and Reporting) Act** is explicit on reporting on pcd relevant issues within government. It calls for annual reporting on progress towards the MDGs and the 0.7 pct goal. It states that the Secretary of State shall include in each annual report such general or specific observations as he thinks appropriate on the effects of policies and programmes pursued by Government departments on (a) the promotion of sustainable development in countries outside the United Kingdom and

⁶⁵ The International Development (Reporting and Transparency) Bill was adopted by Parliament on the 25th of July 2006, and will become effective on the 25th of October 2006.

(b) the reduction of poverty in such countries. In particular reports should deal with progress on the development of non-discriminatory, open and rule based trading and financial systems and the enhancement of debt relief for low income countries.

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:

With the 1997 and 2001 White Papers which led to the 2002 (International Development Act)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?

The **Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)** is responsible for coordinating and pursuing UK policies abroad.

The **Department for International Development** has the responsibility for international development issues and works extensively with other government departments to promote development and PCD.

The following approach is adopted by **UK Government** to promote coherence

- Strong political leadership by Sec of State for International Development;
- Better use of existing co-ordination mechanisms within the government;
- Mobilization of DFID's experience and analytical capacities in support of objective

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD

DFID is a separate Government Department, allowing it to advocate for PCD at a high political level.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation

	Particular Characteristics ⁶⁶	Actors involved: ⁶⁷
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements A - White Paper, International Development Act and the International Development (Transparency and Reporting) Act B - Shared Public Service Agreement targets with the Department for Trade and Industry, The Ministry of Defence, The Treasury and The Foreign Office	All group 2	Par, Cab, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - Cabinet Committees on Foreign Affairs and Defence, and sub-committees on conflict, security, WTO and EU trade policy B - Inter-departmental Working-Group on Development (IWGD), chaired by DFID C - International Development Committee of the UK Parliament D - Cabinet Ministerial Committee on asylum and migration with senior official level sub committee on migration E - Remittance Task Force F - Overseas Corruption Unit (Cross Whitehall working and co-ordination groups also in areas like climate change, environment and natural resources)	A (group 2) B (group 4) C, E, F (group 2)	Par, Cab, PM
6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment A - House of Commons International Development Committee The Commission for Africa and Policy Coherence for Development: First do no harm. First Report of Session	A – (group 3) B – (group 3/4)	

⁶⁶ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics'), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

⁶⁷ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

<p>2004–05 B – Commissioning of studies that focus on PCD</p> <p>Recent studies: Donor Whole-of-Government Approaches to Fragile States The case of the UK in Yemen, Hendrickson, D. Kings College London, 2006</p> <p>Country level Rapid Assessment of UK's Development Footprint, OPM, 2006</p> <p>Policy Coherence for Development in the EU Council: Strategies for the Way Forward CEPS. Brussels, 2006</p>		
---	--	--

7. External Opinions:

Ashoff, G. (2005) Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development: Justification, Recognition and Approaches to Achievement. DIE Studies No. 11 German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn.

DFID differs from most other government departments in that it has considerable experience and knowledge of development policy and developing countries. This gives it an advantage to place greater emphasis on development in the government's work, and also to use its analytical and research capacity to represent development policy interests at different departments. Furthermore, the upgrading of DFID to a ministry of cabinet rank improved its starting point and potential to enhance PCD. DFID also invests into inter-departmental networking at the desk-officer level where coherence related decisions are made, through staff exchanges between DFID and other departments (Ashoff 2005: 54 - 56).

Picciotto R., 2004, 'PCD: A Background Note' for International Development Committee (of UK HoC) Meeting, 12 October 2004

Picciotto mentions that parliamentary scrutiny is central to promoting PCD.

- Parliament could request all legislative proposals address PCD explicitly;
- Could require impact assessments;
- Could emulate two-track approach of EU by requiring future aid programmes make explicit provision for technical support and CB in developing countries;
- Encourage other committees in Parliament to include PCD in their work;
- Encourage inter-parliamentary networks to include PCD in their work.

OECD DAC Peer Review (2001)

The 'recasting' of DFID as an autonomous government department has enabled it to pursue a broader agenda, as well as to play an active role in promoting PCD. Making progress on internalising the **White Paper of 2000** and developing ownership of the poverty reduction agenda across government will require time and effort. DFID needs to ensure that changes in attitude in other departments take place, but also needs to prevent itself from moving too far ahead from the others (OECD 2001: 43,44).

A more recent review of the UK's efforts towards promoting coherence has been made in the **2006 OECD/DAC Peer Review** which says that UK actively pursues policy coherence for development, but also that challenges remain.

*"The current government used its first **White Paper (1997)** to establish the principle that all government policies affecting developing countries should take account of the objectives of sustainable development. A second **White Paper (2000)** addressed the development impact of non-aid policies and led to a substantial engagement by DFID on trade. In 2002, the **International Development Act** provided a legislative basis for the whole of government to deal coherently with issues of development. Much of this high level attention to policy coherence has its origins in the strong support afforded by the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It permitted the UK to use effectively its dual Presidency of the G-8 and the EU in 2005 to further the development agenda. DFID has moved rapidly to operationalize its leadership in this area. It has found its work greatly facilitated by the strategic positioning of the Secretary of State in the Cabinet and several Cabinet sub-committees (e.g. asylum and migration) and by the existence of PSA targets on this topic which are shared among government departments either with DFID leadership or its strong participation. Organisationally, DFID has a strong Policy Division which has proven effective in focussing national and international attention to issues of policy debate and in developing policy guidance that is used*

across government, within DFID headquarters, and in country offices to achieve development policy coherence. This policy function is instrumental in supporting DFID's leadership at home and abroad.

Significant progress has been made in some areas of policy incoherence to date, including those relating to trade and untying, where DFID has successfully worked particularly at the national and European levels. DFID could usefully undertake a comprehensive review of its experience of untying, which would be of general interest for the other members of the DAC. **A report by the Africa All Party Parliamentary Group in 2005** encouraged greater attention to national approaches concerning corruption, anti-bribery and money laundering. Another recent report from the parliamentary International Development Committee notes in summary (<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmintdev/123/12308.htm>) that UK work on policy coherence for development has been good, but "could move further and faster". For example joined-up working on migration has begun to receive greater attention, but there is still more to do in this area. Finally and more specifically, efforts to improve policy coherence toward fragile states also have been noteworthy, although further improvement is challenged by department cultures. In fragile states it is crucial to bridge institutional differences between the local DFID office and the UK Embassy and to build regular communication and effective joint approaches.

Two general recommendations are made to encourage the UK to further strengthen its work on PCD:

- *'The UK should articulate a more clearly prioritised action agenda for policy coherence for development. DFID should make judicious use of its significant headquarters and field resources in identifying and working on specific policy inconsistencies.'*
- *'Policy coherence actions should be fully integrated into DFID's approach to results monitoring and reporting, if at all possible in concert with other similarly motivated international partners.'*

8. Narrative from the 2005 Scoping Study (if not integrated above):

The United Kingdom, though it does not use the label "policy coherence", has set poverty eradication as an objective for the whole of the government in its **2000 White Paper Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor**. This White Paper commits the UK to work with others to manage globalisation so that poverty is systematically reduced and international development targets are achieved. In addition, the **International Development Act**, which came into force in June 2002, is the central piece of legislation governing when the UK can give development or humanitarian assistance, in what forms it can be given, and on what terms. It makes poverty reduction the overarching purpose of British development aid, either by furthering sustainable development or by promoting people's welfare.

The Act makes it illegal to use the development budget for other means than the two above two objectives, and DFID could even be sued if it would use its budget to achieve other means. The Act thus becomes an instrument to oppose incoherences between DFID's objectives and the use of its funds for other objectives than development (Ashoff 2005: 53).

The UK pursues the poverty elimination objective with different forms of inter-departmental collaboration. The Department for International Development (DFID) works closely with other government departments on policies that impact on international development, including those related to agriculture, trade, migration and climate change. As an example, DFID is consulted when the UK government is making licensing decisions on arms exports. The Cabinet-level International Development Secretary coordinates policy and strategy across the government. Where close collaboration is required, inter-departmental working groups have been established, as, for example, the Post-Conflict Reconstruction Unit which involves the Foreign Office, the Ministry of Defence and DFID. Overall, these many collaboration instruments enable departments to dialogue, to exchange views and interests and to coordinate among themselves to present a coherent UK position in international settings.

Furthermore, the International Development Committee of the UK Parliament is interesting with respect to its scrutinising role towards DFID and its role in promoting development issues. This committee, appointed by the House of Commons, examines the expenditures, administration and policy of DFID and its associated public bodies. The committee meets regularly and holds hearings on different policy areas. It investigates various aspects of development and may call on ministers and witnesses to provide testimony. It can request written evidence and recommend further work of DFID, which must then report back to it. The committee is not, strictly speaking, a mechanism for coherence for development, its role being limited to reviewing expenditure, policy and administration rather than looking at cross-cutting issues between development policy and other policies. But its influence on DFID's work is well worth noting.

9. Contacts

Mandeep Kaur-Grewal, European Union Department, M-Kaur-Grewal@dfid.gov.uk	Svein Dale, Global Development Effectiveness Division, Department for International Development (DFID), S-Dale@dfid.gov.uk	Tim Williams, Team Leader, Donor Policy and Partnerships Team, Global Development Effectiveness Division, Department for International Development (DFID), Tim-Williams@dfid.gov.uk
--	--	---