



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

**Appendix IV
Case Study Report
The role of the Finnish Development Policy
Committee in the promotion of PCD in Finland**

**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

Team Members for this case study

James Mackie	ECDPM
--------------	-------

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

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	DATA COLLECTION METHODS	2
3	COUNTRY PROFILES	3
4	DESCRIPTION OF MECHANISM	3
5	MAIN FINDINGS ON EVALUATION QUESTIONS	4
5.1	Evaluation question 1 : origins	4
5.1.1	Effect national debate on coherence had on establishment of PCD mechanisms.....	4
5.1.2	Evidence that international thinking on PCD have influenced mechanisms.....	4
5.1.3	Major ‘agents of change’ advocated for the mechanisms, contributed to its establishment and participate in the further promotion and activities.....	4
5.1.4	Major national or international examples of policy (in)coherence for development which prompted the establishment of the mechanisms.....	4
5.1.5	Dissatisfaction with impact and effectiveness that existing coherence mechanisms have on PCD (limited effects.....)	5
5.1.6	Uniqueness of particular PCD mechanisms to a particular national context	5
5.1.7	Success in surmounting specific obstacles for setting up PCD mechanisms.....	5
5.2	Evaluation question 2: how does mechanism fit with government systems?	6
5.2.1	Mechanisms are in line with the national policy objectives (policy relevance)	6
5.2.2	Mechanisms are integrated in the national policy, implementation and practices (institutional relevance)	6
5.2.3	Key issues from national political context have been integrated in the selection and design of mechanisms (contextual relevance)	7
5.2.4	Mechanisms’ design and actions correspond to their official purpose and take into consideration main pre-conditions (internal relevance).....	7
5.2.5	Mechanisms are in line with the internationally recognised demand for PCD	7
5.2.6	Mechanisms’ remits cover main policy sectors relevant for development	7
5.3	Evaluation question 3 : effectiveness & efficiency.....	8
5.3.1	The design and modus operandi of mechanisms facilitates progress towards intra-governmental PCD.....	8
5.3.2	There is clarity among most relevant actors about the identity, role, specific focus and modus operandi of the mechanisms	8
5.3.3	The mechanisms’ activities contribute towards progress on intra-governmental PCD (as per outcomes in logical intervention diagram).....	9
5.3.4	Appropriate levels of resources (human and financial capacity) are provided to ensure full and efficient use of the mechanisms	9
5.3.5	PCD mechanisms are strong enough in relation to coherence mechanisms of other policy sectors, or other pressure within broader policy process	9

5.3.6	Degree to which combination of three different types of mechanisms takes place and how they support each other (Policy statements, Administrative and institutional mechanisms and Knowledge and Assessment mechanisms).....	10
5.4	Evaluation question 4 : strengths & weaknesses	10
5.4.1	Mechanisms impact positively on encouraging increasing levels of PCD	11
5.4.2	The impact of the PCD mechanisms can be traced back to or linked to a limited number of factors	11
5.4.3	Incentives/disincentives perceived or experienced by officials that help or hinder the full application of the mechanisms.....	11
5.4.4	Monitoring & evaluation system contributing to ensuring that mechanisms remain well adapted to their task.....	12
5.4.5	Importance of political back-up as a key factor, relative to others, in ensuring PCD mechanisms have impact.....	12
5.4.6	Informal mechanisms – processes also impact (negatively/positively) on PCD	12
5.5	Evaluation question 5 : sustainability	13
5.5.1	PCD has become entrenched in government thinking and is becoming second nature to policy makers	13
5.5.2	Government political commitment to PCD has been sustained over some time and is shared by the major political parties in the country.....	13
5.5.3	Resources are available to keep PCD mechanisms operating as long as needed.....	13
5.5.4	Institutional status and capacity of the on-going mechanisms are clearly established.....	14
5.5.5	Mechanisms have the capacity to adapt and renew themselves in order to meet new or changing demands.....	14
5.5.6	Decreasing opposition to the PCD mechanisms and their continued existence.....	14
6	MAIN FINDINGS ON EVALUATION CRITERIA	15
6.1	Relevance	15
6.2	Effectiveness	15
6.3	Efficiency	15
6.4	Impact.....	15
6.5	Sustainability	16
7	CONCLUSIONS.....	16
7.1	Main conclusions from EQs.....	16
7.2	Main issues, trends and challenges for evaluation synthesis report	16
	ANNEX 2: ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE REPORT	18
	ANNEX 3: PERSONS MET	19
	ANNEX 4: COUNTRY PROFILE	20

1 Introduction

The Heads of Evaluation for External Cooperation of the EU Member States and the European Commission have initiated a series of six evaluation studies focussing on how the Maastricht Treaty precepts of, *coordination, complementarity and coherence* (the '3Cs') have been translated into practice, and with what impact. The current study, one of the six in the series, focuses on '**EU Mechanisms Promoting Policy Coherence for Development (PCD)**'. As part of this evaluation seven different mechanisms that promote coherence have been examined in different parts of the EU to see how they carry out this task and to what effect. This report thus covers the role of one such mechanism in promoting PCD.

This evaluation of PCD mechanisms is being carried out by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), the Instituto Complutense de Estudios Internacionales (ICEI), and PARTICIP GmbH. The evaluation analyses and assesses mechanisms for promoting intra-governmental coherence that have been introduced in the administrations of the Members States and the European institutions since the late 1990s, with the purpose of:

Objectives of this evaluation:

- a) Judging their relevance and effectiveness, as well as the mechanisms' efficiency, impact and sustainability, in terms of promoting PCD and within their specific contexts;
- b) Formulating proposals to improve the relevance and effectiveness in terms of promoting PCD of the mechanisms analysed, without neglecting their efficiency, impact and sustainability requirements in this role;
- c) Enabling politicians and officials in Member States and in European institutions to learn lessons from experience about effective PCD mechanisms and use these more widely.

The evaluation has been commissioned and is managed by the Evaluation Service of France, with the support of a Steering Group that also includes representatives from the evaluation services of Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and the European Commission.

A 'PCD mechanism', as the term is used in this Study, is taken to mean a mechanism that is a clearly identifiable object of study with concrete features, such as a name and some terms of reference that include PCD as a purpose even as part of a wider scope. Clarity on who is involved, and defined operating ways, are the other elements that qualify the mechanisms. All the mechanisms have other roles as well, but this study only examines their PCD role and does not pretend to cover any other broader role they may have.

The case studies are intended to give the researchers a livelier grasp of the reality of these mechanisms especially by helping them to understand how they are perceived by stakeholders, and by seeing how they operate in their specific governance system.

The process for selecting the case studies is described in Section 4 of the Desk Study. In choosing the cases a systematic effort was made to choose a selection of different types of mechanisms so as to be able to see at close range how different approaches work and the advantages and disadvantages each one might have. The selection thus includes for example one parliamentary committee, a sector-wide development programme, an external advisory committee, a 'whole of government' approach using a government bill, two different systems of inter-ministerial and inter-departmental committees and an inter-department policy consultation system. Cases are also taken from regions of the EU, from EU institutions and from both larger and smaller member states. Finally there are cases from each of the three different functional types of PCD mechanism identified by the Study in the Inception

Phase: (i) Policy Statements, (ii) Institutional or Administrative mechanisms, and (iii) Knowledge Input and Assessment mechanisms

The prime reason for selecting this particular mechanism for a case study is that the profile of the Finnish Development Policy Committee (DPC) corresponds closely to one of the three functional types of PCD mechanism identified in the Inception Note, the Knowledge Input and Assessment Mechanisms and is one of the very few cases of this type identified by the study. The DPC also has a very clear coherence mandate. This was deliberately added to its terms of reference by the Government when the Committee was reestablished in its current format in 2003. As the Committee nears the end of its current four year mandate the Government and the Committee Secretariat also welcomed the idea of an evaluation and was keen to see this as a learning opportunity.

2 Data collection methods

Two team meetings were organised to prepare the field surveys. During the first meeting, the various tools that could be used were analysed and discussed. Two checklists were produced. A detailed list, covering all EQs and judgement criteria which also sought to identify key issues and tools was prepared as well as a shorter one, aimed at ensuring that all key issues would be discussed during the interviews. The list of types of actors to be interviewed was categorised in different families and integrated in a standard methodology for preparing and implementing the case studies. A template for the case study report was also drafted so as to ensure homogeneity of reporting.

After the field survey tools had been completed a first field mission was conducted to ensure the tools worked well and some improvements were made. Thereafter a second full team meeting was convened to brief all the field survey teams on how to use the tools and ensure homogeneity in their use. Instructions for interviews were also given, and a discussion was had on how to prioritise information within the short space of time budgeted for each case study.

To prepare the visits each case study team sent an information note to the principle contact Ministry which was then forwarded to the various other Ministries presenting the aims and the content of the case study work. Potential interviewees were discussed between the field study team and the contact Ministry and then a final programme was drawn up.

The evaluation used semi-structured interviews based on the evaluation questions as the main information collection tool, and review of background documents on in-country coherence as well as documents related to the specific PCD mechanism. The short period of time allotted to the mission did not allow much time for many consultations with a wide range of stakeholders outside the specific Ministry responsible for managing the PCD mechanism (e.g. parliament, various civil society actors, etc.) but every effort was made to ensure that a representative sample was covered in each case. The two days budgeted for interviews in each country, was in some cases increased a bit where possible to cater for individual circumstances.

Given the limited time available for field work this report represents a snapshot of the background, current practices and future challenges relating specifically to how the mechanism selected performs its role of promoting PCD. It focuses on providing an accurate overview and highlighting main prospective issues relating to this PCD role rather than on detailed information on all actions carried out. In particular readers should note that *no attempt is made to look at any broader role the mechanism might have in addition to that of promoting PCD, except if such a broader role might positively or negatively affect the PCD role.*

One potential bias of the case studies is the high proportion of interviewed staff working in the Ministry responsible for development, compared to the staff of other Ministries. The overall perception may therefore reflect the position of this ministry more than others.

The team of consultants would like to thank the evaluation service of the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Secretariat of the Development Policy Committee for their assistance in organising the study and the persons met for their flexibility and their willingness to help.

3 Country profiles

During the evaluation's desk study phase, individual 'country profiles' have been prepared for each of the EU Member States and Institutions. This profile describes in a systematic manner the main elements of that Member State or Institution's approach towards promoting policy coherence for development. The profiles include information on the most important policy statements, institutional architecture, the internal division of responsibilities and the identified mechanisms to promote PCD.

The analysis in these profiles, which was based on official public documents, was subsequently verified and where possible enriched through a targeted consultation with key officials in EU Member States. As is mentioned on page 11 of the evaluation's Terms of References, the profiles concern the main objective of the desk study for this evaluation and provide a '(...) deeper insight of the existing PCD mechanisms, by building on the scoping study. 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.'

The country profile for the case study covered in this report can be found in Annex 4.

4 Description of mechanism

Finland has had a development policy committee or board of different types since the late 1970s, but in the past the committee was essentially charged with following the country's development cooperation programme and providing a semi-public forum for advice, comment and discussion on the work of the Government in this area. The government invited different political parties and relevant civil society organizations to nominate members of the committee and then engaged in an on-going discussion with them about Finland's bilateral development cooperation programme.

In 2003 the new Government drafted a new Development Policy¹ which, in the words of one official, emphasized policy coherence for development as its '*golden thread*'. The link was therefore made with the mandate of the new DPC and features as its second aim after the requirement to promote Finland's implementation of the MDGs. The previous Advisory Board for Relations with Developing Countries also had a mandate to look at coherence, but only the internal coherence of Finland's Development Policy and not PCD.

The Finnish DPC is composed of 19 members, each with a deputy member, and is serviced by a small secretariat of two half time posts. The members are appointed by all the political parties represented in the Finnish Parliament, development NGOs, Finnish industry, trade unions, the representative organization from the agriculture and forestry sectors, one private sector think tank and academia. The secretariat staff are appointed by the committee itself but are provided office space in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which also provides the committee with a limited budget. In addition to the members the Committee has 24 experts

¹ This was approved as a Government Resolution on 5 February 2004.

nominated to it from the Government: one from each of 13 different ministries and government institutions and the remainder from the different parts of the MFA. The DPC is therefore able to call on expertise on coherence matters from throughout the government.

5 Main findings on evaluation questions

5.1 Evaluation question 1 : origins

To what extent and why did the process of establishing the selected intra-governmental PCD mechanisms respond to specific constraints and produce mechanisms that are particularly suited to these parameters?

5.1.1 Effect national debate on coherence had on establishment of PCD mechanisms

There was general agreement among those interviewed that the debate on coherence prior to the establishment of the DPC as a coherence mechanism had been largely internal to the Government and among development specialists and not something prompted by public debate.

Inside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) however there was quite some debate on what more to do to promote PCD, and it is clear that the inclusion of a concern with PCD in the mandate of the DPC was a deliberate move to promote public discussion, create some sort of larger constituency for PCD and in the process strengthen the hand of the MFA to promote PCD within government.

5.1.2 Evidence that international thinking on PCD have influenced mechanisms

Clearly international thinking has affected the way PCD is approached by the Finnish Government: the MDGs are a clear target, there was strong awareness of work on coherence in the OECD and there had been exchanges of views with the other members of the Nordic+ Group. Several interviewees were also aware of the efforts made by the Swedish government to promote PCD notably through the Government Bill on Global Development, but there was also a feeling that government operated in a different way in Finland.

5.1.3 Major 'agents of change' advocated for the mechanisms, contributed to its establishment and participate in the further promotion and activities

The major 'agent of change' for changing the mandate of the DPC and including a coherence remit within it, seems to have been senior officials in the MFA. NGO actors were pleased with the change but did not claim any credit for having pushed for this particular change.

5.1.4 Major national or international examples of policy (in)coherence for development which prompted the establishment of the mechanisms

There was no particular moment when there had been a public debate on a strong case of incoherence. Interviewees were however familiar with the wider European debates on CAP excess food dumping in developing country markets but these were not in product areas important for Finland. More recently however the issue of sugar had provoked some debate

in Finland as the country has 3,000 farmers involved in sugar production and one of the two refineries will be closed shortly.

5.1.5 Dissatisfaction with impact and effectiveness that existing coherence mechanisms have on PCD (limited effects...)

Senior government officials did indicate dissatisfaction with progress on coherence within government which is one of the reasons they wanted the DPC to follow the issue. Both officials and members of the DPC felt there was a lack of a real forum for PCD discussions within government.

5.1.6 Uniqueness of particular PCD mechanisms to a particular national context

All interviewees perceived the DPC as a typical Finnish mechanism in that it sought to build consensus by ensuring that the key stakeholders were round the table and able to voice their views directly to the government. While all agreed that this was a regular way of doing business and other such committees² existed, opinions did vary on the value of the system. Some interviewees thus pointed out that there were disadvantages as the system tended to 'contain' arguments and real differences of view where these existed and discouraged them from being properly aired in the public domain. In the long run this could even have a negative effect on the electorate who could become excluded from the debate and even disillusioned by politics as a result. According to some the system could even affect the debate in parliament as all the main political parties were included in the DPC and if issues were discussed there first there would then be less debate if and when the issues got to Parliament.

5.1.7 Success in surmounting specific obstacles for setting up PCD mechanisms

The DPC had taken a year to appoint and start operating after the new Government had come in. This was due to some internal government debate about the need the committee and what form it should take. There had also been some political discussion about which party should get the chair which had delayed things. Officials in the MFA were clearly also looking for ways to strengthen their own hand vis a vis other ministries less convinced by the importance of PCD.

Once established the main difficulty encountered by the DPC itself in doing its work was to work out who to report to at what level in government. Some even felt they were working in a bit of a vacuum with no clear indication from government of what they were expecting in terms of output. In the end the chairperson took the initiative to present the first annual Statement of the DPC to the Prime Minister himself. For government officials this proved the point that the DPC was independent and had the highest levels of access if they felt it appropriate to use them, they could also go to the public or to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Parliament – there were no real constraints on them in this respect.

Overall finding for EQ 1 - summary box

The process of establishing the DPC clearly worked within the parameters of the Finnish style of consensus government and produced a mechanism that conformed closely to that approach. The drive for including PCD in the mandate of the committee seems to have very largely come from within government – from a concern among officials to do something

² Two other similar committees were identified by officials: one on Sustainable Development and one on Human Rights. All three were established by government which invited political parties and other interested groups to nominate members.

concrete to promote coherence and as a product of a new government policy on development which put considerable emphasis on PCD. In turn the international debate on PCD derived from exchanges with other donors in the DAC, Nordic+ Group and the UN appear to have been the main sources of inspiration for such a move.

5.2 Evaluation question 2: how does mechanism fit with government systems?

How and why are the selected intra-governmental PCD mechanisms relevant in promoting intra-governmental PCD in their particular national context?

5.2.1 Mechanisms are in line with the national policy objectives (policy relevance)

The DPC was clearly aligned with the government's development policy and its mandate closely linked to the execution of that policy. The DPC is established by a decision of government and is referred to in the Government Resolution on Development Policy of 5 February 2004 in the following terms which also emphasise clearly its role in promoting PCD (emphasis added):

*"The Development Policy Committee assesses the implementation of the policy. **Its work is directed particularly to the achievement of policy coherence.** The Committee reports annually to Government on the implementation of Finland's development policy and the factors affecting it. The Committee's proposals are taken into account in the annual planning of the implementation of the policy. To help it in its tasks, the Committee calls on representatives from different ministries to serve as permanent experts."*³

5.2.2 Mechanisms are integrated in the national policy, implementation and practices (institutional relevance)

It appears that over recent years the government has had to make a real effort to change its administrative culture which historically has tended to be fairly closed and compartmentalised. This appears to still be a problem in terms of getting different government departments to really work together on coherence issues. In fact the creation of the DPC appears to be in some measure an attempt by the MFA to encourage such inter-ministerial discussion by asking all ministries to appoint experts to the DPC who they then hoped would learn to work together and form some sort of informal network. There was recognition and disappointment that this network of officials on PCD had failed to materialise.

The lack of movement on this network has recently prompted the MFA to create a new post of coherence officer within the Ministry so as to have a visible focal point for promoting PCD.

One outside pressure that has however changed this culture has been Finland's accession to the EU. This had led to the growing importance of intra-governmental coordination on EU affairs. EU coordination meetings at different levels occur on a weekly basis. The importance of this system has grown to the extent that some officials now see this as the prime focal point for resolving coherence issues outside Cabinet and the PM's office⁴.

³ Government Resolution 5.2.2004 on *Development Policy*, p.10

⁴ It should be noted that one well placed informant explained that the PM's office discouraged coherence issues from reaching them preferring to see such issues resolved in government or between ministers.

5.2.3 Key issues from national political context have been integrated in the selection and design of mechanisms (contextual relevance)

The DPC is very much a product of the Finnish system of governance by consensus. The whole design of the DPC ensures that all the main political parties and other key stakeholders from civil society are directly involved. The different government departments relevant for PCD issues also have officials accredited to the committee as experts. There was a general view among interviewees that all the key Finnish stakeholders in the development sector were represented in the membership of the committee

PCD itself is a central thread of the government's development policy and features prominently in the mandate of the DPC. The membership of the committee includes sectoral representatives from some but not all of the main policy sectors with which one might expect coherence issues to arise. Thus agricultural and forestry producers are represented, as are industry, commercial and trade union interests. There is however no civil society representative with a primary interest in environmental or climate change issues, though this may be partly due to the parallel existence of another committee on Sustainable Development. The DPC has covered both defence / security and migration issues in its time but there are no security specialists or representatives from migrants organisations among the members of the committee.

5.2.4 Mechanisms' design and actions correspond to their official purpose and take into consideration main pre-conditions (internal relevance)

The ToR of the DPC is a concise clear document which identifies the promotion of coherence as the committee's second aim:

"To establish a policy that promotes coherence in different policy sectors, ensuring that the global view on development is taken into account in national decision-making".

The two annual Statements of the DPC which are its principal output and its list of activities correspond closely to its official purpose and most interviewees clearly felt it was doing its job well and indeed above expectations. There was a bit of a sense that with the end of its mandate approaching the DPC seemed to be a bit running out of steam and no longer quite as proactive and sharp as it had been in its first couple of years of work.

5.2.5 Mechanisms are in line with the internationally recognised demand for PCD

Those responsible for the DPC are well aware of international debates on PCD and situate the action of the committee in this context. The mandate of the DPC does not refer to the EU commitments as such but there is awareness of the main relevant EU policy documents and the EU is considered as an important factor in the committee's work. The mandate of the DPC does refer to the MDGs as the key international foundation of its work.

5.2.6 Mechanisms' remits cover main policy sectors relevant for development

The mandate of the DPC sets no limits to the coverage of the committee's work but rather gives it the very broad mandate of *"...ensuring that the global view on development is taken into account in national decision-making"*. The intention that the DPC's work should have a broad scope can also be assessed by the fact that experts from 13 different ministries apart from the MFA have been appointed to the Committee. In addition, within the MFA the head of the departmental of external trade is also an expert. The Government's emphasis on coherence is further enhanced by the fact that the Minister has the two portfolios of trade and development.

Overall finding for EQ 2 - summary box

The DPC is very much a creature of the Finnish culture of government which seeks to promote consensus and inclusiveness. A wide range of political and civil society views therefore have their voice in the committee. Government has also taken steps to ensure that all relevant Government ministries have a formal link to the committee. On the other hand, within government itself, mechanisms to promote inter-ministerial discussion on PCD are generally poor and have failed to develop as hoped. In the view of the Committee this lacuna has also hampered its work and meant that at times it felt it “*was working in a bit of a vacuum*”. In recent months the MFA has therefore taken the further step of appointing a coherence officer to act as a focal point for promoting PCD. Interestingly the need for Finland to act in a coherent fashion in the positions it takes at the EU level has meant that in practice the inter-ministerial coordination system on EU affairs is seen as one of the current prime places where policy coherence discussions, albeit not usually PCD, do take place within government.

5.3 Evaluation question 3 : effectiveness & efficiency

How effective and efficient are the selected intra-governmental PCD mechanisms in achieving their objectives within their context? In cases where governments have established several intra-governmental PCD mechanisms, to what extent and how do these mutually reinforce each other or do they perhaps work at cross purposes in some respects?

5.3.1 The design and modus operandi of mechanisms facilitates progress towards intra-governmental PCD

No real major difficulties are apparent in terms of the committee doing its work and producing the expected outputs. It is more in relations with government and particularly other ministries than the MFA that there are difficulties.

Relations with the MFA appear to be very smooth. There is very good access for the committee. With the secretariat located in MFA offices with access to the MFA intranet there are very good flows of information back and forth. The Committee also regularly asks government experts from different ministries attached to it to provide background notes on different issues.

The DPC has made a conscious effort to look at and improve its own effectiveness in terms of how it relates to different government departments and how it exerts influence in relation to its central goals⁵.

5.3.2 There is clarity among most relevant actors about the identity, role, specific focus and modus operandi of the mechanisms

The members of the committee are generally clear about its identity, role and the way it works. Those interviewed were also clear that PCD is and should be a major preoccupation of the committee. The same was true for MFA officials working on development policy interviewed. There was more questioning in other ministries or among MFA officials responsible for different sectoral policy areas who professed themselves to be less clear about the precise role of the committee, though it seemed that with time they had come to understand it well.

⁵ DPC, 2005, Effectiveness Strategy for 2005-2007

The leadership of the Committee felt the government could do more to guide their officials on how best to use the committee.

Some members of the committee felt its role was more a way for the government to increase the transparency of its work than anything else.

5.3.3 The mechanisms' activities contribute towards progress on intra-governmental PCD (as per outcomes in logical intervention diagram)

The DPC's activities clearly make an important contribution to the debate on coherence in government circles and the development sector in Helsinki and progress is certainly being achieved in this area. The committee was able to point to policies in other sectors: trade, defence, migration where inputs by the committee had brought about policy change. This was also confirmed by government officials in different departments.

Some government officials felt the committee had a good sense of timing and chose the right topics which clearly increased its effectiveness. The view was also expressed that the committee was open and transparent in its work and by organising seminars and meetings and publishing articles in the media was good at reaching out to a wider public.

5.3.4 Appropriate levels of resources (human and financial capacity) are provided to ensure full and efficient use of the mechanisms

The MFA makes available a budget for the committee but members work on a purely voluntary basis. The budget covers the costs of the secretariat, meetings, some public seminars, publications and a few study trips. At first the budget had been quite low, but an increase was granted after a year or so allowing for an increase in activities and for the secretariat to increase from two part time posts to two full time posts.

The leadership of the committee feels good use could be made of more resources than this however. The monthly meetings are time consuming to prepare. Information has to be collected and then presented with a concise summary. There is also on-going debate, exchange between members and drafting processes between meetings which has to be facilitated and followed. It had been noted that when members of the Irish equivalent of the DPC visited Helsinki on an exchange of ideas and experience they had been surprised by the very limited resources available to their Finnish hosts.

5.3.5 PCD mechanisms are strong enough in relation to coherence mechanisms of other policy sectors, or other pressure within broader policy process

Difficult to judge: the DPC works in a bit of a development sector bubble and while it certainly helps the development sector (both within and without of government) formulate views on coherence it finds it difficult to project and communicate its concerns easily beyond the MFA. Officials in other ministries however did recognise that they take on views from DPC but stakeholders are also clear that there is not yet enough discussion on PCD within government.

Some members of the committee also feel that there is an absence of hard debate in the committee on the really difficult issues essentially because the DPC members are all development sector people. For instance the committee is a strong advocate of the government achieving the 0.7% ODA/GNI target rate, but one member suggested it had never really discussed the hard issue of why the government does not achieve it.

Several interviewees suggested that combining other ministerial portfolios with the development portfolio⁶ was a more powerful way of promoting coherence between two policy sectors, however it is clearly not possible to do this on a wide basis.

5.3.6 Degree to which combination of three different types of mechanisms takes place and how they support each other (Policy statements, Administrative and institutional mechanisms and Knowledge and Assessment mechanisms)

First, it should be noted that the DPC is clearly a good PCD Knowledge and Assessment mechanism. It brings in considerable knowledge into the debate and also effectively uses knowledge already in government. It encourages the circulation of that knowledge through debate and interaction with government, parliament, different constituencies and the public at large through the media. It also provides an element of assessment though it does not commission formal evaluations or studies.

In terms of interaction between different types of PCD mechanism in Finland, there is a clear sense that while two of these three types of mechanisms (the policy statements and the knowledge and assessment mechanism – the DPC itself) are in place what is missing is a solid administrative and institutional mechanism. There was a hope that the government experts appointed to the committee would spontaneously form a network within government but this has not happened. The closest the government therefore appears to get to a good inter-ministry coordination mechanism which has to confront coherence issues is the EU coordination.

Overall finding for EQ 3 - summary box

The efficiency of the committee in carrying out its work appears to be good, but its effectiveness in achieving the desired results is somewhat more in doubt largely, it would seem, because of the absence of a real inter-ministry body to which it can relate on the government side. In that sense it is hampered in its ability to “...ensure that the global view on development is taken into account in **national decision-making**”. For it to be really effective in performing this task it would need a counterpart body within government to whom it could relate in the knowledge that this body was tasked specifically with taking decisions on policy coherence and more specifically on PCD.

The government has in effect set in place two parts of a three part system to promote PCD: there is a good policy statement which highlights the importance of coherence and there is a good mechanism for feeding in, exchanging knowledge and making assessments (the DPC) but there is no clear administrative and institutional mechanism inside government to process coherence issues. Relations and exchange between the DPC and the development policy parts of the MFA are good, but in other departments and ministries responsible for different sectoral policies interest and awareness levels vary a lot. There is thus no solid and consistent cross-government debate on PCD which suggests an inadequate level of political backing for this stated commitment.

5.4 Evaluation question 4 : strengths & weaknesses

What are the key factors contributing to the success of the selected intra-governmental PCD mechanisms and their impact on intra-governmental PCD and why? What are the mechanisms' strengths and weaknesses in this respect?

⁶ For several years the Finnish Minister for Development has also held the Trade portfolio. In an earlier government the development portfolio had been combined with that of environment.

5.4.1 Mechanisms impact positively on encouraging increasing levels of PCD

While impact is difficult to measure in this area it is clear that the committee had certainly contributed significantly to keeping PCD on the agenda with the government and promoted debate around the subject. The committee could also quote cases of government policies in different areas – migration, environment, trade, security (eg. the Security White Paper/defence policy review) – which had been adapted or changed as a result of work done by the committee. This was also recognised by government officials working in some of these sectors. The committee also pushed the government to put the issue of coherence on the agenda for the current Finnish EU Presidency.

5.4.2 The impact of the PCD mechanisms can be traced back to or linked to a limited number of factors

There was widespread agreement among interviewees that the representativeness of the DPC was the main factor behind its success. The presence of representatives from all the main political parties, the private sector, NGOs and the research community was important.

The quality, both in terms of calibre and commitment, of the members on the committee was also cited as a factor for success as was more specifically the quality of the leadership.

Views on resources were varied: by and large most interviewees felt the committee had adequate resources for its work. There were adequate funds for inviting speakers and organising a few study trips. The secretariat had good access to information and support inside the MFA and was able to provide the committee with solid briefings.

Some members felt the provision of information was not selective enough and that more could be done to prepare meetings and enhance the efficiency of committee discussions, but this was not a general view.

One expert regretted the absence of non-development sector specialists on the committee and felt this hampered discussion on coherence and meant that the tendency was to take positions that were unduly sympathetic to development interests.

5.4.3 Incentives/disincentives perceived or experienced by officials that help or hinder the full application of the mechanisms

The members of the DPC work on a purely voluntary basis for the committee and do so on top of their regular job. Different motivations were cited, the most frequent of which was commitment to the cause of development, but it was also recognised that members benefited from the exchange of information that occurred in the committee and the access it gave members to government officials and each other. In other words the DPC also serves as a good networking forum for a diverse groups of people engaged in the development sector some of whom can then use the information and contacts gained in their regular jobs. The perceived success of the committee in communicating a worthwhile message which was by and large taken seriously by the government and the leadership of the chair and secretariat were clearly also incentives.

A few DPC members and outsiders expressed reservations about how seriously the government really took the committee and felt it was used more as a way of containing debate. While they did not go so far as to call into question the existence of the committee this perception did act as a disincentive to attend meetings regularly. At the same time, while the DPC was not seen as an advocacy tool, some members did say that it was much easier to draw government attention to coherence issues from inside the committee than outside and that this was one of its prime values.

Most commonly however the main disincentives cited were the amount of reading required and the sometimes long meetings.

For experts from the different government ministries there seems to have been a certain slacking off in attendance over time, with the first meetings at the start of the mandate much better attended than later on. After some time, officials tended to attend only those meetings where the agenda was directly of interest to them.

5.4.4 Monitoring & evaluation system contributing to ensuring that mechanisms remain well adapted to their task

No formal monitoring or evaluation process of the committee's work is in place but the chair and the secretariat have organised periodic self-assessment discussions during which the committee has discussed the way it works and a number of working processes have been identified for improvement and addressed in different ways. For instance in early 2005 the DPC undertook a review of its effectiveness and drafted a strategy in this respect⁷.

5.4.5 Importance of political back-up as a key factor, relative to others, in ensuring PCD mechanisms have impact

Political back-up for the committee was clearly a factor for success but there were different perceptions about how this was manifested. Thus the fact that all the political parties had representatives on the committee indicated to some the existence of broad based political backing and several interviewees indicated MPs took the views of the committee very seriously. The calibre and political contacts of the senior members of the committee was also cited. The number and seniority of the MFA experts appointed to the committee was seen as an indication of the backing from that Ministry.

On the other hand the political backing for the principle of coherence and the committee's work in this area was clearly less strong. Various members of the committee felt the lack of a clear designated locus for discussion and decision making on PCD as a problem. In the absence of such a body that could give clear leadership on PCD, other existing structures such as the Cabinet and the ministerial coordination committee for the EU became the places where PCD issues were tackled.

5.4.6 Informal mechanisms – processes also impact (negatively/positively) on PCD

In establishing the DPC with a good range of experts from all the relevant ministries, the MFA had in fact been hoping that an informal network on PCD would emerge between these officials with different sector responsibilities. This has not happened.

The informal (and formal) networks of the members of the committee are however an important factor in the way the DPC works and indeed is expected to work. The committee is after all based on the principle of representativeness. Some members took this quite seriously and regularly found ways to report back to their constituencies and networks or exchange views on the committee's work, although the leadership of the committee felt some could do more in this area.

In preparing for meetings where specific PCD issues were on the agenda some members also took the trouble to check with specialists from other policy sectors in their network on what position they should take in the meeting.

⁷ C.f. para 5.3.2 above & DPC, 2005, *Effectiveness Strategy for 2005-2007*

Overall finding for EQ 4 - summary box

The key factor behind the success of the committee is clearly its representativeness and the way it interlinks with all the main political groups and interested parties in the development sector. Linkages through to the relevant parts of government are also good. Other factors for success have been adequate resourcing, high quality leadership and good inflows of knowledge and information both from inside government and beyond.

Outside government the DPC also uses informal networks to strengthen its operation but inside government particularly on the question of coherence this has not worked so well: no informal PCD network has emerged, as hoped, among the government experts attending the committee. This is all the more a shame because one of the clear limiting factors for the DPC's success has been the lack of an obvious locus for debate and coherence issues beyond the MFA itself, to the extent that at times the DPC has felt itself to be working in a bit of a vacuum as regards PCD.

Political backing for PCD thus exists in government to the extent that a policy statement has been passed, the committee itself has been mandated to promote PCD and the MFA from the Minister down are clearly committed to its promotion. But the commitment of the wider government is more questionable and the ultimate handling of PCD issues is thus left somewhat to chance. In such circumstances there is only so far that the committee can go in its impact.

5.5 Evaluation question 5 : sustainability

What (and why) are the main factors influencing the sustainability of the selected intra-governmental PCD mechanisms?

5.5.1 PCD has become entrenched in government thinking and is becoming second nature to policy makers

PCD is clearly well established in the work of MFA officials responsible for development policy. The value of PCD is also recognised by officials in other non-development parts of the MFA but interviews indicated that these also find it more problematic in practice. Insufficient evidence was collected to make an informed judgement on attitudes towards PCD beyond the MFA but indications were that a good deal more work has to be done before support for PCD can be said to be widely recognised in government.

5.5.2 Government political commitment to PCD has been sustained over some time and is shared by the major political parties in the country

Formal recognition of PCD goes back a dozen years in Finland to a first mention in a strategy paper in 1993 and became stated government policy in a decision in 1996. All the main political parties are apparently supportive of the principle. So, while the committee is a creation of each government, there seems to be a high chance of future governments appointing further committees. MFA officials are also clear on the desirability of this and expect PCD to remain a major task of the next committee.

5.5.3 Resources are available to keep PCD mechanisms operating as long as needed

The MFA shows no indications of wishing to terminate the existence of the funding of the DPC and indeed senior officials were clear it should go on with the next government. It has also been a feature of the organisation of the development sector in Finland for the past 30

years, although it is only in its last mandate that the promotion of PCD was explicitly stated among its purposes.

5.5.4 Institutional status and capacity of the on-going mechanisms are clearly established

Despite this 30 year history and obvious institutional status of the DPC its mandate is renewed and updated with every change of government. The real question is therefore less about the continued existence of the DPC after the next elections in early 2007 but more about whether PCD will continue to be a strong feature of its mandate. At present this does not appear to be in doubt and government officials stated clearly PCD should be a continuing important task.

The institutional linkages between the committee and government on PCD issues could also be improved as already indicated.

5.5.5 Mechanisms have the capacity to adapt and renew themselves in order to meet new or changing demands

The renewal of the DPC has been demonstrated in the past and there appears to be sufficient inter-party agreement that the committee should be reappointed again after the next elections.

One disadvantage of the DPC's mandate being linked to that of governments is that there is usually a gap of several months or even up to a year between committees. While this ensures renewal and encourages continued relevance, it can also have a negative effect on continuity and corporate memory as the appointment and contract of the secretary of the committee is also linked to its term.

5.5.6 Decreasing opposition to the PCD mechanisms and their continued existence

There is apparently little or no opposition to the continued existence of the DPC in government and political circles or in the broader development sector in Finland. What is clear however is that the existence of the DPC and its motivation to develop consensus positions on the issues it considers means that the debate on PCD issues does not really emerge into the public domain and some respondents argued the really difficult questions were therefore obscured and possibly even avoided which could lead to popular disillusionment in the government.

Overall finding for EQ 5 - summary box

The DPC is well established and is likely to have its mandate renewed once again after the next elections in early 2007. Extending the mandate of such a well established body to cover PCD was clearly a shrewd move in terms of giving the issue a solid and well recognized base from which to grow. Several respondents both within and outside government also expressed the view that dealing with PCD had given the committee a new and much needed lease of life and increased its relevance. Indications are therefore that the mandate of the new committee after the elections will continue to include the promotion of PCD.

6 Main findings on evaluation criteria

6.1 Relevance

The DPC is clearly a relevant instrument both in terms of its broader role of encouraging debate on Finland's development cooperation programme and as a forum for national discussion on PCD. It is also a relevant instrument to use to promote PCD in terms of the way government works in Finland and government's relationship with parliament, civil society and the broader public.

6.2 Effectiveness

Its effectiveness is reasonably good in terms of its access to the MFA, the political parties and the broader development sector, but it is hampered by the absence of a clear locus for inter-ministerial debate on PCD in the government and cannot therefore really fully perform its task to "...ensure that the global view on development is taken into account in **national decision-making**". For it to be really effective in performing this task it would need a counterpart body within government that included representation from the relevant ministries to whom it could relate in the knowledge that this body was tasked specifically with taking decisions on policy coherence and more specifically on PCD.

6.3 Efficiency

The DPC is seen as efficient in the way it operates by the vast majority of its stakeholders and the few critical voices that suggest improvements are needed are not suggesting that major increases in efficiency are possible. The committee can also be seen as efficient in its task of promoting the debate on coherence in the Finnish national polity as, on the basis of limited resources, it does reach a good number of stakeholders both within and without government and who recognise its value in this respect.

6.4 Impact

The DPC does have an impact on promoting PCD in national decision making and it has succeeded in promoting some policy change in favour of PCD. Specific policy sectors in which the DPC has had an impact in terms of coherence are identifiable and recognised independently by different respondents both in the committee and in government. Officials in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs recognise an impact on their thinking and some indications of impact can also be found in other ministries although this is much less pervasive. The impact of the DPC is also directly influenced by the political importance the government attaches to PCD. The MFA has sought to increase general awareness of PCD among government departments by making it a central element of the mandate of the DPC and the government as a whole approved this mandate. But ultimately the degree to which other ministries consider it relevant to take into account the thinking of the DPC is dependent on the government's programme and the emphasis all ministers, and particularly the prime minister, place on development and PCD. In institutional terms the DPC's impact would probably be increased by the establishment of a clear inter-ministry 'coherence committee' of some form to which it could relate directly beyond the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

6.5 Sustainability

The DPC is a political body whose existence is related to the life cycle of government and the parliament, but given its 30 year history, the sustainability of the instrument is to all intents and purposes assured. The continuation of its PCD mandate, which is a much more recent addition, is also likely to be continued as there is general cross-party support for the way it has performed this task and the MFA which provides guidance to government on the mandate of the committee is clear that PCD should continue to be an important aspect of its work. This is of course also conditional on the extent to which development cooperation as a whole, and more specifically PCD, commands political support among the Finnish electorate sufficient to prompt the government of the day to include it as an important priority in its political programme.

7 Conclusions

7.1 Main conclusions from EQs

The main conclusion emerging from the data gathered from interviews is that while the DPC is a valid and effective PCD mechanism in its own right its operations are hampered by the context in which it operates. Its actions are based on a good policy commitment to PCD but internally the government does not seem to have organized itself in optimal fashion to fully promote PCD.

Various interviewees in different positions came up with this same message and pointed to the need for some form of recognized inter-ministerial forum for discussing PCD issues and resolving contradictions. If such a forum was established and met regularly the DPC would have a more obvious counterpart inside government for its work on PCD and it is also likely that the interaction between the ministers and the committee would then also attract more public attention and lead to more extensive debate in Finnish society on PCD than is currently the case.

Another secondary conclusion is that the form and manner in which the DPC is established is closely associated with the consensus style of government prevalent in Finland. That said there do not appear to be any real particularities of the DPC that might prevent transferring the Finnish experience with using a representative committee external to government as a mechanism for promoting PCD. As it stands the committee's mandate and modus operandi could easily be used outside Finland. The question is more whether another government system and culture would find this way of working acceptable.

7.2 Main issues, trends and challenges for evaluation synthesis report

The above conclusions suggest that individual PCD mechanisms can lose effectiveness if they are expected to operate purely on their own without some other supporting mechanisms. In particular this would support the conclusion that having in place the full trio of (i) policy statements on PCD, (ii) appropriate internal government administrative and institutional mechanisms and (iii) knowledge and assessment mechanisms, would appear to be an important step to take to achieve success in promoting PCD.

Annex 1: List of principal official source documents

- DAC, 1999, *Development Cooperation Review Series: Finland*, No. 31, OECD, Paris
- Development Policy Committee Finland, January 2005, *The State of Finland's Development Policy*, The Development Policy Committee's 1st Statement to the Government in 2005, Helsinki
- Development Policy Committee Finland, 2005, *The Development Policy Committee's Effectiveness Strategy for 2005-2007*, unpublished paper approved at the Development Policy Committee's plenary session on 20 September 2005
- Development Policy Committee Finland, 2006, *The State of Finland's Development Policy II*, The Development Policy Committee's Statement to the Government in 2006, Helsinki
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, August 1993, *Finland's Development Co-operation in the 1990`s. Strategic Goals and Means*, Helsinki
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, 12 September 1996, Decision-in-Principle on Finland`s Development Cooperation, Helsinki
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, 15 October 1998, *Finland's Policy on Relations with Developing Countries*, Helsinki
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, October 2001, *Continuation of the Advisory Board for Relations with Developing Countries from 4 October 2001 to 31 May 2003*, unpublished paper, Helsinki
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, 22 February 2001, Decision-in-Principle on Operationalisation of Development Policy Objectives in Finland`s International Development Cooperation, Helsinki
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, 5 February 2004, *Government Resolution on Development Policy*, Helsinki, http://global.finland.fi/english/publications/pdf/dev_policy2004.pdf
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, 10 May 2005, *Management of Globalisation & Finland*, Government Report on Globalisation to Parliament, Helsinki
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, 8 September 2005, *Finland's Trade Policy Programme*, Government Resolution, Helsinki

Annex 2: Abbreviations used in the report

3Cs	Coordination, Complementarity and Coherence
AidCO	EuropeAid Cooperation Office
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
DG Relex	Directorate General for External Relations
DPC	Finnish Development Policy Committee
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EU-HES	European Union Heads of Evaluation Services
EQ	Evaluation Question
HoD	Head of Department
JC	Judgement Criteria
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MS	Member State
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSA	Non-State Actor
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCD	Policy Coherence for Development
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
ToR	Terms of References

Annex 3: Persons met

Antila, Sinikka	Expert DPC, Head of Unit for Gemneral Development Policy & Planning, Department for Development Policy, MFA
Gustafsson, Jari	Deputy Director General, Department for External Economic Relations, MFA
Karetie, Simo	Member DPC & Senior Adviser, Trade & International Relations EK, Confederation of Finnish Industries
Kiviniemi, Mari	MP & Vice-Chair of Foreign Affairs Committee, Parliament of Finland
Kronman, Gunvor	Chairperson DPC & Director Swedish-Finnish Cultural Centre
Kulmanen, Juha	Managing Editor, Finnish Broadcasting Company & Chair of Finnish Foreign Journalists Association
Kytölä, Tapio	Member DPC & Director, MTK, Central Union of Agricultural Producers & Forest Owners
Lakaniemi, Ilkka	Deputy Member DPC & Liaison person Nokia Group
Lappalainen, Timo	Member DPC & Executive Director KEPA, Service Centre for Development Cooperation
Lappalainen, Rilli	Secretary General, Kehys ry, Finnish NGDO platform to the EU
Ohvo, Hannu	Member DPC & Executive Director SASK, Trade Union Solidarity Centre of Finland
Päivöke, Aira	Director, Unit of Evaluation & Internal Auditing, Department for Development Policy, MFA
Penttilä, Risto	Member DPA & Director, EVA, Finnish Business & Policy Forum
Puustinen, Pekka	Head of Unit for Sectoral Policy, Department for Development Policy
Rask, Eeva	Secretary General of DPC
Toivonen, Juhani	Expert DPC & Deputy Director General, Department for Development Policy, MFA
Sipiläinen, Anne	Expert DPC & Deputy Director General, Political Department, MFA
Sundman, Folke	Adviser to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Uosukainen, Jukka	Expert DPC, Deputy Director General, Ministry of the Environment
Virkunnen, Suvi	Special Adviser on PCD, Department of Development Policy, MFA & Former Secretary General of DPC

Annex 4: Country profile

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/VSLseminaariENG080306MUISTIO.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 Characteristics⁸	Actors involved:⁹
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 ¹⁰ B - Cabinet Committee and Government Secretariat for EU Affairs C - Integrated bilateral negotiations with partner countries ¹¹	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

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

¹⁰ In Finland, foreign trade policy is within Foreign Affairs Ministry so intra-ministerial coordination on trade and development is very important.

¹¹ 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.

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 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

<p>Suvi Virkkunen Adviser for PCD, MFA tel. +358-9-16055157 suvi.virkkunen@formin.fi</p>	<p>Eeva Rask Secretary General of DPC tel. +358-9-16056450 eeva.rask@formin.fi</p>	<p>Liisa Jaakonsaari / Raili Lahnalampi Chair/Counsellor Foreign Affairs Committee of the Parliament liisa.jaakonsaari@eduskunta.fi raili.lahnalampi@eduskunta.fi</p>
<p>Pekka Puustinen Head of Unit - Sectoral Policy, Dpt for Dev. Policy, MFA tel. +358-9-6410 pekka.puustinen@formin.fi</p>	<p>Gunvor Kronman Chair of DPC tel. +358-40-7451738 gunvor.kronman@hanaholm en.fi</p>	<p>Markku Keinänen Head of Unit - General EU affairs tel. +358-9-160 56546 markku.keinanen@formin.fi</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Satu Mäki Special Adviser of the Minister for External trade and Development tel. +358-9-160556306 satu.maki@formin.fi</p>	<p>Jonna Laurmaa Government Secretariat for EU Affairs jonna.laurmaa@vnk.fi</p>
	<p>Tytti Nahi Advocacy officer KEPA tel. +358-9-584233 tytti.nahi@kepa.fi</p>	