



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

**Appendix V
Case Study Report
The role of the Swedish Policy for Global
Development in the promotion of PCD in Sweden**

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
Niels Keijzer	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.....	5
5.1.2	Evidence that international thinking on PCD have influenced mechanisms.....	5
5.1.3	Major ‘agents of change’ advocated for the mechanisms, contributed to its establishment and participate in the further promotion and activities.....	5
5.1.4	Major national or international examples of policy (in)coherence for development which prompted the establishment of the mechanisms.....	6
5.1.5	Dissatisfaction with impact and effectiveness that existing coherence mechanisms have on PCD (limited effects...).....	6
5.1.6	Uniqueness of particular PCD mechanisms to a particular national context	7
5.1.7	Success in surmounting specific obstacles for setting up PCD mechanisms.....	7
5.2	Evaluation question 2: how does mechanism fit with government systems?	8
5.2.1	Mechanisms are in line with the national policy objectives (policy relevance)	8
5.2.2	Mechanisms are integrated in the national policy, implementation and practices (institutional relevance)	9
5.2.3	Key issues from national political context have been integrated in the selection and design of mechanisms (contextual relevance)	10
5.2.4	Mechanisms’ design and actions correspond to their official purpose and take into consideration main pre-conditions (internal relevance).....	11
5.2.5	Mechanisms are in line with the internationally recognised demand for PCD	11
5.2.6	Mechanisms’ remits cover main policy sectors relevant for development	12
5.3	Evaluation question 3: effectiveness & efficiency.....	12
5.3.1	The design and modus operandi of mechanisms facilitates progress towards intra-governmental PCD.....	13
5.3.2	There is clarity among most relevant actors about the identity, role, specific focus and modus operandi of the mechanisms	13
5.3.3	The mechanisms’ activities contribute towards progress on intra-governmental PCD (as per outcomes in logical intervention diagram).....	14

5.3.4	Appropriate levels of resources (human and financial capacity) are provided to ensure full and efficient use of the mechanisms	14
5.3.5	PCD mechanisms are strong enough in relation to coherence mechanisms of other policy sectors, or other pressure within broader policy process	15
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)	15
5.4	Evaluation question 4: strengths & weaknesses	16
5.4.1	Mechanisms impact positively on encouraging increasing levels of PCD	16
5.4.2	The impact of the PCD mechanisms can be traced back to or linked to a limited number of factors	17
5.4.3	Incentives/disincentives perceived or experienced by officials that help or hinder the full application of the mechanisms.....	17
5.4.4	Monitoring & evaluation system contributing to ensuring that mechanisms remain well adapted to their task.....	18
5.4.5	Importance of political back-up as a key factor, relative to others, in ensuring PCD mechanisms have impact.....	19
5.4.6	Informal mechanisms – processes also impact (negatively/positively) on PCD	20
5.5	Evaluation question 5: sustainability	20
5.5.1	PCD has become entrenched in government thinking and is becoming second nature to policy makers	20
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.....	21
5.5.3	Resources are available to keep PCD mechanisms operating as long as needed.....	21
5.5.4	Institutional status and capacity of the on-going mechanisms are clearly established.....	21
5.5.5	Mechanisms have the capacity to adapt and renew themselves in order to meet new or changing demands.....	22
5.5.6	Decreasing opposition to the PCD mechanisms and their continued existence.....	22
6	MAIN FINDINGS ON EVALUATION CRITERIA	23
6.1	Relevance	23
6.2	Effectiveness	23
6.3	Efficiency	23
6.4	Impact.....	23
6.5	Sustainability	24
7	CONCLUSIONS.....	24
7.1	Main conclusions from EQs.....	24
7.2	Main issues, trends and challenges for evaluation synthesis report	25

ANNEX 1: LIST OF PRINCIPAL OFFICIAL SOURCE DOCUMENTS 26

ANNEX 2: ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE REPORT 27

ANNEX 3: PERSONS MET 28

ANNEX 4: COUNTRY PROFILE 30

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 main reason for selecting this particular mechanism for a case study is that the Policy for Global Development (PGD) corresponds closely to the first of the three functional types of PCD mechanism identified in the Inception Note: the Explicit Policy Statement. In addition to this, the Swedish case was particularly interesting because it is the only European Member State whose approach to promoting policy coherence for development can be characterised as a holistic approach to policy change. The Policy for Global Development has frequently been referred to as one of the strongest efforts by an OECD country to promote intra-governmental policy coherence for development. It has sometimes even been described as the 'next step' in promoting policy coherence through a so-called 'whole-of-government' approach, including by Robert Picciotto in a 2004 Paper for the United Kingdom's International Development Committee:

"In terms of laying strong legislative foundations for PCD, Sweden stands out. Its development legislation makes clear that global development is the responsibility of all government ministries and agencies - not just the ministry for foreign affairs where the aid function is lodged" (Picciotto 2004: 11).

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 Department for Development Policy of the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs for their assistance in organising the study and the persons met for their flexibility and their willingness to help. In particular, they would like to thank Elenore Kanter for all her coordination efforts and logistical report.

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

As was emphasised in the first section of this report, the Swedish Government's Policy for Global Development concerns an explicit and holistic approach towards the promotion of PCD through a government-wide policy. The policy strongly advocates for more coherence for development, both as an absolute necessity for global development and as a moral obligation from Sweden towards people living in developing countries:

'The end of the cold war and increasing globalization now make shared progress a real possibility for all. For the first time there is today an internationally agreed agenda for global development, the chief expression of which is the UN Millennium Declaration. Accumulated global wealth has never been greater. Increasing numbers of people the world over live in democracies. Scientific and technological advances have provided us with tools that we could never even have dreamt of only a few decades ago. But a large proportion of the world's population is excluded from this progress. For more than a billion people, life is a struggle for survival every single day. This is morally unacceptable. It is a huge waste of human energy and creativity. Development is more solid when everyone can take part in it.

Life is better for everyone when no one is excluded. This is true in Sweden and it is true in the world as a whole' (Government of Sweden 2003: 7).

The government Bill – which was presented to Parliament on May 15 2003 and adopted in December 2003 –encompasses all areas of policy and proposes one common objective: to contribute to an **equitable and sustainable global development**. The PGD has been shaped around this overarching goal, which is to be attained through a more coherent policy and increased collaboration and co-ordination with other countries and actors. In the Bill, the goal has been formulated so that it applies to different national policy areas and activities. In the Bill, the goal is explicitly operationalised into eight so-called 'central component areas', all of which refer to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs):

- i. Respect for human rights;
- ii. Democracy and good governance;
- iii. Gender equality;
- iv. Sustainable use of natural resources and protection of the environment;
- v. Economic growth;
- vi. Social development and social security;
- vii. Conflict management and human security;
- viii. Global public goods.

(Government of Sweden 2003: 3)

Conceptually, the PGD's overarching objective is informed from two distinct albeit partially overlapping perspectives:

1. **The rights perspective:** the rights perspective is rooted in human rights and stresses democracy as the platform for development, while mostly emphasising respect for all human rights, including the rights of the child, democracy and gender equality. Coherent with relevant UN conventions, the perspective builds on the fundamental principles of universal equality and non-discrimination (Government of Sweden 2006: 4);
2. **The perspective of the poor on development:** this perspective emphasises that '*(...) the circumstances, needs, conditions and priorities of poor people must guide and inform the fight against poverty and the promotion of equitable and sustainable development.*' It does so from the realisation that poverty is a multi-dimensional phenomenon which is mainly about lack of freedom, as well as from the understanding that 'the poor' do not constitute a uniform category (Government of Sweden 2006: 5).

These two perspectives '*(...) combine to create an approach to the work of contributing to equitable and sustainable global development in every policy area*' (Government of Sweden 2006: 4).

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

A decision from government in December 1999 resulted in the appointment of a parliamentary committee which was named 'The Parliamentary committee on Swedish Global Development Policy'. The Committee, popularly referred to as 'GlobKom', was tasked with:

- 1) Strengthening and deepening commitment and understanding expressed in the at that time present overall vision of Sweden's development policy; and
- 2) Providing a basis for broad agreement in Parliament, as well as among popular movement and the public on how development policy and development cooperation should be organised in the 21st Century.

The Committee used three different means to achieving these objectives:

- Through the organisation of meetings, hearings, conferences. Approximately thirty of such events took place, excluding a number of smaller, informal meetings.
- Through journeys of Committee members to developing countries. The Committee made five journeys in order to study development issues. It also visited Geneva and Washington DC, and the Committee's secretariat additionally made three visits to EU Member States.
- And through the commissioning of background research, which among other outcomes resulted in 50 reports and an interactive website.

(GlobKom 2001: 13)

The Committee's work resulted in its final report, 'A more Equitable World without Poverty', an extensive work of 420 pages was submitted in April 2002. The Government Bill on the Policy for Global Development is based on the findings and recommendations which are contained in the Committee's report.

5.1.2 Evidence that international thinking on PCD have influenced mechanisms

The PGD, which has been described and communicated as a unique, whole-of-government approach towards promoting coherence, reflects a substantial amount of international thinking on PCD which was collected by the GlobKom. The evidence which informed the Committee's report includes a variety of papers by non-Swedish thinkers. Several important international influences are discernible in the final text of the PGD, including the conceptualisation of poverty as a multi-dimensional phenomenon, as well as the rights-based approach to development.

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

Although the GlobKom's final report was the result of extensive and inclusive multi-stakeholder consultations, the major 'agent of change' has been the Swedish government, as the government set up the Committee after recognising the need to tackle the issue of policy coherence for development in Sweden. Doing so, they created the conditions for change. Following the finalisation of the Committee's work, the government used the GlobKom's final report to negotiate and – in collaboration with their civil servants – formulate the policy.

It should be noted that although government has been the main responsible actor for the creation of the mechanism, Swedish NGOs had for a long time been active at pointing government officials at the lack of coherence between their policies. This already happened long before the word 'coherence' became used. NGOs thus played an important role in bringing coherence to, and keeping it on the government's agenda.

Although NGOs were involved in the work of the GlobKom, they were much less involved in the drafting of the PGD itself. One of the NGO representatives whom we interviewed mentioned that many NGOs were unhappy with the language that was used in the final version of the Bill, to which many changes were made by parliament during the last week before it was presented to parliament.

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

No particular moment or event was identified by the respondents on when there were public debates around strong cases of incoherence. Coherence-related topic (without explicitly referring to it as such) have however been subject to public debates which were 'sparked' by NGOs and revolved around issues of solidarity and the attention to universal human rights in Swedish policies.

It was mentioned by several respondents that support for reducing incoherencies in Swedish development policy was present in the strong public support for Swedish development cooperation. There is a clear public consensus in Sweden that development cooperation is important; high level; and should be of high quality. This commitment was evidenced by the fact that, in the end, no political party in the 2006 election proposed to lower the relative amount of ODA.

In the Swedish national press, there is not a lot of direct attention to PCD and the Government Bill, although some coherence-related issues do make it to the news every now and then (examples including weapons export and the deployment of Swedish troops in UN missions). Compared with coverage of coherence-related issues in the past, one respondent concluded that attention to it in the press has been shrinking. A report by a coalition of NGOs, which served as a 'shadow-report' to the annual reporting on the PGD to parliament by government, was well-received by the Swedish civil society, but has not received a lot of attention in the press. The common perception among the press is that, once the policy was accepted by parliament and became a government Bill, it became a more internal, technical government process. In other words, the press feels this process does not offer a lot of interesting 'stories', and it is seen by them as a *'formal thing'*.

It was noted that the potential support among the public for the PGD was likely to be higher than the current awareness. In other words, there would be sufficient interest from the public on more media attention towards the implementation of the PGD, but the press still considers PCD to be a relatively technical/technocratic issues, chooses instead to focus on some of the 'symptoms' of policy incoherence.

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

All respondents unanimously commended the Swedish government on the strong commitment to PCD which is made in the Bill. This wide commitment to the idea was also shown by parliament, which accepted the PGD by consensus vote.

However, most respondents made clear that there was much less consensus on the interpretation and operationalisation of the Bill, as well as on the amount of rigour with which it should be implemented. As noted above, there has been some degree of dissatisfaction among several stakeholders with the final version of the Bill. Some of the operational specifics of this dissatisfaction will be dealt with in later sections of this report, as well as in the following paragraphs.

5.1.6 Uniqueness of particular PCD mechanisms to a particular national context

Most of the respondents were of the opinion that the PGD was consistent with the way the Swedish Government works, and more generally consistent with the 'Swedish way of doing things'. This however did not mean that respondents were generally uncritical in their position towards this way of doing things. In particular, some respondents criticised the policy for the way in which it was implemented, which did not allow for a lot of transparency and reduced the issue of PCD into a purely technical matter which needs to be dealt by the government's bureaucracy.

NGOs also argued that the procedure for the annual reporting to parliament on the implementation of the Bill should be changed: rather than a '*massive wall of civil servants*' who sum up how they perceive to be contributing towards the implementation of the policy, it would be better if parliament would decide on the questions for the civil servants to report on.

5.1.7 Success in surmounting specific obstacles for setting up PCD mechanisms

As was noted under 5.1.5, during the drafting of the Bill there was a lack of consensus on the operational and implementation aspects of the Bill. There were three issues where parliament made specific requests. These were suggested by the Riksdag Foreign Policy Committee, debated in parliament, and subsequently accepted:

1. **Instruments:** Parliament did not concretely specify how government should implement the new policies but did request the government to clarify where the co-ordination responsibility for the PGD would be and to establish a specific function responsible for a strong co-ordination and a proactive approach. The Riksdag also asked departmental programmes to detail how the new policy should be implemented. This included the yearly progress reports from government to parliament on the implementation of the PGD, reports which would become public per request from NGOs.
2. **Debt issues:** In addition to the above, the Riksdag requested a regular report from Government on Swedish policies in the World Bank and the IMF.
3. **Arms exports:** Parliament specifically requested government to ensure that existing rules and policies on arms exports took into account the implications of the new policies on poverty, democratic governance and human rights.

(Walan and Ljungman 2004: 290)

The first amendment included the decision to establish a government unit specifically responsible for the coordination of the policy. The proposal on the establishment of this unit led to a debate within parliament and government on the location of this unit in government. The debate focused on whether this unit should be placed in the Office of the Prime-Minister, or rather in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It was noted by some respondents that a Special Secretariat on Sustainable Development had previously been located in the Prime-Minister's office, which was considered a success as they considered high-level political support to be

crucial for the successful implementation of the policy.¹ In the end, it was decided that the secretariat responsible for the coordination of the PGD should be housed in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The 2005 DAC Peer Review commented on this decision as follows:

'The MFA assembled a team in the new department but remains aware, as does the Minister for International Development Cooperation, of the difficulty of managing such a broad based effort out of a line ministry. The fact that the MFA is responsible for overall Swedish development co-operation also (incorrectly) reinforces the perspective that PGD is a matter only for development co-operation. Under these organisational circumstances, it will be a challenge to get other Swedish ministries and institutions to take their own ownership of the concepts of PGD' (DAC 2005a: 44).

This conclusion from the DAC Peer Review team was however not shared by all respondents, whom felt that this analysis would imply that government-wide policies would never succeed unless they would be coordinated from the Prime Minister's office. Later on in this report we will however identify a few examples which were given by respondents in which the placing of the PGD's focal point in the MFA led to some problems, particularly around the role and place of development cooperation in the Bill.

Overall finding for EQ 1 - summary box

The process which led to the adoption of the PGD was widely supported due to its participatory nature, and carried by strong popular opinion in support of development cooperation. Taking advantage of international thinking on PCD and development policy, the process was mostly driven by government, but was supported by a knowledge base and tradition of working that had been forged over time by different Swedish stakeholders.

The policy is generally seen as being consistent with the 'Swedish way of doing things', but whereas there is strong consensus on the 'why' of the policy and on its courageous formulation, there are significant differences in opinion on the interpretation and operationalisation of the Bill, and on how rigorous its implementation should be. The government has also been criticised for dealing with the PGD as an internal, bureaucratic matter.

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)

As the Bill is introduced in an English brochure of the Swedish Government, the Policy for Global Development was and presently still is '(...) *the first country in the world to present an integrated policy for global development.*'² Despite all the different views and experiences which were shared by the respondents concerning the (potential) success, the implementation, the reporting, and all other practical aspects of the policy, most respondents unanimously supported the policy is a relevant and commendable policy. As one respondent concluded, the policy gives the 'what', but not the 'how'.

¹ It should be noted that a year after it had been put in place, the Special Secretariat was relocated from the office of the Prime-Minister to the Ministry for Sustainable Development. During the finalisation of this report, it was decided by the new government to close down the Secretariat.

² http://www.sweden.gov.se/download/9a6ca06f.pdf?major=1&minor=20256&cn=attachmentPublDuplicator_0_attachment

A limited number of respondents, especially those who work in the field of development cooperation (both multi- and bilateral), did note that the policy – by being so elaborate, thematically explicit and comprehensive – may be incoherent with the central precepts of the 2005 Paris Declaration. In particular, the Paris Declaration includes targets on the alignment to National Development Priorities which are set in the South, as well as the paramount importance of ownership for the effectiveness of development cooperation, which can give some conflict with the clear perspectives and thematic priorities which are brought forward in the PGD.

At the time of the country visit, general elections had just taken place in Sweden. The Election Manifesto of the 'Allians för Sverige'³, which formed a majority government after winning the majority of parliament seats during last September's general elections, includes a specific commitment towards implementing the PGD:

'Sverige skall ta sitt ansvar för att främja demokrati och de mänskliga rättigheterna samt tränga undan fattigdom och epidemier som HIV/aids. Som medel bör Sverige ha en utvecklingspolitik som kombinerar ett bistånd med en samlad politik för global utveckling som inkluderar alla politikområden. Sverige ska inom EU driva på för en bättre samordning av utvecklingssamarbetet, att jordbrukspolitiken reformeras samt för ökad frihandel.'

Unofficial translation:

'Sweden shall take its responsibility in promoting democracy and human rights, as well as in driving away poverty and epidemics such as hiv/aids. To do this Sweden should have a development policy that combines development cooperation with a coherent politic for global development that includes all policy areas. In the EU Sweden shall push for a greater coherence of the development cooperation, a reform of the agricultural policy as well as an increased free trade.'

Source: The Alliance 2006: 230

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

Generally speaking, the evidence suggests that the institutional relevance of the PGD has increased in the next few years, and a large number of respondents expected the policy to become more and more embedded in the country's institutions during the years to come. To most respondents, this growing institutional relevance was most shown by the annual progress reports on the implementation of the policy. Whereas the first progress report (2004/05:4, only available in Swedish) was widely considered to be a product of the MFA's Department for Development Policy and wasn't regarded as truly representing a 'whole-of-government' report, the most recent progress report of May 2006 showed quite some progress:

³ Alliance for Sweden consists of the four centre-right (Swedish borgerlig, lit. "bourgeois") parties in the Riksdag (Sweden's parliament). The members are:

The Moderate Party led by Fredrik Reinfeldt, a liberal conservative party currently with 97 of 349 seats (26.1%) in the Riksdag.

The Centre Party led by Maud Olofsson, a centrist party currently with 29 of 349 seats (7.9%) in the Riksdag.

The Liberal People's Party led by Lars Leijonborg, a social liberal party currently with 28 of 349 seats (7.5%) in the Riksdag.

The Christian Democrats led by Göran Hägglund, a Christian democratic party currently with 24 of 349 seats (6.6%) in the Riksdag.

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alliance_for_Sweden

- During the drafting of the reports, key persons from different ministries and departments within the MFA were involved. Although the quality of the contributions differed, the involvement was still relatively high compare to earlier years;
- People also started putting more demands, and are more involved in what 'they' as government were reporting;
- It was also remarked that these processual differences between the ways in which the progress reports were formulated can also partly be explained by the fact that the Department for Development Policy initially needed to be more 'visible' in the work, in order to earn legitimacy among government actors.

Our interviews indicated differences of views on the degree of involvement of the relevant departments that work on migration. As one respondent remarked, '(...) *they like to discuss migration policies in New York, but find them too touchy to discuss here.*' Another respondent remarked that the only time that he was in contact with the Department for Development Policy, and worked on the PGD itself, was precisely when the process reports had to be drafted.

To ensure further increases in institutional relevance of the policy, some attempts have also been made to raise awareness among government actors. In particular, during the fall of 2004, 600 people attended an introductory training of half a day. However, no large training sessions have been organised since. Limited progress has also been made in ensuring that the PGD should be part of the documentation during the introduction period of newly employed civil servants. More recently, efforts have been made to the training opportunities for civil servants on the PGD.⁴ Other respondents however mentioned that these increased opportunities were still not sufficient for enabling staff to fully grasp the PGD and the importance of improving policy coherence for development in the Swedish context. Further training would thus be welcomed.

As is noted in other parts of this report, the perceived institutional relevance of the policy among the general public and non-state actors is considerably lower than among government officials. Although we only have a limited evidence base from the interviews for this, we believe this difference in perception is mostly because government information dissemination efforts have mostly focused on communicating the central objective and two analytical perceptions of the Bill to the public, while giving less information on the actual implementation of the policy.⁵

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

The Policy for Global Development was clearly considered by most respondents as being consistent with the 'Swedish way of doing things', despite the critique from Civil Society actors on the lack of transparency on the formulation, implementation and monitoring of the

⁴ Some examples of this progress:

In recent years, a PGD session has been included in all relevant in-house training both for the MFA and the Government Offices such as the trainee diplomatic training programmes, training for those going abroad; For the training of embassy staff, two specific regional workshops have been held in Hanoi and in Pretoria, which was also attended by a delegation from Stockholm with representatives from five different government ministries.

⁵ Examples of these efforts include:

The Swedish Parliament (2005) 'Sweden's New Policy for Global Development' Stockholm: Sveriges Riksdag; Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2006) 'Sweden's policy for global development' Stockholm: Edita Stockholm; Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2003) 'Shared responsibility – a brief description of Sweden's policy for global development'. Stockholm:

http://www.sweden.gov.se/download/9a6ca06f.pdf?major=1&minor=20256&cn=attachmentPublDuplicator_0_attachment

Bill. It was noted by some respondents that the implementation of the Bill by the new government – which will be composed of different parties - will result in more transparency as it will be more difficult to ‘keep things internal’. One NGO respondent did note that the bill gave a too ‘rosy’ picture on policy coordination between ministries: *‘The Bill is naïve. If two ministers clash, the Prime Minister decides. That’s how it works.’*

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

Whereas the PGD Bill was accepted by consensus in parliament – therewith accepting the official purpose of the PGD as a policy – as was noted before, reaching consensus on how to actually carry out what is mentioned in the Bill required more time and negotiations in government. As was mentioned in 5.1.7, one of the matters which was subject to debate was the ‘location’ of the coordinating secretariat for the policy within government. Once established, the unit responsible for the policy was to compete with other departments and ministries over resource- and staff-allocation. It was highlighted by several respondents that there had been an ‘employment-stop’ within the MFA, whereas other ministries got increases in both human and financial resources.

Being part and parcel of government, the policy was also subject to suspicion by those in government who worked on development cooperation. As seen by some, the Bill could be used to ‘hijack’ development cooperation, by sub-ordinating it to the overall goals for Swedish internal and external public action. In the recent DAC Peer Review, this ‘other side of coherence’ was also referred to:

‘(...) the breadth and depth of public debate on this topic in Sweden have caused some to refer to the “other side” of policy coherence – that Sweden’s development co-operation reciprocally needs to become more responsive to other Swedish national policy interests. It will prove revealing, as the actual implementation of the Policy for Global Development gains in speed, to observe the extent to which this other side of coherence becomes an active issue. Already, some segments of Swedish society, NGOs or think tanks, for example, have criticised the PGD for not directly addressing some of the more entrenched national issues’ (DAC 2005a: 40).

The internal government discussions around this ‘other side of coherence’ can be summarised under two main issues:

- What is the proper hierarchy of objectives within the Swedish government; and how do the objectives of Sweden’s Implementing Agencies relate to those of its Ministries?
- What is the difference between development policy and development cooperation, and does inclusion in the former automatically mandate involvement in the latter?

On the basis of the collected evidence, these two issues will be further detailed and described in the subsequent two evaluative questions.

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

Since the PGD has been hailed in several DAC documents as a ‘whole-of-government’ approach towards the promotion of Policy Coherence for Development, the policy is fully in line with the international demand. As was mentioned in the first section of this report, the mechanism has been referred to as the ‘next step’ in the promotion of PCD, with the country government as a whole being responsible for promoting it.

Concerning some of the critical comments which were made on the implementation of the policy, a limited number of respondents considered the international support and recognition somewhat 'overdone'. While all respondents unanimously supported the Policy for Global Development itself, they felt that other countries had advanced more on the implementation of their approaches towards policy coherence for development. One respondent mentioned:

'At the time, it was cutting edge. It was nice to be Swedish. We're now a bit ashamed that others are now further advanced, and have more political commitment. If we worked at a sustained pace, we would have been so much further. I'm disappointed by that.'

5.2.6 Mechanisms' remit covers main policy sectors relevant for development

The Policy makes it unambiguously clear that the goal of equitable and sustainable development applies to all areas of Swedish policy making. However, it has been easier for some policy areas of the Swedish government to respond to the policy than for others. As was mentioned by one of the respondents, three issues were especially crucial for the success of the policy:

1. Appropriate infrastructure with sufficient capacity;
2. Knowledge about the PCD policy itself among civil servants;
3. Political commitment from all ministers (putting in practice during the short-term what they have committed to on a more long-term level).

Concerning the second issue, in the second report on the implementation of the policy (2004/05:161) five priority areas were introduced. Of these five priorities, three were already considered as functioning. The latter two – migration and security – were specifically added to ensure that sufficient attention was given to the implementation of the policy in these areas. This illustrates the difficult balance that exists in practice between the respective roles of politicians and civil servants in the implementation of the policy, and the differences of opinion among the respondents on whether the roles of these two actors could overlap. This matter is worked out in more detail under the third and fourth evaluative questions. Some respondents suggested that the above three issues are important to take into account when trying to implement the recommendations which are presented in these two subsequent evaluative questions.

Overall finding for EQ 2 - summary box

Whereas it was generally agreed that the PGD is still politically relevant and likely to be supported by the new government and the institutional relevance has been improving, it was believed that efforts should be increased for making the policy more contextually relevant (mostly through increasing the involvement of non-state actors, and through increasing the transparency of the policy process).

Although the policy has received critical acclaim on the international level (noteworthy within the OECD), many Swedish actors are more critical on the limited progress that has been made since the Bill was adopted in 2003. Misinterpretations of the policy have occurred as a result of a lack of political leadership and support for the policy, which has led to the situation where the PGD is having some effect between certain policy areas, whereas it has not been very successful in other policy areas.

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

A number of respondents felt that the annual progress reports facilitated progress towards intra-governmental PCD through, as one of them put it, helping to 'create the policy' through the drafting process. In addition to this, the department for development policies can promote the policy through choosing to strategically involve itself in the drafting of the 'Letters of Appropriation' (LOA) which are drafted by civil servants and adopted by parliament each year.⁶ Whereas the department could potentially have a say anywhere, selectivity is required as the department has a good but finite capacity to involve itself in a small portion of the 233 letters which are adopted every year. These two examples of the work of the Department for Development Policy also clearly show the mixed roles which it plays: on the one hand a 'neutral broker' which tries to achieve evidence-based decision making in government in the context of the PGD, and on the other hand a 'change agent' which intervenes in certain policy processes to ensure follow-up on the PGD. These two roles are further commented on in the next evaluative question.

It should perhaps be emphasised here that, as was previously mentioned under 5.2.4, the 'modus operandi' of the mechanism has been subject to debate by different political and institutional actors in Sweden. The immediate outcomes of the debate in parliament around the formulation of the bill, as well as the emerging consensus during its implementation, have resulted in a situation where the 'secretariat' for the policy does not have sufficient resources to follow-up on all matters and aspects of the policy. This is especially so in cases where there is a need for more inclusive (and thus time-consuming) multi-stakeholder consultations. For example, there has not yet been sufficient follow-up on the PGD's explicit requirement that *'society as a whole must be involved'* (Gov. Bill 2002/03:122 page 55). After a lot of time was spent on working out an appropriate modality for the 'Citizen Forum' on the PGD, at the time of the consultants' visit to Stockholm it was expected that the first forum would be held sometime during the last two months of 2006.⁷

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

Due to the relative low knowledge about and commitment to the PGD among civil servants, it has been a rather difficult task to ensure sufficient clarity about the contents, implications and practical dimensions of the PGD within government. One staff member of the Department for Development Policy recalled that during the first year of implementation, civil servants would remark *'give us some money and we will do development cooperation too'*, or *'we do not have any development projects at the moment'*. The PGD was sometimes misinterpreted within some parts of the Swedish government as being an ODA policy, and the role and place of development cooperation within the policy has proven problematic. The following box summarises the way in which the department responded to some of this confusion:

⁶ As is mentioned on page 21 of the 2005 DAC Peer Review:

'Although it was voted upon by the Parliament, PGD is not a "law". In the Swedish system such a policy is used as guidelines which help direct Swedish government authorities in subsequent implementation. These guidelines are then repeated in other steering documents, particularly the "Letters of Appropriation" to government ministries (e.g. the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and agencies (e.g. Sida). There are no formal sanctions automatically linked to these guidelines.'

⁷ At the time of the finalisation of this report, the government had not yet decided on how to deal with the PGD Citizen Forum.

Understanding the difference between development cooperation and development policy in Sweden

'Recently, the departments of Development co-operation and Development Policy have been split up. It is important to make a clear distinction. Because the budget for Co-operation was increasing, PCD was seen as a reason for Trade, Security, etc. to claim a chunk of the development budget! Now, in order to avoid being associated and confused with actual development co-operation, the Coherence unit is housed under the umbrella of the development policy department.'

(Evert Vermeer Stichting (2006) 'Report Expert Meeting on Best practice in Coherence Instruments' Summary of a presentation by Georg Andren. Brussels: Evert Vermeer Stichting)

Some respondents also highlighted the sometimes difficult relationship between Sida (implementing agency for Sweden's bilateral development cooperation) and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (responsible for overall development policy including development cooperation and multilateral development cooperation). One MFA official attempted to explain it through making clear that Sida is responsible for 'implementation policy', whereas the MFA is responsible for 'policy policy', but this only served to highlight the relative ambiguity, which we will describe later on in more detail.

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

Some of the respondents – in particular the NGO representatives – emphasised the problematic 'floating baseline' of the PGD. In the original Bill, there were no clear indicators or 'targets' formulated on how coherent Swedish government policies should become with the overriding objective of equitable and sustainable development, and in addition there was no time-frame provided. The annual progress reports, in turn, did provide sufficient 'activity-based' reporting, but also left it up to the different government policy areas to (in consultation with others) agree on what they considered appropriate ways to respond to the policy. Therefore, the reports in general do not contain sufficient data on what the government is NOT doing to implement the PGD, precisely because the reporters were not provided with clear terms of reference which clearly state on what they should actually report.

However, notwithstanding this critique and the opportunity which it represents for making the implementation process more explicit and measurable, the majority of respondents were of the opinion that there is a positive trend in which PCD is increasingly brought to the agenda of different policy areas.

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

The Department for Development Policy has been successful in advocating for an increase in staff members which would allow the department to deliver more effectively on its mandate. The department currently has staff members which specialise on certain aspects (policy areas or perspectives in the Bill), such as the rights-based perspective, and the area of trade and development. In addition to this, the decision to locate the Expert Group on Development Issues (EGDI) within the department has ensured for (1) a better connection between research and the practice of the PGD; and (2) the production of information which can increase the knowledge among the department's staff which in turn, when appropriate, can lead to increases in performance of the department.

However, being a 'whole-of-government' mechanism, the effectiveness of the promotion of intra-governmental PCD in the context of Sweden can only to some extent be attributed to the performance of the Department for Development Policy which has been tasked with the coordination of the policy. Other departments, ministries, as well as implementing agencies do not have staff time allocated to work on PGD matters. Since there are many other matters and areas which have been 'mainstreamed' in the Swedish system for policy making, it is likely that some civil servants will consider the PGD as another 'add-on' to their workload. However, the department has been successful in facilitating policy coordination between different ministries, and in some cases in ensuring more development-friendly policies.

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

In the absence of reliable and verifiable data on the interaction between different policy processes, it is difficult to make an informed judgement on this aspect. This is not to say that there were no perceptions on the strength of the policy vis-à-vis other policy processes. For example, some respondents mentioned that in reality, the domestic Swedish interests always come first. As will be discussed in more detail in 5.4.1, practice has actually shown that the PGD has had to struggle with pressures which were internal to the policy itself, and stem from multiple interpretations of the policy and a lack of communication about which interpretation is politically endorsed.

Most of the external pressures come from the aforementioned discussions on the supposed hierarchy of the PGD's central objective in relation to other overarching goals. One example that was given by a respondent was the emphasis on sustainable and equitable development: whereas Sida focuses on poverty reduction as the central goal of its work, it could be argued that poverty reduction, for example through increasing production of and access to electricity and mechanised transport, can actually contribute to a situation of equitable, but completely unsustainable development.

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)

Whereas the explicit policy statement is of course provided fully by the PGD, the administrative and institutional mechanism is provided by the Department for Development Policy's coordinating function. To some extent, this function is supported by the information which is generated by EGDI through the commissioning of research. The strengths and weaknesses of these respective functions will be discussed in the next evaluative questions. It should be clear that there is currently an absence of an assessment function in the Swedish approach to the promotion of PCD since, as argued above, the annual progress reports do not fulfil this role satisfactorily but rather work in function of the institutional/administrative aspects.

Overall finding for EQ 3 - summary box

The 'modus operandi' of the mechanism has been subject to debate by different political and institutional actors in Sweden, although the drafting process of the annual report is believed to help 'create the policy' by promoting ownership and sharing of information between different policy areas. There are also different views on the 'baseline' of the policy (what should the implementation lead to in which period of time), as well as some differences of opinion on the interpretation of the policy, for example on the role of development cooperation in the document.

The absence of a systematic and indicator-based assessment mechanism has reduced the effectiveness of the implementation of the Bill, and has obscured judgement on how

successful the implementation of the policy has been. However, the evidence from the interviews and secondary data analysis does suggest that the policy has been effective in promoting intra-governmental coherence for development of Swedish government policies, and has potential for increasing this effectiveness.

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?

5.4.1 Mechanisms impact positively on encouraging increasing levels of PCD

The adoption of the PGD – besides communicating the commitment of the parliament to increase PCD – also led to a variety of interpretations, some of which can be qualified as the 'other side of coherence'. However, as one of the staff members of the Department for Development Policy explained, it is consistent with the central logic of the policy that every sectoral policy department is also invited to participate in formulating and defining what constitutes 'good' development policy.⁸

One concrete example which illustrates the impact of the policy on the level of PCD was the decision of the Swedish parliament to allocate one billion Swedish Kroner increase on ODA, earmarked specifically for environment. In the 2006 Letter of Appropriation, it was pointed out that this budget needed to be used in such a way that it makes use of the Swedish resource base, and leads to the development of Sweden and the developing countries.

However, partly in response to the 2000 DAC Peer Review – in which Sida was criticised for not having a clear poverty focus – the parliament did decide that all ODA should contribute to poverty reduction by introducing a specific goal for development cooperation in the PGD, being '(...) *to contribute to an environment supportive of poor peoples own efforts to improve their quality of life*' (Government of Sweden 2003: 58; on the basis of Sida's document 'Perspectives on Poverty'). Therefore, the LoA made an operationally challenging decision by which several goals needed to be achieved through one means of financing. According to Sida, it was clear that the goals that were described in the LoA had to be consistent with Sida's overarching goal and therefore could not all be achieved in order to ensure this consistency. The then minister for development cooperation was also clear that the PGD did not mean that there would be more development money for Swedish private companies. The LoA had however created opposite expectations, and some ministries like industry did not want the money to be administered by Sida. To resolve the differences, a committee was put in place with the responsibility of guiding the Director General of Sida on how to implement this allocated money. Especially the first meeting of this committee, but also informal contacts around this matter have been described as 'heated' and relatively sensitive.

Before the Committee was put in place, the decision by Sida was discussed at the level of the state secretaries. It was remarked that the Prime Minister chose not to involve himself in this, which made the conflict more difficult to settle as the different parties were not all bound by the political decision which was made by the minister of development cooperation.

This example clearly describes some of the changes which occurred in the Swedish development policy (not cooperation) system after the adoption of the policy. Other examples

⁸ It is the Minister for Development Cooperation who in the end has the final word on the interpretation of what good development policy really is. One respondent commented that the PGD has evidently opened up the possibility to challenge this.

show some similarities. On the issue of migration, one of the respondents remarked: *'We do not speak each other's languages. Some still think we are after their money.'* It was mentioned that some public servants found it difficult to identify the linkages between the different policy areas, and particularly noted a lack of research, analysis and information. In the absence of this information, one respondent concluded that the PGD – which was seen as being able to create substantial leverage – both represents a strength and a weakness:

- PCD is a mantra: you can always use it, but this also makes it weak;
- If you do not have a structure or network around this issue, it will not mean anything;

While reflecting on the above matters, most if not all of the respondents were of the opinion that the factor which most limits the successful implementation of the policy was the lack of top-level political support.

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

In addition to the points which were made in the previous paragraph – or rather in the absence of these enabling conditions – a number of factors and institutional capabilities have still enabled the PGD, as well as the department responsible for coordinating it, to positively impact on the promotion of PCD:

1. The annual progress reports have been informative, and the improving quality and informative nature of these reports reflect the improvement of the writing process which can mostly be attributed to the facilitating work of the department. This process was seen to contribute to increasing levels of ownership of the PGD among different policy areas, as well as to the creation of a 'knowledge base' on this matter;
2. The departments determination to keep the dialogue going on the establishment of the civil forum on the PGD – although this was difficult to match with the stakeholders' different views, expectations and interests – has to be commended;
3. All respondents which we spoke with were aware of the Department for Development Policy, and the work which they were doing. This suggests that the unit is well networked and well-placed to coordinate the policy;
4. Finally, the current work of the department to develop a clear work plan on the PGD has to be commended as well, and may prove to be very instrumental in the implementation of the policy providing it receives adequate political support from the new government.

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

The importance of sufficient political commitment to 'enforce' the policy was highlighted by several respondents, including the Department for Development Policy itself. As was clearly highlighted by some, the actual decision making is done by the politicians. The role of the civil servants – including the Department for Development Policy – is to provide the basis for evidence-based decisions making. Or, as one of the respondents from the Department for Development Policy noted:

'Our job is finished when all aspects are highlighted. (...) We should not point to them that they should take the PCD option rather than the Trade preference: that is political!'

However, in the relative absence of political commitment, the department has chosen to strategically involve itself in a limited number of policy processes. As one of the staff members of the department put it, besides coordinating the policy, the department is also mandated with driving the implementation of the policy. One of his colleagues however was of the opinion that it is not the role of a public servant to propagate a policy, and that the role of a public servant should remain limited to helping to set up infrastructure, and sharing information. This discussion on whether the department is to propagate or merely coordinate the policy does suggest that there is a need for the department to be clear on its own 'agenda' on how it envisions the successful implementation of the policy.

As a 'side-effect' of the lack of political commitment, it was mentioned that the lack of follow-up and systematic monitoring and evaluation which resulted out of the discussion on the Bill in parliament may have issued a signal to some that there was not a strong need for vigorous implementation of the policy (especially in comparison with policies which applied to one or a few policy areas, which are often more directive and concrete). As one NGO representative remarked: *'if it would have a systematic follow-up mechanism, it would work better'*. Other respondents seconded this perceived need for more institutionalisation, concretisation and operationalisation of the policy.

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

With the exception of the annual progress reports and some ad-hoc studies which are commissioned by different ministries⁹, there is currently no monitoring and evaluation system for the policy for global development. This reflects the 2003 Bill, in which no monitoring and evaluation system for the PGD was proposed, although this was proposed in the GlobKom report:

'Since the Committee proposes a broadening of the policy area, the evaluation operation should also have this breadth. (...) The Committee believes that the evaluation function and analytical work relating to global development issues in Sweden in general should be enhanced. How the work should be organised is not something the Committee feels needs to be specified in detail, but it emphasises the need for independent inspection and parliamentary control' (GlobKom 2001: 324).

In the consultations leading the PGD Bill, it was decided to put in place an independent agency for monitoring and evaluation, but restrict its role to the evaluation of development cooperation only. This independent evaluation function, which became the Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV), was introduced on page 81 of the English translation of the Bill. The formulation is to a large extent similar to the one in the GlobKom report:

'(...) in order to increase the credibility of evaluation activities, evaluations should be performed by an independent body. Steps will be taken to ensure that an independent structure for evaluation of development cooperation is available.'

Many people considered the GlobKom project as a 'development cooperation project', and therefore did not pay attention to the outcomes of this project so much as compared to the contents of the Government Bill which was informed by it. However, one respondent remarked that the SADEV's mandate could be interpreted in a way that would allow the agency to also evaluate some of the PGD related issues. This interpretation could be facilitated in the annual LoA, if the concrete directives would support this interpretation. Insiders to the negotiations leading the PGD bill suggested that the new government could

⁹ Examples of these studies that we are aware of are studies which are commissioned by EGDI, and the MFA departments for trade and development, and migration and development.

likely support this wider interpretation of the agency's mandate, because it originally preferred it that way.

It was mentioned that a more systematic monitoring and evaluation function of the PGD would have a positive effect on the implementation of the policy. Whereas monitoring would allow for a more 'sustained pace' in implementing the policy (through systematically collecting data and reporting on a set of mutually agreed indicators which could both coordinate public servants and inform follow-up decisions by the relevant decision makers), evaluation (which many respondents agreed would be useful to do five years after adopting the Bill) would be useful to build on the evidence that has been collected through the monitoring function. Both the process and outcome of the evaluation would help to revitalise the policy, and help it to adjust and adapt to new (inter)national realities within the different areas of policy.

It was also suggested by one of the NGOs representatives that the annual progress reports on the PGD could be made more useful and interesting if the procedure for writing them would be 'turned around', by having the parliament decide on what aspects government should report. Some respondents suggested that the effectiveness of the reports could further improved if they would (1) be treated in more detail and with more vigour by the Committee for Foreign Policy; and (2) by publishing the reports in a period of the year when more parliamentarians are likely to pay attention to it.

DAC views on evaluating PCD in Sweden

In a recent publication from the DAC, different DAC member's approaches to evaluate their efforts towards PCD were compared. In order to accompany our own findings on this matter in the context of the PGD, we reproduce the following document analysis that was included in the publication:

'The 2004 law on Global Development states that the "policy for global development must be guided on the basis of effective management by results and monitoring and evaluation" and that "evaluation and continual analysis of all our measures will be essential in the work of creating policy coherence". The law also makes "the Government (...) responsible for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the policy" and to "report to Parliament on a regular basis on the measures being implemented to achieve the goal of equitable and sustainable development". The Swedish government still has to set up a monitoring and evaluation system for evaluating the implementation and the impact of the new law. The accent currently lies on the monitoring process and controlling the destination of inputs. The recent decision by the Swedish Parliament to create an autonomous evaluation function does not include evaluation of the new law, and current plans portray the new evaluation unit as complementary to the existing ones and focusing on development assistance, rather than coherence issues' (OECD 2005b: 144).

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

Please refer to 5.4.3, as the lack of political back-up was considered as a major disincentive for the successful implementation of the policy by the majority of the respondents. An increase of political backup for the implementation of the Bill, as well as more political support to the work of the Department for Development Policy in the MFA were, would also allow for a clearer delineation and separation of roles and responsibilities between the political and administrative level. Most respondents also felt that an increase in political support to the department would further increase its legitimacy and enable it to better deliver on its mandate and coordinating role.

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

The informal (and more formal) networks which are facilitated and partly maintained by the staff members of the Department for Development Policy constitute an important factor in the way the PGD works and indeed is expected to work.¹⁰ Other respondents were more critical of the impact of this networking, by mentioning that in some ministries they do not use the PGD unless they are explicitly asked to do so. Furthermore, whereas some people stressed the importance of informal networking, other respondents saw this as contributing to the general lack of transparency of the PGD process, which limited its success.

Overall finding for EQ 4 - summary box

The evidence suggests that some conflicts which are internal to the policy itself have been successfully settled. The Department for Development Policy is well-known in different policy areas, and is considered to be a legitimate facilitator of inter-departmental and inter-ministerial dialogue in the context of the PGD.

However, a certain lack of political support for the Department for Development Policy has led to different views within the department on whether it should play an information-sharing or more advocacy-oriented role in coordinating the policy.

The lack of clear implementation provisions in the policy may have been seen by some parts of Swedish government as implying there was no need to pursue vigorous implementation. Most respondents felt that the pace of implementation would have been higher and clearer in its direction if there had been a monitoring and evaluation system in place. If it is decided to stimulate the effectiveness of the implementation of the policy, there are some possibilities to use existing Swedish structures to evaluate the implementation of the PGD. However, most respondents felt there was more need for a systematic monitoring mechanism, whereas the evaluation of the implementation of the policy and the policy itself could be dealt with at a later stage.

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

The idea of the PGD is well-known to most government officials, whereby those who directly work on development cooperation matters in the MFA and SIDA have a more in-depth knowledge of the policy. Although insufficient evidence was collected to construct a fully informed judgement, most respondents perceived a considerable lower 'entrenchment' among 'non-aid' sectors, but most of them also mentioned that this situation was improving positively. Others emphasised that the policy would require fundamental changes in how the different parts of government interact and interrelate, which requires a change in 'mindset' that can only come into structural effect after longer periods of time (twenty to thirty years was suggested). What is important to stress is that among public servants, and as evidenced in the election manifesto of the now-ruling parties, there is sufficient interest in continuing to

¹⁰ The need to facilitate this network also represents a challenge, as in some cases the department is challenged to facilitate dialogue between two other departments which are officially not in contact with each other.

support and consolidate the policy so that the ownership of the policy can become more and more spread over government officials through the implementation process. In other words, although many respondents were quite critical about the lack of effectiveness of the policy, they would not believe that the implementation of the policy would stop any time soon.

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

All parties in Sweden formally support the idea and concept of the PGD, but there are differences of opinion on how vigorously it should be implemented, and to a more limited extent there are differences on how it should be interpreted. It was suggested that the former Swedish prime minister has not provided strong formal leadership by making clear how the policy should be understood and implemented, and it was expected that the new prime minister would at least have to be clearer in his position on the PGD. The main reason for people to have this expectation is the fact that the ruling coalition of parties will be more transparent in its decision making and discussion of differences, requiring the prime minister to act more strongly on this.

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

No respondents were aware of any immediate plans to terminate the existence of the Department for Development Policy, or to alter its core mandate. Since the Bill, the department has been able to strengthen its human resource capacity, but due to a block on hiring in the whole MFA not all envisaged positions in the department can be filled. One respondent mentioned that the *'(...) structures have been a bit unbalanced'*, and that other ministries and implementing agencies could put more resources on the PGD. The PGD related research that was commissioned by the department for export promotion and by the department for migration and asylum policy shows that these departments took their own initiatives on implementing the PGD. At SIDA, it was also mentioned that they decided to take their own steps on preparing for the implementation of the PGD, after the Department for Development Policy was not able to provide the support they had hoped for. This example suggests that there is some lack of clarity on how much support other departments can expect from the Department for Development Policy. Increased clarity is particularly important given the fact that the Department operates with limited financial and human resources and thus has to prioritise where it focuses most of its efforts.

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

Most of the respondents expected that the institutional status, visibility and use of the PGD would grow over time as there were clear signs of changes in how some policies now started to take account on its central goal. However, several suggestions were made on how the effectiveness and possible impact of the policy could be further improved upon and could improve the legitimacy and sustainability of the policy (although, as mentioned above, the latter is unanimously assumed).

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

The adaptation of the implementation and operationalisation of the PGD has been most clearly demonstrated through the 'splitting-up' of the departments of Development co-operation and Development Policy into two separate departments. Many respondents indicated there was a need for more clear, high-level guidance on the interpretation of the policy in order to facilitate implementation, in particular through better clarifying the distinction between development policy and development cooperation in the implementation of the Bill. A limited number of stakeholders – all of which working in the development cooperation field – mentioned that the Paris Declaration would have some implications for the PGD, mostly on the matter of how 'prescriptive' the Bill could be on Sweden's development cooperation, and the possible conflicts with alignment and ownership. The Bill mentioned nothing concrete on the European Level which would allow it to be positioned to the 2005 European Consensus on Development.

5.5.6 Decreasing opposition to the PCD mechanisms and their continued existence

While there is no formal opposition to the PGD among either public servants or politicians – in other words, coherence of policies towards development is seen as desirable by all – there are differences in views on operational, interpretative and implementation matters. These result out of the positioning of the different ministries' and implementation agencies' mandates vis-à-vis the PGD's central goal and two perspectives. This positioning and communication on interpretations of the policy can to an extent be facilitated and streamlined by adequate and clear political leadership, but a certain amount of difference is likely to be maintained as it represents necessary room to manoeuvre.¹¹

As has been noted earlier, there is a need to improve knowledge of the policy among non-state actors and the general public, as well as increase the involvement of these two groups (resp. directly and indirectly). Both the new 'mixed' government (via more visibility in the media) and the MFA's plans to start the civil forum are expected to increase the two groups' involvement and may further strengthen the sustainability of the policy.

Overall finding for EQ 5 - summary box

No respondents were aware of any immediate plans to terminate the existence of the Department for Development Policy, or to alter its core mandate, and many respondents expected the PGD to gain in relevance in time. As it would require a change in 'mindset' and relationships between policy areas, some respondents expected that this transition would require between two and three decades to take full effect. There is a need to increase the resources for the Department for Development Policy so that it can better play its coordinating role, in particular by commissioning research and communicating information on the interrelationships between different policy areas. There are also indications that the Department for Development Policy could use more of its resources for supporting the different departments in the ministries and implementing agencies in clarifying their role(s) in implementing the Policy for Global Development.

¹¹ The term 'room to manoeuvre' has been used in the context of actor-oriented development sociology, in particular in the work of Norman Long. For a brief explanation, please refer to: http://www.apo-tokyo.org/00e-books/AG-07_RuraLife/05Long.RuraLife.pdf

6 Main findings on evaluation criteria

6.1 Relevance

The PGD, both due to the high-level approach towards the promotion of PCD which it represents, and to the participatory nature of the process through which it was formulated, has received high critical acclaim in both national and international area (in particular at the level of the OECD). Taking advantage of international thinking on PCD and development policy, the process was mostly driven by government, but was also supported by a knowledge base and tradition of working that had been forged over time by different Swedish stakeholders, as well as by widespread popular support for development cooperation.

The policy is considered consistent with the 'Swedish way of doing things', but whereas there is strong consensus on the 'why' of the policy and on its courageous formulation, there are significant differences in opinion on the interpretation and operationalisation of the Bill, and on how rigorous its implementation should be. The government has also been criticised for dealing with the PGD as an internal, bureaucratic matter.

6.2 Effectiveness

The PGD and the Department for Development Policy have been considered as relatively and increasingly effective, but are hampered in this effectiveness by the lack of clear, mutually agreed operational objectives of the policies, a lack of (human) resources, low levels of political support, and the absence of a systematic mechanism for monitoring and evaluation.

6.3 Efficiency

The Department for Development Policy has been effective in strategically intervening in a selective number of carefully-chosen and opportune policy processes, and is progressively able to reduce its importance in the annual reporting process. The general implementation of the policy could however have been more efficient if the differences in interpretation were avoided by clear top-level communications to facilitate this interpretation. However, it was also noted that some degree of flexibility in interpretation is needed for allowing sufficient room to manoeuvre for the different policy areas.¹²

6.4 Impact

The policy has had an impact on bringing development issues into a wide range of policy deliberations, which increasingly shows scope for more development friendly policies. Specific policy sectors in which the PGD was recognised and where some changes were made to policies as a result were mentioned by different respondents, although it was also mentioned that in many cases domestic interests are still given precedence.

¹² It has been suggested that full policy coherence for development can only be achieved under dictatorial conditions.

6.5 Sustainability

The PGD is widely considered as a legitimate and long-term endeavour, which will likely to increase in sustainability over time. There are no indications for the abolishment of either the policy or its coordinating secretariat. A systematic monitoring and evaluation function (in particular monitoring) was suggested as a way to increase the policy's legitimacy and sustainability. Following the results of the recent elections, the formation of a new government will be a good test to see how the 'baton' is passed on from one government to another.

7 Conclusions

7.1 Main conclusions from EQs

The main conclusion emerging from the data gathered from the interviews is that whereas the PGD is both nationally and internationally regarded as an extremely innovative and prestigious effort towards PGD, the lack of clear operationalisation and political leadership has hampered its effectiveness and has led to differences in interpretations in different areas of government, without undermining this overall success. These differences in interpretation have negatively affected the productivity of dialogue between different policy areas.

However, in some areas promising results are emerging, and efforts are being made to achieve full inclusion by working specifically on difficult areas such as migration and security. It is likely that the discussions on the 'other side' of coherence will likely continue unless the new government takes some clear high-level positions on the PGD. The view that every policy area has the right to agree on what is 'good' development policy merits consideration on the political level, in order to avoid lengthy consultations and internal struggles. As an example of such an internal struggle, the case of the government's decision to provide SEK 1 billion through the Official Development Assistance budget to Environment was described under the fourth evaluation question in this report.

As per the problems which were observed around the 'floating baseline' and lack of agreed operational targets and indicators, most respondents felt that the pace of implementation would have been higher and clearer in its direction if there had been a monitoring and evaluation system in place. If it is decided to stimulate the effectiveness of the implementation of the policy, there are some possibilities to use existing Swedish structures to evaluate the implementation of the PGD. However, most respondents felt there was more need for a systematic monitoring mechanism, whereas evaluation of the implementation of the policy and the policy itself could be dealt with at a later stage.

The evaluation team for this country mission agrees with the main conclusions which emerged from the evidence which is presented in this report. They were very impressed by the inclusive and thorough nature of the research that was managed by the GlobKom, and by the way in which the outcomes of this researched provided a strong basis for the promotion of PCD in Sweden. The team gained the impression that the implementation of the Policy for Global Development, despite in general being an effective approach towards promoting PCD, could have been more effective if the implementation were to receive more political support, and would become supported and strengthened by a systematic and independent monitoring and evaluation mechanism. This mechanism should cover both the overall implementation of the policy and the role of the Department for Development Policy in the coordination of the policy process.

Finally, the evaluation team feels that there is still a lot of room for improvement in more effectively communicating the difference between global development policy and development cooperation policy; underlining that action in the latter area does not permit inaction in the former; and communicating the government's position that all other policy areas are to contribute equally towards global development. Although Sweden is the first country with a shared policy for global development, it still has some way to go to become the first country to turn this policy into a shared and concerted effort for global development.

7.2 Main issues, trends and challenges for evaluation synthesis report

Besides the issues which are addressed above, which also apply to the promotion of PCD in other contexts, the evidence which was collected during the interview also suggests that it may not in all contexts be advisable to adopt whole-of-government approaches to the promotion of the PGD. Compared with other contexts in which the responsibility for the promotion of PCD is more concentrated, whole-of-government approaches require more substantive amounts of political commitment as a prerequisite for successful implementation. The evidence collected in Sweden suggests that in the absence of this commitment, the question of how to promote PCD and where to arrive there is reduced to the outcomes of inter-ministerial and inter-departmental dialogue. Under these conditions, it may be challenging to relate these 'bilateral' agreements to a less operational agreement on the national level. This can only be done by an independent assessment function which is equipped with a strong mandate, sufficient resources, clear baseline and indicators which have been agreed by all involved parties.

Annex 1: List of principal official source documents

- Allians för Sverige (2006) 'Fler i arbete – mer att dela på Valmanifest 2006'. Sweden: http://www.maktskifte06.se/fileadmin/Upload/pdf/Valmanifest_2006.pdf
- GlobKom (Kommittén om Sveriges politik för global utveckling) (2002) 'A more Equitable World without Poverty. Report by the Parliamentary Committee on Sweden's Policy for Global Development'. Swedish Government Official Reports SOU 2001: 96
- 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>
- Government Communication 2004/05:161 - Sweden's Global Development Policy
- Government Communication 2005/06:204 - Sweden's policy for global development
- OECD/DAC (2005a) 'Peer Review Sweden' OECD/DAC
- OECD/DAC (2005b) Policy Coherence for Development: Promoting good Practice. Paris: OECD
- OECD/DAC (2000) 'Peer Review Sweden' OECD/DAC
- Picciotto, R. (2004) 'Policy Coherence for Development – A Background Note.' Prepared for the International Development Committee of October 12, 2004. Global Policy Project
- Regeringens skrivelse 2004/05:4 – Sveriges polititk för global utveckling
- Walan, M. and Ljungman, A. (2004) 'Sweden aims for coherent approach' in: Reality of Aid (2004) *The Reality of Aid 2004: Focus on Governance and Human Rights*: <http://www.realityofaid.org/>

Annex 2: Abbreviations used in the report

3Cs	Coordination, Complementarity and Coherence
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EU-HES	European Union Heads of Evaluation Services
EQ	Evaluation Question
JC	Judgement Criteria
LoA	Letter of Appropriation
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
PGD	Policy for Global Development
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SADEV	Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
ToR	Terms of References

Annex 3: Persons met

September 19

09.00 – 10.00

Georg Andrén, Director, Department for Development Policy, Head of Unit for Policy Coherence, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Elenore Kanter, Desk Officer, Department for Development Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

10.00-11.00

Joint meeting w staff members from the Department for Development Policy

Eva Tobison, *Ulrika Funered*, *Prudence Woodford-Berger*,

11.15 – 12.15

Per Bäckman, deputy director, Department for Exportpromotion, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mats Borgenvall, senior advisor, Departement for Development Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

12.15 – 13.45

Wilhelm von Warnstedt, Head of unit trade and development, Director, Department for Trade and Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

14.00 – 16.00

Magnus Walan, Diakonia

Maud Johansson, Forum Syd

Maria Schulz, SNF (The Swedish Society for Nature Conservation)

Karin Lexén, Svenska Kyrkan (Church of Sweden)

16.00 – 17.00

Eva Börje Åkerman, Director, Department for Migration and Asylum policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

September 20

09.00-10.00

Johan Myrsten, journalist, Svenska Dagbladet

10.30 – 11.30

Per Thege, Director, Ministry for Sustainable Development, head international secretariat

Anna Yasgan, Ministry for Sustainable Development, international secretariat

12.00-13.30

Torgny Holmgren, Deputy Director General, Department for Development Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Georg Andrén, Director, Department for Development Policy, Head of Unit for Policy Coherence, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

14.00 – 15.00

Ulrika Lång, country programme coordinator (former special adviser to the Director general on Policy for global development) , Asia Department, Sida

15.00 – 15.45

Eva Lithman, Head of the Secretariat of Evaluation and Internal Audit, Sida

15.45 – 16.15

Jan Bjerninger, Head of Natural Resources and the Environment Department, Sida

September 21

8.45 – 9.45

Mats Hårsmar, Head Secretary, EGDI, Department for Development Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

11.30 – 12.00

Anders Danielson, Director General, Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation

Annex 4: Country profile

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 ¹³	Actors involved: ¹⁴
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

¹³ For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 (‘Type of Mechanism’ and ‘Particular Characteristics’), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.

¹⁴ Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

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