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

Appendix VII
Case Study Report
The Role of the Programme of Action 2015 in the promotion of PCD in Germany

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

René Madrid   Particip GmbH

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:
Merzhauser Strasse 183,
D 79100 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

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 identifyied by the Study in the Inception

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

The prime reason for selecting this particular mechanism for a case study is that the profile of the German Programme of Action 2015 encompasses the three functional types of PCD mechanism identified in the Inception Note (see paragraph above). This programme also has a very clear coherence mandate and even covered various types of coherence. The specific insitutional set up of this programme is also a reason having led to its selection.

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 (see annex 1). 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. On the basis of draft reports two rounds of comments were accomplished and the comments scrutinized by the consultant. In addition one one-day-meeting, in order to discuss the preliminary findings, was held in Paris.

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

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

The team of consultants would like to thank the evaluation service of the BMZ[1] as well as the referat 310[2] for their assistance in organising the study and the persons met for their flexibility and their willingness to help.

3 Country profiles

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

The analysis in these profiles, which was based on official public documents, was subsequently verified and where possible enriched through a targeted consultation with key officials in EU Member States. As is mentioned on page 11 of the evaluation's Terms of References, the profiles concern the main objective of the desk study for this evaluation and provide a *'(…) deeper insight of the existing PCD mechanisms, by building on the scoping study. An elaboration of the analytical and comprehensive overview will allow for a better international comprehension and comparison. This phase will also lead to the final selection of the mechanisms for the case studies.'*

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

4 Description of mechanism

The Programme for Action 2015 or "AP 2015" translates the German government's strategy towards its millennium commitments. As such, it is a broad policy document defining ten priority areas for action on poverty reduction[3].

Within each area of action, priority actions have been defined.

Priority Areas within the AP 2015 are as follows
- Boosting the Economy and Enhancing the Active Participation of the Poor
- Realising the Right to Food and Implementing Agrarian Reform
- Creating Fair Trade Opportunities for the Developing Countries
- Reducing Debt - Financing Development
- Guaranteeing Basic Social Services - Strengthening Social Protection
- Ensuring Access to Vital Resources - Fostering an Intact Environment
- Realising Human Rights - Respecting Core Labour Standards
- Fostering Gender Equality
- Ensuring the Participation of the Poor - Strengthening Good Governance
- Resolving Conflict Peacefully - Fostering Human Security and Disarmament

The AP 2015 is therefore closely linked to the overall strategy and work of the BMZ. It is not a separate programme being implemented within the BMZ activities but encompasses almost all activities of BMZ, putting poverty reduction as the overarching objective of development

---

[1] The BMZ evaluation division was/is responsible for the management of the entire evaluation (preparatory studies, inception report, overall management and donor coordination etc.).
[2] The time table and the appointments for this specific case study were organized by the BMZ Division 310.
[3] Poverty Reduction: a global responsibility. Programme of Action 2015. The German Government's contribution towards halving Extreme Poverty Worldwide; BMZ Materialien N°. 108; 2001; Bonn.

cooperation. A specific unit has been set up within the BMZ in charge of organizing and mainstreaming the AP 2015.

The AP 2015 focuses on the role of PCD as an essential contribution of the industrialised countries to the new global partnership for development, but does not limit itself to a discussion of development policy from that point of view.

The AP 2015 addresses PCD at three levels:

- <u>The international and multilateral level:</u> the German Government is striving for greater coherence between the various international arrangements and institutions so as to achieve well-defined global governance and to ensure that developing countries have a role as equal partners.

- <u>The level of the partner countries:</u> The German Government supports its' partner countries in implementing indispensable reforms and structural changes, which are their responsibility. It supports the efforts of low-income and middle-income countries in drawing up and implementing national, participatory Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and will use these as guidance for its bilateral co-operation programmes.

- <u>Germany itself, Europe and other industrialised countries:</u> The German Government advocates coherence between all policy fields with regard to the objective of poverty reduction and will work towards that goal at the European level, within the framework of the OECD and elsewhere. Legislative proposals of other ministries are to be examined in terms of their compliance with development policy; this includes their relevance for poverty reduction. In parallel with reforms at the international level and in partner countries, the German Government also advocates changes in structures and attitudes in Germany, with the objective of economic and ecological sustainability.

This report focuses on the third type of the above-mentioned coherence. Analysing coherence at country or multilateral level is not part of this study.

It is worth mentioning that:
- this study will only look at a part of the AP 2015, neglecting the role of AP 2015 could have on promoting coherence at other levels (country or multilateral level for example), and that
- the AP 2015 is one mechanism promoting policy coherence for development but that beside it, there are also other mechanisms contributing to PCD.

This study will only focus on the role of the AP 2015 in promoting PCD in Germany.

5 Main findings on evaluative 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 The effect the national debate on coherence has had on the establishment of PCD mechanisms

The national debate in Germany on PCD gained momentum in the early 1990s, in the wake of several incoherencies that were widely discussed among the German development

community (see Chapter 5.1.4). This public debate prompted a first official acknowledgement of the importance of PCD in the Government's 10th Report on its Development Policy, published in 1995.

Consequently, the newly elected SPD/Green Coalition undertook a series of measures to enhance its capacity for PCD:

- BMZ became a member of the National Security Council in 1998. There it participated in the revision of the government's political guidelines for the export of war arms and other armaments, which in 2000 were complemented by development considerations.

- In 1998, BMZ's area of responsibilities was expanded by a series of competencies particularly relevant to development policy, for which other ministries had been responsible until then (e.g. EU development policy and several programs of technical cooperation with Eastern European States).

- In 2000, the Joint Rules of Procedures of the Federal Ministries (GGO) were amended in order to give BMZ an expanded right to scrutinise other department's draft legislation for compliance with development policy (as reported in Chapter 5.2.3, below).

This practical commitment to PCD was formalised in April 2001 as a whole of government obligation in the Program of Action 2015 and documented in the government's 11th Development Policy Report[4], published later on that same year[5].

The 11th Report of the Federal Government's Development Policy[6] stresses poverty reduction as an overarching task for German development and mentions 4 dimensions:
- social justice: poverty-reducing framework conditions and social balance;
- economic efficiency: poverty-oriented growth and economic cooperation;
- political stability: peace, human rights, democracy and equal rights;
- ecological balance: preservation of natural resources as the basis for life

and 3 areas of actions:
- reform of international structures through the shaping of the global environment and international rules;
- improvement of structures in partner countries through development cooperation on the spot;
- improvement of domestic structures through information and coherence work.

The latest Report of the Federal Government's Development Policy also pays specific attention to the coherence issue[7].

5.1.2 Evidence that international thinking on PCD has influenced mechanisms

World conferences in the 1990's (Rio, Vienna, Copenhagen) have all disseminated the principles of sustainable development and the particular focus to be placed on poverty reduction.

---

[4] BMZ-Materialien N0 111; 11th report on German development policy; 2001; Bonn.
[5] As AP2015, the 11th Report of the Federal Government's Development Policy stresses poverty reduction as an overarching task for German development and mentions 4 dimensions (social justice: poverty-reducing framework conditions and social balance; economic efficiency: poverty-oriented growth and economic cooperation; political stability: peace, human rights, democracy and equal rights; ecological balance: preservation of natural resources as the basis for life) and 3 areas of actions (reform of international structures through the shaping of the global environment and international rules; improvement of structures in partner countries through development cooperation on the spot; improvement of domestic structures through information and coherence work).
[6] BMZ-Materialien N0 111; 11th report on German development policy; 2001; Bonn.
[7] BMZ-Materialien N0 131; 12th report on German development policy; 2005; Bonn.

Coherence has been an important issue within the OECD Council and the DAC conferences since the 1990's. The preparation work for these conferences has led to regular discussions on coherence issues between the Ministries. Policy coherence is presented as a major responsibility for the donor countries[8] and has been directly linked to poverty reduction[9]. A first intensive comparative analysis on lessons and approaches to promoting policy coherence was carried out by OECD in 1996[10].

The success of the development policy has been clearly linked to a coherent interaction with other policies such as foreign policy, external economic and trade policy, financial and environmental policy as well as agricultural policy[11].

German Government's involvement in the preparation of the DAC Poverty Reduction Guidelines - whose chapter 4 is dedicated entirely to PCD - overlapped with the millennium process, which led to the formulation of the Program of Action 2015, and so certainly had an effect on the content of that Program.

A decision on the AP 2015 was taken on the way back from the United Nations Millennium Summit held in New York in September 2000.
According to the Millennium Declaration, development policy is part of a global governance policy aimed at safeguarding the global future and embracing; Peace, Security and Disarmament (Chap. II); Development and Poverty Eradication (Chap. III), Protecting Our Common Environment (Chap. IV) and Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance (Chap V), as well as Protecting the Vulnerable; Meeting the Special Needs of Africa; and Strengthening the United Nations.[12]
AP 2015 refers explicitly to the Millennium agenda and focuses on poverty reduction.[13]

The peer review in 2005 stressed the international influence on German commitment to coherence. "In part, due to further encouragement from the EU and international bodies such as the DAC, policy coherence for development is becoming a top BMZ priority and now figures prominently in the BMZ management guidelines for 2005."[14]
Most of the interviewees have also stressed the positive role international discussion has had on increasing awareness in Germany concerning coherence issues.

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

Germany's Red-Green Coalition agreement was the main factor contributing to the launching of the AP 2015. This document reflected a political consensus and created a fertile background for the chancellor's decision to commission the draft of an Action Program and give it support in his cabinet. It also gave the BMZ a predominant role in its implementation.

The public debate raised by certain inconsistencies in German policy has certainly played an important role in increasing awareness of politicians concerning coherence issues. Civil society organisations active in international development issues have accompanied this process prior to the election, by launching public awareness campaigns and since the implementation of the AP 2015 (but to a lower extent), by supporting PCD activities.

---

[8] OECD 1996: Shaping the 21st Century – The contribution of Development Cooperation, Paris.
[9] OECD 2001: The DAC guidelines – Poverty reduction, Paris
[10] OECD 1996: Building policy coherence. Tools and tensions, Public Management Occasional papers N°12, Paris
[11] BMZ: Entwicklungspolitische Konzeption des BMZ; BMZ Aktuell N° 72; 1996; Bonn.
[12] United Nations Millennium Declaration; Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, A/RES/55/2 2000; New York.
[13] MDGs have been mentioned in the MD and were further developed in the 'Road map towards the implementation of the UN MD'; Sept 2001; New York.
[14] DCA Peer review Germany, 2005

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

Main incoherencies that have been mentioned cover agricultural subsidies and a distortion of world agricultural markets, price support and export subsidy policies, fishery agreements, arms exports, import restrictions, and their consequences on developing countries, trade liberalisation (sugar, cotton) and the eclipse of development cooperation by foreign policy.

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

See Section 5.1.4 and 5.1.1.

5.1.6 The uniqueness that particular PCD mechanisms have had on a particular national context

Germany is one of the few countries which has a specific Ministry responsible for development issues (BMZ) besides the Ministry of External Affairs (AA).
While the coalition agreement of 1998 explicitly mentions the objective of ensuring policy coherence for development by giving additional responsibilities or participatory rights to the BMZ, at the same time, it states the existence of a "current fragmentation of development tasks of the previous Federal Government among different Departments".
The backing of the instrument by a decision from Cabinet was unique at that time.

Overall finding for EQ 1 - summary box

The political change at the Head of the Federal State is the starting point of this mechanism. Political parties (SPD and the Greens) are the main agents of change. The Red-Green Coalition agreement has anchored the PCD mechanism in further political agenda, with the objective of mainstreaming development in German policies. Civil society organisations have also played a role in creating political pressure towards an enhanced government commitment.

At the international level, the preparation and discussion on the MDG's for the Millennium Summit gave the final impulse for launching the AP 2015. Germany's objective was to be one of the first countries to engage in a concrete step toward the achievement of the Millennium agenda.

Germany has a specific Ministry responsible for development (BMZ), besides the Ministry responsible for Foreign Affairs (AA).
Having poverty reduction as a core objective and being responsible for development, the mechanism is well-suited to the work of the BMZ. The cabinet decision gives the AP 2015 a global mandate towards coherence, which engages all Ministries.

5.2 Evaluation question 2: how does the 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 The mechanism is in-line with national policy objectives (policy relevance)

The mechanism is in-line with BMZ objectives, i.e. the focus on poverty reduction.
The Cabinet decision on AP 2015 put the achievement of better policy coherence for development at the heart of national policies.
The importance of coherence has been confirmed in national strategies[15].

Conflict potential with other policies with different objectives remained important as each Ministry has its own way of perceiving coherence (based on its own objectives that lead to a sectoral or thematic priorisation of issues that have to be used as reference for coherence work).

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

Development policy is subject to Cabinet discipline and like other Ministries, to serving German interests (Art. 64 and 56 of the Constitution).
The overall responsibility for matters relating to EU development cooperation lies with the BMZ. Decisions covering more domains than the BMZ already has, have to be coordinated with other Ministries.

In 2000, the Joint Rules of Procedures of the Federal Ministries (GGO) was amended. The BMZ has an extended right to scrutinise other department's draft legislation for compliance with development policy, being involved at an early stage in the inter-departmental coordination procedure and has a pro-active right if policy development interests are affected.

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

Three main aspects of the German Constitution have to be considered:
- Department principle: each Federal Minister conducts the affairs of his own department independently and on his own responsibility
- Chancellor Principle: each Federal Minister acts within the limit of the guidelines of policy laid down by the Federal Chancellor
- Cabinet principle: each Federal Minister acts as a member of the Federal Government

The joint rules of procedure of the Federal Ministries also stipulate; "in matters affecting the remits of more than one Ministry, those Ministries will work together to ensure that the Federal Government speaks and acts consistently"[16]

---

[15] German Federal Government, 2002 (Cabinet): Nationale Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie "Perspektiven für Deutschland". Unsere Strategie für eine nachhaltige Entwicklung. And the consecutive two progress reports: German Federal Government, 2004 (Cabinet): Fortschrittsbericht 2004 „Perspektiven für Deutschland". German Federal Government, 2005 (Cabinet): „Wegweiser Nachhaltigkeit". Bilanz und Perspektiven.
[16] BMI: Gemeinsame Geschäftsordnung der Bundesministerien; 2000; Berlin.

The consensus / conflict regulation process between Ministries is also of importance. It functions at various levels: if no agreement can be found in a day-to-day discussion, the issues will be discussed at 'Referat' (unit) level. If no agreement can be found, the issue will be discussed at 'Unterabteilung' (departmental) level, then at 'Abteilungsleiter' (General Director) level, then 'Staatsekretär' (Under-secretary of State) level and finally in the Cabinet.

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

Almost all departments of BMZ are involved in the implementation of the AP 2015 as it is closely linked to the core activities of the Ministry.

The institutional framework set up to accompany the AP 2015 ("mainstreaming unit") has evolved in 3 phases:[17]
- 2001-2002: working group by the Secretary of State (launching of Dialogue Forum 2015; first intermediary report on AP 2015 implementation; draft structure on coherence; first coherence talks);
- 2003-2005: 'Department 300' responsible for AP 2015 and 'core issues' within the direction (second intermediary report on AP 2015 implementation; coherence talks; implementation matrix; study on coherence; coherence agenda);
- Since 2005: 'Department 310' as leading Department for sector departments and for 'core issues' within the direction (merging of Departments 300 and 310; confirmation of the political orientation contained in the AP2015 by new coalition agreement; DAC Peer Review 2005; collaboration with EU and OECD networks; mainstreaming of coherence as a core objective by BMZ.

AP 2015 is a very broad action programme with 10 main themes (see Chapter 4.). It stresses the importance of the mainstreaming unit, "coordinating" the work of the various departments in the implementation of the AP 2015.

The changes in the institutional framework have led to a certain discontinuity in the mainstreaming work, especially with regard to the operational translation of the programme as well as to a lack of capitalisation over the years (loss of institutional memory).
The Programme of Action lacks an implementation plan (at least at the very beginning) and was probably understaffed, given the broad panel of actions to be supported. This understaffing refers to the coordinating work, not to the implementation of activities planed in AP 2015 that have been further carried out by most of BMZ staff.

5.2.5 The mechanism is in-line with the internationally recognised demand for PCD

The mechanism refers to the MDG's and the Millennium Declaration. It is fully in-line with the internationally recognised demand for PCD.

5.2.6 Mechanisms' remits cover main policy sectors relevant to development

AP 2015 covers many sectors, all relevant for development.

---

[17] The institutional framework referred to was set up to accompany the AP2015s implementation, giving incentives in the beginning, monitoring and documenting later on and taking care of specific instruments, such as the dialogue forum, all the way along. It was not set up to implement the programs' wide range of activities. That was up to the respective BMZ-departments, in charge of country and sectoral policies.

Overall findings for EQ 2 - summary box

The Cabinet decision sets coherence for development as a governmental task for all Ministries.

The focus placed on poverty reduction was in-line with the international agenda at the beginning of the year 2000.

The broad coverage of sectors as well as the various levels of coherence to be achieved ensured the internal logic of the mechanism.

The positioning of AP 2015 in a BMZ department, stresses the focus on development and on poverty reduction. AP 2015 is being implemented by the whole BMZ. A specific department is ensuring its coordination – monitoring.

The coordination procedures as well as development impact assessment (compliance check of draft legislation with development policy) ensure (at least theoretically) the promotion of coherence for development and the implementation of the mechanism.

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 the mechanism facilitate progress toward intra-governmental PCD

As mentioned in Section 5.2.5, the institutionalisation of AP 2015 has evolved over time and is now anchored in Department 310 with a mandate to work on 'core issues' (Grundsatzfragen).

The operation plan mentioned in the AP2015 launching document has not been produced.
The main reason is that the plan was too broad so that it was difficult to reach a practical agreement in all issues covered by the programme. When implementing the AP2015 it also turned out that the formulation of an operation plan was unrealistic as the German development cooperation can not unilaterally define concrete activities at partner country level, taking into consideration the principles of ownership and alignment.
Instead of that, two interim reports on progress have been drafted and it has been decided to work out a coherence agenda.

The broad coverage of the mechanism allows the BMZ to discuss many issues with the respective Ministries. It was, at the same time, the mechanism's weakness, which hampered the implementation of AP 2015[18].

The first structuring step was to identify areas of potential coherence and to select departments to collaborate with. An agenda has then been developed by the departments

---

[18] Aiming at covering a broad panel of issues, including conflicting issues, the resources have been diluted among many issues, so that results may have been lower than when resources are concentrated to solve a limited number of issues. This argument may be of specific importance for political decision processes when negotiation (and consensus–building) is a daily challenge. The operation plan should have clarified priorities and focussed the negotiation as well as the resources on the most important issues for BMZ.

involved. The main issues covered include agriculture, trade, financial support, crisis prevention and pro-poor growth.

Based on this selection, coherence talks have been organised by BMZ at General Director level (Abteilungsleiter). Since the inception of the AP2015 in 2001, 17 such talks were held, involving the following Federal Ministries:
- Foreign Affairs (AA),
- Finance (BMF),
- Economics and Technology (BMWi),
- Food, Agriculture and consumer Protection (BMELV),
- Health (BMG),
- Transport, Building and Urban Development (BMVBS),
- Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU),
- Education and Research (BMBF).

Preparation of the Action Plan on Civil Crisis Prevention, launched in 2004 as a consequence of previous commitments documented in the AP2015, involved intense cross government negotiations, in which AA, the Federal Ministry of Defence (BMVg) and BMZ were heavily engaged.

A further step was made in 2004, based on first experience and on a study by Guido Ashoff (see chapter 5.4.3). An implementation matrix of the coherence agenda presenting a series of actions to be undertaken to affirm and improve BMZ-instruments related to PCD was developed:

Table 1: coherence matrix

Goal	Timetable
Goal 1: Government-wide country assistance strategies, particularly in relation to 'anchor' countries (Division 220).	Spring 2005
Goal 2: Coherence talks with DGs of other Ministries to improve mutual understanding and to discuss strategic issues (DGs, directors and division heads, Division 300).	Continuous
Goal 3: Topic-based inter-Ministerial working groups – with the aim of producing common position papers or 'coherence' dossiers (Division 300, sector and institution divisions).	First dossier in first half 2005
Goal 4: Further defining the AP 2015 through use of a structured and time-bound 'Management and Priority-setting Matrix' (Division 300). Autumn 2004,	continuous updating
Goal 5: Revise and issue internal decree to include coherence aspects and requirements in BMZ sector papers (Division 310).	End of 2004
Goal 6: Include coherence aspects/requirements in BMZ country papers (Division 220)	August 2004
Goal 7: Coherence-based use of sector projects and topic teams (Division 310).	2004, thereafter continuously
Goal 8: Make greater use of research and evaluation for coherence (Division 210, 120).	Continuous, starting 2004, initial results end 2005
Goal 9: Concentration of competencies for coherence issues within BMZ (Division 100, 300).	September 2004
Goal 10: Promoting inter-Ministerial specialist competencies and a culture of co-operation (Division 100).	Continuous
Goal 11: Raising greater awareness in Parliament on questions of development policy coherence (Division 03, Minister, State Secretary, institution and sector divisions).	Continuous
Goal 12: Coherence-based co-operation with NGO's (Division 110).	Continuous
Goal 13: Participation in topic-based coherence networks,	From September 2004

especially the European Community PCD network (Division 300, sector and institutional divisions).	onward
Goal 14: Public relations; planning publications (Division 02).	Continuous

Source: DAC peer review 2005

This coherence matrix has been developed in order to focus on a series of issues so as to improve the implementation of the AP 2015. This matrix represents "an initial framework for greater operational clarity in this broad area, but its current goals are set at different levels (activities, outputs or organisational change), lack a sense of priorities among actions and their inter-linkages have yet to be highlighted. It should now be possible to move this action agenda from process considerations to more specific priority issues of policy coherence. This process requires extensive consultation and involvement of key partners, including Parliament, the Chancellery, other Ministries and targeted, influential elements of civil society[19]".

By the end of 2004 another document has been produced: A priority implementation matrix for AP 2015 presenting the situation at this time, the actions that should be taken and the department responsible or involved in the implementation of these actions[20].

The documents produced by End of 2004, are still the ones that are monitored now. It means that there was a lack of actualisation work that could be explained by the changes in the institutional set up of the AP 2015 (take over by department 310 in 2005) as well as a loss in the institutional memory concerning this programme (changes of the responsible in charge of the programme).

The AP2015 stresses the importance of public support for PCD and the central role of alliances and awareness-building. Two instruments it proposes in this context were implemented by the unit in charge of mainstreaming the Program:
- a "Dialogue Forum 2015", composed of high level representatives of the private sector and civil society, the media, Federal Parliament and the Federal states and municipalities and
- a public awareness campaign.

The Dialogue Forum 2015 convened a total of five times. The meetings were held with a thematic focus, and aimed at initiating and reinforcing joint activities of the participants. Themes covered were Trade, Water, Energy, Hunger and Food Security (including the role of gene technology) and Corporate Social Responsibility. Prominent external guests[21] were invited to introduce the themes. One of the more remarkable follow-up activities was an exchange between BMZ and the managing directors of the 30 major German corporations on fair trade, which preceded an increased use of fair trade articles and accompanying development education measures in several corporations. Another was the decision to assume the patronage of the UN Millennium Campaign in Germany, which led to substantive support of the campaign by BMZ, while at the same time maintaining its nature as a non-governmental initiative.

On the whole, however, the assessment of the results achieved by the Dialogue Forum is mainly very critical[22]. The forum is seen to have been an ad-hoc forum for VIP's rather than a real 'platform' for discussion. Criticism has been formulated concerning the low

---

[19] Peer review Germany, 2005. Please note that according to one interviewee the priority implementation matrix had also been presented to the peer review (but it hasn't been published outside BMZ). But the peer review didn't mention this document. In this case, the conclusion of the peer review should be assessed under this new light.
[20] The version obtained by the consultant is a working version with hand notes. It cannot therefore be put as an annex to the report.
[21] Eveline Herfkens, Executive Coordinator of the United Nations Millennium Campaign; Mark Malloch Brown, UNDP Administrator; Jermyn Brooks, Board Member of Transparency International and Alfred Tacke, Secretary of State in the German Federal Ministry of Economics
[22] This view is shared by a large majority of interviewees.

representation of the members as well as the too high degree of formalism which hampers real discussion.

The public awareness campaign centered on three mutually reinforcing instruments:
• a website,
• a poster competition
• an information campaign on fair trade

A website (www.aktionsprogramm2015.de) was launched in 2003 and rapidly arrived at an average of about 5.000 unique visitors per month, with peaks of over 10.000. A quarterly online publication called "Magazin 2015" was among the most frequented pages on the site.

A poster competition focused on poverty reduction was realized among design and graphics students in 2004. The 30 best posters were chosen by a prominent jury, and were then intensely used in public relations. They were posted on highly frequented websites like Spiegel Online and MTV, were discussed on well-known blog-sites and were requested for exhibitions in 200 schools Germany-wide. A private sponsor printed 500.000 postcards with 10 selected subjects and distributed them for free in 80 universities all over Germany, where they were estimated to have reached about 1.5 million contacts. Video Clips with the prize winners were broadcasted by major television channels (ARD, 3Sat, RBB) and reached an estimated audience of about 720.000.

Finally, between 2003 and 2006 BMZ supported a massive civil society information campaign on fair trade, titled "fair feels good". The campaign was sponsored by more than 70 well-known movie, television, radio and sports stars and was well covered by a wide array of mass media. Events such as an annual "Fair Week" on more than 1.000 locations in Germany and attracted about 50 million visitors.

After considering mainstreaming of the AP2015 to have been successful, it was felt that campaigning should no longer be done in separate from the mainstream public relations efforts of BMZ, into which promotional activities related to the AP2015 were integrated in 2006.

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

There are a large variety of actors involved depending on the issue to be discussed.

Various perceptions of AP 2015 co-exist:
• AP 2015 is seen as covering all BMZ themes (what is daily work and what is linked to AP 2015 is difficult to assess and AP 2015 is already mainstreamed in daily work)
• AP 2015 is seen as an old AP which is no more in line with the actual situation[23]
• AP 2015 is not very well known by actors outside the BMZ and the 'Spiegelreferat' (reflective unit) (department in other Ministries dealing with BMZ)
• The AP 2015 is an "expression of wishes" (Absichtserklärung) without implementing instruments. [24]

There is a need of clarity on 'new or emerging' issues about the role of the various Ministries involved, which leads to conflicts between Ministries. This is referring to the role of the ministries in a general way but also on issues covered by the AP 2015 such as for example on the linkages between development and security or migration.

---

[23] This may also be the reason for having launched another AP on civil crisis prevention, a subject which is more in-line with current political events since the 11th of September, 2001.
[24] This formulation has been used by several interviewees.

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

The mechanism has contributed to more coherence in specific issues:

- In 2001, the inter-departmental Committee on export guarantees (Hermes Committee with BMWA, BMF, AA and BMZ) adopted the guidelines on the consideration of ecological, social and development aspects in the allocation of government export credit insurance.

- Campaign on cotton: BMZ has played a pro-active role in strengthening African alliances, which have in return backed the BMZ position at national level. In this case BMZ has given less attention to the search for a compromise among Ministries. It gave the possibility to react quickly but has put BMZ in a difficult position with other Ministries.

- Successful campaign against protectionism on sugar: The strategy of the BMZ has clearly been to build on alliances at the national (with the Chancellor Cabinet and the Ministry of Finance as well as with some active civil society actors who have put pressure on political bodies) and international levels (other countries with similar views).

- The transparency initiative, for which an alliance between BMZ and some civil society actors was made, in order to disseminate information on who is profiting from agricultural subsidies.

- The campaign on fair trade was a successful collaboration between BMZ, BMELV and AA.

- Since the year 2002 there is collaboration between BMZ, AA, BMVg and BMI in Afghanistan. German reconstruction efforts are based on the Afghanistan Compact. The long-term comprehensive commitment includes development efforts and political/civilian stabilisation measures and the ability to quickly take countermeasures in the event of critical developments[25]. The cooperation of the AA, BMZ, BMI and BMVg in Afghanistan has shown that close cooperation leads to measurable results[26].

- A collaboration between BMZ and BMVg takes place in Afghanistan with some pilot projects. The BMVg will finance a series of activities reinforcing the development impact of military activities (training of government staff, local purchase of commodities, etc.).

Some interviewees argue that most of the time, the priority issues that have been selected are 'neutral' ones (cotton, sugar, fisheries) and that other issues with 'internal' consequences should be selected to really test the capacity of applying coherence to sensitive issues.

Most interviewees also mention that although AP 2015 is a Cabinet decision, awareness about coherence in development is low and ensuring that other Ministries consider coherence issues is a daily struggle, with two main consequences: given the limited resources and the "low status"[27] of BMZ, one has to focus on a limited number of coherence issues and most of the time compromises have to be made.

---

[25] We can also refer to the - German Federal Government, May 2004 (Cabinet): "Aktionsplan Zivile Krisenprävention, Konfliktlösung und Friedenskonsolidierung" a*nd the consecutive progress report, Mai 2006 (Cabinet) and* German Federal Government, October 2006 (Cabinet) as well as to the „Weißbuch 2006 zur Sicherheitspolitik Deutschlands und zur Zukunft der Bundeswehr".

[26] Conclusion from an interviewee. The consultant is not in the position to confirm this statement as it was not part of the ToRs.

[27] The formulation "low status of BMZ" has been used by several interviewees. It should be used with care. The fact that a separate ministry is in charge of development cooperation is an evidence of the high political ranking of

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

The following assessment refers not to the overall resources of BMZ as the AP2015 is implemented by the whole of BMZ[28] but to the resources of its coordinating department (actually Division 310 and its special responsibilities with regard to monitoring and reporting and assisting in the management of the coherence agenda).

In addition to its PCD-related attributions, Division 310 is in charge of mainstreaming poverty reduction and the AP2015 in BMZ, has a special thematic responsibility for Social Security and Development and deals with cross cutting issues regarding all of BMZ's sectoral divisions. In addition, it supervises BMZ's contribution to the United Nations' Millennium Campaign in Germany.

6 BMZ staff members take care of this broad portfolio (1 Head of Department; 4 desk officers; 1 administrative support). In this, they are assisted by three projects, managed by GTZ:
- One on mainstreaming poverty reduction, staffed by 5 GTZ employees,
- One as general support to the implementation of AP2015, including policy coherence, with 3 GTZ employees dedicated to those issues. This project also coordinates the UN-Millennium Campaign in Germany, and counts on 4 staff members for this purpose;
- One on Social Security and Development, staffed by 2 GTZ employees

Next to the Head of Department, one of the BMZ staff members accompanies the coherence agenda, in which both are assisted by 2 GTZ employees of the AP2015 project.
Given the broad scope of attributions related to the coherence agenda, the level of resources available to accompany it may not be sufficient.

In addition, many interviewees have stressed the limited specific budget dedicated to the implementation of the AP 2015. This conclusion refers to the budget allocated to the pilot activities during the initial phase of the AP 2015, not on the implementation of the bulk of the programme's activities, which are financed under the general BMZ budget[29].

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

PCD has to be endorsed by all actors. Many interviewees have stressed that sometimes the BMZ may not be in an adequate position to push for certain issues if other Ministries are not on the same line.

The balance of power between Ministries also depends on the political head of the Ministries. The advantage for the BMZ is that there has been continuity in the Minister in charge of Development for the past 8 years.

Some interviewees have mentioned that the new coalition may have weakened the position of development in German policy (giving more priority to economic or internal interests).

---

development cooperation in Germany. On the other side, other German interests more obvious in a short term perspective, such as direct economic interests, often prevail to the detriment of development objectives.
[28] Many persons in the BMZ (and other departments) work on coherence, but don't have it in their job title (e.g. Division 210 Security and Crisis prevention, 303 European Union, 305 Globalisation and Trade, 312 Environment and sustainable resources, 314 Rural Development).
[29] During the inception phase, a limited amount was earmarked for pilot activities deemed suitable to exemplify the programs' political approach. This funding ceased in 2003, "on the grounds that after successful mainstreaming of the programs' strategic orientation, further implementation was being funded by the general BMZ-budget" (quoted from interviewee).

Most of them have stressed that BMZ is always the 'demandeur' of coherence, and that other Ministries are only "reacting" to BMZ requirements and are not pro-active on coherence issues, concluding that there were a lack of awareness on PCD by other ministries.

On the other side, some interviewees from other ministries have stressed that they also have their own coherence and that sometimes they are advocating for more coherence for development than the BMZ does[30]. In that case, other ministries are also in the role of "demandeur" for more PCD.

5.3.6 Degree to which the combination of three different types of mechanisms occurs and how they support each other (policy statements, administrative and institutional mechanisms and lastly knowledge and assessment mechanisms)

AP 2015 includes various types of mechanisms:
- Policy statement: Cabinet decision on AP 2015
- Administrative and institutional mechanism (specific department dealing with AP 2015; 'Spiegelreferat' (reflective unit in other Ministries)
- Knowledge and assessment mechanisms (exchange programme between ministries; internet portal, capacity building, Dialogue Forum)

But many interviewees have stressed the following issues:
- Frustration about the low consciousness of other departments on coherence for development
- Lack of practical translation of policy statements
- Lack of practical integration of civil society actors

Overall findings for EQ 3 - summary box

AP 2015 may have been more difficult to implement than expected. It led to the impossibility of drafting the plan of operation. Instead of that coherence talks have been organised (quite soon) and several documents or tools (coherence matrix and priority implementation matrix) have been produced (only by End-2004).

The effectiveness of AP 2015 has been promoted by:
- Cabinet rank of development policy
- Strategic and technical competence of BMZ
- Pro-active coherence work of the BMZ
- Important coordination mechanisms at desk officer level
- Good analytical work
- Implementation of AP 2015 by the whole BMZ

Following problems are hampering the effectiveness of AP 2015
- Limited weight of development policy compared to other policies
- Unclear understanding of the role of development policy in other Ministries
- High importance of formal responsibilities in work on coherence for development (competency problems concerning new issues)
- Limited inter-departmental networking.
- Limited awareness on coherence issues by other Ministries
- Insufficient information work

---

[30] This refers to the BMELV which advocates for increased importance of agriculture issue in development policy within the achievement of MDGs goal, especially the goal on reducing hunger and poverty. "Agriculture may have lost its importance in the BMZ priority list".

> Given the low level of resources and the results achieved, efficiency can be positively assessed.

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 The mechanism has positively impacted on encouraging increased levels of PCD

The AP 2015 is seen as an important tool for enhancing policy coherence. It gives all BMZ staff the "right to interfere in other policies" and "ask the respective departments for more development compliance of sectoral policies". "It gives us a legitimisation". "We are the guardians of PCD".[31]

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

The impact of AP 2015 is difficult to trace because of its broadness.

Some interviewees argued that coherence was discussed before the creation of the AP 2015 and that it is therefore not linked to AP 2015.

Some impacts on strategies can be mentioned:

- The Federal Government's Sustainability Strategy for Germany in 2002[32]. This strategy defines poverty reduction and the promotion of development as part of Germany's global responsibility.

- The Federal Government's Action Plan for Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building in 2004[33]. This action plan sees the AP 2015 as a pioneer and has drawn on lessons learnt from the AP 2015 (importance of Cabinet decision, interdepartmental discussion, Dialogue Forum)[34].

The exchange programme of staff between BMZ and AA, BMZ and BMVg, AA and BMVg is also a direct consequence of the AP 2015. It is seen as a major step towards mutual understanding. "Coherence will not be achieved through mechanisms but through people, awareness and trust-building processes". Enormous progress has been made since the launching of the exchange programme. It has helped to integrate the perception of all Ministries involved and to find practical modalities for promoting coherence.
In this context, the AP 2015 has led to an updating of training programmes by the Federal Academy for Security Policy (high level staff) as well as by the "Führungsakademie", for mid-level staff, integrating development issues into the programme.

---

[31] These formulations have been used by several interviewees.
[32] Perspectives for Germany: Our strategy for sustainable development; 2002. BMZ
[33] Action Plan "Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict resolution and Post Conflict Peace-Building" 12 May 2004; Auswärtiges Amt.
[34] It may be important to notice that the Ministry for External Affairs (AA) is lead, the BMZ and BMVg being the other members. It may then have more "political" power than the AP 2015.

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

The Coalition agreement in 2002 and 2005 did not mention the transfer of further responsibilities to the BMZ. There are still domains where a "grey area" exists.

The main problem mentioned by many persons is linked to responsibility ("Zuständigkeit") problems between Ministries. Depending on the interviewee, conflict situations are mainly between:

- BMZ and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (AA). The issue of who is lead on a subject seems to be important, even if all Ministers should come to a consensus.
- In linking development, peace and security, clarification of roles may be needed between (BMZ, AA, BMI and BMVg), especially between BMZ and AA.

Disincentives also concern the following issues:
- Development issues still have to be developed in the LRRD process.[35]
- Joint funding of activities seems not to be possible, thus reducing ownership and efficiency of the activities.
- BMZ is seen as the last element in the "decision chain", so that its influence remains limited[36].
- Low awareness and involvement in coherence for development by other ministries.

Another problem is that "political" issues are hampering coherence work, so that focus should be placed on the development of coherence mechanisms at a "lower" level, rather than on coherence talks at a higher level. A focus should be placed on working together around specific themes or at a geographical level (country or project level)[37].

Many interviewees were not aware of the coherence talks, and some of them who were aware, spoke rather of "separating talks" (Trennungsgespräche)[38]. Coherence talks could be organised at a lower level, but some argue that this is not realistic as competency problems cannot be solved at this level.
Many actors see the need for practical guidelines and systematic tools that would systematise cooperation at a practical level and define the specific responsibilities of the various departments involved.

Main incentives are as follows:

- The main incentive towards implementation of the coherence agenda lies in the objective agreement mechanism quoted under the second bullet point in item 5.5.1 below. This mechanism ensures that political priorities – among which PCD figures – are translated into concrete goals and objectives at all operative levels of the ministry.

- The exchange of staff between Ministries. It is considered a key issue by the persons who have experienced it and contributed to the improvement of a mutual understanding (often leading to the assessment that there is not only one coherence but many coherencies depending on the perception of each Ministry, or to the conclusion that it makes no sense to speak of coherence for development, because coherence should be seen as a global entity).

- The development compliance check of other Department's draft legislation ensures that BMZ is at least informed on current and planned policies.

---

[35] Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development. The German pendant is the EON-development oriented relief. Concerning this issue, the perceptions of the actors were different, some arguing that such strategy is well developed, others concluding the contrary.
[36] This formulation has been used by several interviewees.
[37] This type of coherence is not being analysed in this study.
[38] This formulation has been used by only two interviewees.

5.4.4 Monitoring & evaluation systems contribute to ensuring that mechanisms remain well-adapted to their tasks

Monitoring and evaluation have been pro-actively promoted within AP 2015. Two interim reports have been drafted. The last interim report has been postponed to be published in 2007, as an interim report on the achievement of the MDG's goals.
Three studies have analysed the situation of coherence in German policy (policies).

The Ashoff Study[39]
This in depth study was commissioned by BMZ to establish a basis for structuring the Ministry's PCD-related effort. The study stresses the idea of shared responsibility for policy coherence ("it is true to say that development policy is not just a matter for the BMZ, but a cross-sectoral task for many policies. The BMZ should not therefore take on the tasks of other policies and so overexert itself, but urge and help other government departments to share responsibility for development policy". Three recommendations are made:

- "Improving analytical capacity and the information base so as to better assess the effects of other policies on development, to ensure coherence with development policy and to make other departments aware of the need for greater coherence.

- Intensive coherence-related dialogue between the BMZ and other government departments: The BMZ should identify the areas of policy where there is relevant incoherence and the best prospects of practical and policy change so that it may then focus on achieving greater coherence within the appropriate departments at national and EU level. To encourage other policies to make positive contributions to the Federal Government's Program of Action 2015, for example, the BMZ should conduct an informed dialogue with the other Government departments, acting not only as an investigating body but also as an adviser.

- Mobilising political support: As coherence is basically a question of political interests, it is important for it to be discussed in Parliament (at national and EU level) and in public. Experience shows that skilled analyses, public relations work and political initiatives by Parliamentarians, NGO's and the media may be important allies of development policy in efforts to achieve greater coherence".

The DAC Peer Review 2001[40]
Main conclusions are as follows:
- Increasing Germany's commitment at national and international level to the promotion of policy coherence for development;
- "BMZ limited political base and divergent interest may hamper the further improvement of coherence";
- Reinforcement of the practical implementation of AP 2015;
- Development of analytical capacity;
- Reinforcement of communication, public relations and alliance building with other departments and civil society.

The DAC Peer Review 2005[41]
The peer review stressed the growing political interest in Germany towards policy coherence "which has led to a number of specific policy coherence statements over the last five years (e.g. arms exports; crisis prevention, conflict resolution, peace-building; export guarantees;

---

[39] Guido Ashoff: Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development: Justification, Recognition and Approaches to Achievement; 2005; DIE; Bonn.
[40] DAC peer review 2001; Development Co-operation review of Germany; 2001; DAC Journal 2.
[41] DAC Peer Review; Germany ; 2005.

sustainability strategy)". Recognising the resulting more solid, organisational foundation for PCD, the study formulates the following challenge; "Turning this more ambitious vision into operational reality will require additional strategic clarity and resources".

The study mentions that although "the government re-affirmed its commitment to a coherent, Government-wide approach to development with the adoption of AP 2015, the AP 2015 agenda did not become organisationally consolidated until 2004, when BMZ produced a 'coherence agenda' that identified 14 priority goals with targeted division-level responsibilities and a sense of time frame". It is also mentioned that these goals are set at different levels (activities, outputs or organisational change) lack a sense of priority among actions and their inter-linkages have to be highlighted. There is a need to move this action agenda from process considerations to more specific priority issues of policy coherence, which requires extensive consultation and involvement of key partners, including Parliament, the Chancellery, other Ministries and targeted, influential elements of civil society.

Another main finding of this study is the limited capacity within BMZ to identify, analyse and play an advocacy role in the policy coherence arena, as well as the limited information published on the work done so far for promoting policy coherence.

Three recommendations have been made:

- "A clearer and more operational BMZ policy statement on coherence for development should be framed to better focus and organise national action around specific substantive priority issues, and to promote greater political and public support.

- The organisational and resource considerations of BMZ need to be addressed as it further attempts to implement the priority accorded to policy coherence. Additionally, current efforts to work through networks on policy coherence, such as that of the EC, can be an effective approach to reinforcing German capacity.

- In relation to the existing monitoring of AP 2015, the operational definition of policy coherence afforded by the BMZ coherence agenda should lead to improved tracking and reporting of progress."

On the other hand, the documents produced End 2004 have not been monitored in a regular basis. The unit 310 was updating them during this mission.

5.4.5 Importance of political support as a key factor in ensuring that the PCD mechanisms have an impact

This is the most important issue. The Cabinet ranking of AP 2015 has without any doubt contributed to the success of AP 2015.

The change in the political balance at the Federal level in the second phase of the programme may have limited the impact of the mechanism.

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

Almost all interviewees have stressed the day-to-day collaboration at a practical level (regular working context and communication between project managers).
On the other hand, some interviewees have underlined the low cultural sensitivity of cooperation in German institutions, concluding that it is more an issue of "working against each other rather than with each other".

The strong focus of many NGO's on the project approach and their insufficient discussion on policy coherence is also seen as an obstacle to building up the necessary pressure of civil society on political bodies.

AP 2015 is seen as too focused on poverty reduction, holding other main goals of development policies in the background (security governance, environment). The AP 2015 is also seen as a BMZ product and a tool for the BMZ to promote its own importance as compared to the other Ministries, and also to see itself as "the centre of the world" or the "hub of the universe" ("Der Nabel der Welt")[42].

Overall findings for EQ 4 - summary box

Germany belongs to the advanced countries concerning the efforts to promote policy coherence. It has a considerable conceptual framework for this purpose.
The Cabinet ranking of AP 2015 was key to promoting coherence for development. The current political support seems, however, to be lower than it was in the past.

Day to day communication seems to be an effective "informal" coherence mechanism which ensures a smoother implementation of AP 2015.

Coherence work is mainly hampered by competency conflicts between Ministries and insufficient awareness on PCD.

The unit in charge of implementing / coordinating AP 2015 has tried to be more practical in defining a limited number of key issues to focus on (coherence matrix and priority implementation matrix) and to draw some lessons from existing studies (Ashoff and peer reviews).

The regular monitoring of the existing matrix is however weak and capitalisation may not have been the priority (lack of resources?).

The strategy to link the more political MDG goals to the AP 2015 may be an opportunity to give fresh blood to the AP 2015.

5.5 Evaluation question 5: sustainability

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

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

Some elements confirm that PCD is anchored in Government thinking:
- PCD is explicitly mentioned in the present Government's Coalition Agreement of November 2005
- Mainstreaming of coherence in BMZ through objective agreement process (policy coherence is one of the 4 objectives of BMZ as well as for Direction 2 and 3 and for several departments)
- Germany is an active member of the EU and OECD networks on PCD
- Development compatibility assessment for each law has been implemented
- A compromise-finding process is part of the German system (exchange of information, interdepartmental talks, coherence talks, etc.)

---

[42] This formulation has been used by several interviewees.

- AP 2015 is mentioned in many reports of BMZ.

Other elements tends to argue the contrary
- Non-aid Departments continue to have their own coherence agenda, in which their own objectives compete with PCD
- Some interviewees have stressed the steady conflicting situations they are facing between BMZ and other Ministries, stating that compromises have to be taken at a lower level so as to avoid conflicts gaining in importance and having to be resolved at a higher level
- Coherence talks are not a regular occurrence and focus on listing areas of incoherence rather than on tackling them (lack of implementation)
- Some interviewees have stressed the lack of consistency of political discourse or positioning on specific issues, resulting in a lack of credibility of German positions (example of a statement of the Minister of BMZ being contradictory to those of another Minister)
- Collaboration between Ministries is still difficult. The compromises found often lead to lower quality outputs
- Consultation processes are not sufficiently output-oriented
- Many interviewees have stressed that they are always 'demandeur' of coherence in the other Ministries but that in very few cases are they contacted by the other department to discuss coherence issues.

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

Political backing at Federal Government level is the main factor influencing the sustainability of the mechanism. There was a specific mention of ensuring policy coherence for development with other departments in the coalition agreement[43]. Other factors are as follows:
- Political leadership of the Development Cooperation Agency
- Cabinet rank of development policy
- Strategic framework and detailed programmes
- Inter-departmental networking
- Policy coordination structures and processes
- Information and analysis

In 1998, BMZ inclusion in the Federal Security Council (BSR), a Cabinet committee which coordinates the Federal Governments' security and defence policies, made it possible for BMZ to influence two important decisions:
- An amendment of the Federal Governments' political principles for the export of arms and other armaments in 2000
- The Federal Government's comprehensive concept on civilian crisis prevention, conflict resolution and post-conflict peace-building in 2000

Most of the interviewees have stressed that coherence is not a one-way street. There is a right to demand greater development orientation of other policies but also that development policy should take into account other political objectives.

The Government's political commitment was high at the time of the launch of the AP 2015. It led to an increased role of BMZ, to the definition of coherence as a main objective in BMZ as well as an important issue for all departments.
Coherence is also mentioned as an objective in the new overview on BMZ division objectives.[44]

---

[43] Koalitionsvereinbarung zwischen der SPD und Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, October 1998
[44] Hard copy received from Unit 310: Uebersicht BMZ Abteilungsziele; update from 25.09.2006

Despite the continued commitment to PCD, the importance of the AP2015 seems to have decreased over the past few years[45]:

- AP 2015 is no longer listed in the BMZ objectives[46]
- AP 2015 is not listed in the objectives of most BMZ Divisions[47].
- Other issues have gained in importance over the last 5 years (peace and security, governance, regional integration)
- In the new coalition agreement, AP 2015 is no longer mentioned and the focus is placed on security instead of poverty reduction. The GKKE sees a rupture in German policy with a downscaling of the poverty agenda and coherence for development[48].

This may be due to the perception that AP 2015 has played its role and that there is no need for a specific programme any more ("PCD goes on, AP 2015 can die")

5.5.3 Resources are available to keep PCD mechanisms operating as long as need be

As already mentioned resources are relatively low but do not seem to be put in question in the future.

AP 2015 will continue to function but its success will depend on the future of BMZ and on the political commitment to poverty reduction.

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

The coherence agenda and the implementation matrix have clarified the situation and the actors involved in coherence work.

There are still questions of Ministerial competencies, for example between AA and BMZ by the discussion on setting a common strategy on linking security to development by the German Presidency of the Council of the European Union[49].

It has also been mentioned that the BMZ strategy is a value-oriented strategy which is automatically conflicting with other more 'national interest-oriented policies'.

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

The institutional set-up has changed over time. The lack of an implementation plan at the beginning has been resolved by the development of the coherence matrix and the implementation priority matrix.

These plans are two years old and need to be refreshed. The monitoring of these plans seems to have been low. Department 310 is working on an update and seeks to link the mid-term deadline of the MDG's with the AP 2015, so as to increase its visibility and political backing.

---

[45] Please note that the commitment of Germany to PCD seems to have grown in the past. The conclusion in this chapter (as well as in the whole text of this report) is focusing on the commitment to the AP 2015.
[46] Hard copy received from Unit 310: Uebersicht BMZ-Ziele; update from 25.09.2006.
[47] Hard copy received from Unit 310: Uebersicht BMZ-Ziele; update from 25.09.2006. As comparison, the action plan on crisis prevention is explicitly mentioned in the third objective of Division 2.
[48] Gemeinsame Konferenz Kirche und Entwicklung: Große Pläne – Kleine Schritte: Fünfter GKKE-Bericht zur kohärenten Armutsbekämpfung in der deutschen Entwicklungspolitik; GKKE Schriftenreihe 39, Berlin.
[49] According to one interviewee these questions are in the process of being clarified

There is an increasing strategy to link the more political MDG goals to the AP 2015. In the 12th BMZ report on development policy, a table focuses on these linkages:

Table 2: linkages between AP 2015 agenda and MDGs / MD

Boosting the Economy and Enhancing the Active Participation of the Poor	MDG's 1, 8
Realising the Right to Food and Implementing Agrarian Reform	MDG's 1, 7, 8
Creating Fair Trade Opportunities for the Developing Countries	MDG 8
Reducing Debt - Financing Development	MDG's 1, 8
Guaranteeing Basic Social Services - Strengthening Social Protection	MDG's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 8
Ensuring Access to Vital Resources - Fostering an Intact Environment	MDG 7, MD
Realising Human Rights - Respecting Core Labour Standards	MD
Fostering Gender Equality	MDG 3
Ensuring the Participation of the Poor - Strengthening Good Governance	MDG's 1, 3, MD
Resolving Conflict Peacefully - Fostering Human Security and Disarmament	MD

Source: 12th BMZ report on development policy

5.5.6 Decreasing opposition to PCD mechanisms and their continued existence

It is difficult to say whether the opposition to PCD mechanisms has decreased. It was certainly the case in the first years of the mechanism, even if the lack of an operation plan and the selection of 'soft issues' of coherence have contributed to avoiding conflicts.

In the last years, there has been an increasing awareness about coherence, but not automatically on coherence for development. The perception is rather that different kinds of coherence exist and that coherence for development should not be seen as the most important one.

The direction of the change is strongly linked to the political support the current government will deliver[50].

Overall findings for EQ 5 - summary box

The future success of AP 2015 is strongly dependent on the political support of the Government on the one hand and of international pressure on the other but also on the capacity of the implementing department to better coordinate, monitor and capitalise on experiences and best practices.

The practical coherence work may better function at a lower level but the conflicts in competencies are still important.

The strategy to link the AP 2015 to the MDG's may act as a refreshing cure and put pressure on the Government to make more of a commitment.

---

[50] In its report, the GKKE concludes that this back up may not be provided by the current government as the leading political party was against the launching of AP 2015.

6 Main findings on evaluation criteria

6.1 Relevance

AP 2015 can be assessed as very relevant.

It is covering a broad panel of sectors and acts at various levels of coherence. Concerning the intra-governmental coherence, it has a tremendous potential as all issues can be discussed with the other Ministries.

The programme is backed by a cabinet ranking decision, which gives an intersectoral mandate to the programme.

The programme is located at BMZ which is responsible for development and is closely linked to poverty reduction which is a core objective of international aid.

The programme is also in line with the international discussion on improving policy coherence for development as well as with the international agenda on poverty reduction at the beginning of the 2000s.

6.2 Effectiveness

It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the AP 2015 as this programme embraces almost all activities of BMZ.

AP 2015 may have been more difficult to implement than expected.

AP 2015 has contributed to promoting policy coherence for development. The development issue has been integrated in a good number of national strategies.

The effectiveness of AP 2015 has mainly been promoted by the Cabinet rank of AP 2015, the strategic and technical competence of BMZ, the important coordination mechanisms at desk officer level and the implementation of AP 2015 by the whole BMZ

Limited weight of development policy compared to other policies, competency grey zone between Ministries, weak participation of civil society and insufficient monitoring and information work are among the main factors that have hampered the effectiveness of AP 2015

The results might have been better if an operation plan would have been made earlier (or at least in the coherence and priority implementation matrixes would have been better monitored and if current political support would be higher. There are broad areas for improvement.

6.3 Efficiency

Given the low level of resources and the results achieved so far, AP 2015 seems to be highly efficient. However, if we focus on the shortages mentioned concerning the monitoring of the programme as well as to some extent the weak capitalisation on lessons learnt, and if we link this shortage to an insufficient staffing, then an alternative with more staff could have led to much more results.

The changes in the institutional set up of the unit in charge of the implementation / coordination of the AP 2015 has certainly led to a sub-optimised use of personal resources (risk to weaken institutional memory).

6.4 Impact

It is difficult to assess the broadness of the impact of AP 2015 within this short time frame.

Germany belongs to the advanced countries concerning the efforts to promote policy coherence. It has a considerable conceptual framework for this purpose.

In this context, AP 2015 had certainly a positive impact on policy coherence for development. This impact can be traced in a couple of strategy documents (see Chapter 5).

The programme may have not been so successful concerning increasing awareness and dialogue with civil society.

AP 2015 has probably played an important role in promoting the discussion on the coherence issue (beyond the issue of policy coherence for development).

6.5 Sustainability

The future of AP 2015 may come from Brussels (EU network on coherence) or New York (MDG's follow-up) as the current Government seems to have downscale the importance of this mechanism on the political agenda.

Coherence is now at the top of German agenda but the role of AP 2015 has not been clearly developed.

The strategy to link the more political MDG goals to the AP 2015 may be an opportunity to give fresh blood to the AP 2015.

7 Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 Update the priority coherence agenda

Given the "limited political base"[51] of the BMZ and the increasing complexity of interlinked impacts between sector policies, the potential of incoherence or conflicting issues is not likely to be overcome in the short term.

The BMZ should draw up or update a priority coherence agenda, defining the key issues to be dealt with, set objectives and results within a time frame and develop the approaches used to achieve them.[52]

7.2 Better monitoring of other policies

Achieving policy coherence means, of course, assessing the evolution of the situation as well as of the effects other policies have had on development. Beside the information needed to

---

[51] We refer here to the lower importance of development policy compared to other national policies.
[52] Ashoff 2005 gives some information on how to define this priority coherence agenda in Box 9, page 99.

assess the interrelations of policies, there is a need for timely, mutual information so that discussion processes aimed at reducing incoherencies or reinforcing coherence has sufficient time to achieve sustainable results.

The decision of checking the development compatibility of laws is an important step. Its translation into operational terms should be analysed. It seems to be more important to apply this kind of development compliance to other documents or strategies (a different level to the political discussion on laws).

In parallel, the possibility of introducing a 'development impact assessment' of other policies has been voiced, similar to environmental impact assessments. Given the complexity of the coherence issue, such a tool will be difficult to apply in practice and could possibly lead to 'enhanced inaction' or increased delays in promoting coherence. Priority should be given to a limited number of specific issues with greater PCD potential.[53]

7.3 Improve capacity to tackle PCD challenges

Given the complexity of PCD, capacities have to be enhanced concerning:
- The capitalisation and information sharing on definition, practical modalities and best practices concerning PCD
- Training programme on methodologies on how to improve coherence (needs assessment, problem analysis; setting up of an objective diagramme, analysis of alternatives; selection of a coping strategy; setting up communication procedures, analysis of the decision-making process, M&E system, etc.)
- Exchange programmes between departments in order to improve mutual awareness and collaboration
- Analytical capacity in the sectoral departments engaged in specific and concrete PCD activities
- Increase resources for pro-actively managing the AP 2015.

7.4 Process versus structure-oriented approaches to the improvement of policy coherence

Germany has an intensive system of policy coherence mechanisms and procedures. The challenge remains to make these mechanisms work more efficiently and effectively. This issue is closely linked to the focus placed on Ministry competencies in Germany rather than on the achievement of outputs.

Possible solutions are as follows:
- Definition of a common priority agenda and discussion with the partner Ministries
- Focus on high level expertise, sound argumentation but also integrating partner Ministry perceptions into own priority agenda
- Continuation of BMZ's coherence talks at Director General (Abteilungsleiter) level but focusing on ways to avoid competency conflicts
- Enhanced collaboration at the level of Spiegelreferat (reflective unit)
- Enhanced collaboration at all levels (development of best practices and practical modalities)
- Promotion of a culture of cooperation (exchange of staff between departments; awareness-building activities in each department)

---

[53] Ashoff 2005 gives some information on possible steps to set up a monitoring system in Box 10, page 103.

7.5 Mobilise domestic and international support

There is a need to raise Parliament's awareness on the necessity for more coherence for development. Regular contact to Bundestag Committees (Parliamentary Committee on Economic Cooperation and Development –AWZ) and other committees could be envisaged.

A focus should be placed on improving alliances with civil society organisations so as to better collect and disseminate information and increase pressure on political bodies through mobilising campaigns.
The 2015 Dialogue Forum should be rethought to make it more effective.

Communication with the general public (awareness campaigns such as 'Farbe bekennen' {showing your colour} or the production of pedagogical materials for schools) should be further improved.

International cooperation with like-minded countries or departments could be a possibility of improving the influence of German views in Community policies as well as reinforcing (using) pressure from the Community level be placed on the German Government on specific issues.

7.6 AP 2015 needs a refreshing treatment

AP 2015 is considered an old action plan, a grey paper which needs to be refreshed. This "cure de jouvence" could be achieved by new political backing, like a new Cabinet decision. But many people doubt the possibility of obtaining such a decision in the current context. The more realistic option seems to make more out of the existing action plan and to link it more to current issues. The discussion about the mid-term achievements of the MDG's could be a good opportunity to do so, as well as the link to the harmonisation process, or to the peace and security strategy or the increased focus on governance.

7.7 Reinforce the exchange programme.

The good results achieved by the exchange programme concerning mutual understanding have to be developed. Important aspects include:
- Transparent communication rules
- Relevant training programmes on the main issues relevant for the partner Ministry
- Focus on networking, putting the exchange staff in contact with many staff in the other Ministry
- Linking the 'exchanged staff' with responsibilities in the new field of activities

7.8 See incoherence as an opportunity for discussion

The creation of a separate Minister dealing with development issues is without doubt a positive element in promoting coherence for development. The conflicting situations mentioned by many interviewees are the sign of a healthy situation where inconsistencies can be brought to the surface, discussed and sometimes resolved. Besides the search for mutual understanding and compromises, there is still an area where development goals and other policy goals cannot be merged. In that case, the BMZ has an important advocacy role to play.

Annex 1: List of principal official source documents

ASHOFF, Guido, Dr., Study: 'Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development: Justification, Recognition and Approaches to Achievement', Bonn 2005, Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik DIE (German Development Institute).

BLISS, Frank in Zusammenarbeit mit NEUMANN, Stefan, Umsetzung des Aktionsprogramms 2015 in dem Pilotland Vietnam : Länderdarstellung', Remagen/Bonn 2005, BMZ/Referat 300.

BMELV, 'Die EU Agrarreform – Umsetzung in Deutschland', Berlin 2006, Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Verbraucherschutz (Federal Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection).

BMI: Gemeinsame Geschäftsordnung der Bundesministerien; 2000; Berlin.

BMZ Spezial Nr. 53, 'Auf dem Weg zur Halbierung der Armut, Zwischenbericht über den Stand der Umsetzung des Aktionsprogramms 2015', Bonn 2002, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ Spezial Nr. 88, 'Auf dem Weg zur Halbierung der Armut, 2. Zwischenbericht über den Stand der Umsetzung des Aktionsprogramms 2015', Bonn 2004, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ Materialien N°. 108: Poverty Reduction: a global responsibility. Programme of Action 2015. The German Government's contribution towards halving Extreme Poverty Worldwide; 2001; Bonn.

BMZ Materialien Nr. 106, 'Armutsbekämpfung – eine globale Aufgabe, Aktionsprogramm 2015, Der Beitrag der Bundesregierung zur weltweiten Halbierung extremer Armut', Bonn 2003, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ-Materialien N0 111; 11th report on German development policy 2001; Bonn.

BMZ Materialien Nr. 125, 'Globaliserung gestalten – Entwicklungspolitik konkret', Bonn 2004, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ Spezial Nr. 130, 'Mehr Wirkung erzielen: Die Ausrichtung der deutschen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit auf die Milleniums-Entwicklungsziele, Die Umsetzung der Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness', Bonn 2004, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ Materialien Nr. 131, 'Zwölfter Bericht zur Entwicklungspolitik der Bundesregierung', Bonn 2005, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ Materialien Nr. 135, 'Katastrophenvorsorge – Beiträge der deutschen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit', Bonn 2005, German Federal Ministry for Economic

Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ Materialien Nr. 140, 'Der Beitrag Deutschlands zur Umsetzung der Milleniums-Entwicklungsziele', Bonn 2005, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ Information Materials Nr. 141, 'Germany's Contribution to Achieving the Millenium Development Goals', Bonn 2005, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ Materialien Nr. 147, 'Public Private Partnerships (PPP) in der deutschen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit', Bonn 2005, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ, 'Development Policy as an element of global structural and peace policy', Bonn 2002, BMZ Special, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ, 'Entwicklung fördern – Armut bekämpfen, Entwicklungspolitischer Jahresrückblick 2005', Berlin 2006, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development.

BMZ, 'Entwicklungspolitische Kohärenz, Aktivitäten der deutschen Bundesregierung auf der Grundlage des Aktionsprogramms 2005', Berlin 2006, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development.

BMZ, 'Harmonisation and coordination of donor practices in German development cooperation', Bonn 2004, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ, 'Medienhandbuch, Entwicklungspolitik 2006/2007', Berlin 2006, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development.

BMZ, 'Recht – Demokratie – Frieden, Politik für Entwicklung', Bonn 2003, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ, 'Umwelt – Entwicklung – Nachhaltigkeit, Entwicklungspolitik und Ökologie', Bonn 2002, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ, 'Wirtschaft – Soziales – Entwicklung, Armut bekämpfen und Gerechtigkeit schaffen', Bonn 2004, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Division for 'Development Education and Information'.

BMZ: Entwicklungspolitische Konzeption des BMZ; BMZ Aktuell N° 72; 1996; Bonn.

DAC Peer Review; Germany ; 2005.

Development Co-operation review of Germany; 2001; DAC Journal 2.

ENGELHARD, Karl, 'Welt im Wandel, Die gemeinsame Verantwortung von Industrie- und Entwicklungsländern', Stuttgart 2004, Information zur Meinungsbildung, Reihe A: Politik, Band 7, Omnia Verlag GmbH.

German Federal Government (Cabinet), 'Mit Reformen die Zukunft gestalten, Geschäftsbericht der Bundesregierung 2004/2005', Berlin, July, 2005.

German Federal Government, May 2004 (Cabinet): "Aktionsplan Zivile Krisenprävention, Konfliktlösung und Friedenskonsolidierung" a*nd the consecutive progress report, Mai 2006 (Cabinet) and* German Federal Government, October 2006 (Cabinet)

German Federal Government (Cabinet), 'Sicherheit und Stabilität durch Krisenprävention gemeinsam stärken, 1. Bericht der Bundesregierung über die Umsetzung des Aktionsplans „Zivile Krisenprävention, Konfliktlösung und Friedenskonsolidierung"', Berlin 2004-2006.

German Federal Government, 2002 (Cabinet): Nationale Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie "Perspektiven für Deutschland". Unsere Strategie für eine nachhaltige Entwicklung and the consecutive two progress reports: German Federal Government, 2004 (Cabinet): Fortschrittsbericht 2004 „Perspektiven für Deutschland". German Federal Government, 2005 (Cabinet): „Wegweiser Nachhaltigkeit". Bilanz und Perspektiven.

GKKE-Schriftenreihe No. 33, 'Halbierung der extremen Armut, Zweiter GKKE-Bericht zur Umsetzung des Aktionsprogramms 2015 der Bundesregierung', Berlin/Bonn 2004, Gemeinsame Konferenz Kirche und Entwicklung.

GKKE-Schriftenreihe No. 35, 'Halbierung der extremen Armut, Der Beitrag des Aktionsprogramms 2015 der Bundesregierung zu den Milleniumszielen', Dritter GKKE-Bericht, Berlin/Bonn 2004, Gemeinsame Konferenz Kirche und Entwicklung.

GKKE-Schriftenreihe No. 37, 'Milleniumsziele auf dem Prüfstand, Vierter GKKE-Bericht zur Halbierung der extremen Armut', Berlin/Bonn 2004, Gemeinsame Konferenz Kirche und Entwicklung.

GKKE-Schriftenreihe No. 39, 'Große Pläne – kleine Schritte, Fünfter GKKE-Bericht zur kohärenten Armutsbekämpfung in der deutschen Entwicklungspolitik', Berlin/Bonn 2006, Gemeinsame Konferenz Kirche und Entwicklung.

HAGENDORN, Michael, 'Umsetzung des Aktionsprogramms 2015 in dem Pilotland Mosambik : Länderdarstellung', Bonn 2005, BMZ/Referat 300.

Koalitionsvereinbarung zwischen der SPD und Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, October 1998

MINBUZA, 'Progress Report: Policy Coherence for Development', The Hague, 2006, Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

OECD 1996: Building policy coherence. Tools and tensions, Public Management Occasional papers N°12, Paris

OECD 1996: Shaping the 21st Century – The contribution of Development Cooperation., Paris.

OECD 2001: The DAC guidelines – Poverty reduction, Paris

Uebersicht BMZ Abteilungsziele; update from 25.09.2006 Hard copy received from Unit 310

Uebersicht BMZ-Ziele; update from 25.09.2006. Hard copy received from Unit 310

United Nations Millennium Declaration; Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, A/RES/55/2 2000; New York.

Weißbuch 2006 zur Sicherheitspolitik Deutschlands und zur Zukunft der Bundeswehr".

Annex 2: Abbreviations used in the report

3Cs	Coordination, Complementarity and Coherence
AA	Auswärtiges Amt
AidCO	EuropeAid Cooperation Office
BMZ	Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
DG Relex	Directorate General for External Relations
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EU-HES	European Union Heads of Evaluation Services
EQ	Evaluation Question
HoD	Head of Departement
JC	Judgement Criteria
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MS	Member State
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSA	Non-State Actor
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCD	Policy Coherence for Development
PRSPs	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
ToR	Terms of References

Annex 3: Persons met and interview planning

BONN

Day – time	Name	Department / Function
Monday 25.09		
10.00-10.45	Frau Zintl Frau Kranz-Plote Frau Dr. Tekülve	Referate 120 und 310
10.45-11.30	Herr Kloke-Lesch	Leiter Unterabteilung 21
12.00-13.00	Herr Uwe Gehlen	Referat 310
13.20-14 :30	Herr Hermann Frau Seidel	BMVg
15.00 – 16 :00	Herr Breyer	Referat 322 (previously Referat 300/AP 2015 (2002-2005)
16.15-16.45	Herr Dr. Kohlmeyer Frau Kraemer	Referats 314
17:00-18.00	Dr. Guido Ashoff	DIE
BERLIN		
Tuesday 26.09		
10.45-12.15	Frau Lehmann-Richter Frau Woldt	Referat 303
12.30-13.15	Frau Witteler-Stiepelmann Herr Wanning	Unterabteilung 21 und Referat 210
14:-14:30	Dr. Michael Hofmann	BMZ Abteilung 3
14 :30-15 :00	Herr Gehlen	Referat 310
15.15-16.30	Herr Eberle Herr Thiedeman Herr Schaeffer	AA Leiter Referat GF02
16.45-17:45	Herr Hambrink	GKKE
Wednesday 27.09		
10.00-11.30	Frau Bern; Frau Helbing Swantje	BMELV Referat 613 Referat 413
16-18 :30	Herr Gehlen	Referat 310

Annex 4: Country profile

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

2. To what extent is coherence an explicit objective of MS?
The German government advocates coherence and consistency between all policy fields (development, security, foreign trade, international finance or agricultural policy) with regard to the objective of poverty reduction and will work towards that goal at the European level, within the framework of the OECD, and elsewhere: **Federal Ministry for Economic and Development cooperation (2001) Poverty Reduction – A Global Responsibility , Program of Action 2015**, The German's Government contribution towards halving extreme poverty worldwide http://www.aktionsprogramm2015.de/www/images/download/ap2015_engl.pdf The country also points at necessity for industrialized countries to pursue a coherent overall strategy free of in-built contradictions: http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/aussenpolitik/aussenwirtschaft/entwicklung/entwicklungspol_html

3. Indication of when PCD became an issue:
April 2001 (Program of Action 2015 approved)

4. Who is responsible for ensuring the completion of these objectives?
The **Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development** (BMZ) is the lead ministry for the implementation of the Program of Action 2015

5. Characterization of institutional architecture for PCD
(Summarises key points for PCD from the Scoping Study's country research tables) The BMZ is a separate Government Department, allowing it to advocate for PCD at a high political level.

6. List of Identified PCD Mechanisms / Characterisation		
	Particular Characteristics[54]	**Actors involved:[55]**
6.1 Explicit Policy Statements - Programme of Action 2015	Group 2	Par, Cab, PM
6.2 Administrative/Institutional A - Policy coherence dialogue between DGs of ministries (as part of the Programme of Action 2015) B - Inter-departmental committees (export, security) C - Task Force 2015 D - Specific divisions in BMZ, especially division 310 which focuses specifically on AP 2015 and division 03, which is in charge of reviewing legislative proposals as regards their compatibility with development considerations	A (group 1) B (group 3) C (group 4) D (group 3 and 4)	PM

---

[54] For an explanation of the concepts used in 6 ('Type of Mechanism' and 'Particular Characteristics), please refer to the enclosed Explanatory Note.
[55] Used abbreviations: CS = civil society; Par = Parliament; Cab = Cabinet; NGOs; PS = Private Sector; PM = Government Policy Makers; Acad = Academics; others

6.3 Knowledge Input and Assessment - BMZ Dialogue forum	Group 1	PM, NGOs, PS, CS

7. External Opinions:

Ashoff, G. (2002) 'Improving Coherence between Development Policy and Other Policies. The Case of Germany.' GDI Briefing Paper
Ashoff concludes that more research needs to be done on the effects of other policies to identify policy incoherencies and potential synergies. There is thus a need for the further development of the analytical competencies of BMZ, so that it can adequately play its PCD promoting role. It should act both as an investigating body, and as an advisor. Finally, civil society, media and political parties' initiatives are extremely important to further PCD.

Ashoff, G. (2005) Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development: Justification, Recognition and Approaches to Achievement. DIE Studies No. 11 German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn.
According to Ashoff, within BMZ, besides the heads of Directorates-General 2 and 3 and the official responsible for coherence in Division 03 (parliamentary and cabinet affairs), there are two other Divisions who are concerned with coherence issues (excluding certain Divisions and commissioners who work on specific dossier-related coherence issues). They are:
1. Division 04 (principles, conception and political planning of development policy);
2. Division 300 (Action Programme 2015, cross-divisional questions of principle).
In this context, Ashoff recommends for a coherence unit which is mandated to manage the various coherence-related work done by these different divisions (Ashoff 2005: 107, 108).

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

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

Germany advocates coherence and consistency in policy related to development, security, agriculture and international trade and finance vis-à-vis the objective of poverty reduction. It works towards this goal at the European level, within the framework of the OECD and elsewhere. To support its commitment to the UN Millennium Declaration and Millennium Development Goals, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) formulated the **Programme of Action 2015**. With its adoption by the Cabinet in 2001 this programme became a whole-government project. Programme of Action 2015 is a framework for poverty reduction containing 10 areas of emphasis and 75 concrete actions. Implementation of these actions is seen as the common responsibility of the entire government, with BMZ playing a coordinating, monitoring and catalytic role.
Coordination is achieved through regular coherence talks at the directorate-general level, as well as through various other inter-departmental meetings and committees. The Programme of Action 2015 requires that all government policies be consistent with the overall objective of poverty reduction. It mandates the BMZ to approach other departments and, where necessary, require them to adjust policies to bring them into line with the plan.

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

The programme also gives high priority to the mobilisation of political and public support for

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

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