



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 13.7.2005  
SEC(2005) 929

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING PAPER**

**Annex to the :**

**Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the  
European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions**

**Proposal for a**

**Joint Declaration by the Council, the European Parliament and the Commission on the  
European Union Development Policy**

**“The European Consensus”**

**IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**{COM(2005) 311 final}**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	The 2000 EC Development Policy Statement .....	3
1.1.	Economic, social and environmental impact of the 2000 EC Development Policy Statement .....	3
1.2.	Underlying motives and forces for change .....	4
1.3.	The situation under a “no policy change” scenario .....	4
1.4.	Who is affected by 2000 EC Development Policy Statement .....	4
2.	Objectives of the proposed EU Development Policy Statement .....	4
2.1.	Policy objectives .....	4
2.2.	Policy context and established objectives.....	5
3.	Policy Instruments .....	5
3.1.	Proposed policy options.....	5
3.2.	Assessment of available options .....	6
3.3.	Community added value: subsidiarity and proportionality.....	6
4.	Potential Impact of the proposed EU Development Policy Statement .....	6
4.1.	Summary description of the proposal .....	6
4.2.	Economic, social and environmental impact .....	7
4.3.	Impact in developing countries .....	8
4.4.	Impact in the EU .....	8
5.	Monitoring and Evaluation .....	8
6.	Stakeholder Consultation.....	9
7.	Conclusions and Commission Draft Proposal .....	9
	Acronyms .....	11
	Annex 1 Assessment of the EC Development Policy Executive Summary .....	12
	Annex 2 Stakeholders’ consultation .....	16

## **1. THE 2000 EC DEVELOPMENT POLICY STATEMENT<sup>1</sup>**

The framework for the Community's development policy is provided by the Treaty and by the Declaration adopted by the Council and the Commission in November 2000 (the 2000 EC Development Policy Statement or DPS); they determine the main thrust of policy and lay down the basic principles underlying the Community's approach to development cooperation. Due to a series of changes since 2000 both within the Union and on the international scene, discussed in greater detail later in this document, there is now a need to revise the 2000 DPS.

A wide-ranging debate has been carried out to clarify the role of European Union development policy and aid, in order to review the way the EU policies are articulated with the policies pursued by Member States and partner countries and with civil-society initiatives, in a spirit of coherence and complementarity. The discussion has also taken stock of the Commission's resources and competencies. The proposed new Statement, whose impact is assessed in this document, is the result of this debate and provides a framework for a medium-term positioning of the Union on a series of issues in the international debate, as well as a framework to guide the implementation of EC aid for development.

### **1.1. Economic, social and environmental impact of the 2000 EC Development Policy Statement**

The 2000 DPS is seen as a valuable document which performs a variety of useful roles for different stakeholders. It compares satisfactorily with similar statements from other donors and it was well accepted by the development community. Its principal value is that it is seen as a single authoritative statement of the policy of the EC that provides guidance and sets out a limited number of objectives and priorities that can be used at different levels in EU development cooperation. From the point of view of many key actors it captured the discussions on international development in 2000 satisfactorily and outlined a useful and pertinent role for the EC at the time. In many respects it remains up to date and relevant five years on. The main priorities formulated in the DPS, the prime focus on poverty and the principle of concentrating assistance in a limited number of areas, are still ones around which a large proportion of actors come together.

In the case of the focal areas, the principle of concentration is much more widely accepted than the actual six focal areas chosen for the EC in the DPS. Nevertheless, the fact that it identified some areas of concentration was seen as a success at the time in 2000.

As regards the notion of cross-cutting or horizontal issues, the impact of the DPS remains limited. The principle of mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues was seen as generally acceptable, but they are not always effectively integrated in strategies and programmes and implementation has proved problematic.

According to the evaluation study of the EC development policy, one of the principal bottlenecks to implementation of the DPS is a lack of ownership in certain Commission services and among certain key stakeholders, such as in the European Parliament or among non-state actors. Externally, the principles of the DPS are known rather well, even if it is less the case for the document itself.

---

<sup>1</sup> This section is based on *Assessment of the EC Development Policy. DPS Study Report*. ECDPM, ICEI, ODI (2004). The executive summary of this study is included as Annex 1. The study is available online at [http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/tmp\\_docs/ecdpm\\_report.pdf#zoom=100](http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/tmp_docs/ecdpm_report.pdf#zoom=100)

Internally, while the principles are generally widely accepted there is reluctance among officials in certain services to use them extensively in the different regional programmes managed by the Commission, as the statement is not seen as adequately matching all concerns.

## **1.2. Underlying motives and forces for change**

There are three main reasons why the Declaration on Development Policy should be reviewed:

- An accelerated globalisation process which includes not only trade and economic matters, but also other major issues related to the environment, health, migration and security spheres. This makes it necessary to step up cooperation and extend the scope of partnership agreements with developing countries, in conjunction with aid for development as such. Development policy has the potential of becoming the privileged instrument for managing globalisation;
- new political priorities in an enlarged EU: the European Security Strategy, the Neighbourhood Policy and the new institutional set-up deriving from the Constitutional Treaty;
- the emergence of a more robust international consensus on development cooperation reflected in: the UN's Millennium Declaration and Development Objectives; the commitments made in Monterrey regarding funding for development, in Doha regarding trade and in Johannesburg regarding sustainable development; and the debate on the effectiveness of aid, covering issues such as harmonisation between donors and the alignment of aid with policies and procedures in the partner countries.

A repositioning is needed to clarify the role of development policy and enhance the coherence of the EU external action in a turbulent context where new priorities, particularly the issue of security, are attracting the attention of the public and the political decision-makers.

## **1.3. The situation under a “no policy change” scenario**

The main risk under a “no policy change” scenario is that the DPS would become less and less relevant in the broad spectrum of EU external action, and EU cooperation might lose the direction and focus it provides. A chance to remedy its pitfalls would also be missed. For example, the DPS would continue to be perceived as a policy document relating only to ACP countries and it would not clarify the links with other external policies.

## **1.4. Who is affected by 2000 EC Development Policy Statement**

A range of actors are affected by the EC Development policy. Governments and citizens of partner countries can receive more or less, better or worse aid depending on the strategic choices made in the DPS. EU citizens can be affected through the impact that the DPS can have on global public goods (like eradication of diseases, conflict prevention or biodiversity) or on their own economies and societies (through trade and investment or migration flows).

## **2. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED EU DEVELOPMENT POLICY STATEMENT**

### **2.1. Policy objectives**

The overall objective of the new DPS will remain the reduction and ultimately the eradication of poverty within the framework of sustainable development. The operational definition of poverty eradication will be based on the Millennium Declaration and the MDGs in particular. The policy will also seek to achieve greater coherence among Member States and the Commission as well as among the various Commission services involved in EU external action and those in charge of internal policies with an external dimension.

### **2.2. Policy context and established objectives**

The international agenda for development is based on the Millennium Declaration of September 2000, centred on social and human development, human rights with emphasis on children's health and education, gender equality, the impact of development on the environment, and the links between development and trade. The Millennium Declaration is therefore the main international reference document within which the revised DPS will be implemented. The Millennium Development Goals have operationalised these political commitments made by all UN members building on the series of action plans adopted during the nineties<sup>2</sup> with a clear timetable leading up to 2015. The Monterrey Conference on financing for development and the Johannesburg Summit on sustainable development have better defined these commitments, particularly the elements of partnership and shared responsibility between industrialised and developing countries, and the interrelations among the three pillars – i.e., economic, social and environmental – of sustainable development.

Other important international conferences that will affect the future DPS include UN High Level Event (development segment) that will take place in New York in September 2005 and the World Trade Organisation's fourth Ministerial Conference due in Hong-Kong in December 2005.

## **3. POLICY INSTRUMENTS**

### **3.1. Proposed policy options**

There were three fundamental policy options worth considering:

- a) Review and update the current DPS keeping its focus on European Community aid only;
- b) Launch a common policy platform for all EU Member States and the Commission defining common objectives, principles and broad guidelines for the design and implementation of EU aid; and
- c) Follow a two-pronged approach with a policy offering a common platform for EU and MS aid on objectives and principles (the so-called "Brussels Consensus") but keeping an EC focus for implementation guidelines.

---

<sup>2</sup> environment and development (Rio 1992), human rights (Vienna 1993), population and development (Cairo 1994), social development (Copenhagen 1995), women and development (Beijing 1995), food (Rome 1996) human settlements (Istanbul 1996).

The first option is based on the recognition that a policy should not be changed too frequently and that the 2000 DPS has worked reasonably well. Possible changes could be limited, including, inter alia, a more open definition of focal sectors and a clear statement on the need to apply the revised DPS to all developing countries.

The second option would entail replacing each Member State's development policy statement with a new EU joint statement spelling out objectives, principles, values, roles and priorities of EU aid.

The third option is a middle point between the first two. It recognizes that it is both feasible and important, given the international context discussed in Section 2 of this report, to agree on common objectives and principles, aligned to international commitments already made by all EU Member States, and to provide more effective guidelines on priorities, aid modalities and respective roles only for EC aid.

### **3.2. Assessment of available options**

The first option is too timid. It does not address key limitations of the 2000 DPS: among them, its EC-only focus and the failure to mainstream cross-cutting issues. To address these limitations, there is a need to issue a more authoritative, broader statement that would support and promote a stronger EU role in international development. An updated DPS would do too little in this direction.

The second option is unrealistic. The public consultation has shown that there is little support for leaping towards a unification of EU aid. Member states aid structures are also extremely diverse and it would be very difficult to provide meaningful implementation guidelines for all 25 of them plus the Commission. Besides, it could be wrongly interpreted as an attempt to undermine the spirit of the shared competences of the Treaty.

The third option is politically ambitious but also realistic on operationalisation. It translates into policy a "Brussels consensus" that already exists in practice, confirmed by international commitments made by all Member States (like the Millennium Declaration). This consensus is on objectives, principles and a vision for the future. At the same time there is the need to better define the role of the Commission vis-à-vis Member States and to provide the Community with sufficiently flexible priorities to take into account the different needs of partner countries, including middle-income countries.

### **3.3. Community added value: subsidiarity and proportionality**

Development cooperation is a shared competence under the Treaty. The Commission's right of initiative is the Community's most valuable added value in order to advance the EU's agenda of coordination, harmonisation and alignment. Member States do not have this convening and facilitating role individually, therefore Community-level action is needed according to the principle of subsidiarity. The new DPS aims to make progress on the EU collective approach to development.

Of the three options highlighted above, the third option offers the most proportional approach to the issue, since it allows for a flexible approach, adapting EC priorities to the needs of partner countries, with effort and resources focused on broadly defined themes that represent the Community's "offer" in political and programmatic terms. These themes will also allow for a better cohesion of the development policy with the other EU policies and hence an enhanced synergy in the common interest of the EU and the developing countries alike. Besides, this option does not try to achieve an unrealistic unification of EU aid, while providing an answer to the need for a common framework for EU aid.

## **4. POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED EU DEVELOPMENT POLICY STATEMENT**

### **4.1. Summary description of the proposal**

The new policy will be divided into two parts. The first part will define the political framework of development cooperation for the EU and its Member States, in the spirit of all the commitments taken by the Union. It will state objectives, principles and a method aiming at increasing the effectiveness of aid provided collectively by the Commission and the Member States (the Brussels Consensus).

The second part will give the orientations for the implementation of the EU strategy at the European Community's level. The purpose is to clarify the Commission's role and to define themes and modalities for action that can be applied in a variety of contexts and in all the developing countries. This range of themes and modalities should contribute to more effective and coherent development cooperation programmes at the country and regional level.

As stated in the first part of the policy, the overall objective of EU aid will be the reduction and ultimately the eradication of poverty. This objective will be multi-dimensional requiring actions in various domains: from governance to social, economic and commercial, to environmental.

This objective is also articulated with a number of objectives complementing the Millennium Development Goals and focusing on security and governance, human rights and multilateralism. Joint principles of partnership, ownership and participation are defined. A strong reference is made to the harmonisation and alignment agenda and to the importance of Policy Coherence for Development.

The second part proposes a flexible approach for EC aid to accommodate the diverse set of partner countries it deals with. It is explained that the Commission has a special role and responsibilities by being present in nearly all development countries. Six themes for action drawn from the Issues Paper<sup>3</sup> are identified. The linkages between geographic and thematic programmes are addressed and a new approach to mainstreaming is proposed. The various existing modalities of EC assistance are also confirmed with an opening to improved developmental activities by the European Investment Bank.

### **4.2. Economic, social and environmental impact**

No quantitative analysis of economic, social and environmental impact has been possible due to the general and political nature of the proposed Declaration and the number and range of players involved. However, some likely trends can be identified, based on common evaluation findings on development aid.

If applied consistently by Member States and the Commission across partner countries, the new policy should have positive economic, social and environmental impact through:

- stronger EU voice in the international development arena through the explicit recognition of a "Brussels consensus" shared by all EU Member States. This consensus should make coordination among Member States easier, thus improving the overall effectiveness and impact of EU aid.

---

<sup>3</sup> European Union development policy. Issues Paper. European Commission, DG Development, January 2005.

- improved ownership by partner countries thanks to the increased flexibility in applying EU priorities and the recognition of the importance of all stakeholders, including non-state actors;
- enhanced differentiation that will allow the EC to respond efficiently and coherently to the heterogeneity of partners and challenges;
- greater attention to the social and environmental dimension of sustainable development through their “promotion” from cross-cutting themes to be mainstreamed to explicit objectives of EU aid mirrored by detailed thematic priorities for EC aid;
- preservation of the principle of concentration, combined with a clear recognition of the validity of the DPS for all developing countries rather than only for a subset, leading to greater consistency of EC aid across regions;
- greater coherence among EU policies affecting EU development cooperation (e.g., migration, security, trade, etc.); and

### **4.3. Impact in developing countries**

Developing countries will benefit because they will receive more effective and sustainable EU aid. This aid will be more relevant (e.g. better aligned to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and other national development strategies) as it will be more flexible in terms of priorities and modalities, thus building much needed ownership among all stakeholders. A more closely coordinated EU policy and a more flexible concentration of EC aid based on the needs of the partner countries, the Commission’s expertise and experience and its increased role as a political actor will also contribute to the achievement of shared objectives in a more efficient and effective way.

Strengthened policy coherence for development will translate into economic gains for developing countries (e.g., increased exports, reduced costs of remittances by migrants, reduction of the “brain drain”, etc.), improved environmental sustainability and mitigation of climate change, increased human and state security, better work conditions, improved access to services such as transport and energy.

### **4.4. Impact in the EU**

The stronger EU voice in the international development arena will be important for EU citizens because it will contribute to a stronger EU role in international affairs and promote EU values worldwide. EU citizens will also benefit because EU aid will produce more public goods, by helping to prevent conflicts, reduce the spread of diseases and protect our global environment.

## **5. MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

The Commission will mainstream the new DPS into its programmatic tools and institutional procedures. It will ensure that its orientations are followed at the programming phase when Country and Regional Strategy Papers and Thematic Strategies and Papers are drawn and at the evaluation phase, either mid-term or end-of-term.

The Annual Report on the European Community's development policy and implementation of external assistance (prepared by the Commission) will provide useful information to monitor



progress. It will make explicit reference to the revised DPS and assess progress in its implementation. The mid-term report on EU Policy Coherence for Development<sup>4</sup> will also contribute important elements of analysis of progress.

## **6. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION**

An in-depth consultation process has taken place with various stakeholders and actors of EU development policy in the period January 18, 2005 through March 19, 2005<sup>5</sup>.

This consultation process was based on the Issues Paper mentioned above. It included the following:

- A dialogue within the Commission and between the Commission and key players in the EU policy making cycle (e.g., Member States, European Parliament)
- A series of meetings and workshops with key stakeholders (e.g., civil societies, governments, academia, and private sector associations)
- An electronic debate centred on an online questionnaire.

529 contributions<sup>6</sup> were received and 45 meetings were held during the public consultation. These contributions are analysed in the Report on the Public Consultation on the Future of EU Development Policy<sup>7</sup>, prepared by the Directorate General for Development.

The twenty-five elements of consensus emerging from the public consultation are summarised in Box 1. Most of them have been addressed by the Commission's proposed DPS.

## **7. CONCLUSIONS AND COMMISSION DRAFT PROPOSAL**

The analysis of the three options highlights potential risks and trade-offs in the Commission proposal. On the basis of this analysis, the preferred option was analysed and its likely positive economic, social and environmental impact (both in the Union and in developing countries) was discussed.

On this basis the Commission will propose a two-part statement, with the first part addressing the objectives, principles and methods of EU development policy and the second providing guidance for the implementation of EC development assistance. A detailed proposal in this regard is presented along with this impact assessment.

---

<sup>4</sup> See COM(2005) 134 final of 12.4.2005. Policy Coherence for Development. Accelerating progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals.

<sup>5</sup> Contributions received after the deadline (up to April 22, 2005) have been considered in drafting this report.

<sup>6</sup> Including 346 questionnaires and 44 statements.

<sup>7</sup> Report available online at [http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/theme/consultation/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/theme/consultation/index_en.htm)

## Box 1 - 25 points on which a clear consensus emerged from the public consultation

1. Poverty eradication should remain the goal of any new DPS
2. The Millennium Declaration can operationalise this broad objective with concrete and simple targets
3. Development is a tool to address the root causes of insecurity but should not be subordinated to security policy
4. Security-related expenditure should not be considered as ODA
5. The concept to be used is that of “human security”
6. Trade is an important tool to fight poverty, but there is no agreement on how it should be used
7. EU development and migration policies are interrelated but the former should not be subordinated to the latter
8. ODA should not be used to resolve migration issues
9. The EU should be at the forefront against smuggling of people
10. Sustainable development is an important objective of EU aid
11. The Commission should move beyond harmonisation and coordination, and it should be equipped to do so.
12. Importance of ownership and the need to involve partners in all stages of the policy and project cycles.
13. EU programming should be closely linked to each partner country’s PRSP
14. Concentration on six priorities and mainstreaming of cross-cutting themes are important but have not worked well
15. There is a need for a flexible approach to accommodate partner countries’ priorities and respect the principle of ownership
16. The proliferation of new initiatives should be stopped
17. Widespread appreciation for the proposal of a common thematic framework for EU aid
18. Proposed themes may be too broad
19. It should be made very clear that the new EU development policy statement will apply to all developing countries
20. Relief and development must be linked but no agreement on how this should be done
21. EU aid should be increased through a combination of increased donor budgets and new financing initiatives
22. Poverty should remain one of the criteria for the allocation of EU aid
23. The EU should ensure that global initiatives are sustainable (i.e., linked to national strategies – in particular the PRSP; coordinated with other donors on the ground; well integrated with national structures)
24. There is a need to make aid flows more predictable
25. Synergies with EIB should be increased

## ACRONYMS

ACP	Africa, Caribbean and Pacific
ALA	Asia and Latin America
BWI	Bretton Woods Institution (i.e., World Bank and IMF)
CARDS	Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilisation (EC programme for Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Yugoslavia and Macedonia)
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
DDA	Doha Development Agenda
DG	Directorate General
DPS	Development Policy Statement
EBA	Everything but arms
EC	European Community
EDF	European Development Fund
EIB	European Investment Bank
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
EU	European Union
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
GNI	Gross National Income
GSP	Generalised System of Preferences
IDA	International Development Association
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LDC	Least Developed Countries
LIC	Low Income Country
MD	Millennium Declaration
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MEDA	Financial and technical measures to accompany the reform of economic and social structures in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership (countries of Middle East and North Africa)
MIC	Middle -income Country
MS	Member States
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NGDO	Non Governmental Organisation working on Development Cooperation
NSA	Non-state Actors
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
TA	Technical Assistance
TRA	Trade-related Assistance
UN	United Nations
WB	World Bank

## ANNEX 1

### ASSESSMENT OF THE EC DEVELOPMENT POLICY<sup>8,9</sup>

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The European Commission and the Council issued a joint Statement on EC Development Policy (DPS) in November 2000. The statement was a landmark in that it was the first such overall development policy paper for the EC, but it was equally significant in that it was published at the start of a period of far reaching reforms in EC external assistance. A high-level policy statement of this nature is expected to perform a number of tasks. It is first of all a statement of intent against which action can be measured and accounted for, but it is also a rallying point around which various actors and stakeholders can unite in a common effort and provides an overall framework for continuing policy debate. As European development cooperation interacts with a wide variety of actors both in Europe and in a large number of partner countries overseas, achieving a single overall policy statement that is relevant and useful for all these various interests is not necessarily straightforward.

2. The purpose of this study is to assess the extent to which the EC's DPS has been put into effect over the four years of its existence, consider what impact it has had and to identify any bottlenecks that might have impeded the implementation of the policy it lays out. The analysis of the DPS is done with reference to a series of hypotheses about the role of such statements and to similar documents of other key donors and pointers from the OECD/DAC. The evidence collected was drawn from a (i) a review of EC policy and programming papers (official communications, guidelines, working documents and reviews emanating from EC headquarters; regional and country strategy papers for a sample of 23 partner countries and regions, evaluation reports, etc;) and external documents about EC external assistance, (ii) a set of some 70 interviews with EU actors in Brussels and national European capitals, and (iii) some 30 responses to questionnaires sent to EC delegations, government officials and non-state actors in the case study countries. The study also considered the changing context of EC development cooperation both in international terms and in the EU itself.

3. The overall assessment of the study is generally positive. The DPS is seen as a valuable document which performs a variety of useful roles for different stakeholders. It compares satisfactorily with similar statements from other donors and it was well accepted by the development community including the DAC. Its principal value is that it is seen as a single authoritative statement of the policy of the EC that provides guidance and sets out a limited number of objectives and priorities that can be used at different levels in EU development cooperation. From the point of view of many key actors it captured the discussions on international development in 2000 satisfactorily and outlined a useful and pertinent role for the EC at the time. In many respects it remains up to date and relevant four years on. The main priorities formulated in the DPS, the prime focus on poverty and the principle of concentrating assistance in a limited number of areas, are still ones around which a large proportion of actors come together.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Assessment of the EC Development Policy. DPS Study Report.* ECDPM, ICEI, ODI (2004).

<sup>9</sup> The study was conducted for the European Commission, however the views expressed are those of the Study Team and not engage the Commission.

4. However, two major international events have had an impact on the discussion of development policy since 2000 and are thus not adequately reflected in the DPS. First, the Millennium Summit and its Millennium Development Goals have become widely accepted as key guidelines for development cooperation and thus represent an important international consensus which could usefully be reflected in the DPS. In a number of aspects the discussion about poverty focussed development cooperation has been refined in the last couple of years (Monterrey, WSSD, increased efforts on donor harmonisation, etc.). These elements need updating in the DPS, even though the fundamental principles and direction of the debate have not changed. Equally the study found that while the EC has, since 2000, drafted a good number of more specific policy statements on different aspects of development these were by and large compatible with the DPS framework. Secondly, the circle of potential addressees of a policy document on development has enlarged beyond the development community. Post 9/11, security concerns in Europe and the discussion of development policy from a security perspective have had an impact which prompts the need for a development perspective on security, so as to better argue for the position of development policy in the EU external action policy mix. Other policy areas in the external relations ‘family’, such as security or migration, take an increasing interest in development cooperation, seeing it either as complementary to their agendas, or less satisfactorily, as a potential instrument or even impediment. Development policy therefore needs to state its objectives, principles and unique value in a more pro-active way and address groups beyond the specialist development community. The DPS could usefully be updated to contribute to these debates.

5. Our study noted the varying degree to which the DPS is referred to in EC policy documents across regions. It is more frequently referred to in the ACP region than in other regions. However, the principles it embraces (poverty, focal areas, ownership, etc.) can be found across all regions. With regard to key policy documents the focal areas and cross-cutting issues concepts, central features of the DPS, are widely used as points of reference. There was a widespread view that the DPS has done a lot to raise the profile of the poverty focus and most respondents agreed that this needed to remain the primary objective of EC development cooperation. However, poverty reduction was not always found to be the main concern in all the country strategies that we examined and there is a feeling that the way the DPS approaches poverty is most appropriate for the ACP countries and less so for several others. A more differentiated approach to poverty, which also allows for other concepts such as a ‘social exclusion’ approach, would be beneficial.

6. In the case of the focal areas, the study found that the principle of concentration is much more widely accepted than the actual six focal areas chosen for the EC in the DPS. Nevertheless, the fact that it identified some areas of concentration was seen as a success at the time in 2000. In practice while several of these six focal areas are regularly found in the country strategies they are often adapted or given less emphasis in favour of introducing local priorities. Many officials, MEPs, some Member States and external experts all argued for more flexibility in the definition of focal area so as to allow for more space for country prioritisation. Partner country governments in our sample, on the other hand, felt that the formulation in the DPS allowed for sufficient flexibility to allocate country priorities. The principle of concentration per se was not questioned, but the comparative advantage of the EC in any particular focal sector and the link to poverty reduction were not consistently argued in the case studies we examined.

7. As regards the notion of cross-cutting or horizontal issues, the impact of the DPS remains limited. The principle of mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues was again seen as generally acceptable, but they are not always effectively integrated in strategies and programmes and implementation has proved problematic. Environmental issues and human rights are most often referred to in strategy documents and some respondents felt that a degree of success had been achieved with these two. But gender issues and particularly children’s rights are not consistently

picked up and implementation has been unsatisfactory. Lack of specialist staff, guidelines, resources, and lack of political will are the most commonly cited reasons for difficulties with their implementation. Conflict prevention and HIV/AIDS are both frequently features in strategy papers even though they are only marginally covered in the DPS. Some would argue that they should be considered as additional cross-cutting issues but there is also a feeling that too many cross-cutting issues make the concept unmanageable.

8. One of the principal bottlenecks to implementation of the DPS is a lack of ownership in certain Commission services and among certain key external stakeholders, such as in the EP or among NSAs. Externally the principles of the DPS are better known than the document itself. Internally, while the principles are generally widely accepted there is a reluctance among officials in certain services and notably parts of DG Relex, to use them extensively in their regional programmes as the statement is not seen as adequately matching their concerns. These findings suggest a lack of adequate consultation in the preparation of the statement and the need for a greater communication effort since its publication. Some respondents also felt the DPS would have been easier to implement if it had been accompanied by more guidelines on its use and on how to approach key issues such as poverty. Although some guidelines on using the DPS in programming were in fact circulated at a later stage.

9. Key shortcomings of the DPS thus fall into two main areas which should ideally be tackled if a new statement is to be produced:

*a) Some currently important issues are not covered in the text.* The most notable lack is the link with the Millennium Development Goals that became cornerstones for development policy since the DPS was published in 2000. Secondly however the DPS needs to be updated with regard to the evolutions in the external actions policy debate in the EU and particularly the debate about security and development so that it is better able to represent the development sector in EU policy mix discussions.

*b) The limited ownership of the DPS.* The text is seen as relevant by the broader development community and yet it is not well accepted in certain services of the Commission dealing with developing countries. This might be due to shortcomings in the process of drafting the DPS, where some actors might not have felt sufficiently involved, in particular in DG Relex and the European Parliament. Ideally the statement should have higher levels of ownership by all parts of the external services of the Commission and be widely accepted in the Parliament.

10. These aspects, that is updating and/or refining the content, plus adequate timing for a consultation process, need to be taken into consideration when revising the DPS. Stakeholder consultation takes time, but is necessary to make key actors into ‘champions’ of the new DPS and assure its broad reach beyond the narrow development community and beyond an ACP focus. This is particularly necessary as both the international and the EU context for development cooperation have changed and development policy has to argue its principles and objectives in the larger arena of EU external relations. As is often suggested (notably by the OECD) the consultation and consensus building processes leading up to a policy statement are usually as important as the contents of the policy itself. Finally it is also important, in order to increase visibility and ownership, that once approved the document is given an adequate status in the public eye and some respondents suggested that it should be formally approved by the European Council itself and not just at the level of Development Ministers.

11. Based on the study's findings the research team developed four options for the revision of the DPS. One can imagine that the options are situated along a continuum from a short, high-level policy statement which only spells out key principles to, at the other end, a longer more detailed document which goes from principles right down to specific guidelines and even a work programme. The DPS from 2000 is somewhere in between these two extremes though closer to the first.

- a) The first option would then be to choose a middle point in the spectrum and essentially review and update the current DPS. One key choice will however have to be made on whether to fix focal areas or leave that to be determined at the country level.
- b) The second option would be to opt for a statement close to the high-level policy end of the spectrum and focus on a number of key objectives such as poverty reduction and the MDG, but also consider how development can most usefully interact with the other EU external action policies.
- c) A third option would be to go to the other end of the scale and seek to develop a statement that is more detailed and gives practitioners more guidance for implementation. However, it is likely that such a statement would not be that helpful outside the development sector.
- d) A fourth option would be to combine the second and third options and produce both a high level statement and a matching more detailed multi-annual strategy. The former would provide the basis for coherence and policy-mix discussion in the EU external actions arena as well as the overall framework for EC development cooperation policy. The latter multi-annual strategy, which might also be combined in part with regional strategies, would provide the greater level of guidance than the current DPS that many development practitioners sought.

12. Finally, the review of the DPS will open up the question of the complementarity of EC aid with that of the Member States. Many of the persons the study team contacted were clear that this was an issue that could and should be pushed further as progress in the period of the current DPS had been disappointing despite the EC's move towards concentrating its activities on specific focal areas. Most respondents felt that it was necessary to be ambitious in this area; even it was unrealistic at this stage to move to a full EU DPS that also covered the bilateral programmes of Member States. It is possible, however, that given the greater degree of consensus emerging in the EU official development sector since Barcelona and Monterrey, a high-level policy paper as just described (options 2 and 4 above) might at least form the basis of an agreement on principles of development linked closely to the MDG that both the Member States and the EC could adhere to in their development cooperation programmes.

## ANNEX 2

### STAKEHOLDERS' CONSULTATION

#### A varied response covering a broad spectrum of interests and views

In total, 529 contributions were received in response to the Issues Paper. They represent a broad spectrum of different organisations and views and reflect the diversity of structures, traditions and interests that characterise EU development cooperation. However, while the Issues Paper touches upon a wide range of issues, not all contributions address each issue raised in the Issues Paper.

Table 1 below summarizes the inputs received by type.

**Table 1 - Contributions received by type**

Type of contribution	No.
<b>A. Emails supporting or making short statements<sup>10</sup></b>	
Climate change issues should be more prominent in new DPS.	1
Support for Concord's statement	9
Support for Eurostep's statement	2
Support for FERN's statement	20
Support for Peacelink's statement	43
Support for statement on health (salud basica.htm)	5
Underlining importance of culture	1
<b>Total A</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>B. Other Emails</b>	
Question or comment on rules of consultation (e.g., timing, technical problems)	17
Submission of or request for electronic copy of questionnaire	13
<b>Total B</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>C. Total no. of Emails (A + B)</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>D. Statements received from third parties<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>44</b>
<b>E. Comments from other Commission Directorates or Commission Staff</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>F. Comments from EC Delegations</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>G. Comments from Member States</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>H. Replies to the online questionnaire</b>	<b>346</b>
<b>I. Grand Total</b>	<b>529</b>

<sup>10</sup> Copies of the statements mentioned in this table are available at :

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/theme/consultation/contribution\\_stakeholders\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/theme/consultation/contribution_stakeholders_en.htm)


<sup>11</sup> A number of statements were received by email but are excluded from Total number of emails in order to avoid double counting.



While statements and emails cannot be easily classified on the basis of the characteristics of their authors, as details were not always provided with their contributions, this is possible for the online consultation as discussed below.

Contributions were received from all over the world. Belgium, France, Netherlands, Germany, United Kingdom and Spain ranked first as far as the number of respondents is concerned. In total, 346 questionnaires have been filled by respondents from 60 countries.

**Figure 1 - Geographic distribution of respondents in the online consultation**



**Table 2 - Top 10 Respondents as of March 8, 2005**

Country	Number of respondents
Belgium	86
France	31
The Netherlands	30
Germany	23
United Kingdom	23
Spain	21
Italy	14
Finland	9
Bangladesh	8
Luxemburg	7

Two thirds of respondents are from donor countries, while developing countries respondents are from almost all geographical areas reached by EU programmes (i.e., ACP, ALA, CARDS, etc.) with the notable exception of MEDA countries. The case of Bangladesh is also noteworthy as it has the ninth largest number of respondents (8), equal to about 5% of all partner country respondents.

A broad variety of types of organisations have replied to the public consultation:

- European Parliament
- Member States
- international organisations
- local and regional authorities
- NGOs
- trade unions and associations of trade unions
- business associations
- academic institutions
- partner countries' governments
- Commission services and delegations

Comments were also received from private individuals.

As far as the online questionnaire is concerned, about 55% of respondents worked in an organization, half of them NGOs. The remaining 45% were individuals<sup>12</sup>.

About half of respondents were aged between 25 and 44, while only 10% being less than 25 or more than 65. Two thirds of respondents were male.

---

<sup>12</sup> Mostly from donor countries.