



# EU mechanisms that promote policy coherence for development

*A scoping study*

EU MECHANISMS THAT PROMOTE  
POLICY COHERENCE FOR DEVELOPMENT

MINISTRY OF THE ECONOMY, FINANCE AND INDUSTRY,  
TREASURY AND ECONOMIC POLICY DIRECTORATE GENERAL, FRANCE

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT, FRANCE

THE FEDERAL MINISTRY FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (BMZ), GERMANY

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (DGDC), BELGIUM

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION (DGIS), THE NETHERLANDS

EUROPEAid CO-OPERATION OFFICE (AidCO), THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION



# **EU mechanisms that promote policy coherence for development**

**– A scoping study**

**ECDPM (European Centre for Development Policy Management),  
Maastricht**

**ICEI (Instituto Complutense de Estudios Internacionales),  
Madrid**

**Studies in European Development Co-operation Evaluation No 2  
European Union  
Maastricht, 2006**

## **Colofon**

Studies in European Development Cooperation Evaluation is a series of evaluations commissioned by the combined evaluation bureaus of the European Commission and the Member States of the European Union. They are published – on an irregular basis – to inform the interested European audience on results of Europe’s development co-operation. The content of these studies does not necessarily reflect the ideas of the European Commission or the governments of the Member States.

European Union  
February 2006

ISBN 90-5260-212-3  
ISSN 1871-3424

Typesetting: BoekVorm, Amsterdam  
Coverdesign: Haagsblauw, The Hague  
Printed in The Netherlands.

Published in 2006 by Aksant Academic Publishers, Cruquiusweg 31, NL-1019 AT Amsterdam,  
[www.aksant.nl](http://www.aksant.nl)

# Foreword

The group of Heads of the EU Member States' development cooperation evaluation services and the European Commission (EURES) have agreed to carry out a series of joint evaluation studies aimed at establishing the degree of application and impact, in terms of development cooperation, of the principles of *coordination*, *complementarity* and *coherence* which are enshrined in the Maastricht Treaty. An initial report was published in 2004.<sup>1</sup> In 2005, a series of six evaluation studies was launched, each dealing with a specific aspect of the potential impact of the 3Cs. The studies are carried out in a decentralized fashion, with a lead agency and a steering group being responsible for each study:

<i>Evaluation study</i>	<i>Lead Agency</i>
Common Foreign and Security Policy/Development – use of Cotonou Partnership Agreement, article 96	The Netherlands
Coordination of Trade Capacity Building in Partner Countries	AIDCO
Coordination and complementarity in Humanitarian Assistance	ECHO
EU Mechanisms that promote Policy Coherence for Development	France
Coordination and Complementarity of Country Strategy Papers with National Development Priorities	United Kingdom
Coordination and Complementarity of Assistance for Local Development	Sweden

France is leading the study on the effectiveness of mechanisms put in place in the EU for promoting policy coherence with the support of a steering group that includes, besides France, representatives from Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and the European Commission. As a first step a scoping study to explore the different mechanisms put in place in the EU was entrusted to the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), Maastricht, and the Instituto Complutense de Estudios Internacionales (ICEI), Madrid. This publication reports on the results of this study.

Eva Lithman

Chair of the Task Force for the evaluation of the Three Cs

<sup>1</sup> Hoebink, P. [ed.] (2004) 'The Treaty of Maastricht and Europe's Development Co-operation – Triple C Evaluations No 1.' (Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers)



# Preface

In the early 1990s, the international community realised that development aid policies could not be effective unless coherence is achieved with other public policies of industrialised nations, the impact of which sometimes weighs much more heavily on developing countries. Consequently, this principle of coherence now constitutes one of the objectives of the international institutions, most notably the European Union, which included it in the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. It also forms an integral part of the Millennium Development Goals, which commit the OECD countries to examine their policies from the point of view of their impact on developing countries.

As development aid is but a modest strand of the public action of the OECD countries; other national priorities generally take precedence and total coherence of policies with development cannot always be demanded; in some cases, a certain incoherence of policies can even prove positive if it permits a simultaneous response to a multiplicity of legitimately expressed interests.

Three levels of coherence come under the exclusive responsibility of the donors and are therefore identified as central in the study carried out by ECDPM and ICEI: internal coherence (in the different actions carried out within the framework of development policy), intra-governmental coherence (in the interests of greater compatibility of all of the actions and policies of a single country in their contribution to development) and, to a certain extent, intergovernmental coherence (which compares the policies of the different OECD countries in terms of their contribution to development). This last type of coherence, along with the higher levels (multilateral coherence and coherence between donors and beneficiaries), necessitates the establishment of mechanisms for international coordination and harmonisation (forums) which go beyond the scope of this study.

The study's first purpose, therefore, is to shed light upon the different facets of the concept of coherence. The second is to perform an exhaustive review of what the Member States and European Union institutions have undertaken. In recognition of this imperative, several Member States and institutions have actually set up mechanisms specifically designed to promote policy coherence for development. The study has grouped them into three main categories: mechanisms coming under general policy and political decisions, institutional and administrative mechanisms, and assessment and advisory mechanisms. It shows that:



- six countries make no mention of policy coherence *for development* in their policy statements,
- eleven countries have taken initiatives or made general policy declarations aimed at promoting policy coherence for development,
- eight countries (Germany, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom and Sweden) have designed and implemented institutional or administrative mechanisms to pursue policy coherence for development,
- Lastly, the European institutions occupy a separate niche similar to the third group of countries: they have not only made a political commitment (via the Maastricht Treaty and, more recently, the constitutional project in particular), but they have also put in place, at different levels, mechanisms designed to encourage policy coherence (the InterService Quality Support Group, for example).

The countries most committed to policy coherence for development have equipped themselves with mechanisms aimed at supporting or justifying the choices made each time that coherence (or incoherence) appears in their decisions. This facilitates the subsequent assessment of the policies or their institutional coordination. This assessment or advisory capacity seems to be an essential condition for achieving policy coherence for development.

Several countries are also equipped with administrative coordination mechanisms linked to development (working groups or interministerial committees), which are not primarily focused on coherence, but do include it in their mandate. Finland, Germany and the Netherlands combine, on the contrary, national policy frameworks firmly supported by administrative mechanisms specifically designed to promote policy coherence for development, with a reporting obligation. Sweden, and to a lesser extent, Denmark, show a marked difference from the others: the first set up a global development policy in 2003 that involves advanced coordination and coherence between the different areas of public action, while the second relies on various policies strongly centred on coherence, without however resorting to a one comprehensive framework.

The specific nature of each country's institutional background goes a long way towards explaining the diversity of the mechanisms encountered; it guards against any overly hasty temptation for transposition from one country to another.

This study will, I hope, contribute to the consideration of the best means to enrich the institutional mechanisms in order to ensure a more vigorous implementation of the principle of coherence. The evaluation currently being carried out of a selection of mechanisms will subsequently enrich this debate by shedding further light on their effectiveness.

Daniel Kamelgarn  
Head of the Development Evaluation Unit

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	11
1.1 Objective of the scoping study	11
1.2 Methodology	11
1.3 Presentation of the report	12
<b>2. Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development</b>	14
2.1 Why is policy coherence for development important?	14
2.2 What is Policy Coherence for Development?	15
2.3 Achieving policy coherence for development in practice	16
2.4 Global attention for policy coherence for development	18
2.5 Different types of policy coherence for development	19
2.6 Types of mechanisms to enhance policy coherence for development	20
2.7 Evaluating institutional mechanisms promoting policy coherence for development in the EU	22
<b>3. Mechanisms currently in use in the EU</b>	25
3.1 Introduction	25
3.2 Institutional contexts vary widely	25
3.3 Policy actors promote coherence for development differently	27
3.4 A more detailed characterisation	28
3.5 Tentative conclusions	48
<b>4. Selecting mechanisms for evaluation</b>	51
4.1 Selection criteria	51
4.2 A first tentative selection	53
<b>Annex 1. Brief sketch of the institutional architecture for development cooperation in EU member states and institutions</b>	56
<b>Annex 2. Governance levels and enabling practices for promoting policy coherence for development</b>	67
<b>Annex 3. Main development policy statements of EU member states</b>	70
<b>Annex 4. List of contacts</b>	72
<b>Annex 5. Further references</b>	75



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Objective of the scoping study

This scoping study thus identifies, briefly characterises and contextualises relevant coherence mechanisms within the EU. Its primary aim is to identify mechanisms that may be evaluated at this point in time. To this end, it looks into mechanisms set up by the member states and the European institutions in recent years to enhance policy coherence for development.

This study also defines more specifically which type or types of coherence the evaluation study should address. Based upon the framework set by the EUHOE Task Force, and a preliminary analysis of the coherence mechanisms identified, the study proposes a set of criteria by which to assess the pertinence, added-value and feasibility of evaluating each of the mechanisms. It also proposes a selection of mechanisms to be included in the upcoming evaluation study, specifying the governance levels at which such an evaluation should take place. The actual assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency, impact and/or sustainability of the mechanisms proposed for evaluation is not part of this study. This will be part of the evaluation to follow.

## 1.2 Methodology

This scoping study applies a two-part methodology: a study of documentation and a consultation process.

### **Documentation study**

The study team began by reviewing the work and research already done in the area of policy coherence for development at the EU, OECD and member-states level. Secondary sources on the topic were also consulted, such as the OECD/DAC Peer Reviews and contributions to the May 2004 OECD policy workshop *Institutional Approaches to Policy Coherence for Development*.

Then the coherence-related documents of member states and European institutions were screened, including policy declarations and commitments, internal strategy statements, legislation and organisational charts. This gave us an idea of the extent to which coherence is an explicit objective of the member states and European institutions and, if so, helped us to identify who is responsible for achieving this objective.

A brief characterisation of the external relations and development-cooperation institutional architecture of each member-state government and European institution followed. This helped us to understand how these structures mean to promote coherence in relation to the wider context of institutional mechanisms dedicated to coherence.

With this background, we were able to assemble an inventory of all mechanisms and procedures in place to ensure coherence among European institutions, member-state governments, parliaments and civil society. Mechanisms ranged from informal meetings, to ministerial units for ensuring development policy's coherence with other policy areas, development agencies' role on this matter and composition of agency boards, inter-departmental committees, interactions with extra-governmental structures on coherence, dedicated bodies analysing measures taken to ensure coherence, the specific role of parliamentary external relations committees and more.

We looked into the workings of these institutional mechanisms, describing briefly their organisation, frequency of meetings, procedures, measures taken to ensure adequate analytical skills, conduct of assessments of domestic policies' impacts on developing countries and criteria used in cases of results-based management.

This brought us to our assessment of the potential added-value of evaluating these mechanisms, based on existing reporting. We developed a framework by which to judge the pertinence, added-value and feasibility of evaluating each. The framework includes composition, level of members, operational lifespan, presumed added-value, degree of commitment and type of coherence they seek.

Finally, we tentatively classified these institutional mechanisms according to the criteria developed.

### **Consultation process**

The study team identified staff concerned with implementing these institutional mechanisms in each member state and relevant European institution. Limited as we were by time and availability, we conducted telephone interviews with each of them. The interviews complemented our inventory and documentary analysis of coherence mechanisms and improved our understanding of several aspects:

- the type of coherence which each mechanism seeks to address in practice,
- the general functioning of each mechanism and the feasibility of evaluating it,
- the pertinence and perceived added-value of evaluating each.

In some cases, e-mail follow-up provided detailed information to complement the information gathered through the documentation study and interviews.

### **1.3 Presentation of the report**

Section 2 of this report lays out a practical analytical approach to policy coherence for development, based on both a theoretical understanding of the concept and its actual use in the development arena. It recognises several types of policy coherence applied

in practice and highlights enabling factors and the types of mechanisms that may be in use.

Section 3 presents an overview of mechanisms that explicitly address policy coherence for development in different countries of the European Union. It highlights the diversity of institutional contexts and approaches towards policy coherence for development. The mechanisms are grouped in three main categories:

- overall policy-level mechanisms,
- institutional and administrative mechanisms,
- assessment and advisory mechanisms.

Section 4 of our study zooms in on a selection of existing mechanisms for evaluation, using the three selection criteria established for this purpose: pertinence to ongoing policy concerns, added-value in terms of new knowledge, and practical feasibility. A first tentative selection of mechanisms for evaluation is presented for consideration by the Steering Group.

Annex 1 briefly sketches the institutional architecture for development cooperation in the different member states and EU institutions. Annexes 2, 3, 4 and 5 provide additional information, including a selected biography, references and contacts.

## 2. Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development

### 2.1 Why is policy coherence for development important?

Development aid is a small chapter in the book of public policies adopted by industrial countries that affect developing nations. Some policies, such as those for trade, agriculture, fishing, business internationalisation, migration and asylum, security and defence, are better funded and may have greater effects than Official Development Assistance (ODA). A serious, high-quality development aid policy would therefore be of little use if other policies adopted by governments work against it, limiting opportunities for progress in developing countries. The international community understands this. It has included the requirement for greater policy coherence on its agenda with the aim of achieving effective development on an international scale. Although there were some precedents, this objective started appearing explicitly in the 1990s. However, to date only modest progress has been made.

The requirement for coherence is based on reasons of both effectiveness and quality in international action: *effectiveness*, because promoting coherence is a way of improving the impact of the limited funds available for development aid; *quality*, because coherence allows the detection of interference and incompatibility, and of course of complementary aspects, among the various components of policy upon implementation. The aim is therefore to increase the degree of coherence across public policies, in order to achieve better results in terms of international development. As stated by the OECD (2003), ‘greater development coherence in OECD governments’ policy stances will allow the benefits of globalisation to be more equitably distributed and shared’.

Coherence has been adopted as a goal by international institutions. In the case of the European Union, the Treaty of the European Union (Maastricht, 1992) not only laid the legal basis for EU policy on development cooperation, but it also introduced the principles of coherence, coordination and complementariness (the “three Cs”) as the basis for the Treaty’s application (Hoebink, 2001). Article 130V (178) states, ‘The Community shall take account of the objectives referred to in Article 130U [which refers to development cooperation] in the policies that it implements which are likely to

affect developing countries'.<sup>1</sup> In the Common Provisions of the Treaty of the European Union, Article C establishes that 'the Union shall in particular ensure the consistency of its external activities as a whole in the context of its external relations, security, economic and development policies. The Council and the Commission shall be responsible for ensuring such consistency. They shall ensure the implementation of these policies, each in accordance with its respective powers.' It is understood that this objective of consistency, which is obligatory for the European Union, should also underlie action by the member states.

A strategic document issued by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) in 1996, *Shaping the 21st Century: The Contributions of Development Co-operation*, affirms policy coherence as key to achieving more effective development cooperation. It states, 'it is necessary to analyse much more carefully the possibilities of ensuring the coherence of all our policies, with everything that this implies'. The document concludes with the commitment 'to ensure that development cooperation and other relations between industrialised and developing countries mutually reinforce each other'. Six years later, in 2002, the OECD approved a ministerial declaration, *Action for a Shared Development Agenda*, which insists on this idea, pointing to the need to enhance understanding of the development dimensions of member-country policies and their impacts on developing countries.

Finally, the United Nations is concerned with policy coherence. The Millennium Development Goals, which have been put forth as the shared agenda for the international community, include under number eight, the need to 'develop a global partnership for development'. This objective covers all of the actions needed to achieve greater coherence between the purposes of ODA and other public policies (e.g. on market access, treatment of foreign debt and access to new technologies) which affect developing countries. This same spirit was behind the *Conference on Financing for Development* held in Monterrey in 2002. Its extensive agenda covered not only development aid but also trade, investment, foreign debt and the mobilisation of internal funds in developing countries, based on the principle of shared responsibility for development. So far, however, these commitments have not fulfilled expectations.

## 2.2 What is Policy Coherence for Development?

The OECD offers a working definition of coherence as efforts 'to ensure that the objectives and results of a government's development policies are not undermined by other policies of that same government which impact on the development countries, and that these other policies support development objectives, where feasible'. According to the OECD, this means 'taking into account the needs and interests of developing coun-

<sup>1</sup> The article numbers from the Amsterdam Treaty are in parentheses. Articles 130u (177) and 130x (180) refer, respectively, to complementariness and coordination. Article 130y (181) refers to cooperation between the Community and member countries with third countries and with multilateral organisations.



tries in the evolution of the global economy' (OECD, 2003). A wide range of policies are implicated here, as the recent Dutch EU presidency underlined: 'Coherent OECD policies in areas such as trade, agriculture, finance, debt relief, foreign direct investment, environment, intellectual property rights, migration, etc. are also crucial in fostering poverty reduction' (*Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development in the EU*, Discussion Paper for Informal Meeting of EU Development Ministers, October 2004).

The process of forging greater policy coherence for development therefore implies matching different policy frameworks within the action of one and the same administration or between administrations. Forster and Stokke (1999: 23) define a coherent policy as one whose objectives, within a given policy framework, are internally consistent and attuned to objectives pursued in other policy frameworks of the system. At the least, these objectives should not conflict with goals, intentions or motives on which other policies are based. Coherence thus appears most at issue where different frameworks (or rationales) apply to political action by a government or administration. Development is clearly one such rationale which may come into conflict with others, as these others might fortify or detract from achieving development goals.

An analysis of the process of achieving greater coherence might focus on the compatibility between the various fields and instruments of public action and the objectives announced for development cooperation. Coherence may in this sense be considered a necessary aspect, but not the only one, of governability. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the OECD's Public Management Committee has adopted the subject of coherence, devoting several documents to it, though without relating coherence to the objective of development aid. Underlying this attention to coherence is the idea that, at least theoretically, a certain global, comprehensive concept should be preserved of government action to ensure, at least, that actions are not internally conflictive. Ideally, the aim should be to find the most effective and least costly ways of achieving government or intergovernmental objectives, avoiding duplications, contradictions and interference. Greater policy coherence thus implies improving the quality of the processes of collective action that characterise public and intergovernmental institutions.

### **2.3 Achieving policy coherence for development in practice**

Development is a limited and generally subsidised aspect of public action in the OECD countries. In practice, few countries seriously feel that their development objectives should permeate all other aspects of governmental action. Donors have up to now achieved only a minimal level of policy coherence, as shown by the *Scoping Study of Donor Poverty Reduction Policies and Practices* and the *DAC Peer Review Reports*. This is not only because of the technical difficulty of the task, but also because of the lack of political commitment and will to take and implement the necessary decisions.

Nevertheless, in view of the potential of coherence to improve the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of governmental action, governments tend to be keen to enhance the coherence of their actions. From a theoretical viewpoint, this is not only desirable but

feasible. All that is required is a proper examination of governmental action, with sufficient attention to the detection and elimination of contradictions. Any incoherence would be the undesired, and undesirable, result of a lack of forethought or inappropriate manifestation of private interests.

In practice, however, achieving full coherence in policies has proven to be an unrealistic goal. A more modest, realistic approach seems to be required that accepts a certain level of inconsistency. Incoherence could be the result of involuntary factors that are difficult to correct, such as limited knowledge of the real situation or of the impacts of certain decisions. A degree of incoherence may even be useful. It might be the result of responding simultaneously to a wide range of legitimate interests, on which governments have to act even though actions may be partly contradictory. Such incoherence cannot be eliminated without limiting the range of interests on which government action is based. Another (theoretical) possibility would be to achieve unambiguously aggregated preference functions of all the different social groups the government represents – not a very realistic, or even desirable prospect. According to Arrow (1963), either could occur only in an absolutist dictatorship.

Given the above, a gap is to be expected between the need for coherence and a government's capacity for achieving it. In an open, participatory, democratic system, the government may well have to accept a degree of incoherence. This is because coherence is just one of the criteria, and not the only one, used to judge a government's actions. As stated by the OECD (2000), 'Each country represents combinations and delicate balances of different interests, standards and norms. The latter include coherence, efficiency, and effectiveness, but also public participation, the right to take local decisions, moral beliefs, diversity, representation and competition, etc. They are not necessarily easy to insert in a standard of coherence.'

Greater coherence is therefore not the exclusive right of any one administrative system. Different systems may involve different degrees of coherence (and tolerate different degrees of incoherence). No universal optimum level has as yet been defined. Nonetheless, *specific mechanisms* designed and expected to promote coherence for development do exist and can be strengthened. These mechanisms relate less to policy content than to the ways in which political decisions are taken and reinforced. These mechanisms seem generally to be based on one or more of the following:

- *Strong political commitment* to coherence on the part of government(s), with leadership and clearly defined policy objectives, priorities and criteria for assessing progress. Without these, policies follow a pattern of "least resistance", with objectives of smaller or less vocal advocacy groups being abandoned (Ashoff, 1999).
- *Institutional coordination, through an adequate institutional architecture, transparency and flexibility*, including rapid adaptation to a changing environment, early warning of any incoherence, mechanisms for dialogue and resolving disputes and an admin-

istrative culture that promotes inter-sector cooperation and systematic dialogue among different political communities.

- Adequate *analytical capacity* and effective *systems for generating, transmitting and processing relevant information*. The complexity of political decision-making processes means that contradictions are inevitable. But they should at least be recognised, documented and analysed. Inconsistencies cannot be resolved if they are not brought to light. Similarly, it is difficult to achieve coherence without thorough analyses of the options and resources (human and financial) involved in achieving the government's overall objectives.

#### **2.4 Global attention for policy coherence for development**

Coherence is widely recognised as central to achieving the Millennium Development Goals. As part of the Global Partnership for Development, the eighth Millennium Goal commits OECD countries 'to scrutinising their policies...in terms of their impact on developing countries' (*Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development in the EU*, Discussion Paper for the Informal Meeting of EU Development Ministers, October 2004). This expresses the conviction that the impact of the limited resources devoted to ODA could be increased if the impact of other decisions and public policies on developing countries were considered (Alonso, 2003).

As mentioned earlier, the OECD has devoted attention to policy coherence in the broad sense of internal and external coherence in relation to development objectives. The *Chairman's Report on Development Co-operation* of 1992 refers specifically to this. It is also at the heart of the DAC strategic programme entitled *Shaping the 21st Century* and is mentioned in the 1999 OECD document *Policy Coherence Matters*. Policy coherence likewise figured in the OECD Ministerial Declaration entitled *Action for a Shared Development Agenda*, signed in 2002. The recent *DAC Guidelines on Poverty Reduction* also covers this subject, mainly in Chapter 4. Work has been done to coordinate and harmonise donor practices (*Harmonising Donor Practices for Effective Aid Delivery*). In May 2004, the OECD held a policy workshop under the title *Institutional Approaches to Policy Coherence for Development*. All this indicates the importance that analysts and political leaders have placed on improving public policy coherence relative to development objectives.

Recent changes in the aid system, however, add new dimensions to this task. Firstly, the development cooperation agenda has expanded. Alongside traditional objectives, such as promoting economic development and meeting basic social needs, there are now aspects relating to governability, democracy, respect for human rights, gender equity and environmental sustainability. Expanding its fields of action enriches aid policy, but also makes it more difficult to include it in a coherent framework. Secondly, the number of agents involved in drawing up and implementing aid policy has risen and now includes decentralised administrative bodies and civil society agents,

particularly NGOs. It is difficult for a government to effect coherence with so many actors involved. In fact, these actors' most basic contribution is their offering a diversity of viewpoints and methods for providing aid which do not necessarily tie in with current government policies. So development cooperation policy has become richer and more complex, but it is therefore more difficult to subject to a single criterion for coherence because of the wide range of objectives, instruments and agents involved. Finally, as mentioned above, coherence is required not only within aid policy – that is, internal coherence – but also between aid policy and other areas of public action – that is, external coherence. This latter is even more difficult to achieve due to today's interdependence between geographical spaces and policy areas.

## 2.5 Different types of policy coherence for development

The Millennium Development Goals are unlikely to be achieved without simultaneous progress in five areas of coherence (see also Picciotto, 2004, pp. 7–8):

1. *Internal coherence*. This refers to the development policy itself, which should be drawn up to achieve consistency between its goals and objectives, modalities and protocols.
2. *Intra-government coherence*. More consistency is needed across all of the policies and actions of an OECD country in terms of their contributions to development. The strategic options in the policies most relevant for developing countries should be reviewed to prevent, or make up for, any decisions that go against development objectives.
3. *Inter-governmental coherence*.<sup>2</sup> Policies and actions should be consistent across different OECD countries in terms of their contributions to development, to prevent one from unnecessarily interfering with, or failing to reinforce, the others in the same environments or countries.
4. *Multilateral coherence*. Consistency should be promoted across the policies and actions of bilateral donors and multilateral organisations.
5. *Donor-recipient coherence*. Countries receiving donor contributions should be encouraged to set up policies that allow them to take full advantage of the international climate to enhance their economic and social progress.

Of these five, only the first three are the responsibility of donors alone, so donor efforts to enhance coherence should be directed towards them. The latter two are a shared responsibility between the donor and the recipient countries.

2 This aspect of coherence is closely related to the concept of donor coordination and harmonisation. However, whereas coordination and harmonisation refer to instrumental aspects, coherence refers to the content and objectives of political action. From this point of view, there may be policy coherence among donors without coordination.

## 2.6 Types of mechanisms to enhance policy coherence for development

We now know that the task of achieving coherence is not a simple one. It is tied into particular political, social, economic and institutional contexts, as well as the views of stakeholders representing different arenas of policy-making. Lyndsay McLean Hilker (2004), in a comprehensive, comparative analysis of institutional mechanisms to promote policy coherence for development between the European Community, the United States and Japan, enumerates a number of lessons learnt, i.e. opportunities and constraints to greater policy coherence for development. She groups them into eight categories. We collapsed the categories into three, in line with our three broad areas for addressing policy coherence for development, defined above as *strong political commitment*, *institutional coordination* and *analytical capacity*.<sup>3</sup> Thus, in our view, the mechanisms to promote policy coherence for development can be grouped into one of three categories:

- A. overall policy and political decision-making,
- B. government institutions and administration,
- C. assessment and advisory capacity.

### A. Overall policy and political decision-making

At the overall policy and political decision-making level, the first step is to recognise that development objectives, such as the Millennium Development Goals, are not the exclusive purview of government action through development cooperation. Rather, they are part of public action in general. Public policies should first be analysed in light of the context as a whole, to avoid the hurdles of compartmentalised public action. On the part of governments, this requires a culture of dialogue and collaboration among the different national political and administrative bodies.

A next step is establishing a sound development policy with a degree of institutional and strategic autonomy. Development cooperation should set its own agenda, which will subsequently influence the design and implementation of other public policies. Paradoxically, achieving policy coherence for development requires a carefully defined, consolidated and specific aid policy. Without specificity, coherence can be achieved only by diluting the profile of aid, with development cooperation playing second fiddle to other objectives, especially those linked to the interests of the donor country, as demonstrated by the case of Canada (Pratt, 1999).

Greater coherence also requires the objectives of development aid be present in other public policies. In view of the wide range of governmental tasks, this objective can be achieved only gradually, through a series of steps. It is not a technical or administrative matter, but essentially a political one. Coherence can be maintained only if the government's tasks, all of which are desirable, are weighted and prioritised. Since soci-

3 Annex 2 demonstrates the closeness-of-fit of this approach with McLean Hilker's analysis. The annex summarises *enabling practices* to enhance policy coherence for development.

eties are made up of a wide range of interests, this will happen only if there is political commitment at the highest level, not just at the level of the responsible ministry.

### **B. Government institutions and administration**

Regarding government institutions and administration, appropriate mechanisms are needed to influence the behaviour of the various, relatively independent decision-making bodies within public management. Many such bodies operate according to their own rationale and scope. For example, economic policy, domestic policy and foreign policy are pursued relatively independently of one another. The quest for coherence should help overcome segregation between self-contained areas of policy-making and implementation.

Ways and means are needed to promote the inclusion of development objectives in the design and implementation of different public policies and to coordinate across government departments to facilitate decision-making. In some cases, these will be formal mechanisms for coordination or dialogue (e.g. cooperation councils and inter-departmental committees). In others, they will be informal, non-institutional mechanisms for consultation, dialogue or advocacy to promote coherent behaviour by the various agents, including non-governmental and private ones. Such mechanisms are essential to translate the need for coherence into a statement of purpose and a guide for decision-making and public administration.

### **C. assessment and advisory capacity**

Underlying both of the above is the capacity to assess the effects of policies: to identify, document and share specific coherence dossiers and to propose alternatives for decision-making. Such an analytical and knowledge management capacity – including adequate investment in policy-oriented research, systematisation of stakeholders' experiences and studies of the effects of agreed international regimes – provide evidence and content to underpin policy commitment and decision-making. In this area in particular, the role of non-governmental actors and the private sector cannot be underestimated.

OECD country governments address the first two types of coherence distinguished above: (type 1) internal coherence and (type 2) intra-government coherence. Moving up the coherence scale, towards (3) inter-governmental, (4) multilateral and (5) donor-recipient coherence, additional issues emerge. For these, some form of an international forum is needed to lay out policy options and agree on common objectives and road maps. Examples of these are the Millennium Declaration and the WTO regime. However, to ensure that internationally-agreed policies benefit and improve the potential of developing countries, the developing countries too have to be able to fully and knowingly participate in international fora.

Yet given the complex and technical nature of most of the debates, developing countries are often hard pressed to participate effectively. For this, they must be able to

considerably raise their investments in human capabilities. Therefore, for the higher levels of coherence, *strengthening the technical and advocacy capabilities of developing countries* becomes essential, to enable them to participate actively and independently in debates on subjects such as international trade agreements, new financial engineering and multilateral frameworks for action.

Mechanisms for international coordination and harmonisation are thus needed to achieve the upper levels of policy coherence for development. Though these mechanisms may prove difficult to establish, without them no lasting global coherence for development is possible. The Millennium Declaration is an important first step in this regard. Other more operational mechanisms are the *Comprehensive Development Framework* proposed by World Bank President Wolfensohn and the *Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers* which most donors now accept as a tool for crafting coherence. Others are *Sector-Wide Approaches* (SWAPs) and direct budget support to developing countries.

Financing instruments for coherence include global funds for specific tasks (such as the global fund to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis, and the “Fast Track” in education), the *Common Pools* described by Kanbur, Sandler and Morrison (1999), and the *basket funds* used in many countries. These aim to promote donor coordination and management of aid by the beneficiary, at the same time establishing a foundation for policy coherence with binding frameworks for planning and action among the participating donors.

## **2.7 Evaluating institutional mechanisms promoting policy coherence for development in the EU**

This scoping study is preparatory. It prepares the ground for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the institutional mechanisms in use in the EU to enhance policy coherence for development. It looks at mechanisms in use both in EU member states and in EU institutions. The framework agreed upon by the EUHOE Task Force stipulates that evaluations be *pertinent to ongoing policy concerns*, provide *added-value in terms of knowledge* and be *practically feasible*.

With respect to ensuring pertinence and lessons for policy-makers, this assessment focuses, first and foremost, on mechanisms established explicitly to enhance policy coherence for development; those clearly identifiable as such in their stated objective(s), the stakeholders involved, the institutional setting and expected outcomes. Both specific and broader mechanisms are included, as long as their brief makes explicit reference to policy coherence for development. Additionally, given *the current EU policy debates on aid effectiveness and policy coherence for development*, pertinence seems best served by concentrating on mechanisms that promote internal and intra-government (donor) coherence; that is, mechanisms that address coherence within the field of development policy or across the different external and internal policy areas of a single government (cf. *Different Types of Policy Coherence for Development*, pp. 10–11).

In accordance with the above, the first challenge of this scoping study is to identify all pertinent mechanisms presently in use in the EU to strengthen *internal coherence* (type 1) and *intra-government coherence* (type 2), in particular where the former is also seen as part of the effort to achieve the latter. Types (4) *multilateral* and (5) *donor-recipient* coherence are addressed in other evaluation studies of the EUHES Task Force. Hence, the capabilities of developing countries to participate in international fora and prepare, negotiate and advocate their positions is not part of this study.<sup>4</sup>

With respect to *inter-governmental coherence* (type 3), this study addresses mechanisms existing within the EU to achieve coherence across the member states and between the member states and the Commission. EU institutions play different roles in this respect. The European Commission, first and foremost is an important donor to which type (1) and (2) coherence can be applied. Its role in crafting inter-governmental coherence among the member states is as yet limited. The “shared competence” on development cooperation between the member states and the Commission gives such a role to the Council, the European Parliament and the College of Commissioners.<sup>5</sup> Specific mechanisms created by these bodies to reinforce policy coherence for development are covered in this study; though an evaluation of the political decision-making with respect to policy coherence for development within these EU bodies is left out. Also, mechanisms at even broader inter-governmental levels, such as the OECD/DAC level and that of other multilateral agencies, are not considered in this first exploratory study.

In line with the considerations presented above, this scoping study organises EU mechanisms into three groups:

- *Overall policy and political decision-making*. This includes mechanisms that operate at the national or European Commission level. It concerns government acts, comprehensive policy statements and initiatives established to promote policy coherence for development that affect various departments and ministries.<sup>6</sup>
- *Government institutions and administration*. This concerns institutional mechanisms for coordination within the development department or between development and other departments. Such mechanisms contribute to policy coherence to varying degrees; and their mandates may differ from generic to a specific focus on coherence issues.

4 EU presidencies over 2004–2006 are coordinating their agendas, to improve EU policy coherence among other reasons. The European Union is also reinforcing its efforts to further involve state and non-state actors, including parliaments, in developing countries in strengthening policy coherence for development. This study does not address these efforts.

5 See, for example, the External Relations Council of 24 May 2005 and its conclusions on accelerating progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

6 Annex 3 presents a list of policy documents for each member state, particularly those referred to in the text.



- *Assessment and advisory.* This refers to knowledge-based mechanisms that contribute to identification, documentation and assessment of coherence with respect to relevant dossiers. These mechanisms may be to analyse links between development and other sectors, to provide advice to decision-makers and inputs for policies, to monitor existing mechanisms, or to assess the progress and impacts of policy implementation. In the second annex of this study, adapted from McLean Hilker’s analysis, an illustration is given of the kinds of enabling practices at each level

This study identifies mechanisms established by EU member states or institutions to promote policy coherence for development explicitly, not necessarily uniquely. These may include mechanisms established to promote effective governance that include decisive coverage of coherence dossiers as well. The study looks for both formal and informal, tacit and often less well-known mechanisms. Where possible, these are briefly characterised regarding their functioning within a particular policy context.

## 3. Mechanisms currently in use in the EU

### 3.1 Introduction

This section presents the information collected on mechanisms established by member states and European institutions to enhance policy coherence for development. Some do so uniquely while others do so as part of a wider mandate. In accordance with our methodology, the information stems from our analysis of secondary sources, mostly Internet-based, and interviews with key officials. Given the diffuse nature of the information available, this report must be considered a work in progress.

Our documentary study and consultations confirm that a brief, concentrated study such as this can adequately address only those mechanisms that are formally established and operated with the explicit aim of ensuring policy coherence for development. To effectively unearth and chart secondary, informal mechanisms that, intentionally or not, may also contribute to enhancing policy coherence for development, more in-depth study is required. Therefore, we limit our reporting here to mechanisms which are effectively operational and which explicitly refer to policy coherence for development in their briefs. This by no means implies that only “good practices” are considered. In fact, there is no such thing as “good practice” in promoting coherence for development; too little experience and evidence has so far been gained to confirm whether one practice is better than another.

What we present here can therefore be labelled “intentional” or “known” practices, designed and implemented with the explicit aim of enhancing policy coherence for development, as opposed to others that do not have that intention at all. The upcoming evaluation will hopefully shed light on the effectiveness of some of the former.

### 3.2 Institutional contexts vary widely

The institutional set-up of external relations and development cooperation in the 25 EU member states and in the EU institutions is described to some extent in Annex I. Diversity is clearly the foremost characteristic, mirroring the diversity of Europe itself, with its varied histories and cultures. The different institutional frameworks that emerged as a result of this variation have direct bearing on the nature of national governments and the weight that different institutions bring, for example, to the coherence debate. For instance, while some countries traditionally have a parliament with strong powers

of government inquiry and control (i.e. Great Britain), others rely more on an executive to lead debates (i.e. France). Administrative cultures also vary from one country to another and solutions to seemingly similar problems differ widely, as illustrated by the multiplicity of mechanisms that exists in Europe today to ensure coherence for development.

It is paramount therefore to underline that the institutional context is so particular to each country that comparisons, even between mechanisms that might at first look alike, are difficult without in-depth study. Only a few general issues may be brought forward as introductory remarks.

First, for the new member states, development cooperation as regulated in the “*acquis communautaire*” is generally new, and development policy frameworks and institutions are only now being created. Just half of the ten new member states have a development cooperation policy in place. Development budgets vary between 0.01% and 0.06% of GNI; and only a small number of civil servants are available for implementation. Policy frameworks are still emerging in these countries and geographical focus is strongly targeted to neighbouring states. Typically these newest EU members have a small cooperation unit embedded in the foreign affairs ministry; and responsibility for implementation is spread over various line ministries. Project identification appears rather ad hoc and coordination concerns only the screening of proposals. Four of the ten countries have an advisory body to support the development cooperation department.

Second, institutional set-ups for development cooperation have changed considerably in the “older” member states over the past ten years. The typical architecture, with the exception of the UK and Germany, is development cooperation integrated within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, at least at the policy-making and monitoring level. Cooperation is to various degrees concentrated in one government agency. In Italy and Portugal the implementation of cooperation is distributed among a number of government agencies. Denmark is at the other extreme, with a compact and concentrated institutional architecture. Therefore, one interesting question to be answered by evaluation might be, “*What type of institutional setting seems to reflect more positively on the achievement of policy coherence for development, and which types of policy coherence for development are best served?*”

Among European Union institutions, the institutional set-up for development cooperation is unique. Responsibility is shared between the European Commission and the member states. In the Commission development cooperation is embedded in external relations, with the member states retaining considerable influence through the European Development Fund (EDF). Inspired by provisions in the draft constitutional treaty, several new initiatives related to achieving policy coherence for development are under way in the Commission at both the policy and the implementation level. The Commission’s political and institutional context is so specific that it can hardly be compared to that in the member states. We therefore consider it separately in this study.

### 3.3 Policy actors promote coherence for development differently

Table 1 summarises the mechanisms to promote policy coherence for development as identified among the member states and in the EU institutions. To further contextualise these within the EU we infer four categories of policy actors, each of which approaches the promotion of policy coherence for development differently.

I. *Policy actors which make no apparent reference to policy coherence for development in policy statements and which seem to have no mechanisms that focus on intentionally promoting it.* Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta and Slovenia are in this group. While some of the new member states in this list use the term “coherence”, they do so only in relation to the consistency of policies with their own national interests as expressed in their foreign policy.

II. *Policy actors which have explicit overall policy statements or initiatives promoting policy coherence for development but (as yet) do not seem to apply particular institutional or administrative mechanisms for this purpose, though some are in the process of developing such mechanisms.* Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Greece, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic and Spain are in this category. This group is quite heterogeneous and could even be further divided into two sub-groups:

- Estonia, Poland and the Slovak Republic form the first sub-group. These countries emphasise coherence between development and national foreign policy interests. However, the yardstick to measure performance does not yet seem to be the perceived interests of the developing-country partners.
- Austria, Belgium, France, Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain form the second sub-group. These countries have made clear commitments to policy coherence for development, but have yet to fully operationalise these. Belgium and Portugal have mechanisms in place that could stimulate policy coherence for development, however the different fora seem to meet irregularly and policy agendas as yet seem to lack purpose. This may be the result of particularities in the institutional context (the history and administrative set-up of development cooperation in these countries). Spain recently began new initiatives to promote policy coherence for development, but it remains to be seen how these will be operationalised. The policy statements made by the countries in this sub-group refer mainly to intra-government coherence (type 2). This means coherence between development policy and other spheres of national policy. In the case of France, presidential initiatives seem to be the main force driving policy coherence initiatives. Formal mechanisms are in place in France to promote dialogue and coordination. Although these mechanisms do not aim explicitly at policy coherence for development, they may have an impact on it.

III. *Policy actors which combine an overall policy commitment with institutional or administrative mechanisms that have been designed and are implemented to pursue policy coherence for development.* Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK are in this category. Only within this group are specific administrative mechanisms in place explicitly to achieve policy coherence for development. Overall commitment to policy coherence for development is strong in these countries. In the face of this commitment, Sweden stands out for its lack of administrative mechanisms to promote policy coherence for development. However, in Sweden, policy coherence for development is expected to emerge from a whole-government approach rather than from the implementation of specific administrative mechanisms. In contrast, the Netherlands relies on a special coherence unit, while the UK and Ireland pursue policy coherence for development mostly through inter-departmental working groups. Coherence of the third type, inter-governmental coherence, according to European treaties and multilateral agreements, is explicitly referred to as well.

IV. *EU institutions which are committed through the Maastricht Treaty and, more recently, the draft constitutional treaty, to pursue policy coherence for development.* Various EU partnership agreements refer to coherence as well, and several general and specific mechanisms are in place to foster policy coherence from a development perspective. The European institutional set-up to promote policy coherence for development therefore most closely resembles Category III above.

### **3.4 A more detailed characterisation**

This section looks at our four categories in greater detail. Countries per group are listed in alphabetical order.

#### **No reference to policy coherence for development**

The first category is that of policy actors which make no reference to policy coherence for development – as it is defined in this study – in relevant policy statements and do not seem to have specific mechanisms that intentionally focus on promoting it. This study found no specific reference to promoting policy coherence for development, as it is defined here, in six countries: Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta and Slovenia.

#### **Explicit policy statements or initiatives**

Our second category is that of policy actors with explicit overall policy statements or initiatives promoting policy coherence for development, but which (as yet) do not seem to apply any particular institutional or administrative mechanisms to this purpose, though some are in the process of developing such mechanisms. This category, as mentioned above, is further divided into two sub-groups.

The *first sub-group* is made up of countries that emphasise coherence between development and the national foreign policy interests of the donor country. Four countries fit this description: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Poland and the Slovak Republic.

#### *Czech Republic*

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

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

#### *Estonia*

Estonia adopted a set of principles on development cooperation in 1999 (revised in 2003) promoting a holistic approach. This means all policies which could influence the situation of developing countries are to be considered together. However, this study found no mechanism to promote or monitor the implementation of the principles.

#### *Poland*

Poland's *Strategy for Development Cooperation* refers to a “comprehensive approach” to development cooperation issues and to “striving for coherence” of development policies with other spheres of life. Coherence is thus not put forth as an objective, but rather as an influencing factor. Yet in terms of objectives, development cooperation is aimed to serve “the basic goals of Poland's foreign policy”. These are internal, however, and not development driven. Therefore, no mechanisms can be said to exist whereby policy coherence for development is stimulated.

#### *Slovak Republic*

The Slovak Republic's *Medium-Term Strategy for Official Development Assistance (2003–08)* states that development activities should be coherent with foreign policy. As in the case of Poland, this is not considered “policy coherence for development”, as

defined in this study, because it does not depart from the perceived interests of the donor-partner. By this logic, the Slovak Republic's *Inter-Ministerial Commission for the Coordination of Development Assistance and Cooperation* cannot be viewed as a mechanism for policy coherence for development.

The *second sub-group* in this category are countries that have made clear commitments to policy coherence for development, but have yet to fully operationalise these. Seven countries are in this group: Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, Greece, Portugal and Spain.

#### *Austria*

Austria has a coherence clause in its *Federal Act on Development Cooperation*, which mandates government agents to take the objectives and principles of development policy into consideration in other policy processes. However, there is no mechanism to promote or follow up on this clause. The country's *three-year plans* (renewed annually), in which the national advisory body on development cooperation plays a key role, include a section on policy coherence for development and provide a starting point for more work in this area.

#### *Belgium*

Belgium's 2004 *Policy Outline for Development Cooperation* sets out the aim of increasing coherence between development and preventive diplomacy and conflict prevention (within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs); between development and debt policy (within the Ministry of Finance); and between development and peace-keeping (within the Ministry of Defence). The Council of Ministers decided to establish an inter-ministerial working group in 2000, but that has not been made operational.

The *Inter-Departmental Committee on Central Africa* has met on a weekly basis for the past few years. It is managed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Development Cooperation and Defence are permanent members and represented at the political (cabinet) level as well as at the administrative level. Depending on the agenda, other ministries (e.g. Finance, Internal Affairs, Justice) or the Cabinet of the Prime Minister join. These meetings are essentially a forum for information exchange. While they might lead to coordinated activities, they are not considered a mechanism to promote policy coherence from a development perspective. Due to its short-term perspective (the meetings are weekly), discussions tend to be fact-based rather than policy oriented.

Within the development sector, Belgium also aims for more coherence across indirect, bilateral and multilateral cooperation and has expressed the intention to establish a consultation mechanism to increase coherence between policy and operations. Development cooperation is federalised, meaning that regional as well as national governments have development policies. There is no communication as yet between the various governmental levels that could promote coherence across the levels.

## France

France ‘has not explicitly and publicly declared policy coherence for development to be a government objective’ (OECD/DAC *Peer Review Report*, 2004, p. 52). However, since 1998 it has, through a process of reforming its institutional framework for development cooperation, established some mechanisms that could be used for policy coherence for development if mandated to do so.<sup>1</sup> Interestingly, France seems to have strongly increased its focus on *internal* (type 1) coherence between the different actors managing French ODA, especially through the creation of a number of different mechanisms.

The first of these mechanisms is the Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development (the “CICID”). This inter-departmental working group meets at least once a year. It is composed of all ministers that participate in international cooperation and a representative of the President and is chaired by the Prime Minister. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (the “MAE”) and the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Finance and Industry (the “MINEFI”) hold the committee’s joint secretariat, with the MAE serving as leader. The committee’s mission is to outline the general cooperation strategy, select geographical priority areas and assess policies and instruments. Decisions taken by the CICID at its two most recent meetings significantly strengthened and operationalised the ability to coordinate French actors in development cooperation, to increase the coherence of their actions.<sup>2</sup>

The Inter-Ministerial Committee for European Economic Cooperation (SGCI) is another high-level committee with an explicit policy coherence brief. Created in 1948 after the Second World War and falling under the Prime Minister’s authority, it coordinates the French position on European issues and in the OECD. It can thus be viewed as the guardian of coherence and unity in the positions that France expresses within the

- 1 According to the OECD, the creation of an inter-ministerial mission for ODA provides a unique opportunity to consolidate the goals of French cooperation and the planning process through budgetary reorganisation and the drafting of a cross-cutting document.
- 2 Five actions are of particular significance: (i) The existing co-secretariat was reinforced and made a permanent organ to prepare CICID decisions, with meetings held about once a month. (ii) A strategic orientation and programming conference was created (the “COSP” or *Conférence d’orientation stratégique et de programmation*) whose aim is to coordinate the action of the different ministries in terms of development cooperation, to validate documents (e.g. those under *iii* and *iv* below) and to establish an indicative programme for French ODA. The COSP held its first meeting in November 2004. (iii) An inter-ministerial mission was created called “Official Development Assistance”, which groups the programmes financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Finance and Industry and prepares a cross-cutting policy document on French policy for development to be presented to the national parliament along with the annual financing bill to give an overall view of French ODA. The mission is led by the Minister of International Cooperation, who is responsible for communication and implementation of the politics. (iv) Seven sectoral strategies and partner-country partnership framework documents were adopted. These documents define the orientations and priorities of French cooperation with the partner countries for all French public actors.



EU and the group of industrialised nations. It covers all points mentioned in the Treaty of the European Union except for Common Security and Foreign Policy which is dealt with exclusively by the MAE. The SGCI organises working groups from the relevant ministries to deliberate on specific issues. Development issues are not taken into consideration any more than other issues.

The High Committee for International Cooperation (HCCI) was created in 1999 as part of the French reform and slightly modified in 2002. Its objective is to ensure dialogue between public and private stakeholders and to raise awareness about international cooperation. The *Haut Conseil* gives opinions to the Prime Minister, on seven working themes. Its members include civil society organisations and local governments. The *Haut Conseil* is joined by other mechanisms foreseen to guide dialogue with civil society (e.g. a development cooperation commission and a national commission for decentralised cooperation). These will mainly have operational concerns.

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

Finally, the French action on cotton has been cited as a policy area in which France is strongly involved in promoting coherence.<sup>3</sup>

### *Italy*

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

Italy appears to view the concept of coherence in various ways. The dominant view is intra-institutional coherence (i.e., within the Foreign Ministry), although there are also efforts to achieve what might be called "vertical coherence" between the central government's cooperation and that carried out by decentralised administrations (regions and municipalities), as part of what is called "*Sistema Italia*". More generally, there is a noticeable lack of strategic policy guidelines in the Italian system, which seems to be driven by responses to crises and politically motivated initiatives, reflecting

3 In the framework of the Trade Initiative for Africa, launched by the French President at the G-8 Summit in 2003, France submitted a proposal to the EU Council of Ministers in late 2003 calling for a European initiative for "cotton and development in Africa". The Commission responded favourably to the proposal, and in 2004 announced a partnership between Africa and the EU in support of cotton development.

its “flexible” approach. The Italian government sees as a major constraint in progress towards greater policy coherence for development the fact that many policy areas depend on decisions taken in wider EU fora.

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

The CIPE is the organism in which broad debates occur in relation to policy coherence, although it does not have a specific mandate to take action in this regard. There is little coordination between ministries on policies affecting developing countries, although various ministries consult fairly regularly on environmental issues. In the Central Technical Unit (UTC) specialists on environmental matters maintain contacts with colleagues in other ministries, for instance, regarding implications of the Kyoto Treaty. However, these exchanges seem limited to coordinating the Italian position in multilateral fora.

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

The Italian Parliament and NGOs could potentially deal with the coherence issue. But parliamentary debates have as yet been limited to discussing reports, and have not ventured into broader concerns such as coherence.<sup>4</sup> Italian NGOs have focused mostly on advocating for increased aid and improved aid management. Also, their orientation has been more towards humanitarian aid. An exception is a recent campaign by “*Sbiamoci*”, a platform of diverse societal actors interested in Italian aid policy. This platform has cited various policy incoherencies – several of which also came to light in the DAC Peer Review of Italy’s development cooperation programme in late 2004. Inconsistencies regarded particularly immigration, international military operations and commercial interests. In general, this platform worries that development cooperation may be used to further other foreign policy interests.

### *Greece*

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

4 The Parliament has repeatedly failed in its attempts to reform Italian cooperation by passing a new law, which is considered necessary by all parties and social actors. As a result, the present Parliament has taken a low profile on development cooperation.

involved are those of Development, Finance, Merchant Marine and Transport and Communications. But this Committee is not an operative structure to secure coordination and coherence, partly due to the low frequency of meetings and the way issues are addressed.

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

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

#### *Portugal*

Portugal's 1999 strategy paper, *Portuguese Cooperation at the Beginning of the 21st Century*, makes reference to coherence between development objectives and other policies that affect recipient countries. It also mentions internal coherence within cooperation policy and coherence across development sectors. The *Inter-Ministerial Commission for Cooperation* (the "CIC") is the only formal mechanism to promote coordination and policy coherence for development. It is composed of representatives of all the ministries and from other public and private entities, such as the Camões Institute (an agency created by the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to deal with language and cultural affairs in its external policy), the Bank of Portugal, the National Association of Municipalities, the Institute for the Support of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises, and the Portuguese Institute for Youth, among others. The CIC should meet ordinarily twice a year, with extraordinary meetings called at the discretion of its president, who is a member of government in charge of cooperation affairs, usually the Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation.

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

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

### *Spain*

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

Spain has two additional coordination mechanisms: the *Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation* (the "CICI") and the *Inter-Territorial Committee*. The CICI is a technical body that coordinates the efforts of different governmental departments with regard to development cooperation. The Inter-Territorial Committee coordinates, makes arrangements and collaborates among the different levels of government administration in matters concerning cooperation for development policy. Both the CICI and the Inter-Territorial Committee take part in drafting and approval of annual plans for international cooperation. Furthermore, the Spanish development cooperation planning cycle envisages that the different governmental departments with powers in matters concerning development aid participate in drawing up the country plans and sectoral strategies that are inherent to Spanish cooperation.

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

Spain is thus moving ahead, taking remarkable steps towards increased policy coherence for development. The initiatives are relatively recent, however, and are not yet ripe for an assessment that aims at drawing lessons from experience.

### **Policy commitment and mechanisms**

The third category is of policy actors that combine an overall commitment to policy coherence for development with institutional or administrative mechanisms designed and implemented to pursue this objective. Eight countries are in this category: Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

#### *Denmark*

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

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

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

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

#### *Finland*

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

spective in all of the programmes and reports that define Finland's policies affecting development.

An advisory group, the *Development Policy Committee* (DPC), assesses the implementation of development policy, with a special emphasis on achieving policy coherence. The DPC is concerned with both internal (type 1) coherence in the Finnish development sector and with intra-government (type 2) coherence with other policy areas that may impact on the situation in developing countries. The country's view to achieving the UN Millennium Development Goals is particularly important in this regard. The DPC can execute or commission studies and reviews on policy coherence. It meets monthly to discuss the link between a selected topic and development policy. The November 2004 meeting, for example, focused on institutional mechanisms for policy coherence, following up on the May 2004 OECD seminar on this same topic. DPC members represent political parties, the private sector, the agricultural sector, trade unions, NGOs and academia. To help the committee execute its tasks, the government has also nominated representatives from different ministries to serve as permanent experts. Thus, the Committee can be considered a coherence-building forum among the ministries as well as civil society. The DPC drafts an annual statement to the government on development policy and its implementation and makes recommendations. It also contributes statements for policy preparation throughout the year.

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

### *Germany*

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 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 300) is responsible for the implementation of the *Programme of Action 2015*, for coordinating and monitoring the 75 actions, and for indicating 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. BMZ also meets regularly with NGOs to discuss specific aspects of the action programme.

### *Ireland*

Though Ireland has not yet endorsed policy coherence for development as a general government policy, its 2003–05 *Strategy of the Department of Foreign Affairs* aims to ensure maximum coherence within overall foreign policy and close coordination with all partners, domestic and foreign, in the development effort. A key interest here is that external aid fit coherently with the strategies and programmes of the developing countries. All policies and activities of Development Cooperation Ireland (DCI) must concur with the objective of poverty reduction and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. In practice these aims are pursued through formal mechanisms for promoting dialogue, coordination and information exchange within the DCI and through *informal inter-departmental coordination*.

In 2003, a technical and specialist section was established within the DCI for oversight and support of the country's complex and expanding development assistance programme. One responsibility of the section is maintenance of policy coherence and institutional memory.

With respect to trade, the DCI participates in weekly meetings to coordinate policy positions. It also participates in the quarterly meetings of the *Inter-Departmental Committee on UN Issues*. Parliament monitors policy implementation via its *Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs*, which has a sub-committee on development cooperation.

### *Luxembourg*

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

In 2004 a *policy coherence desk* was established in the Development Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs following a recommendation by the OECD/DAC Peer Review. This desk focuses specifically on coherence in relation to agriculture, cotton and debt.

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

### *The Netherlands*

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

The PCU's primary task is to intervene in the formulation and implementation of non-aid government policies taking the perspective and interests of developing countries as its starting point. Acknowledging that most key policies are already within the purview of the European Union, the PCU places particular emphasis on EU policies. The unit participates in national EU coordinating mechanisms, such as the high-level inter-departmental EU coordinating committee that prepares the instructions for Council meetings in Brussels and the inter-departmental committee that screens all Commission proposals. It also drafts an initial Dutch position on EU issues which now-



adays includes an assessment of the impact on developing countries. In addition, the Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation may intervene directly at the highest political level to improve coherence. To heighten its effectiveness, the PCU concentrates on a selected number of focal areas: trade (top priority), agriculture (top priority), trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS) (with an emphasis on health), sustainable fisheries, product standards and market access, and migration.

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

To ensure implementation of the memorandum, joint project teams have been established and commodity papers are being produced, for example, on cotton and sugar. These papers sketch options in the face of current development challenges and are being distributed to Dutch embassies in target developing countries for discussion with authorities there. They look at, for example, how governments can enter into or join consultations and panels on cotton in the WTO and gain support in the WTO negotiations.

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

### *Sweden*

Sweden adopted its *Policy for Global Development* (PGD) in December 2003. The PGD establishes integrated policy-making as the institutional basis for achieving policy coherence for development. A progress report on implementation is to be submitted to Parliament in May 2005.<sup>5</sup> The policy sets out equitable and sustainable global development as the overall goal and commits the government to work towards this goal and the Millennium Development Goals. It requires government agencies to take an active and deliberate stance to balance different policy areas in order to improve coherence.

5 A first report was delivered in autumn 2004. However, it did not address issues substantively enough. The second report was therefore advanced to May 2005. That report was to be compiled by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Department for Global Development, with inputs from other ministries.

The PGD puts Sweden on course to pursue a coherent policy for global development based on a holistic view of what drives development and of the measures required to achieve equitable and sustainable development on a global scale. Development objectives, it states, should embrace all areas of policy and political decision-making; and coordination and coherence between different policy areas should be improved to enhance development outcomes. It also stipulates that Swedish actors be involved to a greater extent in development cooperation.

The whole government is made responsible for attaining Sweden's global development objectives. Conflicting policy areas are to be identified and then made the focus of informed and considered strategic choices. Responsibility for implementing the policy is shared by all policy actors and ministries. A *special unit* (a secretariat) set up in the Department for Global Development of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will assist in annual follow-up studies and in reviewing operational targets to measure the progress and outcomes of the integrated policy.<sup>6</sup>

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

As emphasised in the 2005 OECD/DAC Peer Review, the PGD asks the Swedish government to play a proactive role in favour of policy coherence in multilateral contexts, such as those afforded by the EU (in the Cotonou Partnership Agreement or the Lisbon process) and other specialised fora (Doha, Monterrey, Johannesburg). The government, moreover, supports ongoing efforts to develop an international "coherence index" that can be used to aid Swedish and international efforts towards more effective policies.

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

#### *United Kingdom*

The United Kingdom, though it does not use the label "policy coherence", has set poverty eradication as an objective for the whole of the government in its 2000 White Paper *Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor*. This White Paper commits the UK to work with others to manage globalisation so that poverty is systematically reduced and international development targets are achieved. In addi-

6 The special unit was originally planned to be located within the Prime Minister's office in order to promote the whole-government approach. Its location within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs tends to reinforce the view that 'PGD is a matter only for development co-operation. Under these organisational circumstances, it will be a challenge to get other Swedish ministries and institutions to take their own ownership of the concepts of PGD' (DAC Peer Review, 2005).

tion, the *International Development Act*, which came into force in June 2002, is the central piece of legislation governing when the UK can give development or humanitarian assistance, in what forms it can be given, and on what terms. It makes poverty reduction the overarching purpose of British development aid, either by furthering sustainable development or by promoting people's welfare.

The UK pursues the poverty elimination objective with different forms of *inter-departmental collaboration*. The Department for International Development (DFID) works closely with other government departments on policies that impact on international development, including those related to agriculture, trade, migration and climate change. As an example, DFID is consulted when the UK government is making licensing decisions on arms exports. The Cabinet-level International Development Secretary coordinates policy and strategy across the government. Where close collaboration is required, inter-departmental working groups have been established, as, for example, the Post-Conflict Reconstruction Unit which involves the Foreign Office, the Ministry of Defence and DFID.<sup>7</sup> Overall, these many collaboration instruments enable departments to dialogue, to exchange views and interests and to coordinate among themselves to present a coherent UK position in international settings.

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

### **EU institutions**

EU institutions, which make up our fourth category, are politically committed to policy coherence for development through the Maastricht Treaty and, more recently, the draft constitutional treaty. A number of international partnership agreements also contain explicit references to coherence for development. Various mechanisms are in place to foster policy coherence from a development perspective. As such, the EU institutional set-up for policy coherence for development most closely resembles that of the countries in the third category above.

7 DFID also participates in other working groups and task forces: on remittances, access to essential medicines, debt, environment, trade, anti-corruption, foreign direct investment and conflict.

### *The iQSG*

The *Inter-Service Quality Support Group* (iQSG) was set up in January 2001 as an element of the European Commission's reform of its external assistance programme. Its mandate is to propose improvements in programming methodology and thereby increase quality throughout the programming cycle. It is also responsible for screening draft strategy documents and indicative programmes and suggesting improvements to ensure a consistently high quality. The iQSG is run by a small secretariat located in the Directorate General for Development (DG-DEV). Its board consists of middle and higher-ranking Commission management from all External Relations (RELEX) DGs. Each of these has a quality service group that is linked to the iQSG. These generally consist of one or two staff members who keep an eye on quality and standards.

The iQSG delivered several training sessions for Commission officials on programming of the *Regional Strategy Papers* (RSPs) and *Country Strategy Papers* (CSPs) and on the mid-term review process. It has also facilitated the "programming" of EU budget lines and initiated several internal mechanisms for following programming and review processes. The iQSG was instrumental in programming the first generation of CSPs. Its secretariat and board elaborated implementation guidelines on the content and programming methodology of the CSPs, and it developed a common framework for the CSPs across the regions where the Commission operates. This framework contains a requirement to look at coherence. Each CSP should thus include a section on coherence concerning the EU policy mix. This consists of identifying linkages between external assistance and other Community policies, resources and instruments in fields such as trade, fisheries, agriculture, conflict prevention, food security, and the Common Foreign and Security Policy (EC Guidelines, 2001).

### *Country teams*

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

### *Impact assessment*

An *impact assessment process* was set up by the Commission in 2002 within the framework of the "better regulation" package and the European Sustainable Development Strategy which instigated several concrete actions to simplify the regulatory environment and improve the way the Commission designs policy. Replacing previous single-sector impact assessments, the new process provides the European institutions with an integrated methodology by which to assess policy impact. As now designed, the impact assessment process functions as a tool for improving the coherence of mea-

sures under preparation. 'It associates all relevant Commission services to the analysis, and consults potentially affected stakeholders as regards different scenarios for the policy goals to be achieved' (COM/2005/0134 final). Through the impact assessment process, the Commission identifies the likely positive and negative economic, environmental and social effects of proposed policy actions, and outlines potential synergies and trade-offs in achieving competing objectives, thus enabling informed political judgments to be made about the proposal.

The process takes place in two stages. First a preliminary assessment is completed. Then, if necessary, an extended impact assessment is done. Preliminary assessment is required for all proposals submitted in the context of the annual policy strategy or work programme that the Commission adopted the year before. Key elements of the assessment process are thorough consultation with different stakeholders and coordination across the different Commission services. The assessment process was expected to be fully operational for 2004/05. Commission services are currently improving the process. The last two Council conclusions refer to impact assessment as the European tool for promoting policy coherence for development and called on the Commission to further reinforce it.<sup>8</sup>

#### *Policy coherence working groups*

Within the Commission, *policy coherence working groups* exist for all geographic areas and on many thematic topics. These may take the form of inter-service (i.e. inter-DG) groups, focusing, for instance, on the EU's policies towards Africa. The *RELEX NET group* regularly examines horizontal often development-related items, sometimes in collaboration with DG-DEV staff.

#### *The Committee on Development and Cooperation of the European Parliament*

This committee is responsible for promoting, implementing and monitoring the development and cooperation policy of the Union, matters relating to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement and relations with other relevant bodies. It also organises the European Parliament's involvement in election observation missions, when appropriate in cooperation with other relevant committees and delegations. Though it has no specific institutional mandate to promote policy coherence for development, it does refer to coherence issues in various debates and reports.<sup>9</sup>

8 *Presidency Conclusions of the Brussels European Council*, 16 and 17 December 2004 [http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf](http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf) and *External Relations Council Conclusions: Accelerating Progress towards Achieving the Millennium Development Goals*, Brussels, 24 May 2005, [http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/gena/84945.pdf](http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/gena/84945.pdf)

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

TABLE 1: **Inventory of mechanisms designed and implemented to address policy coherence for development**

<i>Member state or EU institution</i>	<i>Policy-level mechanisms</i>	<i>Institutional and administrative mechanisms</i>	<i>Assessment and advisory capacity</i>
<b>Austria</b>	– Coherence clause in Federal Act on Development Cooperation (2002)	– Three-year plans	– Advisory council on development cooperation.
<b>Belgium</b>	– Reference to coherence in Policy Outline for Development Cooperation (2004)	– Inter-Departmental Committee on Central Africa	
<b>Cyprus</b>			
<b>Czech Republic</b>	– Concept of foreign aid programme for the 2002–07 period	– Inter-Ministerial Working Commission	– Development Centre
<b>Denmark</b>	– New Africa Policy	– Department for Development Policy	
<b>Estonia</b>	– Reference to coherence in Principles on Development Cooperation		
<b>European institutions</b>	– Maastricht Treaty (art. 177) – EU draft constitutional treaty (art III-316) – Development Policy Statement – Commission’s communication (2005) 134 on policy coherence for development – European Council conclusions	– CSP/RSP programming (policy mix analysis required but implementation unsure) – Country teams – Impact assessment – Relex group – Development Committee (European Parliament)	– Inter-Service Quality Support Group (iQSG)
<b>Finland</b>	– Development policy 2004 focuses on coherence – Development issues discussed in other policy documents (e.g. Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2004; Government Report on the Human Rights Policy of Finland 2004)	– Inter-Ministerial theme-based groups at ministerial and civil servant level <sup>10</sup> – Cabinet Committee and Government Secretariat for EU Affairs – Integrated bilateral negotiations with partner countries <sup>11</sup>	– Development Policy Committee

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

<sup>11</sup> Finland negotiates with its long-term partner countries with a broad agenda that incorporates political issues, trade and development cooperation as well as multilateral policy formulation and compliance.

<i>Member state or EU institution</i>	<i>Policy-level mechanisms</i>	<i>Institutional and administrative mechanisms</i>	<i>Assessment and advisory capacity</i>
<b>France</b>	– Presidential initiatives	– Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development – Inter-Ministerial Committee for European Economic Cooperation – Inter-Ministerial and international working group on cotton	
<b>Germany</b>	– Programme of Action 2015	– Policy coherence dialogue between DGs of ministries (as part of the Programme of Action 2015) – Inter-departmental coordination meetings – Inter-departmental committees (export, security) – Task Force 2015 (inc. Division 300)	
<b>Greece</b>	– 2004 Hellenic Aid Plan refers to coherence		
<b>Hungary</b>			
<b>Ireland</b>	– Strategy of the Department of Foreign Affairs (aims to take development interests into account in all government policies) (2003)	– Inter-departmental meetings and committees (trade, agriculture, UN) – Parliament's Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs – Technical and Specialist Section	
<b>Italy</b>	– Policy debates in the Council of Ministers	– Inter-Ministerial Committee on Economic Planning (CIPE)	
<b>Latvia</b>			
<b>Lithuania</b>			
<b>Luxembourg</b>	– Declaration on the policy for development cooperation and humanitarian action (2004)	– Inter-Ministerial Commission for Development Cooperation – Inter-ministerial working groups between Foreign Affairs and Agriculture, Environment and Health – Policy Coherence Desk (2004) in Development Cooperation Directorate	
<b>Malta</b>			

<i>Member state or EU institution</i>	<i>Policy-level mechanisms</i>	<i>Institutional and administrative mechanisms</i>	<i>Assessment and advisory capacity</i>
<b>Netherlands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Dutch foreign policy (promotes coherence between development trade, agriculture, product standards, fisheries, etc.)</li> <li>– Memorandum on coherence between agriculture and development policy</li> <li>– Annual budget memoranda and that on the state of the (European) Union</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Directorate General for European Cooperation (DGES)</li> <li>– Inter-departmental coordination mechanisms on EU policies (e.g. trade at the Ministry of Economic Affairs)</li> <li>– Policy Coherence Unit to represent interests of developing countries in national policy formulation (focus on trade, agriculture, TRIPS, fisheries, product standards)</li> <li>– EU Coordinating Committee</li> <li>– EU screening committee</li> <li>– Informal EU policy coherence for development network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Advisory Council on International Affairs</li> </ul>
<b>Poland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 2003 strategic plan (refers to coherence as an influencing factor on development cooperation)</li> </ul>		
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Reference to various types of coherence in 1999 strategic plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Inter-Ministerial Commission for Cooperation and its Permanent Secretariat</li> <li>– Inter-Ministerial Commission for European Affairs</li> </ul>	
<b>Slovakia</b>			
<b>Slovenia</b>			
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Master plan for Cooperation 2005–08</li> <li>– Article 4 of the International Development Cooperation Act (1998)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation</li> <li>– Inter-Territorial Committee for International Cooperation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Development Cooperation Council</li> </ul>
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Policy for global development (Cabinet)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Special unit for follow-up and review of, and reporting on Policy for Global Development</li> </ul>
<b>UK</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– White Paper Eliminating World Poverty</li> <li>– International development act (sets objective of poverty eradication for the whole government)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Cabinet committees on Foreign Affairs and Defence and sub-committees on conflict and EU trade policy</li> <li>– Inter-departmental collaboration on conflict prevention, remittances, trade, global health and extractive industries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– International Development Committee</li> </ul>



### 3.5 Tentative conclusions

Generally speaking we may conclude that some progress has been made in policy coherence in the 12 years since the signing of the Maastricht Treaty. Where action has been taken on policy coherence for development, however, the trigger seems to have been the UN Millennium Declaration, not so much the treaty itself.

Developing countries appear to be only marginally involved in the debate on policy coherence for development at the level of the European governments and the EU institutions. The main efforts in this respect relate to the Country Strategy Papers and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper process.

#### Emerging practices

It is striking that all countries with a commitment to policy coherence for development have some form of reporting mechanism to document and underline the choices taken and any (in)coherencies in specific dossiers, in support of policy evaluation or institutional coordination. Such an assessment or advisory capacity seems to represent a *sine qua non* for implementing policy coherence for development.

Moreover, several countries have administrative coordination mechanisms<sup>12</sup> related to development which do not primarily focus on coherence but do include it in their brief. These are normally inter-ministerial working groups or committees that meet regularly to coordinate and accommodate various political and departmental interests. The degree to which this type of coordination is a normal governance procedure or specifically focuses on policy coherence for development varies from case to case. In Sweden, the UK and Austria, for example, policy coherence for development is firmly established in a government act. Inter-departmental committees and groups are operational in Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the UK. In some countries the inter-departmental groups have a very broad mandate (Portugal, Spain), while in others they are issue- or theme-based (Finland, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and UK). In three member states inter-departmental mechanisms are used to provide opinions and inputs on European policies (Finland, the Netherlands, UK), thereby extending into the realm of inter-governmental, not just intra-government, coherence. Two member states have special units for policy coherence: the Netherlands established its Policy Coherence Unit in 2002 and Luxembourg initiated its Policy Coherence Desk in 2004. Germany's Division 300 is similar.

12 We distinguish between coordination and coherence mechanisms. An administrative coordination mechanism is an instrumental or operative way of coordinating actions within the government while a coherence mechanism is a tool to achieve a particular objective within or across different policy frameworks. An administrative coordination mechanism may or may not include policy coherence for development as a stated objective. In the case of the coordination mechanisms mentioned here, this objective is to some degree part of their brief.

### **Different approaches emerge in different institutional contexts**

Sweden's "whole-government" approach stands out among the different approaches. Its Policy for Global Development calls for greater coordination and coherence across policy areas, particularly those of trade, security, agriculture and public health, both at the national and international level. The Swedes apply a policy-based holistic approach implemented by the government and public administration as a whole, rather than any specific mechanism. The policy was approved in 2003 and the Cabinet must report annually on progress to the Parliament. A special unit prepares this report. The policy foresees a wide stakeholder consultation forum and an independent evaluation mechanism, but these are not yet established. Denmark is on a similar path, primarily relying on strong coherence-oriented policies. Yet the Danes have various policies, not just one predominant comprehensive policy framework. As an institutional mechanism, it relies on its Department for Development Policy.

Finland, Germany and the Netherlands, in contrast, combine strong national policy frameworks with administrative mechanisms that specifically promote coherence for development. As is the case in Sweden, in these countries a systematic reporting obligation exists.

The European Commission is of course rather unique. Its commitment to policy coherence for development (article 177 of the Maastricht Treaty) is pursued in a number of policies, such as the "Everything but Arms" initiative, and in various institutional mechanisms. Examples of these latter are the CSP/RSP programming and the balance in the EU external relations policy mix, the country teams, the Inter-Service Quality Support Group and the impact assessment process.

It is clear that the way the different actors tackle policy coherence is context-specific and closely aligned with existing institutional frameworks and political approaches. A study of the particular historical and institutional context must therefore be a part of any attempt to evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of coherence mechanisms as they exist in the EU today. The possibility for replicating mechanisms within a different national or EU context will have to be studied carefully. Indeed, a mechanism that is efficient and effective in one institutional context and administrative culture could prove less useful in another.

### **A few other observations**

There seems to be a relation between the *level of consolidation of the aid system* and the attention paid to policy coherence for development. Emerging donors may thus benefit from an evaluation of some of the longer tried approaches to and mechanisms for policy coherence for development.

Comparing current practices in the member states and the European Commission with the *enabling practices* drawn from McLean Hilker's study (Annex 2), we conclude that the more coherence-minded countries have many practices in use at each level. A detailed study of why some and not all are used in each case should be part of the eventual evaluation study.

The scores of several member states on the Commitment to Development Index (CDI)<sup>13</sup> seem to suggest that *different approaches may be equally successful in promoting coherence*. Apparently, there is no one correct way to do the job. For example, Denmark and the Netherlands seem to have very different approaches, the former relying on policy goals and the latter on institutional mechanisms. But both score equally high in the CDI. The same can be said about Sweden, the UK, Germany and France, all of which were among the top-ten in the CDI for 2004.

13 The 2004 Center for Global Development and Foreign Policy Magazine Commitment to Development Index. [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/issue\\_mayjun\\_2004/cgddetail.php](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/issue_mayjun_2004/cgddetail.php)

## 4. Selecting mechanisms for evaluation

### 4.1 Selection criteria

As observed earlier, within the framework agreed upon by the 3C Task Force, evaluations must comply with three main criteria: they must be pertinent to ongoing policy concerns; they should provide added-value in terms of knowledge; and they should be practically feasible. Hence, our search was for institutional mechanisms for promoting policy coherence for development that are pertinent to ongoing debates and policy-making processes and could potentially provide lessons for policy-makers. In addition, the mechanisms had to be identifiable as coherence mechanisms in terms of their stated objective(s), the stakeholders involved, the institutional setting and expected outcomes. Our search concentrated on mechanisms that focus on internal or intra-government (donor) coherence, and included both general and specific mechanisms. In our view, the evaluation of any of the mechanisms identified in this study would comply with the 3C Task Force's *criterion of pertinence*.

The *practical feasibility* of an evaluation study can be ensured by choosing institutional mechanisms that are situated at a well-defined level of governance, so as to permit the study to zoom in on key stakeholders and operations, on actual processes as well as on visible results. In addition, the evaluation should focus on more or less formalised arrangements in order to be able to verify and document objectives, processes and actions. This way, relevant stakeholders are clearly identifiable, political ownership can be determined, and expectations and hence possible effects may be traced. The evaluation will also become more feasible where mechanisms have been operational for more than one year. To these considerations we may add that as a rule, mechanisms cannot be too *politically sensitive* in the eyes of their owners; otherwise the cooperation of key stakeholders may be doubtful, leading to selective and possibly biased evaluation results. Applying the above considerations, Table 2 lists the institutional mechanisms in use in Europe today that are feasible to evaluate.

Finally, our survey of existing literature and documented experiences with respect to mechanisms to promote policy coherence for development in the EU shows that the criterion of *added-value* in terms of bringing new knowledge will be served almost automatically by the evaluations. While the literature on the subject of coherence itself is extensive, research on *how to bring it about* is as yet scarce. In addition, experiences with promoting coherence in Europe are relatively recent and have not been systematically described or

evaluated. The exceptions are the attention paid to policy coherence for development in the DAC Peer Reviews and in the current evaluation of the Dutch Policy Coherence Unit, the results of which are expected in July 2005. Therefore, a systematic evaluation of specific mechanisms for promoting policy coherence for development within the EU will certainly provide new insights and understanding of key policy processes.

TABLE 2: Mechanisms to promote policy coherence for development that are, in principle, eligible for evaluation

<i>Policy-level mechanisms</i>	<i>Institutional and administrative mechanisms</i>	<i>Assessment and advisory capacity</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– New Africa Policy (2004) (Denmark)</li> <li>– Programme of Action 2015 (2001) (Germany)</li> <li>– Strategy of the Foreign Affairs Department (2003) (Ireland)</li> <li>– Declaration on the policy for development cooperation and humanitarian action (2004) (Luxembourg)</li> <li>– Memorandum on coherence between agriculture and development policy (2002) (Netherlands)</li> <li>– Policy for Global Development (2003) (Sweden)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Inter-Departmental Committee on Central Africa (Belgium)</li> <li>– CSP/RSP programming (European Commission)</li> <li>– Country teams (European Commission)</li> <li>– Impact Assessment (European Commission)</li> <li>– Development Committee (European Parliament)</li> <li>– Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development (France)</li> <li>– Inter-Ministerial Committee for European Economic Cooperation (France)</li> <li>– Task Force 2015 (including Division 300) (Germany)</li> <li>– Inter-ministerial policy coherence dialogue (as part of the Programme of Action 2015) (Germany)</li> <li>– Policy Coherence Desk (2004) in Development Cooperation Directorate (Luxembourg)</li> <li>– Policy Coherence Unit (Netherlands)<sup>1</sup></li> <li>– Informal EU policy coherence for development network (Netherlands)</li> <li>– Inter-Ministerial Commission for Cooperation and its Permanent Secretariat (Portugal)</li> <li>– Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation (Spain)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Inter-Service Quality Support Group (iQSG) (European Commission)</li> <li>– Development Policy Committee (Finland)</li> <li>– Development Cooperation Council (Spain)</li> <li>– Policy for Global Development (Sweden)</li> <li>– International Development Committee (UK)</li> </ul>

1 The Policy Coherence Desk is currently being evaluated externally by ECORYS, the reason being that it was established as a temporary unit for four years. The evaluation is to be concluded in July 2005, and its conclusions are expected to be a major input to decision-making in the second half of 2005 on how the unit should be addressed and institutionally arranged within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the longer term.

The value added may be significantly increased, however, should the studies cover mechanisms in a wide range of country and institutional contexts; and if the issue of the *replicability* of the different mechanisms in different institutional settings is made part of the evaluation study. Besides, an evaluation may be expected to render greater insight if the mechanism can be evaluated over *a longer period of time*. Finally, the *innovativeness* of the particular mechanism may be considered. The evaluation of a unit established specifically to boost intra-governmental policy coherence for development may provide more clear-cut and innovative insight than the study of yet another inter-departmental coordination committee. Whether such holds true, however, depends on the particular institutional context in which the selected mechanism operates.

#### **4.2 A first tentative selection**

In line with our purpose and selection criteria, Table 3 presents a number of arrangements and mechanisms that should be considered for evaluation. All mechanisms selected are explicitly intended to promote policy coherence of the internal or intra-governmental type. Most of the selected mechanisms were created specifically for that purpose (e.g., the EU's iQSG and its impact assessment process and the Dutch Policy Coherence Unit and coherence memorandum). Some are broader but have a specific brief on policy coherence for development. The selection also includes countries and institutions with initiatives aimed especially towards promoting policy coherence for development, such as the European Parliament's Development Committee and the UK's International Development Committee, or which could potentially play a role in policy coherence for development (e.g. the France's CICID). It should be taken into account however that to evaluate these rather diverse initiatives and establish their (possible) impacts on policy coherence for development, a research effort rather than a straightforward evaluation study may be required.

Finally, the countries and institutions involved represent a wide spectrum of institutional contexts and approaches to enhancing policy coherence for development. With the exception of Denmark's New Africa Policy, all of the selected mechanisms have been operational for two years or more. This will help to ensure feasibility.

TABLE 3: A first selection of mechanisms for evaluation

<i>Institutional mechanism</i>	<i>-1-</i>	<i>-2-</i>	<i>-3-</i>	<i>-4-</i>	<i>-5-</i>	<i>-6-</i>
	<i>Specific or general*</i>	<i>Since (year)</i>	<i>Policy coherence for development type</i>	<i>Policy actor category (II,III,IV)</i>	<i>Type of mechanism</i>	<i>Gov. or donor</i>
New Africa Policy	specific	2004	intra-	III	- policy-level	DK
Inter-Service Quality Support Group	general	2000	intra-	IV	- assessment/ advisory capacity	EC
Development Policy Committee	specific	2003	intra-	III	- assessment/ advisory capacity	FI
Programme of Action 2015/ Task Force 2015	specific	2001	intra-	III	- policy-level, - institutional/ administrative	DE
Policy Coherence Unit <sup>2</sup>	specific	2002	intra-	III	- institutional/ administrative - assessment/ advisory capacity	NL
Memorandum on coherence between agriculture and development policy	specific	2002	intra-	III	- policy-level	NL
Policy for Global Development <sup>3</sup>	specific	2003	intra-	III	- policy-level, - assessment/ advisory capacity	SE
Development Committee of the European Parliament	general	—	internal and intra-	IV	- institutional/ administrative	EP
Impact Assessment	specific	2002	intra-	IV	- institutional/ administrative	EC
Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation	general	1984	intra-	II	- institutional/ administrative	ES

- 2 This evaluation could make use of the results of the external evaluation the coherence unit itself recently undertook; these are expected in July 2005. The 3C Task Force study could then, for example, focus more on replicability.
- 3 Interestingly, the very recent (May 2005) DAC Peer Review on Sweden encourages Sweden to share 'its experience in implementing the Policy for Global Development with the DAC members, especially the special role played by parliament and operational approaches which encourage whole of government ownership of the global agenda.'

<b><i>Institutional mechanism</i></b>	<b>-1-</b>	<b>-2-</b>	<b>-3-</b>	<b>-4-</b>	<b>-5-</b>	<b>-6-</b>
	<i>Specific or general*</i>	<i>Since (year)</i>	<i>Policy coherence for development type</i>	<i>Policy actor category (II,III,IV)</i>	<i>Type of mechanism</i>	<i>Gov. or donor</i>
International Development Committee	general	1997	internal and intra-	III	- institutional/ administrative	UK
Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development (CICID)	general	1998	intra -	II	- institutional/ administrative	FR

*Note:* \* Specific mechanisms, according to their brief, have been designed and implemented exclusively to promote policy coherence for development. General mechanisms are not intended exclusively for PCDD, but their brief includes an explicit reference to it.



# Annex 1. Brief sketch of the institutional architecture for development cooperation in EU member states and institutions

## **Austria**

In 2004 Austria joined those DAC members with a Ministry of Foreign Affairs responsible for aid policies and overall coordination of assistance. A separate agency, the Austrian Development Agency (ADA), acts as the intermediary executing agent for the bilateral assistance programme. Section VII of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs serves as the focal point for development strategy and provides policy leadership for the country's aid system. Its leadership function will be strengthened when the ADA takes over the operational aspects of bilateral aid.

Austria's reform of its ODA has not reduced the number of actors in its aid system. Apart from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, seven other federal ministries are involved to varying degrees in spending or policy decisions related to cooperation. Furthermore, Austrian provinces and some communities fund ODA projects. As for implementation, most of these actors work together with Austrian NGOs, business enterprises and international organisations. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is mandated to ensure that the aid programme is consistent. For this a three-year programme orients the system and communicates its activities and goals nationally and internationally. Strategies aligned with partner countries' own national strategies are to serve as a frame of reference for the various development cooperation actors.

## **Belgium**

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

Development cooperation is one of the policy areas currently being de-federalised, or shifted to regional governments. The Flemish government already has a develop-

ment cooperation unit in its external relations department. However, no policy dialogue is yet under way between the regional and federal levels.

### **Cyprus**

Cyprus' bilateral ODA is managed mostly by its Planning Bureau and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Ministry has three departments involved in aid programming, but without a clear coordination mandate. The Planning Bureau is the economic and administrative arm of the Central Planning Commission and the Planning Committee on Policy and Budget. It is a government service, independent of any ministry and accountable to the President of the Republic.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs sets geographical priorities taking into account Cyprus' own interests as well as EU recommendations. The Ministry of Finance establishes the budget to be allocated to ODA.

A technical assistance committee was established in 1994, consisting of representatives of the Planning Bureau and four ministries: Foreign Affairs; Finance and Commerce; Industry and Tourism; and Labour and Social Insurance. This committee meets annually and its main function is to plan technical assistance.

### **Czech Republic**

Development cooperation in the Czech Republic is divided over the line ministries. Coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, these ministries are responsible for the identification and preparation of projects, as well as their implementation and evaluation. In August 2003 the government asked the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to set up the Office for International Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance to be headed by a national coordinator and a staff of nine officials responsible for both bilateral and multilateral development cooperation.

Up to ten line ministries manage bilateral projects and cooperation with multilateral institutions in their respective areas of competence. The line ministries submit proposals (often drafted by non-state actors) to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which, in cooperation with the Development Centre (based within the Institute for International Relations) screens the proposed projects. Eligible projects are forwarded to government for final approval and financing. A development agency is slated to take over the current role of the Development Centre. There is also a foreign aid council, which is set to take on an advisory role.

### **Denmark**

Denmark has an exceptionally compact and centralised aid system designed to promote coherence. Leadership and implementation is highly concentrated in one of the three departments of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is the "South Group", also known as DANIDA. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has a separate minister who currently combines migration and development policy. The Ministry appoints the nine-member Board of International Development Cooperation, which approves large

programmes and reviews country strategies on a monthly basis. The 50-person Council of International Development Cooperation oversees policy issues and functions as a think-tank. Its meetings are quarterly.

Four large NGOs are involved in implementation of targeted programmes, based on four-year work plans. Execution is further highly decentralised to the embassies.

### **Estonia**

In 2001 Estonia created the Development Cooperation Division within the External Economic Policy Department of its Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The division plans and organises the implementation of development assistance. Other ministries may be involved on a case-by-case basis, for example, providing technical expertise. Parliament is involved in discussions on political and financial commitments.

### **European institutions**

Development cooperation within the European Union is embedded within the Union's broader and more political external relations framework. Policy leadership is with the European Parliament, especially its committees for Development, Foreign Affairs and Budget; the Council of Ministers; and the European Commission. There are also several consultative forums, such as the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly. Implementation lies with various Commission institutions.

DG DEV is responsible for development policy and relations with the ACP. As such, it is in charge of some €3 billion annually, half of the total EC budget for external aid. The Commissioner for Development is responsible for the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO), which will soon be additionally charged with all food security, food aid and food management programmes.

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

AIDCO, the EuropeAid Cooperation Office, is in charge of the implementation of programmes covering the whole of the project cycle except for programming. AIDCO is accountable to a board consisting of all the external relations (RELEX) commissioners.

The EU Delegations in partner countries are responsible for implementation at the partner-country level. A process of devolution of authority to the delegations is under way. Delegations may play an important role in ensuring programmes and strategies are coherent with those of the partner countries.

### **Finland**

In Finland the Ministry of Foreign Affairs prepares and implements foreign policy – including policy towards developing countries. In so doing, it brings together the expertise of different national players to facilitate coherence in the policies formulated. The Ministry is organised in theme-oriented departments: political, external, economic, development, communication and culture. These implement policies in their respective competencies across all geographical areas. The Ministry also has geo-

graphical departments responsible for integrating policy instruments into coherent regional approaches.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has a separate Minister of Foreign Trade and Development. The Ministry also has a Department for Development Policy, which is responsible for planning, evaluation and institutional relations related to development cooperation. It further has a focal point for policy coherence. Development cooperation projects and programmes are managed by geographical departments and the department of global affairs. Some 80 country representations participate in policy implementation.

### **France**

France has a complex institutional structure for development with several actors: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MAE), the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Finance and Industry (MINEFI) and the French Agency for Development (AFD). In 1998, the country undertook a major reform of its institutional architecture for foreign assistance. Previously, development cooperation had been geographically divided between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Cooperation, the latter dealing with France's traditional areas of influence. To enhance the coherence and effectiveness of its development action, the two were fused in 1998 creating the Directorate General for Development and International Cooperation (DGCID).

The complexity of the French foreign aid system has led to a plurality of goals. The MAE and the MINEFI are jointly responsible for the strategic management of ODA. The AFD acts as the principal operator. Each element in this structure has its own mandate, though development is not their sole objective. The MAE, responsible for cooperation and cultural action, combines solidarity with influence in support of French diplomacy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is assisted by two ministers of state, one of which is responsible for cooperation with the francophone countries.

The MINEFI is responsible for macroeconomic and financial aid and therefore for debt management policy and monetary and financial cooperation with CFA franc zone countries. It also handles investment promotion, export financing, economic and financial relations with transition countries and relations with international financial institutions. An internal reform of the MINEFI was recently implemented to enhance the coherence of its actions vis-à-vis developing countries. International affairs, development cooperation services and multilateral trade services were placed within the same directorate general.

The AFD's sphere of action includes both developing countries and France's overseas departments and territories. Its objective is stable economic and financial development that maintains social cohesion and safeguards the environment.

A last aspect to be mentioned is the Institutional Act on Finance Legislation (LOLF), which will take effect from 2006 onwards and should make ODA more transparent. This act states several objectives. Following up on the Millennium Development Goals

and development in Africa are specific targets. Its logic favours internal coherence across development policies.

According to the OECD, France's creation of an inter-ministerial mission for ODA provides a unique opportunity for the country to consolidate its cooperation goals and planning processes through budgetary reorganisation and the drafting of a cross-cutting planning document.

### **Germany**

The Federal Foreign Office ensures that Germany speaks with one voice in international arenas. To that end, it cooperates closely with policy-makers, the business community and civil society. It reconciles and pools many, often diverging, interests, and combines the country's many specialist positions and individual perspectives into a coherent German foreign and security policy through practical coordination. The BMZ is a separate government department responsible for development policy and programming. The Federal Foreign Office, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Economy, the Ministry of Technology and territorial units (Lander and below) are all significant players in German development policy and programming.

The German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) and the German bank for financial cooperation (KfW) are important parastatal implementation agencies for development policies and programmes. Several other agencies also play a role, such as Capacity Building International (InWEnt), the German Development Service (DED) and various political foundations.

### **Greece**

Since 2002, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has directed and coordinated Greek development assistance. A deputy minister is positioned in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with two basic competences: international economic relations and international development.

The Directorate General of International Development Cooperation (YDAS) – or “Hellenic Aid” – is a decentralised body for planning and coordinating ODA and administering the ODA budget. Multilateral contributions are still directly managed by each ministry. Implementation responsibility is spread across several agencies, including ministries and other public bodies, development NGOs, universities, local foundations and church associations.

### **Hungary**

Hungary's Department for International Cooperation was created just recently in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and it is not yet fully operational. The Ministry is responsible mainly for humanitarian aid, with other initiatives spread over the line ministries. Coordination is in the hands of an inter-ministerial committee.

In 2001, the Hungarian International Development Assistance Non-profit Co. (HUN-IDA) was created to take the place of TESCO, the state agency formerly responsible

for management of aid. HUN-IDA is to assist the Department of International Cooperation in preparing calls for proposals and terms of reference for future programming.

### **Ireland**

The Irish Minister of Foreign Affairs is assisted by two ministers of state, one responsible for European affairs and the other in charge of development cooperation and human rights. The Development Cooperation Division (DCI) is one of ten divisions in the Foreign Affairs Department. The DCI administers the government's programme of assistance to developing countries and assists the Minister of State in managing aid programmes at the political level. Further, it helps the Minister of Foreign Affairs maintain institutional relations with other aid organisations. The Division has a role in coordinating ODA contributions by other departments as well. Since 2003, it has played a coordination role in the Foreign Affairs Department on all aspects of Ireland's relations with programme countries in Africa.

The DCI works to ensure that Ireland's development policies are consistent with other aspects of foreign policy and to promote coherence across government policies (agriculture, trade, environment, fiscal matters).

### **Italy**

Development cooperation is a responsibility shared by various governmental institutions in Italy. Two ministries, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Economy and Finance, are the main central government players. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, through its Directorate General for Development Cooperation (DGCS), oversees all development cooperation in collaboration with the other ministries. This Ministry directly manages slightly more than a fourth of Italian ODA, while it jointly manages another 51% together with the Ministry of Economy and Finance, which itself manages 17%.

The DGCS is organised in 13 offices (*uffici*). One of these deals with policy analysis and planning and another focuses on multilateral and EU cooperation. The Central Technical Unit (UTC) carries out actual implementation of programmes and has some presence in the field. Italy's Ministry of Foreign Affairs is characterised by a separation between the political-diplomatic level and the technical level in terms of type of personnel and decision-making processes. This makes it difficult to incorporate policy coherence for development into policy discussions, since much of the expertise is found at the technical level.

Within the Ministry of Economy and Finance, it is the Treasury Department that handles development assistance matters, mostly in relation to multilateral development banks, debt relief and export credits. The Treasury Department shares with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs responsibility for maintaining ties with the EU and other multilateral bodies. Several other ministries have fairly important development portfolios.

An inter-ministerial management body, or steering committee, the Directorate Committee for Development Cooperation (CDCS) makes decisions on large-scale initiatives, though it does not deal with policy concerns beyond development.

### **Latvia**

There is not yet any real involvement of Latvia in development assistance, except for ad hoc technical assistance provided by civil servants to neighbouring countries. Recently, a consultative board on development cooperation was established composed of line ministries, NGOs and academics under the chairmanship of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Its policy guidelines were adopted in January 2003.

### **Lithuania**

Lithuania has implemented foreign aid on an ad hoc basis so far. In 2002, the Technical Assistance Division was set up within the Economic Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Division's capacity is to be progressively strengthened. Line ministries implement cooperation activities related to their respective mandates. Parliament's role is as yet limited to the approval of the cooperation budget.

### **Luxembourg**

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

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

### **Malta**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs manages all of Malta's cooperation. A department for international cooperation is being created in the Permanent Secretary's Office as an inter-ministerial standing advisory committee to promote coordination. Line ministries are responsible for implementation.

## **Netherlands**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which coordinates and implements Dutch foreign policy, comprises three ministers: the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister for Development Cooperation and the Minister for European Affairs.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has five directorates general, one of which is dedicated to development cooperation. This DG for International Cooperation (DGIS) is responsible for development cooperation policy, including its coordination, implementation and funding. DGIS is also concerned with coherence between Dutch and EU policy regarding developing countries. It is subdivided into regional departments charged to develop and carry out coherent, effective policies for selected regions and countries. Theme-oriented departments pool expertise in one or more foreign policy areas. These include the Security Policy Department (DVB), the Human Rights and Peace-Building Department (DMV), and the Environment and Development Department (DML). Multilateral departments convey Dutch contributions to multilateral forums and send Dutch delegates to international organisations.

There are also several government advisory bodies, such as the Advisory Council on International Affairs (AIV) and the Netherlands Development Assistance Research Council (RAWOO).

## **Poland**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is responsible for supervising and coordinating Polish development policy. Its Department of the UN System and Global Affairs prepares guidelines for development policy and is in charge of practical supervision of projects. The Ministry of Finance is responsible for the financial aspects of cooperation. Line ministries develop their own cooperation activities and report these ex post to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The most important public actors in development are the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Education. The Know-How Foundation has been selected as the official implementing agency.

## **Portugal**

Portugal has a highly decentralised development cooperation system spread across all ministries and several other public entities, such as universities, municipalities and state enterprises. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is responsible for formulating, coordinating and executing Portugal's external policy. Development policy, as a key component of external policy, is among this Ministry's competencies. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs delegates many competencies related to cooperation to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, with the Ministry acting more at the level of strategic policy definition.

IPAD is a public institute with administrative autonomy, superintended by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. IPAD directs and coordinates Portugal's cooperation policy and ODA. It also plans programmes, monitors their execution, evaluates the results of cooperation and ODA and oversees projects by other state bodies and public entities.



One of IPAD'S goals is to centralise information on all cooperation projects carried out by private Portuguese entities.

Apart from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, virtually every ministry has a cooperation programme and budget. As such, all of the ministries are represented in the Inter-Ministerial Commission for Cooperation. This Commission to some extent coordinates the development cooperation activities carried out by the different public agents.

Policy in the various fields of development work is formulated autonomously by the corresponding ministries and governmental departments. There is as yet no clear form of articulation of the main assistance activities within an overall policy nor any formal analysis of potential impact on developing countries.

### **Slovakia**

Development assistance programmes are prepared, implemented and evaluated by four line ministries in Slovakia, coordinated by a small unit within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Ministry is supported by a high-level advisory body, the Coordination Committee for ODA. The Institute for International Studies, funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the UN Development Programme and private foundations, used to assist the Ministry in formulating its development policy. That role has now been taken over by the Slovak Foreign Policy Association. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has set up a structure for ODA management and established good and transparent relations with NGOs. The Ministry of the Interior is responsible for humanitarian aid.

The Inter-Ministerial Commission for the Coordination of Development Assistance and Cooperation was established as an advisory body to the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Chaired by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs State Secretary, it will coordinate development efforts across the various entities. It has representatives from Foreign Affairs and line ministries and one representative from the national platform of non-governmental development organisations (but not from the business sector and academia). Meetings are ad hoc.

### **Slovenia**

In 2002, the Slovenia Ministry of Foreign Affairs was made responsible for coordinating development and humanitarian assistance. A national coordinator was appointed and the Office for International Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance was created within the Ministry. Projects are identified and prepared by twelve line ministries, which meet in an inter-ministerial commission.

### **Spain**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation is responsible for formulating and implementing Spanish foreign policy. It coordinates all of the bodies of the Spanish public administration which have a role in development cooperation. Development cooperation policy is part of foreign policy and falls within the jurisdic-

tion of the Secretary of State for International Cooperation (SECI). The Spanish International Cooperation Agency (AECI) manages programmes of non-reimbursable aid and the micro-finance support scheme. Aid in the form of commercial credit (FAD credit) is managed by the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism. Actions taken to relieve developing nations' foreign debt are carried out by the Treasury and the Department of Economic Affairs.

Other governmental departments contribute to development cooperation policy as well, albeit to a lesser extent, for example, the Department of Employment and Social Affairs, the Department of Education and Science, the Defence Department and the Department of Health. The Inter-Ministerial Commission for International Cooperation (CICI) provides technical coordination.

Regional and local governments are also involved in development cooperation in Spain. The Inter-Territorial Committee coordinates cooperation efforts across the different administrative levels.

The Development Cooperation Council monitors the extent to which development policy is coherent. The governmental departments responsible for managing aid policy participate in this advisory body, together with other representatives of the aid system. However, this body has limited power, because it is just advisory.

## **Sweden**

The two main actors in the Swedish development cooperation system are the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (for policy-making and multilateral implementation) and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) (for bilateral implementation). A variety of other official and non-governmental groups play strong roles in specific areas, particularly the Swedish Parliament which decides on policies and budgets.

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs is broadly responsible for national development cooperation policies, coordination among official Swedish actors and actual implementation of programmes, in collaboration with the Ministry of Finance and/or SIDA. Many programmes originate from the United Nations, the European Commission, international financial institutions and humanitarian missions, which together represent about 37% of national ODA. The Ministry is large and complex. It has three ministers, for foreign affairs, development cooperation, and migration. The development cooperation portion of the Ministry is primarily situated in the Department of Global Development and is supervised by a director, a director-general, a state secretary and a minister. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs is responsible for 102 embassies, delegations and consulates, many of which house development cooperation programmes.

SIDA is an independent government agency charged to implement government policies according to allocated funds and government directives. It is managed by a director general and supervised by a board, although the latter's responsibility is essentially limited to approving the yearly request for funds and SIDA's annual report.

The Ministry of Finance also plays a role in Swedish development cooperation by linking with the international financial institutions. For this, the Ministry has a special division for international financial institutions. In close collaboration with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Swedish Central Bank, this Division works with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The Ministry of Finance also deals with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, debt issues (in cooperation with the Export Credit Guarantee Board) and budget support (in cooperation with SIDA and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs). The Ministry of Finance co-manages 12% of ODA.

### **United Kingdom**

The Department for International Development (DFID) is one of the government agencies that manages Britain's aid to poor countries and works to eradicate extreme poverty abroad. Other government departments whose policies impact on development are the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), which coordinates and pursues UK policies abroad; the Ministry of Defence, which defends the UK and its interests abroad and strengthens international peace and stability; the Treasury, which formulates and implements the government's financial and economic policy including UK contributions to debt relief and ODA; and the Department for Trade and Industry, which champions UK business at home and abroad and stands up for fair and open markets in the UK, Europe and the world.

DFID is represented in the Cabinet by the Secretary of State for International Development and in the House of Commons by both its Secretary of State and its Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State. It acts as an autonomous government department and works towards the Millennium Development Goals in partnership with governments, civil society, the private sector and the research community. DFID also collaborates with multilateral institutions, including the World Bank, United Nations agencies, and the European Commission.

## Annex 2. Governance levels and enabling practices for promoting policy coherence for development

<i>Governance level</i>	<i>Enabling practices</i>
<p><b>Policy level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– How/whether development and development-related issues are a government priority on an ongoing basis and in all relevant policies.</li> <li>– How/whether the government has a clear, strategic policy framework to ensure the implementation of commitments to policy coherence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Tradition of development assistance and a supportive public.</li> <li>– Strong interest in development issues at high levels of leadership, in particular understanding that poverty reduction is in the national interest.</li> <li>– Overall generic commitment to achieving coherence and consistency across government policies.</li> <li>– Government commitment to international targets and agreements, such as the Millennium Development Goals.</li> <li>– A government-wide commitment to policy coherence for development, reflected in policy documents at different levels and in different sectors and regions.</li> <li>– An overall framework that sets goals to achieve more policy coordination and coherence.</li> <li>– Specific policy-making guidelines stipulating involvement of various ministries and the need to address coherence issues.</li> <li>– Personal commitment of senior politicians to development issues.</li> <li>– Specific policy statements on linkages between policy areas and development.</li> <li>– Government efforts to raise public awareness and develop material to broaden public support and increase understanding of development issues.</li> <li>– Institutional reform processes pressing for better coordination and a more joined-up, efficient government (a “whole government” approach).</li> <li>– A parliamentary development committee monitoring development issues.</li> <li>– Organised pressure by and structured dialogue with non-state actors on development policy.</li> </ul>

<i>Governance level</i>	<i>Enabling practices</i>
<p><b>Institutional and administrative level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– How/whether the structure, form and system of government, the interaction of its different parts and the designation of responsibilities facilitate policy coherence.</li> <li>– Existence and effectiveness of inter-governmental/inter-departmental coordination mechanisms to coordinate policy, consult on policy options and detect and resolve policy conflicts and inconsistencies.</li> <li>– How cross-sectoral cooperation, information exchange and dialogue between different policy departments are promoted and enforced in day-to-day working practices.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– A lead ministry or department responsible for different aspects of external policy, providing that sufficient priority is given to development issues.</li> <li>– A development ministry, institution and/or agency with a mandate to oversee and coordinate all aspects of development cooperation plus the status to represent development interests in the government.</li> <li>– A central unit or cabinet office to coordinate policies between ministries and resolve policy conflicts.</li> <li>– Specific policy coordination bodies with a mandate to promote coherence (for development).</li> <li>– Inter-ministry consultation procedures to discuss policy coherence for development.</li> <li>– Voting procedures used to push through coherent policies or to block incoherent policies (at national and regional levels).</li> <li>– Inter-departmental working groups or task forces as fora to discuss policy coherence for development; these groups working with development agencies on cross-cutting questions.</li> <li>– Legal requirements on policy-making processes and decision procedures requiring consultation with stakeholders, other institutions or ministries and approval of national parliaments.</li> <li>– A management style encouraging consultation and cooperation.</li> <li>– Information flows and regular contact from the senior level down to desk officers.</li> </ul>

<i>Governance level</i>	<i>Enabling practices</i>
<p><b>Assessment and advisory level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Analytical capacity and knowledge management so as to define the policy issues at stake, gather relevant information, conduct analyses and feed information into policy processes.</li> <li>– Existence and utilisation of policy monitoring mechanisms to adjust policies in light of new information, changing circumstances and feedback on impacts.</li> <li>– Ability and willingness of government to consult and balance the interests of all stakeholders in policy- and decision-making.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Sufficient staff with policy and analytical skills to work on wider policy areas and coherence issues.</li> <li>– Funding of policy-oriented research programmes and consultancies on wider policy areas and coherence issues.</li> <li>– Internal knowledge management systems which effectively diffuse the results of analyses, research and best practices within ministries and the government as a whole.</li> <li>– Annual reports covering coherence issues.</li> <li>– Independent evaluation unit, whose mandate may include the examination of impacts of wider policy areas on development and information exchange between evaluation units in different sectors or ministries.</li> <li>– NGOs and other actors use of publicly available policy-making documents and decisions to lobby on coherence issues.</li> <li>– Forums for consultation with different sectors of civil society and partners to discuss and identify actual or potential coherence issues.</li> <li>– Specific public consultation on (new) policy proposals to invite participation and inputs, including from development actors.</li> <li>– Involvement of development actors as members of advisory committees and councils to the government on relevant issues.</li> <li>– An active and well-informed NGO and academic community which can put coherence issues on the government's agenda.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Source:</i> Adapted from McLean Hilker, Lyndsay (2004) "A comparative analysis of institutional mechanisms to promote policy coherence for development. Case study synthesis: The European Community, United States and Japan". Paper prepared for the OECD policy workshop Institutional Approaches to Policy Coherence for Development, 18-19 May.  <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/0/31/31659769.pdf">http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/0/31/31659769.pdf</a></p>	

## Annex 3. Main development policy statements of EU member states

- Austria: Federal act on development cooperation (2002) including its amendment (2003)  
[http://www.bmaa.gv.at/up-media/269\\_joint\\_act.pdf](http://www.bmaa.gv.at/up-media/269_joint_act.pdf)
- Belgium: Policy outline for development cooperation (2004)  
[http://www.dgdc.be/en/the\\_minister/political\\_note/index.html](http://www.dgdc.be/en/the_minister/political_note/index.html)
- Czech Republic: Concept of the Czech Republic foreign aid programme 2002–07 (2002)  
<http://www.mzv.cz/wwwo/mzv/default.asp?ido=7633&idj=2&amb=1&ikony=&trid=3&prsl=&pocti=>
- Denmark: Government priorities for cooperation with Africa 2005–09  
<http://www.um.dk/NR/rdonlyres/952F5A8D-7865-4054-93B5-52F82ACC6A00/0/PolicyonAfrica.pdf>
- Estonia: Principles of development cooperation (2003)  
[http://www.vm.ee/eng/kat\\_178/3815.html](http://www.vm.ee/eng/kat_178/3815.html)
- Finland: Government resolution on development policy (2004)  
[http://global.finland.fi/english/publications/pdf/dev\\_policy2004.pdf](http://global.finland.fi/english/publications/pdf/dev_policy2004.pdf)
- France: Official declarations on foreign policy  
<http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/actu/bulletin.asp?liste=20050519.html#Chapitre2>
- Germany: Programme of Action 2015 (2001)  
[http://www.aktionsprogramm2015.de/www/images/download/ap2015\\_engl.pdf](http://www.aktionsprogramm2015.de/www/images/download/ap2015_engl.pdf)
- Greece: Hellenic Aid action plan for coordination and harmonisation (2004)  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/43/35/33981897.pdf>
- Ireland: Strategy of the Department of Foreign Affairs  
<http://foreignaffairs.gov.ie/aboutus/strategy/default.asp?m=a>
- Italy: Cooperation guidelines on poverty reduction (2004)  
[http://www.esteri.it/eng/4\\_28\\_66\\_71\\_52\\_37\\_13\\_2.asp](http://www.esteri.it/eng/4_28_66_71_52_37_13_2.asp)
- Latvia: The Basic Principles for the Development Cooperation Policy of the Republic of Latvia  
<http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/DevelopmentCo-operation/BasicDocuments/>

- Lithuania: Agreement between Political Parties of the Republic of Lithuania on the Main Foreign Policy Goals and Objectives for 2004-2008:  
[http://www.urm.lt/popup2.php?item\\_id=255](http://www.urm.lt/popup2.php?item_id=255)
- Luxembourg: Declaration on policy for development cooperation and humanitarian action (2004)  
<http://www.gouvernement.lu/gouvernement/cooperation/index.html>
- Malta: website Ministry of Foreign affairs  
<http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa.nsf/mfa?OpenForm>
- Netherlands: Millennium Development Goal 8: Progress report on developing a global partnership for development (2004)  
<http://www.undp.org/mdg/netherlands.pdf>
- Poland: Strategy for development cooperation (2003)  
<http://www.msz.gov.pl/docs/39/DCstrv2.doc>
- Portugal: Guidelines and strategy for Portuguese cooperation on the threshold of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (2003)  
<http://www.ipad.mne.gov.pt/images/stories/legislacao/res43-1999-secXXI.pdf>
- Slovak Republic: Medium-term strategy for ODA (2003-08) (2003)  
<http://www.slovakaid.mfa.sk/en/index.php/article/articleview/30/1/2>
- Slovenia: Office for International Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance)  
<http://www.sigov.si/mzz/eng/index.html>
- Spain: Annual plan for international cooperation (2002)  
<http://www.mae.es/documento/0/000/000/500/plan2002.pdf>
- Sweden: Shared responsibility: Sweden's policy for global development (government bill 2002/03:122) (2003)  
<http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/45/20/c4527821.pdf>
- United Kingdom: Eliminating world poverty: Making globalisation work for the poor (White Paper on international development) (2000)  
<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/whitepaper2000.pdf>
- International development act (2002)  
<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2002/20020001.htm>
- European Union: Treaty on European Union  
<http://europa.eu.int/en/record/mt/top.html>
- Draft constitutional treaty  
[http://europa.eu.int/constitution/futurum/constitution/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/constitution/futurum/constitution/index_en.htm)



## Annex 4. List of contacts

### *Austria*

Klaus Kögeler, Head of Unit for EU, Department VII.1 (Multilateral Development Cooperation), Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Josef Müllner, Head, Department VII.4, Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

### *Belgium*

Ludo Verryken, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Paul Frix, Focal Point on Policy Coherence for Development, Directorate General for Development Cooperation/Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Myriam Bacquelaine, Permanent Representation Belgium with EU.

Dominique de Crombrughe, Special Evaluator, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Ivan Godfroid, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

### *Cyprus*

George L. Viridy, Plenipotentiary Minister, Director, Economic Affairs Division, Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Emmanuelle Lambrinides, Senior Coordination Officer, Directorate for International Economic Relations, Technical Assistance and Administration, Planning Bureau.

Chrysostomos Stavrou, Attaché, Economic Affairs Division, Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

### *Denmark*

Karina Hedemark, Department for Development Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### *European Commission*

Cecilia Thorfinn, Secretary of the Inter-Service Quality Support Group (iQSG), DG Development, European Commission.

Ina von Frantzius, Secretary of the iQSG, DG Development, European Commission.

Patrice Lenormand, G-12 09/103 DEV.A.2, Relations with UN System, Member States and other OECD donor countries, European Commission, DG Development.

Marc van Bellinghen, Dep HoU, RELEX A4, Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management, ACP Political Issues.

Lisabetta Foa, ACP regional integration and insitutional support, AIDCO.

### *Finland*

Suvi Virkkunen, Secretary General, Development Policy Committee.

Mari Linnapuomi, Adviser to the Director General, Department for Development Policy.

### *France*

Aude de Amorim, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Head of Office, Evaluation Unit.

Emma Hagre, Intern, Evaluation Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Philippe Orliange, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sub-Director for Strategy and Multilateral Issues.

Michel Pré, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Program Officer for Economic Organisations, Agricultural Policy and Food Security

Daniel Kamelgarn, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Finance and Industry, Head of Development Activities, Evaluation Unit, European and International Affairs.

Brice Quesnel, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Finance and Industry, Head of Official Development Assistance and Multilateral Development Banks.

Jean-Marie Hatton, Secretary General, International Cooperation High Committee.

Francois-Regis Benois, Administrator, Senate Finance Committee.

Denis Cassat, Inter-Ministerial Committee for European Economic Cooperation, Head of Development Cooperation Sector.

### *Germany*

Daniel Alker, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Section 300 (Programme of Action 2015 on Poverty Reduction).

Guido Ashoff, Head of Department, German Development Institute (GDI).

### *Greece*

Evripidis Stylianidis, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

George Filipeos, Director of YDAS-2, Directorate for Rehabilitation & Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Telessila Kaklamanou).

Georgia Revithi, Expert Counsellor, International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Pantelis Sklias, Chair, Greek NGO National Platform, European Perspective Hellenic NGO.

Aterix Julieris, Development Expert, Associate Professor, University of Athens.

### *Italy*

Marco Zupi, Centre for International Policy Studies (CeSPI).

Gianni Ghisi, Deputy Director General, Directorate General for Development Cooperation (DGCS), Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

### *Luxembourg*

Alex Diederich, Programme Officer, Directorate for Cooperation and Humanitarian Action, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Diane Muller, Chargée de Mission, Directorate for Cooperation and Humanitarian Action, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Diane.Muller@mae.etat.lu

### *Netherlands*

Otto Genée, Director, Policy Coherence Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

### *OECD*

Alexandra Trzeciak-Duval, Special Advisor on Policy Coherence for Development.

Hunter McGill, Head, Peer Review and Evaluation Division.

### *Portugal*

Inês Rosa, Portuguese Institute of Development Assistance (IPAD).

Manuela Ferreira, Portuguese Institute of Development Assistance (IPAD).

### *Slovakia*

Jozsef Berenyi, Chair, ODA Coordination Committee, State Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Peter Hulenyi, Secretary ODA CC, Coordination of FCU UNDP and Cooperation with UNDP Trust Fund; Deputy Director, OMES, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Attila Szep, Director, Bureau of the State Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Vladimir Bujalka, Head, ODA Programme Countries and Humanitarian Aid Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Maria Calfova, Executive Secretary, MURO (Slovak non-governmental development organisation platform), Plataforma Nacional de ONG (MVRO).

Chandran Thiruchittampalam, Canadian Field Adviser, Official Development Assistance for Central Europe (ODACE) Programme.

### *Slovenia*

Setinc, Head of ODA Division, Ministry for Foreign Affairs; e-mail contact: Ana Kalin.

Gorana Flaker, Director, South East European Child Rights Action Network (SEECRAN).

Mjomir Mrak, Professor of International Finance, University of Ljubljana.

### *Spain*

Leire Pajín, Secretary of State for International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation

Juan Pablo de la Iglesia, Secretario General, Spanish International Cooperation Agency

Manuel Iglesia Caruncho, Director, Bureau of the Secretary of State for International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation.

Jose Antonio González Mancebo, Vice Director, Planning and Evaluation Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation.

Javier Jiménez de Gregorio, Director, Bureau of the General Secretary of the Spanish Development Cooperation Agency (AECI).

David Alvarez, Chair, Spanish NGO Platform (CONGDE).

Eva Sánchez Buendía, Subdirección General de Planificación y Evaluación de Políticas de Desarrollo, Secretary of State for International Cooperation (MAEC).

### *United Kingdom*

Ellen Wratten, Team Leader, Aid Effectiveness, Policy Division, Department for International Development (DFID).

Anna Walter, Policy Division, Department for International Development (DFID).

## Annex 5. Further references

- Alonso, J.A. (2003) “Coherencia de políticas y ayuda al desarrollo: el caso español”, in J.A. Alonso and V. Fitzgerald (eds), *Financiación del desarrollo y coherencia en las políticas de los donantes*, Ediciones Catarata, Madrid.
- Alonso, J.A. and V. Fitzgerald (eds) (2003) *Financiación del desarrollo y coherencia en las políticas de los donantes*, Ediciones Catarata, Madrid.
- Arrow, K.J. (1963) *Social Choice and Individual Values*, Wiley, New York.
- Ashoff, G. (1999) “The coherence of policies towards developing countries: The case of Germany”, in Forster y Stokke (eds), *Policy coherence in development Co-operation*, EADI Book Series 22, Frank Cass, London.
- European Commission (2005) Communication to the Council, the European Parliament and the European Economic and Social Committee – Policy Coherence for Development Accelerating Progress towards Attaining the Millennium Development Goals – COM/2005/0134 final.  
[http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2005/com2005\\_0134en01.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2005/com2005_0134en01.pdf)
- European Commission (2001) Guidelines for Implementation of the Common Framework for Country Strategy Papers.  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/reform/document/iqsg\\_04\\_01.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/reform/document/iqsg_04_01.pdf)
- Forster, J. and O. Stokke (eds) (1999) *Policy coherence in development Cooperation*, EADI Book Series 22, Frank Cass, London.
- Fukusaku, K. and A. Hirata (1995) “The OECD and ASEAN: Changing economic linkages and the challenge of policy coherence”, in *OECD and the ASEAN economies: The challenge of policy coherence*, Development Centre Documents, Paris.
- Fukusaku, K. and A. Hirata (1995) *OECD and the ASEAN economies: The challenge of policy coherence*, Development Centre Documents, Paris.
- Hoebink, P. (1999) “Coherence and development policy: The case of the European Union”, in Forster y Stokke (eds), *Policy coherence in development cooperation*, EADI Book Series 22, Frank Cass, London.
- McLean Hilker, Lyndsay (2004) “A comparative analysis of institutional mechanisms to promote policy coherence for development. Case study synthesis: The European Community, United States and Japan”. Paper prepared for the OECD policy workshop *Institutional Approaches to Policy Coherence for Development*, 18–19 May.  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/0/31/31659769.pdf>
- Nicod, M. (2004) “Institutional approaches to promote policy coherence for development: Findings and lessons from DAC peer reviews”. Paper prepared for the OECD policy workshop *Institutional Approaches to Policy Coherence for Development*, 18–19 May.  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/28/59/31664293.pdf>
- OECD (1996) *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> century: The contributions of development cooperation*, Paris, DAC.

- OECD (1999) *Échanges, investissement et développement. Pour la cohérence des politiques*, Paris, OECD.
- OECD (2000) "Governance and coherence: The PUMA mandate, the challenge and the concept. In mimeo, OECD, Paris.
- OECD Observer (2003) *Policy coherence: Vital for global development*. Policy Brief, July. Paris, OECD.
- Pocciotto, R. (2004) "Policy coherence and development evaluation. Concepts, issues and possible approaches". Paper presented at the OECD policy workshop *Institutional Approaches to Policy Coherence for Development*, OECD, Paris.
- Pratt, C. (1999) "Greater policy coherence, a mixed blessing: The case of Canada", in Forster and Stokke (eds), *Policy coherence in development cooperation*, EADI Book Series 22, Frank Cass, London.

*EU mechanisms that promote policy coherence for development*

Policy coherence for development has been adopted as a goal by international institutions in the 1990s. Member states and institutions of the European Union have put in place mechanisms to promote it. This study reviews these. It specifies the main types of coherence under study (internal, intra-government, inter-government). It shows that the three types of mechanisms (overall policy and political decision-making, government institutions and administration, assessment and advisory capacity) reflect a growing commitment of policies to development.

*Cohérence des politiques au service du développement :  
mécanismes mis en œuvre dans l'Union européenne*

La cohérence des politiques des pays industrialisés avec le développement est devenue un objectif affiché par la communauté internationale dans les années 1990. Les Etats membres et les institutions de l'Union européenne ont mis en œuvre des mécanismes pour la promouvoir. Cette étude en fait un inventaire raisonné. Elle permet de préciser les principaux niveaux de cohérence recherchée (interne, intra-gouvernementale et intergouvernementale). Elle montre que les trois types de mécanismes répertoriés (politique générale et décisions politiques, institutionnel et administratif, capacité d'analyse y de conseil) reflètent des degrés croissants d'implication des politiques en faveur du développement.

Evaluation Services of the European Union | 2005

ISBN 90-5260-212-3

Distributed in North America by Transaction Publishers

CO-OPERA  
Development co-operation

aksant

ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS

ISBN 90-5260-212-3



9 789052 602127