



EU NEWS

ISSUE 5

July 2009

Content:

EU Development Policy

- [Outcome of the UN Conference on the Financial crisis and the G8](#)
- [Priorities of the Swedish Presidency](#)
- [European Parliament: composition and programme of the new Development Committee](#)
- [2008 report on EC External Assistance: figures and trends](#)
- [CSO Development Effectiveness](#)

EU Sectoral Policies

- [Climate Change: Environment ministers meeting in Åre, Sweden](#)
- [EU Home Affairs and Migration: The Stockholm Programme](#)
- [Global Forum on Migration and Development](#)

EU Humanitarian Aid Policy

- [ECHO Annual Report 2008](#)

EU relations with third countries

- [Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum to meet in November](#)
- [EU-ACP: mid-term review of Country Strategy papers has been launched](#)

EU Funding for Development

- [European instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, implementation and review](#)

News from the Networks

- [APRODEV](#)
- [CIDSE](#)
- [Caritas Europa](#)

EU DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Outcomes of the UN Conference on the Financial crisis and the G8

The 24-26 June UN Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and its Impact on Development opened several important doors in the global response to the crisis:

- **Trade:** Developing countries earn half their GDP from exports, and trade is the main way the financial crisis is hitting them. The conference outcome document recognizes many countries will need to change trade and investment rules or **impose capital account restrictions**, to implement crisis recovery measures.
- **Debt:** Developing countries face more than \$3 trillion in debt maturing this year. The agreement includes **temporary standstills on debt payments** for countries in crisis, and agreement to go beyond existing ad hoc responses to a **structured mechanism for sovereign debt settlements**.
- **Stimulus:** The agreement calls on countries with stimulus spending not to impose rules that hurt third countries.
- **Continuing mandate:** While some countries opposed follow-up to the conference, the **UN will have a continuing working group to implement these measures**.

The latter is particularly important, as it acknowledges a role for the UN in matters of global economic governance, beyond decision-making in the limited G20 forum and the steering role given to the International Financial Institutions.

At the conference, CIDSE and Cordaid, together with Oxfam, Afrodad and Latindadd, organised a side event sponsored by the Netherlands with a focus on: 1) enhancing international cooperation to counter illicit financial flows including tax evasion: 2) a comprehensive and lasting solution to sovereign

unsustainable debt; and 3) making financial regulation work for development and the MDGs. Read the report [here](#).

Two weeks later in L'Aquila, Italy on 8-10 July, **G8 leaders notably pledged \$20bn (€15bn) to boost food security in the world's poorest countries**, as African presidents and prime ministers and representatives of international bodies joined the group of rich industrialised countries to assess the impact of the global recession on the world's poorest countries. The initiative, spearheaded by the United States, intends to invest in agricultural capacity in the South, giving attention to smallholder farmers in developing countries. However, **financial commitments are insufficient to feed the world's one billion hungry**. The G8 is setting aside \$20bn for the coming 3 years, while they have spent \$13bn in just the past 18 months. The proposed management of the pledged funds by the World Bank also raises doubts: the UN is far more suitable and competent for this purpose, as food security is one of their key objectives.

The good intentions of the G8's 'seven principles' do not mirror their own national policies on food and trade. The **G8 must look to their own policies to ensure the poorest are not subject to market-distorting subsidies and product dumping**. As EU Ministers of Agriculture met in Brussels 13-14 July, **CIDSE and APRODEV asked European Commissioner for Agriculture Marianne Fisher Boel to speak out for the immediate abolition of all export subsidies** and not to wait until the completion of the WTO round of negotiations. The subsidies put the livelihoods of Southern farmers at risk and fail to benefit European farmers.

On climate change, for the first time the world's richest **agreed that it would be a good thing if average global temperatures did not rise above 2 degrees, to avert dangerous climate change**. They also agreed to try to cut their own emissions by 80% by 2050 in order to meet that target. However, they crucially **faltered over the 1990 baseline for these cuts** which is critical for them to have any credibility. Most disappointing was the **object failure of the G8 to provide any leadership on the financing needed if these targets are to be reached**. Developing countries are currently unwilling to come to the UN negotiating table because they feel it is unfair to expect them to bear the financial burden for adapting to climate change and shifting their economies onto a greener footing.

On **reforming the economy**, there were lots of warm words on "more robust, green, inclusive and sustainable" growth, and they listed all the essential areas to achieve this: regulation, anti-corruption, taxation, trade, investment, innovation, and again said a lot of the right things. However, there is **no detail on how they will put these good intentions into practice**. And there are big assumptions about the way they will be delivered. For example, the idea that foreign investment brings technology transfer and that it is appropriate and affordable is a huge assumption. In addition, a lot of the tools governments used to encourage technology transfer are undermined in free trade agreements and other international agreements, often with these same G8 countries.

On aid, the G8 reaffirmed their commitment to the 2005 promise to double aid to Africa by 2010, but considering the failure of Italy and France to deliver on the previous promise, one can be sceptical about the meaningfulness of this one. In a bid to improve their poor delivery on commitments, the UK managed to get **an accountability framework agreed which would publish each year how G8 countries are doing on each of their previous promises**.

Priorities of the Swedish Presidency

On the 1st of July, the Czech Republic handed over the Presidency of the European Union to Sweden. In this time of crisis, the Swedish Presidency has nominated economy and climate change as its key priorities for the next six months.

With regards to development issues, the Swedish Presidency will focus on climate and democracy. It wants to bring on the one hand development and democracy-building and on the other hand development and climate change agendas closer together. For the latter, the Swedish Government will use the report of the International [Commission on Climate Change and Development](#) that was launched in May and will encourage actions towards climate proofing investments, increasing attention to adaptation and finding ways to better integrate climate change into development assistance. Furthermore, the Swedish Presidency emphasizes the importance of aid effectiveness and policy coherence for development. Sweden aims to prioritize the Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) agenda with the European Commission's submission of its second EU biennial PCD report in October.

The Presidency will also call for an action-oriented response to the commitments made in the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.

Increased free trade continues to be a major priority under the Swedish Presidency. Trade negotiations are being prioritized, primarily a rapid conclusion of the Doha Round, but also progress in negotiations with regional groupings. The Presidency aims to work towards making substantial progress in the negotiation and conclusion of regional Economic Partnership Agreements (EPA) between the EU and the Africa, Caribbean and the Pacific countries and in the negotiations on a revised Cotonou-agreement.

It is the Swedish Presidency's ambition to strengthen EU preparedness to deal with the unexpected and coordinate its actions in crisis situations, in particular in Africa. Therefore, it wants to use all of the EU's instruments; from civilian and military crisis management operations to dialogue and diplomacy within the common foreign and security policy, and trade and development policy initiatives.

The Swedish Presidency aims to enhance the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) both with regard to the Eastern dimension through the Eastern Partnership, concerning Ukraine, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia and Belarus, and to the Mediterranean dimension, within the Union for the Mediterranean. Sweden will oversee the development of the new ENP Action Plans, with particular emphasis on policy reform, good governance and human rights. The work on enlargement will also continue under the Swedish Presidency, with the continuing of the accession process of the Western Balkan states and Turkey. Croatia's negotiations with the EU could enter a final stage during the autumn. Moreover, the Presidency will work to make further progress in the EU integration process of the countries of the Western Balkans.

Regarding asylum and migration, the Presidency strives for common policies and systems, focusing on the common asylum system, and resettlement (*see article on Stockholm Programme*). The Swedish Presidency supports the Stockholm Programme, which should allow increased labour immigration to the EU, and the EU Global Approach to Migration, which Sweden considers as an important tool to strengthen the positive link between migration and development, and to counteract irregular immigration.

More at <http://www.se2009.eu/en>

CIDSE Presidency Outlook for Development available soon at www.wdev.eu and www.cidse.org

European Parliament: composition and programme of the new Development Committee

The new European Parliament officially started its mandate on 13 July in Strasbourg. It is there that the lists of members of the different political groups were confirmed and that the chair and vice-chairs of the Parliament were elected. 7 political groups constitute the actual Parliament:

- the [EPP](#): the group of European People's Party, center-right, Christian democrats – 265 seats
- the [S&D](#): the group of the progressive alliance of Socialists and Democrats – 184
- the [ALDE](#): the group of the alliance of Liberals and Democrats – 84
- the [Greens/EFA](#), the group of Greens and European Free Alliance – 55
- the ECR, European conservatives and reformists group – 54 (no website, newly created)
- the [GUE/NGL](#), the Confederal Group of the European United Left - Nordic Green Left- 35
- the EFD, Europe of Freedom and Democracy group – 32 (no website)

In addition, 27 MEPs are not affiliated to any group.

The 69-year-old Polish MEP, Jerzy Buzek will lead the European Parliament for the coming two and a half years (until January 2012). President Buzek is the first President of the European Parliament to come from Central and Eastern Europe following the EU's enlargement in 2004. He belongs to the small community of the Lutheran Evangelical Church of Poland and is a member of the EPP group, the biggest political group of the newly elected Parliament (see ENI article [here](#).)

The second week of activity of the new Parliament was dedicated at establishing and first meetings of the 22 committees of the Parliament. Amongst them the Development Committee held its first meeting on 21st July. **Mrs Eva Joly, a French MEP** born in Norway and known for campaigning against corruption, from the Group of the Greens will chair the Committee with the support of 3 other vice-chairwomen, Michèle Striffler (F, EPP), Iva Zanicchi (I, EPP) and Corina Cretu (R, S&D) and one vice chairman, Deva Nijr (UK, ECR).

The [list of members](#) of the Development Committee counts **30 members among whom 23 are new to the committee** and 14 are new MEPs. Louis Michel, former Commissioner for Development and Belgian member of the ALDE group is one of 30 substitutes of the committee. Mr Michel will also seat as a member in the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home affairs and is looking forward to becoming co-chair of the Joint ACP-EU Parliamentary Assembly. His mandate as Commissioner was interrupted on 13 July and the Belgian Government nominated Karel de Gucht (Foreign minister of Belgium at that time) for his replacement. A hearing of K. de Gucht by the Development Committee will take place early September.

At the first Development Committee meeting, the chairwoman, Mrs Joly, presented the programme of the committee for the coming months. On top of their agenda are two key priorities: the impact of the financial and economic crisis on developing countries and the inter-relation between climate change and development. The Dev. Committee would like to have debates on these two issues in plenary sessions of the Parliament as early as possible.

Two new reports have been commissioned by the Committee, one on the impact of the financial crisis and another one on the mid-term review of the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) instrument.

A working document on **Climate change and Developing countries** was already discussed at this first meeting after a presentation on the status of and expectations from the UNFCCC negotiations by Tim Core from Oxfam. The committee also expressed its intention to be well represented in the Parliament's delegation to the Copenhagen conference.

The Committee also intends to organise a hearing on the Commission's management of Non-State Actors' involvement in EC Development Cooperation in follow-up of the publication by the Court of Auditor of a report on that issue (see *EU News 4*). Note as well that the Council of ministers recently adopted conclusions on that same report (available [here](#)).

Finally, one important issue that was debated at the first committee meeting was the **2010 EU Budget** for External Relations (Heading 4 of the budget). Gay Mitchell, an Irish member of the EPP group who was already very active in the Dev. Committee during the previous term will draft the report of the committee with amendments to the draft budget recently adopted by the Council. The budget process always leads to difficult negotiations between the Parliament and the Council. This year again we can foresee a hot debate after the decision of the Council to make substantial cuts in the preliminary draft budget that had been submitted by the EC in May. The Council decided to cut commitment appropriations for external relations by €89 million and payment appropriations by €508 million of which €248 million from the emergency aid reserve that would be emptied. MEPs present at the first committee meeting expressed serious concerns and disapproval about these cuts.

Gay Mitchell will prepare his list of amendments by the beginning of August and other members of the Committee will have the possibility to propose additional ones until 18 August. The vote of Mitchell's report in the Development committee is planned on 3 September. Once adopted, the report will be transmitted to the Budget committee that will adopt a final list of amendments (based on reports from all committees) to be voted in plenary in October. This EP vote will close the first reading of the budget; the second reading by both Council and Parliament will end with the second vote by the EP in December to adopt the final 2010 budget.

The [website](#) of the Development Committee of the European Parliament will be updated at the end of August. For more information, contact k.sohet@aprodev.net

2008 report on EC External Assistance: figures and trends

EuropeAid recently posted on its website its annual report 2009 on the **European Community's Development and External Assistance Policies and their Implementation in 2008**.

When the European Development Fund (EDF) for African, Caribbean and Pacific countries (ACP) is taken into account, total EC external assistance represents **9% of the total budget of the Union** in 2008. Note that it is exactly the same percentage as in 2004, showing that the budget for external relations increased in the same proportion as the total budget in the last five years.

The total value of funds committed during 2008 reached €12,83 billion while the total actual disbursements (payments) reached €11.11 billion. In comparison, in 2004, total commitments amounted €9.89 billion while payments were a bit higher with €10.2 billion.

Not all of EC aid can however be accounted as Official Development Assistance (ODA), 6.4% of commitments and 17% of payments are out of the ODA category. If the vast majority of EDF money is

ODA eligible (with the exception of the Peace Facility) it is not the case for the annual EU budget with 24% of disbursements not counted as ODA. The fact that certain neighbouring countries benefiting from EC assistance are not developing countries and that assistance relating to security issues, migration and promotion of business often doesn't comply with ODA criteria explains this difference. In addition, international fisheries agreements (€174.2 million) and cooperation with non EU industrialised countries (€24.86 million) are also included in EC external assistance tables.

Total ODA payments managed by the EC in 2008 equals €9.2 billion. EC ODA represents more or less a fifth of total EU ODA from EC and Member States that amounted almost €50 billion in 2008.

The **poverty focus of EC aid** has often been criticised, it however improved in recent years with the closure of the pre-adhesion programme for the 12 countries that joined the EU since 2004 and the fact that the DAC list of developing countries has been extended. In 2008, 41% of net disbursements were allocated to the 61 Least Developed (LDCs) and other Low Income countries (OLICs) and 39% were allocated to the 90 Lower and Upper Middle Income countries. The 20% left were allocated to regional cooperation and other non defined category (including administrative costs). Compared to 2007, the percentage of assistance allocated to LDCs remained at the same level (35%) but aid to OLICs decreased from 10% to 5.9% while **the percentage allocated to Upper Middle Income countries (UMICs) increased from 10 to 13%.**

The explanation provided by the EC to justify these trends relates to changes in the DAC list of developing countries: *In the new DAC list, which took effect in 2008, a number of OLICs have been reclassified as Lower Middle-Income Countries (LMICs): Cameroon, Cape Verde, India, Republic of Moldova, Mongolia, Nicaragua, and Republic of Congo.* It is also important to note that 9 LMICs have also been re-classified in the Upper Middle Income category (among which Brazil, Cuba, Belarus, Serbia and Montenegro) which probably explains why it is that category of countries that benefited from an aid increase.

MICs make up just under half of the world's population and are home to one third of those people across the globe living on less than two dollars per day. All 17 Latin American countries benefiting from EC assistance are presently defined as MICs. (see new and old DAC lists [here.](#))

Comparison of aid to different regions

It is quite interesting to see the big difference in the distribution of EC aid into sectors and modalities of cooperation in the different regions of the globe.

Contrary to what could be expected when considering public finance management and state capacities in the different regions, it is in Africa that the percentage of aid disbursed through general budget support (GBS) is the highest while in non-ACP countries, the EC favours Sectoral Budget Support (SBS). In the 78 ACP countries, social sectors (separately from GBS) only account for 16% of the commitments made in 2008, while they account for 66% in Latin America and Asia (DCI) and for 45% in the neighbouring countries which are the champions of disbursements in favour of social sectors with 75% of payments, most of it is in the form of sectoral budget support.

Budget support commitments (GBS + SBS) represented 39% (€3.86 billion) of all commitments from the EC budget and the EDF in 2008.

GBS commitments made up 60% of all new budget support operations, amounting to €2.3 billion. The main beneficiaries were 21 ACP countries as well as Laos, Vietnam and Honduras.

In the ACP countries **MDG-Contracts**, which are more predictable and longer-term forms of general budget support were initialled with 7 ACP countries (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mali, Mozambique, Rwanda, Uganda, and Zambia), representing over 40% of programmed GBS in the 10th EDF.

SBS also increased especially in non-ACP countries. Total SBS commitments amounted to €1.5 billion and represented only 18% of new budget support commitments for the ACP region, nearly 60% in Asia, and up to 100% among eastern and southern neighbours and in South Africa.

This situation is commented in the Court of Auditors' report on EC support to the health sector published at the beginning of 2009. The Court deplores the fact that GBS hasn't yet made an effective contribution to improving health services and that, while SBS is likely to be more effective in improving health services, because it is more focused, the EC has made relatively little use of this type of support in sub-Saharan Africa. (see article on the Court's report in *EU News 1 - 2009*)

Another difference between regions that we noticed is in the **support to the economy**. Support to production (and in particular to agriculture) is very low in ACP countries (9% of payments and 2% of commitments) while huge disbursements are made to improve economic infrastructure and services

including transport (29% of P and 25% of C). Such discrepancy is not observed in Latin America and Asia (DCI) where investments in infrastructure and support to production are better balanced.

Lessons from evaluations

Among the lessons learnt by EuropeAid from the evaluations it commissioned in 2008 is the **general weakness of aid efficiency mainly due to delays in implementation, cumbersome procedures and weak management**. *This also limits the effectiveness of EC actions. Most evaluations also point out the necessity for the Commission in certain cases to develop a more global strategy both in programming and implementation. More thought needs to be given to synergy between activities, mix of modalities for delivering aid and coherence between country and regional aid (and we would add coherence with thematic aid, as well as support to multi-actors approaches and to civil society in general).*

Highlights and full report available [here](#). For more information contact k.sohet@aprodev.net

CSO Development Effectiveness

More than 170 representatives of various sectors of the civil society (among which Caritas Europa and Aprodev) as well as representatives of donors and government from nearly 50 countries participated in the 2-day long conference on the effectiveness of civil society organisations (CSOs) in development held in Prague on 23-24 June. As an official accompanying event of the Czech EU Presidency, the conference was co-organised by FoRS, the Czech platform of development NGOs, and CONCORD.

The conference aimed at sharing good practices, analyses and views on CSO **development effectiveness**, especially with regard to possible CSO development effectiveness principles, the specific role of CSOs in development and the external conditions that could best contribute to CSOs' performance (enabling environment).

During the event Caritas Czech Republic presented two case studies that provided an evidence-based analysis of the role and effectiveness of CSO, focusing on their project experience on rural livelihood development in Indonesia and Georgia, and on gender in Indonesia.

The conference wrapped-up with the adoption of a [conference statement](#) highlighting the participants' commitment to further explore different aspects of CSO Development Effectiveness.

The **Global Facilitation Group** that is facilitating the organisation of the global Open Forum on CSO development effectiveness met for the third time in Prague, before FoRS conference. Progress has been made in terms of the preparation for the political dialogue at international level focusing on CSO enabling environment, CSO outreach and mobilisation as well as fund-raising. With the funds raised, many consultations will be organised at national level around the world aiming at generating a conceptual framework on CSO development effectiveness, in the shape of principles and implementation guidelines. For more information: www.cso-effectiveness.org

Civil society regional consultations on aid effectiveness

BetterAid organises regional workshops for Civil society Organisations (CSOs) on aid effectiveness (Paris Declaration), and more specifically on the implementation of the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA). The workshops will also involve donors and governments. They aim to support NGOs in monitoring the implementation of the aid effectiveness commitments of donors and governments and preparing for the next high level forum on aid effectiveness in 2011, in South Korea.

As of today, the schedules for the regional workshops are as follows:

1. East Africa (Nairobi, Kenya) – August 3 to 5
2. Latin America-Andean (Medellin, Colombia) – August 17 to 20
3. Southern Africa (Johannesburg, South Africa) – September 21 to 23
4. West Africa (Dakar, Senegal) – October 5 to 8
5. Central Africa (Cameroon) – October 12 to 15
6. MENA (Lebanon) – November 9 to 11
7. Central and West Asia (Moscow) – late 2009 or early 2010

BetterAid is a platform composed of CSOs that is leading the CSO advocacy on aid effectiveness. Notably they had organized the civil society parallel forum in Accra, the days before the official high level (which produced the AAA) in August 2008.

For any information on the workshops, please contact: Eden Gallardo: egallardo@ibon.org

For more information on the open forum please contact bbouniol@caritas-europa.org

EU SECTORAL POLICIES

Climate change: Environment ministers meeting in Åre, Sweden

On 24 and 25 July an informal meeting of environment ministers in Åre focused on issues in preparation for the climate change negotiations in the autumn. The chairs of the two Working Groups for the UN climate change negotiations, Michael Zammit Cutajar and John Ashe, presented their view that the negotiations are moving far too slowly, but recognised that there are also negotiations underway in parallel processes, such as in the G8, the Major Economies Forum (MEF), which gathers both industrialised countries and rapidly growing economies such as China and India, and bilateral meetings that can boost the negotiation process. Ministers expressed support for continued EU leadership that could eventually lead to an agreement with other developed countries on a 30% mitigation target. Environment Council chairman, Swedish minister Andreas Carlgren said after the meeting: *"the EU has confirmed that it wants an agreement that takes it beyond the unilateral target of a 20% reduction in its emissions by 2020 and up to 30%. We are ready to move to this target as soon as we are sure that the others will make a big enough effort. This puts pressure on the other parties."*

Note that our three networks asked the EU to be more ambitious and to adopt a 40% mitigation target ([joint letter](#)).

However, a paper [presented by the Commission on comparability of mitigation pledges](#) by developed countries claimed that comparison was complex, and showed that negotiators are from the scientific recommendations with regard to collective mitigation effort. According to the data collected by the EC, only two European countries made pledges similar to the EU; Norway pledged for a 30% decrease in 2020 compared to 1990 while Switzerland's offer is aligned with the EU's one (20% to 30%). All other countries pledged lower reductions (or even envisage increases) so that the total pledge by Annex-I countries so far is not higher than 15% reduction in 2020 compared to 1990.

In its paper the Commission also proposes a set of 4 criteria to assess the comparability of emission reduction targets for developed countries: (1) GDP per capita, (2) GHG emissions per unit of GDP; (3) Population trends over the period 1990 to 2005 (taking into account the link between the size of the population and total GHG emissions) and (4) trend in GHG emissions between 1990 and 2005 (recognising domestic early action to reduce emissions) which of course produce a completely different set of data (see EC table in the paper).

An [EC paper on Climate finance](#) was also presented with a progress report on the work undertaken by the working group of the ECOFIN that was established earlier this year. ECOFIN has set out principles for scaling up international financial flows to support action by developing countries to tackle climate change. The working group should now develop these principles into practical proposals – **in relation to delivery, governance and sources** - to deliver increased international financial flows that respect these principles. **A lot of work still needs to be done to develop EU's position further before the ECOFIN Council of 9 October that will feed together with the Environment Council contribution into the decisive European Council on 29-30 October.** Minister Carlgren was however sceptical regarding the fact that the EU would release any pledge on finance before the Copenhagen conference even if the EU mandate is adopted in October.

A central question related to this timetable is to which extent the G-20 Meeting in Pittsburgh will take the climate financing debate forward. President Obama at the 1st Leaders' Summit of the Major Economies Forum (MEF) stressed the role of Leaders over the coming months to allow negotiators to seek compromises beyond their current positions. He mentioned the upcoming G20 Summit in Pittsburgh as one important opportunity for Heads of State to provide further guidance on finance **There will be a need for the EU to agree on a matured position on finance ahead of the Pittsburgh Summit. This should support additional, adequate and predictable finance flows, principles notably missing from both the G8 and MEF communiqués.** One issue that might be taken up again is the "fast track" proposal earlier discussed under the Major Economies Forum (extract from EC paper.)

More information on the Informal Environment Council meeting [here](#).

See also [The wheels are turning, but we're not yet moving...](#), CIDSE policy update on the UNFCCC negotiations, June 2009

EU home affairs and migration: The Stockholm Programme

On 10 June 2009, the European Commission adopted a Communication on 'Freedom, Security and Justice Serving the Citizen'. This Communication is the Commission's contribution to the discussions on the new EU programme for the next five years (2010-2015) in the area of justice and home affairs, the so called [Stockholm Programme](#), which is due to be adopted by the European Council in December 2009, under the Swedish Presidency.

The Commission outlined the positive cultural and economic elements of migration, as well as the duties of Member States to provide international protection for those who fit the criteria. It also reiterated the need for European solidarity (as well as solidarity with non-EU states) and the ultimate harmonisation through the Common European Asylum System.

During its Presidency, Sweden must steer the Stockholm Programme its infancy. **The Presidency has highlighted the desire to accelerate the progress of the negotiations in the spheres of migration and asylum.** It will remain to be seen whether or not the Swedish Presidency will fulfil the expectations of the Member States. Challenges which lay in its wake include a shorter autumn term, a new European Parliament and European Commission and the unresolved and illusive issue of the Lisbon Treaty.

The Caritas Europa Migration Commission recently participated in several high-profile meetings with relevant governmental bodies in Sweden. Caritas Europa took this opportunity to convey a number of concerns to the Swedish Presidency. These included retaining and adopting high standards in relation to the Common European Asylum System instruments and the pivotal nature of harmonisation and state solidarity. Although the Stockholm Programme is unquestionably a positive and definite step forward, it is regrettable that the Programme isn't more ambitious and forward-looking. **A right-based approach to migration and asylum issues is crucial to respect and protect human dignity.** Caritas-Europa and CCME in collaboration with other christian organisations (the Christian Group), have released a series of [Recommendations](#) for the Migration and Asylum Policies in the Stockholm Programme (2010-2015).

Global Forum on Migration and Development

The Civil Society days of the Global Forum on Migration and Development will take place in Athens, on 2 and 3 November 2009. This conference is organised by the Greece-based Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation, with the support of an international advisory committee, of which CCME and Ms Martina **Liebsch**, from Caritas Internationalis general secretariat are members.

This conference is organised in tandem with the 2009 Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) which gathers government officials. **The overarching theme proposed for both GFMD and Civil Society Days this year is "Integrating migration policies in development strategies for the benefit of all".**

The Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) is a state-led, voluntary, informal, and non-binding dialogue focusing on how migration can help achieve development goals. The Forum was created following a proposal by former U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan in September 2006. It brings together senior policymakers from around the world to exchange experiences, identify best practices, and foster interstate cooperation in leveraging migration for the benefit of development. The Forum and the CS days takes place every year, since 2007 (in Brussels in 2007 and in Manilla in 2008).

Participants in the Athens Civil Society Days will draw on their experiences in the field of migration and development to formulate proposals that will be presented to government representatives during the GFMD. Three thematic [roundtables](#) will take place on 1- How to make the migration-development nexus work for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals; 2- Migrant integration, reintegration and circulation for development; and 3- Policy and Institutional Coherence Partnerships.

In the run up to the conference, an [On-Line Dialogue](#) platform was set up on the CS days website in order to facilitate the widest possible exchange of views between Civil Society partners all over the world and to enable interested participants to get informed about this year's Civil Society Days. The online dialogue input will be used as background material for consideration during the two-day CSD conference.

EU HUMANITARIAN AID POLICY

ECHO Annual Report 2008

The European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO) released its [Annual Report and complementary financial report for 2008](#). While the number of protracted crisis remains stable, although refugee numbers showing an upward trend, the frequency and severity of natural disasters induced by climate change is increasing considerably. The report thus identifies **climate change as the most important factor in the increase of humanitarian needs** with an immediate impact on food security for the most vulnerable populations.

ECHO in 2008 remains the **largest single donor of humanitarian aid worldwide** with a total amount 937 million EUR in over 60 countries implemented through a range of diverse partners: NGOs, UN, and IOs. The report reveals that “through its humanitarian aid budget – food aid included – the EU provided assistance to an estimated **143 million beneficiaries** in third countries. In addition, 18.5 million of people were supported in respect of disaster preparedness, by strengthening community resilience and response capacity”.

The initial budget was set at 751 million EUR but had to be reinforced several times due to new evolving humanitarian needs and the rise in food prices. ECHO points out a structural problem: while international humanitarian aid on a global level is steeply rising due to the effects of climate change, the Commission’s humanitarian aid budget – at least until 2013 – does not mirror this trend with proportional higher funding allocations. And, in taking a long-term view on it, the **Community humanitarian budget is in decline**: “in real terms the share of the Commission’s humanitarian assistance in global humanitarian assistance decreased between 1993 and 2004 by 30% while global humanitarian aid increased by 48%.”

The breakdown of funding per region shows that the main recipients of humanitarian aid and food aid programmes were ACP countries (552 million EUR), followed by Asia and Latin America (192 million EUR), and Eastern Europe, New Independent States, Middle East and Mediterranean countries (156 million).

As the top 10 humanitarian crisis in terms of ECHO allocated funding are: Sudan (167 million), Palestinian territories, including refugees in Lebanon (82.5 million), Somalia (46 million), DRC (45.5 million), Myanmar (39 million), Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran (36.3 million), Chad (30 million), Drought preparedness programme (30 million), Iraq (30 million), Zimbabwe (25 million).

Among these funding decisions, two stand out for their size: Sudan and the West Bank and Gaza Strip and Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. Considerably less was allocated to other major crises like Somalia, DRC or Zimbabwe. According to ECHO policy, funding decisions in ECHO are made on the basis of sound needs assessments. However, the huge differences in the allocation of funding raises questions about the **proportionality**, and the possible politicisation of humanitarian aid.

The report reveals also that **NGO funding has decreased further** amounting for 44 percent while the UN is up to 46 percent and hence overtaking the NGOs share for the first time while funding to other International Organisations remained relatively stable with 10%. This analysis confirms a consistent and worrying trend. However, since ECHO in 2007 integrated food aid into its humanitarian aid budget it is difficult to come up with a comparative differentiated financial analysis.

The UN World Food Programme and the FAO are the biggest implementing partners in the distribution of food commodities. In 2008, ECHO’s food aid budget rose from initially 223 to 363 million EUR due to the food crisis and soaring food prices. These factors may, at least in part, explain the shift in funding channels which has taken place. NGOs have to keep monitoring this trend while at the same time further improve their systems and procedures to demonstrate their added value to ECHO as high quality partner in the delivery of humanitarian aid.

Caritas organisations in Europe have implemented with their local partners a total of 14.5 million EUR in programme activities. Contracts with ECHO for the above mentioned countries were held in, Afghanistan, DRC, and Sudan. APRODEV members have signed contracts with ECHO for a total amount of 12.08 million EUR in 2008.

The report also highlights that ECHO has been recently very active on policy through its effort to bring about the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid and the adoption of the action plan for its implementation. This is a considerable step forward to strengthen humanitarian policy and the strategic orientation of humanitarian aid in the EU based on the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence. The challenge is that the Consensus needs to be taken up at all levels. Therefore, in the coming years it will be interesting to see whether this European Consensus translates into relevant policies not only at Brussels level but also at the level of the EU Member States.

For more information, please contact Harald Happel, hhappel@caritas-europa.org

EU RELATIONS WITH THIRD COUNTRIES

Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum to meet in November

In its [Communication of December 2008](#) on the Eastern partnership, the Commission proposed “to support the further development of Civil Society Organisations” (CSOs) and, in particular, “to establish an **Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum** to promote contacts among CSOs and facilitate their dialogue with public authorities”.

To ensure transparency of the process leading to the establishment of the Civil Society Forum, all interested parties were invited to provide their opinion. The consultation process started on 25 March and was closed on 25 April. Some 40 contributions were received, mainly from civil society organisations based in the Eastern Partner countries but also from several EU-based organisations. A reasoned analysis of the contributions received can be found under [Results of the consultations with CSOs and NGOs](#).

In the Eastern Partnership joint Prague Declaration, from 7 May 2009, “the participants of the Prague Summit invited the European Commission to develop and propose modalities for the establishment of a Civil Society Forum of the Eastern Partnership”. The Commission proposed the following [Concept-paper](#).

On June 29 the Commission invited all interested parties, i.e. grass roots organisations, trade unions, employers' organisations, professional associations, NGOs, think-tanks, non-profit foundations, national and international CSOs/networks and other relevant Civil Society actors, to submit their Expressions of interest to participate in the [Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum](#), using the following [form](#). Note that information and the form are also available in Russian [here](#).

The deadline for submission of expressions of interest is set at 31 August 2009.

The European Commission, together with the EU Presidency and the European Economic and Social Committee, will organise the **launch of the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum in mid-November 2009 in Brussels.**

EU-ACP: mid-term review of Country Strategy papers has been launched

According to the Cotonou Partnership Agreement, the country strategy papers for ACP countries financed with the European Development Fund (EDF) have to be revised at mid-term of their implementation. **The 10th EDF was agreed in 2005 but legally started being implemented in July 2008** after a long ratification process. It has a budget of €2.682 billion and will last until 2013. So, we can not really say that we are at the mid-term of its implementation but nevertheless, DG Development considers that it is high time to revise CSPs that were based on pre-2008 situation and priorities.

The main drives of the mid-term review (MTR) are:

- The Economic and **financial crisis** and the measures adopted by the EU to mitigate its impact in developing countries. In the short-term and independently from the MTR, a so-called **Vulnerability Flex** instrument financed with non-programmed EDF money will be set-up to provide 500 million euros in 2009-2010 to ACP countries worst hit by the financial crisis. In the longer-term it is envisaged to adapt the CSPs through the mid-term review in view of more structural answers to the crisis, among which a strong push in favour of infrastructures and transport.
- The **new priorities and changes of context**; in particular climate change, the progress in EPAs negotiations, fragility and conflicts, migration and the operationalisation of the Joint EU-Africa Strategy (JAES). *The Strategy is to be considered as a political framework to guide the EC (and Member States') programming at the continental, regional and national levels, as well as the utilisation of available financial envelopes. The current MTR is the first major opportunity to follow through this commitment by adapting the national programming to the requirements of the JAES.*(extract from EC guidelines on MTR)
- The implementation of the Accra Agenda of Action and more particularly of its principle of coordination which, in the EU, translates into a **better division of labour between EC and Member states.**

The **two main objectives of the review** are to adapt, where appropriate, the country strategy and to adjust, where appropriate, the country's financial allocation (A envelope).

The review will be based on the annual reports for 2008 and 2009 prepared jointly by the delegation and the recipient government as well as the **possible revision of the governance profile of the country and a performance assessment**, both done by the EC delegation. The performance assessment will ultimately and after a quite complex rating process, lead to a decision by the EU (Commission + member states committee) to increase, maintain or decrease the financial allocation of the country. Performance will be measured on the basis of 4 elements; governance, economic situation, poverty and social

situation and the implementation of EC cooperation. For each of these elements a few underlying questions will be answered and will lead to ratings that will finally be consolidated to produce a final recommendation. Note that this consolidation process will also take special considerations related to limiting factors such as natural disasters, regional instability and fragility as well as constraints on EC side into account.

This relatively complex in-country process is supposed to take place before mid-October and is also supposed, as foreseen in the Cotonou agreement, to be an inclusive and consultative one. It is without saying that it will be quite a challenge for EC delegations as well as civil society actors in beneficiary countries to make sure that civil society can have a qualitative and relevant influence on that process.

It is the reason why, the **Cotonou group of CONCORD prepared a toolkit** with the view of informing ACP civil society partners about the process and helping them to take part. A special website on EDF programming, hosted by Eurostep, is accessible at: www.acp-programming.eu You will find there all information available on the MTR including the toolkit, EC guidelines and country strategy papers.

For more information, contact k.sohet@aprodev.net

EU FUNDING FOR DEVELOPMENT

European instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, implementation and review

On 9 July 2009, the EC organised a consultation meeting with NGOs regarding the implementation and upcoming review of the EIDHR.

Information was provided on the calls for proposals to still take place under the first multiannual strategy 2007-2010. This meeting was also the first of a series of consultation meetings between the EC and CSOs in view of the elaboration of the new Strategy Paper which will cover the period 2011-2013. The next meeting will take place in October when the annual action plan 2010 will also be discussed. NGOs are invited to provide written inputs with regard to their assessment of the instrument's implementation so far and recommendations for the future strategy by 15 September. The Human rights and democracy network ([HRDN](#)), an informal grouping of NGOs operating at EU level in the broader areas of human rights, democracy and conflict prevention is preparing an input.

At the meeting the EC presented its first ideas and comments with regard to the review:

- The existing 5 objectives of the instrument will remain the same, but more money should be made available for objective 1 (actions in countries where fundamental freedoms are most at risk) and for Country Based Support Scheme (CBSS) of objective 2 (strengthening the role of civil society in promotion of HR and democracy).
- Under objective 1, the EC feels there is still a gap between what the EC expects from the projects and what CSOs submit. The EC wants to put emphasis on difficult countries rather than difficult situations. The idea behind objective 1 is to help local civil society work and move forward despite the unwillingness from their authorities to do so (quoting the EC "the objective is to give some oxygen to local civil society"). CSO need to be more careful when selecting countries of action.
- For objective 2 the idea is to increase the list of countries benefiting from CBSS, in order to respond to requests of the EC Delegations. The EC stressed the importance of ensuring complementarity with other thematic and geographical programmes. In addition, in terms of implementation of objective 2, the focus is more on reinforcing CS capacity to handle HRs issues, rather than CS contribution to the democratisation process. Note that this is an issue where the EC and NGOs seem to diverge as certain NGOs present at the meeting asked for a more balanced approach between democracy and HRs projects, and suggested that specific tools to approach democracy assistance need to be defined in the selected countries.
- The EC also stressed the political will of the EU to reinforce the EIDHR implementation at local level, by local actors. The EC wants to facilitate access to CfP to local civil societies and local NGOs.
- The EC was satisfied with the outcomes of the first Calls for Proposals for action against torture and HRs violations (part of objective 3, support to EU guidelines).
- No more than 25% of the overall budget should be allocated to EU Election Observation Missions (objective 5).
- The EC also mentioned that some changes to the Financial Rules applicable to the instrument are being negotiated with the Council and Parliament for the moment, especially on the use of sub-

granting mechanism and the eligibility of VAT costs in countries where there is no exemption. The same issues are under negotiation for the Development cooperation instrument (DCI).

With regard to implementation of the current strategy, the EC informed participants of the **forthcoming calls for proposals (to be confirmed on EC website):**

- Objective 1: next deadline is 30/10/09 and in 2010 deadlines are 30/04/10 and 30/10/10
 - Torture (obj.3): call expected in July 2009 with more than 45 days for Concept note preparation.
 - HRs defenders (obj.3) and Transnational/Regional actions (obj.2): only 2 calls are expected in 2010
 - CSOs support to the ICC (obj.4): call expected in Sept/Oct. 2009
 - Regional Human Rights masters (obj.4): Nov/Dec. 2009
 - Children and children in armed conflicts (obj.3): no new calls are theoretically foreseen for 2010!
- The EC would prefer to finance projects from the reserve list!

More information on EIDHR [here](#).

Note as well that the list of all grants and contracts signed by EuropeAid (and the EC delegations) in 2008 is now available [here](#).

For more information, contact k.sohet@aprodev.net

NEWS FROM THE NETWORKS

NEWS FROM APRODEV

Christian Aid has launched an [advertising campaign](#) and a [report](#) to inject new urgency into the debate on how to seize the opportunity that the global financial crisis gives us to make the necessary changes to end poverty.

FinnChurchAid is organising together with APRODEV and EPLO a conference "Inclusion and Human Rights as a Key to Development and Security", to be held in Helsinki on 24 September 2009.

The conference aims to promote discussion among practitioners in Europe on the need to emphasize inclusion and human rights in fragile situations. The core of the conference is provided with local civil society views from Haiti, Nepal, OPT and Burundi on how the lack of Human Rights and exclusion affects stability and development in their countries. As main speakers there is a range of local NGO representatives from the countries concerned, MFA representatives from EU Member States, the European Commission as well as Aprodev and EPLO.

The conference is the main event of Finn Church Aid's two-year campaign "The Invisibles", which aims to raise awareness of the link between lack of rights, exclusion and poverty. Preliminary registrations are expected by 10 August to Suvi.Virkkunen@kirkonulkomaanapu.fi

NEWS FROM CIDSE

CIDSE published its quarterly [Advocacy Newsletter Nr. 42](#) with an editorial describing CIDSE's work ahead of the Copenhagen Climate Conference in December 2009. The newsletter also carries articles on global governance reform, food, agriculture and sustainable trade, CIDSE's climate campaign, the G8 Summit in Italy and CIDSE work on aid. CIDSE also published the report entitled "[The Governance Considerations: Donors' Use of the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment Tool](#) (June 2009)." The paper analyses the use of the World Bank's CPIA rankings (governance criteria) by bi- and multilateral donors in their aid allocation and other related decision-making processes.

CIDSE [welcomes](#) Pope Benedict XVI's social **encyclical 'Caritas in Veritate'** (Charity in Truth), which sends a strong signal to world leaders. It says that the current financial crisis shows that the economy should not be a process independent from moral and political frameworks.

The CIDSE Secretariat bids a warm farewell to Geraldine Thomas, who has left CIDSE after four years, and welcomes Annissa Garcia (garcia@cidse.org) as the new Assistant to the Secretary General. Annissa comes to CIDSE following her Masters in European Studies.

NEWS FROM CARITAS EUROPA

The [first Caritas Europa International Forum](#) was held on 1-3 July in Soesterberg (NL), gathering 45 participants representing 17 member organisations from all over Europe. The overarching theme of the Forum was the impact of the crises on Caritas work, organisations and the people we serve through development and humanitarian interventions. The topics tackled ranged from food security,

climate change, economic crisis to NGO funding, effectiveness and accountability, and Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development. The Forum aimed at reinforcing bridges between policy and practice, as well as between Caritas humanitarian and development work. The Forum produced a [message document](#) addressed to European policy-makers which reflects the participants' view and experience. In the document Caritas call on the joint efforts of international institutions, governments in Europe, European and national parliaments, Churches and civil society organisations to ensure efficient policies addressing poverty, injustices and inequalities in Europe and abroad. The Caritas network is now equipped with its own "facebook-like" online social network called [IamCaritas](#). IamCaritas is a space open for the staff of Caritas member organisations to share their experiences, stories, and resources useful to their work.

Pr. Georg Cremer, secretary general of Caritas Germany and associate professor of economics at the University of Freiburg, published a book entitled "[Corruption and Development Aid: Confronting the Challenges](#)" (Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc). Pr. Cremer explores the nature and impact of corruption, the conditions under which it is most likely to take hold, and the strategies that can enable aid organizations, both NGO's and those in the state sector, to limit the risk.

EU News Editors: Karine Sohet, APRODEV (k.Sohet@aprodev.net)
Denise Auclair, CIDSE (auclair@cidse.org)
Blandine Bouniol, Caritas Europa (bbouniol@caritas-europa.org)

APRODEV is the association of the 17 major development and humanitarian aid organisations in Europe, which work closely together with the World Council of Churches. APRODEV agencies engage in many kinds of activities related to development cooperation: relief, rehabilitation and development activities, capacity building, research, awareness raising and campaigning, education and advocacy. <http://www.aprodev.net/main> - 28 Boulevard Charlemagne, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium – Tel : +32 2 234 56 60

CIDSE is an international alliance of Catholic development agencies in Europe and North America. Its members share a common strategy in their efforts to eradicate poverty and establish global justice. CIDSE's advocacy work covers global governance, resources for development, climate change, trade & food security, EU development policy and business & human rights. <http://www.cidse.org> - 16 rue Stévin, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium – Tel: +32 2 230 77 22

Caritas Europa, one of the 7 regions of Caritas Internationalis, is the European network of 48 Caritas member organisations, working in 44 European countries. Caritas Europa focuses its activities on policy issues related to poverty and social inequality, migration and asylum within all countries of Europe, and issues of emergency humanitarian assistance, international development and peace throughout the world. With regard to all these issues, the organisation develops policies for political advocacy and lobbying at European level and at national level. <http://www.caritas-europa.org> - 4 Rue De Pascale, B-1040 Brussels, Belgium – Tel: +32 2 280 02 80