



EU NEWS

ISSUE 6

September 2009

Content:

EU Development Policy

- [New EC communication on the 'Whole of Union approach'- a radical shift in PCD](#)
- [New EU Development Commissioner for end of term](#)
- [EU discusses position on financial issues for G20 summit](#)
- [For a robust review mechanism of the UN Convention Against Corruption](#)

EU Sectoral Policies

- [European Commission finally presents proposal on climate finance](#)
- [Food and Trade: briefings and events in the European Parliament](#)
- [European Commission proposal for a Joint EU Resettlement Programme](#)

EU Humanitarian Aid Policy

- [€ 53 million for vulnerable populations in 9 African countries](#)
- [Information meetings on Global Plans 2010](#)

EU relations with third countries

- [Mixed progress in implementation of the Joint Africa-EU strategy](#)
- [Sudan is not part of the Cotonou agreement anymore](#)
- [Civil society call for a strong EU position in response to human rights violations in Honduras](#)

EU Funding for Development

- [Review of EC cooperation with Non State Actors and Local Authorities](#)

News from the Networks

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

EU DEVELOPMENT POLICY

EC communication on the 'Whole of Union approach' – a radical shift in PCD

European Commission's Communication *Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) – Establishing the policy framework for a whole-of-the-Union approach* was adopted on 15 September. It refers in many places to the bi-annual PCD report that is soon expected but not yet public.

The Communication states that the present EU approach to Policy Coherence for Development embracing 12 policy areas having a potential impact on developing countries is not working because of lack of political will and diverging interests and the fact that the dividing line between external and internal policies is becoming more blurred. In the wake of the economic crisis, sustaining the development aid effort is not sufficient anymore.

Instead of addressing the shortcomings in the implementation of the PCD agenda, the communication proposes a new approach combining a focus on 5 priority areas (Climate change, Food security, Intellectual Property rights, Security and Migration) with the 'ODA plus concept' vaguely defined as 'using ODA to leverage more non-ODA funding'. PCD is then justified by the fact that the non-ODA resources will only be effective for development and the MDGs if the political framework is the right one.

However, the European Union's policies having the most damaging impact on developing countries, i.e. 'Global Europe' strategy on EU access to raw materials, free trade policies and poorly regulated financial transactions are completely out of this new PCD approach (trade is only mentioned as an area having impact on food security). **PCD is now conceived as more of finance and accounting approach** -- development is about funding and counting -- rather than a political matter as set out in the EU Treaty: *"the Union shall take account of the objectives of development cooperation in the policies that it implements which are likely to affect developing countries"*.

In short, **the EC is moving away from the broader PCD agenda to a set of political priorities they feel more comfortable with** and teaming this up with an argument for not increasing future aid flows (in the long run) and in fact justifying present cuts in ODA (ODA plus would mean Europe is contributing more to development than "just" ODA). In fact, during Louis Michel's last appearance as Commissioner before the Development Committee in May; **he criticized the "whole of Union" approach as a tactic by Member States to cover their aid decreases**. All this without paying any attention to the damaging effects of EU policies and to the ways to prevent financial losses in developing countries (illegitimate debt, tax evasion, etc...). The EC notes that this new approach will be largely dependent on the actions of private individuals and economic actors and for this reason both developed and developing countries will need to ensure there is a good enabling and regulatory environment which is also very worrying in terms of potential reforms to be suggested and further economic conditionality imposed (as already experienced in the context of EPA negotiations).

Very concerning for the future of EU development policies and aid is their reference to the fact that the new approach should *"inform discussion about the next EU financial perspectives and in particular the structure of external spending as well as identifying financial flows to development countries from internal policies financial instruments."*

Note that CONCORD will launch its **Spotlight on Coherence report** by mid October and that a more in-depth analysis of the new EC communication and the 2009 EU PCD report will be done by then. The communication is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/development/index_en.cfm

New EU Development Commissioner for end of term

Following Louis Michel's election to the new European Parliament, Belgium designated Foreign Minister Karel De Gucht as his successor for the remainder of the current Commission's term. On 1 September, the Parliament's new Development Committee held its hearing of Mr. De Gucht. The full Parliament votes on his appointment in its plenary session of 16 September.

The shadow of Louis Michel loomed large during the hearing. Mr. Michel's **last appearance as Commissioner before the outgoing Development Committee** in May was the occasion for a look back at his mandate. **He presented as his main accomplishment a thorough renewal and Europeanisation of development policy, its philosophy and instruments, based on the European Consensus on Development.** This found expression in priorities such as the division of labor between EU donors, as well as policy coherence for development, with the acknowledgement of development's links to migration, climate change and energy. He argued that he had led the way in shifting from an assistance, donor/recipient approach to an approach of mutual responsibility and equal partnership with a focus on political dialogue. Here he cited both the EU-Africa Strategy and the challenge of governance, engaging rather than sanctioning countries such as Zimbabwe, Sudan, and Burma.

Mr. Michel praised the increased role of the Development Committee, particular with regards to the Development Cooperation Instrument. In his view, putting the European Development Fund under Parliamentary control in the post-2013 EU budget would bring radical change, improving efficiency and solving many problems. The lack of direct control by the Development Commissioner over EuropeAid's operations was also mentioned as an obstacle. Generally, the EU would need the budgetary means to be much more reactive, for example in post-conflict countries like Liberia, and less bureaucratic.

Mr. De Gucht, like Mr. Michel, comes from the Belgian Liberal Party and Foreign Affairs Ministry. The hearing revealed little new, with **Mr. De Gucht expected to generally follow the trajectory of Mr. Michel's policies for the remaining months of his term**, and with no certainty that he will continue to hold the development portfolio in the next Commission. He will however be challenged to defend

the interests of development in view of major upcoming international meetings including the G20 summit, climate negotiations, and the November World Food Summit.

EU discusses position on financial issues for G20 summit

Ahead of the 24-25 September G20 summit in Pittsburgh, USA, EU leaders are holding a joint dinner on 17 September to discuss the EU's position. This follows upon the EU Finance Ministers' breakfast on 2 September, just prior to the G20 Finance Ministers' meeting in London. High-profile positions have been expressed in recent weeks by France, Germany, the UK, and the Netherlands on the issue of financial executive and trader compensation. Headlines from the G20 Finance Ministers' meeting focused on changes to capital requirements for banks. These issues are far from the priorities of developing countries affected by the financial and economic crisis, but which do not hold a seat at the G20 table.

An area crucial for development is strengthening international tax cooperation and combating capital flight. A report released during the summer by the Norwegian Government Commission on Capital Flight from Poor Countries estimates illicit capital outflows at 10 times the total development assistance going to these countries. In France, a legal proposal is being floated to require banks to automatically communicate to the government information about citizens' bank transfers to tax haven territories. In effect, **mandatory and automatic information exchange is needed, and measures should target the transnational companies, banks, and individuals who use tax havens.** EU Finance Ministers currently acknowledge this only in relation to development banks, with the July NGO coalition Counter Balance report revealing that subcontracting banks and multinational companies responsible for projects funded by the European Investment Bank are making significant use of tax havens.

There is support in the UK for **changes to international accounting standards that would require companies to report on a country-by-country basis profits earned and taxes paid.** This would increase transparency and eliminate detrimental transfer mispricing practices. And in the UK and in Germany, top politicians have recently spoken out **in favor of a financial or currency transaction tax,** already supported by Austria and Belgium. This type of tax would discourage speculation, contributing to global financial and economic stability, and provide additional, sorely-needed financial resources for development. **The European Commission will in the first half of next year release a communication on taxation and development, with leadership from the Spanish EU Presidency.** The communication should not focus only on developing countries' own taxation policies and administrative capacity, but also on the **EU's own policies that undermine mobilization of domestic resources for development.**

An issue far from the G20 radar screen but pressing for developing countries is **preventing a new debt crisis.** Even before the recession, nearly forty countries that are most vulnerable already required substantial debt cancellation. These countries could be joined by many others currently facing severe declines in public revenue and hardened debt terms. UNCTAD has called for a three year **debt moratorium,** which should be put into effect immediately. Short-term stabilization financing arrangements, primarily based on grant terms, are needed for low-income countries. For the long term, a **comprehensive and binding international framework for sovereign debt** should be created that allows for an orderly and timely response to default situations, with a fair burden sharing by both lender and borrower.

The European Parliament's Development Committee on 3 September voted a resolution on the consequences of the financial and economic crisis on developing countries. The committee reviewed the results of a study commissioned from Oxford University, which concluded that the **International Monetary Fund and World Bank have not been responsive to the needs of low-income countries in the context of the crisis,** with the IMF's increased resources going mainly to emerging economies (82% to Europe; only 2% to Africa). The Committee judges that this situation is **mainly caused by overdue governance reforms.** In the meantime, Finance Ministers decided to up the EU contribution to the IMF's increased resources from €75 to €125 billion. Some press analysis read this as a defensive step to deflect criticism of the EU's continuing refusal to fundamentally reconsider its over-representation in the IMF and World Bank boards. The EU continues to argue for a technical, financial capacity-based approach to determining quotas, rather than a **political goal of granting developing countries fair representation in decision-making that significantly affects them.**

This would include moving towards double majority voting (percentage of votes + number of members) for the most significant decisions. Here the EU is more open to the idea, while placing a caveat of efficiency in decision making.

CIDSE raised the above concerns in a letter to Heads of State ahead of the EU summit.

For a robust review mechanism of the UN Convention Against Corruption

Corruption and poverty reinforce each other. Corruption undermines equitable economic growth and sustainable development. The diversion of public funds, loss of investment and the reduction in tax revenues hits the poorest and most vulnerable hardest.

Six years ago, the UN General Assembly adopted the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), the first global treaty ever that provides a framework to harmonise anti-corruption efforts worldwide. The UNCAC sets standards to fight corruption both domestically and internationally, through cooperation between States. It requires from the complying governments to criminalise corruption offences including bribery and money laundering and to work together in cross-border law enforcement. It also calls on states to provide technical assistance in the field of anti-corruption to countries needing it.

The 140 governments that signed the Convention will meet at the Conference of States parties in Doha on November 9-13th where they will notably discuss the implementation of UNAC standards to date and the UNCAC review mechanism to monitor implementation.

The European Union has a pivotal role to play in negotiating a robust and transparent review mechanism, which allows monitoring the progress of implementation and compliance. On August 7th, Caritas Europa, CIDSE, some of their member organisations as well as some member organisations of Aprodev have joined hands with other faith-based organisations in a call to the EU to agree a common position for a robust and credible review mechanism, based on transparency and the participation of civil society. The group also calls on the EU Member States that have still not ratified the Convention to do so immediately, in order to reinforce the EU credibility at the negotiations.

At the same time, more than 50 faith leaders signed a joint letter to UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon, in which they expressed their support for the adoption of a strong review mechanism during the Doha conference

See the faith-based organisations letter to the Swedish Presidency of the EU [here](#).

See the faith leaders' letter to the UN [here](#).

EU SECTORAL POLICIES

European Commission finally presents proposal on climate finance

On 10 September, the European Commission released its long-awaited communication on climate finance. Following are highlights from Aprodev's analysis, supported by CIDSE.

The estimates of the international public finance contribution in 2020 (€22-50 billion) and EU fair share of this (€2-15 billion) are inadequate. Environmental and development NGOs in the Climate Action Network have estimated the total public finance needs for adaptation and mitigation to be at least €110 billion p.a. by 2020, of which the **EU fair share would be** approximately one third, i.e. **€35 billion**. In the EC proposal, developing countries are expected to pay a large share of both mitigation and adaptation costs (the former identified as 'long term low cost efficiency measures') themselves; this is both unrealistic and unjust. The communication states that "a large part of the funding for adaptation can also come from private household and private firms as it is in their own economic interest". This is fundamentally in conflict with the principle of industrialized countries' historical responsibility to pay for the consequences of climate change.

The idea that all countries (except LDCs) should contribute to cover the costs of climate change in developing countries also does not take into account the right of poor countries to development. **If the idea of "universal contribution" by all countries continues to be pursued, it should be based on historical responsibility for emissions and capacity to pay, accompanied by a development threshold, codifying the right to development.** The threshold is set at a level of welfare below which people are not expected to share the costs of the climate transition. People below this threshold are taken as having development as their proper priority. As they struggle for better lives, they are not similarly obligated to labor to keep society as a whole within its sharply limited global

carbon budget. People above the threshold, on the other hand, are taken as having realized their right to development and as bearing the responsibility to preserve that right for others.

The European Commission's **proposals on Low-Carbon Development Strategies to be undertaken by developing countries**, risk further widening the trust gap with developing countries, as they **do not entail a clear link to financial support** to cover capacity building and other needs. Nor do they allay developing countries' fears of financial support being followed by burdensome conditionalities.

The European Commission identifies development aid as a key source for climate finance in both the near, medium and long term. However, **diverting existing or already promised ODA to finance climate actions means less money for health, education and other development goals. Climate finance must clearly be new and additional** to existing ODA commitments (0.7 % or above). Anything less would constitute a severe threat to development. Climate change action and development must be handled jointly on the ground, but should be financed from separate sources.

The European Commission acknowledges that there may be a need for a central UN Climate Fund, to complement bilateral and multilateral channels of climate finance. Although this would enhance the ability to close potential funding gaps and improve the chances of an equitable outcome, the fundamental problem of donor proliferation and ineffectiveness would remain. **A central UN Climate Fund**, under the authority and guidance of the UN Conference of Parties, **should be the main vehicle for climate finance**. This would ensure the necessary coherence and co-ordination of funds, an equitable distribution of resources and allow developing countries to focus on climate actions themselves rather than the process of shopping around amongst a multitude of donors for financial support.

The European Commission proposes a near-term finance commitment by industrialized countries, amounting to €5-7 billion p.a. during 2010-2012, to cover near-term adaptation, capacity building and technology research and development costs. The **EU should commit to a fair share**, approximately a third of the total cost, as a pre-Copenhagen offer, with a potential to provide much needed trust and momentum in the UNFCCC negotiations. It is crucial that **the near-term finance offer** is not used as a negotiating tactic, but is **closely linked to an ambitious, adequate, predictable and sustainable long-term finance offer**.

In the context of the **CIDSE-Caritas** campaign for Climate Justice, a [Delegation of Bishops and Climate Experts from the developed and developing world](#) will be in **New York on the occasion of the High-Level Meeting on Climate Change on 22 September 2009**. The delegation will present a [Climate Justice Statement](#) and urge political leaders to take bold action to protect the world's poorest people from the devastating impacts of climate change. Meetings are scheduled with European Commission President José Manuel Barroso and the Swedish EU Presidency, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Yvo de Boer, and a number of other governments. Members of the delegation will participate notably in a lunch with the UN Secretary-General, Heads of State, and business and civil society leaders; a CIDSE-Caritas panel on adaptation technologies; a panel of religious leaders; and a roundtable co-organized by the European Commission, Swedish EU Presidency, and UN. The delegation includes Bishops from Scotland, Nigeria, Bangladesh, and Guatemala; climate experts from India, Bolivia, Brazil, and Kenya; and CIDSE and Caritas leadership.

Food and Trade: briefings and events in the European Parliament

EPA briefing for new MEPs: APRODEV, together with a broad group of NGOs prepared a [briefing paper](#) aiming at raising awareness in the new European Parliament on issues, concerns and challenges relating to the negotiations of Economic Partnership Agreement between the EU and ACP countries. The paper provides an update of the status of the negotiations (dated August 2009) and a series of demands and recommendations for the MEPs.

Note that since the publication of that paper, a new interim EPA has been signed between four countries (Zimbabwe, Madagascar, Seychelles and Mauritius) of the Eastern and Southern Africa region and the EU. Zambia and Comoros have indicated they will sign at a later date ([more](#)).

World Food Summit: Joint APRODEV-CIDSE lobby event in the European Parliament

On **6 October**, APRODEV and CIDSE are organising a panel discussion in the European Parliament, sponsored by MEP Thijs Berman (S&D), Albert Deß (EPP) and Jose Bové (Greens) with the title: *The EU and Global Food Security – Towards a just outcome at the World Food Summit*.

Panellists will include Bishop Tolbert, FECCIWA - The Fellowship of Christian Councils & Churches in West Africa; Cathy Rutivi, Consumers International African Regional Office - South Africa; Member of IAASTD governance board and representatives from the European Commission and Swedish presidency.

In view of that event and in preparation for the WFS, the two networks are preparing a joint statement, ***Putting Rights at the Heart of Food Governance***, with a series of recommendations relating to the right to food, small farmers, rural development, livestock policy, fishery policies, land policies, gender responsiveness and social sensitivity, agricultural research, production methods, genetic engineering, food storage, international trade, global food architecture, participation and funding.

For more information, please contact k.ulmer@aprodev.net

FAO, IIED and IFAD report on land grab presented in the European Parliament

Last WFS committed to decrease numbers of hungry, but numbers are increasing! Hungry people have grown in numbers in all continents at similar levels, i.e. 10 to 15 %.

This worrying trend was discussed at a recent event in the European Parliament where a new FAO, IIED and IFAD report on [«Land Grab or Development Opportunity? Agricultural Investments and International Land Deals in Africa»](#) was presented by Alexander Müller, Assistant Director General of the FAO.

Land acquisitions over 2004 to 2009 in Ethiopia (1.4%), Madagascar (2.4%) or Sudan (0.4%) may be considered still marginal, **but this is just the start of a new trend**. Suitable land is already under use or claim, often by local people, and pressure is growing on high-value lands (e.g., those with irrigation potential or closer to markets). The private sector dominates on the investor side, though often with strong financial and other support from government and a significant level of government-owned investments also occurs. Virtually all the contracts analysed by this study tend to be short and simple compared to the economic reality of the transaction. The paper makes a series of recommendations for the different stakeholders and the FAO wants to propose guidelines on good governance with regard to access to land resources and is interested in good examples of rural communities having successfully defended their land rights.

European Commission proposal for a Joint EU Resettlement Programme

The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that for 2010 alone, some 203,000 refugees (of the approximate 10 million refugees worldwide) are in need of resettlement. Most refugees are displaced to neighbouring countries, none of which are within the EU. These receiving countries frequently have limited resources and inadequate conditions to accept such influxes and to guarantee safety to all refugees. **Resettlement is viewed as a last resort** for those who have fled their countries of origin, as it is considered unsafe to return home and also not viable to remain in the receiving/transit state. It is imperative to draw a clear line of distinction between the resettlement of refugees from third countries and the relocation of refugees from one EU Member State to another so as not to adversely affect resettlement quotas.

The current lack of cooperation, cohesion and coordination in the EU has led to considerable lacunae in the field of resettlement. It is desirable that a pan-European position be adopted to raise the EU's effectiveness and credibility in international affairs. An important first step was taken on 2 September with the **European Commission's proposal for a 'Joint EU Resettlement Programme'**. This Programme aims at facilitating further resettlement within the EU through providing greater protection for refugees and increasing political and practical cooperation between Member States. Essentially the Programme seeks to enhance the strategic use of resettlement through integrating resettlement into EU External and Humanitarian policies, to provide for more cost-effective means by which Member States can accept refugees and to increase international protection afforded to refugees.

Resettlement, in the Commission's proposal, should remain a voluntary good-will initiative by Member States however **it should not disadvantage spontaneous arrivals** of people seeking international protection in the EU. **Many EU States lack any resettlement programme** whatsoever and this initiative aims at encouraging and facilitating such Member States in the implementation of future programmes. The participation of UNHCR, IOM and NGOs significantly increases capacity and experience which would in turn allow Member States to widen the scope of their resettlement activities.

The Programme aims at **standardizing resettlement practices among all Member States**, through setting common annual priorities on resettlement as well as more effective use of the financial

assistance available through the **European Refugee Fund** (ERF). Currently the ERF provides for financial assistance for four specific categories of persons; persons from countries/regions designated for the implementation of a Regional Protection Programme; separated children; children and women at risk of psychological, physical or sexual violence or exploitation and persons with serious medical needs. Although it is undeniable that these categories demand protection and particular attention, it is also imperative that targeted groups are identified according to changing humanitarian needs.

As part of the Programme, a Resettlement Expert Group would be responsible for information exchange on quantitative targets and also for encouraging MS who do not take part in resettlement activities to become active in this field. The Group could also prepare the identification of the common priorities for the coming year. Additionally **the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) would become operational in 2010** with a mandate to provide a structured framework for carrying out practical cooperation activities with respect to resettlement. It is also proposed that it would coordinate issues relating to the implementation/mechanisms relating to the external dimension of the **Common European Asylum System (CEAS)**. It will also serve as a *rapporteur* to the Council and the European Parliament on the resettlement efforts made within the EU, as well as initiating discussions on the pledges made by Member States in an effort to follow the progress of such resettlement plans.

The Joint EU Resettlement Programme will be evaluated in 2014. It would be highly desirable to include this Programme in the Stockholm Programme due to be adopted in late 2009.

Caritas Europa welcomes the Commission's proposal which should lead to the participation of more countries in resettlement programmes, thus provide additional solutions to the growing number of people in need of resettlement. **CCME also believes that the proposal is a step in the right direction**, and welcomes incentives which would encourage additional member states to start resettlement Programmes. However, CCME points out that a significant reduction of the number of people trying to cross EU borders would however require a more comprehensive and broader review of EU asylum and migration policies.

See CCME "[12 Arguments and 7 Proposals for the EU Resettlement Scheme](#)" of 29 June 2009.

EU HUMANITARIAN AID POLICY

€ 53 million for vulnerable populations in 9 African countries

The European Commission has earmarked a further €53.475 million, through a series of financing decisions, for expanded humanitarian aid to vulnerable people in Somalia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Chad, Burkina Faso, Niger, Mali and Mauritania. Each funding decision launched by the Commission is tailor-made to respond to the specific humanitarian needs in the countries concerned. In all cases, the most vulnerable populations have been greatly affected by poor and erratic rainfall leading to smaller harvests, loss of livestock and increased food prices.

A separate emergency decision with an amount of €3 million for supporting the victims of floods in West Africa (and in Ouagadougou in particular) was also adopted last week.

See press releases at http://ec.europa.eu/echo/index_en.htm

Information meetings on Global Plans 2010

ECHO'S financing decisions must reflect as closely as possible the humanitarian needs on the ground and take into account the existing response capacities of ECHO'S partners. ECHO therefore welcomes the contributions of its partners to the decision-making process. On ECHO website, you will find a list of meetings ECHO has planned for the preparation of future financing decisions. Meetings planned in coming weeks concern Chad, Colombia, DRC, Sudan and Uganda.

Have a look at http://ec.europa.eu/echo/funding/meetings_en.htm

EU RELATIONS WITH THIRD COUNTRIES

Mixed progress in the implementation of the Joint Africa-EU strategy

The next EU-Africa Summit is planned at the end of 2010, 3 years after the signature of the Joint Africa-EU strategy (JAES) in Lisbon. The EC staff recently prepared a [working document](#) that will form the basis for the Ministers' discussion on the mid-term review of the Strategic Partnership and its 3-year action plan at the next Troika meeting on 14 October 2009.

EC staff views the strategy as the **best framework for enhanced political dialogue** between Africa and the EU including on additional measures and initiatives to overcome the financial crisis. It also remains a test case for EU's collective capacity to accelerate progress in the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action, and to achieve greater aid effectiveness, policy coherence and donor coordination.

EC staff however identifies a series of cross-cutting shortfalls:

"At policy level, operational follow-up of political dialogue meetings is insufficient, only modest progress has been made towards establishing common positions in international fora and key negotiations, and both parties are struggling with the concept of "treating Africa as one"; Progress with moving the Partnership "beyond Africa, Development and Institutions" has also been slow. Although efforts have been made to ensure the timely information and involvement of African regional organisations and Sub-Saharan countries, their proactive contribution in the work of the informal Joint Expert Groups (JEGs) is still not sufficient. The division of labour between the Africa and the EU, and between the Commissions and Member States, remains unsatisfactory. On the operational level, the implementation of concrete activities and projects continues to rely almost exclusively on the Commissions' initiative and expertise and on the EDF and EC's financial instruments; the buy-in of European Member States and African countries and RECs remains insufficient, and therefore the innovative implementation architecture agreed in Lisbon – in particular the Joint Expert Groups (JEGs) - has not yet produced the expected added value. It is still unclear how EU Member States and African countries are aligning their bilateral strategies. The involvement of other actors such as the private sector, local authorities and international partners needs to be improved."

The paper contains a series of recommendations to address these shortcomings during the mid-term review of the JAES. The most feasible and advanced one is to mainstream the JAES objectives and action plan in the 10th EDF and other EC instruments through their on-going mid-term review. Considering the reluctance of member states to do the same with their own bilateral aid programmes, we doubt that this mainstreaming process will address the imbalance between EC and member states' responsibilities and financial input. In addition, it mainly focuses on ACP states and does not tackle the problem of the distinctive treatments of North and Sub-Saharan Africa and the incapacity of the EU to treat Africa as one.

With regard to civil society participation, progress has been slow but organised structures on both EU and African side are now established. On EU side, a steering group regrouping around 30 organisations interested in monitoring the implementation of the 8 partnerships of the JAES and in making inputs in the work of the JEGs and in the political dialogue has been established. It includes networks, platforms and a few individual organisations representing a wide range of interests and organised groups of civil society. It is an open and self-regulated group and has nominated a coordinating committee where the EU CS contact points for the 8 partnerships are involved.

On the African side, an AU CSO Steering Committee, set up in spring 2007, was reactivated in spring 2009. Among its 21 members are the eight chairs of the [AU ECOSOCC](#) sectoral cluster committees, elected in May 2009. Since spring 2009, the cooperation between the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) and the AU-ECOSOCC, its African 'sister-institution', has gathered speed through mutual invitations and participation in the respective events.

A first meeting of the **Africa-EU Civil Society Forum**, that would have gathered representatives from the two Steering Groups, was expected to take place in mid-September 2009 but has been judged premature and postponed to a later date (probably in 2010).

Both steering groups will be invited to send a representative to the **European Development Days** in Stockholm to take part in a panel discussion on *"Citizens at the heart of the Africa-EU Partnership"* on 23 October. It should be an occasion to establish a direct contact between them.

EU CS participation in the work of the 'Implementation teams' established by the EU Council for each of the 8 partnerships is improving. Contact points of the EU CSO steering group are invited to take part in the meetings. Most advanced partnerships, in terms of CS participation, are those on human rights and democracy and on the MDGs for which consultation with a broader group of civil society actors have been organised (more information available on request). Participation is also effective but more restricted for the other partnerships.

Development NGOs, through CONCORD, are taking the lead for the partnerships on the MDGs (CBM, BOND) and on Trade and Regional Integration (APRODEV) and CONCORD has established its own working group on the JAES to coordinate its positions and inputs.

EU and African CS participation in the Joint Experts Groups (JEGs) was so far irregular and limited and very much dependent of the goodwill of the co-chairs of the JEGs.

For more information, contact k.sohet@aprodev.net
Official website of the JAES: <http://africa-eu-partnership.org>

Sudan is not part of the Cotonou agreement anymore

Earlier this year, in *EU News 3*, we informed you that the main EU aid programme in Sudan, financed by the European Development Fund, ran the risk of being suspended. Now that the Government of Sudan has chosen not to ratify the revised Cotonou Agreement by the legal deadline of 30th June 2009, this threat became reality.

As explained in an [information note](#) (FAQ) recently posted on EC website, the non-ratification by Sudan is due to a new clause in the Agreement *encouraging the ACP states to take 'steps towards ratifying and implementing the Rome Statute and related instruments'*. *The Rome Statute is the treaty that established the ICC; so far the revised Cotonou agreement is the only binding legal instrument including an ICC-related clause. (...) Since Cotonou provides the legal framework for relations between the EC and ACP states, non-ratification by Sudan prevents the EC from implementing bilateral development cooperation in Sudan. This means that the EC will not be able to disburse the €300 million pledged at the May 2008 Sudan Consortium for the period 2008-2013.*

Some money (around 54 million) remains however available from the 9th EDF, which will continue to be disbursed over the next year or so with a focus on **governance and elections** (€14 million) as well as rural roads (€40 million from STABEX). Financial support for the elections commission and technical preparations will be organized through a UNDP basket fund, to which the European Commission and several member states will contribute.

Particularly worrying is the fact that the **Sudan Post-conflict Community-based Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme**, [RRP](#), will run out of money in 3 or 4 months.

The programme which focuses on basic services and livelihoods is managed by UNDP and implemented mainly by international NGOs. UNDP officials in charge of administering the RRP are seriously alarmed by the prospect of an abrupt end of EC funding. If there is no alternative funding of the RRP much of what has been achieved in the first project phase will be in danger and a carefully developed infrastructure of relationships and coordination would be lost.

EC plans to identify some of the most successful initiatives funded through the RRP and to find other ways to fund them. It seems that it will be possible to use the Sudan allocation under the **Thematic Programme on Food Security** in that way while EC is exploring possibilities for **ECHO** to temporary support certain activities in the health sector but this will certainly not compensate for the whole RRP.

While the EC is exploring ways to continue providing development funding to Sudan, member states continue to question whether there isn't more the Commission could do and to put the onus on Brussels to find solutions. Certainly, there is no legal option for the EC to continue funding the RRP with EDF, and therefore, the best option for continuing this program would be through funding from national development agencies. Moreover, even if the EC can be pressed to find solutions that allow them to shift the 300 million earmarked for Sudan under the 10th EDF to other ACP countries, and then shift a nearly equivalent amount from those same countries to Sudan through allocations under the thematic programmes, these different types of funding are not equivalent and support different types of activities and actors. So, merely getting to equivalent numbers of overall funding does not necessarily mean getting equivalent development needs met.

Political consequences of the non-ratification of Sudan have probably been discussed in the General Affairs and External Relations Council on 14 and 15 September although there is no mention of that issue in the [Council conclusions](#) (see p.8). As explained in the EC FAQ, the EU intends to maintain its political dialogue with Sudan and the fact that Sudan is part of a regional grouping (Eastern and Southern Africa, ESA) negotiating an economic partnership agreement with the EU means that trade negotiations will be maintained as well (although EPAs are also part of the non-ratified Cotonou agreement !). So, the only aspect of the agreement that will finally be affected by the non-ratification is development aid, the one that is affecting local population most. Note that this situation is not unique; Zimbabwe for example is currently under targeted EU sanctions and

suspension of EDF but has recently co-signed an EPA between the EU and a group of 4 countries of the region (more [here](#) and [here](#)).

With regard to the deteriorating situation in the country, note the urgent appeal : ***'Let us join together to rescue the peace of our people'*** co-signed by catholic, orthodox and protestant churches of Sudan and adopted at the General Assembly of the Sudan Council of Churches on 14 August is available on request. For more information, please contact [K.sohet@aprodev.net](mailto:k.sohet@aprodev.net)
For more information on the present situation in Sudan and prospects with regard to the elections, you can read IKV-Pax Christi Netherlands [CPA Alert](#).

Civil society call for a strong EU position in response to human rights violations in Honduras

In a letter sent on September 4 addressing the European Commissioners and the Swedish presidency, APRODEV together with the European civil society networks and international human rights organisations CIFCA, FIAN International, FIDH, Friends of the Earth Europe and Grupo Sur, asks for a stronger EU position in response to the coup d'état and the human rights violations in Honduras. **The letter follows numerous reports of serious human rights violations in Honduras since the coup d'état** and the breakdown of constitutional order on June 28. The international community, including the European Union, has unanimously condemned the coup. The EU has also decided to freeze diplomatic relations and budget support to Honduras, and has made declarations condemning the coup and supporting the efforts of the OAS for a peaceful solution aiming at restoring the constitutional order. Unfortunately, the transition proposal presented by Oscar Arias, President of Costa Rica, has been rejected by the de facto government and the diplomacy of the OAS has not resulted in a solution of the situation.

Among the main concerns raised by civil society regarding the EU response to the crisis in Honduras is the **position of some member states to continue the negotiations for an association agreement with Central America without Honduras**. But in a meeting on September 1, COLAT (Working Party on Latin America) decided not to exclude Honduras from negotiation, but to maintain the suspension of the negotiations. Another concern is the lack of a clear EU position on the November elections called under the de facto government. However, on September 10 the Commission announced that the EU will not send observers to the elections, as the conditions are not in place to hold free and democratic elections. Despite of this, the Council conclusions on Honduras adopted in the GAERC meeting (General Affairs and External Relations Council – Ministers for Foreign Affairs) on September 15 does not include a clear EU position with regards to the elections. Nor do the conclusions mention the association agreement negotiations. Compared with previous EU statements, there is a slight improvement in that concern is expressed over the human rights violations.

Read the [letter](#)

Council conclusions on Honduras:

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/gena/110116.pdf

EU FUNDING FOR DEVELOPMENT

Review of EC cooperation with Non State Actors and Local Authorities

EuropeAid office recently commissioned a study by external consultants to provide an assessment of the strategy and multi-annual programme of the NSA and LA thematic programme and of its implementation mechanisms. The study is expected to provide a series of recommendations for the mid-term review of the TP.

CONCORD FDR had a first exchange with the consultants and it was agreed that a series of 6 questions would be sent to CONCORD members through the FDR.

Meanwhile, discussion are taking place between EuropeAid and CONCORD in preparation of the seminar on EC cooperation with non state actors to take place at the end of 2010 or beginning of 2011, the so-called Palermo II seminar. The FDR is presently preparing a concept note with its proposals for the objectives and methodology of the seminar and the kind of issues that should be debated.

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

NEWS FROM THE NETWORKS

NEWS FROM APRODEV

Gender and Trade: An interview of Karin Ulmer posted online at Commonwealth sponsored website on Gender and Trade: www.genderandtrade.org tries to summarise Aprodev work and lessons learnt on gender and trade over the last years:

<http://www.genderandtrade.org/gtinformation/164143/179758/213294/213299/interview/>

The Fair Trade Advocacy Office (FTAO) and the Interchurch Organization for Development Cooperation (ICCO) have issued a new publication entitled 'Aid for Trade: Is the EU helping small producers to trade their way out of poverty?'

The new publication is available under:

www.fairtrade-advocacy.org/images/aid_for_trade_publication_ftao.pdf

The newly established **ACT Rapid Support Team** is a roster of ACT International emergency professionals around the world on standby to go to any country if an ACT member needs help with its emergency response. Mr Nduna, Director of ACT Int. expressed his personal appreciation to **Norwegian Church Aid** for developing the RST and to all the ACT members whose staff made up the roster. The team is made up of people skilled in emergency operations, appeal and proposal preparation, finances, communications, security, finance, protection, water and sanitation, food and nutrition, health, hygiene, psychosocial care, logistics and shelter and camp management.

More at www.act-intl.org

NEWS FROM CIDSE

On 5-6 October, a CIDSE delegation including partners from Colombia and the Philippines will participate in the United Nations [OHCHR consultation](#) in Geneva on the operationalization of the UN Special Representative for Business & Human Rights' "Protect, Respect, and Remedy" framework. The delegation will highlight the experiences of affected communities and the need for extraterritorial legislation regulating the impacts of multinational companies' operations abroad.

The CIDSE Secretariat warmly welcomes Cayetana Carrión (Carrion@cidse.org) as new Programme Cooperation Officer. Cayetana has a Masters in Human Rights, Development Cooperation and Latin American Civilisations. She worked previously for CIDSE (1999-2003) coordinating Asia and Latin America programme work. Grainne Delaney (Delaney@cidse.org) will replace Edurne Portillo as programme and advocacy assistant during her maternity leave through March 2010. Grainne holds a Bachelors in European Studies and Spanish language and previously worked as an Assistant for Gay Mitchell, MEP.

NEWS FROM CARITAS EUROPA

Caritas Europa 2009 Migration Forum will take place from 17 till 19 September in Poland. The Forum will focus on labour migration "free movement of workers: reality or utopia?". Keynote speakers include representatives from the Polish Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and the International Labour Organisation. See previous Migration Forum [material](#).

[Caritas Europa](#) is applying its new emergency response mechanism to effectively coordinate the response to the earthquake in Albania and Georgia as well as the inundation in Turkey that stroke early September

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