

SHARING KNOWLEDGE AND TRANSITION EXPERIENCE FOR DEVELOPMENT: MAPPING OF (SELECTED) NEW EUROPEAN DONORS

Jan Marusinec, M.E.S.A. 10

Cristian Ghinea, CRPE

Prague, November 2012

Content of the presentation



- Aim and scope of mapping
- Territorial focus of experience sharing
- Thematic focus of experience sharing
- Modalities used by donor countries
- Volumes of programmable bilateral aid
- Capacity constraints
- Cooperation: current state of affairs and ideas for improvement

Aim and scope of mapping

- **Aim:** mapping of the TES/ODA in Europe and CIS with participation of emerging donors, in particular:
 - ▣ **key players** (providers, stakeholders, recipients), including state and non-state actors, and their capacities
 - ▣ **substantive areas** of focus and extent of overlap/duplication among various players
 - ▣ **modalities** used (institutional set up, funding models, involvement of academia, NGOs and private sector and partnerships with multilateral organizations)
- **Countries covered:** Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Turkey (Latvia and Lithuania); focus on their TES/ODA activities in Balkans and CIS

Territorial focus of experience sharing

- **Georgia** (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Turkey)
 - **Moldova** (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey)
 - **Ukraine** (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Poland, Romania, Turkey)
 - **Serbia** (Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey)
 - **Belarus** (Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia)
 - **Egypt and Tunisia** (Czech Republic, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Turkey)
-
- **Afghanistan** (NATO operation support)

Thematic focus of experience sharing



- Transition specific topics:
 - ▣ **Political transformation:** democratization, civil society and human rights (Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Romania)
 - ▣ **Economic/administrative transformation:** EU integration and good governance / capacity building (Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Croatia)
- Economic domain: **agriculture** and **environment**, with a focus on water and energy
- Social domain: **education** (vocational, higher and life-long) and **health** (healthcare services, sanitation)

Modalities used by donor countries

- strong line ministries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Croatia, Turkey, ... Slovakia)
 - ▣ specific knowledge, horizontal relationships
- MFA or government council coordination (Poland, Czech Republic)
 - ▣ better focus on priorities, longer-term programming
- MFA and implementing agency (Czech Republic, Slovakia, Turkey, ... Hungary)
 - ▣ division of policy and implementation, accountability, focus on results
- TF and other external instruments (Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria)
 - ▣ use of more formalized mechanisms for assistance delivery
- government sponsored NGDO platform or public foundations (Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria)
 - ▣ preserving local knowledge, more competitive in EU tenders, possibility to outgrow the region
- quasi-governmental centers of excellence (Slovenia)
 - ▣ very specialized assistance, broad territorial focus
- business orientation of bilateral ODA (Czech Republic, Slovenia)
 - ▣ domestic industry/service sector support

Volumes of programmable bilateral aid



- funds available limited to 15-20m EUR annually and due to budget constraints not expected to grow
 - ▣ Czech Republic ca. 7m EUR
 - ▣ Slovakia ca. 2-3m EUR
 - ▣ Slovenia ca. 3m EUR
 - ▣ Hungary ca. 2m EUR
 - ▣ Romania ca. 2m EUR
- project size tends to be fairly small due to limited overall funding

Capacity constraints



- majority of bilateral ODA is represented by knowledge sharing (no budget support or big infrastructure projects)
- administrative capacity
 - ▣ lack of staff and rotation in diplomacy
 - ▣ weak relative position of ODA units / implementing agencies
 - ▣ leading to externalization of project management
- other important factors
 - ▣ outdated legislative framework and policy documents
 - ▣ short-term focused prioritization and planning
 - ▣ limited resources, many small interventions, high transaction cost
 - ▣ shaky political commitment in times of austerity

Cooperation: Current state of affairs

- **ideal conditions** for cooperation among NMS
 - ▣ similar transition experience
 - ▣ overlapping priorities (territorial and thematic)
 - ▣ underdeveloped administrative capacity
 - ▣ limited funding
- **reluctance to team up with other NMS** due to concerns about impact and visibility, specifics in transition experience considered competitive
- **interest to cooperate** mainly with **traditional donors** (SIDA, DFID, USAID) and/or **internationals** (UNDP) due to **established procedures**, possibility of **know-how transfer**

Cooperation: Ideas for improvement

- advantages of joining forces
 - ▣ better relevance and visibility, being respectable partners for recipient countries
 - ▣ sizing up local consultancies / NGOs to become more competitive in EU tenders (piloting in regard to Arab Spring countries?)
- what can be done among NMS themselves
 - ▣ joint programming (if not implementation)
 - ▣ more frequent meetings of officials involved in ODA (quarterly)
 - ▣ best practice transfer on ODA implementation among NMS
 - ▣ cooperation among embassies to identify needs in recipient countries
- EU initiatives that can serve as a base for improving cooperation
 - ▣ EU Communication “Supporting societies in democratic transition”, European Transition Compendium, European Endowment for Democracy, V4 platform
 - ▣ leveraging available EU funds, meaningful if done jointly (NMS are rich in know-how but lack financial strength)
 - ▣ ENPI/ENI (CBC component in particular) and IPA (innovative financing arrangements)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION.

Contacts:

marusinec@mesa10.sk

cristian.ghinea@crpe.ro