**Thematic RESULTS - Topic n° 6- How can Joint Programming foster joint implementation**

**Who was there?**

Jean-Michel Le Dain FR Embassy Ethiopia; Simone Knapp, AT Embassy Uganda; Daria Fane, EU Delegation Kenya/Somalia; Pieter Dorst NL Embassy Rwanda (1st moderator); Anna Renieri, EU DEL CHAD; Simona Leali, IT Embassy, Ethiopia; Erwin De Wandel, BE Rwanda; Annegret Al-Janabi DE Embassy, Ethiopia; Izabella Eriksson, Embassy of Sweden - Ethiopia;

2nd round; Jean-Paul Heerschap, EU DEL Namibia; Achim Johanssen, DE Coop Burundi; Alemayehu Semunigus, EU Del Ethiopia; Aldo Biondi, ECHO Office Kenya; Achim Tillessen, EU DEL Rwanda; Julien Bouzon, EU DEL Tanzania; Veronica + Alex OR; Diederick Zambon EIB;

3rd round ; Heinz Haberthauer, AT Embassy Ethiopia; Cristina Gutierrez, ES Ministry; Enrico Strampelli, EU Del Mozambique; Guy Hambrouck, Burundi BE Embassy

**ADDED VALUE/ COSTS/PROCEDURES/COMPLEXITY**

* **Joint implementation – Definition I**: instrument (aid modality) or also monitoring/evaluation, common results framework needed? Where does it start/end? Is it “w**hatever means leads to less transaction costs”**, which implies streamlining modalities of implementation?
* **Joint implementation – Definition II: organise ourselves around a logical framework at sector level,** with development results agreed, and individually contributing (after joint programming strategy). Results framework could be easier. Common M&E frameworks too. **Aligning around a common logical framework**, where there is already a **best practice**, where there are better chances of increasing **aid effectiveness.** Starting instead with a **common logical framework**, different MS can follow different instruments which have a different focus and flexibility (for example, if for Germany TA is light (= does not need long approval), basket funds are heavy (need parliament approval but the procedure is not heavy), which could be easier for other donors instead) – case by case basis.
* **Joint implementation – Definition III:** building from what one donor is doing ("**coordinated implementation"**) for example sharing the identification fiches of projects with other MS for comments to avoid overlaps (current good practice); in this sense those who do joint programming must accept that each one is less "free" when projects are identified (as they need consultations with others to avoid overlaps)
* The **legal basis for joint implementation** is in EU Consensus on Development (joint statement Council/EP/Commission)[[1]](#footnote-1).
* **Visibility**: is it an issue? Compromise possible? Visibility for all? Issue and non-issue, needs discussion. See joint financing: donors are "disappearing", **but problems can be manager locally to seek fair visibility**
* **Visibility**: also means access to policy dialogue, but practical "low-level" immediate visibility is more interesting in the mind of many.
* What are the difficulties for the **donor taking the lead in implementation**? **Sufficient resources** needed to run the "machine" (including dialogue), but **overheads cost have limitations**.
* Objective: **no duplication in aid coordination at sector level**; no parallel consultation mechanisms/meetings/reporting…; how to make it leaner? In particular if good coordination exist at top level between EU MS.
* **Aid modality**:
  + What are the **tools** available: Del cooperation, Trust Funds; but how to jointly **monitor** implementation? How to jointly **evaluate**?
  + Tools: project approach; diversity – not all MS can access diverse tools (i.e. France more inclined to do project approach) – so **how does it work to have joint implementation with others** **having different tools**?
  + Loan / grant: aid portfolio management, blending?
  + **Do we have to choose a common instrument** necessarily or we **take advantage of diversity?**
  + **How far can we go, with which instruments? Procedures are different, reporting requirements, budgetary procedures**.
  + **Complexity of using different procedures**: see also % of co-funding in grants which has different rules in each MS
  + **new instruments**, possibilities for EU Trust Funds? How do MS see that, should EU push Trust Funds forward? Trust funds: depends on how you implement them (through call for proposals = quick; if through decentralised cooperation: very long!)
  + The extent to which one can do joint implementation depends on donors expectations (**donors may wish to keep their channels/access to governments**). Modalities do play a role. Reporting requirements will still be multiplied. **Different decentralisation of decisions between MS** increases difficulty in setting up anything in common.
* Limitation in the **tools available to each donor vs capacity to engage the government. For example** in a country EU might put higher amounts in a program, FR typically funds smaller projects**. But smaller money can go far in influencing reforms;** for example there is a higher impact from a small TA embedded in the ministry than withhigher amounts put in a different modality
* Somebody proposed to set **country targets on % of aid to be implemented jointly** **at HQ would help**, as a driver to jointly implement.
* Role of **government** (leadership) in "facilitating" dialogue on joint implementation at sectoral level is important
* Even after joint programming is achieved (analysis, strategy, results definition) **what is the value added** of *joint implementation* as compared to *coordinated implementation,* especially looking at **transaction costs**? Perhaps joint programming move towards joint implementation is too ambitious. Using a bit more existing instruments would still be ok (Delegated Cooperation), but different national rules make everything more difficult.
* Division of Labour possible also not being obliged to a choice of sectors (see Namibia);
* **Scope of joint implementation.** Better start with sector analysis before engaging in joint or coordinated implementation, if any. Let's not focus on transaction costs first. Let's focus on aid effectiveness
* **With so many fragile states,** flexible instruments are there to implement decisions jointly (i.e. where no government / NAO exists). Difficult to understand from a humanitarian perspective the reluctance of some MS to adapt their rules and allow (more effective) joint implementation (this before a new crisis kicks in such as in famines in Sahel and Horn of Africa).
* **“Mutual Reliance Initiative” (EIB/AFD/KFW agreement)**: common appraisal, then lead given to one of the team for many issues, even delicate ones. Uniform reporting, visibility is together when possible, when donors are not too many and not working on the same sector.
* **Common project appraisal**: joint implementation should focus on successes to be replicated.
* Rwanda: DOL is there, at least minimum coordination; but no one knows who is doing what precisely in which sectors, so it is **unclear whether *joint implementation* can achieve better the country strategy results**
* **Different interests (resource/money) in doing joint implementation. Case by case**
* Common objectives yes, but **DoL at programme level using comparative advantage**. Then we can consider implementation phase taking into account **different financial cycles** (we need to understand them better; who is first ready, go ahead). **Coordination mechanism at the programme level needed**
* If there was a single European Development Agency we would not have any issue. Why having multiplication of MS agencies, which are reflected in multiplicity of government/ministries/coordination mechanisms. We need more single common legislation/ procedural frameworks. If not tackling this we will go around endlessly. The rules back home constrains action at field level.
* Let's trust each other in leading policy dialogue by sector. **Implementation is not an immediate/reachable outcome**, but could be **started and shown to capitals**.
* Good practice: Burundi trust fund BE + FR in education USD130m. Run by WB, which reviewed national procedures (accreditation was long). Also preparatory and approval work by HQ was long (overall 2,5 years). Works well.
* Joint program - same project components run by different donors. At sector level or larger.

**LINKS JOINT PROGRAMMING / JOINT IMPLEMENTATION**

* Added value of joint programming is surely perceived in getting to joint implementation. Already by doing joint analysis donors understand common direction: **joint programming foster implementation through analytical work**
* Joint programming toward implementation depends on ambitions of joint programming (and presence of critical sectors)
* Joint programming commitments: predictability, financial projections are positive aspects; BUT we all realise **synchronisation in programming does not imply synced funds commitments and implementation** – it is impossible then to give a clear implementation calendar to others (donors/partner country government)
* Joint programming has political ambitions and will deliver. Joint programming gives the **strategic direction to joint implementation**, but then it should include also indications on how to jointly implement, otherwise it remains useless. Somebody even said **joint implementation is the only way to make joint programming meaningful**. **Without joint implementation there is no sense in engaging in joint strategy/ joint programming.**
* Having a joint programming document in place would **naturally increase chances of joint implementation.**
* **Joint implementation bring/realises the joint programming at sectoral level (DOL within the sector) – common modalities not needed necessarily. “Coordinated implementation” is the norm, the good practice to start with**.

**The main consensus points:**

* Need to better define joint implementation: at instruments level? Also at joint process level: i.e. M&E / results frameworks? Is it w**hatever leads to less transaction costs, which implies streamlining modalities of implementation?**
* **Visibility** can be managed locally in a fair way, but convince political masters to give up some visibility is hard; **how to do it jointly and practically?**
* Using joint (same) instruments OR using different instruments jointly?
* Setting **country targets on % of aid** to be implemented jointly at HQ?
* **Coordinated implementation (consulting on projects at identification level at country level),** but it all depends on situations/sectors/personalities, or you put it in the TOR of the sector group)
* Predictability, financial projections; **synchronisation in programming does not mean synced funds commitments and implementation** – unable to give a clear calendar to others **(especially an EU issue or also MS?**)
* **More decentralisation** **to field offices** (**and more flexible rules** behind it – what instruments) would help in the long term to arrive at joint implementation schemes which answers crisis better in these regions
* **Careful about joint implementation**, not to be perceived as **a requirement of joint programming.**

1. <http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/european_consensus_2005_en.pdf>

   31. The EU is committed to promote better donor coordination and complementarity by working

   towards **joint multiannual programming**, based on partner countries' poverty reduction or equivalent strategies and country's own budget processes, **common implementation mechanisms** including shared

   analysis, joint donor wide missions, and the use of co-financing arrangements. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)