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|  |
| --- |
| Context and summary:Component 2 “external interaction and collaboration” aims to make external collaboration possible and more systematic, addressing a gap of our existing IT tools, rather inward looking with a few exceptions (CIRCA BC, CISNET, PADOR, PROSPECT, Capacity for Dev). It corresponds to a recent change of pattern in the way to do development with more importance given to interaction with EU partners (strengthen EU external action, joint programming), with other partners and with beneficiaries countries (aid effectiveness agenda), more importance given to multi-donors programme and to mix of financing resources (as for blending). Within EU it aims to offer a more permanent involvement and coordination with EU MS (at country level, easing the current local coordination and consultation work) and with EIB and EU DGs (currently involved late at programming stage only through country team meeting and inter service consultations), as well as a better visibility and coherence to EU interventions. It aims also to ease the work of our operational managers by capturing key data coming from implementing partners, applying the principle of capturing data the closest to the source in order to the extent possible to avoid re-encoding and risk of error.With regard to external collaboration with EU MS, the system:* Must allowing managing EU joint programming obligations in a given country or region, with local EU MS partners and like minded countries part of the process (ie Norway); such obligations cover: giving access to the adopted joint EU strategy, to the financial matrix of EU interventions per sector, to EU sector lead arrangements, to sector information for sectors to which the EU Delegation ensures the EU lead, to any preparatory documents including roadmaps, etc.; and analytical work used to set up the EU strategy (ie political economy analysis, CSO Roadmaps, early warning systems, fragility assessments, etc.) with the appropriate restricted access for sensitive documents, and to any follow up document (notes, (mission) reports, minutes of EU cooperation coordination meetings).
* must allow any collaborative work needed for joint programming, as the joint EU strategy, or the regular revision of such strategy, and ensure operational management or consultation (depending on access level) of work at sector level including any joint implementation arrangement (including identification/formulation of actions) to which the EU Delegation is participating. It should include the attribution of operational role to actors by stream of activity (ie sector lead donor) under EU del overall coordination and oversee.
* Should give access to limited authorised officers in EU MS HQ and EU MS representations in Brussels to all related joint programming information, with a regular check of access validity; it will cover the role of the corresponding private network/website of Capacity for Dev.
* The public part of joint programming documents should be made available on DEVCO and Delegations websites
* And finally the use of CIRCA BC for comitology should be re-examined and possibly replaced by the new system if there is a gain of efficiency at marginal cost (no re-encoding, direct access to the right version of the document, notifications, gathering comments)

With regard to external collaboration with EU financial institutions and other DGs, the system:* Must allowing exchange of information between DEVCO/NEAR and EU financial institutions (first: EIB) as well with other DGs in order to build an EU/COM portfolio of activities in a given country or region for visibility and coordination purpose
* Should allow specific collaborative work and access to information from both sides on activities on-going or planned in a given country or region, as for programming, identification formulation of actions, also field missions and dialogues from EIB and other DGs side.

With regard to external collaboration with implementing partners, mainly CSOs, EU MS development agencies and UN agencies, the system:* Must allow direct encoding from implementing partners on selected data provided that there is an internal DEVCO/NEAR validation (ie at operational manager level); selected data may cover the description of the programme, the initial result framework and its follow up until the end of the programme, monitoring reports, direct invoicing to be transferred to ABAC

With regard to external collaboration with partner/beneficiary countries and regions[[1]](#footnote-1), the system:* Should provide to partner/beneficiary countries and regions, on a regular basis, information on programmes on a structured way, according to EU international commitments on aid effectiveness, , with more detailed information provided to ACP partners (depending on post Cotonou orientations). The coherence with data already provided to IATI (raw information provided worldwide) might be explored. The first objective is to alleviate the burden of EU delegations in their obligation to provide such information to local country and region partners.

And finally with other external partners, the system:* Must allow an extensive access to the EU Parliament (equivalent to EU MS access) and to the Court of Auditor (for financial management related data, or for any special report purpose)
* Should allow an extended access to non EU donor partners like World Bank, IMF, UN agencies, other bilateral cooperation, based on local arrangements and particularly on local sector lead arrangements
* Should allow a specific, limited and temporary access based on demand and needs for consultants, academics, researchers, civil society and any request coming from the public sphere.
 |

Glossary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CUD | Create, Update, Delete (mode of interaction with the system) |
| Dir geo | Director of the concerned geographic directorate (Dir geo is a visa) |
| Geo desk, unit, director | Resp the concerned geographical desk, unit or director |
| HoS | Head of operational section in a Delegation (could be a team leader at HQ) |
| HoC | Head of Cooperation (could be the head of operational section in Delegations with a single operational section, or the senior HoS in Delegations with two operational sections or more and no formal HoC position) |
| HoD | Head of Delegation (double “hatted” staff: EEAS and DEVCO) |
| OM | Operation Manager |
| R | Read only (mode of interaction with the system) |
| region | Should be understood as the political regional entity the EU is working with (dialogue, Regional indicative programme), including African Union  |
| CIS | Consultation inter services |
| HoU | Head of Unit at HQ |
| Partner/beneficiary country | The country benefitting from the action |
| Partner/beneficiary region | Regional organisations we are working with as for regional Economic Communities, including Africa Union |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| SPSP | Sector Policy Support Programme (could be a mix of sector budget support and project approach as for capacity building) |

External collaboration has the following four main purposes:

1. to allow managing joint programming obligations with EU MS and alike (must) and allow better managing any additional local EU arrangements (must)
2. to allow exchanging information on COM external action activities and to build a COM portfolio of actions in a given country for visibility and coordination purpose (must)
3. to allow implementing partners to initiate some data encoding and updating, particularly in term of initial programme data encoding, follow up and result management (should)
4. to give the programme information package required by our aid effectiveness or legal obligations with regard to partner/beneficiary countries and regions, alleviating the burden of our EU Delegation colleagues in providing it (should)

Both working with EU MS (managing joint programming obligations) and other COM DGs are supporting EU external action core objectives (better EU visibility, better EU action).

External collaboration has also as secondary purpose to give differentiated level of access to information to other groups of external actors: EU Parliament and European Court of Auditors, Donor Partners (WB, IMF, UN Agencies, non EU bilateral cooperations), consultants as well as academics, researchers, civil society and the public sphere as a whole.

This component has interactions and overlaps with:

* Component 3 and 4.1: interaction with EU MS on sector intelligence (ie in the framework of joint programming obligations), and interaction with programming
* Component 4.6 and 5: monitoring of programmes and results management (contribution of implementing partners to it)
* Component 9: transparency (structured information provided to beneficiary countries)

Actors involved in external collaboration:

External actors:

1. EU MS:
2. At country/region level: EU MS and alike (EU+ joint programming stakeholders)
3. At HQ level: EU MS representatives at committees, EU MS contact persons in Brussels and capitals
4. Implementing partners, at country/region level or at HQ level (CSOs, EU MS development agencies, UN agencies, local institutions, etc...)
5. Beneficiary country or transnational organisation (REC, AU, ...), at country/region level:
6. Other COM DGs, EU financial institutions and EU services:
7. At HQ level: broad spectrum of staff for NEAR, FPI, ECHO, EIB and EEAS (geo divisions); contact points for others
8. At country/region level: local offices and programme officers (EIB, ECHO, FPI, other DGs, EEAS political officers)
9. EU Parliament, European Court of Auditors
10. Other donor partners (World Bank, IMF, UN agencies, non EU bilateral cooperations)
11. Consultants
12. Academics, researchers, civil society, public

Cabinet (Commissioner Mimica cabinet) is considered as an internal actor subject to internal collaboration.

Internal actors:

1. At country level: operation manager, Head of Section/Head of Cooperation, Head of Delegation, EEAS/Delegation political advisor
2. At HQ level: DEVCO geo unit, units A2, A3, B2, C3, EEAS geo political desk

DEVCO processes involved in external collaboration:

* Programming:
	+ Capturing and feeding EU joint programming process which should be the umbrella for national or regional programming and may become at a further stage the basis for programming document
	+ Making easier the coordination and complementarity with external EU partners (EU financial institutions, EU MS, other DGs) when setting up or reviewing national or regional programming, upstream to the interservice consultation (for EU DGs), to the comitology process (for EU MS) by making available information on what they are doing, and by integrating key partners not part of those formal consultation processes (like minded partners part of joint programming, EIB).
* Identification formulation: limited involvement except:
	+ when looking at coordination and coherence with EU MS (joint programming framework), EU financial institutions and other DGs actions in a given country and region
	+ For involvement of partner countries and regions (information provided on changes made on an action proposal, situation of the file at key milestones)
* Implementation/evaluation:
	+ For the contribution of implementing partners to data encoding and programme monitoring
	+ For alleviating the information mandatory work with regard to country and region partners on our programme activities

Triggers/prioritisation/ internal reporting needs (dashboards):

**External actors:**

1. EU MS:
2. At country/region level: EU MS and alike (EU+ joint programming stakeholders)
	1. The list of access and permissions must be regularly updated in case of turn over, based on a double check by EU MS and the local EU Delegation, the final decision being taken by an internal DEVCO actor; access should be given to any local EU MS cooperation team or to EU MS local Embassies with no cooperation activities – CUD
	2. EU MS local representatives must be able to access to the system through a secured log in to read existing data and documentation related to joint programming
	3. EU MS local representatives must be able to work on collaborative documents (as for a draft joint strategy, or on a joint EU cooperation related paper)\_ CUD
	4. EU MS should be able to share their own analytical work related to joint programming or sector context information, their contribution to a possible local EU blue book indicating what EU is achieving collectively in the given country, making it available for all EU MS represented into the country as well as for HQ actors (DEVCO, EEAS, EU MS) having permission accesses; they should be able also to upload a website link giving access to their own data base and documentation in the given country and region- CUD
3. At HQ level: EU MS representatives at committees, EU MS contact persons in Brussels and capitals
	1. EU MS contacts persons in Brussels and capitals (an average of 20 people per EU country?) should be able to access to data and documentation uploaded about joint programming and joint EU activities in countries worldwide- R
	2. During the (local) consultation process of EU MS on programming and identification/formulation, EU MS representatives in various committees should be able to be notified when a document is made available for comments and endorsement, to have access to the concerned document, to be able to provide comments, and to be able to have access to joint programming documentation in any concerned country- CUD
4. Implementing partners, at country/region level or at HQ level (CSOs, EU MS development agencies, UN agencies, local institutions, etc...)
	1. Implementing partners should be able to register into the system through a portal; a link should be made with PADOR or its possible successor (PDM URF) for CSOs; registration should contain a minimum of identification elements for the implementing partners- CUD
	2. Identification of implementing partners agents called to provide data into the system should made separately from the partner entity identification process, submitted to a check from the concerned operational manager, and to a permanent check of acess validity (in case of turn over)\_ CUD
	3. Implementing partner operational agent must encode into the system the basic data for the programme (title, description, analytical breakdown, results framework, logical framework), those date being validated by the DEVCO operational manager before being made available to all into the system-CUD
	4. Implementing partner operational agent must encode/upload key follow up activities as internal monitoring reports, progress reports and update of the result framework, submitted to the validation of the DEVCO operational agent- CUD
	5. The implementing partner operational agent should be notified in case of amendment of encoded data by the DEVCO operational manager, and should have a read access non sensitive and validated operational and financial data of the concerned programme- R
5. Beneficiary country or transnational organisation (REC, AU, ...), at country/region level:
	1. Beneficiary country or transnational organisations should be able to extract information on a structured way on programme implemented in their country/under their contracting authority; extraction requests should be submitted to the HoC for validation and can be made at any frequency; data extracted cannot cover sensitive data or areas; the format for data extraction should be determined at a later stage- R
6. Other COM DGs, EU financial institutions and EU services:
7. At HQ level: broad spectrum of staff for NEAR, FPI, ECHO, EIB and EEAS (geo divisions); contact points for others
8. Statutory staff in other DGs and services should be able to access to information captured by the system in a given country: validated information, final documents, and metro station view for a programming process or an on-going action process, overview of all EU activities listed in the given country/region- R
9. DG/service contact point(s) for DEVCO should be able to provide the data, link and documentation related to the DG/service interventions in the given country/region in order to feed an overview of COM/EU interventions in that country/region; it should cover financing, programmes, field missions and on-dialogues with the government and/or local authorities-CUD
10. At country/region level: local offices and programme officers (EIB, ECHO, FPI, other DGs, EEAS political officers)
	1. Dito with regard to 4.1 according to each internal organisation specificity; local offices should have a read access and possible a create/update)delete access if they have the subdelegation for that from their HQ- R and CUD
11. EU Parliament, European Court of Auditors
	1. The system must allow an extensive access to European Parliament statutory staff to the system, on an equal basis as for EU MS- R
	2. The system must allow an extensive access to the Court of Auditor statutory staff covering any financial management related data or any data covered by the scope of a special report- R
12. Other donor partners (World Bank, IMF, UN agencies, non EU bilateral cooperations)
	1. The system should allow an extended access to non EU donor partners limited to sector management and contributions to multi donor programmes, based on local arrangements, at the exclusion of sensitive data- R
13. Consultants
	1. Consultants should be allowed for a specific temporary access to documentation according to the scope of their activities, with the agreement of a DEVCO statutory staff, at the exclusion of sensitive data and documents-R
14. Academics, researchers, civil society, public
	1. Academics, researchers, civil society and requesting persons from the public sphere could be allowed for a specific temporary access with strict security rules according to their request, and at the exclusion of any sensitive data or document.

**Internal actors:**

1. At country level: operation manager, Head of Section/Head of Cooperation, Head of Delegation, EEAS political advisor
	1. The operational manager in charge of joint programming or of an EU sector coordination must be able to open a collaborative document with EU MS locally (joint programming, sector discussion)- CUD
	2. The operational manager (above) must be able to upload a final document to be shared with EU MS locally (joint programming, analytical note or contribution) and to notify them, with the agreement of his HoS or HoC or HoD\_- CUD
	3. The operational manager (above) must be able to upload the public part of the joint programming documents on DEVCO website, with the agreement of his HoS/HoC and with the agreement of the geo desk at HQ- CUD
	4. Operational staff (DEVCO), HoD (EEAS) and the political and information section (EEAS) at the EU delegation should be able to access to all information shared with EU except for sensitive files (trade negotiations, human rights, ...) which deserve restricted access – R
	5. All operational staff, HoD should have access to the information provided by other DGs on the full EU country portfolio – R
	6. The operational manager in charge of the coordination with other DGs should be able to build a full COM/EU portfolio of EU actions in the given country and region based on information provided by other DGs, in close collaboration with the geo desk at HQ and the local communication officer (EEAS) – CUD
	7. The operational manager in charge of the concerned programme must be able to validate or amend the data provided by the implementing partner , with notification to the implementing partner in case of amendment; the system will keep the memory of who has validated what- CUD
	8. The operational manager in agreement with his/her HoS or HoC should be able to provide access to selected non sensitive data for consultants, researchers, academics, civil society and any public sphere request - CUD
2. At HQ level: DEVCO geo unit, units A2, A3, B2, C3, EEAS geo political desk
3. The DEVCO geographical unit must have access to any action carried out in the system by the EU delegation – R
4. (provided that CIRCA BC functions are deemed to be part of the new system) DEVCO units in charge of comitology must be able to notify EU MS representatives when a document is made available, with the attached deadline for comments, upload the corresponding document directly from the system, and gather comments from EU MS; in parallel an information to the European Parliament should be made possible- CUD
5. The geo desk at HQ must be part of the process to set up a COM/all DGs portfolio in a given country or region (collaborative work, notification of changes) – CUD
6. The geo desk at HQ in agreement with his/her team leader or HoU should be able to give access to selected non sensitive data for consultants, researchers, academics, civil society and any public sphere request – CUD
7. Concerned DEVCO units (A2 for EU MS, A3 for UN agencies and other partners, B2 for civil society, C3 for EIB) must have access to the information available in the system with regard to their area of competence – R
8. The EEAS geo political desk should have access to the same level of information as the DEVCO geo desk for external collaboration except for potentially sensitive financial related data.

High level data model

*To be developed*

External/official reporting needs:

*To be clarified in the framework of the rationalisation of reporting exercise.*

Next steps:

1. Check any overlapping occurring with capacity for dev and find agreed solutions (06)
2. Check with 04 the scope for EU Parliament access, the scope for EU MS access, and check with R2 the scope of access for the Court of Auditors
3. Once the principle is agreed: Further detailed work and roadmap with concerned units: A2, B2, A3, D3
4. Once the principle is agreed engage a form of consultation with concerned external partners though the appropriate channels/dialogue and coordination bodies, to be determined:
* EU MS: CODEV? EU DGs meeting ?
* Other DGs and EIB: on a bilateral basis, step by step, SG involvement? Starting with EIB, ECHO, TRADE, HOME and RTD, then expanding to others (MARE, ENV, SANCO, CLIM, MOVE, REGIO); for each partner the discussion should cover:
	+ Their appetite to get what level of information from DEVCO (beyond public information on the website); the potential cost and sustainability of any exchange of information process (frequency, resource persons involved, …)
	+ Their willingness and ability to provided what kind of information
	+ Their interest to develop exchange of data and get a more permanent on our activities beyond the existing formal process (CIS)
* Implementing partners: as it will be impossible to engage a tailor made approach with all potential implementing partners we should focus our consultation process on the main groups of current implementing partners:
	+ CSOs (CSOs platform interacting with us in Brussels and a few CSOs acting in the field would be the best format for consultation)
	+ The main EU MS development agencies working with us (GiZ, AfD, ?)
	+ The main UN agencies working with us (UNDP, UNICEF, ?); knowing that it might be challenging to get value for time in such consultation process; for UN agencies an alternative would be to approach UN contacts in the field through a few selected EU delegations
* Countries, regions: as it will be impossible to engage a tailor made approach with each partner it should be more about informing them about our intention, in relation with IATI and international aid effectiveness commitments; we may collect their needs in order to determine the most appropriate format for data to be provided to them; we can envisage two approaches:
	+ With ACP countries through ACP secretariat?
	+ With non ACP countries through regional organizations or on a bilateral basis?
1. Examine further redundancy with CIRCA BC
2. Examine any possible redundancy between raw information provided to IATI and more structured and specific information to be provided to country and region partners.
1. Essentially Governments and regional organisations we are working with [↑](#footnote-ref-1)