

	MS	Date of Answer	Person delivering answer	post	Dept & Ministry / Perm Rep	email
1	LU	27 Jan	Alex Diederich	Chargé de Programme. Burkina Faso, Niger, M&D	Direction de la Coopération au développement et de l'action humanitaire Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes	alex.diederich@mae.etat.lu
2	DK	27 jan	Lars Kjellberg	CHIEF ADVISER	Development policy and Global Cooperation (EU-team), MFA	larkje@um.dk
3	RO	22 Jan	Mihai Sirbu		Department for Relations with the Republic of Moldova, MFA	mihai.sirbu@mae.ro
4	NL	29 Jan	Alex Gerbrandij		Ministry of Foreign Affairs	alex.gerbrandy@minbuza.nl
5	DE	29 Jan	Susanne Berghaus		Division 100 - Policy issues of bilateral development cooperation, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development	Susanne.Berghaus@bmz.bund.de
6	BE	29 Jan	Marc Laplasse		DG Cooperation for Development Public Federal Service of Foreign Affairs	Marc.Laplasse@diplobel.fed.be
7	PL	01-Feb	Zdzisław Sośnicki	Minister Counsellor	Development Cooperation Dept, MFA	Zdzislaw.Sosnicki@msz.gov.pl
8	SK	01-Feb	Ivana Kasárová		Development Co-operation and Humanitarian Aid Department, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs	ivana.kasarova@mzv.sk
9	SI	01-Feb	Tadej Furlan	Minister Plenipotentiary	Department for International Development Cooperation Policies, MFA	Tadej.Furlan@gov.si
10	LT	04-Feb	Indrė BERNOTIENĖ	Chief Officer, Bilateral Cooperation Division	Development Cooperation Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Indre.BERNOTIENE@urm.lt
11	BG	04-Feb	Aleksandrina Atanasova	Attaché	United Nations and Development Cooperation Directorate, MFA	Alexandrina.Atanasova@mfa.bg
12	FR	09-Feb	Florent Cheval		Perm.Rep FR	Florent.Cheval@diplomatie.gouv.fr
13	ES	09-Feb	Eva del Hoyo	Advisor	Secr.Gral. International Cooperation for Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	Eva.delHoyo@maec.es
14	FI	10-Feb	Max von Bonsdorff	Senior Adviser on Development Policy (Results Management)	Department for Development Policy, MFA	Max.vonBonsdorff@formin.fi
15	SE	12-Feb	Roger Karlsson		Department for Aid Management, MFA	Roger.m.karlsson@gov.se
16	IT	12-Feb	Daniela Tonon		MFA	daniela.tonon@esteri.it
17	AT	16-Feb	Stefan SCHOLZ	Head of Department	Planning and Programming Development Cooperation, Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs	Stefan.SCHOLZ@bmeia.gv.at

CONTENT of JP DOCUMENTS

		1. Required content in a JP document		
		1.1 Information that Joint Strategy (i.e. J.Analysis & J.Response) include to use it as a bilateral programming docs? eg: objectives, results & indicative allocation per sector, Results and Monitoring Frameworks, Risk Assessments...	1.2 Programming period - Flexibility to ensure synchronisation	1.3 Additional / Complementary information
EU	EU	<p>To foster alignment on national priorities, the 2014-2020 programming instructions for the DCI the EDF have adopted an approach to base the programming as much as possible on the existing National Development Plans (NDPs).</p> <p>For ENI, the EU programming is based on the ENP Action Plan or Association Agenda or equivalent document where they exist. The programming document will take the form of a Single Support Framework.</p> <p>For EDF and DCI, the process starts with an analysis of the National Development Plan covering: country constraints, challenges and perspectives (political, economic, social, environmental situation; sustainability and capacity); country development priorities and objectives (of the NDP); consistency with EU development policy; Performance Assessment and Monitoring (of the NDP); conclusion and proposal for the overall lines of the EU response. The analysis of the NDP should be shared with the EU Member States present in the country (as stated in the Programming Instructions).</p> <p>For EDF and DCI this analysis is the basis for the EU multi-annual programming document (MIP- Multi-annual Indicative Programme/ NIP -National Indicative Programmes, which contains the EU response) The text of the documents are however not expected to include the analysis. They only contain a succinct chapter on strategic objectives of EU cooperation with the partner country. In exceptional cases where such alignment on the National Development Plan is not possible, the programming document should include a country analysis, as well as the overview of past and present donor cooperation, complementarity and consistency. In those exceptional cases, the programming documents consist of a Country Strategy Paper and a MIP/NIP.</p> <p>For ENI, for beneficiary countries without an ENP Action Plan or Association Agenda or equivalent document, the multi-annual programming document will consist of a country strategy paper (CSP) and a multi-annual indicative programme (MIP)</p> <p>The EU requirements for the response part include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic objectives of the EU's relationship with the partner country • Priority sectors (max. 3; less for smaller country allocations; specific considerations for fragile states and situations of conflict and crisis) • For each sector, the overall and specific sector objectives • For each specific objective, the main expected results • For each result, the main indicator(s) (limited in practice to not more than 15 indicators in total per sector) • Donor coordination and policy dialogue: describe donor coordination, other main donors' key priorities, the organisational set-up for policy dialogue including the role of the lead donor, and possible steps to increase donor harmonisation). • The Government's financial and policy commitments: the main sector and policy measures to be taken by the partner country which are necessary to obtain the expected results should be described, including the partner country's commitments to ensure mainstreaming of crosscutting issues.) • When needed, the appropriate type of environmental assessment (Strategic Environmental Assessment or Env) • The overall risk assessment of the sector intervention • Support measures (For example for ACP countries covered by the EDF, a Technical Cooperation Facility). <p>In ACP countries, there are two others components of a NIP which could be integrated in a JP document: measures in favour of civil society, if appropriate; and measures to support the National Authorising Officer.</p>	<p>EDF & DCI : The programming period is of 7 years.</p> <p>Synchronisation is a key commitment of the Aid and Development Effectiveness Agenda, which Joint Programming contributes to promote. Synchronising EU programming cycles with Partner Country cycles is an objective stated in the DCI and EDF regulations. For most of the EDF and DCI countries, synchronisation is made possible mainly through the reviews of programming documents that may be undertaken within the framework of the 7 years programming period (2014-2020).</p> <p>For ENI, subject to the need to synchronise with country processes, programming documents will generally be established for a period of 3 to 4 years, with possible review if circumstances in the country so require. In the period 2017-2020 there are opportunities to further encourage Joint Programming.</p>	
LU	Luxemburg	<p><u>Bilateral programming doc(s): Programmes Indicatifs de Coopération (PIC) - Cooperation indicative programme</u></p> <p><u>Necessary in the JP doc:</u> Information on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the objectifs, - results, and - indicators per sector, - alignment with the policies of the partner country (the PIC will also use as much as possible the indicators included in the JP doc). 	<p><u>Duration:</u> General duration of a PIC: 5 years</p> <p><u>Synchronisation:</u> POSSIBLE, in order to ensure alignment with the UE JP and the partner country programme</p>	<p>Need to ensure acceptance in the long term of the JP doc both by the EU DEL and by the partner country (in Mali a JP doc was presented an approved on a 1st stage, but was afterwards rejected by the EUDel and the Mali's govt. as basis for the cooperation. LUX had used it as basis for its programming</p>

CONTENT of JP DOCUMENTS

		1. Required content in a JP document		
		1.1 Information that Joint Strategy (i.e. J.Analysis & J.Response) include to use it as a bilateral programming docs? eg: objectives, results & indicative allocation per sector, Results and Monitoring Frameworks, Risk Assessments...	1.2 Programming period - Flexibility to ensure synchronisation	1.3 Additional / Complementary information
DK	Denmark	<p><u>Bilateral programming doc(s)</u>: Country Policy and a Country Programme document</p> <p><u>Required in a bilateral programme doc</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - justification based on a context analysis and coherence with strategic priorities of partner country + Denmark as development partner; - adherence to the principles of the Development Effectiveness Agenda; - integration of previous experiences; - budget specified at outcome level; - description of programme management and administration arrangements. 	<p><u>Duration</u>: There is no fixed timeframe. Programmes / their funding are usually approved for periods between 3-5 years (usually 5 years for larger programmes).</p> <p><u>Synchronisation</u>: POSSIBLE.</p> <p><i>*Limitations</i> : existing procedures for approval and planning of grants within the Danish State budget set certain boundaries for the flexibility regarding timing, and the possibilities to synchronize (it will depend on the specific timing and programme cycles of the national and development partners involved in the JP process).</p>	<p>Country Programme doc usually covers 3 thematic areas / sectors and (possibly) a development contract associated to general budget support.</p> <p><u>Commitments of funds</u>: MFA undertakes prioritisation of development funds during the annual allocation process (during the elaboration of the proposal for the forthcoming year's State Budget).</p> <p>In practice, most of resources available in 1 year will be planned during programming of the following country programmes, programme extensions, continued support to existing partners, etc. This limits the flexibility to allocate funds.</p>
RO	Romania	<p>There is <u>no country programming doc</u>.</p> <p><u>Required in any programming doc</u>: it should rely on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) development priorities of target country; ii) identification of funding targets with the most potential for positive impact; iii) flexibility for reallocation between sectors and between donors; iv) allowing for particular expertise of one MS in certain fields. 	<p><u>Duration</u>: General duration of 1 year</p> <p><u>Synchronisation</u>: POSSIBLE.</p> <p>The aid programming period is flexible at the moment, to allow for changes in the political, and socio-economic circumstances in partner country.</p>	
NL	Netherlands	<p><u>Necessary in the JP doc</u>: info summed up in the JP Guidance note + Annexes is sufficient:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - objectives, - results & indicative allocation per sector, - Results and Monitoring Frameworks, - Risk Assessments <p>Additionally: bilateral issues related to other instruments for foreign policy and details on human resources and finance (see Ethiopia example).</p>	<p><u>Duration</u>: Fixed planning cycle of 4 years (2014-2017)</p> <p><u>Synchronisation</u>: POSSIBLE, on an annual basis (through our annual planning and monitoring process).</p> <p><i>Next cycle preparations start now and more flexible approaches will be discussed and considered (decisions will be subject to the results of general elections taking place in 2017).</i></p>	<p>NB. After the next elections, different requirements might arise (eg. to include the wider foreign relations with a country).</p>

CONTENT of JP DOCUMENTS

		1. Required content in a JP document		
		1.1 Information that Joint Strategy (i.e. J.Analysis & J.Response) include to use it as a bilateral programming docs? eg: objectives, results & indicative allocation per sector, Results and Monitoring Frameworks, Risk Assessments...	1.2 Programming period - Flexibility to ensure synchronisation	1.3 Additional / Complementary information
DE	Germany	<p><u>Bilateral strategy document</u>: BMZ requires a bilateral Strategy document in "focal countries" (with up to 3 focal sectors, currently 50 countries are considered focal).</p> <p><u>Essential elements for a JP doc in order to substitute its bilateral strategy document</u></p> <p>(a) Sound analysis (assessment of framework conditions)</p> <p>(b) Definition of priority sectors</p> <p>(c) Joint Results Framework per defined priority sector with results at outcome/ impact level according to OECD standards</p> <p><u>The structure of a JP strategy should ideally include :</u></p> <p>I. Executive Summary (in English)</p> <p>II. Introduction (context and relevance of JP...)</p> <p>III. Joint Analysis</p> <p>Socio-economic background; outline of partner country's development policy; critical assessment of partner country's development policy by EU development partners; lessons learnt from cooperation so far; collaboration of the donor activities and level of implementation of aid effectiveness agenda</p> <p>IV. Joint Response</p> <p>Objectives of the EU cooperation (General objectives, strategic objectives); Modalities of the EU cooperation; Priority sectors (per sector: main problems, risks / opportunities, outline of national sector strategy and capacity of country systems, donor activities and partner country's own activities; Interactions and complementarities between Priority Sectors (fields of action); Division of labour (preferentially with "before and after" comparison to see the "value added" of the JP exercise); Indicative medium-term financial planning (preferentially with "before and after" comparison to see the "value added" of the JP exercise); Planning cycles (preferentially with "before and after" comparison to see the "value added" of the JP exercise); Overall risk assessment</p> <p>V. Monitoring</p>	<p><u>Duration</u>: Country strategy papers (= strategic policy plans) cover a period of up to 6 years. Mid-term reviews are recommended, adaptations to the strategy are possible when required.</p> <p>Projected disbursements per partner country are given for the respective current year and the following two years (i.e. 3 years time horizon).</p> <p><u>Synchronisation</u>: POSSIBLE.</p> <p>It is explicitly allowed in the "Guidelines on Joint Programming", subject to some rather complicated internal procedures. Therefore, the process should start well in advance.</p>	<p><u>Multi-annual commitments</u> are foreseen with annual budgets.</p> <p>*Each year the Parliament approves the annual budget in Sept. (financial year starts in Jan.): the budget lays down the spending and commitment authorizations for the financial year as <i>budget item</i>. The "commitment authorizations" enable the govt. to pledge payments also for subsequent years to third parties (e.g. partner countries, multilateral organizations) on a binding basis. The funds required to meet these commitments are made available in the budgets for the subsequent years. Germany guarantees these commitments through agreements under international law with the partner country; the commitments thus acquire a high degree of certainty for the partner.</p> <p>Financial commitments are usually - subject to certain exceptions - made on a triannual basis (i.e. for a period of 3 years).</p>
BE	Belgium	<p>The concept of Joint Programming is progressing along two approaches:</p> <p>(i) there is the strong political belief that presenting common European values and interests (human rights, democracy, solidarity) will increase results and impact;</p> <p>(ii) the technical implementation in the field through a common set of tools (division of labour of the MS, synchronization of cycles and increasing aid volumes) is hampered by national rules and regulations.</p> <p>*Reconciling both, could be a decisive element in the process of using Joint Strategy Papers as bilateral programming documents.</p> <p><u>Joint Strategy documents, replacing bilateral programming documents</u>, should consist at least of the following <u>essential elements</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - priority sectors - specific objectives in combination with a realistic timeline - expected results (incl. risk management) - performance indicators (monitoring matrix, results framework / aid effectiveness benefits, visibility) - indicative financial allocation (incl. per priority area) 	<p><u>Duration</u>: national commitments are limited to cycles of 3-4, exceptionally 5 years.</p> <p><u>Synchronisation</u>: DIFFICULT</p> <p>A strict ruling of program cycles towards national cycles and present budgetary constraints make long-term political commitments impossible.</p>	<p><u>General considerations about JP</u></p> <p>* The concept of <i>joint analysis</i> has not been problematic so far in the countries where JP has started. Some of the MS have even used it as basis for their new programme (Belgium did not because national procedures still request a separate analysis format).</p> <p>> As partner countries evolve institutionally and socio-economically, the joint analysis should be updated regularly (3-4 years) and could constitute a more "living document" to which MS could subscribe with proper cycles, priorities and budget.</p> <p>* The phase of <i>joint response</i> seem in practice more difficult, because of the internal different rules of MS or even the Commission's. Small donors benefit from the DoI, while large countries (having more interests) do less.</p> <p>* National development priorities could be revised due to changing political constellations after elections.</p>

CONTENT of JP DOCUMENTS

1. Required content in a JP document			
1.1 Information that Joint Strategy (i.e. J.Analysis & J.Response) include to use it as a bilateral programming docs? eg: objectives, results & indicative allocation per sector, Results and Monitoring Frameworks, Risk Assessments...		1.2 Programming period - Flexibility to ensure synchronisation	1.3 Additional / Complementary information
PL	Poland	<p><u>Bilateral programming doc(s)</u>: Annual plans of development cooperation</p> <p><u>Necessary in the JP doc</u>: in order to substitute its bilateral strategy document it should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - objectives, - results and indicative financial allocations per sector, - Results and Monitoring Frameworks, - Risk Assessments. 	<p><u>Duration</u>: Plans of development cooperation last 1 year</p> <p>Development cooperation framework: <i>Multiannual Development Cooperation Programme 2016-2020</i>, which specifies the objectives, thematic and geographical areas of Polish cooperation, with 10 priority countries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 of them are covered by the Eastern Partnership programme (Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine) - 6 from Africa, Asia and Middle East (Ethiopia, Kenya, Myanmar, Palestine, Senegal, Tanzania). <p>Participation in JP process: in 3 countries (Georgia, Moldova, Ethiopia).</p>
SK	Slovakia	<p><u>Necessary in the JP doc</u>: it should contain as much information as possible. At least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sectors, - indicative allocation per sector, - specific objectives, - results, - indicators, - risk assessment 	<p><u>Duration</u>: Programming docs last 1 year</p> <p>Territorial (and sectorial) priorities can be added through Annual Programs taking into account the actual situation and urgent needs.</p> <p>*Annual Bilateral ODA Program is approved by the Government at the beginning of each year, within the framework of the <i>Medium-Term Strategy for Development Cooperation 2014 -2018</i>, that it differentiates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 Program countries (Afghanistan, Kenya and Moldova), for which there is a Country Strategy Papers (CSPs, valid until 2018). - 7 Project countries (Ukraine, Belarus, Georgia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and South Sudan).
SI	Slovenia	<p><u>Programming docs</u>: Agreements of general nature and Strategic documents/Programmes</p> <p><u>Necessary in the JP doc</u>: OK the content listed in the title of this Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - objectives, - results & indicative allocation per sector, - Results and Monitoring Frameworks, - Risk Assessments <p><u>Purpose of the JP document should be</u> identification of the overall development needs and expected outcomes agreed with the partner country. This would enable the DoL among the donors according to their strengths and comparative advantages.</p>	<p><u>Duration</u>: 3 years (NB. Duration has not always been the same. At present a reconsideration towards the 2 years duration is under discussion, due to their environment and budgetary process).</p> <p><u>General framework</u> (in force since 2010): Framework programmes of Development Cooperation, lasting 3-4 year. They are decided by the Govt., but adoption of the national budget relies on the National Assembly (therefore, when they are published, they contain estimations on allocations).</p> <p><u>8 Agreements of general nature</u>: bilateral agreements with Albania, Bosna and Hercegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldavia, Serbia and Cape Verde.</p> <p>2 Specific strategic documents/programmes: with Macedonia and Montenegro (two MoU for the period 2013-2015).</p>
LT	Lithuania	<p>NB. Lithuania has started to take part in JP in 2016, in Moldova (in the Joint Analysis split per sub-sectors).</p> <p>Lithuania's bilateral development co-operation is mostly provided in the form of small-scale project grants.</p>	<p><u>Duration</u>: Budget for development cooperation projects is approved annually.</p> <p><u>Synchronisation</u>: DIFFICULT Due to annual budgets, there is no place for flexibility</p> <p>7 Priority partner countries: EU Eastern Partnership countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine) + Afghanistan.</p> <p>All development co-operation projects are funded by the <i>Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Programme</i> of the MFA.</p>
BG	Bulgaria	<p><u>Necessary in the JP doc</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - objectives, - target sectors/ groups, - monitoring framework, - allocations per sector. 	<p><u>Duration</u>: ODA is programmed for a period of 3-4 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Financial resources are planned according to a Mid-term financial prognosis, usually on a 3 year basis. -Each year an annual plan with implementing projects is adopted. <p><u>Synchronisation</u>: POSSIBLE Adjustments to the programming period are possible to some extent.</p>

CONTENT of JP DOCUMENTS

1. Required content in a JP document		
1.1 Information that Joint Strategy (i.e. J.Analysis & J.Response) include to use it as a bilateral programming docs? eg: objectives, results & indicative allocation per sector, Results and Monitoring Frameworks, Risk Assessments...	1.2 Programming period - Flexibility to ensure synchronisation	1.3 Additional / Complementary information
<p>FR</p> <p style="text-align: center;">France</p> <p><u>Programming docs: Documents cadre de partenariat</u> (DCPs - Framework partnership documents). these documents are elaborated only in a limited number of countries. End of 2015 these countries were Mauritania, Burundi, Ghana, Guinea, Senegal, Niger, Burkina, Benin.</p> <p><u>Necessary in the JP doc:</u> A JP doc should at least contain the components defined in Busan (2011):</p> <p>1. A <i>joint analysis</i> on the development strategy of the partner country FR has asked its offices in the field to ensure a deep and possibly structured analysis, on the following elements: (i) a causal analysis of the development dynamics and challenges in the partner country; (ii) a logical framework identifying the main leverage points, multiplier effects to foster and prioritize activities to be implemented, in order to make progress towards the SDGs; (iii) an analysis of existing interventions to reduce the risk of duplication and to identify complementarities to be exploited; (iv) an analysis of gaps, especially relating to the French priority axes of interventions and (v) a summary of the results.</p> <p>2. A joint response, defining the priority sectors of intervention FR favors (but do not consider it necessary) a broad approach to value the "non programmable" and not "fully programmable" aid and to present a broad vision of the European actions (peace and security, humanitarian aid, actions presenting benefits for the climate, decentralised cooperation, culture domain and/or francophonie etc.), also including non-public development aid. With regard to the sectors of concentration (where there's some flexibility on the exact terminology), the French offices in the field should focus on 3 priority sectors of the French aid (among the 10 sectors of interventions legally identified), together with 2 two cross-cutting priorities consisting on the equality between women and men and the fight against climate change.</p> <p>3. A DoL as precise as possible: Offices in the field have been requested to adopt a breakdown by sector or sub-sector.</p> <p>4. Indicative financial allocation per sector and donor (*) - Financial allocations are indicative and may be modified. In order to permit a higher degree of flexibility, the financial allocations on its bilateral action may be presented highlighting maximum and minimum values (fourchettes). Field offices are invited to refer to the 'EU results framework' and to the French aid indicators with a view to get to a limited number of measurable results indicators temporally defined for each of the concentration areas.</p>	<p><u>Duration:</u> DCP in a limited number of partner countries, with different durations. These documents cover varying periods (2-4 years).</p> <p><u>Synchronisation:</u> POSSIBLE DCPs are synchronized with the development strategies of the partner countries.</p>	<p>There are no minimum requirements established for the substitution (to keep a certain degree of flexibility and to adopt a case by case approach).</p> <p>In cases where the JP process is incomplete or if there are missing parts in the joint analysis, it would be possible to enrich the European process with a complementary bilateral document.</p> <p>Importance of having it strategy aligned with the development strategy of the partner country.</p> <p>(*) Accountancy of expenditures on public development aid follows the DAC criteria. It should include (as much as possible) all the actions of its DACable bilateral programs, detailing in each case the correspondent financial instrument: grants, loans, guarantees, and technical assistance. For its ongoing debt and development contracts, JP docs should reflect the contracts under implementation (under sector agreements that have been signed between AFD and the beneficiary partner country). For contracts under negotiation, JP docs could include estimated allocations.</p>

CONTENT of JP DOCUMENTS

		1. Required content in a JP document		
		1.1 Information that Joint Strategy (i.e. J.Analysis & J.Response) include to use it as a bilateral programming docs? eg: objectives, results & indicative allocation per sector, Results and Monitoring Frameworks, Risk Assessments...	1.2 Programming period - Flexibility to ensure synchronisation	1.3 Additional / Complementary information
ES	Spain	<p><u>Programming doc:</u> Country Partnership Framework (CPF). <i>Marco de Asociación País (MAP)</i></p> <p><u>Spanish requirements for each JP process:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of all the agreed development results negotiated and prioritized by the Spanish Cooperation in the MAP. Alignment and Ownership: permanent dialogue with the Government, creating fora to facilitate their adequate participation during the process. Proportionality in the number of representatives of the different stakeholders. Promotion and warranties to fulfil the aid effectiveness principles, with special attention to the mutual accountability, and the predictability. The "Joint Analysis" may include references about how to obtain the most adequate level of alignment and ownership. Higher accuracy and a more defined methodology in the JP process. Balance between leadership at the field level and coordination at HQ level. Development of results frameworks and inclusion of budget estimations. Clear criteria on the choice of sectors & strategic orientations. Role of MS: Internal documents elaborated during the JP process should detail the criteria used to assign roles to each participating MS. 	<p><u>Duration:</u> The programming period aims to be aligned to / synchronised with the National Development Plan: it is flexible and it is adapted to each specific context. Frequently, it is a four years period. It may vary between 3-5 years.</p> <p><u>Synchronisation:</u> POSSIBLE Spain has already synchronized its bilateral programming with the JP process: all concerned field offices have received the instruction to pay attention to this aspect. Eg. 2 countries (Bolivia and Paraguay) extended the existing current CPF, complementing and synchronizing both documents.</p>	
FI	Finland	<p><u>Programming doc:</u> Country programme</p> <p><u>Necessary in the JP process:</u> On a policy level EU JP is supported as a means to increase country level aid effectiveness. From this context, Finland has supported country level JP.</p> <p>JP docs will be used as part of Finland's country programming preparations, particularly if the joint analysis meets set quality criteria. The overall harmonized sectoral objectives, division of labour and indicative financial allocations in the joint programming documents are useful for the more detailed programming by Finland.</p> <p>JP docs are particularly useful strategy documents in the non-priority countries where Finland does not have a country program process.</p>	<p><u>Duration:</u> NO INFO</p> <p><u>Synchronisation:</u> NO INFO</p>	
SE	Sweden	<p><u>Programming doc:</u> Strategy country document</p> <p><u>Necessary in the JP process:</u> info summed up in the JP Guidance Package + Annexes is sufficient.</p>	<p><u>Duration:</u> Most bilateral strategies last 5 years.</p> <p><u>Synchronisation:</u> POSSIBLE A new Government decision can replace a strategy at any time, e.g. due to changing Government priorities or external conditions. A new decision would normally follow the process described below.</p>	
IT	Italy	<p><u>Programming doc:</u> Country programming (CP)</p> <p><u>Necessary in the JP process:</u> ><i>Joint Strategy</i> should include information on: - general objectives, - expected results, - indicative allocation per sector, - results and monitoring frameworks (including clear targets and indicators), - governance mechanisms, and possible conditionalities/prerequisites (policy, governance, public financial mechanisms), - financing instruments (programme approach, sector or general budget support, triggers for disbursement, pooling mechanisms etc.), - risk assessments and related mitigation measures. - if possible, it also include "CSO Roadmaps" and be coordinated with other EU processes such as "EU Democracy Support" and Human Rights Country Strategies.</p> <p><u>Joint Analysis</u> should '- include priority sectors including cross-cutting issues such as gender, human rights, youth and civil society, which will be mainstreamed as agreed. - take stock of the National Development Plan and Sector Plans' reviews and evaluations, in order to reflect what is left to be done, along with a feasibility and gaps evaluation.</p>	<p><u>Duration:</u> Bilateral programming is based on a 3 year cycle, subject to fine-tuning on a yearly basis.</p> <p>The next bilateral programming document will cover the period 2016-2018.</p> <p><u>Synchronisation:</u> POSSIBLE The instrument has potential flexibility to consider synchronization with JP timeframe.</p> <p>The new Development Cooperation Law (125/14) underlines the importance of coordinating and harmonizing Italy's development cooperation activity with that of European Union ("Italy participates in the definition of European Union's development aid policies, contributes to the budget and external funds of the European Union and harmonizes its policy orientations and programming with those of the European Union, favoring the implementation of joint projects").</p>	<p>The process leading to JP requires efforts in terms of technical and human resources, from both donors and partner country, and needs political support.</p> <p>JP is an instrument that serves the final purpose to synchronize and align EU and MS aid with the partner country</p> <p>According to the <i>Italian Development Cooperation (IDC) Policy Framework</i>, the Joint Strategy should be in line with: i) the recipient country's national priorities; ii) the 3-year programming document ; iii) the regional integration processes/international commitments.</p>

CONTENT of JP DOCUMENTS

1. Required content in a JP document		
1.1 Information that Joint Strategy (i.e. J.Analysis & J.Response) include to use it as a bilateral programming docs? eg: objectives, results & indicative allocation per sector, Results and Monitoring Frameworks, Risk Assessments...	1.2 Programming period - Flexibility to ensure synchronisation	1.3 Additional / Complementary information
<p>- include the state of play, an assessment of the political situation (respect for democracy and human rights, rule of law, governance, security and conflict risk assessment) and economic, social and environmental situation, gap analysis, emerging needs and priorities, stakeholders involved, financial channels and pledged and disbursed budget at the actual state. ' - contain a specific assessment per identified priority sectors, and analysis of specific issues intertwined with the humanitarian crisis and the reconstruction process.</p> <p>- include involvement in regional cooperation initiatives and their influence on national policy (both actual and potential) and country capacity (public institutions, civil society and private sector) .</p> <p>The <i>Joint Response</i> document should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be based on a timetable that is effective and realistic. - contain core elements such as: an overall strategy including a commitment to synchronize MS planning cycles with the national cycle, a clear division of labor that shows which EU donor will work in which sectors, besides indicative financial allocations from each EU donor to each sector. - be based on a results framework, set upon key performance indicators evaluated with SMART criteria with reference to international indicators (i.e. SDGs, PEFA, CPIA, GEI, etc.). - include a risk assessment, a communication strategy and the commitment to a review of the effectiveness and impact. 		<p>Role of MS: To better improve the performance of EU Joint Strategy, MS should focus their programming on the sectors where they have added value and comparative advantage, reducing fragmentation and avoiding duplications, enhancing Aid Effectiveness and ensuring complementary and coherence. It will be important to ensure that the group of donors shares the same definition of the sectors, within the group and with the Government of the partner country.</p>
<p><u>Programming doc:</u></p> <p><u>Necessary in the JP doc:</u> AT agrees with elements mentioned in the question are fine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - objectives, - results & indicative allocation per sector, - Results and Monitoring Frameworks, - Risk Assessments <p>And would also propose to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lessons learnt, - conclusions, - possible options - an update of the respective theory of change. <p>Would like to float the idea for a <i>common results framework for development cooperation</i> . The benefits to be gained from a common results framework are economic, political and strategic. While the results framework would be operational and practical, it also expresses the commitment to partnership and mutual accountability that is inherent to the 2030 Agenda.</p>	<p><u>Duration:</u> Bilateral cooperation strategies usually cover a planning period of 3-6 years.</p> <p><u>Synchronisation:</u> POSSIBLE But we allow for flexibility. Synchronisation – as appropriate – with NDPs and with JP is another important parameter.</p>	

AT

Austria

PROGRAMMING PROCESS

2. Programming process

2. Programming process			
	2.1 How to ensure ownership of the partner gov't / consultations	2.2 Adoption process: Steps & timelines and level of decision making (HQ/Embassy)	2.3 Instructions on programming to embassies / field offices (guidelines, instruction notes...)
EU	<p><i>DCI-EDF Programming instructions 2014-2020</i> "The programming normally starts with the national government (...), national parliament and other representative institutions, taking ownership of an inclusive development process. (...) CSOs and the private sector are (...) crucial to ensuring national ownership and should be consulted in the process of defining the priorities to be retained in the EU programming documents."</p> <p><i>ENI instructions</i> "Programming shall be an inclusive process, involving in particular and as appropriate, national, regional and local authorities as well as civil society organisations and social partners, in order to strengthen mutual accountability."</p>	<p><u>Country programming process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For EDF and DCI the EU country programming process is launched by EU HQ through formal instructions and on that basis initiated by the EU Delegation at country level. - The starting of a review of existing programming documents requires a joint EEAS/DEVCO decision (at Director level) on the basis of a proposal from the EU Delegation. At country level, the EU Delegation is in the lead on the process <p><u>Decision making process:</u> EEAS/DEVCO; Country Team Meeting (CTM), involving other DGs concerned; for DCI and ENI countries: a strategic dialogue with the EP; launch of the Internal Service Consultation (ISC) involving other DGs, Legal Service, DG Budget and the Secretariat General of the Commission; transmission to Examination Committee (comitology); submission to College for approval by written procedure. The Commission decision is only to approve the EU part of a JP document.</p>	<p>EU multi-annual country programming is subject of detailed formal instructions by EU HQ (joint EEAS/DEVCO instructions) defining</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the process between EU Delegations and EU HQ - the nature and format of the programming, including the templates of the programming documents.
EU Luxemburg	<p>The Indicative Cooperation Programmes (PIC) follow the Busan principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - alignment with the general and sector programming of the partner country; - use of national systems as much as possible; - taxation and the mobilization of internal resources; <p><u>Consultations:</u> In the partner countries, all stakeholders participate in PIC identification and the formulation of project/programme documents arising from the PIC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) ministries /administration, ii) representatives of the private sector ii) CSO <p>The corresponding Ministry of the partner country must approve the document of project/programme before the signature of the bilateral financing agreement.</p>	<p>Adoption process</p> <p>Identification of a new PIC generally starts 1 year before the end of the PIC in force. The length of the different phases of the process may vary depending on the country and the circumstances (eg. the formulation of a PIC which falls within the continuity of the previous one takes less time than the formulation of a PIC that includes new areas or modalities of intervention). Steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Identification and signature of a bilateral PIC, followed by a formulation mandate with the agency responsible for the implementation of the projects/programme (5-10 months). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Embassy plays an important role on the identification phase, working back to back together with the country-desk responsible in HQ. - The implementing agency is also involved at this stage and can be mandated to carry out ad hoc studies. 2) Executing agency: prepares a formulation proposal on the activities planned in the PIC (1-2 months) + formulation of the projects/programmes agency (6-12 months). 3) MFA: reviews the document submitted by the executing agency to the MFA + signature of the implementing mandate for the Agency (1 month). 4) Signature of the bilateral financing agreement with the partner country + beginning of the activities (asap), generally 1-2 months after the mandate signature (in any case, after the signature of the financing agreement). <p>Decision making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final decision for each step will be taken in HQ. - Final decision on the signature of a PIC is taken by the Minister in charge of the development cooperation. 	<p>Guidelines MFA to Embassies</p> <p>The <u>Directorate of Cooperation for Development</u> (MAEE) drafts the general templates applicable to all partner-countries, concerning the identification of the PIC reports, the PIC document, the project/programme document used by the implementing agency and the bilateral financing agreement to be signed for each project/programme.</p> <p><u>Role of the Embassy:</u> takes the lead on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the identification process, including the drafting of the identification report, - the preparation of the final agreement with the authorities of the partner country + ensures its follow up during the implementation phase. <p>*Work is done in close collaboration with the Directorate of Coop. for Dev.</p>

PROGRAMMING PROCESS

2. Programming process			
	2.1 How to ensure ownership of the partner govt / consultations	2.2 Adoption process: Steps & timelines and level of decision making (HQ/Embassy)	2.3 Instructions on programming to embassies / field offices (guidelines, instruction notes...)
DK Denmark	<p>Danish bilateral development cooperation is based on long-term partnerships involving permanent dialogue with the national governments and programme partners, and aligned to the extent possible to national strategic priorities.</p> <p>The preparation of new programmes or programme phases always involves thorough partner consultation and dialogue.</p>	<p>Adoption process Different approval processes for programmes and programme grants, depending on the size of the grant (approval processes and requirements are described in the Danida Aid Management Guidelines http://amg.um.dk/en/)</p> <p>Preparation of a Country Programme would typically take 1-2 years from identification to grant approval and agreements signature. Preparation of smaller programmes may require substantially less time.</p> <p>Decision making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MFA: provides the overall strategic priorities set out for Danish Development Cooperation, the general Aid Management Guidelines, as well as technical support as required. All programme and project grants above a certain threshold have to be quality assured and approved at HQ. - Embassies: are in charge of programming / programme management in the priority countries: <u>Danish bilateral development aid is decentralised</u> and relies on the Embassies. 	<p>Guidelines MFA to Embassies Guidelines for Country Programmes (2015)</p> <p>Guidelines exist for bilateral programmes of different sizes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guidelines for Programmes and Projects > 37M. DKK (2015) - Guidelines for Programmes and Projects < 37M. DKK (2015) <p><i>NB. See all the Guidelines published in English:</i> http://amg.um.dk/en/technical-guidelines/</p>
RO Romania	<p><u>Consultations</u>: Priorities are established in <u>cooperation with</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) authorities ii) civil society in partner country <p>through high-level and expert level meetings.</p> <p>Implementation is followed closely and the track-record of implementing entities is taken into consideration when new allocations are made.</p>	<p>Adoption process / decision making Embassy informs and works closely with HQ at all times for evaluations and decisions on priorities.</p>	<p>Cooperation/exchanges Embassy-HQ RO's development cooperation strategy has overall guidelines, complemented by sector priorities (updated as needed).</p> <p>Embassy and HQ are constantly in contact regarding priorities and developments of the projects in progress.</p>
NL the Netherlands	<p><u>Consultations</u>: taken care of by the Embassies</p>	<p>Adoption process / decision making Previous adoption took less than 6 months. Embassies drafted a document that was submitted to HQ for approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The regional division takes the lead and bring in thematic experts for advice. > Discussion takes place with Embassies (through VCs) and further fine-tuning takes place. > Final version has been approved by the SG for the final discharge. 	<p>Guidelines MFA to Embassies An instruction with policy guidance is sent to the Embassies through "instruction notes" that include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - thematic guidelines (also on crosscutting themes) and - a general template for the content of the MASP (Multiannual Strategic Plan).

PROGRAMMING PROCESS

2. Programming process			
	2.1 How to ensure ownership of the partner govt / consultations	2.2 Adoption process: Steps & timelines and level of decision making (HQ/Embassy)	2.3 Instructions on programming to embassies / field offices (guidelines, instruction notes...)
DE Germany	<p><u>Consultations:</u></p> <p>i) Key aspects are discussed with the partner government in official consultation processes.</p> <p>ii) Civil society in the partner country and in Germany +</p> <p>iii) <u>other donors</u> are also consulted in the course of the development of the strategy document (usually a 3-month intense consultation period).</p>	<p>Adoption process</p> <p><i>Bilateral country strategies are only obligatory for A-countries</i>: the drafting is made by the corresponding country desk officers in HQ (=centralized process), who closely cooperate with HoC in the field.</p> <p>Decision making</p> <p>Within BMZ HQ: Country desk officer submits final version to a multi-sectoral "quality Steering Committee" under supervision of the Strategy Dept. (who coordinates the process and likewise comments on the document).</p>	<p>Guidelines describe the process and requirements in the development of a Country strategy document.</p> <p>*<u>Country strategy docs</u> sets out the main guidelines for aid allocation and strategic focus and draw on findings from internal assessments and from bilateral consultations with partner countries and other partners in the countries. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - assessments of countries' level of development and outline strategic areas for future co-operation. - indicative spending plans as part of their country strategies, broken down by calendar year or as an aggregate level of funding for the entire period. - indicative spending plans on request and based on existing commitments. <p>*They are published in the Internet</p> <p>There are also "Guidelines on Joint Programming"</p> <p>Data are published as part of the DAC Survey on Indicative Forward Spending, aggregated for all government departments.</p>
BE Belgium	<p>Belgian Development Cooperation is <u>implemented</u> through three channels: multilateral (UN agencies, EU), non-governmental (with non - state actors) and governmental cooperation (Governmental cooperation is approx. 1/3 of the total development aid budget).</p> <p><u>Consultations:</u> NO INFO</p>	<p>Adoption process / decision making</p> <p>Phases of the governmental cooperation program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Embassies lead the preparation (including the policy dialogue), towards a substantive agreement on the program together with the partner country during a Joint Commission and the identification of the interventions; 2) Implementation relays under the responsibility of the Belgian Development Agency (BTC / CTB); 3) At HQ, monitoring and evaluation is carried out by the Belgian State. Monitoring between partner country and MS through yearly Partner Committees; 4) Closure (and if appropriate, exit phase) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - of the Cooperation programme, done by the Belgian State; - of the intervention done by BTC / CTB. 	<p>Reports from implementing agency to the Embassy</p> <p>BTC / CTB informs the competent Embassy in charge on the progress of interventions and programs, providing the following reports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The <i>annual progress report</i> of the sectorial programs and punctual interventions formulated in terms of results. These are handed over one month before the start of the partner committees; 2) The reports of the <i>6 monthly</i> Steering Committees of the sectorial programs and interventions; 3) The reports of the mid-term and end-of- term evaluation of the interventions; 4) Result-oriented final reports of interventions that are handed over 9 months after the ending date of the implementation agreements. <p>Approval of reports by HQ.</p> <p>Approval by the Belgian State of these reports is considered as final acceptance of the interventions.</p>

PROGRAMMING PROCESS

2. Programming process			
	2.1 How to ensure ownership of the partner govt / consultations	2.2 Adoption process: Steps & timelines and level of decision making (HQ/Embassy)	2.3 Instructions on programming to embassies / field offices (guidelines, instruction notes...)
PL	Poland	<p>Adoption process / decision making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programming documents (Multiannual Development Cooperation Programme and <u>Annual Plans of development cooperation</u>) are prepared by Development Cooperation Department of MFA. - Docs are further consulted with the partners of bilateral development cooperation as well as in the framework of Development Cooperation Programme Board (established and attached to the MFA). 	<p>Guidelines MFA to Embassies</p> <p>MFA regularly instructs Embassies in terms of programming.</p>
		<p>Consultations</p> <p>i) to the partner government (also analysis of strategic documents of partner) via Polish embassies</p> <p>ii) partners of bilateral development cooperation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NGOs, - public administration bodies, - Solidarity Fund PL, - private sector entities <p><i>*Social partners provide suggestions concerning development cooperation, among others by participating in the work of the Development Cooperation Programme Board.</i></p>	
SK	Slovakia	<p>Adoption process / decision making</p> <p>Annual Bilateral ODA Program & the Mid-term Strategy are prepared by the MFA in consultation with the Slovak Agency for International Development Cooperation (SAIDC) + relevant Slovak Embassies + other ministries/state institutions. Both are approved at the level of Government.</p> <p><u>Country Strategy Papers</u> (CSPs) have been prepared for the first time in 2014/2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft primarily within the MFA in consultation with SAIDC and relevant Embassies. - Final approval by MFA (responsible for the ODA coordination at the national level). 	no answer
		<p>The Development Plans are taken into account to ensure partner government ownership.</p> <p><u>Consultations</u> include</p> <p>i) donors,</p> <p>ii) implementing agencies</p> <p>iii) local subjects involved into the implementation process.</p> <p><i>*Consultations with relevant local subjects should be more prominent in the future</i></p> <p>-Case of Kenya: consultations with local subjects, but mostly with the Slovak organisations implementing projects in the field.</p>	
SI	Slovenia	<p>Adoption process / decision making</p> <p><u>Bilateral programmes</u> are prepared in advance of the programming period, ensuring enough time for its consolidation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interested public partners (in the partner countries) submit their financing request for development projects to the national coordinating body of the partner country. - The programme is at first consolidated within the partner country govt and then, between the partner country govt. and the Slovenian govt., with close involvement of the respective Embassies in the process (in HQ and specially in the partner country). 	<p>Guidelines MFA to Embassies</p> <p>Embassies are strongly involved in the development cooperation, with specific instructions, as needed.</p>
		<p><u>Consultations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programming doc in collaboration with the recipient government - in consultation with stakeholders in the donor country as well as relevant stakeholders in the recipient country. Public consultation should also be allowed. 	
LT	Lithuania	<p>NO INFO</p> <p>All development co-operation projects are funded by the <i>Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Programme</i> of the MFA.</p> <p>Each year MFA launches calls of concept papers on projects implementing the <i>Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Programme</i>. Financing is provided for projects that aligned with the <i>Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Policies</i> established for the period 2014-2016.</p>	<p>Guidelines MFA to Embassies</p> <p>Embassies follow the <i>Development Cooperation Policy Guidelines</i> (2014-2016).</p>

PROGRAMMING PROCESS

2. Programming process

	2.1 How to ensure ownership of the partner govt / consultations	2.2 Adoption process: Steps & timelines and level of decision making (HQ/Embassy)	2.3 Instructions on programming to embassies / field offices (guidelines, instruction notes...)
BG	<p>Bulgaria</p> <p><u>Consultations:</u> Embassies engage with: - stakeholders at regional, governmental and local level - local NGOs</p> <p>Priority thematic areas in the programming documents are consulted with the govt. of the country partners via the Embassies: with the correspondent Units in charge of the development assistance or the competent Ministries and, exceptionally, with local actors.</p>	<p>Adoption process / decision making</p> <p>The <i>Mid-term Programme</i> is drafted by the MFA, including proposals from the line Ministries, Embassies and NGO`s working in the field of development (drafting takes 4-6 months).</p> <p>MFA submits Mid-term Programme to the Council of Ministers for its adoption (this takes approx.. 2 months).</p>	<p>The planning and programming is strictly done by HQ.</p> <p><u>Role of the Embassy:</u> - participates in the planning and programming process with concrete proposals, after engaging with stakeholders (at regional, governmental and local level), as well as local NGOs. - plays an active role in the drafting process of the Mid-term Programme (so that is updated with the procedures for planning and programming)</p> <p>Regular instructions are sent to Embassies when needed.</p>
FR	<p>France</p> <p>DCPs are developed in dialogue with the administration of the partner country.</p> <p>A wide consultation process should in particular identify the priority areas of the French development cooperation. At the end of this process, DCPs are co-signed with the authorities of the partner country.</p>	<p>Adoption process</p> <p>Embassies in the field drive the programming exercise (whether under a DCP or a JP doc) by closely associating actors involved in the management of French aid (AFD notably) who regularly report on the progress of the work.</p> <p>Decision making</p> <p>An arbitration at the ministerial level is sometimes necessary during the process for issues requiring a political orientation/ strong validation.</p> <p>The final document should be validated by the MFA and the Ministry of Economy and Finance (Treasury), after consultation with AFD HQ.</p>	<p><i>Instructions on the development of the DCPs</i> were transmitted in 2012 (including a financial annex model).</p> <p><i>Guidelines on JP</i> were transmitted to the field in July 2015, together with the EU Guidance Pack: they provide clarification on how the French actions can be presented within a JP doc, seeking to preserve the necessary flexibility.</p> <p>They state that (except under exceptional circumstances) JP should lead to renounce to the development of a new DCP.</p>
ES	<p>Spain</p> <p>Bilateral programming document follow a methodology that establishes the steps and requirements needed in order to develop the document. Measures to ensure ownership of the partner document and consultation with stakeholders are considered.</p> <p>It has been highlighted in the last DAC Peer Review to (2015) that Spain excels in terms of ownership, alignment and dialogue with our partner countries.</p> <p>Same scheme is promoted for the Joint Programming process.</p>	<p>Adoption process</p> <p>The document is prepared step by step in four phases that may be agreed with stakeholders at field level and at HQ level. Every team has a chronogram that takes into consideration the capacities in place and the time required to complete the document according to the methodology in place.</p> <p>There are coordination groups with different Spanish actors, both at field and HQ level.</p> <p>Decision making</p> <p>The final document is an executive document that summarizes the most important content developed. This document is revised at high level from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, Embassy and from the designated Partner Country Governments</p>	<p>Country partnership frameworks methodology</p> <p>There is a thorough methodology on how to prepare the Country Partnership Frameworks, with a highly participative and transparent approach. The process is supported and supervised during the preparation phase.</p> <p>The leadership and document`s preparation relies on the field cooperation offices (Spanish Technical Cooperation Office-AECID).</p> <p>DAC Peer Review evaluators have mentioned that this methodology is a model in terms of decentralization.</p>
FI	<p>Finland</p> <p>NO INFO</p>	<p>NO INFO</p>	<p>NO INFO</p>
SE	<p>Sweden</p> <p>Embassies and Sida are responsible for local consultations.</p>	<p>Adoption process / Decision making</p> <p>1) Government develops the framework of the development cooperation in a specific country. 2) Based on it, Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) is instructed to draft a proposal and supporting document for a strategy (including, among others, poverty and rights perspective, possible results, risk and opportunities, implementation, and follow-up and analysis). 3) After Sida`s proposal and supporting document, the Government formulates a strategy under the form of an Instruction to Sida. The instruction outlines what to do and certain priorities and limitations. The strategy period and allocation of funds is also stated here.</p>	<p>Instruction to implementing agency</p> <p>The Strategy document decided by the government is the instruction to Sida regarding implementation in a specific country.</p> <p>Guidelines on strategies</p> <p>The government also establishes Strategic implementation guidelines, through Sida and the Embassies.</p> <p>The <i>MFA/Embassy annual plan of operation</i> is also an important document.</p>

PROGRAMMING PROCESS

2. Programming process

	2.1 How to ensure ownership of the partner govt / consultations	2.2 Adoption process: Steps & timelines and level of decision making (HQ/Embassy)	2.3 Instructions on programming to embassies / field offices (guidelines, instruction notes...)
IT Italy	<p>The Program is first designed locally, in line with the government strategies and policies, shared and agreed upon with the partner government before being officially approved by the Parties.</p> <p>Negotiations / consultations Country Program (CP) is usually directly negotiated with the Prime Minister Office and concerned Line Ministries in order to ensure a strong alignment of the CP objectives with the priorities identified by the Partner Government.</p> <p>Encourage the promotion of inclusive partnerships with -NGOs, -private sector, -academia and -local authorities is strongly supported, aiming at a “whole of the country approach to cooperation”: programs/ projects design and formulation are drafted in consultation with stakeholders and provincial/district authorities.</p> <p>Consultation with these actors are addressed through periodic meetings, promoted by the IDC Country Office and the Embassy.</p> <p>IDC ensures ownership of the partner government also by keeping a constant dialogue with the line Ministry responsible of supervising and coordinating the ODA inflow in the Country.</p>	<p>Adoption process The adoption process includes the following steps: 1) definition of sectoral and geographic priorities at political level between the Parties; 2) in line with those priorities, Programs/Projects proposal are drafted at local level, shared with the Embassy, and submitted to HQs for approval through an official request signed by the relevant Ministry of the partner country.</p> <p>The adoption process is based on high level dialogue with the Treasury in order to jointly identify priorities and modalities.</p> <p>Decision-making applies at HQs level. If the HQs provides a positive feed-back, the local office starts the negotiation of the specific objectives of the new Country Programming with the national authorities and the other Development Partners.</p> <p>The <i>Country Programming</i> is generally framed within the priority areas of the 3-year Guidelines (TYG) of IDC, the national strategies of the partner country, where possible, the EU priorities. The document also capitalizes on the lessons learnt of the previous Country Programming, and takes into consideration donor coordination/division of labour initiatives.</p>	<p>The flow of information between HQs and Field Offices is constant during the year.</p> <p><u>IDC policy framework</u>: the IDC country offices carry out an annual assessment on the portfolio of initiatives through the STREAM document (Synthetic, Transparent, Realistic, Exhaustive, Agreed, Measurable), which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is a planning tool, rather than a binding document. - sets out the multi-annual country programming, by providing a transparent and synthetic picture of objectives, sectors and resource allocation. - depending on the availability of resources and the disbursement/ implementation status of the portfolio of initiatives, IDC Country Office can also propose to the HQs to start the negotiation of a new Country Programming.

PROGRAMMING PROCESS

2. Programming process

		2.1 How to ensure ownership of the partner govt / consultations	2.2 Adoption process: Steps & timelines and level of decision making (HQ/Embassy)	2.3 Instructions on programming to embassies / field offices (guidelines, instruction notes...)
AT	Austria	<p><u>Ownership strengthen</u> The current 3 years Austrian Development Cooperation Programme (ADC) for the 1st time (i) includes a process goal as strategic objective, committed to a results based management cycle system, informed by the SDG indicators (and especially those relevant for the AT thematic profile), and (ii) pursue a whole-of-government approach. Both goals aim to strengthen government ownership and to build a system based entirely on the needs of the partner country, further sharpening the focus of the Austrian development system's special profile.</p> <p>Joint corporate monitoring both of SDG trends and of the performance of ADC's interventions aims at building ownership of the information (both documents and data) held both by AT and the partner country and should bring new lease of life to the aid effectiveness agenda and its approach to partnership.</p> <p><u>Consultations</u> The most relevant stakeholders in the partner country and in AT will be invited to take part in strategy workshops and debriefings in order to guarantee a participative and inclusive process.</p>	<p>Adoption process / Decision making There is no unified administration: MFA at strategic level, Austrian Development Agency ADA at operational level, but it is committed to a whole of government approach. So far there is no standard model and the adoption processes vary in practise. ADC has HQ two headquarters (MFA and ADA) and a number of field offices which are parts of an embassy and form the operational unit of ADC.</p>	<p>Guidelines on country strategy MFA is about to issue guidelines for the elaboration of bilateral country strategies with a whole-of-government approach. Our aim is to standardize the format and the consultation process and to institute a more regular dialogue with the partner governments at national and local level that has to be transparent and therefore well documented.</p> <p>Communication from MFA to the field Austrian embassies and field offices are informed about the details of the foreseen strategic process - by communication from MFA via the MD of ADA. The ensuing operational programming is steered by the country strategies and executed by ADA.</p>

LEGAL STATUS OF PROGR. DOC

3. Legal status of national programming document

3. Legal status of national programming document		
	3.1 Legal status of the programming doc. (legally binding?)	3.2 Need of co-signature of programming doc with the partner country
EU	<p>MIPs, NIPs and multi-annual programming documents for ENI i.e SSFs are <i>mandatory documents</i> foreseen in the legal regulations which form the basis for the commitment of the credits which the EU will use for the support to partner countries. The programming documents are of an "indicative" nature. This means that the document does not create legally binding financial commitments for the EU towards the partner country, and the financial contribution for the DCI therein can also be adjusted unilaterally by the EU. This is also the case when a programming document is or needs to be signed with the partner country like is the case with ACP countries.</p> <p>The approval of the programming documents by the Commission is a formal Decision, through which the Commission agrees to implement the programmed support by the subsequent adoption of financing decisions engaging the funds necessary to do so. The same would apply where the Commission approves a Joint Programming document replacing an EU MIP/NIP.</p>	<p>Co-signature is mandatory only for ACP countries, relating to the EU part of the Joint Programming Document.</p> <p>In other cases, summary documents can be signed with the partner country.</p>
LU	<p>The Indicative Cooperation Programme (PIC) is <i>indicative</i> as regards activities only in relation to its funding. It is the operational expression of the cooperation agreements signed with the partner countries.</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>The PIC is signed with the partner country by the two ministers having the Development Cooperation in their attributions.</p> <p>- <i>In Luxembourg</i> : the agreement is presented before signing to the Chamber of Deputies.</p> <p>- <i>In the partner countries</i> , the practices may vary: in the majority of countries, the govt. just inform the National Assembly; in others, ratification by the Parliament is required.</p>
DK	<p>Country Programme doc serves as the basis for grant approval and constitutes an essential annex of the programme agreement co-signed between Denmark and the partner country Govt (or other)</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>As a rule.</p>
RO	<p>There is a Development Cooperation strategy, but <i>no country programming document</i>.</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>There is little added value to co-signing the overall programming document, because the needs of the partner country are taken into account in the RO strategy for development cooperation and in the concrete allocations, and the ownership by the partner country is ensured by constant dialogue and strong implementation monitoring.</p>

LEGAL STATUS OF PROGR. DOC

3. Legal status of national programming document		
	3.1 Legal status of the programming doc. (legally binding?)	3.2 Need of co-signature of programming doc with the partner country
NL	the Netherlands Policy document, not legally binding	
DE	Germany Country strategy documents (15 pages) are <i>not legally binding</i> .	NO Bilateral country strategies must not be signed by the partner government.
BE	Belgium General Agreements on Cooperation between the Partner Country and the Belgian State are <i>signed and ratified by the Parliament</i> .	YES In that framework, a legally binding Cooperation Program document will be co – signed at Ministerial level. Special Arrangement of interventions executed within the framework of a Cooperation Program are also signed at Ministerial level.
PL	Poland <i>Multiannual Development Cooperation Programme</i> is a governmental document (adopted by Council of Minister of the Republic of Poland). <i>Annual plans</i> are adopted by MFA.	NO
SK	Slovakia Even though Country Strategy Papers are considered as official Slovak Aid documents (approved by the MFA), they are <i>not legally binding</i> . Annual Program and the Mid-term Strategy (approved by the Government), are <i>not legally binding</i> , only politically.	NOT ALWAYS <u>Case of Kenya</u> : Strategy Paper for Kenya has not been co-signed with the partner country. Co-signature depends on the “size” of the donor (amount of contribution provided) as well as on the modalities of implementation. At the identification phase consultations have been mostly concentrated on NGOs and the grant system and its formal approval of the Kenyan side was thus not necessary. <i>Benefits of co-signature</i> : gives the programming more legitimacy and can contribute to its sustainability and strengthen the ownership principle.
SI	Slovenia The programming docs are confirmed by both governments, ratified and published in the official journal. They have a <i>status of international agreements</i> (and foresee that disputes shall be dealt with by the interstate joint committee, established by each respective agreement).	YES (ALTHOUGH NOT OBLIGATORY) There is no such requirement in the International Development Co-operation of the Republic of Slovenia Act, but the established practice is such that both governments sign the agreed programming document.

LEGAL STATUS OF PROGR. DOC

3. Legal status of national programming document		
	3.1 Legal status of the programming doc. (legally binding?)	3.2 Need of co-signature of programming doc with the partner country
LT	Lithuania	NO INFO
BG	Bulgaria	Mid-term programme on ODA and humanitarian aid is <i>adopted by Decision of the Council of Ministers.</i>
FR	France	<p>> DCPs: are considered as a "<i>declaration of intent</i>" and financial annexes are only indicative. They are not legally binding and a French representative can sign documents (DCPs or JP docs).</p> <p>> Debt and development contracts: are <i>legally binding</i> .</p>
ES	Spain	As a standard procedure, there is a <i>cooperation agreement</i> with the partner country, serving as framework formalizing the cooperation relation. These agreements establish a "Joint Commission" that will revise and provide guidance content to the cooperation relation. Every time the "Joint Commission" meets, the projects and programmes portfolio are reviewed and somehow evaluated.
FI	Finland	NO INFO
SE	Sweden	Strategy documents adopt the form of a "Special government Decision" which acts as an <i>instruction to an independent government agency</i> , in most cases Sida. The agency is obliged to follow the instruction.
IT	Italy	The Programming Document sets the strategic vision, main objectives, intervention criteria and priorities (as foreseen in the International Development Cooperation Law (125/14) . Upon proposal by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, in close coordination with the Minister of Finance, the document is approved by the Council of Ministers by the 31st of March of every year, after acquiring the opinion of the parliamentary committees. The <i>strategic vision, objectives, intervention criteria, and thematic and geographical priorities reflect the government cooperation policy</i> are binding.

LEGAL STATUS OF PROGR. DOC

3. Legal status of national programming document

3. Legal status of national programming document		
	3.1 Legal status of the programming doc. (legally binding?)	3.2 Need of co-signature of programming doc with the partner country
AT	<p>Austria</p> <p>It is not legally binding but we are trying hard to bring about the maximum of commitment on all sides.</p> <p>To strengthen the ownership and buy in of line ministries, preliminary ideas have been floated to submit country strategies to the Council of Ministers for approval.</p>	<p>LATELY DISCONTINUED</p> <p>This has been practise in the past but lately discontinued in favour of joint public presentations at the political/senior officials level.</p> <p>The strategies are translated, published and posted at our MFA/ODA website.</p>

4. COUNTRIES for SUBSTITUTION and NEW JP COUNTRIES

**4.1 POSSIBLE SUBSTITUTION OF BILATERAL PROGRAMMING BY THE JP DOCUMENT?
IF YES, WHERE?**

4.2 NEW JP COUNTRIES ENVISAGED

	EU	The EU proposes Laos, Senegal, Palestine and Mali and signals that there is also some potential for Ethiopia where discussion is currently ongoing. Substitution may be explored in these countries even though there is no common indication	EU sees some potential for triggering JP in the Central African Republic.
LU	Luxemburg	Lux does not consider that a JP doc can fully replace its programming document. JP doc may serve, Process as annex to the PIC, setting our interventions in the framework of national policies of the partner country and the JP.	Cape Verde
DK	Denmark	NO ANSWER	NO ANSWER
RO	Romania	NO ANSWER	THERE IS NO BILATERAL PROGRAMMING DOC
NL	the Netherlands	NO ANSWER	NO ANSWER
DE	Germany	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Benin (?) 2. Cambodia 3. Ethiopia 4. Kenya 5. Laos 6. Mali 7. Palestinian Territories 	We recommend to focus our time/ energy on the successful completion of the existing set of countries (focussing on high potential countries) in order to provide concrete examples of success (impact/ efficiency).
BE	Belgium	NO ANSWER	NO ANSWER
PL	Poland	NO ANSWER	NO ANSWER
SK	Slovakia	NO ANSWER	NO ANSWER
SI	Slovenia	NO ANSWER	NO ANSWER
LT	Lithuania	TOO EARLY TO ANSWER, AS HAS ONLY JOINED THE JP EXERCISE IN 2016	TOO EARLY TO ANSWER, AS HAS ONLY JOINED THE JP EXERCISE IN 2016
BG	Bulgaria	NO ANSWER	NO ANSWER

4. COUNTRIES for SUBSTITUTION and NEW JP COUNTRIES

**4.1 POSSIBLE SUBSTITUTION OF BILATERAL PROGRAMMING BY THE JP DOCUMENT?
IF YES, WHERE?**

4.2 NEW JP COUNTRIES ENVISAGED

FR

France

Possibility to renounce to the bilateral docs is foreseen, by only using the JP docs. Unless there are justifying circumstances, substitution should be feasible in all JP countries. Nevertheless, AFD will continue to elaborate its “*country intervention frameworks*” that will provide an operational framework in line with JP document.

DCPs (framework partnership documents) overview at the **end of 2015** was as follows:

- *8 DCPs in force* : Mauritanie (2013-2015); Burundi (2013-2015); Ghana (2013-2016); Guinée (2014-2016); Sénégal (2013-2017); Niger (2013-2015); Burkina Faso (2013-2015); Bénin (2014-2016).
- *2 DCPs under negotiation*: Algeria and South Africa.
A DCP might also be developed with Madagascar.

France has also concluded with several partner countries "*debt and development contracts*" (C2D): bilateral component for relief of debt in respect of development assistance, additional to the multilateral initiative to alleviate the debt of poor countries (HIPC initiative).

Debt and development contracts are compatible with the JP process. The technical and financial partners, and especially the EU, are always involved in their negotiation. But they cannot be replaced by the JP docs, as they are legally binding and will still be required to enclose the French debt-relief initiatives. They can create difficulties in terms of temporal synchronization which should be taken into account (ideally so to minimize these difficulties, joint programming exercise should precede the negotiation of a debt reduction and development contract). The following contracts are ongoing and negotiations will be held in 2016 for Cameroon and Guinea:

Cameroun (2011-2017) (probable : 2017-2025); Congo (2015-2019); Côte d’Ivoire (2014-2020); Guinée (2013-2017); Libéria (2012-2016); Mauritanie (2014-2019); Mozambique (2015-2019); RD du Congo (2013-2017); Tanzanie (2011-2016).

France supports the extension of EU Joint programming in all partner countries where heads of mission will have jointly estimated that the conditions are met.

4. COUNTRIES for SUBSTITUTION and NEW JP COUNTRIES

**4.1 POSSIBLE SUBSTITUTION OF BILATERAL PROGRAMMING BY THE JP DOCUMENT?
IF YES, WHERE?**

4.2 NEW JP COUNTRIES ENVISAGED

ES	Spain	<p>Spain is not considering substituting the bilateral programming document (MAP) by the Joint Programming Strategy. Spain has developed a methodology that works in areas that JP is not considering (coordination about Spanish actors, involvement of other policies beyond cooperation, internal policy coherence, role of different institutions...).</p> <p>Besides, our bilateral agreement preparation follows a methodology with quality warranties. Our engagement model differs substantially of the current Joint Programming frame. Bilateral Cooperation Frameworks area passed in the Parliament and Joint Commissions are held on the basis agreed in the general terms.</p> <p>For legally binding reasons we cannot sign any agreement where it is stated explicitly that we give up on our bilateral agreements (as we understand it is a national competence).</p> <p>- The country that has developed a Joint Programming Strategy Draft that clearly fulfils our expectations in a satisfactory way is Bolivia; but a substitution of our bilaterale programme framework is not yet considered.</p>	<p>Spain has as priority countries five upper middle income countries that currently are not triggering the JP process;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dominican Republic, 2. Peru, 3. Ecuador, 4. Colombia 5. Cuba <p>NOTE. In all these countries ES has installed capacities at field level, ready to support the whole process.</p>
FI	Finland	<p>At present Finland is not in a position to substitute its bilateral country program documents, in its priority countries, with the EU JP ones, because its country programs are part of the results management system of Finnish country level development cooperation, and they are designed to additionally include: general sectoral results targets, more detailed results targets that are directly linked to the programs supported by Finland.</p>	<p>All Finland's partner countries (Ethiopia, Somalia, Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia, Mozambique, Afghanistan, Nepal and Myanmar/Burma) are included in the current list of 55 countries.</p> <p>Finland, however, in principle supports the expansion of the JP process to new countries, if demand exists.</p>
SE	Sweden	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Myanmar, 2. Burkina Faso, 3. Cambodia, 4. Afghanistan <p>*A political decision would be needed for the substitution of strategies in these countries.</p>	
IT	Italy	NO ANSWER	NO ANSWER
AT	Austria	NO ANSWER	NO ANSWER