

Technical Seminar on Joint Programming (19 February 2016)

Synthesis of replies and preliminary proposal on minimum requirements

In December 2015 a light survey targeting MS was launched with a view to update information on key features of programming practices and systems in MS and to prepare the ground for how JP Strategies would comply with requirements of all MS + EU.

17 MS responded: Belgium (BE), Bulgaria (BG), Denmark (DK), Finland (FI), France (FR), Germany (DE), Italy (IT), Lithuania (LT), Luxembourg (LU), the Netherlands (NL), Poland (PL), Romania (RO), Slovakia (SK), Slovenia (SI), Spain (ES), Sweden (SE) and Austria (AT).

Bilateral programming practices are characterised as follows:

- Embassies lead the drafting of bilateral programming documents. In some cases implementing agencies are involved (LU, DK, SK, BE, SE, ES, AT).
- Bilateral documents are approved at HQ level.
- Some MS require the signature of the partner country: LU, DK, BE, SI, FR, ES. EU foresees co-signature in all ACP countries (receiving funds from the EDF).

Consultations carried out in partner countries include partner governments as well as other stakeholders. Some MS have specifically mentioned that they also consult CSOs (DE, LU, RO, DE, PL, BG, IT + EU), the private sector (LU, PL, IT + EU) or other donors (DE, SK).

11 MS have **Guidelines / Instructions** on Country programming: LU, DK, NL, DE, PL, SI, BG, FR, ES, IT, AT); 2 MS have developed their own Guidelines on Joint Programming (DK and FR).

The **duration of country programming** documents varies: 1 year (RO, PL, SV, LT); 3 years (SI, IT); 2-4 years (FR); 4 years (NL); 3-5 years (DK, BE, BG, ES); 5 years (LU, SW); 3-6 years (AT) up to 6 years (DE). However for many MS duration of the cycle depends on a number of factors including type of partner country ("priority" or not) and the information above is indicative.

All MS agree on the importance of alignment with the partner countries policies. 10 MS (LU, DK, RO, NL, DE, BG, FR, ES, SK, IT, AT)¹ confirm that **they can ensure flexibility to allow for synchronisation**. 2 MS consider it difficult (BE, refers strict internal ruling & current budget constraints; and LT to their annual budget).

The issue of **possible substitution of bilateral programming** by the JP document has been addressed by 6 MS: 2 MS consider it possible and have taken internal measures (DE and FR), SE is positively considering it, but still needs a political decision to confirm its feasibility; 3 MS (LU, FI and ES) do not envisage it; and 1 MS has just joined the JP exercise so it is not ready to take a position on this yet (LT).

FR is foresees the "possibility to renounce to its bilateral documents" (document cadre de partenariat) where JP documents exist. FR indicates as well that "is always possible to enrich the European process with a complementary bilateral document" where the JP process is incomplete or certain analysis are missing.

On the **list of possible countries** who may be considered for **substitution**: DE has suggested 7 partner countries: Benin (to be confirmed), Cambodia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Laos, Mali and the Palestinian Territories; SE, pending a political decision to confirm the possibility of substitution, puts forwards 4 potential candidates: Myanmar, Burkina Faso, Cambodia and Afghanistan. AT

¹ Out of 11 who responded to this question

is considering Palestine. 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.

ES considers that the only country where all JP expectations are fulfilled is Bolivia, even though substitution is not yet considered. At this stage LU does not envisage either full substitution of its programming documents (PICs) by the JP documents.

On **new countries where a JP process could be triggered**, the following has to be noted. DE does not consider advisable to expand the list until the current JP exercises is consolidated; FR support this option wherever Heads of Mission will have jointly estimated that conditions are met. FI would also support the extension to new countries if demand exists. LU indicates Cape Verde.

ES would support the inclusion of 5 upper-middle income countries: Dominican Rep., Peru, Cuba, Ecuador, Colombia and Cuba (priority countries for the Spanish Development, where ES has field offices that would support the JP process).

EU sees some potential for triggering JP in the Central African Republic.

Preliminary proposal to be discussed in the Technical Seminar

Based on the survey and also on recent practices it appears that the following elements should be part of a Joint Strategy substituting bilateral programming. These elements are broadly in line with the Guidance Pack / joint strategy menu² which remains a valid point of reference.

Elements of a Joint Strategy	Core element	Optional
Executive summary	X	
Joint analysis	X	
Joint Response : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU shared vision • Objectives • Priority sectors: related objectives and expected results by sector • Indicative financial sector allocations • Division of Labour (lead donor by sector) • Risk assessment 	X	
Overall indicative multi-annual financial planning	X	
Indications on intervention modalities and programme management		X
Monitoring and results framework	X	
Cross cutting issues (gender, climate change, etc...)	X	
Communication Strategy		X
Sector fiches in annex		X

Principles and process aspects

- Ownership: Partner governments should be involved as much as possible.
- Signature of the partner government seems key for substitution for LU, DK, BE, SI, FR, ES + EU (for the EU only in ACP countries).
- Consultation of civil society should be a core principle. For BG, SV and IT, it is also important to consult local government/authorities.

² <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/joint-programming/minisite/eu-joint-programming-guidance-pack-2015>