

## FICHE CONTRADICTOIRE

### Evaluation of the EU Joint Programming Process of Development Cooperation (2011-2015)

For details on the recommendations please refer to the main report – page 69-77

Recommendations	Response of services	Follow-up (one year later)
<p><b>Improve and update the intervention logic</b></p> <p><b>R1. The Commission and EEAS should review the intervention logic of Joint Programming to update its strategy</b>, in consultation with EUD and MS HQ and field staff (as to reflect a shared vision). The <u>desired impact</u> “increased EU aid effectiveness” in the initial intervention logic should be reformulated as “better EU contribution to development” and the two primary <u>expected outcomes</u> from JP should be “better coordinated and more strategic EU-MS aid” and “joint EU-MS positions and messages”. An additional <u>output</u> could be added: “comprehensive and coherent EU approach”. EU and MS should also clarify how they expect JP to contribute to aid effectiveness principles over time and who are the main target beneficiaries of JP at different levels. This update should be reflected in texts and guidance.</p>	<p><b><u>Partially agree</u></b></p> <p>We agree to have "<i>more coherent and strategic EU and MS development cooperation</i>" and "<i>joint EU-MS positions and messages</i>" as important expected outcomes needed to achieve the desired benefit.</p> <p>However, we consider that improving aid effectiveness with Joint Programming remains an important outcome towards which we have to engage more actively as the evaluation has demonstrated that this requires time and efforts to become a reality.</p> <p>JP has the potential to increase country ownership, alignment to national priorities and strategies, predictability, transparency and focus on results but also to create more inclusive processes.</p> <p>ACTION 1: Review the intervention logic, with the caveat that we should not reduce our level of ambition while strengthening our aid effectiveness commitments, in line with the new Consensus on Development<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>ACTION 2: Include conclusions of this review into the HQ guidance level (for example in the Operational Manual on JP).</p>	
<p><b>R2. The EU and MS should define more precisely the overall scope or perimeter of JP and how this translates into its guidance, as well as the specific scope and focus of JP in a given country.</b></p> <p>JP should take into account broader funding and strategic issues.</p> <p>At country level it should focus on what EU and MS do best/is most needed/is not well covered by others.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree</u></b></p> <p>ACTION 1: Update Guidance, in coordination with Member States, to better assist Delegations in identifying at the local level, from the very beginning of a process what is the JP ambition, added-value and expected benefits in a specific context. This should better take into account broader funding and strategic issues.</p> <p>ACTION 2: In cases of fragility, explore how to increase coherence between Joint Programming and other non-</p>	

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/05/pdf/European-consensus-on-development/>

		<p>programmable tools and processes (i.e. Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace, Emergency Trust Fund, humanitarian aid, security missions).</p> <p>ACTION 3: in case of countries in transition to higher income levels, explore further if JP can accompany this transition as part of a wider relationship going beyond external assistance.</p>	
<p><b>Keep JP strategic, flexible and pragmatic</b></p>	<p><b>R3. JP process and products should be enhanced allowing more flexibility and ease adjustments over time</b>, ensuring frequent exchanges at strategic level, defining the specific focus of JP at the start of each country process and fostering JP uptake (using existing platforms to provoke dialogue/foster common responses, considering the use of joint result monitoring).</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>The recommendation to enhance JP processes and products in coordination with Member States to allow more flexibility, , coincides with our assessment.</p> <p>ACTION 1: Expand/support the use of country-based joint results and monitoring frameworks. They are crucial in this context as a way to bring analysis to the dialogue.</p> <p>ACTION 2: Ensure regular reviews/updates in the joint programming group on changes in context, needs to refocus messages and emerging and evolving strategic issues.</p> <p>ACTION 3: Encourage regular reviews/updates of the Joint Programming in-country documents to align with the partner country's own development strategy and strengthen synchronisation.</p> <p>ACTION 4: Update the Operational Manual annually to ensure it adjusts to, and reflects a flexible approach.</p>	
	<p><b>R4. Use JP process to improve EU collaboration as a group on the ground</b>, identifying the key capacities and interests of the EU and MS for JP to see how they can complement and provide mutual benefits. Use the JP process to build a more joint vision/response to country challenges both internally and in its dealings with the partner country and external actors. EU and MS should deliver as much as possible joint messages and speak with one voice and further the pragmatic ways for joint implementation. EU should better inform MS of what it plans to do. Within this process, participation by all MS should be facilitated, allowing them to fill various roles and responsibilities.</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>The evaluation shows that and we agree that JP improving EU collaboration on the ground is an important outcome that needs to be nurtured and supported; JP can be an important instrument for policy dialogue when supported by leadership and responsibility by the EU and MS alike.</p> <p>Through JP, the EU and MS build more joint visions and responses to partner country's challenges and develop joint messaging increasing their speaking with one voice.</p> <p>ACTION 1: Encourage EUD and MS embassies to sharing information and develop joint messaging and common approaches (possibly by including these initiatives in regular reporting).</p>	

		<p>ACTION 2: EU Delegations to take measures to increase the understanding and visibility of how European development partners jointly work (i.e. joint communication, joint messaging, etc.)</p> <p>ACTION 3: Improve /encourage systematic use of knowledge-sharing platforms (capacity4dev/ Brussels-based and regional workshops) to ensure a continuous stream of information, coherent guidelines and instructions (both ways HQ-field-HQ).</p>	
	<p><b>R5. JP supporting services (guidance pack, experience-sharing, technical assistance) should be continued and consolidated</b>, adding clarifications when needed and/or further disseminating them to EU and MS staff in the field and HQ. Ensure institutional memory with regard to JP exercises, in country offices and at HQ.</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>We recognise that the initial costs of JP are high even if the return on investment is recognised to be good when a certain level of collaboration is reached.</p> <p>It is considered key to involve Member States as well here, so as to spread guidance and bridge the gap between capitals and the field.</p> <p>ACTION 1: to continue, adapt and consolidate our supporting services as well as the provision of technical assistance. Consider widening offer with online training (webinars, etc.).</p> <p>ACTION 2: continue providing regional meetings for knowledge-exchange facilitation.</p> <p>ACTION 3: Guidance pack will be supplemented with an Operational Manual and be widely disseminated to HQs and the field.</p> <p>ACTION 4: EU Delegation to consider joint (EU and MS) handover files to address institutional memory.</p> <p>ACTION 5: Supporting services will be maintained and Training and regional meetings will be organised for knowledge-exchange facilitation, including to secure institutional memory at country level.</p>	
<p><b>Clarify and reinforce the role of all stakeholders</b></p>	<p><b>R6. Clarify roles and ensure both political and cooperation actors are engaged throughout the process.</b> Ensure the political dimension is explicitly part of JP, along with the aid / development dimension. Continuously engage the two parties.</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p> <p>We agree with the recommendations that JP happens at country level but HQs support and mandate is essential and should be unequivocal.</p> <p>ACTION 1: EU Heads of Cooperation to involve Heads of Mission and Political advisors early on in the process, as well</p>	

	<p>Define respective roles. EU HQ should engage with MS HQ and EUD with MS Ambassadors.</p>	<p>as at strategic moments in the JP process such as when JP strategic expectations are defined, commitments are made, revisions to JP and evaluations. Ensure engagement of both levels (political and cooperation).</p> <p><b>ACTION 2:</b> Geographical services and joint programming teams to continue and strengthen support, and provide clear guidance, to Delegations on how to advance joint programming (i.e. Operational Manual, etc.)</p> <p><b>ACTION 3:</b> the Joint Programming network, gathering focal point in each MS, will continue meeting at least 2 a year to provide common guidance to field offices.</p>	
	<p><b>R7. Deepen the dialogue with national stakeholders.</b> Consider each milestone in the JP process as an opportunity for strategic dialogue with national stakeholders (line and technical ministries; Parliament; civil society; the private sector; diaspora when applicable...). When there is already a well-established forum for strategic dialogue, consider how JP can bring value to it. In parallel, continue emphasising good practices in aid transparency and aid predictability.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree</u></b></p> <p>The involvement of National governments and National stakeholders is crucial to ensure country ownership for sustainable results. The evaluation gives some suggestions that are welcome. We will pursue work on this aspect.</p> <p>However, ownership can also come with time after local partners have realised the positive contribution of JP. JP can therefore be pursued notwithstanding possible initial lack of interest by partners.</p> <p>Sequencing (gradual approach) of engaging with the different actors in the partner country should also be considered;</p> <p>Also, national stakeholders should be involved in Joint Programming, <i>but the key question is at what stage</i> (for example, when developing results frameworks or when agreeing on strategic objectives);</p> <p><b>ACTION 1:</b> Strengthen/improve guidance on how to engage partner country stakeholders (civil society organisations, private sector, government, etc.) in the joint programming process.</p> <p><b>ACTION 2:</b> Increase use of existing channels, platforms, and opportunity for joint messages in policy and political dialogue (incl. Article 8).</p>	
	<p><b>R8. The incentives for investing in JP should be improved.</b> MS Embassies/field offices to discuss the benefits of JP with the top leadership at HQ and with Ambassadors upstream. This could enable some MS to play an active role in leading parts of JP. MS</p>	<p><b><u>Agree</u></b></p> <p>As JP is time consuming in particular in the first phase and leads important and positive returns at a later stage, it deserves</p>	

	<p>to clarify who is the go-to person/unit at HQ for support, and to clarify their role. EU and MS to recognise and reward staff efforts on JP, e.g. by reflecting them in job descriptions. EU and MS to examine to what extent JP documents may replace or integrate bilateral programming documents.</p>	<p>to be supported and incentivised. We should consider how to provide incentives to make joint programming the preferred approach.</p> <p>ACTION 1: Better integration and more coherence of Joint Programming guidance in future overall programming guidelines</p> <p>ACTION 2: Encourage Delegations to allocate sufficient manpower to Joint programming while being helped by Technical Assistance (HQ and locally hired).</p> <p>ACTION 3: Strengthen training including through Regional seminars, including clarifying roles.</p> <p>ACTION 4: Replacement will be pursued wherever possible and further guidance to be developed in the Operational Manual insisting on the need for early involvement of headquarters, including line DGs, before validation by Heads of Mission.</p>	
--	---	--	--