



Global Joint Programming Learning Event

4-6 December 2018

Siem Reap, Cambodia



Global Joint Programming Learning Event

4-6 December 2018

Siem Reap, Cambodia

Detailed Report

Contents

Objectives of the Global Joint Programming Learning Event	4
Summary - main results of the event	4
Joint Programming Training Outcomes and Key Takeaways	5
Global Learning Workshop Outcomes 6	8
ANNEXES	15
What JP is/is not?	
Knowledge Marketplace	
List of participants	
Tables with conclusions	
Agenda of Global Workshop	
Tables summarising discussions	



I. Objectives of the Global Joint Programming Learning Event

1. The objective of the first day (training) was to enable course participants to get an overview of Joint Programming and to identify practical steps towards institutionalising joined- up approaches at partner country level.
2. The main objective of the global learning workshop (Day 2 and 3) was to facilitate peer-learning among the European development partner practitioners (country/field offices and headquarters) about Joint Programming, based on experiences to date with a strong focus on practical implementation at country level.
3. A more specific objective of the workshop was to inform the participants about the available support and tools for a more effective implementation of Joint Programming.

II. Summary: Main results of the event

Close to 60 European participants representing the EU, 9 Member States and Switzerland, came together in Siem Reap, Cambodia (4-6 December) for a Joint Programming training followed by a 2 day Global Learning workshop to share experiences and ideas on Joint Programming at country level (16 different partner countries :Bangladesh, Cambodia, D.R. Congo, Georgia, Ghana, Kenya, Laos, Madagascar, Myanmar, Nepal, Palestine, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Togo, Vietnam). The event was hosted by the EU Delegation to Cambodia and opened by the EU Ambassador.

Colleagues from the DEVCO and EEAS Joint Programming teams, EU Delegations, Member States Capitals, Member States Embassies, Member States agencies (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain) and like-minded partners (Switzerland) actively participated in the discussions.

The training and workshop involved several complementary activities, namely:

1. An update on the framework for Joint Programming and joint implementation and the state of play globally;
2. An introduction of the new Joint Programming Guidance and tools to support knowledge sharing;
3. Showcasing the value-added and impact of Joint Programming through sharing country experiences and Joint Programming stories;
4. A sharing of challenges encountered in taking forward a Joint Programming process and the pragmatic approaches and solutions found at country level, including challenges linked to Joint Programming in countries transitioning to Middle Income status, in fragile contexts and cases where ODA is less important;
5. Discussions to identify the key enabling conditions needed from peers, headquarters, or external experts to facilitate in-country Joint Programming processes;
6. Discussions to identify ways to integrate the 2030 Agenda/SDG and EU policy priorities into Joint Programming.

The training focused on sharing the existing Joint Programming Guidance and ensuring a better understanding of the key elements of a Joint Programming process. The Global Learning workshop was structured to ensure a sharing of Joint Programming experiences in preparation of future programming cycles. Both of these were highly appreciated by participants who requested subsequent events at a regional level.

The Global Learning event recognised the value of better linking the EU external action priorities together through Joint Programming. However, the common feeling of participants was that there is a need for more guidance in this regard, notably on how to involve the different sections in EU Delegations and Member States Embassies.

There was a common consensus that there is work to be done to better integrate SDGs into Joint Programming processes and joint results frameworks; participants suggested both improved guidance and a greater focus on coordinated European support to data collection and analysis at country level. The participants also shared that they would appreciate more information on the next EU programming cycle and how the proposed 'Joint Programming preference' would translate into the future programming instructions.

The discussions also highlighted that Joint Programming is a process of working together, and the process is, in itself, as important as the product: the product being a written reflection of the process. Working Better Together requires a range of skills and activities and participants highlighted that these need to be recognised by respective Member States and EU HQ. Participants also felt that it would be helpful to have more visible commitment and buy-in at management level in the respective HQs.

Participants highly appreciated that DEVCO and EEAS jointly facilitated the training and the learning event.

The **following sections summarize in more detail the key take-aways** from both the training and workshop's group-work sessions and open floor discussions per event day.

III. Joint Programming Training Outcomes and Key Takeaways

1. The first part of the training emphasized the **evolving nature of JP**: Originally conceived as a tool for Division of Labour, JP has become a key tool for influencing policy dialogue at country level, especially in light of the considerable share that cumulated EU contributions represent within the total ODA of many partner countries.

2. EU HQ JP teams presented the EU's **strengthened policy commitments towards Joint Programming**, with the 2016 EU Global Strategy promoting a more "joined up" Union and the clear commitments made in the European Consensus for Development on working better together. The EU's new single European Instrument under the new MFF 2021-2027 (NDICI) is expected to further institutionalise JP; in the commission's proposal for the NDICI, JP is proposed as the preferred EU approach (Art. 10), while further encouraging JP members to replace their own strategies through the JP document (Ar. 12). Moreover, the recent Council Conclusions on the revised EU Results Framework ask the EU and Member States to promote joint results frameworks.

3. An exchange on **"Replacement"** looked at whether those partner who had opted for it, had genuinely replaced their country strategies/programming documents. The Joint Programming teams of the EEAS and the Commission highlighted that in the case of the Commission, it was a real replacement of either the MIP, NIP or SSF. The Head of Cooperation of Palestine described the experience of EU replacement, while sharing thoughts on the length of the approval procedure, which coupled with staff turnover has somewhat affected the JP momentum. There is a chapter on the EU's approval process of a Joint Programming Document in the JP Guidance and steps are clearly highlighted; this process is becoming smoother with subsequent JP documents.

Participants also asked about the countries where Member States had replaced their strategies: this has been done by some MS in some countries – e.g. Mali and Comoros – but that there was, to date, no country where all European partners have replaced their strategies.

Exchanges also highlighted that even if replacement is the preferred option, but is deemed unfeasible by certain Member States, this should not prevent the JP process from going ahead. The option of endorsement remained.

4. Further, participants flagged that **messages coming from different European HQ levels were at times difficult to reconcile**. The DEVCO JP team confirmed that efforts had been initiated by EU and MS HQs (eg. recently a meeting with BMZ) to better coordinate and harmonize messages.

5. Generally-speaking, the conclusion was that internal procedures should not stop us in what we are trying to achieve at country level, while acknowledging that this may sometimes mean bringing the process to lowest common denominator, to be able to kick-start a process of Working Better Together.

Further discussions in the working sessions highlighted:

Starting a Joint Programming process:

- European partners are hardly ever starting to work together from scratch, so **identifying lessons learnt** from past experiences should be part of the scoping exercise, along with a **mapping of programmes and results**;
- Start with the **identification of key challenges** – what is the problem we are trying to solve and does the way we engage in country respond to that challenge?;
- Identify the (potential) **added value of JP** vis-à-vis partner governments' structure:



- Assess the current aid architecture – is there a need for improvement?;
 - Conduct preliminary consultations (government; civil society; other actors e.g. private sector), to both react to and influence the national agenda;
 - Identify low-hanging fruits to demonstrate how JP can add value and be effective (both to communicate and generate commitment amongst donors and partners);
- Ensure that you speak the Government's language from the start, by identifying the relevant government policies and policy documents (National Development Plans, Voluntary National Reviews, Political Parties' Manifestos) and assess their relevance for addressing development priorities. Use national sector definitions where possible and be consistent on wording (simple, easy, understandable, and communicable wording helps the message to be easily shared).
 - Assess the **level of buy-in** from both the partner country and European partners' HQ for the JP process. Involve Head of Missions and political counsellors for joint messaging.

Starting a joint analysis:

- The joint analysis, which can be fairly concise, should capture key challenges/issues for a joint response, by centring the document around three guiding questions: (i) who are we talking to? (ii) is our aid relevant to what we are trying to do?; (iii) what would we like to do.
 - Be clear on why you want to do the analysis and of/for what. Agree on scope, objectives, and process of the analysis, keeping in mind that the overall analysis should be related to the global common challenges identified during the scoping exercise.
- The joint analysis should consider the broader country context, beyond development. It should take into account the partner Government's perspective, e.g. on economic development. Consider involving government and other stakeholders (incl. beyond development) in the analysis.
 - The analysis can include stock-taking of processes, charts of annual ODA, compared with the Government's aid system (Nepal).
 - In fragile countries, it may be useful to build upon or build in a shared risk and conflict analysis (e.g. as done in Burundi, Yemen, Libya, Cambodia, Myanmar).

Building trust between actors:

- Among EU donors: institutionalise regular meetings; consider using Chatham house rules; conduct regular updated mappings to "Get to know each other" covering priorities, sectors, constraints (partners, modalities each of us can use); use common commitments (e.g. Consensus, gender action plan, CSO roadmap) as a basis/ starting point; share information/ documents, before comitology; share training opportunities where possible to help promote mutual understanding and networking; Agree that we may disagree – but act coherently; Understand our own limitations first before building trust with government; identify strategic areas of shared interest where common voice is needed – e.g. earthquake response in Nepal; organise activities that help team building and incentivise joint work (e.g. Joint Monitoring / Fact Finding / Missions -Mozambique on Social Protection); develop a joint communication strategy as part of JP process.
- Between EU donors and the country government: demonstrate how JP takes forward the partner government's own agenda; identify incentives for dialogue, as well as champions within government

administration to put forward messages; ensure maximum possible level of transparency of documents (e.g. Palestine); recognise that communication needs to be at the right level and through the relevant focal point; listen (carefully) to the partner government; consider the establishment of dialogue facilities – e.g. ASEAN. South Africa; organise retreats, team building activities involving the authorities (Laos: Zumba).

Reflections on joint policy dialogue:

- Technical level
 - Identify lead Development Partner and share/distribute tasks : recognise and value the role and expertise of Programme Managers in that context.
 - Identify common messages, prepare joint sector briefs, on the basis of joint technical analysis
 - Identify champions, build trust, relationships (formal and informal)
 - Identify policy dialogue entry points and opportunities
- Policy level
 - Discuss joint policy briefs based on the overall sector/programme level
 - Raise issue during EU+ meetings, high level meetings, receptions, joint meetings with partner government
 - Establish links with HoMs group

- Political level
 - Read policy briefings and organise joint events/ dinners on the issues
 - Raise issues in meetings with ministers/HoMs/PM/ Non-State Actors/DPs/Parliament/Media
 - Emphasise partnerships

The trainer further challenged participants to consider whether EU aid is creating **adequate incentives for dialogue** on the side of partner country government interlocutors: *“All too often we continue to fail to translate our priorities into what is politically relevant locally”*. **There is a need to identify objectives that matter to government’s political priorities** – and build a dialogue around that.

- Participants highlighted that being ‘joined up’ allows European partners to speak with one voice to both partner Governments, to our their own hierarchies and to the managing boards of the multilateral partners when necessary (e.g. Cambodia Global Fund case).
- When it comes to sector expertise needed for policy dialogue, it was flagged that while individual donors may have limited resources, pooling of TA resources may provide them with access to a wider range of expertise and knowledge.
- It was also shared that while all European partners may have a dialogue at technical, policy and political level, are these different levels mutually reinforcing each other.



IV. Global Learning

Workshop Outcomes

I. While discussing “**JP challenges**”, a number of important issues were raised by participants:

- The term “Joint Programming”, can be seen as misleading (is it about jointly programming? Aligning programming cycles? Division of labour through sector exits?);
- How to ensure that JP documents are “living documents” which are politically relevant and strategically respond to a wider political, trade and/ or humanitarian/stabilisation context;
- How to best involve the government and other key players/actors, while avoiding additional layers to already existing all-partner coordination systems;
- How to integrate EU Trust Funds within JP;
- How to work with European partners who do not have a bilateral cooperation portfolio.
- How to keep up the joint European group together when there is disagreement on an issue.
- Does the JP processes take full advantage of the existing technical knowledge and presence of MS technical agencies in country?

These questions triggered a fruitful debate and exchange of lessons learnt among participants, summarised hereafter:

On the **terminology issue** (joint programming), while it might be challenging to change an “internationally” recognized term at this stage in time, the group concluded that Joint Programming should indeed be understood as meaning “working together” at country level. Neither the terminology, nor individual donor rules should stop us from moving the process forward at country level.

It was also noted that JP should be seen as an **inclusive process** (rather than just a product); as an opportunity for bringing different actors, including ECHO, technical agencies, civil society, humanitarian and peace-building actors, as well as, where appropriate, national and/or local authorities to one table. While such multi-actor participation may, in some

cases, only occur at the stage of the joint analysis or sign-off of the strategy document, it has, in other cases, proven to be helpful for JP priority setting. Moreover, involving HQ departments from the start, e.g. through joint EU-MS HQ inception missions (Mali) can be a good way of obtaining their buy-in at an early stage. Country examples also show that the fact of having no bilateral and physical presence in the partner country is not an obstacle to JP participation as such (ex. Kenya: inclusion of non-resident European partners).

However, it was felt that **inclusiveness should not become an obstacle to moving ahead**. If some MS / other actors are not ready to join the process or disagree with some of its key elements, start by “working with the willing”, while leaving the process open for others to join when appropriate. Similarly, if replacement is not a feasible option from the start for certain JP members, the latter can start by endorsing the strategy, while others may move ahead with replacement.

On the **more strategic and political dimension of JP**, the latter needs to be reflected from the start in the JP document: to ensure that the bigger picture is not lost. When selecting JP priorities, consider the option of going beyond classic sector definitions, by looking at strategic areas where JP can have an added-value (e.g. resilience in Burundi). Involving HoMs and political advisors (e.g. Burundi) in JP priority setting can help to provide more ‘political’ relevance to the strategy.

As for “**keeping up the momentum**” and making JP a “living process”, even when faced with high staff turnover, it was highlighted that agreeing on a joint results framework and related monitoring activities are important first steps to take, as they provide moments to come together as a group and focus on what we are doing together. Accompanied by regular dialogue, joint activities provide incentives to bring people together (e.g. joint field missions, retreats etc) and also help momentum.

In response to the **coordination** question, some participants flagged that EU JP may help in addressing inefficiencies of existing all-partner coordination mechanisms. The example of Palestine showed that together the EU group was able to influence the broader aid coordination structure. It was also flagged that joint messaging in the context of JP can provide the group with more weight in both the dialogue with new, emerging donors, as well as multilateral boards and global/vertical programmes (e.g. Cambodia).



2. Country presentations illustrated some of the key lessons learnt drawn from JP processes in different countries: notable quotes include from **Kenya**: “The process is as valuable as the product”- the press-covered launch event of Kenya’s JP document “put the EU group on the map as a partner”. **Laos**, on replacement of EU MIP through JP document: “We thought it would be more complicated than it was in the end”, as buy-in from government for JP was obtained over time, through investment in an intercultural dialogue.

3. At the end of the day, a “**knowledge market place**”, provided an opportunity to visualise what participants were seeking in terms of knowledge and expertise for JP, and what they can offer. Discussions and matchmaking between participants based on their offers/needs were encouraged and very lively (for more details on who could offer what, see detailed group work summary in annex).

On the second day a range of JP studies were shared with the workshop.

1. Joint Programming and Fragility: the emphasis of this study is to identify lessons learned and existing opportunities to strengthen JP processes in conflict-affected and fragile states, as well as to assess if and how JP can be a tool for a more integrated approach at country level.

Key findings of the study include:

- Defining fragility is a challenge, but some key challenges to JP are comparable across different conflict scenarios such as: absence of partner country government and/or dialogue; lack of donor presence and scarcity of Human Resource capacities, particularly in situations where part or all of the staff is evacuated; absence or poor quality of the partner country’s national development plan to rapidly changing contexts as an impediment to medium term-planning; a fragmented aid landscape, marked by a tendency towards short-term planning.
- **The “integrated approach” is not yet operationalised** at country level Joint Programming can be a tool for bridging and balancing political and operational priorities but when it comes to security and peacebuilding, donors’ individual interests and priorities in these sectors are often an impediment to joint approaches. Moreover, there is a reluctance on the humanitarian side towards linking their efforts with those in the area of security and peacebuilding, as this is perceived as a potential threat to the humanitarian principle of neutrality.
- Efforts to effectively integrate a **humanitarian-development nexus approach through Joint Programming** have had limited success to date: the joint Humanitarian Development Frameworks appear to be under-utilized and there is little evidence of success in overcoming the ongoing challenges

posed from separate and parallel humanitarian and development coordination mechanisms that are in place in most fragile context.

- **Whilst coordination is all the more important in fragile contexts**, the terminology "Joint Programming" may not help in getting allies on board, often because it is misunderstood. One common refrain (correct or not) is that JP's do not allow flexibility that is all the more important in volatile, fragile contexts.
- **Shared context, risk and conflict sensitivity analysis** seen as a necessary and valuable component of Joint Programming but institutionalising conflict-sensitivity systematically is an ongoing challenge. The group discussed the challenge

The group discussed the challenge of better involving ECHO and other humanitarian actors in JP processes. Whilst there are extensive experiences of consultation and coordination with ECHO, it was acknowledged that the institutional culture of humanitarian actors is based on the premise of responding to crisis and not medium-term planning of interventions; which is the core of JP. These two approaches could complement each other but in practice tend to drive competing not complementary workstreams. However, as flagged by some participants, there are positive examples, notably in DRC (regular consultations between EUD and ECHO) and Nepal (integration of the ECHO office within the EU Delegation).

2. The JP and Middle Income or More Advanced Developing Countries.

The key findings include:

- Income levels (GDP per capita) are not good predictors of the type of challenges that define the programming partnership in a particular country;
- Most JP documents focus on 'MIC style' priorities of dialogue, mobilising domestic resources and private sector investment;
- Changing global dynamics mean the size of the financial envelope is in most cases insufficient to ensure policy dialogue;
- Technical Assistance (peer to peer), Blending and Triangular are clear entry points but need to be better integrated;
- JP strategies regardless the income level of the partner country, call for programming to be more relevant to local political context.

Many acknowledged the difficulty in getting technical units and staff to adjust to the political context including in the way programming is designed. The group also discussed the need to better structure and communicate the linkages between European political priorities, the Partner Country's political priorities and Agenda 2030. Finally, the group called for better practical guidance on what to do differently in programming to be relevant to middle income country dynamics.



3. The Joint Results Frameworks (JRFs)

Key findings include:

- JRFs are useful and add value in measuring the combined contribution to development;
- The JRFs tend to be of good quality;
- The JRFs are a basis for policy dialogue and tools for influencing policy dialogue through setting ambitious targets;

The group discussed how JRFs could potentially be just an amalgamation of priorities (all extensive), rather than about ranking priorities of the European group, and thus dilute rather than strengthen the message. The importance of selectivity of indicators and use of JRFs was highlighted. A key question raised was how to identify joint objectives that matter to donors and to the government. Finally, the group exchanged on how officials are able to face down competing HQ demands in order to prioritise and ensure the JRF is relevant and manageable.

4. Sustainable Development Goals:

The key findings include:

- There is still a lack of ownership of the SDGs both amongst partner countries and international development partners;
- SDG indicators are not yet being directly used to monitor national results frameworks or joint programming documents;
- UN and government entry points for SDG dialogue are not sufficiently leveraged to date, by the EU group and HoMs have not been mandated to play a specific role in advancing the SDGs;
- The Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) are few and are of limited use when assessing EU contributions to SDG progress.

The group commented that there is still a need to understand better how the SDGs relate to partner country priorities. Participants also saw a challenge in many SDG indicators not being measurable at country-level. Using programming opportunities to support capacity-building for data collection and analysis was seen as key for the European group in order to support countries in monitoring the achievement of the SDG targets and Goals.

Group discussion groups then exchanged on the following questions:

1. The question “How to ensure JP is not confined to the realm of development counsellors?” concluded:

- There needs to be more formal and transparent information sharing about JP updates/progress.
- Minutes of HoC meetings should be wider shared to communicate on the JP.
- Ensure participants speak the same language and adopt terminology so that is understandable and inclusive.
- Set up an easily accessible mission calendar to ensure advance information sharing, capturing opportunities for coordinating and creating a sense of urgency.
- Plan for staff turn-over and invest in institutionalising memory such as through hand-over notes as a starting point, organizing “boot camps” for colleagues new to the country, using “brown bag lunches” for knowledge sharing and organizing retreats.
- JP should be communicated at different levels, both to programme and technical and between the European agencies
- JP Document should be a living document and should be accessible and communicated at country and HQ level, with resident and non-resident European partners.

2. The question “What do we need to do differently so that Joint Programming supports the achievement of the SDGs?” concluded:

- There is a need to focus on joint mapping activities and capacity-building for SDG data collection and analysis, for example through: Jointly mapping existing SDG initiatives; Mapping of entry points for SDG dialogue; Establishing a SDG web-based tool (see lessons learnt from Colombia); Assessing how to improve the UN-EU partnership on SDGs; Conducting joint data field missions; Assessing how to better link SDG data analysis to budgetary planning.
- There is a need to further strengthen local ownership of the SDGs, for example by: Reading SDGs in the local language and narrative ; Supporting local “SDG transformers” – civil society, private sector etc. ;Joint messaging around off-track SDGs.

Moreover, participants pointed to the need for costing the SDGs and thought that the SDG costing exercise by IMF could be good tool to look into. Further, it was highlighted that the European group's voice can be important at country level to promote interlinkages between SDGs: the JP can help cluster/show these interlinkages.

Reflecting on the combined size of the EU and EU MS financing of development cooperation in most countries (often more than half of all ODA), there was some recognition that the ability to effectively advocate for the SDGs through a joined up approach at country level has often been overlooked.

3. "How can we join-up our communication resources to better advocate for our joint policy priorities?"

concluded that JP processes should:

- Purposefully identify the audience for the JP and purpose of communication;
- Include all projects and communication lines to reduce fragmentation that currently exists;
- Ensure that all HoMs and HoCs speeches emphasise the joint approach;
- Enable regular meetings between Communication Officers and HoCs to facilitate common EU messages (• Head of Cooperation •Head of Political Section, • Head of Mission);
- Join up communication resources and the work of the mission's communication officers to deliver effectively;
- For implementing partners like the UN and Civil Society Organizations, include standard text in their contracts on what and how they communicate regarding the JP and the joint EU-Member States approach at country level;
- Adapt to local communication practices such as in using Facebook;
- Identify decision-makers in the Government and organise events to effectively deliver messages that matter to them.

In the final session of the workshop the participants shared their learning points, reflected on the value-added of a global learning event and formulated key messages for HQ colleagues. These are summarised below:

Learning Points

- Process is as important as product.
- JP is not one size fits all, that it is first and foremost a process- a process that should be flexible and that joint dialogue/strategy is already a good example of JP.
- JP requires good coordination and clear mandates across and within the European agencies (HQ, field office management/technical staff, etc.).
- Need to reinforce training tools.
- Stronger role of Heads of Delegations and Heads of Missions is essential.
- "Joint Programming" terminology may be misunderstood by many; need to invest in explaining
- Joint political dialogue is key during difficult times!
- The more complex situation on the ground, the more European partnership is needed
- JP approach needs to be based on the country context.
- Understanding better incentives/disincentives affecting JP processes.
- Developing mechanisms for coordinated European support to civil society.
- Need for communicating better on JP.
- JP is a means to an end – a tool for policy. It has to be relevant locally and fit into a strategy

What participants liked:

- Approach: Practical and interactive approach with good facilitation. Hearing voices from the country offices. Group discussions at the tables were useful.
- Case studies: Good to hear field examples of practical challenges of JP and how to deal with them.
- Extremely valuable to bring together European colleagues from HQ and field.
- Mixing people from Delegations, Embassies and HQ makes exchanges of experiences very meaningful.



Messages for HQ

- Think about incentives for staff when engaging in JP
- Acknowledge the process better, even though the product may still be in the making.
- Operationalise the workshop outcomes in terms of follow-up activities for the coming months.
- Communicate clearly to the MS what it means to make JP the “preferred approach”.
- Consider organising such workshops at regional level.
- Operationalize the JP Tracker.
- Promote joint missions and retreats and support country staff in the development of soft skills when working with stakeholders (example of use of Zumba in Laos)
- Think about ways to foster informal dialogue between the EU and MS staff in HQ who are in charge of country or sector portfolios (geographic desks).
- Organising in-country trainings for EU Delegations and MS.

Notes

1 -For further details on the training content, please consult the training handout, which includes detailed notes, as well as the DEVCO/EEAS JP presentations' handouts.

For more information contact:

EEAS JOINT PROGRAMMING:
joint-programming-support@eeas.europa.eu

DEVCO JOINT PROGRAMMING:
devco-joint-programming-support@ec.europa.eu

NEAR JOINT PROGRAMMING:
near-joint-programming@ec.europa.eu

Annex 1: What JP is/is not?

What is JP?	What JP is Not?
<p>Thinking and acting as a European Team</p>	<p>Not an HQ-led process. Not an EUDel-dominated process or an opportunity for EUDels to set or override the development agendas of MS.</p> <p>Not yet a programming exercise. Not yet an instrument for EU external action. Not an obligation to have a single programming document.</p>
<p>Process of thinking and working better together. Way for improving how we work together. A naturally good idea for working better together and working better with our partners. Putting hands together. Working better together in development cooperation and beyond (e.g. joint action). Working better together, increasing European value and relevance in development. A way to work strategically together, rather than being an ex-post mapping of what we do, though it is an incentive for mapping</p>	<p>Not a tool to override national policy instruments. Overriding national strategies of partner countries or of European partners. Opportunity for EC and EUDels to override or set the agenda for MS. Abolishing of national strategies of EU and MS cooperation. Giving up the right of individual MS to decide on financing. Not a harmonisation of MS individual development cooperation policies. Not an individual cooperation. Not a competition of bilateral donors in sectors.</p>
<p>Instrument for harmonisation of member states development cooperation in a country. JP is the best way to enhance EU aid effectiveness. JP is an instrument/strategy for increasing development effectiveness. Best way to enhance European Aid Effectiveness. Common effort to greater efficiency.</p>	<p>Not a silver bullet for aid effectiveness. Not making aid effectiveness about European strategies only.</p>
<p>Flexible process that adds value</p>	<p>Not just a product. It's not tick-the-box exercise or just an exercise. It's not a good use of resources if it does not lead to effective joint implementation.</p> <p>Not a doctrine. Not a one size fits all. Not a standard tool. Not a template of instructions. Not a standardisation tool. Not a strait jacket for EU and MS to do the programming. Not a fixed menu. Not a harmonisation or strict and inflexible rules.</p>

What is JP?	What JP is Not
<p>A means to Aid Effectiveness and EU visibility. An attempt to work better together and increase EU visibility (though not always clear how or what we mean by JP)</p>	
<p>Collaborative process to take advantage of synergies and overcome common challenges. JP is a common effort to gain efficiency and is more than the sum of individual efforts.</p>	<p>Not only a summary of individual efforts. Not just a compilation of individual donors programmes.</p>
<p>Deep partnership</p>	<p>Not easy. Not an evident process. Not an end in itself. Not something we should be afraid off.</p>
<p>Pulling resources together for better results. A way of working together for improving development results. JP is better results and impact for our work. Working together for an increased impact.</p>	
<p>Strengthening coordination, visibility and policy coordination. Harmonised coherent development cooperation actions. Better cooperation. Better coordination and dialogue among European partners.</p>	<p>Not a good use of resources unless it leads to effective joint implementation. Not working in isolation. No coordination.</p>
<p>Instrument to ensure aid effectiveness, to support and enhance country ownership. Tool to support the country ownership and ensure aid effectiveness by donor community</p>	
<p>Single European voice in policy dialogue. Stronger policy dialogue. JP helps to bring messages to HQs and partner Governments, other interested partners and NGOs. Communication tool – for better policy dialogue</p>	

What is JP?	What JP is Not
A great communication tool , also for policy dialogue with the partner government.	
A brilliant tool for structured communication and better planning based on self-reflection and analysis. Joint planning and response in development cooperation. Joint analytical work that leads to joint conclusions and positions that leads to joint dialogue.	
Effective partnership for delivering on joint policy commitments. Enhancing shared values and messages	
A tool for EU and Member States to influence vertical instruments (Global Fund, GAVI, etc.) and multilateral organisations (World Bank, African Development Bank, etc)	Not a tool for MS to get a share of the cake.

Annex 2: Knowledge market

Needs	Offers
Joint Programming 'stories' to prepare case studies (Fiona, DEVCO A2)	Facilitation and technical support for all stages of JP process (Alex, Katarina, Sibylle, JP Experts)
Experiences of implementing JP in MIC context (Kim/HQ BMZ, Carine/French Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs)	Knowledge with regards to EU contractual modalities and EU Financial Regulation (Marion, AFD)
Good evidence-based practice of JP and Joint Implementation (Benjamin, LuxDev Laos)	Spain has elaborated a document about different measurements of Total Official Support for Sustainable development (TOSSD)/flows beyond ODA, in which different categories of the fund flows are established. It can be especially useful for MIC context. (Juan, MAEC Spain)
More support and recognition from our HQ on our JP work! (Franck, EUDel Cambodia)	The Global Partnership Initiative for Results & Mutual Accountability (GPI R&MA) may offer support to a JP process in one or two countries in view of their objective to enhance the use of country results framework. Not sure at this stage what type of support can best be offered. (Ingrid, SDC HQ)
Inputs into the JP Guidance from country-based colleagues – what is good/not so good/lacking? (Fiona, DEVCO A2)	Share experience on producing a JP monitoring report (Fiona, DEVCO A2)
Understand better/more why some projects that are fit for Joint Implementation are not done jointly? What are the barriers/obstacles? (Marion, AFD)	Explaining the EU HQ approval system of JP documents (Christos, DEVCO A2)
Why the COM limits its co-financing to only 3 sectors of concentration? This limits potential for further joint implementation when doing delegated cooperation. (Marion, AFD)	Synchronisation (Nacho, EUDel Laos)
How to do replacement? (Kristina, Sida)	MS experience with replacement of bilateral country strategy (Claudia, BMZ HQ)
Clarity on roadmap for the next JP (to be concluded by early 2020). (Bryan, EUDel Laos)	JP CSO involvement (Chiara, AICS Italy)

Needs	Offers
Clarity on the next multi-annual EU programming (Vincent, EUDel Togo)	Experience of organising a joint mission with Member States Capitals to a country (Fiona, DEVCO A2)
Approval of political masters/hierarchy (Marc, HQ Belgium)	Joint Policy Dialogue (Vincent, EUDel Togo)
Full-time staff on programming, joint programming, joint reviews, coordination, joint CSO strategy, joint Gender Action Plan, etc. (Vincent, EUDel Togo).	Dialogue to follow-up on a study about multi-stakeholder initiatives with Government, CSOs, DPs, private sector (Carin, SDC Cambodia)
Get more in-depth feedback on how EU and MS have succeeded to overcome different types of difficulties with regard to the JP process (Marion, AFD)	Time management! Approaching the exercise from an administrative burden-reduction perspective. (unknown)
Support/facilitation on how to proceed after the Joint Analysis was finalised and it is not clear if 1) there is appetite among partners to proceed, and 2) if this makes sense in the country context (Daniel, German Embassy Georgia)	Make sense of JP and Joint Implementation to technical experts/project managers (Benjamin, LuxDev Laos)
Advice on how to move forward when one of the partners blocks the launch of the JP roadmap (Natalija, EUDel Nepal)	Connecting to Member States Capitals colleagues on specific country issues (Fiona, DEVCO A2)
How to sell Joint Analysis? (Franck, EUDel Madagascar)	Experience in Bangladesh (Evangelina, EUDel Bangladesh)
Best practices on how to involve Heads of Mission (Alessandra, EUDel Palestine)	JP country experience in Burundi, CAR, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Benin, Cambodia, Tunisia, Honduras (Sibylle, JP Expert)
Guidance documents (Guillaume, French Embassy Bangkok)	Preparation - drafting and editing - of joint cooperation strategies, especially in Ghana (Nathalie, EUDel Ghana)
Mapping of donors in different countries in Southeast Asia (Guillaume, French Embassy Bangkok)	One week retreat in the jungle until we draft our new JP strategy! (Franck, EUDel Cambodia)
Study cases in Southeast Asia (Guillaume, French Embassy Bangkok)	Using 5Ps of the European Consensus as framework (Franck, EUDel Madagascar)
Support on how to go about the mid-term review of the European Joint Strategy synchronising with the bilateral mid-term reviews. (Alessandra, EUDel Palestine)	ODA analysis (Katarina, JP Expert)

Needs	Offers
Advice on how best to make the joint programming document a strategic document (Carine/French Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs)	JP links to CSO roadmaps and Gender Action Plans (Katarina, JP Expert)
Country colleagues to volunteer for a JP country video (Fiona, DEVCO A2)	Coordination/contacts related to JP in Sida/MFA in Sweden (Erik, Sida HQ)
Concrete example of a JP process/dialogue where "other external action" priority/priorities are included with political colleagues (Sharmila, EEAS)	Experience with JP mid-term reviews (Nacho, EUDel Laos)
Help with updating the expected results of development cooperation (achievable, please) (Juan, AECID Philippines)	Joint implementation in PFM, based on complementarity of actors/instruments/mandate and added value (Martina, Sida Cambodia)
Examples and advice on joint results frameworks – how to make JRFs add value to the monitoring arrangements of national development agenda (Nathalie, Ghana)	Ideas of joint cooperation – what to do in the absence of "real" joint programming in the strict sense (unknown)
How to integrate policies/instruments/actors beyond development? (Claudia, HQ BMZ)	A more speedy approval process of your JP document at HQ (Sharmila, EEAS)
Better sharing of knowledge and coordination between and across European partners' country offices and HQs. Maybe by using better web resources? (Juan, MAEC Spain)	Relevant experience from 4 countries in working on joint policy and political dialogue and joint implementation (Mehdi, DEVCO A6)
Training by EC on JP (new guidelines) at country level + MS HQ level (Chiara, AICS Italy)	Experience advising partner countries (Alex, JP Expert)
Translation in Italian of the JP Guidance (Chiara, AICS Italy)	Information on JP approval process within the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Carine, French Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs)
String lead on JP by EU Delegations in partner countries (Judith, Austrian Embassy in Bangkok)	
Reporting on implementation of Joint Cooperation Strategy (Hubert, EUDel Kenya)	Practical experience on how to do Joint programming – Do's and Don'ts (Hubert, EUDel Kenya)
Results framework (Hubert, EUDel Kenya)	Counselling for conflict resolution in donor settings that are not functioning, including issues of malfunctioning coordination structures (Daniel, German Embassy Georgia)

Needs	Offers
How to cooperate with Member States in Joint Implementation (Hubert, EUDel Kenya)	Delegated cooperation, blending, joint implementation (Marion, AFD)
Additional staff member to support HoC in JP process (Mehdi, DEVCO A6)	As a non-European, offering hands-on observation of benefits of JP in the context of previous experience working for two ministries in Cambodia - Ministry of Public Works and Ministry of Finance and Economy. (Monyrath, EUDel Cambodia)
HQ support in terms of coordination between capitals to avoid a top-down approach (unknown)	Joint Implementation modalities – delegated cooperation, co-funding – from policy and implementation perspective (Kim, BMZ HQ).
Learn from JP retreat experience (Nacho, EUDel Laos)	Bringing Member States together on topic of JP and getting them motivated to pursue JP (Natalija, EUDel Nepal)
Shared understanding with the MS of what JP is about (unknown)	Effects of good communication (Muna, EUDel Cambodia)
Separate discussion on steps to JP – as compared to “contracts” from MS. (unknown)	Overview of practices around JP globally (Christos, DEVCO A2)
	Historical background to JP (Etienne, French Embassy Vietnam)
	Joint results frameworks and monitoring reports (Kristina, Sida)
	Organising a successful JP retreat (Nacho, EUDel Laos)
	Guidance note on European Joint Strategy Results Frameworks outlining process and Annual Reporting template (Alessandra, EUDel Palestine)
	Communication advice and support (Christos, DEVCO A2)
	Bilateral strategy replacement (Bryan, EUDel Laos and Nacho EUDel Laos)
	Inter-cultural lab for dialogue with Government (Bryan, EUDel Laos)

Needs	Offers
	Zumba diplomacy with how to dance, included in the package (Bryan, EUDel Laos)
	ToR for a visibility contract on communicating on Joint Programming (Alessandra, EUDel Palestine)
	Connecting people/looking for compromises (Marc, HQ Belgium)
	Honest broker (Marc, HQ Belgium)
	Central Office experience (Marc, HQ Belgium)

Annex 3: Participants List

European partner	Title	First Name	Last Name	Job title	Organisation	Partner country
EU	Ms	Alessandra	VIEZZER	Head of Cooperation	EU Delegation	Palestine
EU	Ms	Alessia	BURSI	Head of Finance, contract , audit	EU Delegation	Cambodia
Expert	Mr	Alexander	O'RIORDAN	JP Expert	DEVCO A2/JP Facility	Global
FR	Ms	Anne	CHAPALAIN	Deputy Country Director	AFD	Cambodia
SE	Ms	Annika	OTTERSTEDT	Deputy Head of Asia Department	Sida	HQ
DE	Mr	Benjamin	KNÖDLER	Counsellor and Head of Development Cooperation	German Embassy	Cambodia
LU	Mr	Benjamin	MACKAY	Programme Officer; Vientiane Regional Office	Luxembourg Development Cooperation Agency (LuxDev)	Laos
EU	Mr	Bryan	FORNARI	Head of Cooperation	EU Delegation	Laos
EU	Mr	Camilla	LOMBARD	Deputy Head of Cooperation	EU Delegation	Cambodia
CH	Ms	Carin	SALERNO	Director of Cooperation/Head of Mission	Swiss Development Cooperation	Cambodia
DE	Ms	Claudia	IMWOLDE-KRAEMER	Senior Policy Officer; Policy Issues of Bilateral Development Cooperation	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	HQ
FR	Mr	Cyprien	FRANÇOIS	Head of Cooperation	French Embassy	Myanmar
DE	Mr	Daniel	HAAS	Head of Cooperation	German Embassy	Georgia
EU	Mr	Daniel	HACHEZ	Head of Unit Cooperation, Minister counsellor	EU Delegation	D.R. Congo
AT	Ms	Edith	FUCHS	Attache adjoint	AT Embassy Bangkok	Thailand
SE	Mr	Erik	ILLES	EU Coordinator; Multilateral Coordination Unit	Sida	HQ
FR	Mr	Etienne	ROLLAND-PIEGUE	Counsellor for Cooperation and Cultural Affairs, Director of the FR Institute	French Embassy	Vietnam

European partner	Title	First Name	Last Name	Job title	Organisation	Partner country
EU	Ms	Evangelina	BLANCO GONZALEZ	Programme Manager - Cooperation Coordination and Aid Effectiveness	EU Delegation	Bangladesh
EU	Ms	Fiona	RAMSEY	Team Leader "Working Better Together"	DEVCO A2	HQ
EU	Ms	Francesca	CICCOMARTINO	Attaché (Governance and Human Rights)	EU Delegation	Cambodia
EU	Mr	Francisco	GUERRA PIRES	Political Officer	EU Delegation	Malaysia
EU	Mr	Franck	PORTE	Head of Cooperation	EU Delegation	Madagascar
EU	Mr	Franck	VIAULT	Minister Counsellor/ Head of Cooperation	EU Delegation	Cambodia
EU	Ms	Franziska	FREIBURGHHAUS	Head of East Asia Division	Swiss Development Cooperation	HQ
EU	Ms	George	EDGAR	Ambassador	EU Delegation	Cambodia
EU	Mr	Hubert	PERR	Head of Cooperation	EU Delegation	Kenya
EU	Mr	Ignacio	OLIVER CRUZ	Programme Manager	EU Delegation	Laos
CH	Ms	Ingrid	PLAG	Adviser to Ms Andrea Ries, Senior Policy Advisor and Focal point Development Effectiveness	Swiss Development Cooperation	HQ
FR	Ms	Isabelle	MISCOT	Premier Conseiller; Deputy Head of Mission	FR Embassy in Sri Lanka and for the Maldives	Sri Lanka
EU	Mr	Johann	HESSE	Head of Cooperation	EU Delegation	Myanmar
ES	Mr	Juan	PITA	General Coordinator, AECID	Embassy of Spain	Philippines
ES	Mr	Juancho	IZUZQUIZA RUEDA		Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	HQ
AU	Ms	Judith	SCHILDBERGER	First Secretary/ Deputy Head of Mission (in charge of Cambodia)	Austrian Embassy	Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand
LU	Ms	Julie	WAGNER	Attachée	Luxembourg Embassy	Laos
Expert	Ms	Katrina	COURTNADGE-KOVAČEVIĆ	JP Expert	EU Delegation/ DEVCO A2 - JP Facility	Cambodia, Global

European partner	Title	First Name	Last Name	Job title	Organisation	Partner country
DE	Ms	Kim	NGUYEN VAN	Senior Policy Officer Vietnam	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	HQ
SE	Ms	Kristina	KÜHNEL	Counsellor – Sida Coordinator, Foreign and Security Policy Department, Permanent Representation of Sweden to the EU	Sida	HQ
CZ	Mr	Lucie	CHUDÁ	Head of Development Section	Czech Development Agency (CzDA) / Czech Embassy	Cambodia
BE	Ms	Marc	LAPLASSE	Attaché, D2	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation	HQ
IT	Ms	Maria Chiara	VENIER	Joint Programming Focal Expert	Italian Agency for Development Cooperation (AICS)	HQ
FR	Ms	Marie-Cécile	THIRION	Country Manager	AFD	Myanmar
FR	Ms	Marion	EXCOFFIER	European Partnerships and Cofinancing	AFD	HQ
FR	Mr	Mathilde	GASPERI	Deputy Country Manager	AFD	Myanmar
EU	Mr	Mehdi	MAHJOUB	Team leader Programming - EC DG DEVCO - Unit A6 - Coordination and Programming of External Financing Instruments	DEVCO A6	HQ
EU	Ms	Monyrath	NUTH	Programme Officer (Gender, Aid Effectiveness and Communication)	EU Delegation	Cambodia
EU	Ms	Muna	HAQ	Visibility & Communications Officer	EU Delegation	Cambodia
EU	Ms	Natalija	WALDHUBER	Junior Professional in Delegation	EU Delegation	Nepal
EU	Mr	Nathalie	LARSEN	Programme Officer	EU Delegation	Ghana
Expert	Mr	Paul	GOSSELINK	JP Expert	DEVCO A2	Global
FR	Mr	Philippe	DEVAUD	Deputy Head of Cooperation	French Embassy	Myanmar
FR	Mr	Philippe	STEINMETZ	Country Director	AFD	Cambodia
DE	Mr	Reinhold	ELGES	Head of Liaison Office to the EU	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	HQ

European partner	Title	First Name	Last Name	Job title	Organisation	Partner country
SE	Mr	Samuel	HURTIG	Counsellor; Deputy Head of Mission, Head of Development Cooperation	Swedish Embassy	Cambodia
EU	Ms	Sharmila	BIHARI	Policy Officer	EEAS	HQ
Expert	Ms	Sibylle	KOENIG	JP Expert	DEVCO A2/JP Facility	Global
UK	Ms	Solinn	LIM	Country Director	OXFAM	Cambodia
CH	Mr	Tim	ENDERLIN	Regional Director Mekong Program	Swiss Development Cooperation	Laos
EU	Mr	Vincent	VIRE	Chef de Coopération	EU Delegation	Togo

Annex 4: Agenda of Global Workshop

Day I of Global Workshop: 5 December

08.00	Registration	14.00-15.30	Country presentations of Joint Programming experiences: Pecha Kucha style* Facilitator: Paul Gosselink Laos (Government ownership), Palestine (joint results framework), Cambodia (monitoring process?), Kenya (second JP process), Togo (joint programming and joint implementation),
08.30-09.00	Welcome and overview George Edgar, EU Ambassador Cambodia Photo of the group		
09.00-09.30	Ice breaker exercise to get to know each other Facilitator: Paul Gosselink		
09.30-10.15	Presentation on State of Play Joint Programming Sharmila Bihari, EEAS and Fiona Ramsey, DEVCO Chair: Franck Viault, EU Delegation Cambodia: Questions from floor		* Pecha Kucha style is short interventions relying on graphics/images more than words/text (20 slides per presentation – 20 seconds per slide)
10.15-10.45	COFFEE	15.30-16.00	COFFEE
10.45-11.00	Introduction to videos: Fiona Ramsey, DEVCO 'Joint Programming voices'	16.00-16.45	Anecdote circles: experiences on Joint Programming Facilitator: Paul Gosselink JP experts to support circles.
11.00-11.30	Table discussions to identify questions/concerns/challenges/requests Rapporteurs: 5 Cambodia European group colleagues (Carin Salerno, Benjamin Knodler, Lucie Chida, Camilla Lombard, Cashel Gleeson, Samuel Hurtig) Table facilitators: Alex, Sibylle, Katarina, Fiona, Sharmila		*Anecdote circles allow members of the circle to contribute /ask questions/debate an issue in the circle without any formal facilitation.
11.30-12.30	Feedback from table discussions and plenary Chair of plenary: Claudia Imwolde-Kraemer, Germany	16.45-17.30	Knowledge market place * to be set up on a wall Facilitator: Paul Gosselink *Knowledge market places provide an opportunity to visualise what participants are seeking in terms of knowledge and what they can offer in terms of knowledge / practice. Discussions between participants based on their offers/needs encouraged.
12.30-14.00	LUNCH	17.30-17.45	Wrap up: Fiona Ramsey, DEVCO and Sharmila Bihari, EEAS
		19.00	Group Dinner

Day 2 of Global Workshop: 6 December

08.30-09.00	Introduction: Paul Gosselink	12.30-14.00	LUNCH
09.00-10.15	<p>Presentation of JP studies: preliminary findings</p> <p>Joint results: Katarina JP and fragility: Sibylle JP and MICS/MADS: Alex JP and SDGs: Sibylle</p> <p>Chair: Sharmila Bihari, EEAS: Questions from floor</p>	14.00-15.30	<p>World Café: 3 rounds of questions</p> <p>Table hosts: Cambodia European group (Bejamin Knodler, Lucie Chida, Camilla Lombard, Cashel Gleeson, Samuel Hurtig)</p>
10.15-10.45	COFFEE	15.30-16.00	COFFEE
10.45-11.30	<p>Open Space discussion: peer assistance for Joint Programming</p> <p>Discussion group hosts: JP Experts (Alex, Katarina, Sibylle ++)</p> <p>Rapporteurs: Cambodia European group (Bejamin Knodler, Lucie Chida, Camilla Lombard, Cashel Gleeson, Samuel Hurtig)</p> <p><small>*Open space allows participants to create a discussion corner to brainstorm on a topic they need assistance on. Participants are encouraged to move between discussion corners contributing to a range of discussions.</small></p>	16.00-16.30	<p>Plenary feedback on World Café by table hosts (organise seating arrangements)</p> <p>Chair: Kristina Kuhnel, Sweden</p>
11.30-12.15	<p>Plenary feedback on open space discussions</p> <p>Chair: Marion Excoffier, AfD</p>	16.30-17.30	<p>Table discussions: key takeaways, Individual next steps, HQ support</p> <p>Rapporteur: Cambodia European group Cambodia European group (Bejamin Knodler, Lucie Chida, Camilla Lombard, Cashel Gleeson, Samuel Hurtig)</p> <p>Plenary discussion: Paul Gosselink</p> <p>Wrap up Fiona Ramsey DEVCO and Sharmila Bihari, EEAS</p>
12.15-12.30	<p>Introduction to World Café*: the potential of Joint Programming</p> <p>Facilitator: Paul Gosselink</p> <p><small>* World café allows small group discussion at tables in an informal atmosphere to take place through specific questions. Groups form and reform in different rounds to bring a diversity of views into the discussion.</small></p>	17.30	<p>Close of event: Franck Viault, EU Delegation Cambodia</p> <p>*****</p>
		17.30-18.30	<p>EU Heads of Cooperation Individual coaching with JP experts – registration in predetermined time slots</p>

Annex 5: Tables summarising the key points

Summary of key takeaways and action points - Day 1

Key takeaways	Required HQ action	Required country-level action
JP is likely to become the EU’s “preferred approach” under the new MFF, which includes the option of replacement.	Ease and accelerate replacement approval procedures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider and encourage replacement as a preferred option among EU group. If not feasible, start with endorsement. • Do not wait for new programming instructions, in order to move ahead with JP – so as not to lose the momentum.
An effective policy dialogue is based on trust and speaking with one voice, by using “the government’s language”.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure coherent messaging to country level and demonstrate clear support for JP. • Allow for early sharing of information/ documents between EU and MS, before comitology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make JP relevant to the government’s political priorities and identify key entry points and incentives for dialogue. • - Ensure maximum level of information-sharing and transparency of documents vis a vis the government. • - Elaborate joint positions/ policy briefs, to serve joint messaging towards government, HQs and multilateral boards.

Summary of key take-aways and action points – Day 2

Key takeaways	Required HQ action	Required country-level action
<p>The process of “working better together” at country level is as valuable as the JP product and should be as inclusive as possible in light of the need of moving ahead.</p>	<p>Ensure all EU and MS HQ departments to support and move the JP process forward by inserting JP in internal programming guidelines.</p> <p>- Balance number of multi-department consultations against the need for keeping up the momentum.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not let JP terminology stop you from “working better together” as appropriate at country level. • -Invite ECHO, like-minded donors, technical agencies, civil society and humanitarian/ stabilisation actors to participate in or contribute to JP process, by balancing number of consultations against need to move ahead. • - If some MS / other actors are not ready to join the process, start by “working with the willing”, while leaving the process open for others to join when appropriate.
<p>There is a need to make JP more strategic and politically relevant.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make HoMs aware about the new political and “external affairs”- dimension of JP and new expectations towards HoMs involvement in the process. • -Introduce key performance indicators on JP progress within job assignments in political sections. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When selecting JP priorities, involve HoMs and political advisors, and where possible the government. • Consider opting for more politically relevant and strategic areas, where JP can have an added value. • Make JP a living document by agreeing on a (reviewable) joint results framework and related monitoring activities, accompanied by regular dialogue and incentivizing joint activities (e.g. joint field missions, retreats etc).

Summary of key take-aways and action points – Day 3

Key takeaways	Required HQ action	Required country-level action
<p>JP needs better branding – it is still misunderstood by many and often resisted due to mis-conceptions. In humanitarian contexts it is still too often shelved as something to do ‘after the crisis is over’ rather than a means to improve response in the crisis.</p>	<p>Continue investing in mainstreaming JP in related programming processes to expand knowhow; consider further relaxing the use of terminology to better reflect relevance in the local context.</p>	<p>Identify process indicators related to building the sense of shared purpose amongst the EU and EU MS and in working jointly on programming related activities. Invest resources in making ‘joined up’ work an institutional reality regardless the JP output.</p>
<p>JP must be about making programming more relevant and impactful within the partner country’s political economy (to ensure it delivers on development effectiveness and does not become a donor driven priority).</p>	<p>Advocate for more ambitious use of existing tools and processes (e.g. civil society mapping, project identification and formulation processes) to develop evidence on how a joined up approach to programming can make the EU/EU MS more politically relevant.</p>	<p>Use the development counsellors/Heads of Cooperation group to set the agenda to make programming relevant within the partner country’s local political economy. Use the group to ensure that projects designed and technical expertise mobilised deliver better on the goal of making programming relevant to local politics.</p> <p>Build linkages internally with the political officers and invite their input and analysis on programming strategy.</p>
<p>Country level programming is not doing enough to promote the SDGs and Agenda 2030.</p>	<p>Strengthen guidance on how to balance global ambitions to achieve the SDGs with the cross-cutting priority of making programming relevant to the local country political context.</p>	<p>Use the convening power of the development counsellors meetings to incentivise sector leads to develop a plan to make the SDGs relevant to the local dialogue processes. Set aside a portion of resources to support localising the SDGs. Use the EU and EU MS combined voice in national aid architectures to insist the SDGs feature more prominently in project design and dialogue. Link procurements and calls for proposals to local political priorities as well as the SDGs.</p>
<p>Communication and visibility remain as a cross-cutting concern.</p>	<p>Initiate dialogue with the EU MS on a common approach for promoting joined up work of EU MS and EU communication officers at country level.</p>	<p>Establish a working group of EU and EU MS communication officers. The communication groups should identify shared priority messages and strategies to better communicate these messages jointly. The group should report to the development counsellors and heads of mission on progress in communicating jointly where opportune. Where required pool communication resources.</p>

