



Rapid survey of 40 ACP Country Support Strategies

What about civil society participation?

Preliminary remark: most of the information provided in this paper originates from an analysis of Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) that are published on the website of DG Development for the following countries: Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Republic of Central Africa, Cape Verde, Chad, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Antigua, Dominica, Dominican republic, Grenada, Jamaica, St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Island, Tonga, Vanuatu, Western Samoa. The 40 CSPs are summarised in a **table** prepared by Aprodev and used as a basis for the present survey. When other sources of information are used they are referred to in the paper.

1. What are the main priorities of the National Indicative Programmes

A. TRANSPORT

22 countries selected transport (mainly road building and maintenance) as a priority area of the NIP and allocated 49.6 % of the programmable envelope to this sector on average. Among them, 19 are African countries with an average allocation of 47.1 %.

More than 50% of the programmable envelope is allocated to transport (mainly road building and maintenance) in 10 countries:

- Cameroon (50 to 60%)
- Central African Republic (71%)
- Dominica (100%)
- Gabon (70%)
- Guinea Bissau (64.5 incl. other infrastructures)
- Guinea Conakry (50 to 60 %)
- Madagascar (50.1%)
- Mauritania (85%)
- Ethiopia (55%)
- Suriname (84% of the NIP for rehabilitation of Port Paramaribo)

More than 30% of the programmable envelope is allocated to transport in 11 countries:

- Benin (49%)
- Burkina Faso (36%)
- Chad (41%)
- Ghana (30%)
- Jamaica (33%)

- Malawi (32.6)
- Mozambique (25 to 35 %)
- Niger (30 to 40 %)
- Tanzania (40%)
- Uganda (38%)
- Zambia (37.5%)

20% of envelope A is allocated to transport in Lesotho.

B. MACRO-ECONOMIC SUPPORT AND BUDGETARY SUPPORT

Macro-economic or Budgetary Support is a main feature of the NIP in:

- Benin (26%)
- Burkina Faso (54.5%)
- Cameroon (30 to 35 %)
- Central African Rep. (18.8 %)
- Chad (25%)
- Ethiopia (25 %)
- Ghana (26%)
- Guinea Conakry (20 to 25%)
- Jamaica (33%)
- Lesotho (50%)
- Madagascar (22.5 %)
- Malawi (25.4 %)
- Mozambique (45-55%)
- Tanzania (34%)
- Uganda (38%)
- Zambia (37.5 %)

An average of 32.5 % of the programmable envelope is allocated to macro-economic support in the 16 countries listed. In 15 African Countries (out of 25 studied), the two main priorities of the NIP are transport and macro-economic support.

In average, in these 15 African countries, 75% of the national envelope is earmarked to the two sectors of transport and macro-economic support.

C. OTHER MAIN PRIORITIES

Food security and rural development

- Burkina Faso (7 million from B7-201))
- Ghana (rural development, 35% of envelope A)
- Guinea Conakry (rural devt and food sec., 15 to 20%)
- Madagascar (22.5 % + 90 million from B7-201)
- Mozambique (45 Million from B7-201)
- Namibia (rural development, 60% of envelope A)
- Niger (12-15% of envelope A)
- Ethiopia (14% of A + x million from B7-201)
- Malawi (Agriculture and natural resources, 21.7%)
- Uganda (Rural development, 15%)

Water and sanitation

- Cape Verde (78%)
- Chad (25%)

- Dominican Republic (45%)
- Lesotho (20%)
- Nigeria (41.7%)
- Papua New Guinea (30.9 %)
- Western Samoa (75 %)

Education and human resources development

- Antigua (90%)
- Botswana (80%)
- Dominican Republic (45%)
- Namibia (30%)
- Papua new Guinea (43.2 %)
- Saint Kitts and Nevis (85%)
- Swaziland (65%)
- Tanzania (basic education, 15%)
- Trinidad and Tobago (80%)
- Vanuatu (88.3 %)

Environment

- Mauritius (85% for national sewage plan)
- Gabon (10% for sustainable forest management)

Health

- Benin (12.5%)
- Santa Lucia (90% of 5 million mainly for building a hospital)
- Trinidad and Tobago (20% on HIV/AIDS in non-focal)

Tourism

- Grenada (90%)

Institutional development – State and Institutional reform

- Zambia (concentrates on private sector and gov., 16.7 %)
- Nigeria (39.8%, on state reform)

D. GENERAL COMMENTS ON SECTORAL PRIORITIES

Apart from transport and macro-economic support, the three main sectors of intervention are food security and rural development (with 12% to 35% allocation under the programmable envelope or 7 to 90 Mio from the specific budget line B7-201), human resources and education and water and sanitation. Health is retained as a priority in the form a specific separate project (outside budgetary support) in three countries including one African country (Benin with an allocation of 12.5%). Environment is absent from most NIPs and a priority in only two of them, Mauritius and Gabon.

Transport has always been a major feature of the NIPs for ACP countries. The present priority attached to this sector can be seen as a result of the past experience of EU/ACP co-operation programmes. The EC considers it has an added value in this sector both in terms of expertise and financing capacities. Macro-economic support is a more recent priority that is fully in line with the new EU Development Policy and the whole donor community approach driven by the World Bank through the PRSP processes. There also, Commissioner Nielson sees a main added-value of EC cooperation in the fact that it is one of the few donors that has the financial capacity to bring the funding level that is required for macro-economic support (Nielson's contribution to the seminar 'Hitting the target' in the European Parliament, 26 February 2002) .

Macro-economic support is generally presented in the CSPs as a way to improve access to basic services such as education and health and to support macro-economic reform programme of the State. In Tanzania for example it is presented as a way to support the national poverty reduction strategy by contributing to the general budget through untied macro support. *EC support will permit substantially higher levels of allocation to priority social sectors within the budget.* In the case of Burkina Faso the macro-economic support also aims to reduce the State's budget deficit and to support the balance of payments; the EU aid will represent 6.5% of the State's budget and 50% of the total external support needed.

Macro-economic support also aims at assisting public finance management, capacity building and institutional support to ministries including finance and trade ministries. From Country Strategy Papers it is very difficult to assess how the objective of poverty reduction will be met through budgetary and macro-economic support and how the EC aid will reach the population in need. The impact of such a support is in fact very much dependent on the quality of the national poverty reduction policy and strategies and the quality of the services delivered by the State.

Disbursement of yearly 'tranches' of EC support will depend on the achievement of satisfactory results that should be assessed through a set of performance indicators. In general the idea is to agree on indicators that can be used by all official contributors to the State's budget (through macro-economic support or SWAPs). Progress in the development and use of such indicators are variable from one country to the other. In Burkina Faso, a set of joint targets and indicators applicable to all donors is under experiment since 1997 and has resulted in a joint donor's approach adopted in November 2000. In Uganda, *evaluation and monitoring in education and health are already well co-ordinated through bi-annual sector reviews that monitor targets, set new targets and judges whether progress against agreed undertakings is satisfactory.* In the case of Lesotho, where 50% of EU aid will be provided in the form of macro-economic support, the parameters for the review process are very general (e.g. reduction of unemployment, increase of the rate of vaccinated children and school enrolment) and certainly not sufficient to really assess the impact on poverty. The paper however mentions the fact that Performance and Poverty monitoring indicators for all sectors of EDF support should be agreed by the end of 2002. It is not clear whether these indicators will be made public and whether there will be any consultation of civil society in their elaboration and use.

One conclusion that can easily be drawn for the 15 African countries where 75% of aid will go to the sectors of transport and macro-economic support, is the fact that the participation of civil society organisations in the implementation of the main priorities of the NIP is very difficult to assess and will most probably be very limited. CS actors are only mentioned twice as actors in the transport area (in the NIPs of Mozambique for the rehabilitation of rural roads and AIDS prevention along roads corridors and of Gabon regarding user's organisations). Participation of beneficiaries and local communities is however mentioned in several cases when it comes to rural roads maintenance and rehabilitation and feeder roads but without any detail on the way it will be organised.

2. Consultation of civil society during the programming exercise

The following information originates from the Country Strategy Papers (CSP); in general it is not accurate and documented enough to provide a fair and comprehensive assessment of the way civil society has been consulted. For example, when the paper mentions that a seminar with civil society has been organised it is impossible to judge the quality of the seminar, there is no information on how many and which organisations attended it and on the real content of the debate. Was it a seminar to inform civil society on the NIP or really to consult NGOs on it? Strategy papers also often refer to the fact that civil society was consulted on the national poverty reduction programme (in general in the framework of the PRSP process) without mentioning any specific process for consultation on the CSP itself.

Surveys organised with the support of *Eurostep* in a few ACP countries (Tanzania, Uganda, Benin, Cameroon, Dominican Republic) through a questionnaire sent to NGOs and CBOs demonstrates that even in the case concrete mechanisms for consultation on the CSP were put in place, local civil society organisations feel that these mechanisms were not always appropriate and that they couldn't really have an impact on the outcome of the process. The surveys call for comprehensive and appropriate information, flexible timetables, accountability of government and EU delegations, the formation of non-state actors fora, and capacity building for CSOs.

In certain countries, there was apparently no specific consultation on CSP

- Benin (consultation on PRSP and health sector)
- Burkina Faso (consultation on PRSP but not on CSP)
- Cameroon (consultation on PRSP)
- Dominica (consultation on national development strategy)
- Ethiopia (no mention of neither PRSP nor CSP)
- Grenada (no information)
- Kiribati (NSA committee exists for consultation with government in general)
- Lesotho (consultation on PRSP)
- Malawi (PRSP mentioned in view of improvement)
- Mauritania (desire to better involve CS in future)
- Mozambique (desire to improve consultation in future through capacity building)
- Nigeria (consultation foreseen in future during implementation and review, capacity building in that view)
- Santa Lucia (wide consultation on national health programme)
- Saint Kitts and Nevis (consultation on national education long term plan)
- Tonga (intensive consultation organised by government but not specifically on CSP)
- Western Samoa (no clear mention of a consultation process however consultation of NSA is referred to as a usual feature of the country)

In certain countries, consultation on CSP is mentioned but without details

- Antigua
- Cape Verde
- Jamaica
- Solomon Island

- Trinidad and Tobago
- Swaziland

In certain countries details are provided on the consultation process (in general in the form of seminars)

- Botswana (three workshops CS + government)
- Central Africa (workshop attended by 30% of CS organisations, 80 participants, documented in annex)
- Dominican Republic (1 seminar on CSP)
- Gabon (1 seminar on NIP)
- Ghana (5 consultative workshops)
- Guinea Bissau (special consultative committee + workshop)
- Madagascar (3 field missions, 2 seminars and working meetings)
- Mauritius (3 stakeholders meetings)
- Namibia (brochure + survey + 5 regional and 1 national workshops; a report will be prepared to guide CS participation, specific annex on non-state actors)
- Niger (1 seminar with CS and another specific one with peasant organisations)
- Papua new Guinea (1 task force and several working groups, documented in annex)
- Suriname (programming seminar, limited number of NGOs involved)
- Tanzania (extensive consultation was conducted, see also annex 1)
- Uganda (2 workshops)
- Vanuatu (various discussions with CS)
- Zambia (two consultative meetings but in total only 5 CS organisations involved)

It is interesting to note that the CSP for Zambia is the only one that provides the list of organisations that have been consulted.

The most sophisticated example is Chad with the creation of a specific CS organisation:

In the framework of the 9th EDF a new structure of non-state actors has been set up, the OANET, as well as a Permanent Conference of actors in development. Field mission to consult the population were also financed by the EDF. The tasks of the OANET in the framework of the CSP are:

(1) advice and orientation on development issues on behalf of non-state actors, (2) nomination of representatives to the different dialogue structures, (3) participation at the permanent conference of partners in development, (4) facilitation of exchanges and consultation between the different non-state groups in view of their empowerment and capacity building. In Chad there also exist a national coalition of NGOs (SILONG including local and international NGOs) and a '*Collège de Contrôle et Surveillance des Revenus pétroliers*' of 9 members including 4 NGOs.

In a number of countries, it is foreseen that 9th EDF funds will be allocated to support a better participation and consultation of civil society and NSA in the Cotonou agreement in the future (consultation in review process, information, participation in design of future interventions, better dialogue with the state,..). It is the case for Lesotho, Guinea, Chad and Swaziland.

In conclusion, despite the fact that delegations were provided with guidelines on civil society consultation during the programming process, we observe a great disparity in the way civil society was informed and consulted. A specific consultation on the CSP

was organised in 22 countries (however in 6 countries it is only mentioned in vague terms). In the other 18 countries, the EC seems to consider that the consultation process on the PRSP and/or the national sectoral programmes is sufficient and that no specific consultation on the CSP was needed. It is highly probable that, in these countries, civil society organisations are simply not aware of the existence of the EU aid programming process and maybe of the existence of the Cotonou agreement as such.

3. Civil Society participation in implementation of the NIP

In most cases, civil society organisations are referred to in the non-focal part of the NIP mainly as beneficiaries of a capacity building or institutional strengthening programme as part of a good governance objective or through microprojects programmes.

There are however exceptions to this common feature. The two extreme situations are:

- **6 country papers don't mention CS organisations or NSA** (except private sector) as potential actors or beneficiaries in the NIP
 - o Zambia
 - o St Lucia
 - o Vanuatu
 - o Grenada
 - o Antigua
 - o Saint Kitts and Nevis
- **11 country papers foresee a specific role for CS organisations or NSA in the main priority areas that is clearly defined in the NIP:**
 - o Dominican Republic (in water and sanitation)
 - o Kiribati (direct support to NSA = second priority area, 10% of A)
 - o Lesotho (water sanitation and microprojects)
 - o Madagascar (participation in rural development, Food security and water micro-projects)
 - o Mauritania (capacity building of NSA is part of a priority area)
 - o Mauritius (decentralised cooperation programme is the second priority)
 - o Nigeria (water sanitation / institutional reform)
 - o Papua New Guinea (capacity building and governance is the third main priority and covers NSA)
 - o Solomon Island (is an exception with 85 % of the envelope allocated to a micro-projects programme in the area of sustainable rural development and the 15% left allocated to direct support to CS, the whole envelope is thus accessible to CS organisations.)
 - o Tonga (social services in general)

Civil society organisations are also mentioned as **potential** actors in the priority areas **but in vague terms and/or at a limited scale in :**

- Benin (in health sector)
- Botswana (could be partners in human resources development)
- Burkina Faso (peasants organisations and NGOs could be partners in food security and rural development)

- Cape Verde (in water and sanitation sector for accompanying measures)
- Chad (in water programme, details in an annex of the CSP)
- Ethiopia (mainly in food security, rural micro-credit)
- Gabon (targeted actions in priority sectors, user's organisations in transport)
- Ghana (rural development and feeder roads)
- Guinea Bissau (in military demobilisation programme)
- Mozambique (in transport sector (rural roads and AIDS))
- Namibia (in rural development)
- Niger (in rural development and food security)
- Tanzania (in the education sector and gender)
- Trinidad and Tobago (education and HIV/AIDS)
- Uganda (in the Programme of modernisation of agriculture)

The list shows that, in most cases, CS organisations are expected to participate in the sectors of food security, rural development and water (13 CSP on 25). The other sectors open to CS participation are linked to social services (education and training, gender). Transport is mentioned in 2 cases (Mozambique and Gabon) and feeder roads in one case (Ghana).

In 9 country papers however the participation of CS is **confined in very specific programmes in the non-focal areas**.

- Cameroon (capacity building-institutional building)
- Central African republic (health and micro-projects)
- Dominican republic (€ 5 mio in direct support to non state actors)
- Guinea Conakry (info + capacity building and inst. support)
- Jamaica (community based initiatives and institutional strengthening)
- Malawi (subject to feasibility study)
- Suriname (institutional strengthening)
- Swaziland (MPP programme in non-focal but will complement focal areas + CB and IS)
- Western Samoa (capacity building and micro-projects)

A majority of CSPs include a **specific civil society programme aiming at capacity building and institutional strengthening** of non-state actors. In most cases, these are however small programmes of a few millions. When the total envelope allocated to civil society is mentioned, it rarely exceeds 5% except for Jamaica (6%), PNG (7.4%), Gabon (10% for CS, no details), Cameroon (5.5%), Kiribati (10% direct support to NSA), Western Samoa (20%), Solomon Islands (15% in CB and IS and 85% in micro-projects).

In conclusions, CS is expected to play a role in the priority areas of the NIP of 25 countries. However 10 NIPs only mention this participation in concrete terms; in the other cases, CS participation is mentioned as a potentiality or in vague terms. CS organisations will benefit from special and limited capacity building or micro-project programmes outside the main priority areas in 9 countries and will not be involved in implementation at all in 6 countries. In one case, Solomon Island, non-state actors will be the main partners in the implementation of the NIP.

4. What about gender mainstreaming?

The screening of 40 ACP Country Strategy Papers (CSP) made at the end of 2001 by the Commission's gender helpdesk¹ shows that the concept of gender and mainstreaming of gender equality is hardly found in the CSPs at all. The screening shows that 3% of CSPs have mentioned gender in three of four sections of the CSP, 31% in two sections and 50% in one section only, mostly in the chapters on EC objectives (terminology), Country Policy agenda and Country analysis. When it is mentioned it is almost always in the social sector and sometimes in the context of human rights and/or governance. It is also notable that in most CSPs, the focus is on women and women's situation, whereas analyses on men and boys are missing.

From our own Aprodev analysis on the way gender issues are taken into account in the 40 CSPs studied, it appears that some efforts are made to meet external coherence. Increasingly, reference is made to governments' international commitments in existing or forthcoming national gender policy plans or relevant government units responsible for gender mainstreaming. More gender aspects are taken up in the country analysis and more often in social sectors specific approaches. Yet not much is done to translate and meet these concerns within the EC strategy response or with financial support under the National Indicative Programme. The following sector-based analysis realised by Karin Ulmer on the basis of the table summarising the 40 CSPs demonstrates quite well the low interest attached to gender in most NIPs.

We haven't specifically studied the way women's organisation were consulted during the programming exercise, but our general survey of CSPs hasn't provided any evidence of the fact that special attention was attached to their participation in the process. If efforts in that direction were made there are not well documented in the CSPs.

Transport: only 5 CSPs mention gender explicitly under the transport and rural development sector mainly under employment opportunities or in relation to AIDS. Yet no further reference is made to different gender needs and priorities. Whereas for men it is central to move between home and working place, women's mobility is multidimensional. Their responsibility for livelihood, and community and care work makes them move mainly in the local area from fetching fuel and water to fieldwork, and care or community work. Whereas men will appreciate speed for long-distance travelling, women's prior need is in safe travelling without sexual harassment. In Nigeria, for example, traders on rural markets make up to 90 % women, whereas in urban markets there are only 10% of women.

Macro-economic or budgetary support: it is very difficult to assess how the objective of poverty reduction strategies is met through macro economic and budget support, and how the women and men in need will be reached.

13 CSS mention gender issues in social services, referring to education and health, others refer to HIV/AIDS, violence, female headed households, or more generally to poverty and women, a few indicate the need of gender disaggregated data. It can also be noted that gender budgeting as a means for accountability of government spending

¹ European Commission (February 2002) "Assessment of Country Strategy Papers with Reference to Gender"

is not mentioned in any of the CSS. Specific gender-related targets and indicators are mentioned in certain cases mainly with regard to access to education.

Regarding **Education**, the recent EC evaluation of its education work lends weight to concerns about the impact of budget support on promoting gender equality.² Support for universal primary education, through an increase of funds for basic education or through budget support, produces only an indirect effect on poverty reduction and gender inequality. Girl's education and gender appear in almost all policy documents, but only a few countries have developed consistent implementation measures to date. Lessons highlighted by the report are that universal primary education is not able *per se* to reach the poor and poor girls, and that in absence of specific targeted measures, it is difficult for them to benefit from the potentially increased access. The report concludes that the fight against poverty will reach its objectives and its beneficiaries only by specifically targeting the poor and girls at school. This casts a shadow on the strategy of implementing gender mainstreaming through government budgetary support, rather than targeted spending.

Food security and rural development is mentioned as a main priority in 10 out of 40 countries.

None of the 10 CSP looked at gender issues explicitly under this priority area. Key gender issues to be addressed in this section are production, access and control over resources (land, heritage, credit, etc), subsistence and commercial food production, and nutritional quality. The lack of attention given to gender was also evident in the evaluation report 2000 of EC Food Security Policy and programme management³ which concludes that the question of changes in gender relations, ie negative or positive impact of balance of responsibilities and labour between women and men, is not adequately addressed. The report states that most project designs make no specific reference to gender issue. If projects aim specifically at women, an analysis of changes in social and economic status of women and men is not included. Common statements are that the project does not have a specific gender perspective or is gender neutral. In view of further modernisation of agriculture, liberalisation of agricultural trade, which often excludes and ignores women's farmers in their own right, such lack of attention must be seen as a major omission.

Institutional capacity building, good governance and the rule of law: Female poverty should be seen in the context of good governance and legal/political framework. About 6 CSPs mention legal frameworks and discriminatory laws as one of the reasons for women's subordinate position and female poverty. Others refer to the mainstreaming of gender in the PRSPs and a third of the CSPs make reference to the national gender policy (existing or forthcoming).

Yet, despite the numerous conflict situations in many of the ACP countries under study, not much attention is given to gender and conflict prevention or resolution. Only two Pacific countries make an explicit reference to women's contribution to conflict prevention and leading role in conflict resolution. It can be concluded that women are often still solely seen as a vulnerable group and not as a force for change. Yet, EP and UN resolutions as well as NGOs provide ample evidence that women

² Development Researcher's Network Sri (May 2002) "The evaluation of EC Support to the education sector in ACP countries - Final Report"

³ Evaluation of EC Food Aid Security Policy, Food Aid Management and Programmes in support of Food Security, Regulation No 1292/96 of June 1996 – 951569, report dd December 2000, done by NR International Ltd, NEI b.v.

offer complementary and practical strategies and solutions at all levels of peace building process, and that without women's participation in of all conflict prevention initiatives, women and men will not both benefit from reconciliation and reconstruction initiatives⁴. Initiatives funded under the EIDHR⁵ are well taken notice of, but its integration into the EC response strategy has not become evident.

5. How is Decentralised Cooperation mainstreamed?

An interesting outcome of the study of the 40 CSP is the fact that decentralised cooperation is very poorly integrated in the ACP support strategies however it is included as an objective of the ACP-EU cooperation since Lomé IV.

The concept itself is not mentioned at all in 17 CSP (the words don't appear in the text).

It is mentioned in relation with Budget line B7-6002 or with the Regional indicative programme or in relation with past EC aid in 13 cases.

It is recommended (from an evaluation or in the general introduction) as an objective to be explored in the future in relation with non-state actors participation in 3 CSP: Mauritania, Zambia and PNG (in this case an evaluation report recommends to integrate decentralised co-operation approach in the sector of water).

The NIP of these three countries however doesn't mention explicitly that a decentralised cooperation programme will be undertaken.

Finally, Decentralised Cooperation is part of the NIP of 6 countries only:

- Niger: one DC programme in the non-focal area amounting 5% of the envelope A (€ 10.6 mio)
- Mauritius: one DC programme aiming at poverty reduction is the second priority of the NIP (15% of the envelope, €5 mio)
- Jamaica: DC is mentioned as a potential activity in the non-focal area.
- Guinea: accompanying and capacity building programme for civil society is presented as a decentralised cooperation programme.
- Lesotho: continuation of the micro-projects programme with greater emphasis on decentralised cooperation.
- Swaziland: micro-projects programme in Swaziland is referred to as a decentralised poverty reduction programme.

In the CSP for **Solomon Island**, decentralised cooperation as such is not mentioned however 85 % of the envelope are allocated to a micro-projects programme in the area of sustainable rural development and the 15% left are allocated to direct support to CS.

Karine Sohet and Karin Ulmer, APRODEV (16 September 2002)

⁴ Report of Interagency Forum on Conflict Prevention: Women, Conflict Prevention and Resolution: The role for the EU, organized by European Centre for Common Ground, International Alert and APRODEV, 2 May 2002; as well as EP Report on participation of women in peaceful conflict resolution (2000/2025(INI)), rapporteur Maj Britt Theorin, dd. 20 October 2000

⁵ EC Communication on Conflict Prevention (COM(2001)211 final)

