



EU NEWS

N°2 – JULY 2013

EU Top News

- [Post 2015 Framework : the EU and the High Level panel have high aspirations but weak concrete commitments](#)
- [MFF 2014-2020: Political Agreement between the European Parliament and the Council - what's next](#)

EU News in Focus

- [Maximising the development impact of migration : Commission's proposals to introduce migration and mobility in the post 2015 framework](#)

Analysis and Reports

- [Financing Sustainable Development in the post 2015 era : what should the EU bring to the table ?](#)
- [CIDSE and EAA report: G8 plans for corporate-led investments threaten African Food Security](#)
- [Religion and Development : an APRODEV study to promote reflection](#)

EU Funding in Focus

- [Call for proposals 2013 for Development Education and Awareness Raising](#)
- [CSO-LA Thematic Programme 2014-2020: main orientations tabled by the EC](#)

News from the Networks

- [APRODEV](#)
- [CIDSE](#)
- [Caritas Europa](#)

EU TOP NEWS

POST 2015 FRAMEWORK: THE EU AND THE HIGH LEVEL PANEL HAVE HIGH ASPIRATIONS BUT WEAK CONCRETE COMMITMENTS

Development Ministers meeting in Brussels on May 28 in the Foreign Affairs Council (FAC) endorsed **Council Conclusions on the Post - 2015 Development Framework** which outline a common EU approach to the new global development framework.

These [Council Conclusions](#) have since been also endorsed by EU Environment Ministers and by the General Affairs Council – both chaired by the Irish Presidency that ended on 30 June.

At the FAC meeting of May, the Council also adopted conclusions on [Food and Nutrition Security](#) and on [Resilience](#).

The CONCORD-Beyond 2015 European Task Force (ETF) made an [analysis of the Council Conclusions](#) and noted the progress that had been made during the negotiations of these Conclusions:

- A key positive element of the Council Conclusions on post the 2015 framework is that the eradication of poverty and the promotion of sustainable development are intrinsically linked, mutually reinforcing and should be integrated into **one single overarching framework post – 2015;**

- particularly welcome is the strong language on the need for a single comprehensive post-2015 framework **applying to all countries** and addressing all three dimensions of sustainable development;

- also welcome is the recognition of the need to work on developing **indicators of progress beyond GDP** and on addressing unsustainable production and consumption, and the need for enhanced policy coherence for development at all levels;

- as well as the EU support for a **rights-based approach** in the post-2015 framework, and the inclusion of governance and gender equality, women's empowerment and the elimination of violence against women among the issues that the framework should address;

- however, no mention is made of governance issues outside of certain UN institutions and there is a **lack of substantial reference to accountability** while lack of effective accountability is recognised as one of the major factors undermining the achievement of the MDGs. The EU should, inter alia, elaborate its proposals for a rights-based approach to a post-2015 framework, for which a pre-requisite will be addressing accountability;

- a major shortcoming in the EU's position is a **lack of concrete indications of what the EU is ready or willing to do**. Clearer indication of changes the EU is ready to embrace would have sent a stronger political signal to the UN debate in September 2013;

- in particular, little is said about the need to re-orient the economy to serve people and planet; for example through a better regulation of the financial system and the private sector. It is high time to go beyond a Corporate Social Responsibility approach and adopt a **Corporate Social Accountability** approach.

EU and its Member States should translate the principles and proposals contained in the conclusions into concrete commitments on the basis of which they will participate in the negotiations beginning in the UN Special Session on the MDGs in September 2013. Between now and 2015 **the EU can play an important role** in supporting the emergence of an impactful 2015 agreement by progressing agreement and action at home in key areas, including enhancing policy coherence for development.

On 9 July, at the European launch of the High Level Panel report on the post 2015 framework, in the presence of Commissioners Piebalgs and Potocnik, the EEAS and MEPs Goerens and Cashman, CONCORD also had the occasions to reiterate part of these concerns and a few others related to the HLP report.

In theory, the Panel's report contains all the good words and calls for the new post-2015 goals to drive five big transformative shifts:

- 1) Leave No One Behind.
- 2) Put Sustainable Development at the Core.
- 3) Transform Economies for Jobs and Inclusive Growth.
- 4) Build Peace and Effective, Open and Accountable Institutions for All.
- 5) Forge a New Global Partnership. A new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability must underpin the post-2015 agenda. The Process

In practice, the report identifies 12 goals and 54 targets but **there is a general feeling of business as usual or 'MDG Plus approach'** and the transformative agenda envisaged in the introductory part of the document is not really reflected in the avenues proposed for implementation.

Moreover, as stated strongly by **Commissioner Potocnik, there is a real problem of integration and coherence between the 3 pillars** of sustainable development that produces a silo approach. A more integrated approach should be followed; a single target should, for instance, contribute to more than one goal. In the economic area in particular the focus is still on international trade, investments and productivity and little attention is paid to the planet boundaries and the urgent necessity to radically change consumption and production patterns. **Drivers to transform the economy** need to be explicitly integrated at the goal and target level. Commissioner Potocnik also highlighted the question of **responsibilities** including financing and the necessity to explore new tools such as fiscal reform as well as the **necessity for the EU to speak with one voice**.

As said in the Beyond 2015 and reiterated at the Brussels launch by the ETF, *the report fails to adequately challenge the current growth narrative and status quo of the global financial system (...) Positive messages on sustainable consumption and production seem to be at odds with the statements on economic growth. It is a myth to suggest that we can keep on growing without consequences, and without the rich having to address their life style. The report also fails to address the redistribution of wealth and access to resources and indeed, the global and growing challenge of inequality is hardly addressed while it should be at the core of the HLP ambition of leaving no one behind.*

Another weakness of the report is in the area of accountability that is viewed merely as a reporting exercise rather than a commitment from each category of actors to uphold to its responsibilities towards the people and the planet in

respect of universal human rights conventions and other existing or to be elaborated binding conventions, regulations and agreements.

As clearly stated by the proponents of the report present at the European launch, including commissioner Piebalgs, the report is only a first step and a lot need to be done to identify concrete ways of implementing the vision that it contains. For that a good communication and outreach strategy will be needed with the involvement of all stakeholders, from UN member states to civil society and private actors. Piebalgs praised the support and inputs of civil society and European NGOs in the process so far. See ETF paper on the post-2015 framework: [Putting people and planet first](#).

Many NGOs have commented on the HLP report, see <http://www.beyond2015.org/hlp-report>
[Beyond 2015 press release](#)
[CIDSE letter to Ban Ki Moon](#) / [ACT press statement and](#) / [Christian Aid blog](#)
[Caritas Europa reaction to FAC conclusions on Post2015 and Food Security and Nutrition](#)

MFF 2014-2020: POLITICAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL - WHAT'S NEXT

On 3 July, a comfortable majority of 474 Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) voted in favour of the political deal on the multi-annual financial framework (MFF) that **had been stroke on 27 June by Schulz, Barroso and the Prime minister of Ireland, Enda Kenny** and endorsed by Member State's ambassadors on 28 June. In its resolution the EP states that *it is ready to put the MFF Regulation and the new Interinstitutional Agreement to the vote in the early autumn, as soon as the necessary technical and legal conditions for the finalisation of the relevant texts are fulfilled, so that the latter reflect the overall agreement reached between the Council and Parliament. This vote will pave the way for the final adoption of the 2014-2020 MFF by EU Member States (after more than 2 years of negotiations).*

The compromise reached at the end of June yields **new elements on flexibility and on a review in 2016**, but does not change much in the distribution of the allocations in and between the six budget headings¹. The main change is that €6 billion made available by the Member States at the February European Council for a **new youth employment initiative** will be 'frontloaded' into 2014-15 and that additional funding of up to €2bn will be made available afterwards for the same purpose from unused allocations. Indeed, any unused appropriations for 2014-17 in other policy areas will be made available for **growth and jobs** programmes, in particular youth employment, from 2016 onwards. Such transfers will not be limited by the ceilings set by the MFF but after 2016 there will be a ceiling for such roll-overs – €7bn for 2018, €9bn for 2019, and €10bn for 2020.

In addition, up to €400m will be frontloaded in 2014-15 for research, the Erasmus exchange programme (in particular for apprenticeships), and small and medium-sized enterprises. This frontloading is to be decided in the course of adopting annual budgets. The **European Fund for the Most Deprived**, part of cohesion policy, will be maintained at its current level of €3.5bn, rather than cut to €2.5bn as the European Council had decided in February. The additional €1bn is to come from voluntary contributions by member states to the Social Fund.

No frontloading or flexibility is intended in the case of External Action Budget. It seems that the flexibility between headings and between fiscal years is only intended at supporting growth and employment in Europe. It is a good thing that unused money will not automatically return to Member States but it could also mean that in the case development cooperation funding is not fully used in a year, it could be diverted to support internal EU programmes. However, annual External Action budget is generally fully committed and lacking finance rather than the contrary and we may expect that it will continue like that in the future.

The European Parliament also sought, and received, assurances that the 2014-20 budget will be reviewed in 2016. MEPs wanted to ensure that the Parliament that is elected next May and the new European Commission will have a chance to shape the long-term budget and argued that the numbers in the budget were agreed in a time of austerity and that the economic situation might have changed well before 2020. The draft MFF regulation includes article 1A

¹ €58.7 bn for External Action Heading as a whole, €17.28 bn for the Development cooperation instrument and €29.09 bn for the 11th EDF (in 2011 prices).

where it is stated that *by the end of 2016 at the latest, the Commission shall present a review of the functioning of the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 taking full account of the economic situation at that time as well as the latest macroeconomic projections. This compulsory review shall, as appropriate, be accompanied by a legislative proposal for the revision of this regulation in accordance with the procedures enshrined in the Treaty.* The EP also obtained that later this year, a working group with representatives from EC, EP and Council of Ministers will be established to **look into the issue of EU revenue sources**, with a first report expected by the end of 2014. In 2016, an inter-institutional conference (with participation from national parliaments) should agree the way ahead regarding EU revenues. In addition, the 11 member states supporting the creation of a Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) will examine whether the FTT could provide a new resource for the EU (*see EU News 1-March 2013*).

In the negotiations on the MFF, MEPs also sought firmer assurances from the Member States that they would make available the **€11.2 billion additional contributions for the 2013 budget requested by the EC** to pay all outstanding bills that are due to be paid in 2013 (for commitments made in previous years). In May, the Member States agreed to pay a first instalment of €7.3bn (confirmed on by Finance Ministers on 9 July) and to consider a second instalment in the autumn, once the Commission came up with figures on actual payments.

Next steps

In its resolution adopted on 3 July, the European Parliament stresses that *the MFF Regulation cannot be legally adopted unless there is a political agreement on the relevant legal bases, especially on points that are also reflected in the MFF Regulation; expresses its willingness to conclude the negotiations on the legal bases for all multiannual programmes (instruments) as soon as possible and reconfirms its adherence to the principle that 'nothing is agreed until everything is agreed'.*

Particularly important for such a political agreement is to find a final deal between the 3 institutions on the scope and content of the so called 'delegated acts'. **Delegated acts are executive decisions taken after a 'no-objection' consultation** of the Parliament and the Member States. The European Parliament is not satisfied with the fact that, once the legal basis of each instrument would be adopted, **MEPs would have no say in decisions regarding their implementation** that would mainly take the form of 'implementing acts' escaping EP scrutiny. This issue is under discussion for months and is preventing any serious progress in the *Triolog* processes on external action instruments. The EC recently tabled a new proposal that seems realistic and acceptable and would suggest, in the case of the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI), that the priorities for regional and thematic programmes would be subject to delegated acts while the EP would have no say on national allocations, national priorities and indicative programmes.

Once, this issue is agreed upon, probably after the summer, the DCI *Triolog* discussion on the remaining contentious issues (e.g. country differentiation and list of eligible countries, 20% benchmark for social sectors, cross-cutting issues and definition of civil society) will go on. **The legal bases could then be adopted in October** so that delegated acts' no-objection procedure on regional and thematic priorities can take place before the end of the year.

Programming process

In the meantime, the EC is going forward with the preparation of the Multi-annual Indicative Programmes for both geographic and thematic programmes. **In the case of ACP countries (EDF), the second phase of country programming was launched at the end of May.** It should also start soon for the countries covered by the DCI (to be confirmed).

EU Delegations have been requested to prepare draft (National) multi-annual indicative programmes in consultation with partner governments (and other stakeholders including civil society) by the end of October. The drafts will then be reviewed by the EEAS and DEVCO and it is highly probable that some adjustments will be requested and that the **final adoption of the MIPs will not take place before mid-2014.**

In the case of thematic programmes and the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), it may be as well that no final MIP will be available before mid-2014, especially for the Thematic Programme on **Global Public Goods and Challenges** that is seriously delayed and for which little information is currently available. No formal consultation has taken place for the **EIDHR** so far (in the absence of final decision on delegated acts) but the preparatory work is well advanced. **In the case of the CSO-LA programme**, two discussions have already taken place at the Policy [Forum on Development](#) in November 2012 and June 2013 and written comments on a detailed preparatory paper are expected by 15 July. Once the MIPs are adopted, the Commission will also have to prepare and adopt annual action plans for 2014 before calls for proposals can be launched.

For more information: k.sohet@aprodev.net
[EC MFF website](#)

MAXIMISING THE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT OF MIGRATION: COMMISSION'S PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE MIGRATION AND MOBILITY IN THE POST-2015 FRAMEWORK

The second United Nations [High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development](#) (HLD) organised by the UN General Assembly will be held on 3rd and 4th October 2013 in New York. It aims at “identifying concrete measures to strengthen coherence and cooperation at all levels, with a view to enhancing the benefits of international migration for migrants and countries alike and its important links to development, while reducing its negative implications.”

During the HLD, discussions will be organised around four thematic roundtables:

- 1: “Assessing the effects of international migration on sustainable development and identifying relevant priorities in view of the preparation of the post-2015 development framework.”
- 2: “Measures to ensure respect for and protection of the human rights of all migrants, with particular reference to women and children as well as to prevent and combat the smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons and to ensure orderly, regular and safe migration”.
- 3: “Strengthening partnerships and cooperation on international migration, mechanisms to effectively integrating migration into development policies and promoting coherence at all levels”.
- 4: “International and regional labour mobility and its impact on development”

At the end of May 2013 the European Commission has presented its view on these topics in a Communication entitled “[Maximising the Development Impact of Migration](#)”. This communication provides the basis for a potential common position of the EU and its Member States at the UN High-level Dialogue (HLD) as well as proposing what should be done at the EU level. However, it is obvious that the communication came too late for the Development Council (FAC) of last May and that no Council Conclusions could be adopted so far. Hence, it is not clear to us when and how a joint EU position will be adopted.

The Commission's contribution to the HLD is generally positive, indeed, **the Commission recognizes the need for a comprehensive policy linking migration and development**, including the challenges for particular regions and countries and the introduction of migration and mobility in the post-2015 framework. In line with the UN task team on the post 2015 development agenda, the EU views **migration as an “enabler for development”** that should be integrated in several MDGs (or future goals that will replace them) but should not be a goal in itself.

Also positive is the **EC recognition of climate change and environmental degradation** as having an increasing effect on migration and mobility. However, there is no framework or institution that has a clear mandate in the domain of migration and displacement due to climate change. Therefore, we believe that a new multilateral legal instrument is required to specifically address the needs of 'climate refugees' in order to confer protection to those fleeing environmental degradation and climate change.

Forced migration is also addressed, including the recognition of its potential benefits for national and local economies through refugees and other forced migrants. However, the communication doesn't make any concrete proposal on fighting the root causes of forced migration that could be related to governments' commitments on the MDGs and official development assistance, improvement of aid effectiveness by donors and recipient governments or removing donor's conditionalities relating to migration control. Moreover, there is no mention in the communication on the necessity to provide an **enabling environment** for migrants and diaspora, human rights and development organisations to organize and associate freely, and to be involved in policy formulation and implementation.

The Commission recognizes that a better implementation of internationally agreed frameworks is needed as well as an enforcement of the protection of human rights of migrants at national and regional levels. From that point of view it is deplorable that EU Member States have not yet ratified the **UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrants Workers and Members of Their Families** and that there is no mention of the right of family reunification in the communication. It seems that ratification by the MS is unrealistic for the moment. If most of them agree with 95% of the content of the Convention, the remaining 5% are very sensitive and concern the non-distinction between regular and irregular migrant workers.

For more information contact ifernandez@caritas-europa.org

FINANCING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN A POST 2015 ERA: WHAT SHOULD THE EU BRING TO THE TABLE?

At the time we were finalizing this newsletter, the EC was adopting [a new communication on Financing for Sustainable Development](#): 'Beyond 2015: towards a comprehensive and integrated approach to financing for poverty eradication and sustainable development'. [The communication](#) will inform the EU position on financing the SDGs and the Post-2015 framework (in as much as there will be a coordinated EU position). A paper on the same issue presented by Commissioner Piebalgs at the Bali meeting of the UN High Level Panel on the Post-2015 framework provided a first insight on EC views. The present analysis is based on both documents.

According to the communication, the UN expert committee mandated by the Rio+20 conference to propose options for a sustainable development financing strategy should be fully coherent with the financing for development process. Merging these strands, an international conference should be organised to develop a comprehensive and integrated approach to financing, building on the outcome of the Expert Committee and the processes preparing a post 2015 framework.

Moreover, the EC takes a holistic 'beyond aid' approach to financing for development which is welcome. However, the risk is high that the beyond ODA concept could be used to let the EU off the hook on its ODA commitments and reinforced by the fact that **Policy Coherence for Development** which is key to a real and effective beyond aid approach is not addressed in the paper.

The EC proposals have to be read in today's context of falling ODA budgets and fiscal uncertainty in many EU member states. In this situation, the long-term effort of civil society to get the EU act to counter capital flight and tax evasion is finally bearing fruit as EU officials are **more responsive to our advocacy on domestic resources mobilisation**, desperate as they are to find ways to plug the leaks. On the international side, in the face of reduced ODA and increasing south-south cooperation and financial assistance, the EU is quick to put a greater emphasis on shoring up the ability of developing countries to raise resources domestically. More is expected however on the role that the EU should play to fight tax evasion and tax fraud. The Communication only briefly refers to existing transparency focused initiatives (EITI, country by country reporting, and exchange of fiscal information).

Not surprisingly, the paper is framed within the Agenda for Change. It views trade as a main engine of growth, makes a clear distinction between MICs and LICs and emphasises the need to concentrate on fewer sectors in LICs. What follows is a **general lack of attention to the issue of inequalities**.

As another fall-out to falling ODA budgets, the paper promotes the use of public money to leverage loans from DFIs and private capital investment especially in the MICs. In our view, limited **ODA resources should not be diverted to complement and/or facilitate investments** by IFIs and loans to private companies. Moreover, when this is done through international or European Development Finance Institutions, the majority of support goes to developed world companies, and to sectors and countries where private finance is already available, not the poorest countries or regions. **The catalytic role of ODA is not in leveraging private finance**, mitigating the risk of foreign investors or as an incentive for the recipient to sustain the costs of environmental and social externalities. Limiting and addressing externalities should be the core responsibility of investors and project promoters and a key decision element for EU public development banks and other IFIs. In MICs, in particular, **ODA should be rather targeted at (catalytic) game-changing interventions**, aiming at reducing inequalities and redistributing wealth (including social protection and fair taxation).

Beyond this, **the communication is silent about the impact that greater lending would have on debt levels of LICs**. It only expresses concern for debt sustainability which again betrays a very one-sided view to debt which is a departure from the development consensus that debt sustainability should be seen from a "rights and needs" perspective. **The position on debt is therefore many steps backwards** rather than progressing on the debt and development agenda. With the HIPC initiative expiring, situations of over-indebtedness, debt distress or outright debt crises are impossible to manage unless the international financial architecture is updated and new debt work-out mechanisms are put in place. The UN has recently started a process to discuss this critical issue. Fair and transparent debt work out mechanisms

would require a neutral body for decision-making on debt restructuring, that is mandated to make binding decisions for all debt, taking into account the needs of developing countries to fulfill their human rights obligations when assessing debt and debt service sustainability, and giving all stakeholders the right to be heard.

It is in the area of Climate Finance that there is a notable difference between Piebalgs' paper and the new communication. The difference most probably results from the consultation of DG Climate and or DG Environment. While Piebalgs gave the **feeling that additionality between development and climate finance was no longer on the agenda**. The EC communication recognizes that different independent processes are going on: *...the UN committee to come up with options for a sustainable development financing strategy is starting work and the UN General Assembly is holding consultations to possibly strengthen the Financing for Development process. In addition, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change works on the mobilisation and effective use of climate finance for post 2020 and the Convention on Biological Diversity is operationalising its resource mobilisation strategy. These and other processes consider the same resources for achieving a range of policy goals, which may lead to overlapping commitments. Instead, investments towards such goals, based on existing and future commitments, should work seamlessly together and create synergies, both at national and international level.*

The \$100bn per year of climate finance promised by developed countries by 2020 is likely to cover only half of what is needed in public finance alone. Therefore it is indeed crucial that these financing commitments are respected and strengthened, and that donors do not divert already stagnating aid budgets: finance should be new and additional, with transparent reporting and verification. **Much of this additional financing will need to be publically provided** – to invest in public policies and public services, protect ecosystems and biodiversity and help poor countries adapt to the realities of a changing climate.

It is clear that new sources of public financing for sustainable development and global public goods are urgently needed. The EU must be an advocate of a variety of additional sources for development and climate finance. New financing mechanisms that are predictable and sustainable, including taxes which have the potential to raise significant additional resources are already on the table. For example, a financial transaction tax (FTT) among 11 EU countries could soon raise an additional €34 billion a year. Carbon taxes on global aviation and maritime transportation are also promising revenues streams, in addition to helping reduce climate and environmental damage. The Communication **lacks detailed attention to the FTT or other innovative sources of public finance while it emphasizes the need for innovation in leveraging private finance** or for investments in research and exchange of technologies through advance market commitments. This is a very disturbing undermining of the positive role that the European Commission has been playing in the EU's FTT debate.

On private finance, even though the communication acknowledges that development is not a priority for private finance, it still considers that *even a small shift in private investment priorities and modalities could bring about significant benefits to public policy goals. Such shift can be achieved primarily through domestic and international policy incentives, e.g. public-private partnerships*. The EC doesn't make any distinction between domestic and international private finance considering that both react to the same incentives and even more concerning, no distinction is made between different types of private actors and no attention is given to the specific needs and values of small and medium enterprises. This is particularly concerning knowing that the **illicit outflows of resources from developing countries, caused for at least half of them by companies' tax dodging²**, is the same size as all the inflows combined (ODA, FDI, remittances and government borrowing). **That issue should be more seriously addressed in the EC communication.** In particular the EU should 1) deliver public government registries of the real beneficial owners of companies, trusts and other corporate structures through the upcoming revision of the Anti-Money Laundering Directive; 2) Make the country-by-country reporting, soon required for the banking industry, mandatory for multinational companies **in all sectors** and 3) Ensure full and effective participation of developing countries in the design and implementation of multilateral automatic information exchange between tax authorities.

² Global Financial Integrity (2010): "The Implied Tax Revenue Loss from Trade Mispricing"
http://www.gfintegrity.org/storage/gfip/documents/reports/IMPLIED%20tax%20revenue%20loss%20report_final.pdf

Finally, little attention is paid to shocks (as a result of financial crisis or swings in commodity prices) and the response proposed is shockingly shallow. **It does not address the need for financial sector regulation and only refers to strengthening the international financial architecture and to the role of precautionary reserves at country level.**

A CONCORD paper on Financing for Development is under preparation and should be soon available on CONCORD website. For more information, contact Saldanha@cidse.org or k.sohet@aprodev.net

CIDSE AND EAA REPORT: G8 PLANS FOR CORPORATE-LED INVESTMENT THREATEN AFRICAN FOOD SECURITY

A new report, “[Whose Alliance?](#)” sharply criticizes the G8’s “New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa” for ignoring human rights and the root causes of hunger and instead seeking solutions through a market orientation. The report, published by CIDSE, together with EAA, the Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance, was launched at a panel discussion in Brussels in June, and makes clear recommendations to the EU/G8 members on how existing commitments to food and nutritional security can be upheld.

The New Alliance is a partnership between the G8, the African Union, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), its Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), the governments of six African countries, and roughly 45 companies (comprising mostly multinational corporations and a few African businesses). The initial Camp David launch in May 2012 included Tanzania, Ghana and Ethiopia, and was shortly followed by Mozambique, Côte d’Ivoire, and Burkina Faso. Over time it is expected to expand to any other African country willing to join. **The initiative pushes African countries to change legislation, particularly on seeds and land rights**, both areas of a great interest to corporate investors.

The aim of the initiative is to drive “sustained and inclusive growth” for Africa’s agricultural sector, with emphasis on “accelerating the flow of private capital” to African agriculture. Mechanisms used to accomplish this include designing cooperation agreements with host States, developing new tools to mobilise private capital and manage risk, shaping national investment plans and engaging and leveraging the capacity of private sector partners. The private sector has so far committed US\$3.5 billion in investments towards this effort. The report finds the New Alliance too heavily focused on the role of markets as a food security strategy, and **urges serving food security through a focus on communities, not corporations.**

The report was launched with panel discussion in Brussels featured keynote speaker **Mamadou Goita** (IRPAD/ROPPA), along other voices of African agricultural producers’ organizations and European civil society, sharing perspectives on the New Alliance.

The report argues there is a real risk that the New Alliance’s approach, partnered with the quest for a **new Green Revolution in Africa**, offers inadequate and inappropriate solutions to world hunger which could lead to serious, long-term repercussions for small-scale food producers. **The example of Mozambique is presented**, where experience of “agricultural growth corridors” such as the Maputo Development Corridor (MDC) suggests that the focus on small-scale producers and traders may be lost when profit targets demand actions which may not be in line with social and ecological objectives.

The report makes recommendations for how to bring the New Alliance into line with existing commitments to food and nutritional security, through improving policy coherence for the right to food, reorienting the vision and pathways to sustainable agricultural development, and ensuring transparency, participation and accountability in the process. [The report is available for download on the CIDSE website.](#)

RELIGION AND DEVELOPMENT: AN APRODEV STUDY TO PROMOTE REFLECTION

Whereas Western Europe is going through a process of secularisation, continents like Africa and Asia remain thoroughly religious. If anything, the role of religion in the public sphere is becoming more prominent, for better or for worse. In those parts of the world, everything is religious and religion is everything, whether we like it or not.

This has profound implications for development cooperation. If foreign actors enter thoroughly religious contexts with an attitude that religion is something ‘backward’, primitive and a thing of the past, they are less likely to be effective than actors which have an antenna for the fact that religion can be very important for human beings, shape their world of ideas, and influence the way they act. Excluding religious perspectives from analyses, policy making and praxis can

significantly diminish the 'development effectiveness' of programmes and projects. The issue of HIV/AIDS is a case in point as this issue is likely to be addressed in a more effective way when religious leaders are involved in the programmes to combat the disease.

Faith can be a strong motivating force but it can be a force for ill as well as for good. An often cited quote comes from Father Sjeff Donders who cautioned: *"We should realise that there is good religion, bad religion and very bad religion"*. Obvious examples of the latter are practices of slavery and of apartheid which were defended with the hand on the Bible. Furthermore, certain religious strands do not have very good track records in promoting gender equality or respecting the rights of people of different sexual orientations.

So-called Faith Based Organisations, such as the members of APRODEV, encounter issues related to religion and development in their daily work. On the one hand the issue relates to the identity of the agencies themselves; what does it mean to be a Protestant, Anglican, Orthodox or Roman Catholic development and humanitarian aid organisation? How does your identity translate into policies? What does it mean for the composition of your staff? Should you nurture your identity and, if so, how? On the other hand, the issue is important for the way you select partners; what are the criteria used to choose partner organisations?

During the past couple of years, quite a few papers have been written about the relation between development and religion. Most of these documents consider the topic from a 'functionalist' point of view. APRODEV, as a subject rather than an object, wanted to go one step further to 'internalise' the issues at stake. To that effect, **a study document was written which, we hope, can be used to promote reflections about the topic.** The document gives some Biblical and theological reflections on human rights, explores views on development, elaborates specificities of APRODEV agencies, and reflects on what this may mean for the membership of APRODEV. **Finally, ten principles are identified which are shared by the membership as a whole.**

The document is on APRODEV web site: www.aprodev.eu. For more information, contact Rob van Drimmelen (r.van.drimmelen@aprodev.net).

EU FUNDING IN FOCUS

CALL FOR PROPOSAL 2013 FOR DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AND AWARENESS RAISING

At the occasion of the Policy forum for Development meeting of 18 and 19 June, a DEAR stakeholder meeting took place to discuss the 2013 action plan on DEAR and the call for proposals to be launched on 16 September. The original proposal of the EC contained a number of contentious issues relating mainly to the yearly priorities identified by the EC, the size and geographic coverage of the projects and the lack of attention to the situation of actors from the new member states. There was a high concern expressed in a letter from 11 Member States that the EC conditions would make it impossible for small scale NGOs and particularly for NGOs from the 13 'new member states' to act as lead applicants in the Call for Proposals, while their potential role as partners is also threatened. This could ultimately lead to an uneven participation of Member States in development education and awareness raising activities of the EU.

After the latest discussion at the PFD, the European Commission adopted a revised proposal for the call with the following elements:

There will be 5 lots under the 2013 call: Lot 1: All NSA, Global learning within formal education system / **Lot 2:** All NSA, Global Learning outside formal education system / **Lot 3:** All NSA, Campaigning and Advocacy / **Lot 4** (20% of NSA envelope): EU12+Croatia NSA ONLY / **Lot 5:** all Local authorities.

With project size of €3-5 million for lots 1, 2 and 3 and of €1-5 million for lots 4 and 5.

Increased EC co-financing to 95% in the case of actors from the new Member States.

Number of countries to be covered lowered to 10 for NSA (15 originally) and 6 for LAs and for actors from the new MS.

2015 European Year of Development and Decent Life for All would remain the major themes of the call while CONCORD was arguing in favour of keeping the broad issue of Policy coherence for Development as a main priority and preserving as far as possible the right of initiative of civil society in deciding on the theme of their action.

The new EC proposal is far from satisfying the demands that had been expressed in the CONCORD position conveyed to the EC in May; in particular the call to reduce the minimal threshold for the projects' size to 500.000 euros and to reduce further the number of countries to be covered.

The Power point presentation explaining the changes introduced to the 2013 DEAR Call for Proposals is available on the [Policy Forum CiSoch page](#) (slides 5 and 6 contain the new orientations for this upcoming call.)

The EC seems to consider that this is its last word but many NGOs are still worried that the conditions of the call are not adapted to the DEAR sector and will be detrimental to the access to funding and to the effectiveness and impact of the DEAR activities supported by the EU. It will be essential to make sure that a better outcome is reached regarding the priorities and funding modalities for DEAR in the future CSO-LA thematic programme 2014-2020.

For more information, contact k.sohet@aprodev.net

CSO-LA THEMATIC PROGRAMME 2014-2020: MAIN ORIENTATIONS TABLED BY THE EC

At the Policy Forum on Development (PFD) organised by DG DEVCO/Europeaid on 18 and 19 June, [a preparatory document](#) for the elaboration of the 2014-2020 thematic programme for civil society and local authorities (TP CSO-LA) was presented and discussed. These proposals are still preliminary as the legal basis for the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) that will regulate the TP CSO-LA is still under discussion and will probably not be adopted before the autumn.

The TP will contain 3 broad priority areas:

A/ Focus on country level: enhancing CSOs' and LAs' contributions to governance and development processes.

Support will be provided to:

- I. Enhance CSOs' contributions to governance and development processes as:
 - a. actors in governance and accountability;
 - b. partners in fostering social development
 - c. key stakeholders in promoting inclusive and sustainable growth.
- II. Enhance LAs' contributions to governance and development processes as:
 - a. actors of local governance and creators of local public space;
 - b. providers of public services, including social services, and promoters of inclusive and sustainable growth at local level.
- III. Test pilot actions promoting local development through a territorial, multi-stakeholder approach.

B/ Reinforcing regional and global CSO and LA networks.

C/ Develop and support Education and Awareness Raising initiatives.

The preparatory paper provides a number of details and examples on the kind of measures the EC would be interested to support under these priorities but, in the absence of a final decision on the DCI and the Common Implementing Rules legal basis, doesn't provide any idea yet on the way the TP budget might be divided into the different priorities and actors or on the modalities of financial support. The Commission was expecting comments on its preparatory paper by 15 July and the CONCORD FDR organised a consultation of CONCORD members in that view.

According to the original EC proposal for the DCI regulation, it was foreseen to allocate a total budget of € 2 billion to the TP CSO-LA which represented 8.58% of the total DCI budget proposed by the EC. In the draft 2014 Budget recently submitted by the EC to the Council and Parliament, the DCI is cut by 12.6% compared to 2013 and the thematic programmes represent 38.1% of the DCI with 27.7% for Global Public Goods and Challenges and 10.6% (or €244.4 m) for the CSO LA programme. These 10.6 % represent an increase compared to the 8.58% foreseen in the original EC proposal and show that the **EC decided to keep strengthening the CSO-LA TP despite a serious decrease of the DCI budget compared to its original demand.** In the case these figures don't fit with the final decision taken later this year by the Council and the Parliament on the DCI legal basis it will still be possible for the EC to rectify them with an amending letter (see draft [budget 2014 presentation](#)).

For more information, contact k.sohet@aprodev.net

NEWS FROM THE NETWORKS

NEWS FROM APRODEV

Anticipating the retirement of Rob van Drimmelen at the beginning of the year 2014, APRODEV is recruiting its future **Secretary General**. Applications, accompanied by a motivation letter and CV, by 26 July 2013 to Henrik Stubkjaer, chairman of the Board of APRODEV. More at www.aprodev.net

APRODEV is also recruiting a **Climate Change and Development Policy officer**. Look at www.aprodev.net

At the General Assembly of APRODEV on 15 and 16 May, Christine Allen, Christian Aid's Director of Policy and Public Affairs was elected as a new board member. She will take the seat of Eric Lysen from Church of Sweden whose mandate has expired. The other members of the board are Henrik Stubkjaer for DanChurchAid (chair), Evert Jan Hazeleger for Kerk in Actie and Ueli Locher for HEKS/EPER.

APRODEV Policy Brief of May 2013 that looks at the involvement of DFIs in investments where land grabs have been reported and analysis the internal guidelines of DFIs to assess whether sufficient safeguards are in place to prevent involvement in land grabs is now posted [The Role of European Development Finance Institutions in Land Grabs](#).

The joint report ALOP, APRODEV, CIFCA, EURODAD and GRUPO SURALOP on the **EU Latin America Investment Facility** is available in [English](#) and [Spanish](#) on APRODEV website.

NEWS FROM CIDSE

A CIDSE workshop "Bringing about a paradigm shift towards just and sustainable development" held on 14-15 May gave rich material for an interactive report with video interviews. To access the report, check the [CIDSE website](#).

Preparations for the UN Special High Level event on the Millennium Development Goals and Post 2015 framework (25 September) are getting momentum. Ahead of the release of his report, CIDSE [wrote to UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon to share its views](#). Moreover, CIDSE will organise a side event in New York around the Special event and take part in various events. For more information, please contact Jean Saldanha ([saldanha\(at\)cidse.org](mailto:saldanha(at)cidse.org)).

Concord: Denise Auclair was re-elected member of the Steering group of the Policy Forum and Jean Saldanha joined the newly established Financing for Development Task Force.

CIDSE directors said goodbye to René Grotenhuis and Justin Kilcullen, respectively Directors of Cordaid and Trócaire who will cease their functions later this year when they met in Dublin on the occasion of their mid-year meeting (23-25/06/2013). CIDSE welcomes [Simone Filippini](#) who will succeed to René Grotenhuis as Cordaid Managing Director.

Giulia Bondi will replace Kate Durbin as CIDSE Advocacy Assistant during her maternity (end August - May 2104). A new intern, Markus Vennevald, will join the CIDSE team on 7 August to assist CIDSE post 2015 work.

NEWS FROM CARITAS EUROPA

From 8 to 12 July 2013 Caritas Europa organised for its member organisations the 6th edition of the **Caritas Europa Summer University**. During the week, participants had a broad choice between a series of interesting workshops, run by external speakers and Caritas experts. All contents were related to the Caritas Europa work plan 2013 and of high relevance to the Caritas Europa Working Groups' themes and priorities: <http://www.caritas-europa.org/code/EN/abou.asp?Page=1518>

Regional conference raised concerns to the FAC Council on the need to focus on the Right to Food <http://www.caritas-europa.org/code/EN/abou.asp?Page=1536>

EU News Editors:

Karine Sohet, APRODEV (k.Sohet@aprodev.net)

Denise Auclair, CIDSE (auclair@cidse.org)

Isabel Fernandez Sarabia (ifernandez@caritas-euopa.org)

APRODEV is the association of the 16 major development and humanitarian aid organisations in Europe, which work closely together with the WCC and ACT Alliance. APRODEV advocacy work covers EU policies in the area of development, climate change, trade & investments, agriculture and food security as well as EU relationships with Africa, the Middle East, Central America and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. In this work, special attention is paid to integrating rights-based approaches and gender equality and equity. <http://www.aprodev.net> - 28 Boulevard Charlemagne, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium – Tel : +32 2 234 56 60

CIDSE is an international alliance of Catholic development agencies in Europe and North America. Its members share a common strategy in their efforts to eradicate poverty and establish global justice. CIDSE's advocacy work covers global governance, resources for development, climate change, trade & food security, EU development policy and business & human rights. <http://www.cidse.org> - 16 rue Stévin, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium – Tel: +32 2 230 77 22

Caritas Europa, one of the 7 regions of Caritas Internationalis, is the European network of 49 Caritas member organisations, working in 46 European countries. Caritas Europa focuses its activities on policy issues related to poverty and social inequality, migration and asylum within all countries of Europe, and issues of emergency humanitarian assistance and international development throughout the world. With regard to all these issues, the organisation develops policies for political advocacy and lobbying at European level and at national level. <http://www.caritas-europa.org> - 4 Rue De Pascale, B-1040 Brussels, Belgium – Tel: +32 2 280 02 80