

CHAIRMEN'S SUMMARY REPORT
Joint Africa EU Strategy (JAES) RESOURCES WORKSHOP
Addis Ababa, 5-7/10/2009

An Africa EU Workshop on resources for the JAES and first Action Plan took place in Addis Ababa on 5-7 October 2009. The Workshop was held by the AUC and chaired by the AU and EU Presidencies and Commissions. This report reflects a summary of the discussions and was agreed by the chairmen.

Session 1 & 2: Introductory session (co-chaired by the Swedish EU presidency and Libyan AU presidency) and thematic breakout sessions.

After an introductory plenary session, the partnerships broke up into individual sessions. The objective was to discuss the resourcing of the JAES and Action Plan, notably by addressing the 3 following issues: obstacles to the implementation of the Strategy, potential identified shortfalls in terms of resources and suggestions to improve the overall situation at partnership level. Key outcomes were reported to plenary and the following points have repeatedly been identified:

- Roadmaps: most of the roadmaps are now ready, the priority now is to speed up the delivery of quick wins before the next summit. Overall shortfalls exist at global level, but only a few have been identified in relations to the activities included in the roadmaps
- Capacity constraints, in terms of human resources, technical expertise...
- Synergies and communication within and between different thematic partnerships are crucial
- Functioning of JEGs: lack of continuity in the participation; need to sustain work between meetings; need for greater participation of MS and RECs, especially at expert level; key role of the co-chairs; improved communication exchanges (notably in the preparation and follow-up of meetings), more use of internet tools to facilitate communication; language and translation issues should be worked on; need to involve other multilateral institutions and associated technical implementation agencies.
- Furthermore, there is a need to clarify the scope and mandate of the JEGs. For example, some concern was raised that the JEG architecture is inappropriate for implementation. Relevant implementing structures should therefore be identified and used.

Session 3: identifying key challenges to the implementation of the JAES and Action Plan (co-chaired by AUC ambassador to the EU institutions and the EU HoD to the AUC)

1. Critical evaluation of progress (Resources /implementation mechanisms).
 - Noted the importance of holding this Workshop on resources to get things moving on both sides.

- It was noted that the JAES is an overarching, long-term, political framework for relations between Europe and Africa, with the objective of focusing on issues of common interest both at policy and (development) technical cooperation level. It does not substitute for the whole development cooperation relation between Europe and Africa. Principles of the ambitious agenda were recalled (new relations and cooperation in international fora, beyond development, and intensified political dialogue.)
- However, some participants insisted on the need to address the poverty reduction and development of Africa in the JAES framework.

Implementation

- Successful cooperation has taken place at the policy and political level. Examples have been referred to, such as the joint Africa EU declaration on Climate Change before the Poznan conference. The Peace and security partnership was also often cited as a positive example. This success was largely attributed to the existence of APSA, demonstrating the need for functioning African structures to be in place.
- Noted also that within most of the partnerships, there are projects already implemented or in the pipeline.
- However, concern was raised that although the roadmaps have come far, the implementation process is very slow.

Resources

- While some partnerships expressed concerns over the lack of financing, an overall appreciation was that there is no fundamental lack of financing for implementation of roadmaps activities.
- The financial issue was raised as a shared responsibility. Availability of funds was often recognized, but the difficulties in accessing the resources were seen as a big obstacle.
- Issue raised on the number and variety of financial instruments: complexity of procedures and lack of information on their functioning and access modalities.
- Several references were made to weak capacity and lack of human resources, not only on the African side
- There was a call for greater efficiency and effectiveness in the use of the available resources

Harmonisation and alignment

- Necessity to prioritize the proposed programs and projects taking into account their relevance for the major development issues in Africa
- Several speakers highlighted the need to ensure that the roadmaps and their projects should be integrated into Africa's strategic plans and national/regional development programs and budgets and linked with existing on-going policies. In this regards, the need for better communication about roadmaps activities in the relevant national and regional body was stressed.

- A strong opinion was expressed that it is important to build on existing mechanisms and paradigms rather than to create new ones for the strategy.

Architecture

- The setting-up of the innovation architecture was noted as an achievement: formation and elaboration of guidelines for the functioning of the JEGs
- The innovative architecture put in place for the Strategy has been recognized to be flexible, but the role of the JEGs has to be further defined, so as to improve their functioning, effectiveness and added-value.
- It was suggested that in the future the issues of the number and thematic content of the JEGs could require further reflection.
- Participation in the JEGs is irregular and often not at expert level, sometimes because of a mere lack of resources to travel.
- Some participants expressed the need for the functioning of the JEGs to be more deeply analyzed.
- Several speakers noted the need for greater active engagement from the member states on both sides.
- Too many parallel meetings make it difficult for smaller member states and regional partners to fully participate at expert level: sequencing of the meetings should therefore be improved in this sense.

2. Treating Africa as one

- It was expressed that treating “Africa as one” is a Lisbon commitment and has to be taken as a shared responsibility.
- The question was posed whether both sides have a common understanding of the Lisbon consensus and declaration.
- Some participants felt that financial instruments did not respect this principle, notably because of the variety of frameworks for the different regions.
- In the roadmaps, continental added-value should be better identified and the means of articulation with the regional and national levels should be ensured.
- Several RECs noted that treating Africa as one did not mean that specific regions of Africa do not also have issues that are specific to themselves.
- There was a common feeling that more attention needed to be paid towards strengthening the AUC in terms of its human resources and its mandate to be able to play a more active, central and coordinating role on the African side.
- Increased synergies between the different instruments were called for in order to increase their efficiency in dealing with the pan-African challenges.

3. Buy in from the stakeholders

- Participants concurred with the Mid-Term Review point that the implementation obstacles do not only lie on in the financing of the JAES and that major challenges

remain in terms of policy guidance and inputs, human resources, technical expertise and institutional and management capacity.

- Substantial political will has already been demonstrated through the creation of JAES and its architecture, but sometimes it is not fully exercised by all the stake holders.
- The parties expressed appreciation for the participation of RECs, Parliaments, Civil Society, the AfDB, the private sector and other institutions in the meeting and called for an increased involvement in the different partnerships.
- ECOSOCC stated its involvement in the JAES: its members have already met several times in Africa and are open to meet the EU civil Society and will get organized to strengthen its participation. But concern was expressed over the fact that as of yet no joint Africa-EU civil society meeting has been held, although funding for such an event is still available.
- Partners mentioned positively the openings and possibilities for third parties like the UN, China, India and Brazil to be brought into tripartite arrangements within the framework of the strategy
- As regards absorption capacity of resources, it was noted that there are problems of efficiency and flexibility to be addressed on both sides
- African participants suggested that the partnership required Africa to prioritize participation of MS in JEGs.
- [Based on needs assessments in each of the partnerships, it was suggested that an envelope per partnership is set-up. Another suggestion was to use part of the African oil revenue.]

Session 4: accessing instruments (co-chaired by AUC ambassador to the EU institutions and the EU HoD to the AUC).

- The session started with the reporting of the partnerships breakout sessions. Main points are mentioned under session 1's report.

- A series of presentations from the EU side provided explanations and clarification on the existing resources and instruments as well as their access and functioning.

- EC presentation of relevant Community instruments contributing to the Africa-EU Strategy and its 1st Action Plan (powerpoint presentation)
- EU MS cooperation with Africa: SW, FR, DK, UK
- EIB presentation on accessing EIB Resources (powerpoint presentation)
- AUC presentation on budget and finance (powerpoint presentation)

Session 5: mobilising resources (co-chaired by Senegal and Spain)

- Presentations

- AfDB (powerpoint presentation)

- EC efforts in mainstreaming the JAES into the existing instruments: EDF10 Intra-ACP & RIPs, ENPI, EDF10 Mid-term Review of NIPs, Cotonou Revision
- COMESA (powerpoint presentation)
- ECCAS

- Discussions:

- MS recalled their political commitment to the JAES
- Aid effectiveness principles should be applied at the continental level
- Need to integrate the JAES priorities in the continental and regional organisations' action plans.
- Suggestion to work together on improving the articulation of the African continental cooperation structure, between AUC, RECs and MS
- The RECs reiterated their fundamental role in coordination and implementation. In this regard AUC and RECs were urged to ensure the full involvement of the RECs in the implementation process.
- The meeting recognized the JAES as a novel approach to cooperation between Europe and Africa. Hence the need for appropriate instruments to meet the demands of the new partnership was expressed in a number of interventions.
- Inspiration can be taken from best practices on the implementation of strategies at national level
- Awareness building needed at national level on the JAES so that it is appropriately taken into consideration in policy and resource allocation.
- One participant suggested to try and speed up projects, by looking for innovative ways, such as joint audit and monitoring of projects, to ease disbursement bottlenecks.
- A concrete way of addressing the communication, transparency and knowledge about accessing existing instruments would be for the parties to better post this information on the website of the JAES
- The question was repeated of parties holding different perceptions of the objectives and rationale of the JAES (and thus a need to refer to the Lisbon text).
- Political cooperation should not be forgotten: JAES is broader than development cooperation and there is a huge potential for political cooperation between Europe and Africa, for example in the UN fora. It is important to build on the model of climate change joint declaration, for example to address the global challenges in the area of food crisis, financial crisis.
- Need for greater consultation and for strengthening of existing instruments for purposes of broader mobilisation and implementation of resources, as well as to involve other donors and the private sector

- Again, concerns on the complexity of modalities for accessing the different instruments were raised.

JAES RESOURCES WORKSHOP

Addis Ababa, 5-7/10/2009

Reports from the thematic breakout sessions by partnership

Partnership 1: Peace and Security

The partnership is progressing and the joint implementation peace and security group recognizes that significant achievements have been accomplished. RECs/RMs have been involved from the beginning. The main resources shortfalls are primarily in the area of human resources, coordination and exchange of information and not in the area of financial resources.

I Main Obstacles for implementation of the partnership

- 1) Inadequate human resources from a qualitative and quantitative perspective
- 2) Insufficient coordination AU-RECs/RMs- EU
- 3) Need for a joint AU-RECs/RMs-EU consolidated strategic framework in order to determine/establish the priorities and needs at continental and regional levels for operationalisation of APSA, based on relevant AU decisions
- 4) Problem of coordination, coherence, synergies, complementarity (with sometimes double use) of support by partners concerning the African Peace and Security agenda

II Identified resources shortfalls :

- 1) Insufficient knowledge regarding available resources/instruments and procedures to manage funds
- 2) Weak financial and administrative capacities to face the multiple contributions by multiple partners (not harmonised financial management procedures and reporting)
- 3) Limited flexibility of financial instruments and complexity in rules pertaining to the flow of funds, eligibility constraints
- 4) Insufficient capacity (personnel, infrastructure, equipment,...) in order to be able to work in a good environment and allow a certain anticipation
- 5) Need for encouraging to mobilise resources from within Africa

III Proposals :

- 1) Improve the exchange of information between AU-RECs/RMs-EU-Member States of AU and EU and other partners on the knowledge of financial resources and the reinforced coordination of the use of these resources
- 2) Support the reinforcement of capacities : improve the quality based recruitment of human resources in order to ensure transversality of APSA (link between the different elements of the overall framework), financial and administrative management
- 3) Work out a joint AU-RECs/RMs-EU consolidated framework with priorities and needs of APSA (trilateral roadmap)
- 4) Review the concept of the JEG : improve the participation of RECs/RMs and the MS (AU, EU) to thematic sessions (EWS, Centres of excellence, seminars on ongoing work regarding ASF,...) and organise the overall JEG in a more comprehensive and systematic way in Africa with a joint secretariat in order to review the progress or needed orientations of the roadmap for the partnership peace and security.
- 5) Encourage mobilising resources, incl financial ones, from within Africa

Partnership 2: Democratic Governance and Human Rights

I. Lessons learnt/acknowledgements

1. New participation of African Member States, RECs and other African institutions (18) shows great interest in this partnership; decrease of EU-MS participation has been noted.
2. The Roadmap (encompassing the three pillars democratic governance, human rights and cultural goods) as a living document has been agreed upon.
3. The African Group agreed to finalize its common position on Human Rights and Governance before the next iJEG-meeting.
4. Agreement in principle to hold a workshop to refine respective positions and agree on a consolidated approach of launching the platform.
5. Both sides noted the progress made in the area of cultural cooperation.

II. Obstacles

The Workshop agreed that:

1. Communication needs improvement.
2. Human resources shortfalls need to be addressed in a timely manner, incl. in the field of cultural cooperation.
3. The continuity of participation in iJEGs needs to be ensured aiming at increasing the institutional memory of the partnership.
4. In addition, the Workshop stated that the pace of implementation is not as fast as expected, mainly due to the complexity and sensitivity of the issues dealt with in this partnership (democratic governance, human rights, cultural goods).
5. Furthermore, the three distinct policy areas of the partnership require the mobilization of special expertise respectively, which implies too high a demand for national administrations and the two Commissions.
6. The difficulties in accessing, incl. the lack of flexibility of existing financing instruments and programmes, to fund the activities of this partnership is seen as a handicap.
7. Last but not least, the Workshop identified the need for further strengthening the capacities on the African side, namely African MS, AUC-organs and RECs, in the field of the three pillars of the partnership.

III. Suggested solutions/way ahead

1. Regarding the communication problem, the EU side presented Guidelines on Communication and Working Methods that will be discussed during the next iJEG-meeting.
2. The identification of focal points in all MS-administrations, Commissions, RECs, Parliaments, and civil society organizations involved in this partnership is requested.
3. Further thoughts need to be given to reducing the complexity of this partnership.
4. Financial needs and gaps have to be identified in a timely manner to ensure adequate implementation.
5. Further work and thoughts are needed to increase better and more flexible access to available funds and to think about potential new funding mechanisms in response to the above mentioned needs assessment.
6. Common agreement that the problem of capacity building needs to be tackled with utmost priority; further work needs to be done in order to identify the needs covering all three pillars of the partnership in this regard.

List of participants

AU Members

1. Mr. Mohammed MONIR, Egypt
2. H.E. Amb. Nkoyo TOYO, Nigeria
3. Mme. Lebbaz KAHINA, Algeria
4. Ms. Maphoi KOMANYANE, Botswana
5. Madame Eliane COMPAORE, Burkina Faso
6. Mr. Mulusew LIBSEWORK, Ethiopia
7. Mr. Faradj Djadda MAHAMAT, Chad
8. Ms. Angela REITMAIER, Ph.D., Kenya
9. Ms. Mahlapho Diabo ELIAS, Lesotho
10. Mr. Hassan ABOUTAHIR, Morocco
11. Amb. Rossette Nyirinkindi KATUNGYE, Uganda
12. Mrs. Juliet Semambo KALEMA, Uganda
13. Mr. Kokou MINEKPOR, Togo
14. Mr. Kenneth Dumazi MARIVATE, South Africa
15. Mr. Thokozani THUSI, South Africa
16. Mr. Prince CHOABI, South Africa
17. Ms. Clara KIESEWETTER, South Africa
18. Dr. Mataywa BUSIEKA, South Africa
19. Mr. Brian NYIRENDA, Zambia
20. Mrs. Sienzeni MATETA, Zimbabwe
21. Mr. Salvator MATATA, COMESA
22. Mr. Joseph SHILENGI, ECOSOCC
23. Mr. Nzamwita GAKUMBA, AfCHPR
24. Mr. Mohammed FADEL, PAP
25. Ms. Mariama CISE, Social Affairs-AUC
26. Mr. Jalel CHELBA, CIDO-AUC
27. Amb. Emile OGNIMBA, Director, DPA-AUC
28. Mr. Salah S. HAMMAD, DPA-AUC

EU Members

1. Mr Wouter DETAVERNIER, BE
2. Ms. Lasia BLOSS, DE
3. Ms. E. MILDEBERGER (BMZ, Bonn), DE
4. Mr. Armin NOLTING (GTZ), GE
5. Ms. Ilaria ALLEGROZZI, IT
6. Ms. Carolina QUINA, PT
7. Mr. Alfonso PASCUAL, EC
8. Mr. Christophe PELZER, EC
9. Ms. Melis Sandrine ALGUADIS, EC
10. Mr. Victor MADEIRA DOS SANTOS, EC
11. Ms. Emma ACHILI, EC
12. Ms. Morgan TOM, EP
13. Mr. Joaquim NEVES, PT

Partnership 3: Trade, regional integration, infrastructure

Meeting as a breakout session of the Joint EU-Africa Resources Workshop (5-7 October 2009), the JEG was asked to address a number of questions as a contribution to the plenary sessions of the Workshop. On the basis of the roadmaps:

1. What are the main obstacles to the implementation of the partnership?
2. Based on the review of the roadmap, are there identified resources shortfalls for agreed activities of the roadmap?
3. What are the suggestions/envisaged solutions to address the overall situation?

As regards the first question, a number of weaknesses and challenges were identified:

- Organisation of African Member States: insufficient structuring of work; insufficient information on the Partnership; lack of identified experts for the relevant items of the roadmap.
- Participation of RECs: more active participation of RECs in AU meetings is required; more active participation of AUC in regional meetings is required; insufficient communication between RECs and AUC (tendency to undermine each other's efforts).
- Other institutions: insufficient involvement of specialized bodies such as ADB, UNIDO, UNICA.
- JEG format: the JEG format is adequate, but it is not suited for implementation.
- Handling of Infrastructure: despite the all embracing character of the Partnership on Infrastructure (Pillar 3 of the Action Plan), infrastructure is dealt over different Partnerships, thus stretching scarce human resources and putting at risk the innovative all embracing character of the Infrastructure Partnership.
- Some argued that funding arrangements did not reflect the principle of treating Africa as one.

As regards Question 2, following the review and update of the Roadmap (Point 1 of the JEG Agenda), no resource shortfalls were identified.

As regards Question 3, the following recommendations were identified:

- Member States focal points should be identified and ensure continuity of participation and involvement.
- Technical expert teams for key areas of the roadmap (regional integration, capacity building in policy management, norms and standards, trade) will be formed to ensure coordination at technical level.
- In the area of infrastructure, more technical meetings should be held between the meetings of the Steering Committee of the Infrastructure Partnership. The AUC will be welcome to take part in the Steering Committee and is invited to liaise closely with ADB in view of presenting projects for funding by the EU Infrastructure Trust fund.
- The JEG should remain a broad-based platform for technical engagement, actual implementation work being done by relevant structures. On the African side, implementation should be coordinated by AUC and other agencies, including RECs.

Partnership 4: Millennium Development Goals

Main Obstacles to Implementation of Partnership

1. The scope of the Partnership is far too broad (Finance & Policy, Food Security, Education, Health) and well beyond the sensible remit of one joint experts group (JEG) and Partnership
2. The Partnership does not have a clear niche and is not adding value to the very diverse institutional and financing architecture at the international level that is supporting achievement of the MDGs in Africa.
3. There are serious weaknesses in participation and engagement, with a lack of continuity in representation, variable levels of expertise, many Member States not represented and very limited engagement in the Roadmap and wider mapping exercises. There is a lack of awareness and engagement at country level in Africa and in Europe.

Financing Issues

1. Detailed mapping has shown that specific activities in the MDG Action Plan are mostly well or reasonably well financed. However, the international community is currently not on track to fulfil the financial commitments it had made to Africa, including in relation to Food Security, Education and Health.
2. Further, more needs to be done to comply with commitments made under the Paris and Accra agreements on Aid Effectiveness, including in relation to predictability and timeliness of financing.
3. On the African side, there was a recognition that countries need to fulfil financial commitments they have made, such as allocating 15% of budget for health (the Abuja Declaration)

Solutions

If the MDG Partnership is to add value in future, including in a 2nd JAES Action Plan, the following measures are needed:

1. A much sharper focus on a very small number of issues.
2. Within these, precision about what we are aiming to achieve, i.e. making clear the niche and added value.
3. The chosen issues should be selected on the basis of clear criteria that test whether the Partnership can genuinely add value.
4. This focus and specificity might deliver greater credibility of and engagement with the Partnership and contribute to resolving the problems of participation and awareness. It might also result in stronger engagement of important stakeholders, notably civil society, parliamentarians, and regional economic communities (REC).
5. The 2010 MDG Summit presents an important opportunity to put this new focus into practice.
6. In the short term, the MDG Partnership will continue to arrange sectoral JEG's in Food Security, Education and, if possible, Health alongside other events that are attended by relevant experts, thus securing a high quality of discussion and decisions.

Partnership 5: Energy

I. Participants

Africa: AUC, Mauritius (IT co-chair), Uganda, South Africa, Cote d'Ivoire; Benin, Algeria, Burundi

EU: EC, Austria (IT co-chair), Germany (IT co-chair), France, Italy, EU delegation

Others: EIB, EUEI PDF

II. Questions to be addressed

- What are the main obstacles to the implementation?
- Are there identified resources shortfalls for agreed activities of the roadmaps?
- What are the suggestions/envisaged solutions to address the overall situation?

III. Outcomes

Obstacles

- The partnership is facing a problem of human resources capacity, planning capacity and sustained work/follow-up on the African side that has led inter alia to a slower than expected process of agreeing to the road map. This lack of resources was expressed in particular for the AUC, but also mentioned as affecting RECs and ministries responsible for energy at the national level.
- Lack of capacity and structure at the African side to coordinate and implement with various partners.
- Difficulties in strengthening the Department of Infrastructure and Energy at the AUC might slow down the implementation of the partnership.
- Another obstacle concerns the use of the €55 million from the EC for capacity building at the AUC, which is currently facing some difficulties which need to be solved.
- Difficulty to transform ideas and proposals into bankable projects. In addition, stringent environmental and social criteria as well as financial sustainability of the debtor must be adhered to. There is a lack of understanding of the requirements and availability of financing instruments.
- Delays in launching the PIDA study due to financing problems were highlighted. Need to coordinate between the energy partnership and PIDA process was mentioned.
- Lack of an enabling environment for private sector investment in the energy sector.

Gaps and shortfalls

- There is need for urgent joint approval of the road map through the agreed procedure.
- There exists a substantial investment gap in energy infrastructure in Africa. Only about €1bn in ODA is available annually compared to identified African energy investment needs of about €35 bn per year.
- Participants underlined that resources involve more than funds for physical energy projects and also include resources for institutional, human resource and management capacity, creating an enabling environment for private investments and project preparation capacities.

Suggestions/envisaged solutions

- A quick examination of ODA figures shows that ODA alone cannot fill the investment needs. Private sector investment must be mobilized by inter alia creating a conducive environment. Furthermore, domestic surplus revenues from natural resources should be used to co-finance the implementation of the partnership.
- As a partial solution to bridge the resource shortfalls, many participants stressed the need to use and strengthen existing structures by using inter alia RECs, the IPPF, and regional banks, to organize future African Implementation team meetings, and in order to better involve civil society, research institutions and the private sector.
- Encourage development partners, African countries and their institutions to contribute resources to IPPF for preparation of bankable projects.
- The energy partnership needs to advance from discussing its content to implementation of joint actions. Therefore the framework of the partnership needs to be agreed as soon as possible (i.e. the Road Map should be approved while remaining a living document that will be further improved).
- The need was clearly expressed by participants to move the partnership to a higher political level in light of a High-level Ministerial Meeting on Energy envisaged for early 2010.
- A comprehensive mapping of ongoing EU-supported energy activities in Africa has been undertaken on the European side. Partnership activities should support African capacity to contribute to this process in view of the completion of the mapping.
- Necessary financial and political support should be provided to complete the study on PIDA as soon as possible, as PIDA will be the African framework for infrastructure and provide guidance to the partnership.
- Operational improvements on the African side could be achieved by strengthening and streamlining the implementation set-up and through budgeting of sufficient funds from 2010 onwards by the AUC, including from the €55 million. Similarly, RECs and African countries budget for participation in partnership activities.
- The AUC will regularly update partnership participants on progress in the PIDA process.
- Links with other partnerships were discussed, in particular with the infrastructure and climate change partnerships. Namely carbon financing, inter alia via CDM projects on renewable energy, and energy efficiency in Africa was mentioned as an incentive to increase linkages between partnerships. Need was highlighted for a particular chapter under CDM to enable increased access for African countries to the mechanism.

Partnership 6: Climate Change

Contexte : le JEG 6 Climat dont la présidence est assurée conjointement par le Maroc et par la France a été constitué et a donc démarré ses travaux plusieurs mois après les autres JEG.

1. Quels obstacles liés au fonctionnement du JEG 6

Les problèmes identifiés :

1.a Problèmes de langue : fort risque de non implication des pays francophones, voire de sous-régions pourtant très vulnérables aux effets du changement climatique (prise en compte érosion côtière en Afrique de l'Ouest par exemple)

↳ VEILLER A AVOIR UNE REPRESENTATION EQUILIBREE DE TOUTES LES SOUS REGIONS D'AFRIQUE

1.b Compétences des membres, participants réguliers et non occasionnels

↳ IDENTIFIER UN « CŒUR » DE MEMBRES PRESENTS TOUT EN MAINTENANT LE CARACTERE OUVERT DU JEG

↳ ELARGIR LA COMPOSITION DU JEG : INTEGRER DANS LE « CŒUR » REPRESENTANT Banque Africaine de Développement, quelques représentants de RECs ..

1.c Gérer les interférences avec les réunions Climat UNFCCC (Bonn et Conférences Climat annuelles)

↳ MENAGER UNE REUNION DU JEG LORS DE CES CONFERENCES

Objectif : faire en sorte que le JEG constitue une composante à part entière (comme les workshops portant sur des thèmes de la convention ou territoires spécifiques)

1.d Difficulté de déplacements physiques pour tenue du JEG 6 en un même lieu

↳ POURSUIVRE MIX REUNIONS « PHYSIQUES » ET VIDEOCONFERENCES

↳ FAIRE TOURNER LIEUX DE REUNION ENTRE SOUS-REGIONS

1.e Manque d'informations ou d'accès à l'information (infos validées ou documents de travail)

Site Web pertinent mais mal connu et peu utilisé et peu consulté

↳ VEILLER A UNE BONNE ARTICULATION REGULIERE ENTRE WEBMESTRE ET CO-CHAIRS DU JEG 6 POUR IDENTIFIER DOCUMENTS A METTRE EN LIGNE

↳ FAIRE PLUS DE PUBLICITE SUR L'EXISTENCE ET LE ROLE DU JEG 6

2. La feuille de route du JEG 6 :

Elle est composée de la déclaration conjointe (le pilier) identifiant les priorités, le plan d'action et la sélection à partir de la déclaration conjointe de 5 blocs prioritaires

2.a Projets prioritaires à affiner et enrichir (le JEG ayant démarré plus tard, les remontées de premières consultations de pays sur les projets ont été parfois incomplètes)

↳ LES CONTRIBUTIONS SUPPLEMENTAIRES AUX FICHES SERONT L'OCCASION D'ACTUALISER ET D'INTEGRER LES OBSERVATIONS DES « NOUVEAUX » PARTICIPANTS (sans remise en cause des 5 thèmes identifiés)

2.b Disponibilité de bases de données statistiques ou techniques permettant d'identifier plus aisément les projets africains de manière concrète

↳ SITE WEB PEUT VISER REMPLIR CE BESOIN + LIEN A MENAGER AVEC AUTRES SITES (UNFCCC, BANQUE AFRICAINE DE DEVELOPEMENT, AIE, UNECA..)

3. Recommandations complémentaires :

3.a ↳ PARTENARIAT DOIT PERMETTRE DE PROMOUVOIR CERTAINES INITIATIVES OU PROGRAMMES : GRANDE MURAILLE VERTE, CLIMDEV...)

3.b ↳ PARTENARIAT DOIT ETRE OCCASION D'UNE MEILLEURE RECONNAISSANCE DU ROLE DES RECs (Communautés économiques régionales) ET PERMETTRE LEUR RENFORCEMENT POUR UNE MEILLEURE EXPERTISE ET IDENTIFICATION DES PROJETS MIS EN ŒUVRE AU NIVEAU REGIONAL

↳ MOBILISER EGALEMENT LES AUTRES INSTITUTIONS REGIONALES : ACMAD, ..

↳ DIMENSION « REGIONALE » DES PROJETS DOIT ETRE CLAIREMENT VALORISEE AU SEIN JEGs (exemple développement de certaines énergies renouvelables dans une région donnée ; mesures d'adaptation...)

3.c ↳ PROMOUVOIR LA MISE EN RELATION DES PROJETS CONSIDERES COMME PRIORITAIRES DANS DIFFERENTS JEGs

exemple : CDM et projets accès à l'énergie pays Afrique ou projets énergies renouvelables

3.d Financements : multiplicité des structures de financement nuisant à lisibilité et transparence

↳ RECHERCHER UNE CLE ENTREE UNIQUE D'ACCES AUX DIVERS FINANCEMENTS ET SPECIFIQUE AU PARTENARIAT

↳ RECHERCHER MOBILISATION INSTANCE COORDINATION POUR LE MONTAGE DE PROJETS REGIONAUX (ou capacité disposer de groupes experts mobilisables à la demande)

3.e Important potentiel de petits projets (énergie renouvelables, utilisation de la biomasse...) qui ne peuvent être finalisés faute de portage adéquat ; coût dissuasif (1/3 du coût total du projet) du recours à des experts extérieurs (européens, etc..)

↳ PROMOUVOIR COOPERATION TRIANGULAIRE permettant de porter des projets sur une même sous-région AVEC UN (OU DES) PAYS AFRICAIN(S) AVEC MOBILISATION D'UN FONDS FINANCIER ET REALISATION PAR DES EXPERTS D'AUTRES PAYS

↳ PERMETTRE AUX PAYS AFRICAINS DE MIEUX EXPRIMER ET IDENTIFIER LEURS BESOINS EN MATIERE DE CHANGEMENT CLIMATIQUE ET D'ACCES A L'ENERGIE (approche Bottom up) EN MOBILISANT EN TANT QUE DE BESOIN LES RECs, CDAO, COMESA, SADC, CILSS ACMAD, Banque de Développement Africaine..)

3.f GCCA s'intéresse prioritairement aux pays du monde les plus vulnérables ; d'autres pays voisins peuvent avoir identifié les mêmes besoins

↳ REFLECHIR AUX CONDITIONS POUR PERMETTRE, EN ADEQUATION AVEC RESSOURCES FINANCIERES DISPONIBLES, AU PARTENARIAT D'APPORTER UNE REPOSE SIMPLE A DES PAYS AYANT DES PREOCCUPATIONS COMMUNES NOTAMMENT EN MATIERE D'ADAPTATION MAIS DONT CERTAINS NE SONT PAS ELIGIBLES AU GCCA

Remarque : d'une certaine manière ClimDev peut potentiellement apporter une partie de la réponse.

3.g ↳ SE DONNER LES MOYENS LOGISTIQUES D'ASSURER UNE PERIODICITE SATISFAISANTE DES REUNIONS DU JEG 6.

Partnership 7: Migration, Mobility, Employment

1. Participants

Africa: Algeria, Burundi, Chad, Egypt, Lesotho, Libya (co-chair), Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Zimbabwe, AU Commission, ECOSOCC

EU: Denmark, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Spain (co-chair), Sweden, European Commission

2. Identified obstacles to the implementation of the partnership

(a) In relation to the functioning of the JEG:

- No continuity in the membership of the JEG;
- Lack of internal coordination amongst Ministries in Member States;
- Problem to access documents and relevant information
- Lack of Human Resources (in AUC) to manage JEGs.

(b) As regards implementation of Roadmap:

- Limited involvement of RECs and civil society;
- No links with existing processes (e.g. Rabat and Tripoli);
- Insufficient articulation of Pan African projects that add value to existing national / regional initiatives.

3. Identified resources shortfalls for agreed initiatives

(a) Financial resources

- No shortfalls identified;
- But multiplicity of EU financial instruments is considered confusing and intransparent => need for rationalisation of financial resources.
- Joint commitment to quickly complete the feasibility assessment related to the Tripoli Fund.

(b) Human resources

- Capacity problems on all levels (including within civil society, trade unions etc).

4. Suggestions / envisaged solutions / outcomes to be reported

1. Improve the functioning of the JEG: secretarial support structure; identification of focal points in countries participating in JEGs; electronic communication system (intranet); meetings between experts on specific subjects identified in road map;
2. Strengthen the Pan African focus of the Road Map: joint effort to better articulate truly Pan African challenges and programmes;
3. Reach out to the RECs: actively associate the RECS as full members of the Partnership;
4. Rationalise financing: increase visibility, transparency and accessibility of existing financial instruments;
5. Protect what has been achieved: recognize that this partnership is a historical stepping stone in the political dialogue and cooperation between the EU and Africa in the area of Migration, Mobility and Employment, and continues to offer a window of opportunity to address the challenges identified in this partnership.

Partnership 8: Science, Information Society and Space

1- Participants :

Afrique : Tunisie (co-président), Afrique du sud, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, COMESA, Commission de l'Union Africaine.

Union Européenne : France (co-président), Portugal, Finlande, Commission Européenne.

2- Questions soulevées :

Les obstacles majeurs à la mise en place de ce 8^e partenariat :

- Manque de règles de fonctionnement courant et de circulation de l'information au sein du groupe conjoint d'experts relatifs à ce partenariat
- Difficulté à mobiliser plus d'Etats membres, plus d'organisations régionales, la société civile et le secteur privé.
- Les trois thèmes de ce partenariat ne sont pas actuellement traités avec le même degré d'importance.
- Difficulté à réunir les ressources opérationnelles pour le fonctionnement du groupe de travail notamment pour le côté africain.
- Inadaptation des instruments financiers existants pour les projets déjà identifiés.
- Besoin de meilleure compréhension des mécanismes existants pour l'identification et instruction des projets et désir de mise en place d'un nouveau mécanisme pour le 8^{ème} partenariat.

Le manque de ressources pour la mise en œuvre des projets déjà identifiés :

- Quatre des six projets « early deliverables » ont pu bénéficier d'une identification de sources de financement existants et vont commencer à être mis en œuvre dès 2010. Il est impératif pour les deux projets restants d'identifier une source de financement pour le 6^{ème} (projet AXIS et Observatoire UA pour données géospatiales)
- Pour les treize autres projets phares, l'identification de ressources est partielle pour certains et inexistante pour d'autres.

3- Décisions et recommandations à rapporter en plénière :

- 3.1- Mise en place d'un groupe ad-hoc pour l'élaboration d'un document sur le fonctionnement interne du JEG8 et des procédures de circulation de l'information. Ce document sera discuté en vue d'approbation lors de la prochaine réunion du JEG8 qui se tiendra le 23 Novembre 2009 à Hammamet (Tunisie) en marge du forum ICT4all. Ce document fera partie intégrante de la feuille de route de ce Partenariat.
- 3.2- Mise en place d'un groupe d'experts parmi les membres du JEG8 pour préparer les termes de référence en vue de choisir un bureau spécialisé qui sera chargé de l'étude de faisabilité de la création d'un nouveau fonds spécifique au financement des activités liés à ce partenariat. Ce document sera également discuté lors de la prochaine réunion du JEG8.
- 3.3- Il est nécessaire de considérer les trois thèmes de ce partenariat avec le même degré de priorité en impliquant des spécialistes de chacun de ces thèmes afin d'en aborder les spécificités.
- 3.4- Il est requis d'identifier des points focaux pour ce partenariat dans chaque Etat membre africain et européen.

- 3.5- Il est recommandé d'inviter le EU-Africa Business Forum à prendre part aux travaux du JEG8 et de faire participer les deux co-chairs du JEG8 aux travaux de ce Forum.
- 3.6- Il est recommandé d'encourager les Etats Membres de l'Union Européenne et de l'Union Africaine et toutes les autres parties prenantes à suivre l'exemple de l'Espagne et de la Guinée Equatoriale dans le financement direct de projets identifiés dans le cadre de ce 8^{ème} Partenariat.
- 3.7- Il est recommandé d'encourager toutes les parties prenantes à suivre l'exemple des Etats Membres d'ores et déjà impliqués dans la mise en oeuvre du 8^{ème} Partenariat.
- 3.8- Il est recommandé d'établir des mécanismes de coordination avec les autres partenariats, notamment celui chargé des Infrastructures and MDGs.
- 3.9- Il est recommandé d'encourager la mise en place d'un mécanisme d'identification et de validation de nouveaux projets en appui de ce Partenariat.
- 3.10- La mise à jour de la feuille de route est en cours de finalisation pour être portée à l'attention de la prochaine réunion de la Troïka UE-Afrique du 14 Octobre 2009.

4. **Nom du Rapporteur désigné** : CHELLY Fahmi, Tunisie, co-Président du JEG8.