

Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development: Justification, Recognition and Approaches to Achievement

Ashoff, Guido

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Forschungsbericht / research report

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

SSG Sozialwissenschaften, USB Köln

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Ashoff, G. (2005). *Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development: Justification, Recognition and Approaches to Achievement*. (DIE Studies, 11). Bonn: Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik gGmbH. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-193580>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

d·i·e

Deutsches Institut für
Entwicklungspolitik



German Development
Institute

Studies

Enhancing Policy Coherence for Development:
Justification, Recognition and Approaches
to Achievement

German Development Institute (DIE)

The German Development Institute (DIE) is a multidisciplinary research, consultancy and training institute for Germany's bilateral and for multilateral development cooperation. On the basis of independent research, it acts as consultant to public institutions in Germany and abroad on current issues of cooperation between developed and developing countries. Through its 9-months training course, the German Development Institute prepares German and European university graduates for a career in the field of development policy.

Dr. Guido Ashoff is a senior researcher and head of department at the German Development Institute. His main areas of research and consultancy are basic issues of development policy and development cooperation with the Middle East and North Africa.

E-mail: guido.ashoff@die-gdi.de

Enhancing policy coherence for development: justification,
recognition and approaches to achievement

Guido Ashoff

Studies / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik
ISSN 1860-0468

Ashoff, Guido: Enhancing policy coherence for development : justification, recognition and approaches to achievement / Guido Ashoff. – Bonn : Dt. Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, 2005. – (Studies / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik ; 11)
ISBN 3-88985-299-8
Dt. Ausg. u.d.T.: Der entwicklungspolitische Kohärenzanspruch : Begründung, Anerkennung und Wege zu seiner Umsetzung
ISBN 3-88985-286-6

© Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik gGmbH
Tulpenfeld 4, 53113 Bonn
 +49 (0)228 94927-0
 +49 (0)228 94927-130
E-Mail: die@die-gdi.de
<http://www.die-gdi.de>

Preface

This study is based on a more comprehensive, confidential report drawn up by the author for the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and submitted in May 2004. The report was prepared while the BMZ was holding discussions on coherence with the German Foreign Office and the Federal Ministries of Economic Affairs, Finance, Agriculture and the Environment, most of which were attended by the GDI. While those discussions considered aspects of coherence relevant to the government departments concerned, the task of the parallel report was to examine the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development and its achievement from a general perspective, taking account of international experience.

Besides analysing the discussions on coherence and a wide range of other material, the author had numerous discussions at the BMZ, the Chancellor's Office, the Permanent Mission of Germany to the EU, the Development Cooperation Directorate of the OECD (DAC Secretariat), the British Department for International Development (DFID), the Netherlands Foreign Ministry and the Swedish Foreign Ministry. I would again like to express my thanks to all those interviewed for being so cooperative. I am also grateful to my colleague Imme Scholz for Box 11.

This study considers the justification for, the recognition and scope of and the limits to the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development and then, against the background of international experience, explains that, if that goal is to be achieved, complex "coherence management" will be needed. Questions of ministerial competence do not form part of this study. The following text essentially reflects the level of information in May 2004. More accurate or up-to-date information has been added in some few places.

Bonn, September 2005

Guido Ashoff

Contents

Abbreviations

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Summary | 1 |
| 1 The concept of “policy coherence for development” | 11 |
| 2 Justifying the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development | 14 |
| 2.1 The “negative” justification: incoherences between development policy and other policies | 14 |
| 2.2 The strategic justification: policy coherence as a response to globalization challenges and as a requirement of global governance | 16 |
| 2.3 The substantive-programmatic justification: the guiding concept of sustainable development and the Millennium Declaration | 17 |
| 2.4 The system of objectives underlying the goal of enhancing coherence for development and its place in that system | 19 |
| 2.5 Development policy’s limits in justifying its goal of enhancing policy coherence | 23 |
| 3 The German Government’s recognition of the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development at national and international level | 26 |
| 3.1 National framework | 27 |
| 3.2 EU framework | 28 |
| 3.3 OECD framework | 32 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 3.4 | UN framework | 33 |
| 4 | Causes of policy incoherences and plea for a realistic understanding of coherence | 34 |
| 4.1 | Causes in the area of societal and political norms | 34 |
| 4.2 | Causes in the area of political decision-making | 35 |
| 4.3 | Causes in the area of policy formulation and coordination | 37 |
| 4.4 | Causes at conceptual level | 38 |
| 4.5 | Conclusion: plea for a realistic understanding of coherence | 40 |
| 5 | Institutional approaches to enhancing policy coherence: general frame of reference | 41 |
| 5.1 | State of the debate | 41 |
| 5.2 | OECD study “ <i>Building Policy Coherence</i> ”: principal statements | 42 |
| 5.3 | Analytical framework for identifying approaches at different levels to improving policy coherence | 44 |
| 5.4 | Comments on the OECD’s general frame of reference | 49 |
| 6 | Other OECD countries’ efforts to enhance policy coherence | 51 |
| 6.1 | Preliminary comments | 51 |
| 6.2 | United Kingdom | 52 |
| 6.2.1 | Political will | 52 |
| 6.2.2 | Strategic concept | 53 |
| 6.2.3 | Information and analysis | 54 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 6.2.4 | Structure and process of policy coordination | 55 |
| 6.2.5 | Budget coordination | 55 |
| 6.2.6 | Administrative culture | 57 |
| 6.2.7 | Supplementary comments | 57 |
| 6.3 | Netherlands | 58 |
| 6.3.1 | An overview of the Dutch approach to policy coherence | 58 |
| 6.3.2 | Political will | 60 |
| 6.3.3 | Strategic conception | 62 |
| 6.3.4 | Information and analysis | 63 |
| 6.3.5 | Structure and process of policy coordination | 65 |
| 6.3.6 | Supplementary comments | 67 |
| 6.4 | Sweden | 68 |
| 6.5 | DAC recommendations for improving policy coherence in other countries | 71 |
| 6.6 | Conclusions | 74 |
| 7 | Germany's efforts to enhance policy coherence: progress in recent years and assessment by the DAC | 77 |
| 7.1 | Progress in recent years | 77 |
| 7.1.1 | Institutional changes | 77 |
| 7.1.2 | Substantive progress | 79 |
| 7.2 | The DAC's assessment of Germany's efforts to enhance policy coherence | 82 |
| 8 | Conclusions and recommendations for German development cooperation | 87 |
| 8.1 | Policy coherence as a complex management task | 87 |
| 8.2 | Starting position for further steps to improve coherence | 88 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 8.3 | The importance of political will and leadership | 89 |
| 8.4 | Increasing the political weight carried by development policy and improving policy coherence by means of a law on development policy? | 90 |
| 8.5 | Increasing strategic competence and the capacity for active coherence work | 94 |
| 8.5.1 | Further development of the development policy concept from the coherence viewpoint | 94 |
| 8.5.2 | Definition of a priority coherence agenda | 98 |
| 8.5.3 | Monitoring other policies | 100 |
| 8.5.4 | Prerequisites for effective coherence work in the BMZ | 104 |
| 8.5.5 | Mobilization of necessary expertise | 105 |
| 8.5.6 | Establishing a policy coherence unit for the systematic preparation, support and appraisal of coherence work | 107 |
| 8.6 | Arranging policy coordination and interdepartmental agreement | 108 |
| 8.6.1 | Process- versus structure-oriented approaches to the improvement of policy coherence | 108 |
| 8.6.2 | On the question of a development cabinet or a special state secretaries' committee for global development tasks | 109 |
| 8.6.3 | Optimizing the process of policy coordination and interdepartmental agreement | 111 |
| 8.6.4 | Function of the coherence talks | 112 |
| 8.6.5 | Interdepartmental handling of coherence problems | 113 |
| 8.6.6 | Promotion of a culture of cooperation rather than insistence on strictly defined areas of competence | 113 |
| 8.6.7 | The BMZ's use of the monitoring and coordinating function of the Federal Chancellor's Office | 115 |
| 8.7 | Mobilizing domestic support | 116 |
| 8.7.1 | Parliament | 116 |
| 8.7.2 | Non-governmental organizations | 117 |

| | | |
|-------|---------------------------|------------|
| 8.7.3 | Public relations work | 119 |
| 8.8 | International cooperation | 119 |
| | Bibliography | 121 |

List of Boxes

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| Box 1: | Place of development policy and development cooperation in the system of objectives of global governance | 20 |
| Box 2: | Basic tools of coherence | 43 |
| Box 3: | Approaches to improving policy coherence (OECD) | 44 |
| Box 4: | Policy coherence for development – the Dutch approach | 58 |
| Box 5: | Functions of the Policy Coherence Unit (PCU) in the Dutch Foreign Ministry | 64 |
| Box 6: | DAC recommendations for enhancing policy coherence made in the peer reviews of development policies in 2002 and 2003 | 72 |
| Box 7: | Statements on Germany's efforts to enhance policy coherence made in the DAC's review report of 2001 | 82 |
| Box 8: | Advantages and disadvantages of specific laws on development policy: experience in the DAC member countries | 92 |
| Box 9: | Criteria for defining a priority coherence agenda | 99 |
| Box 10: | Monitoring of other policies from the viewpoint of coherence for development | 103 |
| Box 11: | Functioning division of labour between the BMZ and the BMU | 115 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|---|
| AP 2015 | Programme of Action 2015 for Poverty Reduction |
| AwZ | Committee for Economic Cooperation and Development of the German Parliament (<i>Ausschuss für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung</i>) |
| BAKS | Federal College for Security Studies (<i>Bundesakademie für Sicherheitspolitik</i>) |
| BMF | Federal Ministry of Finance (<i>Bundesministerium der Finanzen</i>) |
| BMI | Federal Ministry of the Interior (<i>Bundesministerium des Inneren</i>) |
| BMU | Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (<i>Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit</i>) |
| BMVEL | Federal Ministry of Consumer Protection, Food and Agriculture (<i>Bundesministerium für Verbraucherschutz, Ernährung und Landwirtschaft</i>) |
| BMWA | Federal Ministry of Economics and Labour (<i>Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Arbeit</i>) |
| BMWi | Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs (<i>Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Technologie</i>) |
| BMZ | Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (<i>Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung</i>) |
| BSR | Federal Security Council (<i>Bundessicherheitsrat</i>) |
| CDI | Commitment to Development Index |
| CDU | Christian Democratic Union (<i>Christlich-Demokratische Union</i>) |
| CIDA | Canadian International Development Agency |
| CIS | Commonwealth of Independent States |
| CFSP | Common Foreign and Security Policy (EU) |
| CSU | Christian Social Union (<i>Christlich-Soziale Union</i>) |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee (OECD) |
| DANIDA | Danish International Development Agency |
| DFAIT | Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (Canada) |
| DFID | Department for International Development (United Kingdom) |
| DGIS | Directorate-General for International Cooperation (Netherlands) |

| | |
|---------|---|
| DIA | Developmental impact assessment |
| EC | European Community |
| EGDI | Expert Group on Development Issues (Sweden) |
| EIA | Environmental impact assessment |
| EU | European Union |
| FDP | Liberal Democratic Party (<i>Freie Demokratische Partei</i>) |
| GDI | German Development Institute (<i>Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik</i>) |
| GGO | Joint Rules of Procedure of the Federal Ministries (<i>Gemeinsame Geschäftsordnung der Bundesministerien</i>) |
| GKKE | Joint Conference Church and Development (<i>Gemeinsame Konferenz Kirche und Entwicklung</i>) |
| Globkom | Commission instructed by the Swedish government in 1999 to examine Sweden's policy for global development |
| GO BReg | Rules of Procedure of the Federal Government (<i>Geschäftsordnung der Bundesregierung</i>) |
| G8 | Group of Eight Nations (seven leading industrialized countries + Russia) |
| GTZ | German Agency for Technical Cooperation (<i>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit</i>) |
| HIPC | Heavily indebted poor countries |
| IMF | International Monetary Fund |
| IWGD | Inter-departmental Working-group on Development |
| LLDCs | Least developed countries |
| MD | Millennium Declaration |
| MDG(s) | Millennium Development Goal(s) |
| MFA | Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Netherlands) |
| NGO | Non-governmental organizations |
| NL | Netherlands |
| ODA | Official development assistance |
| ODA | Overseas Development Administration (United Kingdom) |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| PCU | Policy Coherence Unit (Netherlands) |
| PSA | Public Service Agreement (United Kingdom) |
| PUMA | Public Management Service (OECD) |

| | |
|-------|---|
| SPD | Social Democratic Party of Germany (<i>Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands</i>) |
| TRIPS | Trade-related intellectual property rights |
| UK | United Kingdom |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNCED | United Nations Conference on Environment and Development |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| WTO | World Trade Organization |

Summary

1 The concept of “policy coherence for development”

Policy coherence for development means, as a first definition, the absence of incoherences, which occur when other policies deliberately or accidentally impair the effects of development policy or run counter to its intentions. A second, more ambitious definition sees policy coherence as the interaction of all policies that are relevant in the given context with a view to the achievement of overriding development objectives.

2 Justifying the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development

The goal of enhancing policy coherence for development can be justified in three ways. The “negative” justification is based on a number of incoherences observed in past years (owing, for example, to the EU’s trade, agricultural and fisheries policies). The strategic justification sees policy coherence as a task for global governance, i.e. efforts actively to shape globalization. The substantive-programmatic justification results from the demand for sustainable development as the supreme guiding concept of global governance, which was defined in more precise terms through the specification of important objectives at the world conferences of the 1990s and in the Millennium Declaration adopted by the international community in September 2000 and calls for all policies to share responsibility. The most concrete objectives formulated are to be found in the section of the Millennium Declaration entitled “Development and poverty eradication” in the form of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The goal of enhancing policy coherence for development is thus a legitimate one and indeed ranks as an overriding objective. Nonetheless, it is subject to certain limits. Firstly, development policy is but one part, albeit an important part, of global structural policy, which is committed to the fundamental development goals reaffirmed in the Millennium Declaration. Other policies, too, must contribute and provide appropriate conceptual answers. Secondly, for several reasons (see Chapter 4) development policy

does not by any means already have all the answers to the question: when do other policies act coherently with development policy? Thirdly, other policies, too, pursue overriding objectives, such as consumer protection, environmental protection or security interests, which must be taken into account by all policies, including therefore development policy. There is, however, no preordained hierarchy of the various overriding objectives. In this context it is necessary rather to spell out the various systems of objectives and to bring about a consensus on the priorities in each specific case.

3 The German Government's recognition of the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development at national and international level

The goal of enhancing policy coherence for development has been endorsed not only by the BMZ: the Federal German Government, too, has explicitly recognized it at national level, primarily in its Programme of Action 2015 for Poverty Reduction (AP 2015), at EU level (policy coherence for development is demanded in the Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties, of which Germany is a co-signatory), in the OECD (statements to this effect by the Council of Ministers and the Development Assistance Committee/DAC) and in the UN context (the Millennium Declaration, the WTO Ministerial Declaration in Doha in 2001, the Monterrey Consensus in 2002, the Declaration of the World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg in 2002).

4 Causes of policy incoherences and plea for a realistic understanding of coherence

Policy incoherences have a number of causes, which can be assigned to four areas: (i) the area of societal and political norms, (ii) the area of political decision-making (divergences of political interests at national and EU level, added complexity of political decision-making processes as a consequence of globalization and decentralization, weakness of development policy in the play of political forces), (iii) the area of policy formulation and coordination (shortcomings in policy formulation and in the structure and process of policy coordination, shortages of information), (iv) the

conceptual area (increasing complexity of the development agenda, knowledge gaps, complexity of the development process per se). Perfect policy coherence is therefore possible neither in theory nor in practice.

Against this background, the goal – feasible in principle, though possibly difficult to achieve politically in specific cases – should be both to overcome manifest incoherences and progressively to improve coherence by means of a more accurate analysis of the interaction among different policies that influence development in partner countries and globally, through the increased integration of aspects of coherence for development into other policies and through the mobilization of political support for greater coherence with a view to the achievement of such overriding objectives as that of halving poverty by 2015. Efforts to enhance coherence are not politically immune to setbacks. If coherence cannot be enhanced, it is all the more important to recognize incoherences and to minimize their costs as far as possible. This calls for careful analysis and information.

5 Institutional approaches to enhancing policy coherence: general frame of reference

The general question, i.e. one not related to specific incoherences, about ways to improve policy coherence has been slow to attract attention in the debate on coherence for development. In the mid-1990s the OECD drew from its member countries' experience in the field of policy coherence a number of conclusions which were published as *“Building Policy Coherence. Tools and Tensions”* and remain the most detailed frame of reference to date. Although it was established without any explicit reference to the debate on policy coherence for development, it can certainly be used in that context. It identifies numerous starting-points for improving coherence at different levels (political leadership, strategy formulation, analysis and information, structure and process of policy coordination, administrative culture).

The OECD frame of reference, which was developed from the perspective of public administration, must, however, include the political arena in which government action is taken, i.e. such actors as parliaments, interest groups, non-governmental organizations and the media, which have, or seek to have, a major influence on a government's political will.

6 Other OECD countries' efforts to enhance policy coherence

According to information obtained from the DAC Secretariat, efforts to improve policy coherence for development are comparatively advanced in four OECD countries. Besides Germany, they are the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden. The coherence efforts of the latter three countries are characterized by several basic elements:

(i) a marked commitment of the ministers responsible for development policy to greater coherence, (ii) cabinet ranking of development policy, (iii) strategic competence (detailed conceptual justification of the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development and identification of specific needs with regard to individual policies), (iv) limited importance attached to the question of which government departments have or need to have formal responsibility in areas under discussion in work on coherence for development, (v) proactive work on coherence by the ministries or divisions responsible for development policy, (vi) interministerial networking and joint analysis of coherence issues, especially at desk-officer level, (vii) intensive analytical work and dissemination of information. These findings are confirmed by an appraisal of the recommendations addressed to nine other OECD countries by the DAC in 2002 and 2003 as part of its aid reviews with a view to their increasing their efforts to improve coherence for development.

7 Germany's efforts to enhance policy coherence: progress in recent years and assessment by the DAC

In recent years there have been a number of institutional and substantive initiatives to achieve greater coherence. The BMZ became a member of the Federal Security Council in 1998, took charge of the EU's development policy and of the TRANSFORM programme in the same year and, as a result of the amendment of the Joint Rules of Procedure of the Federal Ministries (2000), was granted an extended right to scrutinize other departments' draft legislation for compliance with development policy. The substantive initiatives include the debt relief initiative launched at the 1999 G8 summit, the amendment of the arms export principles (2000), the

Comprehensive Concept and Action Plan for Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building (2000 and 2004 respectively), the Programme of Action 2015 for Poverty Reduction (2001), the guidelines on the consideration of development aspects in the allocation of export credit insurance (2001) and the commitment entered into at the European Council in March 2002 to increase the German ODA/GNI ratio to 0.33 % by 2006.

The DAC's most recent peer review of German development cooperation, in 2001, acknowledged in particular the explicit political commitment not only by the BMZ but by the German Government as a whole to the need for improved policy coherence for development, the justification and enshrinement of the goal of enhancing coherence for development in strategy documents (especially the AP 2015), Germany's commitment at international level to the promotion of policy coherence (e.g. the HIPC initiative, liberalization of access to the EU market for LLDCs), the fact that Germany has a separate development cooperation ministry and a development cooperation minister in the cabinet, the BMZ's increased involvement in the Hermes Export Guarantee Committee since 1998 and (for the first time) in the Federal Security Council and the BMZ's awareness of the importance of political support from actors outside the government (e.g. NGOs) for the efforts to enhance coherence.

However, the peer review also pointed out that, in view of divergent interests, influential interest groups, domestic constraints and the BMZ's limited political base, the improvement of coherence would require sustained political commitment. The other recommendations concerned the following issues: submission of the implementation plan announced in the AP 2015 and operationalization of the programme, development of the analytical capacity needed by the BMZ to carry out the mandate associated with the programme of action (including the provision and training of the staff required for this purpose), evaluation of the application of the guidelines on the granting of export guarantees, which were amended in 2001 *inter alia* to reflect development aspects, and intensive public relations work to generate the support needed for the implementation of the Programme of Action 2015.

8 Conclusions and recommendations for German development cooperation

8.1 Policy coherence as a complex management task

Improving policy coherence for development is a complex (i.e. political, conceptual/strategic, substantive/analytical, structural, procedural and administrative) management task subject to special restrictions (limited influence of development policy compared to other policies, considerable need for information in view of the wide range of subjects covered by the coherence agenda and the BMZ's shortage of staff while its tasks multiply).

8.2 Starting position for further steps to improve coherence

The comparison with other donor countries, the DAC's assessment of Germany's efforts to enhance coherence and the positive experience referred to by those interviewed in the BMZ show that quite some progress has already been made towards enhanced coherence. Despite the problems that exist, the starting conditions for further improvements are therefore favourable.

The favourable starting conditions include: the Federal Government's recognition of the goal of enhancing coherence for development, the existence of an independent BMZ represented at cabinet level, the awareness at the BMZ's executive and working levels of the need for improved policy coherence, a conceptual framework that sets the direction to be followed in enhancing coherence for development and explicitly refers to the shared responsibility of other policies, and practical experience in work to enhance coherence at the various levels. Advantage must be taken of these starting conditions in the efforts to further enhance coherence for development.

8.3 The importance of political will and leadership

The experience of the forerunners in efforts to enhance coherence (the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden) and Germany's experience

in recent years show that progress towards coherence for development depends to a considerable extent on the political weight carried by and the commitment of the member of the cabinet responsible for development policy. If the political will needed for progress in enhancing coherence for development is to be generated, the Federal Chancellor's support must also be obtained when important issues with a tendency to be controversial arise. This requires both the right feel for situations in which such support seems promising and prudent political management which, for example, takes advantage of a favourable moment (such as a prominent international conference), wins allies in the cabinet and possibly at EU level and, not least, also makes it clear that the BMZ will actively support progress towards coherence.

8.4 Increasing the political weight carried by development policy and improving coherence by means of a law on development policy?

Like half the DAC members, Germany does not have a law on development policy as such. It has repeatedly been urged to increase the political weight carried by development policy, to expand its role as a cross-section task of all policies and thus to step up the call to enhance coherence for development by passing a separate law on development policy.

Development policy would, however, be strengthened by a law only if it did not otherwise have any long-term political foundations and its fundamental objectives were in danger of being repeatedly altered or made subject to other objectives when governments changed or coalitions were formed. A law might, moreover, facilitate efforts to enhance coherence for development if the cross-cutting nature of the development policy and the responsibility shared by other policies were not yet politically established elsewhere. Neither assumption is true, however.

Although a law might still reaffirm the goal of enhancing coherence for development, it could not prescribe implementation since that requires substantive reasoning and political negotiation. For practical progress towards coherence, a separate law for development policy is not therefore a prerequisite.

8.5 Increasing strategic competence and the capacity for active coherence work

Sustained progress towards coherence calls for an increase in the BMZ's strategic competence and capacity for active coherence work. To this end, the study proposes measures in six areas: (i) further specification of the concepts of development policy from the viewpoint of coherence (elaboration of a concept for the German contribution to the achievement of the MDGs; further specification of the areas of action of the AP 2015; reflection of coherence aspects in the BMZ's sectoral, cross-sectoral and country concepts); (ii) definition of a priority coherence agenda (criteria: relevance of the issues, political feasibility, temporal prioritization) with an indication of the objective (intended effect), result (output) and necessary approach; (iii) monitoring of other policies (the subject of various procedural proposals); (iv) improvement of the conditions for effective coherence work in the BMZ (ensuring adequate professional competence, time, staff continuity and manpower capacity; coherence management appropriate to the definition and processing of the priority coherence agenda and ongoing monitoring of other policies); (v) mobilization outside the BMZ of the necessary expertise on the impact of other policies on development and effective processing of this expertise in the BMZ; (vi) formation of a task force for the systematic preparation, support and appraisal of coherence work.

8.6 Arranging policy coordination and interdepartmental agreement

In the debate on German development policy it has repeatedly been proposed that coherence for development should be improved by means of new structures (a "development cabinet" or a special committee of state secretaries to consider global issues). There is, however, no lack of fora for interdepartmental coordination and agreement (besides the Federal Security Council and the Hermes Export Guarantee Committee, regular meetings of permanent and parliamentary secretaries and at lower levels). It is more a question of optimizing the process of policy coordination and interministerial agreement.

Important elements of process optimization are: (i) continuation of the

BMZ's coherence discussions with other departments, (ii) definition of a priority agenda on coherence for development, (iii) ongoing monitoring of other policies from the viewpoint of coherence for development, (iv) consideration of coherence problems identified by the previous three steps with the departments concerned with the aim of finding a solution that is as coherent as possible with development policy, (v) promotion of a culture of cooperation rather than insistence on strictly defined areas of competence, (vi) use by the BMZ of the monitoring function of the Chancellor's Office with respect to the implementation of the AP 2015, since the AP 2015 was adopted by the cabinet.

According to those interviewed, the BMZ can make a major contribution to progress towards coherence if it (i) acts competently, (ii) offers other government departments expertise and sound arguments, (iii) not only backs up but also actively emphasizes its concerns, (iv) has the support of the BMZ's minister and her deputies in this, i.e. raises coherence issues at political level with commitment, and (v) where possible and necessary, mobilizes political support. This assessment is confirmed by the experience of coherence work in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

8.7 Mobilizing domestic support

Possible allies in work to enhance coherence for development are parliament, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the public. Contacts with them should therefore be nurtured and used. Parliament is being made aware of coherence for development (e.g. Commission of Inquiry into the Globalization of the World Economy, the reports to the *Bundestag* on the Federal Government's development policy, statements by the BMZ minister in parliamentary debates), but this is an ongoing task. Important targets are the parliamentary committees, the working parties on development cooperation of the political parties represented in the *Bundestag* and, not least, the rapporteurs on the BMZ budget in the budget committee.

Development NGOs have repeatedly voiced constructive criticism of the BMZ's efforts to enhance coherence. It is therefore important for the BMZ to examine and use the information provided by NGOs, to address coherence issues in the dialogue with NGOs and, not least, to use and support the significant role played by NGOs in public relations work in the devel-

opment field by providing information (e.g. the BMZ's participation in debates and discussion circles organized by NGOs). Cooperating with NGOs in this way does, however, have transaction costs, which must be borne in mind. They can be reduced by fostering the sometimes well-established cooperation with reputable NGOs, i.e. those with sound arguments, and by involving the proposed coherence task force in the management of NGO-related coherence work. Informing and educating the public about development and coherence issues is an important aspect of the efforts to enhance coherence. The BMZ has already taken numerous steps in this direction, not least as part of the AP 2015 campaign (e.g. by setting up the 2015 Dialogue Forum). Similarly, if Germany is to contribute to the achievement of the MDGs, the public must be made more aware of them.

8.8 International cooperation

A considerable amount of coherence work concerns policies and measures on which decisions are taken at EU or international level, where, in other words, the BMZ or the Federal Government is not the sole actor. International cooperation with like-minded countries is therefore important. The BMZ has already engaged in such cooperation on many occasions, sometimes with the support of implementing institutions, and should continue to do so.

Possible levels are the governments in EU Councils of Ministers or at international negotiations (e.g. G8, UN, international financial institutions, OECD), ministers responsible for development policy (EU, DAC High Level Meetings, Utstein Group), directors-general (EU, DAC Senior Level Meetings), directors, division heads and desk officers (networking), coherence commissioners (where they exist) and, not least, academic advisory groups and research institutes.

1 The concept of “policy coherence for development”

The term “policy coherence” is used in two senses in the following.¹ On the negative side, it means the absence of incoherences, i.e. of inconsistencies between and the mutual impairment of different policies.² On the positive side, it means the interaction of policies with a view to achieving overriding objectives.³

Policy coherence is considered desirable for government action because deficient coherence may lead to ineffectiveness (failure to achieve objectives), inefficiency (waste of scarce resources) and the loss of credibility of policies. Despite its desirability, policy coherence is, however, subject to limits (explained in Chapter 4), which call for a realistic understanding of coherence.

In the present development policy context the term is defined as follows:⁴

- The *subject-matter* is the relationship between development policy and other policies pursued by Germany or the industrialized countries which also influence development in the partner countries and global development (external or horizontal coherence). Thus it is not a question either of coherence within development policy, i.e. the consistency of its objectives, conceptions, instruments, programmes and projects (internal or vertical coherence) or of coherence among the donor countries’ development policies (a task for donor coordination)⁵ or of coherence between development policy and the partner

1 There is no uniform definition of policy coherence either in the academic or in the development debate. For various definitions see *inter alia* Forster / Stokke (1999a, 2–3 and 1999b, 19–24); Hydén (1999, 58–63); Hoebink (1999, 329–336); Picciotto (2005, 10).

2 Sometimes known as policy consistency: “*Policy consistency means (...) avoiding policies that conflict with reaching for a given policy objective, in this case international poverty reduction.*” OECD/DAC (2001a, 104).

3 In some cases only this dimension is known as policy coherence: “*Policy coherence goes further [than policy consistency; G.A.]; it involves the systematic promotion of mutually reinforcing policy action across government departments and agencies creating synergies towards achieving the defined objective.*” OECD/DAC (2001a, 104).

4 See Ashoff (1999, 129).

5 Donor coordination is a separate item on the international agenda. Important signposts in this context are the 2003 DAC recommendations “*Harmonising Donor Practices for*

countries' policies (a matter for policy dialogue or for alignment, i.e. the integration of donor contributions into the partners' priorities and strategies).⁶

- The aim is greater development orientation⁷ of all relevant policies. In the international debate this is referred to as “policy coherence for development”.⁸ The goal of enhancing coherence is formulated from the viewpoint of development policy or overriding development objectives; it is not determined by the agendas of other policies to which development policy should subordinate itself. This goal is justified in Chapter 2.
- *Definition:* In line with the explanation given above, policy coherence from the development viewpoint means, as a first definition, the absence of incoherences, which occur when other policies deliberately or accidentally impair the effects of development policy or run counter to its intentions. A second and more ambitious definition sees policy coherence as support for development policy from other policies or as the interaction of all policies that are relevant in the given context with a view to achieving overriding development objectives.⁹
- *Further explanation:* Policy coherence is not synonymous with policy coordination. Incoherence is not bound to be present where coordina-

Effective Aid Delivery”, see OECD/DAC (2003a), and the 2003 Rome Declaration on Harmonisation. For an overview of the subject of donor coordination see Ashoff (2004).

- 6 The need for alignment follows from the principles of “helping developing countries to help themselves” (or in more up-to-date language: “putting the partner country in the driver's seat”) and the partners' ownership. Accordingly, development cooperation can only ever comprise donors' contributions to the partners' own efforts. See the 2005 *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability*.
- 7 Other terms used in this context are “development-friendliness” and “commitment to development”. A current example is the Commitment to Development Index (CDI) developed by the Center for Global Development (Washington). See Birdsall / Roodman (2003).
- 8 See, for example, OECD/DAC (2002, Chapter II). Other terms used are “developmental coherence”, as in OECD (1999, Part II), and “development coherence of rich countries' policies”, as in OECD Development Centre (2003, 1).
- 9 Similarly, McLean Hilker (2004, 5): “*Policy Coherence for Development means working to ensure that the objectives and results of a government's (or institution's) development policies are not undermined by other policies of that government (or institution), which impact on developing countries, and that these other policies support development objectives where feasible.*”

tion is absent or coordination problems occur, these often being due to differences of opinion on substance or responsibilities.¹⁰ A lack of coordination may or may not lead to policy incoherence. What is decisive is whether the effects of development policy are impaired by other policies owing to the lack of account taken of development policy objectives.¹¹ Although a lack of coordination among different policies often leads to inefficiencies (losses of information, delays, duplication of effort, waste of resources), it does not automatically endanger the effects of development policy. A decision on whether the absence of coordination actually leads to policy incoherence is possible in the final analysis only after an examination of each case, since the boundaries may be fluid in practice. Conversely, decisions which are intended to facilitate policy coherence may raise additional coordination problems.¹²

It should also be pointed out that the terms “development policy” and “development cooperation” are not synonymous. Development cooperation is a level of action of development policy. This is discussed in greater depth in Chapter 2.4 and Box 1.

-
- 10 There have been a number of coordination issues or problems between the BMZ and other government departments. In the relationship with the German Foreign Office they have included the following in recent years: the leadership of delegations to negotiations abroad or to international conferences, responsibility where commitments have been made to the security sector in developing countries, the division of labour between disaster relief provided by the Foreign Office and reconstruction aid provided by the BMZ, different assessments of the German position on certain countries (e.g. Iran, Cuba and North Korea). Between the BMZ and the Federal Finance Ministry (BMF) views differ, or have differed, for example, over the Tobin Tax, international insolvency law, German participation in budget financing and the threshold values for the BMF’s participation in decisions on financial and technical cooperation. The BMZ also sees a greater need for coordination as a result of the proliferation of operational development cooperation activities of other government departments (e.g. the Foreign Office and the Defence Ministry).
 - 11 For examples of such incoherences see Chapter 2.1.
 - 12 An example is the Netherlands’ incorporation of the previously separate office of the Minister for Development Cooperation into the Foreign Ministry in 1996. See Chapter 6.3.5 and footnote 136.

2 Justifying the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development

2.1 The “negative” justification: incoherences between development policy and other policies

The call for greater policy coherence for development has long been voiced and has its origins in numerous incoherences which mar, or have marred, the success of development cooperation. Other policies may impair the effects of development policy in two ways:

- In the first case, development objectives are eclipsed by the interests of other policies, with the result that inconsistencies may occur between the declared objectives and development cooperation in practice.¹³ The special feature here is the direct influence of other policies on development cooperation. Examples: eclipse of development cooperation by foreign policy, export promotion and/or labour market interests with repercussions, for instance, for the country allocation of development aid, the selection of projects or the conditions attached to aid (e.g. tying).
- In the second case, development cooperation is undertaken in accordance with its declared objectives, while other policies either directly impair its effects or run counter to its intentions. Examples:¹⁴ import restrictions particularly on agricultural but also on industrial products from developing countries; distortion of world agricultural markets due to the industrialized countries’ price support and export subsidy policies, with the result that world market prices are depressed and agriculture in many partner countries has to accept reduced export earnings and/or unfair competition from imports;¹⁵ fishery agreements that threaten coastal fishing in partner countries; approval of arms exports to developing countries where their domestic situation is marked by conflict or regional stability is at risk. These are, as it

13 At first glance this is a lack of internal coherence within development policy in the above sense. As, however, it is due to the influence of other policies, it is covered by the term used here, “external coherence”. See Ashoff (1999, 129 and 2002, 1 f.).

14 For a more detailed discussion see Ashoff (2002, 1–2).

15 The only developing countries to benefit from the industrialized countries’ export subsidy policies are those which, for structural reasons (climate, water shortages), continue to be net importers of agricultural products even at undistorted world market prices.

were, the classic and most frequently discussed types of incoherence from which development policy suffers.¹⁶

Various attempts have been made to quantify the costs or magnitude of policy incoherence. They either estimate the benefits lost to developing countries (owing, for example, to aid-tying¹⁷ or the industrialized countries' failure to liberalize imports¹⁸) or compare spending on a policy classed as incoherent (e.g. agricultural subsidies in the donor countries) with the level of development aid payments.¹⁹ Even though model calculations of, say, the cost of the failure to liberalize trade are based on assumptions which are worthy of consideration and therefore arrive, in some cases, at different conclusions, they are still useful for increasing awareness of the considerable relevance of policy incoherence.

The criticism levelled by the development community at the incoherences referred to above also grew in the 1990s because the substantial relative and, in some cases, absolute decline in official development assistance (ODA)²⁰ increased the pressure to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of development cooperation and, to this end, to ensure greater policy co-

16 Other areas of policy requiring attention from the viewpoint of coherence for development include foreign investment rules, science and technology transfer and migration. See OECD (2003).

17 The OECD refers to estimates according to which aid-tying increases the cost of goods and services provided in the context of development cooperation by 15 to 30 %. See OECD (2001).

18 The World Bank estimates the gain in the developing countries' earnings from complete import liberalization by the industrialized countries at US\$ 75bn and, with induced productivity increases included, at US\$ 124bn. See World Bank (2001, 167, 171). For earlier studies see OECD/DAC (1992, 45). An up-to-date overview of various studies of the effects of the OECD countries' agricultural policies on the developing countries is given by Matthews (2004).

19 The OECD countries paid their agricultural producers subsidies totalling US\$ 231bn in 2001. See OECD (2002a, 158). By comparison, the net ODA of the OECD countries in the same year amounted to US\$ 52.3bn. See OECD/DAC (2003b, 86).

20 Germany: decline in the ODA/GDP ratio from 0.41 % in 1990 to 0.26 % in 1999. See the BMZ's statistics at: <http://www.bmz.de/infotehk>. All DAC countries: decline in the ODA/GDP ratio from 0.33 % in 1990/91 to 0.22 % in 2000. See OECD/DAC (2003b, 259).

herence in order to reduce the impairment of development policy due to the adverse effects of other policies.²¹

2.2 The strategic justification: policy coherence as a response to globalization challenges and as a requirement of global governance

The call for greater policy coherence has acquired a new justification in view of globalization. Globalization, meaning “*rapid increase and intensification of cross-frontier societal interactions, linking national societies ever closer together in terms of space and time*”,²² presents opportunities, but also poses risks, and entails major challenges in both respects. Coping with them calls for efforts to achieve the political shaping of globalization, i.e. global governance.²³ An essential (though not the only) factor in this context is that the various domestic policies must interact more closely than they have done in the past.

The reason is that under the conditions of globalization virtually all policies, even those which originally were primarily inward-oriented, are increasingly acquiring an international dimension.²⁴ The traditional distinction between domestic and foreign policy, which has long been blurred,

21 See Ashoff (2002, 2).

22 Nohlen (2002, 181). In this a distinction is made between various dimensions and especially the economic, ecological, social, cultural and political dimensions.

23 For further consideration of the term “global governance” see Deutscher Bundestag (2002, 415–455).

24 “*Currently the federal ministries have 336 divisions occupied with international tasks, 281 of them with issues that also extend beyond ‘European domestic policy’.* By comparison, the Foreign Office has 74 divisions. It should also be noted that international tasks are performed at higher levels of the hierarchy (directorates-general, directorates). The line ministries take on many operational tasks relating to international cooperation: they include involvement in international organizations, bodies and regimes, attendance of international conferences and close relations with equivalent departments in other countries. For the world conferences of the 1990s the Foreign Office headed the German delegation on only one occasion (the Human Rights Conference in Vienna, 1993), the various line ministries performing this task in all other cases. Each line ministry has thus in fact become the ‘foreign ministry’ for the area of policy in which it operates.” Messner (2002, 10 f.).

especially in the course of European integration, has continued to lose its legitimacy.

Against this background, the Commission of Inquiry on the Globalization of the World Economy set up by the German Parliament (*Bundestag*) in December 1999 put forward the following recommendation in its final report of May 2002:²⁵

“The Federal Government’s ability to take action at international level is an essential prerequisite for the active shaping of globalization. It is closely linked to a high degree of coherence of all policies concerned with international issues. The Commission of Inquiry recommends the Federal Government to strengthen existing concepts for the achievement of greater coherence and to identify and implement more ambitious approaches.”

2.3 The substantive-programmatic justification: the guiding concept of sustainable development and the Millennium Declaration

Strictly speaking, the previous two justifications of the call for greater policy coherence give no indication of the direction which the goal of coherence will take. Although the incoherences that have been mentioned are regrettable in development terms, they are not necessarily so from the viewpoint of other policies, for which the cost-benefit ratio of incoherent policies may appear different. Nor does greater policy coherence as a requirement of global governance give any indication of the general direction to be taken or, therefore, of the contributions to be made by the various policies.

What right does the development policy have to demand greater development orientation of other policies? True to the motto that “coherence is not a one-way street”, it might conversely be expected of the development policy that it take account of other political objectives and so, for example, help to promote German exports and employment. The development policy is, after all, subject to cabinet discipline and, like all policies, to the

25 Recommendation 10–2; see Deutscher Bundestag (2002, 421).

requirement of the Constitution that it serve German interests.²⁶ In calling for greater coherence, is the development policy thus falling into a trap?

This is not the case if there are overriding objectives able to serve as a guideline for determining the contributions to be made by various policies to coherence. Considerable progress has been made in this respect.

- Globalization and the increasing cross-frontier, regional and global effects of economic, societal and political action which are associated with it have raised the fundamental question as to the ability of world society to survive in the future. Sustainable development, which is meant to ensure just this ability, has therefore become the supreme guiding principle of global governance,²⁷ from which a global shared responsibility of all policies ensues.
- The world conferences of the 1990s, such as the Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, the World Human Rights Conference in Vienna in 1993, the World Social Summit in Copenhagen in 1995 and the various follow-up conferences, specified the guiding principle of sustainable development and set internationally recognized objectives for the shaping of global development (e.g. ecological sustainability, respect for human rights) which all policies must take into account.
- The Millennium Declaration adopted by 189 States at the United Nations Millennium Summit in September 2000 sees the positive shaping of globalization as the main challenge for the international community²⁸ and, to this end, reaffirms or emphasizes for a number of important policy areas objectives previously adopted within the UN framework,²⁹ including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs),³⁰

26 Oath of office taken by every minister pursuant to Articles 64 and 56 of the Constitution.

27 *“The most important programmatic objective of a global governance policy is to give practical shape to social, ecological and economic sustainability (...).”* Deutscher Bundestag (2002, 419).

28 *“We believe that the central challenge we face today is to ensure that globalization becomes a positive force for all the world’s people.”* United Nations (2000, 2).

29 These policy areas are: *“peace, security, and disarmament”, “development and poverty reduction”, “protecting our common environment”, “human rights, democracy and good governance”, “protecting the vulnerable”, “meeting the special needs of Africa” and “strengthening the United Nations”.* See United Nations (2000).

which are the most detailed of objectives in terms of the situation sought, the time horizon, operationalization with the aid of indicators and the monitoring of goal achievement. The goals signify a joint, though differing responsibility for developing and industrialized countries. According to the Declaration, this includes shaping the global environment in such a way that it meets the needs of the developing countries and the countries in transition, a task primarily for the industrialized countries. MDG 8, “Develop a global partnership for development”, is more specific and provides, among other things, for better market access for the developing countries’ agricultural and industrial exports in the OECD countries, i.e. for trade and agricultural policies that are more coherent from the development viewpoint.

2.4 The system of objectives underlying the goal of enhancing coherence for development and its place in that system

The call for greater policy coherence for development thus has its legitimacy. To enable the scope of and limits to the goal of coherence for development to be more accurately defined, the system of objectives from which it is derived and in which it has its place must be explained. This system can be described with the aid of the Millennium Declaration and the basic statements on the German development policy made in the Eleventh Report on the Federal Government’s Development Policy, and is shown in Box 1. From this the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Development policy is part of global governance or global structural policy, which is committed to the overriding objective of safeguarding the global future and ensuring sustainable development. According to the Millennium Declaration, this overriding objective is multi-dimensional. It embraces, in particular, peace and security, development and poverty reduction, protection of the environment, human rights, democracy and good governance.

30 The MDGs are set out in the chapter of the Millennium Declaration entitled “*Development and poverty eradication*” and were operationalized in the report of the UN Secretariat on the implementation of the Declaration. See United Nations (2001).

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Box 1: Place of development policy and development cooperation in the system of objectives of global governance</p> | <p>Overriding objective: safeguarding the global future and ensuring sustainable development as a task for global governance <i>"We believe that the central challenge we face today is to ensure that globalization becomes a positive force for all the world's people."</i> <i>"Development policy makes a decisive contribution to safeguarding the global future and ensuring sustainable development."</i>^{***}</p> | | |
| <p>Essential policy areas for achieving the overriding objective, according to the Millennium Declaration (MD)^{**}^{***}</p> | <p>"Peace, security and disarmament"^{**} (Chapter II of the MD) (security policy)</p> | <p>"Development and poverty eradication"^{**} (Chapter III of the MD) (development policy)</p> <p>Specification: Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)</p> | <p>"Protecting our common environment"^{**} (Chapter IV of the MD) (global environment policy)</p> |
| | <p>Objective: Poverty reduction (<i>"Poverty reduction is an overarching task for German development policy too."</i>)^{**}</p> <p>Dimensions of the objective:^{**}</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Social justice: poverty-reducing framework conditions and social balance;</i> • <i>economic efficiency: poverty-oriented growth and economic cooperation;</i> • <i>political stability: peace, human rights and democracy, equal rights;</i> • <i>ecological balance: preservation of natural resources as the basis of life."</i> <p>Important areas of action:^{**}</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Reform of international structures through the shaping of the global environment and international rules;</i> • <i>improvement of structures in partner countries through development cooperation on the spot;</i>^{****} • <i>improvement of domestic structures (in Germany; G.A.) through information and coherence work."</i> | <p>"Human rights, democracy and good governance"^{**} (Chapter V of the MD) (human rights policy and promotion of democracy)</p> | |
| <p>*</p> | <p>UN Millennium Declaration (United Nations, 2000)</p> | | |
| <p>**</p> | <p>Eleventh Report on the Federal Government's Development Policy (BMZ, 2001a, 60 ff.)</p> | | |
| <p>***</p> | <p>The other chapters of the Millennium Declaration (VI <i>"Protecting the vulnerable"</i>; VII <i>"Meeting the special needs of Africa"</i>; VIII <i>"Strengthening the United Nations"</i>) can be subsumed conceptually under the four policy areas referred to here or draw conclusions for the UN. The area of <i>"Development and poverty eradication"</i> has been described in greater detail because it is at the centre of this study (not because it is more important than the other three policies).</p> | | |
| <p>****</p> | <p>Development cooperation is one part, i.e. one of the three levels of action, of development policy and not a synonym for it.</p> | | |

- Accordingly, the pursuit of the overriding objective is a task not only for development policy but also for security policy, for global environment policy and for human rights policy and the promotion of democracy. Here development policy has its place at the same level as the other policies.
- The overriding objective common to the four policy areas gives rise to reciprocal calls for coherence. From its understanding of the overriding objective, its contribution to the achievement of that objective and its experience, development policy can, and does, demand coherence from the other three policy areas, such as security policy.³¹ The Federal Government's "enlarged security concept", for example, also has an inherently development policy dimension.³² At the same time, however, development policy must face up to the demands for coherence from the other three policy areas. This calls for an agreement on the precise substance of the overriding objective, which is not only a conceptual matter but, in the final analysis, a question of defining interests and so a process of political negotiation.
- Examples of the integration of development policy into the complex system of objectives of security and development are the Federal Government's Comprehensive Concept on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building of 7 April 2000,³³ the Federal Government's Action Plan for Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building of 12 May 2004,³⁴ which is based on the Comprehensive Concept, and the European Security Strategy ("Solana Strategy") adopted by the European Council on 13 December 2003.³⁵ The basic idea is "no de-

31 In the logic of the hierarchy of objectives presented here this is, so to speak, the "first level" of the need for enhancing coherence for development.

32 See, for example, the Federal Government's Comprehensive Concept on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building of 7 April 2000: "*The starting point for crisis prevention, conflict resolution and post-conflict consolidation measures is an enlarged security concept that includes political, economic, ecological and social stability. This is founded on the respect of human rights, social justice, the rule of law, participatory decision-making, the protection of natural resources, development opportunities in all regions of the world and the use of peaceful conflict-resolution mechanisms.*" Bundesregierung (2000).

33 See Bundesregierung (2000).

34 See Bundesregierung (2004).

35 See European Council (2003).

velopment without security – no security without development.”³⁶ From this it follows that, to achieve security, development cooperation must interact with other civil and military instruments.³⁷

- The overarching task of development policy is the reduction of poverty. This objective has four basic dimensions (social justice, economic efficiency, political stability and ecological balance). In each of these dimensions development policy is, on the one hand, dependent on the other three policies referred to in the Millennium Declaration (e.g. no development without security) and, on the other hand, contributes to their efforts (e.g. contributions to conflict prevention and thus security).
- Although poverty reduction is the overarching task of development policy, it cannot be achieved, or can be achieved to only a limited degree, if other policies run counter to that objective. Just as poverty has multiple causes, other policies (e.g. trade, agricultural or migration policy) can contribute to an increase in poverty or to its reduction. Other policies accordingly have a shared responsibility which ensues, in the final analysis, from the overriding objective of safeguarding the global future. Poverty reduction is not therefore an obligation solely of development policy, but a cross-section task of many policies.³⁸
- Development policy has three levels of action: the international level (shaping of the global environment), the level of the partner countries (improvement of their structures through development cooperation) and the domestic level (educational and coherence work). Develop-

36 “Peace and security are prerequisites for development and prosperity. Conversely, peace and stability cannot be enduring without development.” Bundesregierung 2004, 1. “In much of the Third World, poverty and disease cause untold suffering and give rise to pressing security problems. (...) Security is a precondition of development. (...) A number of countries and regions are caught in a cycle of conflict, insecurity and poverty.” European Council (2003, 2).

37 “Civilian crisis and conflict management requires a comprehensive political strategy which is coordinated at national and international level and tailor-made for each individual situation. This strategy has to dovetail instruments from foreign, security, development, financial, economic, environment, cultural and legal policy fields.” Bundesregierung 2000. “The challenge now is to bring together the different instruments and capabilities: European assistance programmes and the European Development Fund, military and civilian capabilities from Member States and other instruments.” European Council (2003, 13).

38 In the hierarchy of objectives this is the “second level” of the need for enhancing coherence for development.

ment cooperation is not, then, synonymous with development policy, but one part of it and is understood as such in the present study.

- Responsibility for development policy in the Federal Government is not restricted to the BMZ. The overriding objective of safeguarding the global future in any case defines a general responsibility of the Federal Government, and especially of the four policy areas referred to in Box 1. But even development policy, as part of global structural policy, is, as mentioned above, dependent on coherent contributions from other policies. However, within the Federal Government BMZ is in charge of development policy.³⁹ Merely to complete the picture, it should be pointed out that development cooperation as defined above is not undertaken by the BMZ alone: various other departments and the *Länder* too make contributions to development cooperation in the form recognized as ODA by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC).
- The BMZ's core competence lies in the area of development policy in line with the place that policy occupies in the system of objectives of global structural policy, as shown in Box 1, its overarching task of poverty reduction, the four dimensions of its objectives and its three levels of action.

2.5 Development policy's limits in justifying its goal of enhancing policy coherence

From the system of objectives described above it follows, on the one hand, that development policy has two grounds for calling on other policies to improve coherence: in relation to the substantive definition of the overriding objective of safeguarding the global future and ensuring sustainable development and practical efforts to achieve that objective and in relation to the definition and achievement of its own overarching objective of reducing poverty. On the other hand, the definition and achievement of the overriding objective are not incumbent solely on development policy since at this level it is integrated into the efforts of the other policies. Although

³⁹ This is evident, for example, from the fact that the Reports to the *Bundestag* on the Federal Government's Development Policy and the Programme of Action 2015, as adopted by the Federal Cabinet, were drawn up by the BMZ and then agreed with the other government departments.

poverty reduction, too, is a priority, it is not a task solely for development policy: other policies can and must contribute.

The goal of enhancing policy coherence for development thus does not mean, for example, that development policy rises to the position of sole standard-setter for all other policies. Other grounds can be cited for this:

- As development policy does not have sole responsibility with respect either to the overriding objective or to its own overarching objective of reducing poverty, it does not have sole conceptual competence or even the power of definition when it comes to the achievement of the overriding objective or even of the poverty objective (or of the more precisely formulated MDGs). In line with their shared responsibility, other policies must also provide conceptual answers. However, given its explicit mission, particularly with regard to poverty reduction, and its experience, development policy has a special programmatic role to play in increasing the awareness of other policies of the need for greater coherence for development.
- Development policy does not by any means already have all the answers to whether, when and to what extent other policies are coherent with development policy. While, for reasons which are discussed in Chapter 4, this is not the case, it does mean for development policy the task of paying particular attention to the effects of other policies on development in partner countries and on global development with a view to demanding with substantive justification greater coherence from other policies. This is sometimes a difficult task.
- Every policy pursues its own objectives, which in democratically constituted, pluralist societies are the expression of different interests, all competing for a political majority. Hence the importance of the contention that the call for coherence for development is derived not only from objectives pursued by development policy as one of many policies, but from overriding development objectives. However, two aspects must be borne in mind in this context:
 - The overriding development objectives, as set out or reaffirmed in the Millennium Declaration, have not been formulated and operationalized to such an extent as to permit the deduction from them in each case of precise instructions for action under development policy, let alone precise demands for coherence addressed to other

policies.⁴⁰ If, however, development policy sees itself as the champion of the overriding development objectives and endeavours to formulate and operationalize them, it will surely tend to be perceived as one policy among others, in the face of which other policies may describe their respective objectives as being in principle just as legitimate.

- In some cases, other policies similarly put forward overriding objectives, such as environmental or consumer protection interests, which are to be borne in mind by all policies, even those which concern the developing countries, including, then, development policy.⁴¹ There is, however, no preordained hierarchy of the various overriding objectives. What rather needs to be done here is to spell out the respective systems of objectives and, in specific cases, to bring about a substantive and political consensus on the priorities.

For both reasons it should come as no surprise if other policies declare that their objectives cannot be simply subsumed under the development policy's objectives. In this case other policies need to be made more aware of the justification for and substance of the goal of enhancing coherence for development. What can and must be expected is that other policies see the

40 This is evident from the MDGs. While MDG 8 ("Develop a global partnership for development") lays down in Target 13 (tariff- and quota-free access for LLDC exports to the industrialized countries' markets) a precise prescription for trade policy, MDG 1 (halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015) does not include corresponding prescriptions for other policies.

41 Two examples can be given of this:

- The Federal Government's Consumer Protection Action Plan submitted in April 2003 under the responsibility of the Federal Ministry of Consumer Protection, Food and Agriculture (BMVEL) states in the introduction: "*With the Consumer Protection Action Plan the Federal Government systematically includes consumer policy aspects in all policy areas. (...) Consumer policy also has a global dimension. Policy is called upon here to create at all levels – national, EU-wide and international – an environment for a trend that takes due account of consumer interests.*" BMVEL (2003, 1, 2).
- According to the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe (Articles III-119 and III-120 of the consolidated version of 29 October 2004), environmental protection requirements and consumer protection requirements must be integrated (shall be taken into account) in(to) the definition and implementation of all policies of the European Union. See Conference of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States (2004).

partner countries' development opportunities and global development objectives as their *shared* responsibility and, in view of the many incoherences, take *greater* account of them than in the past. This calls for substantive persuasion and, ultimately, political negotiation. On the other hand, development policy must be prepared to consider claims of the validity of rival overriding objectives. One-sided demands for coherence by development policy would not be devoid of moral and political arrogance at this level.⁴²

3 The German Government's recognition of the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development at national and international level

The goal of enhancing policy coherence for development is not only justified, as has been explained: the German Government has also explicitly recognized it, at both national and international level.⁴³ What is important here is the recognition of this goal not only by the BMZ, even though it is part of the Federal Government, but by the Federal Government as a whole, i.e. at cabinet level, which concerns all policies. The emphasis is on this level in the following.⁴⁴

42 See Siebold (1998, 13).

43 Where the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development is enshrined in legal acts requiring ratification, such as the Treaty on the European Union, it has also been recognized by the German Parliament.

44 Under Article 65 of the German Constitution ("Basic Law"), each Federal Minister conducts the affairs of his own department independently and on his own responsibility (department principle). He does so, however, within the limits of the guidelines of policy laid down by the Federal Chancellor (Chancellor principle) and as a member of the Federal Government (cabinet principle; Article 62 of the Basic Law). Under section 19(1) of the Joint Rules of Procedure of the Federal Ministries, "*in matters affecting the remits of more than one Ministry, those Ministries will work together to ensure that the Federal Government speaks and acts consistently*" (BMI 2000). In the present context this means that, to the extent that the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development is pursued by the BMZ, it initially reflects the BMZ's departmental view and responsibility. On the other hand, the BMZ acts as part of the Federal Government and, especially in the case of decisions and statements at international level (as in the EU Council of Ministers responsible for development policy, in the OECD's Development Assistance Committee or in the UN framework), first comes to an agreement with the

3.1 National framework

The goal of enhancing policy coherence for development is endorsed not only by the BMZ in many ways, e.g. in interdepartmental discussions, statements by the BMZ's minister and her deputies, in parliamentary debates and in basic documents.⁴⁵ It has also been repeatedly and publicly reaffirmed by the Federal Government, particularly in:

- the Tenth Report to the Parliament (*Bundestag*) on the Federal Government's Development Policy, 1995,⁴⁶
- the Eleventh Report to the *Bundestag* on the Federal Government's Development Policy, 2001,⁴⁷
- the Federal Government's Programme of Action 2015 for Poverty Reduction (AP 2015) of 4 April 2001,⁴⁸

other departments. The BMZ's calls for policy coherence, particularly where they form part of international decisions and declarations relating to development, therefore reflect not only the BMZ's own view but also the opinion of the departments with which agreement has been reached. As, however, the subject of coherence concerns the inconsistencies that sometimes exist between development policy and other policies, the Federal Chancellor's or Federal Government's explicit recognition of the demand for policy coherence for development carries particular weight politically.

- 45 An example of a basic document is the BMZ's 1996 Development Policy Conception, which states in reference to development cooperation: "*As part of an overall policy, its success depends on its coherent interaction with other policies, such as the foreign policy, the external economic and trade policy, the finance policy and the environment and agricultural policy.*" BMZ (1996, 2).
- 46 "*Self-help [by the developing countries] is very strongly encouraged in many areas by a consistent, coherent overall policy pursued by the industrialized countries. (...) Parallel efforts in all policy areas that affect the developing countries are therefore needed. This is true, for example, of the security policy, the international economic and finance policy and the agricultural and environment policy.*" BMZ (1995, 47).
- 47 The Eleventh Report on the Federal Government's Development Policy devoted two sections to the subject of policy coherence (section 2.1.2.3: "Improving domestic structures through educational and coherence work", and section 2.2.12, "Domestic efforts to strengthen policy coherence for development"), stating inter alia: "*But the economic and societal situation and policies at home must also make sustainable development possible here and in the partner countries. The Federal Government is therefore committed to and is implementing an overall policy that is coherent with development policy.*" BMZ (2001a, 67 f.).
- 48 "*The German government advocates coherence between all policy fields with regard to the objective of poverty reduction and will work towards that goal at the European*

- the Federal Government's Sustainability Strategy for Germany, 2002.⁴⁹

It should also be pointed out that the agreement of 16 October 2002 on which the present ruling coalition is based sets out in the section entitled "Global justice and development cooperation" the Federal Government's intention to support the implementation of a number of reforms long demanded by development policy-makers with a view to enhancing policy coherence.⁵⁰

3.2 EU framework

The call for policy coherence for development was first set out in law in the Treaties of Maastricht (1992) and Amsterdam (1997) on European Union.⁵¹

*level, within the framework of the OECD and elsewhere." BMZ (2001b, II). "The German government will continue to be a strong advocate in the OECD of tackling the central task of poverty reduction as part of a coherent, and thus comprehensive, political approach which creates synergies, in particular, between the areas of environmental and agricultural policy, trade, science and technology and economic and financial policy. Within the EU, too, the German government is striving for Community trade and agricultural policies to be designed in a way that is conducive to development. It will call for coherence of all EU policy fields." *ibid.*, 7.*

- 49 "For the Federal Government, fighting poverty therefore constitutes an important part of its overall policy, which is directed towards world peace and future security." Bundesregierung (2002, 303).
- 50 Examples: improved market access for developing countries and elimination of unfair competition due to the industrialized countries' subsidization of exports to the countries of the South. Although the present coalition agreement, unlike its predecessor of 20 October 1998, does not contain an explicit declaration of intent to ensure policy coherence for development with other government departments, it does emphasize the need to reform the international economic order in many respects in order "to increase the development opportunities of all countries in the context of globalization and to reduce the risks of instability, social tensions and the waste of natural resources." See Koalitionsvertrag (2002) and Koalitionsvereinbarung (1998).
- 51 According to the Treaty of Maastricht (amended by the Treaty of Amsterdam) the EU is based on three pillars: the Treaty establishing the European Community (EC), the provisions of the common foreign and security policy (CFSP) of the Union (contained in the EU Treaty) and the provisions on justice and home affairs policy (also contained in the EU Treaty). The Treaty of Nice of December 2000 (entered into force on 1 February 2003) does not affect development policy.

“The Community shall take account of the objectives [of its development policy] in the policies that it implements which are likely to affect developing countries.” (Article 178 of the EC Treaty of Amsterdam)

This article formally applies only to the relationship between the development policy and other policies of the Community and not analogously to the EU’s Member States (which are, however, required by Article 10 of the EC Treaty to act in the Community’s best interests). Its wording is also rather reserved⁵² and not entirely unequivocal in the context of the EU Treaty since, besides the requirement of policy coherence for development under Article 178 of the EC Treaty, there is a general requirement of coherence for foreign policy under Article 3 of the EU Treaty, which also extends to development policy.⁵³ Nonetheless, Article 178 represents an important reference base, since a number of policies which are inconsistent with development policy are the Community’s formal responsibility (common commercial, agricultural and fisheries policies).⁵⁴

The Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe⁵⁵ (European Constitution) retains or indirectly further reinforces the requirement of policy coherence for development set out in the Treaty of Maastricht/Amsterdam. This is partly due to a position paper which, in May 2003, the development ministers of seven EU Member States, including Germany, addressed to the European Convention commissioned to draft the Constitu-

52 Article 6 of the EC Treaty of Amsterdam calls for policy coherence for the environment in clearer terms: *“Environmental protection requirements must be integrated into the definition and implementation of the Community policies and activities (...), in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development.”* This provision has been incorporated unchanged into the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe (Article III-119). See Conference of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States (2004).

53 *“The Union shall in particular ensure the consistency of its external activities as a whole in the context of its external relations, security, economic and development policies.”* Article 3 of the EU Treaty of Amsterdam.

54 The Council of Development Ministers and the EU Commission have repeatedly reaffirmed the requirement of policy coherence for development, an example being a joint statement issued in November 2000. See press release on the 2304th meeting of the EU Council of Ministers for Development of 20 November 2000, paragraph 39; <http://www.ue.eu.int/Newsroom>.

55 Consolidated version of 29 October 2004; Conference of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States (2004).

tion.⁵⁶ The paper emphasized the important role of development policy in the Union's foreign relations and called *inter alia* for the explicit inclusion in the text of the Constitution, as in the Treaties of Maastricht and Amsterdam, of the requirement of policy coherence for development.

Article III-316(1) of the European Constitution includes the following statement:

“Union development cooperation policy shall have as its primary objective the reduction and, in the long term, the eradication of poverty. The Union shall take account of the objectives of development cooperation in the policies that it implements which are likely to affect developing countries.”

This corresponds to the current Treaty of Amsterdam.

Like the Treaty of Amsterdam, the European Constitution contains a general requirement of policy coherence⁵⁷ and a requirement of policy coherence in the area of the Union's external action.⁵⁸ What is new, on the other hand, is the provision of the Constitution which states that *“Union policy in the field of development cooperation shall be conducted within the framework of the principles and objectives of the Union's external action.”* (Article III-316(1)).

56 European Convention (2003).

57 Article 3 of the EU Treaty of Amsterdam: *“The Union shall be served by a single institutional framework which shall ensure the consistency and the continuity of the activities carried out in order to attain its objectives (...).”* Article III-115 of the European Constitution: *“The Union shall ensure consistency between the policies and activities referred to in this Part (...).”*

58 *“The Union shall ensure consistency between the different areas of its external action and between these and its other policies.”* (Article III-292(3)). The term “the Union's external action” in the Constitution is new. The Treaty of Amsterdam did not have a single title for the Union's external action. The common foreign and security policy formed part of the EU Treaty, the common development policy part of the EC Treaty. The new Title V, “The Union's external action”, which forms part of Part III of the European Constitution, covers *inter alia* the common foreign and security policy (Chapter II), the common commercial policy (Chapter III) and cooperation with third countries and humanitarian aid (Chapter IV, Section 1 of which covers development cooperation) and sets out common objectives for the various areas of external action (Chapter I).

At first glance, this looks like a weakening of development cooperation from the viewpoint of policy coherence for development.⁵⁹ What should be borne in mind, however, is that, under the Constitution, unlike the Treaty of Amsterdam, the Union's external action would be subject to accurately defined objectives, including genuine development objectives.⁶⁰ In addition, the Constitution, unlike the Treaty of Maastricht/Amsterdam, includes development aspects among the Union's fundamental objectives.⁶¹ This means two things:

- The latent tension between Article 178 of the EC Treaty and Article 3 of the EU Treaty of Amsterdam acquires a more pronounced development connotation in the draft Constitution: although development policy forms part of the Union's external action, which is to be organized coherently, the definition of objectives of that external action has a distinct development slant.
- Development policy thus has in Article III-292(2) a reference base for demanding of the other areas of external action policy coherence to its advantage. It is not therefore a question of shielding development policy but, since it forms part of external action, of gearing the latter on the whole to development as far as possible. For this the draft Consti-

59 Analogous to the abolition of the Council of Development Ministers decided at the EU summit in Seville in 2002 and its integration into the Council for General Affairs and External Relations.

60 According to Article III-292(2), the objectives of the Union's external action include the following:

- “consolidate and support democracy, the rule of law, human rights and the principles of international law” (paragraph 2(b)),
- “foster the sustainable economic, social and environmental development of developing countries, with the primary aim of eradicating poverty” (paragraph 2(d)),
- “encourage the integration of all countries into the world economy, including through the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade” (paragraph 2(e)),
- “assist populations, countries and regions confronting natural or man-made disasters” (paragraph 2(g)).

61 Article I-3(4) (The Union's objectives) states: “In its relations with the wider world, the Union shall uphold and promote its values and interests. It shall contribute to peace, security, the sustainable development of the Earth, solidarity and mutual respect among peoples, free and fair trade, eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights (...).”

tution provides a better basis than the Treaty of Amsterdam. Taking advantage of it, however, is a political task.

3.3 OECD framework

The Federal Government has also endorsed the requirement of policy coherence for development in the OECD framework:

- in declarations by the OECD Council, which, at a whole series of annual meetings, has explicitly emphasized the need for greater coherence between the member countries' development and other policies,⁶²
- in the Development Assistance Committee (DAC),⁶³ where the member countries have been considering the subject in depth since the early 1990s and have explicitly reaffirmed the goal of policy coherence for development on many occasions, and especially:
 - at the High Level Meeting in December 1991,⁶⁴
 - in the 1996 document entitled “*Shaping the 21st Century: The Contribution of Development Cooperation*”, which describes policy coherence as a major responsibility of the donor countries,⁶⁵
 - in the DAC's 2001 Guidelines on Poverty Reduction, which contain a detailed section entitled “*Towards Policy Coherence for Poverty Reduction*” and in another subsection discuss institutional requirements for improving policy coherence.⁶⁶

62 See the communiqués on the annual meetings of 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2002. The 2002 communiqué contains a declaration entitled “*OECD Action for a Shared Development Agenda*”, which includes a section devoted to “*Encouraging policy coherence for development.*” OECD (2002b, 7).

63 Germany is represented in the DAC by the BMZ. However, as the documents and guidelines adopted at the DAC's High Level Meetings (minister or state secretary level) are previously agreed at meetings of the relevant government departments, they reflect more than just the BMZ's views.

64 The state of the discussion in the DAC at that time is described in detail in the 1992 annual report of the DAC Chairman. See OECD/DAC (1992, 5–6, 31–51).

65 See OECD/DAC (1996, 15).

66 See OECD/DAC (2001a, 74–93 and 108–109).

It should be noted that the member countries' implementation of the declarations of principles and guidelines adopted in the DAC is examined during the DAC's peer reviews.⁶⁷ The resulting reports have usually devoted one of the main chapters to the subject of policy coherence in recent years.

3.4 UN framework

Last but not least, the Federal Government has also endorsed the requirement of policy coherence for development in the UN framework in a number of important declarations, including:

- the Millennium Declaration adopted by the UN General Assembly on 18 September 2000, in which the UN members commit themselves to creating at both national and global level an environment geared to development and poverty reduction,⁶⁸
- the declaration adopted at the ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organization held in Doha in November 2001, which reaffirms that international trade can play a major role in promoting development and reducing poverty,⁶⁹

67 In regime theory terms the DAC may appear to be a weak actor because, although it sets standards (in the form of guidelines and the like) and reviews their implementation, it does not take any legally binding decisions or have any means of imposing sanctions to ensure compliance with its rules. The DAC is, however, the only organization to review all the member countries' development policies regularly and comprehensively. See also Forster / Stokke (1999b, 50). The term "regime" or "international regime" signifies an "*institutionalized form of standard- and rule-led conduct in the political management of conflicts or interdependence problems*"; a regime is constituted by principles, standards, rules, decision-making procedures and compliance with the rules. See Wolf (1994, 423) and Sprinz (2003).

68 "*We resolve therefore to create an environment – at the national and global levels alike – which is conducive to development and to the elimination of poverty.*" United Nations (2000, paragraph III.12). This general statement is then applied to such areas as the multilateral trade and financial system: "*We are committed to an open, equitable, rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory multilateral trade and financial system.*" *ibid*, paragraph III.13.

69 See World Trade Organization (2001, paragraph 2).

- the Monterrey *Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development* of 2002, which devotes a separate chapter to the subject of policy coherence,⁷⁰
- the declarations of the *World Summit on Sustainable Development* held in Johannesburg in 2002.⁷¹

4 Causes of policy incoherences and plea for a realistic understanding of coherence

There are many possible causes of policy incoherence, some having a particular impact on development policy. They can be assigned to four areas: the area of societal and political norms, the area of political decision-making, the area of policy formulation and coordination and the conceptual area.⁷²

4.1 Causes in the area of societal and political norms

At the beginning of this study it was said that policy coherence is desirable for government action to ensure the efficiency, effectiveness and credibility of policies. While this is true, it is not absolutely so, since there are competing values, respecting which may make policy coherence difficult.

“However, every country represents combinations and delicate balances of different interests, standards or norms. These norms include coherence, efficiency and effectiveness but also public participation, rights to local decision-making, moral beliefs, diversity, representation and competition etc. These norms are not necessarily integrated with the standard of coherence. And it is not preordained that coherence should be seen as the most important norm at all times. Therefore, the

70 Chapter F: “*Addressing systemic issues: enhancing the coherence and consistency of the international monetary, financial and trading systems in support of development.*” United Nations (2002a).

71 The Political Declaration states: “*We undertake to strengthen and improve governance at all levels for the effective implementation of Agenda 21, the Millennium development goals and the Plan of Implementation of the Summit.*” United Nations (2002b, 4, paragraph 30).

72 See Ashoff (1999, 131–134); OECD/PUMA (1996) and (2000); Mkandawire (2001).

pursuit of coherence should be recognised as only one quest among others, though a very important one."⁷³

4.2 Causes in the area of political decision-making

- *Divergences of political interests at national level:* Such divergences are a fact of life in any state, especially democracies, which are characterized *inter alia* by the free articulation of interests and rivalry among interest groups for influence over political majority decision-making.⁷⁴ The consequence is often policy incoherences as a result of divergent interests and political compromises. At a theoretical level the impossibility of perfect policy coherence is attributed *inter alia* to the Arrow paradox⁷⁵ and the dilemmas of collective action.⁷⁶

73 OECD/PUMA (2000, 3).

74 Dictatorships only appear to have an advantage in this respect. Although they may enforce a greater degree of policy coherence by suppressing the articulation of pluralist interests, such coherence reflects only the interests of the dictator or the ruling group (coherence is not an end in itself!) and does not comply with the guiding principle of development, which is to enlarge people's choices. Experience shows that most dictatorships have seriously impaired their countries' development opportunities. Thus, even if the articulation of pluralist interests is accompanied by certain policy incoherences, it is an important corrective in the political process. This is also reflected in the fact that not even conceptually perfect policy coherence is possible and that the way to greater coherence is, to some extent, a process of trial and error.

75 According to the Arrow paradox, it is impossible, given plausible assumptions, to aggregate the preferences of individuals or groups in society to form a totally consistent social welfare function. This would be possible only in a dictatorship which prescribed the social welfare function (the social ranking would then be identical to an individual preference, namely that of the dictator, which is inconsistent with the assumption of different individual preferences).

76 As consensus-building, avoidance of free-riding and effectiveness are major challenges for large organizations, a way out is sought in the formation of suborganizations or smaller organizations. Similarly, governments that have complex problems to deal with tend to make the complexity easier to handle by forming specialized decision-making bodies. "*Hence, the rationale of committees or departments with jurisdictions over specialized domains. But breaking out complex issues into manageable segments encourages a 'silo' approach to policy-making. As a result, coherence within a specialized group may be secured at the expense of incoherence across groups. This is such a frequent occurrence that policy coherence is often equated with a 'whole of government' approach.*" Picciotto (2005, 8).

- *More complex political decision-making processes as a consequence of globalization and decentralization:* Efforts to enhance policy coherence are made more difficult both by globalization, in the course of which developments in other countries or at international level impact on nation-states more rapidly and more directly than in the past and exert additional pressure on them for political action,⁷⁷ and by the fragmentation of political decision-making processes in federally structured states, such as the Federal Republic of Germany, or in centrally governed states that grant subnational levels (e.g. regions) more powers as they decentralize. National governments therefore need to take account of several levels when pursuing their political agendas and considering demands for policy coherence.⁷⁸
- *Divergent political interests at EU level:* The situation is further complicated by the fact that the EU is formally responsible for some policies, such as the foreign trade, agricultural and fisheries policies, i.e. they cannot be adjusted by an individual EU Member State, which may be well aware of a certain incoherence. The call for greater policy coherence therefore means that the governments of the EU Member States must bear in mind not only their national policies but also EU policies, for which they share responsibility.
- *Weakness of development policy in the political play of forces:* The above factors and the resulting possibility of incoherences occurring affect, in principle, all or, where the EU is concerned, the communitarized policies. An added factor relating specifically to development policy is that it tends to be weak in the political play of forces compared to other policies, since it is not backed by any powerful domestic interest groups. Development policy is therefore more likely to be confronted with incoherences than other policies because its objectives frequently do not correspond to short-term or immediate interests of the donor countries and in the domestic debate it may soon be forgotten that development cooperation is very much in the donors' overriding and long-term interests. Greater policy coherence from a development perspective therefore requires particular efforts to raise public awareness and to mobilize political support.

77 This is the mirror image of the process mentioned above of primarily inward-oriented policies increasingly taking on an international dimension.

78 "These developments compel governments to find better ways to manage multiple layers of policy making without losing sight of their own national policy agendas." OECD/PUMA (1996, 7).

- *Failure of partner countries to take countermeasures:* It is often assumed that partner countries are merely the victims of incoherent policies pursued by the industrialized countries, that, in other words, the latter are solely responsible for policy incoherence. However, policy incoherence has its equivalent in the partner countries in many cases. Some of these countries are well able to defend themselves against the donors' incoherent policies, for example, by protecting their agriculture against subsidized agricultural exports from the EU or the USA with countervailing duties.⁷⁹ This is obviously a question of different interests within the partner countries (in this case, the interest of the urban population in cheap foodstuffs as against the development opportunities of the rural population). Development policy-makers and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the donor countries should therefore raise the subject of policy coherence not only at home but also in the dialogue with the partner countries.

4.3 Causes in the area of policy formulation and coordination

- *Shortcomings in policy formulation:* Policies can be coherent only in respect of common overriding objectives which are the guide and yardstick for the interaction that is sought and themselves require longer-term, strategic perspectives and priorities for government action. The more the objectives of development policy form part of the strategic perspectives, the sooner it can demand coherence. The less concrete the perspectives, the more difficult it becomes to encourage and demand policy coherence for development.
- *Shortcomings in the structure and process of policy coordination:* The pursuit of as coherent an overall policy as possible is, in principle, the task of interdepartmental coordination under the responsibility of the head of government (in the German system of government, the Chancellor's right to set the broad lines of policy). The structure of policy coordination (e.g. the distribution of formal responsibilities, opportunities for the various government departments to participate, the coordinating role of the government's centre, or the Chancellor's

79 In the 1990s the West African countries reacted to the EU's subsidized beef exports in different ways. Senegal, for instance, imposed high tariffs on imports of frozen meat, while the Ivory Coast pursued a far more liberal import policy. See Brandt (1995, IV, 53).

Office in the German system, the number and powers of interdepartmental committees), the process of policy coordination (e.g. nature and intensity of interdepartmental coordination, exchange of information and/or staff between departments, monitoring of the effects of different policies) and the weight carried by and action taken under the development policy in this context may facilitate or impede policy coherence.

- *Information shortages*: Policy incoherence is partly due to the fact that available information on the substance and effects of different policies is not, not adequately or not promptly absorbed and processed by those concerned for the decisions that have to be taken.⁸⁰ An example of this is the earlier incoherence between the promotion by development policy of good governance in partner countries and the possibility that existed under German tax law until 1999 of deducting from tax bribes paid to foreign officials. This incoherence was long known to only a few insiders and was not disclosed to the public by non-governmental organizations until 1995.⁸¹ The procurement of information and the systematic use of available, but often scattered, information are therefore necessary preconditions of greater policy coherence.

4.4 Causes at conceptual level

- *Increasing complexity of the development agenda*:⁸² Today, in contrast to previous development decades, development policy pursues a whole range of objectives and amended strategies. The 2001 Eleventh Report on the Federal Government's Development Policy refers, for example, to four target dimensions of sustainable development: social justice, economic efficiency, political stability and ecological equilibrium.⁸³ With the proliferation of objectives, however, the possibility

80 This concerns information already available. There are also information shortages in the sense of a lack of analysis of the effects of other policies. This point is discussed under the heading of "knowledge gaps" in Chapter 4.4. The boundaries between the thus designated information shortages and knowledge gaps may be fluid.

81 See Ashoff (1999, 142–145).

82 See also Mkandawire (2001, 8 f.).

83 See BMZ (2001a, 62). The internationally recognized overriding objective of development cooperation (poverty reduction) has been specified as a consequence of the

of inconsistencies not only within development policy but also among the various policies also grows, because other policies can now have an impact not only on one development objective but on many objectives. Thus import liberalization by the industrialized countries may help to improve the partner countries' export opportunities and economic efficiency but worsen the ecological situation (through an increase in monocultures for export, for example) unless appropriate counteraction is taken. Equally, once coherent policies may later turn out to be incoherent when strategies are changed in development cooperation.⁸⁴

- *Knowledge gaps*: Incoherences such as that between development policy on the one hand and agricultural and fisheries policies on the other may be obvious. But often the effects of other policies on the development process (and vice versa) in the partner countries and at global level are far less visible and identifiable only with considerable effort. An example is immigration, the assessment of which is not so obvious from a development viewpoint and calls for a differentiated view to be taken.⁸⁵ Furthermore, industrialized countries' policies do not have a positive or negative impact on all developing countries alike, as can be seen from the current reform of the EU's sugar policy, which will be advantageous for big exporters like Brazil and disadvantageous for ACP countries that enjoy preferences under the current sugar policy. The monitoring of other policies and impact analysis in cases of supposed incoherence are therefore essential.

Millennium Declaration in the form of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

84 A simple example: if, as in the 1950s and 1960s, a development strategy geared primarily to promoting the urban industrial and service sector *inter alia* by means of low agricultural prices (intersectoral transfer of incomes to the detriment of agriculture) is pursued, world market prices of agricultural products kept artificially low and subsidized agricultural exports from the industrialized countries which enable the developing countries to import cheap agricultural products are nothing less than desirable in development terms. If, on the other hand, development cooperation promotes the improvement of food security in the partner countries by their own efforts, the same agricultural policy pursued by the industrialized countries proves to lack coherence for development.

85 See the analysis in Wiemann (2001) of the advantages and disadvantages for the developing countries and the countries in transition of the emigration of highly skilled workers encouraged by the Federal Government's Green Card initiative.

- *Complexity of the development process*: Even where the effects of other policies are consistently monitored, the main problem continues to be the complexity of socio-economic and political development, which frequently allows of no more than partial findings on the links between cause and effect, especially in the case of forecasts. What appears to be coherence or incoherence today may turn out differently in the future.

4.5 Conclusion: plea for a realistic understanding of coherence

The outline of the various possible causes of policy incoherence shows that efforts to improve coherence between development policy and other policies should not be based on the idea that perfect coherence can be achieved. It is not possible either in theory or in practice. This being the case, the goal – feasible in principle, though possibly difficult to achieve politically in specific cases – should be both to overcome manifest incoherences and progressively to improve coherence

- by means of a more accurate analysis of the interaction among different policies that influence development in partner countries and globally,
- through the increased integration of aspects of coherence for development into the formulation and implementation of other policies,
- through the mobilization of political support for greater coherence with a view to the achievement of overriding objectives such as the halving of poverty by 2015 and global environmental targets.

Efforts to improve coherence are undertaken against a background of tension between possibly competing societal and political norms (e.g. coherence versus participation) and competing overriding objectives,⁸⁶ viewed conceptually, they remain a process of trial and error and are not immune to setbacks in the political clash of differing interests. If perfect coherence cannot be achieved, it is all the more important to discuss the competing normative and political claims and interests, to disclose unavoidable inco-

86 See Chapter 2.5.

herences and to minimize their costs as far as possible. This calls for careful analysis and information.⁸⁷

5 Institutional approaches to enhancing policy coherence: general frame of reference

5.1 State of the debate

The debate on policy coherence for development has long focused on the substance, i.e. the effects of concrete incoherences, coupled with the demand that incoherent policies be adjusted and made more development-friendly. In contrast, the general question, i.e. one not related to specific incoherences, about ways to improve coherence long attracted barely any attention.⁸⁸

It is only in recent years that this has changed, as awareness of the need for coherent policies for the reasons given in Chapter 2 has grown, the donor countries have stepped up their efforts to improve coherence and, against the background of these two factors, interest in basic guidelines and generally applicable experience has risen. Comparisons have been made of various donors' attempts to improve coherence.⁸⁹ The OECD and DAC in particular have played a major role in distilling lessons learned and approaches to enhancing policy coherence.

- In the mid-1990s the OECD drew from its member countries' experience in the field of policy coherence a number of conclusions which

87 “(...) what matters most is not simply whether contrasted policies are being pursued, but whether they are being pursued knowingly, or unwittingly. If contradictory decisions must be made, the key concern is that they be made lucidly, deliberately, and on the basis of information and analysis that enable the decision takers to mitigate the costs of incoherence, as well as to explain their course of action in the context of the difficult choices they are confronted with. A high premium is therefore put on developing information systems and analytical capacities.” OECD/PUMA (1996, 9).

88 One exception is the 1992 annual report of the DAC chairman, which contains a brief chapter entitled “*The Politics of Policy Coherence*” with a few indications of ways to improve coherence. See OECD/DAC (1992, 46–48).

89 See Forster / Stokke (1999a, 5–12); OECD/DAC (2001a, 93–94); McLean Hilker (2004); Nicod (2004). For a comparison of different proposals in the German debate see Ashoff (1999, 165–173).

were published as “*Building Policy Coherence. Tools and Tensions*” and remain the most detailed frame of reference to date.⁹⁰ Although it was established without any explicit reference to the debate on coherence for development, it can certainly be used in that context and is briefly presented in the following in structured form because of its systematic nature.

- In 2001 the DAC added to its plea for greater coherence for development in the aforementioned poverty reduction guidelines brief indications (including a checklist) of how policy coherence can be improved.⁹¹
- In 2003 the DAC Secretariat launched a process aimed at drawing conclusions from DAC peer reviews, followed in 2004 by a workshop on institutional approaches to enhancing policy coherence. The results have been published under the title “*Policy Coherence for Development. Promoting Institutional Good Practices.*”⁹²

5.2 OECD study “*Building Policy Coherence*”: principal statements

The OECD study draws five main conclusions from its examination of coherence problems and experience in the member countries and then identifies basic “tools of coherence” (Box 2). The five conclusions are:⁹³

- There is a gap between the need for coherence and the capacity to achieve it.
- Governing in a democratic political system necessarily involves a degree of incoherence.
- No policy-making system can guarantee improved coherence.

90 OECD/PUMA (1996).

91 See OECD/DAC (2001a, 91–92, 104–106) Similarly, the OECD’s Public Management Service (PUMA) has pointed to the action needed to improve coherence with a view to the achievement of the goal of sustainable development. See OECD/PUMA (2002). They are based on a comparative study of experience in five OECD countries. See OECD (2002c).

92 See OECD (2005).

93 See OECD/PUMA (1996, 8–9).

Box 2: Basic tools of coherence

“The experience of OECD countries, distilled into a handful of practical lessons, has led to the identification of the following basic tools of coherence. These are organisational concepts which, translated into appropriate structures, processes and methods of work, have proved conducive to higher degrees of policy coherence in governments from different political and administrative traditions. Some may seem, at first glance, deceptively obvious. However, experience shows that successfully putting them into practice requires painstaking experimentation and careful adaptation to the legal, administrative and political requirements of each national system.

- *Commitment by the political leadership is a necessary precondition to coherence, and a tool to enhance it.*
- *Establishing a strategic policy framework helps ensure that individual policies are consistent with the government’s goals and priorities.*
- *Decision makers need advice based on a clear definition and good analysis of issues, with explicit indications of possible inconsistencies.*
- *The existence of a central overview and co-ordination capacity is essential to ensure horizontal consistency among policies.*
- *Mechanisms to anticipate, detect and resolve policy conflicts early in the process help identify inconsistencies and reduce incoherence.*
- *The decision-making process must be organised to achieve an effective reconciliation between policy priorities and budgetary imperatives.*
- *Implementation procedures and monitoring mechanisms must be designed to ensure that policies can be adjusted in the light of progress, new information, and changing circumstances.*
- *An administrative culture that promotes cross-sectoral cooperation and a systematic dialogue between different policy communities contributes to the strengthening of policy coherence.”*

Source: OECD/PUMA (1996), 10

- There are nevertheless good practices and “tools of coherence”. They include, in particular, a strong strategic capacity at the centre of government, the need for organizational flexibility and the need for effective information-gathering and processing systems.
- The most important instrument is informed political decision-making, not least as a means of making the implications and costs of unavoidable incoherences transparent.

5.3 Analytical framework for identifying approaches at different levels to improving policy coherence

The OECD study describes the basic tools for coherence in detail by referring to numerous approaches at various levels to improving policy coherence. The most important aspects are summarized in Box 3.

| Box 3: Approaches to improving policy coherence (OECD) | |
|---|---|
| Level | Description |
| Political leadership and the role of the centre | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Political leadership</i>: balance conflicting interests while striving to maintain a consistent line of action based on the government's agenda. • <i>Role of the centre (administrative leadership)</i>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – systematically monitor and evaluate the implications of new policy proposals for the overall coherence of the government agenda, – ensure that policy decisions, once made, are communicated to all concerned players, and implemented as intended by decision-makers; – the centre cannot impose implementation (principle of ministerial autonomy); – the centre can partly compensate for its lack of formal power to enforce implementation by carefully managing the preparatory phase of decision-making. |
| Strategic framework and priorities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Strategic planning capacity</i>: The centre must maintain a capacity to develop strategic perspectives and options, and to bring them to bear on shorter-term decision-making. • <i>Strategic framework</i>: By establishing a comprehensive set of goals and priorities, and ensuring that policy proposals come within its parameters, decision-makers are better able to pursue their common agenda more coherently. |
| Information and analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Informed decision-making – the most important tool of coherence</i>: Decision-makers need to know what their realistic options are, what inconsistencies result from their decisions, how the costs of inconsistencies can be |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>mitigated, and how they can explain the trade-offs they have to make.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A key test of decision-making:</i> Are contradictory decisions made knowingly or unwittingly? • <i>Dealing with the information overload:</i> The policy-making system must have the capacity to filter, interpret and prioritize information. That capacity depends largely on the analytical and presentational skills of the advisers. • <i>Translating information into analysis and options:</i> Decision-makers need: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – a clear definition and a good analysis of the issues, with explicit indications of known or possible inconsistencies with other policies, – an appreciation of what is <i>not</i> known about the issues at hand, and of the risks which the attending uncertainties might entail, – information on the views of actors within and outside the government who have an interest in the decision, – the assurance that the information and advice have been properly tested (e.g. by involving other interested actors in the development of policy proposals), – realistic options which take into account the objectives of the government of the day, as well as the wider and longer-term interests of society. |
| <p>Policy coordination structures</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Core executive:</i> typically the focal point for policy coordination and issues management; but relying heavily on the centre for coordination can create tensions, especially at a time when the prevailing ethos is decentralization. • <i>Council of ministers:</i> The challenge is to strengthen the capacity of the council to deal with cross-cutting issues, while preserving ministerial accountability. • <i>Committees of the council of ministers:</i> widely used to coordinate defined policy fields; but if cross-cutting issues overlap those policy fields, they will overlap the boundaries between the committees. • <i>Superministries:</i> While it is logical to locate similar |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>programmes within a single ministry, the coordination gains may be more apparent than real. There are limits to the number of policy conflicts that can be internalized in a large multisectoral ministry. Such a ministry can help integrate related policies in a more coherent framework, but it risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – reproducing on a smaller scale the coordination problems found in the government as a whole, – reducing the political accountability for policy making, to the extent that conflicts are resolved internally by ministry officials, rather than at the political level by ministers, – depriving the government of the creative tension that results from a measured degree of interministry policy competition. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Small, issue-specific ministries:</i> A large number of small ministries increases fragmentation and makes coordination problematic. Small ministries nevertheless provide flexible structures that can focus on specific problem areas or constituencies. They can thus obtain a more holistic view of the concerns in their problem area, and then help larger ministries adapt policies and programmes to their needs. • <i>Ministries centred on client groups or geographical areas:</i> Ministries of this type seem well suited to deal with cross-cutting issues, on the condition that, in addition to providing services to the target groups or regions, they can also ensure that services provided by other ministries are compatible. • <i>Lead ministries:</i> Line ministries can be given additional responsibilities to lead cross-cutting coordination efforts beyond their portfolio mandate. A possible drawback is that additional responsibilities can overload an already busy ministry. • <i>Interministerial committees and temporary task forces:</i> a flexible tool to approach cross-cutting issues especially when government is unsure about how to conceptualize a cross-cutting policy area, or when it is contemplating important policy reforms. • <i>Lateral mechanisms and matrix management:</i> flexible cross-linking arrangements that are organized around issues rather than around permanent functions and bring |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>together, from different policy fields, the staff needed to address a given issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Advantages: They bring together an array of skills and perspectives to bear on a problem and allow managers to recombine staff in different configurations, in order to stimulate creative problem-solving; – Costs: The system generates extra organizational work for managers, and weakens accountabilities for performance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Advisory committees</i>: fora that represent the interests of relevant actors from outside government and can help bring to light some cross-cutting aspects of policies that might otherwise have remained hidden. • <i>Coalition governments</i>: tend to magnify the political dimension of policy work; when ministers are from different political parties, there might be a need to improve interministry communications at the administrative level, and to establish special mechanisms at the centre. |
| <p>Policy coordination processes</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Structures, while important, cannot guarantee successful coordination</i>: To a greater degree than structures, the effectiveness of processes depends on the commitment of the decision-makers and managers to the goals of coordination. • <i>Resisting the temptation to restructure</i>: A common temptation, in order to solve policy coordination problems, is to seek structural solutions, e.g. by creating or dismantling ministries. The experience of countries increasingly seems to point to the limitations of those solutions because restructuring is disruptive and policy issues and their interlinkages change too rapidly to allow timely structural adaptations. • <i>Evaluation of policies</i>: can enhance coordination provided it is directed at complexes of programmes rather than at single programmes. • <i>Coordination comments</i>: rules and mechanisms that require ministers to circulate for comments any proposal they bring to the council of ministers. • <i>Using coordination processes to identify unresolved conflicts</i>: When a policy coordination system fails to forge a consensus among the concerned actors, it has in fact fulfilled the second of its key functions, which is to |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>identify issues that cannot be resolved through negotiation and compromise, and which must therefore be arbitrated at higher levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Arbitration of unresolved issues:</i> When contentious issues move up the levels of the hierarchy towards arbitration (by a special body, such as a select committee of ministers or a coalition council, or by the head of government), it is important to ensure that they are clearly defined and that the interests at stake are identified. • <i>Enhancing information flow:</i> Regular exchanges of information between centre and line, and among line ministries is of paramount importance to the achievement of consistency at every stage of policy development. • <i>Civil service network:</i> Civil service systems in which officials move more often among ministries are more likely to produce better policy coordination. Civil servants who have spent time in a variety of ministries have a better perception of the perspectives of other policy fields. • <i>Integrating multiple voices:</i> Powerful interest groups can distort the political process, simply because they are more vocal than the quieter majority. Governments need to manage the disparate pressures of interest groups in a way that helps to bring to light the interdependencies between different issues. |
| <p>Policy-budget coordination</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The budgetary process is a powerful tool of coherence.</i> It affects all sectors of activity, provides a cyclical opportunity to set political and strategic directions for the future, and plays a determining role in the definition of the government's economic and other policy priorities. • <i>Balancing the policy agenda and budgetary imperatives:</i> The improvement of policy coherence, especially in times of fiscal restraint, requires that the centre and the budget ministry collaborate closely in order to manage the relationship between policy proposals and their resource implications. • <i>Need to manage an inherently adversarial process:</i> The major interface in resource allocation processes takes place between the budget ministry and line ministries. It is an adversarial process which underscores the need for |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>mechanisms that systematically link the policy-making process to the budgetary process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Using the horizontal dimension of the budget:</i> An increasingly important issue, in the search for coherence, is how the budgetary process can be restructured to integrate the horizontal lines of policies. For example, in Australia, the budget was focused around a major policy statement on employment. It addressed all the linkages relating, for instance, to income support, education and training, industrial, trade and regional development policies. |
| <p>Administrative culture</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultation-oriented culture:</i> A predisposition to consult, and a willingness to resolve conflicts before they become contentious are essential tools for more coherent policy-making. • <i>Cooperative networking:</i> The capacity of officials to network can be enhanced through personnel management policies, designed, for example, to facilitate the movement of officials among ministries. • <i>Interdisciplinary meetings:</i> Bringing together officials from different policy fields to examine the interconnections between policies is an important way to foster a more cooperative administrative culture. • <i>Shared frameworks of understanding:</i> The languages used by different policy communities can constitute significant barriers to the development of coherent policies. Creating a shared language and framework of understanding is central to the development of a more cooperative administrative culture. |
| <p>Source: Compiled from OECD/PUMA (1996)</p> | |

5.4 Comments on the OECD’s general frame of reference

The OECD study has three advantages. Firstly, it is based not only on theoretical considerations but also on the member countries’ experience and is consequently closer to reality. Secondly, it provides a highly comprehensive overview of possible approaches, even if they are by no means all new, but are, as the study itself says, “deceptively obvious” in some cases. Thirdly, it refers to the advantages and disadvantages of a number of approaches, which need to be weighed up.

Worth noting is the considerable importance attached to the formulation of strategic objectives, the procurement and processing of information and the process of policy coordination. Similarly worth noting are the references to the fact that the structure of policy coordination (e.g. the calibre of government departments, distribution of responsibilities, formalized coordinating bodies and procedures), which is often first mentioned in the debate on ways to improve policy coherence, does not provide the key to greater policy coherence on its own, but depends heavily for its effectiveness on the political commitment of the decision-makers and on the process of policy coordination.

With regard to further deliberations the OECD study does, however, suffer from two major constraints:

- The recommendations focus on policy coherence primarily from the perspective of the centre of government (head of government, office of the head of government). This is plausible since the centre is *ex officio* responsible for ensuring policy coherence. The call for greater policy coherence for development, on the other hand, is usually voiced by the department responsible for development policy and not by the centre, and other departments and the centre first have to be persuaded of its advantages. The references contained in Box 3 must therefore be viewed from the perspective of a department responsible for development policy. They are no less relevant for this, but they tend to be more difficult to put into practice. As emphasized in Chapter 3, this is what makes it so important for the whole of government to recognize the goal of coherence for development.
- The study drawn up by the OECD's Public Management Service concentrates on policy management within the system of government and largely ignores the political arena in which government action is taken. Such actors as parliaments, parliamentary committees and political parties, interest groups, non-governmental organizations and the media, which have, or seek to have, a major influence on a government's political will, are considered no more than marginally, but they have to be taken into account because, depending on the context, they may be opponents or allies in efforts to achieve greater policy coherence.

6 Other OECD countries' efforts to enhance policy coherence

6.1 Preliminary comments

As mentioned in Chapter 3.3, the DAC has for some years devoted one of the main chapters of the reports on the reviews of its member countries' development cooperation to the subject of policy coherence. The DAC reports and the DAC Secretariat, which is involved in the reviews and draws up the reports, therefore represent important sources of information on other donor countries' efforts and experience in the coherence field. These sources have been analysed for this chapter.

Interviews with DAC Secretariat staff⁹⁴ have revealed that efforts to improve policy coherence for development are comparatively advanced in four countries, these being, in alphabetical order, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The following begins with a description of the efforts of the last three of these countries to enhance coherence (Chapters 6.2 to 6.4).⁹⁵ Their experience provides possible pointers for other countries.

To place the resulting guide frame on a broader basis, Chapter 6.5 then gathers together the recommendations for the improvement of coherence which the DAC review reports formulated for a further nine countries reviewed in 2003 and 2002.⁹⁶ The recommendations make it clear where the DAC sees the greatest need for action and so which aspects require particular attention.

94 Interviews conducted by the author on 30 and 31 January 2003.

95 In the case of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, the structure of the description is based on important categories of the framework presented in Box 3. As Sweden's efforts, on the other hand, still largely consist of a programme which has yet to be implemented, the categories of the framework are not yet sufficiently applicable.

96 The analysis concerns 2003 and 2002 for two reasons: firstly, they give a relatively up-to-date picture. Secondly, the chapters on coherence became more detailed in the review reports drawn up after the adoption of the DAC Guidelines on Poverty Reduction in April 2001, which, as mentioned above, consider the subject of policy coherence in some depth and include a checklist. In 2003 Luxembourg, Denmark, Finland, Ireland and Japan were reviewed, in 2002 Greece, Spain, the EU, Canada and the USA. The EU is excluded here since the coherence issues in its case are closely linked to the competence of the EU Member States.

Chapter 6.6 then identifies major features common to the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden and compares them to the DAC's recommendations to the other nine countries considered.

6.2 United Kingdom⁹⁷

Since the Labour Party took office in 1997, the British development policy has acquired a distinctly reform-oriented profile (e.g. poverty reduction as the overriding objective). Efforts to improve coherence between development cooperation and other policies play an essential role in this respect.

6.2.1 Political will

The Development Cooperation Minister who held office until early May 2003, Clare Short, gave the British development policy a distinct profile and political weight in the cabinet, outwardly (public) and inwardly (development cooperation administration). This was due to the strong support she enjoyed in the Labour Party, her close relationship with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown, her ability to form political alliances, her belief in development as such and, associated with this, her credibility in public and at the grass roots of development policy. She also saw her own and DFID's role essentially as that of advocating greater coherence of all government policy for development (until she resigned over Prime Minister Blair's policy on Iraq).

Another major factor was the upgrading of the Overseas Development Administration (ODA), previously part of the Foreign Office, to the rank of ministry, giving the Development Cooperation Minister a seat in the cabinet.

97 The following comments are based on interviews conducted by the author at the Department for International Development (DFID) on 15 May 2003, on the evaluation of extensive material available on DFID's website (<http://www.dfid.gov.uk>) and on OECD/DAC (2001b, I-45; I-51). See also Meyer (2003a).

6.2.2 Strategic concept

Of importance for the conceptual orientation of development cooperation and the goal of policy coherence for development were the two White Papers of 1997 and 2000 with the joint title “*Eliminating World Poverty*”, which were drawn up by DFID and approved by the cabinet.⁹⁸ In both documents the government declared its commitment to greater policy coherence and explained what this meant for some important areas of policy. The interdepartmental process of drawing up the White Papers helped to raise other government departments’ awareness of development issues. DFID uses the documents as a reference base for its demands for enhanced policy coherence.

In 2002 the Overseas Development and Cooperation Act 1980 was replaced by the International Development Act, which defines poverty reduction and the promotion of sustainable development as overriding objectives of British development cooperation. Under the new Act using the development cooperation budget for other than these two objectives (e.g. for the promotion of British exports) is illegal, and DFID could be sued for doing so.⁹⁹ DFID thus has an instrument for opposing any incoherence between its own objectives and the use of funds for other than development cooperation.

For its work DFID has elaborated systematic objectives, which, by analogy with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), divide the overriding objective of poverty reduction into five main objectives, each with several targets, and include a number of goal achievement indicators. The objectives and targets defined by DFID serve not only to create a distinctive image for its own work but also to improve policy coherence, since some of them are joint targets of several ministries, which share the responsibility for their achievement and are required to submit joint reports.¹⁰⁰

98 See DFID (1997 and 2000).

99 “*The 2002 Act is drafted in such a way that a policy such as Tied Aid (and the Aid and Trade Provision), in which assistance is given for the purpose of promoting UK trade or for other commercial or political reasons, would now be challengeable in the courts.*” DFID (2002).

100 For further details see Chapter 6.2.5.

6.2.3 Information and analysis

Unlike most other government departments, DFID has considerable experience and knowledge of developing countries and development policy and exploits this advantage to place greater emphasis on development in the government's work. In addition, proceeding from the idea that demanding increased policy coherence for development from other departments first requires a sound information base on the effects of other policies, DFID has significantly stepped up its research and analysis activity (internally and externally by commissioning experts) on relevant policies to give itself a solid foundation on which to represent development policy interests at departmental level.

A notable example is trade policy. DFID has set up its own International Trade Department, with a staff of about 20, which, with the help of substantial analyses, has enabled DFID to approach other departments, especially the trade and industry and the agriculture ministries, with competence. Other examples are conflict prevention (the staff of the relevant DFID division has been increased), intellectual property rights and migration.

DFID has also taken a number of initiatives to encourage the private sector to behave responsibly in such areas as labour standards, corruption, human rights, conflicts and the environment and so to help improve coherence between development policy and corporate action.

The increase in DFID's staff complement for strategic and coherence issues was possible for three reasons: (i) the change in the understanding of DFID's role (see the next point), (ii) the fact that the development cooperation budget rose significantly in 1998 and especially 2000 and (iii) the growing orientation towards programme aid and budget financing, which has permitted staff cuts at project level.

6.2.4 Structure and process of policy coordination

As mentioned above, the upgrading of the former Overseas Development Administration to a ministry of cabinet rank improved DFID's starting position in its efforts to enhance policy coherence.¹⁰¹ With its establishment as a ministry, DFID also became a member of the Ministerial Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence and of two cabinet subcommittees concerned, respectively, with conflict issues and EU trade policy.

In addition, an Inter-departmental Working-group on Development (IWGD) chaired by DFID was set up. About a dozen government departments are represented on it, and it is meant to consider the progress made towards policy coherence, although it evidently does not meet very often. Those interviewed were rather muted in their views on the importance of the IWGD for DFID's work on policy coherence. As they saw it, interdepartmental networking at desk-officer level (e.g. the work done by the interdepartmental Trade Policy Group, which meets every month) is highly relevant.

Remarkably, DFID is not seeking to increase its powers with a view to enhancing policy coherence. It clearly attaches less importance to the question of which department does what. What appears to be more important is that government policy as a whole should become more coherent. DFID's consequent understanding of its role is described in an internal evaluation of its involvement in the field of international trade policy as a "*shift from a position of largely unsuccessful lobbying on behalf of developing countries to more of a capacity-building role within government.*"¹⁰²

6.2.5 Budget coordination

The Public Service Agreements (PSAs) and the joint targets of several departments set in the PSAs are an interesting aspect for the work on policy coherence. In 1998, as part of the budgetary procedure (public spend-

101 "*DFID itself now takes full part in inter-departmental co-ordination mechanisms at an official level, rather than, as in the past, having its views integrated into the position the FCO [Foreign and Commonwealth Office] would bring to these fora.*" OECD/DAC (2001b, I-45).

102 Pedley (2002), vii.

ing review and establishment of the budget), the Labour government introduced PSAs for all departments, requiring them to define targets for their work and indicators for monitoring their achievement. Each department attaches a Service Delivery Agreement to its PSA.

DFID has its own PSA (the current one concerning the period 2003–2006),¹⁰³ which includes three joint targets: one with the Foreign Office and Ministry of Defence relating to conflict prevention, one with the Treasury relating to debt relief operations and one with the Department of Trade and Industry and the Foreign Office relating to trade policy.

In the case of the first joint target the initiative was taken by the Treasury, which believes that budget resources will be used efficiently and effectively for conflict prevention if the three departments concerned combine their respective budget titles for this purpose to form a pool budget. This decision now forces the three departments to set joint targets and elaborate concepts for their achievement. This approach has meanwhile prompted the German Government to consider in the context of its Action Plan for Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building of 12 May 2004 the establishment of jointly administered funds for crisis prevention from budget resources of the departments for foreign policy, defence and development cooperation on the British model.¹⁰⁴

The PSAs are not just non-binding declarations of intent: they play an important role in budgetary decisions, within government departments and in the external presentation of government work. DFID's PSA, for example, is broken down internally into divisions and departments, with clear responsibilities allocated for the achievement of targets. Reports on achievement are published.

On the other hand, the alignment of government work with verifiable targets is not without its problems, since the setting of unambitious targets facilitates their achievement while the setting of overly ambitious targets may lead to frustration (to aid fatigue in the area of development cooperation). After initial target euphoria, the government has reduced the number of targets from about 260 to some 120. DFID sees the joint targets as an important lever for its work on policy coherence.

103 See DFID (2003).

104 See Bundesregierung (2004, 62 and 63).

6.2.6 Administrative culture

As mentioned above, DFID is at pains to bring about interdepartmental networking at desk-officer level where important coherence issues are concerned. This is facilitated by staff exchanges between DFID and other departments.

6.2.7 Supplementary comments

DFID's and the government's efforts to enhance policy coherence are accompanied by constructive criticism from NGOs. BOND, the umbrella association of some 280 development-oriented NGOs in the United Kingdom, has taken up the issue of policy coherence in recent years and conducted its own studies and held information meetings on the subject.¹⁰⁵

Despite DFID's efforts to enhance policy coherence, progress towards greater coherence of British policy for development has been slow in some areas in recent years (as regards corruption, money laundering and arms exports, for example),¹⁰⁶ which reveals the political influence wielded by other interests. Nor is the United Kingdom among the leaders in the Commitment to Development Index of 21 donor countries (April 2003), taking only eleventh place.¹⁰⁷

As former DFID Minister Clare Short saw it, the UK's involvement in the Iraq war without a UN mandate was a glaring example of incoherence, which eventually led her to resign after she had initially voiced her criticism. The DAC's most recent review of the United Kingdom's development policy in 2001 confirms DFID's efforts to change the attitude of other departments, but warns of the danger of getting too far ahead of them.¹⁰⁸

105 See the information on BOND's homepage: <http://www.bond.org.uk/>

106 See OECD/DAC (2001b, I-46).

107 See Birdsall / Roodman (2003, 26). The index will not be overrated here since it is still being improved in terms of content and methodology. It merely indicates that, despite DFID's efforts, there is still a need for greater policy coherence.

108 *"As in the past, the key challenge for DFID continues to be to ensure that the necessary change occurs in attitude in other government departments and avoid a situation where DFID is too far ahead of the others."* OECD/DAC (2001b, I-46).

6.3 Netherlands¹⁰⁹

6.3.1 An overview of the Dutch approach to policy coherence

Great efforts are being made in the Netherlands at both national and international level to achieve greater coherence between development cooperation and other policies. It is pointed out with some pride in this context¹¹⁰ that, among the 21 countries included in the Commitment to Development Index, the Netherlands takes first place (April 2003).¹¹¹ The following comments, which are structured in much the same way as those on the United Kingdom, are preceded by a summary in Box 4 of the Netherlands' own description of its approach to policy coherence.

| Box 4: Policy coherence for development – the Dutch approach* | |
|--|---|
| 1. Political impetus from the top | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • coherence as part of government programme (1998) • policy memorandum based on DAC Poverty Guidelines (March 2002) • political support from successive governments • organizational translation: a <i>Policy Coherence Unit</i> in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for impulse and advocacy |
| 2. Organizing policy coherence: levels of intervention | |
| 2.1 At general level by promoting: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whole government approach in the Netherlands (ownership with other departments) • accountability of NL and EU policies by reports to parliament, coherence indices and MDG-8 reports |

109 The following comments are based on interviews conducted by the author in the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 28 February 2003, on the analysis of various government documents available on the internet (<http://www.minbuza.nl>), on the two most recent DAC review reports on Dutch development cooperation (OECD/DAC 1997 and 2001c) and on Bendix (1987) and Meyer (2003b).

110 This reference is made, for example, in the latest development strategy document “*Mutual interests, mutual responsibilities: Dutch development cooperation en route to 2015*” of October 2003. See Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken (2003a, 13).

111 See Birdsall / Roodman (2003, 26).

- focused policy research on impact of NL, EU and OECD policies
- international networks

2.2 Focus on NL positions at EU level - being at the table and alert in:

- interdepartmental coordination mechanisms and cabinet, preparing instructions for EU councils and committees
- interdepartmental screening mechanism of draft EU proposals in early stage
- instructions for multilateral meetings

2.3 At specific level:

Focus on selected coherence dossiers with:

- proactive approach of international agenda
- opportunities for alliance-building and direct cooperation with developing countries
- concrete objectives: measurable short-term to medium-term results in negotiations
- engaging other stakeholders (NGOs and business sector)

Project teams within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and where possible with other ministries

- joint preparation, adoption by cabinet and joint implementation where possible

3. Current coherence dossiers

Agricultural reform

Policy memorandum on coherence between agriculture and development cooperation

- focus on products and issues of specific interest to developing countries (sugar, cotton, export and domestic support, development box, sanitary and phytosanitary measures)
- 2-way street: what can aid contribute?

Intellectual property and development

- TRIPS & health: follow-up Doha Declaration
- protection of biodiversity and of traditional knowledge

Product standards and market access

- African cut flowers, Peruvian sardines, maximum residue levels (MRLs) for pesticides, EU directives on food & hygiene
- 'best practices' for development of sanitary and phytosanitary measures (SPS) and technical barriers to trade (TBT) measures with impact on developing countries, tailored transition periods and capacity-building

Fishery policies

- EU fisheries agreements, with focus on Mauritania
- WTO disciplines on fisheries subsidies

4. Advocacy approach to cotton

- strategy paper for discussion with stakeholders
- "coherence diplomacy" with West African governments (support in WTO dispute settlement and in WTO agricultural negotiations)

5. Making coherence concrete and operational in EU, OECD and WTO: requirements

- information exchange and like-minded networks on (specific) coherence issues
- better and focused impact research at global, country and thematic level
- cooperate to influence decision-making: stimulate research/debate in DAC/ OECD (in peer reviews, donor impact review at country level, OECD substantive committees, preparation MCM 2004)
- address glaring incoherences first
- keen eye for political economy and timing
- challenge Member States for coherent EU policies and positions in multilateral negotiations
- well researched cases and advocacy will fail without real political commitment
- West African cotton proposal acid test for policy coherence and Doha development round

* Description by the head of the Policy Coherence Unit of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Source: Genee (2003)

6.3.2 Political will

Since 1965 political responsibility for development cooperation has rested with the Minister for Development Cooperation, who, though a member of the cabinet, does not have a ministry of his or her own.¹¹² Despite or be-

112 The ministerial apparatus responsible for the conception, planning and control of development cooperation forms part of the Directorate-General for International Cooperation (DGIS), which is one of the now five directorates-general of the Foreign Ministry.

cause of this special status, Development Cooperation Ministers since the 1970s have claimed the right not only to perform the tasks originally assigned to them¹¹³ but also to introduce development aspects into discussions in the cabinet of all policies of relevance to developing countries.¹¹⁴ Advocacy of the coherence of government work for development has thus long formed part of the Dutch Development Cooperation Minister's understanding of the role he or she should play.

Former Development Minister Eveline Herfkens redoubled the efforts to enhance policy coherence during her period in office from 1998 to 2002. This conformed to her intention not so much to redefine the goals of development cooperation (poverty reduction had already been the overriding objective before this time) as to improve the effectiveness of development cooperation through a number of approaches.¹¹⁵ Herfkens developed considerable political commitment in this respect and very much led the way in the shaping of Dutch development cooperation. A number of factors played a part in this: her experience as a politician,¹¹⁶ her background in development¹¹⁷ and a favourable political environment.¹¹⁸ During her period in office Herfkens took a number of initiatives at national, EU, OECD and multilateral level to improve policy coherence.¹¹⁹ Her successor,

113 Conception of a consistent development cooperation policy and defence before parliament of summaries of the development cooperation titles in the various departmental budgets; see Bendix (1987, 25).

114 See Bendix (1987, 25).

115 *Inter alia* through closer donor coordination, greater influence on multilateral organizations, more ownership to be accepted by partners and more sectoral programmes instead of individual projects; see Meyer (2003b, 103).

116 *Inter alia* as a Labour Party Member of Parliament for many years.

117 From 1976 to 1981 she was a head of department in the Directorate-General for International Development of the Foreign Ministry, from 1990 to 1996 an executive director of the World Bank and from 1996 to 1998 ambassador to the UN and WTO.

118 This favourable political environment included a Labour-Party-led government open to development concerns and the growth of political pressure from NGOs for greater policy coherence, not least after the failure of the WTO conference in Seattle.

119 They are described in detail in a communication of 18 March 2002 approved by the cabinet from Minister Herfkens to parliament on the subject of policy coherence. See Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken (2002).

Agnes van Ardenne¹²⁰ of the Christian Democratic Party, has maintained the momentum of the efforts to enhance policy coherence (see below).

6.3.3 Strategic conception

The need for enhanced policy coherence for development has been emphasized since the early 1980s in various documents defining development policy principles and strategies, including “*Development Cooperation in a World Economic Perspective*” (1980), “*The Quality of Aid*” (1989) and especially “*A World in Dispute*” (1993).¹²¹

In March 2002 the then Development Cooperation Minister, Eveline Herfkens, submitted to parliament a *General Memorandum on Policy Coherence*, which had been approved by the cabinet, justified the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development and described in detail the government’s approach to the improvement of policy coherence at national and international level.¹²² The current Development Cooperation Minister, Agnes van Ardenne, outlined her policy in the policy paper “*Mutual Interests, Mutual Responsibilities: Dutch Development Cooperation en Route to 2015*”, in which she endorsed the efforts to enhance policy coherence.¹²³

An up-to-date overview of current efforts to enhance policy coherence is provided by the document “*Policy Coherence for Development*”.¹²⁴ It identifies six areas considered to be particularly important from the coherence viewpoint,¹²⁵ presents a brief analysis of the coherence problem in

120 After the change of government on 27 July 2002, Agnes van Ardenne was initially State Secretary for Development Cooperation in the Foreign Ministry until 27 May 2003. She has since been Minister for Development Cooperation in the Foreign Ministry.

121 See OECD/DAC (2001c, I–27). There have also been other strategy documents, such as “*A World of Difference*” (1990) and “*Aid in Progress*” (1995).

122 See Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken (2002).

123 See Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken (2003a), thereof section 5.2 “Coherence”.

124 See Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken (2003b).

125 The six areas referred to in the document are:

1. Reform of the EU agricultural policy (with particular regard for Mozambique’s access to the EU’s sugar market,
2. WTO agricultural negotiations,

each area and then specifies the objectives of and the measures to be taken under the Dutch policy at national and international level with a view to improving policy coherence in each case.

6.3.4 Information and analysis

The efforts being made under the Dutch development policy to improve policy coherence are largely based on an analysis of coherence problems and on information work designed to raise the awareness of other departments and parliament and to influence political decisions at national and international level. Sound analysis and information are regarded as the necessary basis for the political advocacy of improved policy coherence. It is also pointed out, however: *“Well researched cases and advocacy will fail without real political commitment.”*¹²⁶

While Eveline Herfkens was still minister, the Foreign Ministry’s Directorate-General for International Cooperation (DGIS), responsible for development cooperation, began systematically analysing cases of incoherence. Herfkens had initially to admit that the ministry did not have the necessary analytical capacity.¹²⁷ In 2001 an ad hoc working party was set up to consider a number of coherence issues (agricultural policy, fisheries policy, TRIPS) and to draw up initial proposals for dealing with them. In May 2002 a permanent Policy Coherence Unit (PCU) was formed with a staff of five and a secretary. Its place in the institutional set-up and its tasks are described in Box 5.

-
3. US and EU cotton subsidies,
 4. Product standards and market access,
 5. Developing countries’ access to medicines in the context of the WTO TRIPS agreement
 6. EU fisheries agreements with African countries (especially Mauritania).

Other aspects on which efforts to enhance coherence have focused in recent years have been human rights, small arms, migration, the Everything but Arms initiative and tax agreements with developing countries. See Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken (2003b).

126 Genee (2003). See also Box 4.

127 *“The minister expressed her concern over the lack of an analytical capacity to maintain a more systematic identification of possible issues.”* Thus the 2001 DAC review report on Dutch development cooperation. See OECD/DAC (2001c, I–27).

Box 5: Functions of the Policy Coherence Unit (PCU) in the Dutch Foreign Ministry

1. Place in the institutional set-up

- The PCU forms part of the Directorate-General for International Cooperation (DGIS).
- The head of the PCU reports to the head of the DGIS, who reports to the Minister for Development Cooperation.
- A PCU representative attends the weekly meetings of the interdepartmental Committee for European Affairs (committee of state secretaries), in which the Dutch position in the EU Councils of Ministers and committees is determined.

2. Tasks

- Monitoring other policies for possible incoherences
- Coordination of the positions of the various departments on problems associated with policy coherence for development
- Compilation of “coherence dossiers” by interdepartmental groups of experts on important coherence issues (the PCU initiates and monitors the process and organizes the use of the dossiers in efforts to enhance policy coherence at national and international level)
- Agreement on the Dutch position and its introduction into international discussions and negotiations in the case of other coherence issues on which dossiers are not compiled
- Organization of coherence-related information work and the mobilization of political support for greater policy coherence by means, for example, of approaches to parliamentary committees, seminars and cooperation with NGOs

Source: Information provided by the head of the PCU during an interview on 28 February 2003

In the meantime, a number of “coherence dossiers” have been compiled on the initiative of the PCU (or its predecessor, the ad hoc working party) by interdepartmental teams of experts (*inter alia* on agricultural policy, TRIPS, product standards, fisheries policy). The paper on agricultural policy, *Memorandum on Coherence between Agricultural Policy and Development Policy*, was jointly adopted by the Ministers for Development Co-

operation and Agriculture, forwarded to parliament and published.¹²⁸ It contains a detailed analysis of the coherence problem in various areas (rice, sugar, cotton, fruit and vegetables) and defines the objectives of the Dutch policy on the improvement of policy coherence. The Memorandum is to be complemented by an action plan. According to the PCU, the discussions while the Memorandum was being drawn up were at times difficult (especially on the sugar chapter). On the other hand, the political context had been favourable inasmuch as the Dutch Finance Minister, too, was an advocate of the reform of the European agricultural policy.

What is remarkable about the coherence dossiers is that they emerge from an interdepartmental discussion process in which differing views are debated at length and, when completed, represent common positions of the Netherlands Government, which are then presented in the EU and the OECD and at multilateral level. An example is two papers submitted by the Netherlands at the DAC Senior Level Meeting in 2002 on coherence between agricultural policy and development policy and on coherence problems in the cotton sector.¹²⁹ The coherence dossiers are also used in Dutch development cooperation to some extent for “coherence diplomacy”, e.g. in support of West African countries at the WTO negotiations on the cotton problem.

The PCU pleads at both national and international level for the mobilization of research capacity to analyse coherence problems and for the more systematic study of the effects of the industrialized countries’ policies on developing countries. It endorses, for example, the international research project on “The Development Impact of Rich Countries’ Policies” planned in the context of the Global Development Network.¹³⁰

6.3.5 Structure and process of policy coordination

According to the most recent DAC review report on Dutch development cooperation, which was drawn up in 2001, it is particularly significant

128 See Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken / Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij (2003).

129 Netherlands’ Delegation (2002a and 2002b).

130 See Genee (2003). A meeting of experts was held in Paris in June 2003 to prepare the research project. See Ashoff (2003).

from the coherence viewpoint that development policy is represented in the cabinet by its own minister.¹³¹

In 1996 a White Paper on the reform of the Dutch foreign policy led to the hitherto independent post of Development Cooperation Minister being integrated into the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), with the result that two (currently three) ministers have since headed the MFA.¹³² At the same time, sustainable poverty reduction was declared one of the five overriding objectives of Dutch foreign policy.¹³³ Both measures underline the fact that development cooperation is seen as an essential part of foreign policy and that the latter is, in turn, explicitly committed to the development policy goal of poverty reduction.

The DAC review report referred to above notes that the integration of political responsibility for development cooperation into the MFA has facilitated coherence between foreign policy and development policy,¹³⁴ but also points out that, in practice, a great deal depends on there being a good understanding between the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Development Cooperation, since the two together are accountable to parliament and the public for the development cooperation objectives and strategy and for coherence between development cooperation and the rest of the foreign policy.¹³⁵ It should be noted that, according to the DAC report, the integration of the post of Development Cooperation Minister into the Foreign

131 “(...) *the importance of having a Minister for Development Cooperation in the national cabinet is critical in this respect.*” OECD/DAC (2001c, I–10).

132 The Dutch Foreign Ministry describes the leadership of the ministry on its homepage as follows: “*The Minister of Foreign Affairs is responsible for Dutch foreign policy and the Ministry’s overall leadership. He is assisted by the Minister for Development Cooperation and the Minister for European Affairs. These three Government members are the Ministry’s political leaders.*” <http://www.minbuza.nl>.

133 The five objectives are: “*to promote (i) international order, (ii) peace, security and stability, (iii) European integration, (iv) sustainable poverty reduction, (v) bilateral relations.*” <http://www.minbuza.nl>.

134 “*Broadly speaking, the integration of development cooperation within MFA facilitates policy coherence between the foreign affairs and the development cooperation sides of the Dutch government.*” OECD/DAC (2001c, I–27).

135 See OECD/DAC (2001c, I–36).

Ministry has raised coordination problems despite the improvement in coherence.¹³⁶

The Development Cooperation Minister or the DGIS and PCU put forward their ideas on coherence for interdepartmental agreement, which, as usual, occurs at various levels: in the cabinet at the highest level, at the next lower level of, in particular, the state secretaries' Committee for European Affairs, whose weekly meetings are attended by a PCU representative, and finally at desk-officer level.

The interdepartmental working parties which have been formed to consider current coherence issues and compile the coherence dossiers referred to above are important for coherence work. According to the PCU itself, by initiating and monitoring these working parties, it has played a major role, but it also emphasizes that the political commitment and openness of other departments to the discussion of the various coherence issues were an equally important prerequisite for the compilation of the coherence dossiers. It adds that the interdepartmental working parties had been formed without difficulty and had operated flexibly. Further institutional arrangements had not been necessary.

6.3.6 Supplementary comments

Policy coherence is also an issue for Dutch NGOs. The *Evert Vermeer Stichting*, an independent foundation close to the social-democratic Labour Party, has set up a website, which includes a "Coherence Manual" (*Handboek Coherentie*) containing information on coherence issues and taking a

136 "However, the co-location of both the Minister of Foreign Affairs and that for Development Cooperation in one organisational framework means that the Development Cooperation Minister, while responsible for perhaps 80 % of the overall MFA budget, has less authority than the Minister of Foreign Affairs in critical operational areas such as personnel. This is similarly true in the field, where development cooperation is located in the Dutch embassy. The development cooperation portfolio usually represents the vast majority of overall Dutch funding in the recipient country, yet, the considerable authorities that are delegated to the field remain with the ambassador, who may not necessarily be a development professional. The operational ambiguities created by this unusual organisation, in which authority does not necessarily equal operational responsibility, has the potential to generate management confusion within the Ministry." OECD/DAC (2001c, I-33).

critical view of Dutch policy from the coherence viewpoint.¹³⁷ The PCU sees this initiative as a political aid to its own work.

6.4 Sweden

In May 2003 the Swedish Government submitted to parliament a document on basic principles entitled “*Shared Responsibilities: Sweden’s Policy for Global Development*”, which emphasizes that all the country’s policies share responsibility for the overriding objective of equitable and sustainable development, deriving from this an explicit demand for policy coherence and adding to the development policy’s tasks in the development cooperation sphere the role of catalyst for progress in other areas of policy towards the achievement of the common overriding objective. The document is seen as the conceptual response to increasing globalization and, in particular, the Millennium Declaration and was approved by parliament in December 2003.¹³⁸

The document was drawn up by working parties together with other ministries and government agencies under the overall responsibility of the Foreign Ministry, which includes the Minister for Development Cooperation,¹³⁹ and was based on the extensive report of a commission (*Globkom*) that had been instructed by the government in December 1999 to examine Sweden’s policy for global development¹⁴⁰ and submitted its findings un-

137 <http://www.coherentie.nl>.

138 See Regeringskansliet / Ministry for Foreign Affairs (2003). A summary can also be found in Morgenroth (2003).

139 The Swedish development policy is the responsibility of the Foreign Ministry, in which a separate minister of cabinet rank is politically responsible for development cooperation. At the time the document was forwarded to parliament, the Development Minister was Jan O. Karlsson. Currently, there are three ministers of cabinet rank in the Swedish Foreign Ministry: the Foreign Minister, the Minister for Development Cooperation and the Minister for Migration and Asylum Policy.

140 In December 1999 the government had instructed the then Minister for Development Cooperation, Maj-Inger Klingvall, to form a commission of representatives of all the parties with seats in parliament, who were then assisted in their work by experts from various ministries and government agencies and by other, external advisers.

der the title “*A New Swedish Policy for Global Development*” in March 2002.¹⁴¹

According to the head of the commission secretariat, the *Globkom* initiative was due to various factors.¹⁴²

- the growing realization in government and parliamentary circles of the need for a conceptual response to issues relating to globalization, poverty reduction and the role of development cooperation and other policies in this context,¹⁴³
- the commitment of parliamentarians, especially members of the Social Democratic Party,
- the commitment of the Minister for Development Cooperation, which was given political weight by her cabinet rank,
- the Prime Minister’s pronounced openness to questions of equitable and sustainable global development.

While drawing up the report, *Globkom* had consulted not only all the ministries and government agencies concerned but also representatives of interest groups in society and NGOs at some thirty hearings and conferences and, in addition, asked experts and academics for contributions. In the commission’s opinion, the broadly based process of the report’s evolution did a great deal to raise the various actors’ awareness of the objectives and requirements of the policy for global development. The means thus formed part of the end. Much the same can be said of the drawing up of the basic document “*Shared Responsibilities*”, during which many meetings and discussions were held with other ministries and government agencies.

141 This was the title of the summary; see Committee on Sweden’s Policy for Global Development (2002) and Morgenroth (2003). In “*Shared Responsibilities*” the title of the *Globkom* report is given as “*A More Equitable World without Poverty*”. See Rege-
ringskansliet / Ministry for Foreign Affairs (2003, 6).

142 Telephone interview conducted by the author with Mia Horn af Rantzien on 27 January 2004.

143 The DAC review report on Sweden drawn up in 2000 refers to two other factors: opinion polls, revealing aid fatigue and reduced expectations of the role of development cooperation in poverty reduction, and competing objectives of various policies (such as the agricultural, trade, environment, security and migration policies) in the shaping of the foreign policy. See OECD/DAC (2000, 1–14 f.).

As regards the improvement of policy coherence, the following declarations of intent in “*Shared Responsibilities*” seem important:

- The goal of equitable and sustainable development applies to all policies.
- The basic document explicitly calls for a coherent policy for global development and defines this goal by setting fundamental objectives for eleven policy areas,¹⁴⁴ but leaves the specification and operationalization of the objectives to future government work. The efforts to enhance policy coherence also apply to Sweden’s involvement at EU level.
- The document does not refer to any conflicting objectives, but notes that they are to be identified, analysed and made the subject of carefully considered strategic decisions during the implementation of the policy for global development.
- The government declares itself responsible for implementing, monitoring and evaluating the policy for global development on the basis of precise definitions of objectives and results-based management. The evaluation and ongoing analysis of all measures are regarded as essential components of coherence work.
- Sweden supports the further development of the international Commitment to Development Index and of international research on policy coherence issues.
- Development cooperation is part of the policy for global development, has as its main objective the reduction of poverty in accordance with the MDGs and also performs the function of encouraging progress in other areas of policy.
- The government intends to inform parliament regularly in an annual report on the implementation of the policy for global development.
- The government intends to cooperate closely with parliament, NGOs, the private sector and trade unions on the improvement of policy coherence. To encourage a broad public debate on the policy for global

144 Legal systems, security and defence policy, trade and investment policy, migration policy, social and health policy, economic and financial policy, education policy, agricultural and fisheries policy, cultural policy, environment policy, industrial and employment policy. A summary of the objectives can be found in Morgenroth (2003).

development, it proposes a forum consisting of representatives of parliament, interest groups in society, the private sector, experts and government agencies and intends to increase its public relations work.

- Apart from the points summarized above, “*Shared Responsibilities*” makes no references to the organizational implications of the policy for global development, but announces that they will be presented later.¹⁴⁵

The Expert Group on Development Issues (EGDI)¹⁴⁶ is currently considering the coherence problem in four areas: (i) migration and economic development, (ii) security and development, (iii) special and differentiated treatment of developing countries in the WTO and (iv) the multilateral development financing system.¹⁴⁷

6.5 DAC recommendations for improving policy coherence in other countries

In the peer reviews the DAC examines the coherence of its member countries’ policies for development in terms of substance (analysis of incoherent policies) and procedure (consideration of efforts to enhance coherence). Where the latter aspect is concerned, the reviews conform roughly rather than fastidiously to the checklist on policy coherence in the DAC

145 The earlier Globkom report had proposed the establishment in the ministries of a coordination unit for the policy for global development with the following tasks, which resemble the tasks of the Policy Coherence Unit in the Netherlands:

- organizing and analysing the flow of information between the ministries for the implementation of the policy for global development,
- reporting to Parliament,
- preparing background analyses,
- initiating interdepartmental working parties,
- identifying interdepartmental cross-cutting issues.

146 The EGDI is a group of international and Swedish development experts and representatives of the Swedish Foreign Ministry and Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), having as its task the initiation of studies on current development issues. The EGDI’s chairman is the State Secretary for Development Cooperation in the Foreign Ministry. See <http://www.egdi.gov.se>

147 See Holmgren (2003).

Guidelines on Poverty Reduction of May 2001.¹⁴⁸ Box 6 below outlines the recommendations made in the DAC review reports in 2003 and 2002 under main headings, indicating the countries addressed in each case.

| Box 6: DAC recommendations for enhancing policy coherence made in the peer reviews of development policies in 2002 and 2003 | |
|--|--|
| Area | Countries* |
| <p>1. Political leadership of the centre and/or the development cooperation agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • communicate political commitment (by the highest authorities) (Ireland, Denmark, USA, Greece) • DANIDA needs to play a stronger leadership role in analysing and promoting the developmental coherence of policy decisions (Denmark) • USAID needs to play a stronger advocacy role vis-à-vis other government agencies in the analysis and promotion of development policy coherence (USA) | Ireland, Denmark, USA, Greece |
| <p>2. Strategic framework and priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need for an explicit government statement on policy coherence (Japan) • give more prominence to coherence in strategic documents (Denmark) • need for a clear statement that calls for policy coherence (Finland) | Japan, Denmark, Finland |
| <p>3. Information and analysis</p> <p>a) Enhance analytical capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhance analytical capacity to deal with coherence issues (by assigning adequate staff resources) (Ireland, Finland, Luxembourg, USA, Greece, Spain) • create a specialized unit responsible for assessing policy coherence / analysing the impact of non-aid policies on developing countries (Ireland, Denmark) • establish a system for monitoring the environmental, social and governance aspects of foreign direct investment (Japan) | Ireland, Japan, Denmark, Finland, Luxembourg, USA, Canada, Greece, Spain |

148 See OECD/DAC (2001a).

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating monitoring mechanisms and reinforcing existing ones would enable the government to exercise enhanced oversight in areas that have a bearing on policy coherence (Canada) • staff will need skills and appropriate training to analyse non-aid policies from a development perspective and should remain in their posts long enough to form solid partnerships with other key government agencies (Denmark) <p>b) Conduct assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conduct assessments of the development impact of non-aid policies (Ireland, Japan, Denmark, Canada) • vet or review proposed legislation or documents submitted to cabinet (Denmark, USA, Canada) | <p>Ireland, Japan, Denmark, USA, Canada</p> |
| <p>4. Policy coordination structures and processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish dedicated / formal consultation mechanisms (within, across and outside government agencies; on an on-going basis for key policy areas or as special task forces for emerging issues) (Ireland, Denmark, USA) • the mandate of the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Development Cooperation could be extended to give it a more active role in promoting debate on policy coherence (Luxembourg) • the role of the Policy Coordinating Committee on Development and the contribution it can make should be clearly established (USA) • increase USAID's political involvement (e.g. by a standing invitation to attend the meetings of the National Security Council) (USA) • USAID needs to seek strong working relationships with policy coordinating groups such as the National Security Council (USA) • the roles and responsibilities of CIDA and DFAIT in promoting greater policy coherence for development may need to be further defined (Canada)** • the mandate of the Interministerial Committee and the Monitoring and Administrative Committee could be extended to include coordination for policy coherence (Greece) | <p>Ireland, Denmark, Luxembourg, USA, Canada, Greece, Spain</p> |

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the institutional coordination structures in place could be used to support a more systematic approach to addressing policy coherence issues (Spain) | |
| <p>5. Parliamentary involvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> expand parliamentary involvement (Ireland) the Foreign Affairs Committee could assess non-aid policies with substantial impact on developing countries; these assessments could be carried out jointly with the parliamentary committee concerned (Denmark) | Ireland, Denmark |
| <p>* Countries are listed in the order of their reviews (the most recent first).</p> <p>** CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) reports to the Minister for International Cooperation; the DFAIT (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade) reports to the Foreign Minister and the Minister for International Trade.</p> <p>Source: Compiled from OECD/DAC: The DAC Journal, Vol. 3, 2002, Nos 2, 3, 4, and Vol. 4, 2003, Nos 2, 3; http://www.oecd.org/dac</p> | |

6.6 Conclusions

The three countries presented, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden, are making great efforts to improve policy coherence, with Sweden now in the process of implementing an ambitious programme. A comparison of the three cases reveals that efforts to enhance coherence are characterized by the following essential elements:

- Political leadership:* The ministers responsible for development policy (United Kingdom, Netherlands) or the government and parliament (Sweden) have both justified with political commitment and underpinned with concepts and strategies the need and will for enhanced policy coherence (see below).
- Cabinet rank of development policy:* In this, the fact that development policy is represented in the cabinets of the three countries by its own ministers has, according to the working units responsible for coherence work or the DAC peer review reports, proved beneficial.
- Strategic competence:* The political will to enhance coherence has been conceptually justified in the detailed strategy documents approved by the governments and, in the case of various policy areas,

backed by an analysis of incoherences and the setting of objectives for coherent policy.

- *Understanding of development policy's role:* On the one hand, development policy is regarded in the three countries as part of a policy for equitable and sustainable development and not as solely responsible for such development. On the other hand, it sees itself as responsible not only for development cooperation but also for raising other policies' and departments' awareness of the need for greater coherence for development.
- *Limited importance of formal responsibilities in the work on coherence for development:* In the three countries the formal responsibilities for policies of importance in coherence terms (e.g. agricultural, fisheries, trade and migration policies) are largely distributed among government departments or ministers.¹⁴⁹ Nonetheless, in none of the three countries is the transfer of further formal responsibilities to the ministries or ministers in charge of development cooperation regarded as a major precondition for the improvement of coherence. According to those interviewed, this is partly due to the aforementioned understanding of development policy's role and the cabinet rank of the development cooperation ministers, which increases their influence on government work.
- *Proactive coherence work of the ministers or divisions responsible for development cooperation:* In the three countries the government working units responsible for development cooperation have involved other departments and government agencies in an intensive coherence-related dialogue: during the compilation of strategy papers (White Papers in the UK, various documents on basic principles in the Netherlands and Sweden), during the detailed analysis of incoherences in various areas of policy (coherence dossiers) and, on this basis, during the elaboration of joint government positions, with a particular view to negotiations at EU and multilateral level. This coherence work also includes initiatives at international level. In the Neth-

149 An exception in some ways is Sweden, where the Foreign Ministry is responsible not only for development cooperation but also for a number of other areas of international policy. According to the latest organization chart (October 2003), these areas include export promotion and the EU internal market, strategic export controls, international trade policy, global security, migration and asylum policy. However, there are also shared responsibilities. A state secretary in the Ministry for Industry, Employment and Trade, for example, is responsible for foreign trade issues.

erlands proactive coherence work has found institutional expression in the formation of a separate working unit for coherence; in Sweden a unit of this kind has been proposed.

- *Interdepartmental networking and joint analysis of coherence issues, especially at desk-officer level:* Coherence work in the three countries makes use of the usual formal coordination fora (at the highest level the cabinet, under it various permanent interdepartmental working parties or committees) and coordination mechanisms (such as co-signing). However, intensive interdepartmental networking and the joint analysis of coherence issues at desk-officer level have proved particularly important: they have formed the substantive basis for sound political discussion and decision-making at a higher level. Interdepartmental working parties dealing with a given subject for a fixed period, to which appropriate staff have been temporarily seconded, have been formed for this purpose.
- *Intensive analytical and information work:* In all three countries the advocates of coherence work have mobilized analytical capacities and expertise from within and outside the government to examine the effects of other policies for possible incoherences or synergies and to draw up proposals for government action at national and international level. The findings have an impact as an information base on interdepartmental analysis and coordination, but they are also used for dialogue with the public, interest groups and NGOs.

This picture of the efforts of three pioneering countries in the coherence field is confirmed in virtual mirror-image fashion by the DAC recommendations to nine other countries for the improvement of policy coherence, which are summarized in Box 6. The recommendations concern the following aspects in particular:

- political commitment and strategy formulation,
- a more proactive role for the government agencies responsible for development cooperation,
- the use (or mandating) of existing interdepartmental coordination fora for coherence work,¹⁵⁰

150 The creation of formal coordination fora for coherence issues has been recommended less frequently than the use of existing fora.

- the development of analytical capacities (most frequent recommendation, addressed to all countries),
- the more systematic monitoring of other policies (including the review of legislation proposed by the cabinet and other departments).

7 Germany's efforts to enhance policy coherence: progress in recent years and assessment by the DAC

7.1 Progress in recent years

7.1.1 Institutional changes

During the last parliamentary term (1998–2002) the BMZ acquired additional responsibilities or participatory rights, some of which had already been announced in the coalition agreement of October 1998 with a reference to the objective of ensuring policy coherence for development.¹⁵¹ The following changes were made:

- *The BMZ's inclusion in the Federal Security Council (Bundessicherheitsrat – BSR) in 1998:* The BSR is a cabinet committee which coordinates the Federal Government's security and defence policies and is formally responsible for questions of principle relating to arms exports.¹⁵² As a result of its membership of the BSR the BMZ was directly involved in the amendment of the Federal Government's arms export principles in 2000 and in the elaboration of its Comprehensive Concept on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-

151 “*The new Federal Government will ensure (...) policy coherence for development with other departments. The current fragmentation of development tasks of the previous Federal Government among different departments will be abolished, and those tasks will be concentrated in the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). The BMZ will assume overall responsibility in matters relating to EU development policy with a view to promoting international structural policy. The BMZ will become a member of the Federal Security Council.*” See Koalitionsvereinbarung (1998), Chapter XI, section 1.

152 The establishment of the BSR was decided by the cabinet in 1955. Its meetings are held in secret. It has nine members: the Federal Chancellor, who acts as chairman, the Head of the Chancellor's Office and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Defence, Home Affairs, Justice, Economic Affairs and Economic Cooperation and Development. See www.bundesregierung.de/artikel,-55726/Der-Bundessicherheitsrat.htm.

Conflict Peace-Building in the same year.¹⁵³ As a member of the BSR, the BMZ is also represented on the Board of Trustees of the Federal College for Security Studies (*Bundesakademie für Sicherheitspolitik* – BAKS), which is Germany’s leading training institution for security policy issues and a national and international forum for discussion in this area.¹⁵⁴

- *Overall responsibility in matters relating to the EU’s development policy since late 1998*: Previously, responsibilities in this respect had been distributed among several ministries.¹⁵⁵ With the transfer of overall responsibility to the BMZ, the latter also assumed responsibility for matters relating to trade issues under the Lomé IV Convention and the Cotonou Agreement.
- *Formal responsibility for the Transform Programme and for matters relating to “Working Table II” of the Stability Pact for South-East Europe since late 1998*: Previously, the Transform Programme (consultancy and technical cooperation with Eastern Europe and the CIS States) was jointly coordinated by the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs, the Foreign Office and the BMZ. “Working Table II” is concerned with the areas of economic reconstruction, development and cooperation.¹⁵⁶
- *Amendment of the Joint Rules of Procedure of the Federal Ministries (GGO), 26 July 2000*: Since the amendment of the GGO the BMZ has had an extended right to scrutinize other departments’ draft legislation for compliance with development policy. While under the old GGO the BMZ did not receive such drafts until late in the interdepartmental coordination procedure, it is now involved at an early stage and itself considers whether development policy interests are

153 For further details see Chapter 7.1.2.

154 The Board of Trustees is composed of the members of the Federal Security Council.

155 For historical reasons overall responsibility for matters relating to the EU’s development cooperation rested with the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs until 1998, whereas resources for the European Development Fund came (and continue to come) from the BMZ’s budget, and the BMZ represented the Federal Government in the EU Council of Development Ministers and in the various development committees at EU level. Finally, the Foreign Office acted on the Federal Government’s behalf during EU negotiations with developing countries (e.g. under the Lomé Convention).

156 See BMZ (2001a, 93).

affected.¹⁵⁷ In practice, this means a change in degree, in that more information is provided earlier, but not a change in principle, since the BMZ is, as a general rule, involved in the Federal Government's law-making process, and was so even before the amendment of the GGO,¹⁵⁸ and is usually informed at an early stage of the work of other departments on draft legislation, especially as the latter is in itself the condensed form of political decision-making that often begins a great deal earlier, at parliamentary party level, for example.

The coalition agreement of 16 October 2002 concerning the present ruling coalition does not, unlike its 1998 predecessor, provide for the transfer of further responsibilities to the BMZ. In preparation for the coalition negotiations and to justify calls for further responsibilities, the BMZ had identified internally the "residual responsibilities" of other departments in the development sphere and the posts associated with them.

7.1.2 Substantive progress

Some considerable substantive progress has been made in the improvement of policy coherence for development in recent years:

- *The Federal Government's HIPC initiative in 1999:* At the G8 summit held in Cologne in 1999 the Federal Government proposed a debt relief initiative for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPCs), which was approved at the annual meeting of the IMF and World Bank in September of the same year. The basic factors leading to the initiative included Germany's presidency of the G8, the BMZ senior management's commitment, meticulous preparation by the BMZ together with the Federal Ministry of Finance (BMF) and, not least, the popu-

157 This results from Annex 8 to the GGO as amended on 26 July 2000 (see BMI 2000). The annex lays down rules on the participation of the federal ministries in the law-making process and makes a distinction between two groups of departments: those to be involved *to examine whether* aspects of their portfolios are affected (i.e. such ministries do the examining themselves) and those to be involved *if* their interests are affected (the preliminary decision on this being taken by the department which proposes the draft legislation). The BMZ is now a member of the first group, which includes the Ministries of the Interior, Justice, Families and Women and the Environment, and had advocated this status by analogy with the Ministry for Families and Women.

158 At the latest when draft legislation is forwarded before a decision is taken in the federal cabinet.

lar debt relief campaign run by many non-governmental organizations.

- *Amendment of the Federal Government's Political Principles for the Export of War Arms and Other Armaments, 19 January 2000.*¹⁵⁹ In decisions on arms exports to countries which are not members of the EU or NATO or deemed equivalent to NATO members, the amended principles require that consideration also be given to the human rights situation and to the possibility of the sustainable development of the recipient countries being seriously impaired by disproportionate spending on armaments.
- *The Federal Government's Comprehensive Concept on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building, 7 April 2000.*¹⁶⁰ The concept was elaborated by the BSR and defines development policy as part the Federal Government's overall strategy for civilian crisis and conflict management. It is based on the enlarged security concept mentioned above, in which development policy aspects are inherent.¹⁶¹ The strategy seeks to dovetail instruments of the foreign, security, development, financial, economic, environment, cultural and legal policies.
- *The Federal Government's Programme of Action 2015 for Poverty Reduction, 4 April 2001 (AP 2015).*¹⁶² The AP 2015 originated from a BMZ initiative,¹⁶³ was announced by the Federal Chancellor at the UN Millennium Summit in New York in September 2000, was subsequently elaborated and was approved by the federal cabinet in April 2001. It explains in detail that poverty reduction is not merely an obligation for development policy, but requires coherent contributions from other policies. As a result of this and the cabinet's approval the programme has a major role to play in the BMZ's efforts to enhance policy coherence.

159 See Deutscher Bundestag (2000).

160 See Bundesregierung (2000).

161 See footnote 32.

162 See BMZ (2001b).

163 The BMZ's initiative was also influenced by the fact that it came at the time when the work on the DAC Guidelines on Poverty Reduction, in which Germany had been heavily involved and which focused on ways of achieving the objective of poverty reduction, was about to come to an end.

- *Guidelines on the Consideration of Ecological, Social and Development Aspects in the Allocation of Government Export Credit Insurance, 26 April 2001:*¹⁶⁴ The interdepartmental Committee on Export Guarantees (Hermes Committee), on which the BMWA, BMF, Foreign Office and BMZ are represented, adopted, with wide parliamentary support, guidelines that provide for a screening procedure designed to detect any ecological, social or development aspects and, where indications of such aspects are found, for a review procedure.
- *Commitment to increase the German ODA/GNI ratio to 0.33 % by 2006:* At the European Council in Barcelona on 15 March 2002 the Federal Chancellor endorsed the EU Member States' commitment to increase official development aid as a proportion of GNI to 0.39 % in the EU as a whole and to at least 0.33 % in each Member State.¹⁶⁵ In 2001 and 2002 the German ODA/GNI ratio was still 0.27 %.
- *The Federal Government's Sustainability Strategy for Germany, 17 April 2002:*¹⁶⁶ This strategy defines poverty reduction and the promotion of development as part of Germany's global responsibility.¹⁶⁷
- *The Federal Government's Action Plan for Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building, 12 May 2004:*¹⁶⁸ The Action Plan spells out and operationalizes the Comprehensive Concept on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building adopted in 2000 and defines numerous actions in various areas of policy. It provides for the appointment in the departments involved of commissioners for civilian crisis prevention, who together form the Interdepartmental Civilian Crisis Prevention Task Force, which is chaired by a representative of the Foreign Office and held its constituent meeting on 20 September 2004.

164 See Hermes Kreditversicherungs-AG (2001).

165 In taking their decision in Barcelona, the EU Member States were under pressure not only from the UN, development policy-makers and the public but also from the USA to undertake a specific commitment to increase development aid at the forthcoming UN Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey (the USA had itself announced a significant increase).

166 See Bundesregierung (2002).

167 Chapter F, section I; see Bundesregierung (2002, 303). See also footnote 49.

168 See Bundesregierung (2004).

7.2 The DAC's assessment of Germany's efforts to enhance policy coherence

The DAC's most recent review report on German development cooperation, drawn up in 2001,¹⁶⁹ took a close look at German efforts to enhance policy coherence, acknowledged progress in a number of areas and made various recommendations. Although the report no longer reflects the latest situation, it enables a comparison to be made with other donor countries since it forms part of the series of ongoing DAC peer reviews.

Box 7 contains the most important statements in the report, breaks them down into positive assessments and recommendations and assigns them to important categories of the general frame of reference for the identification of approaches to improving policy coherence, as presented in Chapter 5.3.¹⁷⁰

| Box 7: Statements on Germany's efforts to enhance policy coherence made in the DAC's review report of 2001 | |
|---|---|
| Positive assessments | Recommendations |
| <p>1. Political leadership and commitment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A key feature of German development cooperation is its effort to attain coherence between national development policy and the other national policies related to it. (II-43) • Policy coherence principles have been reaffirmed at the highest political levels, including Parliament, and special leadership responsibilities have been given to BMZ. (II-43) • Germany is broadly supportive of the OECD and other international organiza- | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BMZ frequently needs to argue its case with more powerful ministries within the German system. (II-44) Because of the multiplicity of actors, possible domestic political constraints and the limited political base of the BMZ, the implementation of effective policy coherence will require a sustained political commitment in the years to come. (II-43) |

169 See OECD/DAC (2001d). The German development policy will again be reviewed by the DAC in 2005.

170 One category not included in the general frame of reference (Box 3) is added: Political alliances and public advocacy.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>tions which work together to deepen international policy coherence. Coherence issues supported by Germany include work on international trade and direct investment, international finance, food and agriculture, natural environmental sustainability, social issues, and governance and conflict. (II-45)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the first actions of the current government with regard to the international agenda of coherence issues was its sponsorship of the "Enhanced HIPC Initiative" at the 1999 Cologne Summit. (II-45) • German officials assert that their influence contributed significantly to the March 2001 EC decision to free up LLDCs' access to the European market, especially in the area of agricultural products. (II-47) | |
| <p>2. Strategic framework and priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BMZ has regularly stressed the need for greater policy coherence in its official statements and documents. (II-43) • The political statement of vision [1998 Coalition Agreement] has proven to be an important starting point for the series of subsequent actions that are building toward an operational framework for developing country policy coherence. (II-44) • The coherence of German government development policy was given a major boost with the cabinet approval of its new poverty strategy, the Programme of Action 2015. (II-46) • The most remarkable feature of this programme is the commitment by the German Government to promote coherence in all national policies that relate to developing countries. (II-15) • The programme provides a better scope | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The real challenge of this new approach [i.e. the Programme of Action 2015] now lies in the future. First, an implementation plan, which will have to be negotiated with other partners within Germany, is expected early in 2002, following which the best intentions of the government will need to be translated more operationally into today's realities. (II-46) |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>for the BMZ in screening draft legislation for policy coherence, and in its participation in interministerial committees on export guarantees and arms exports. (II-9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The German Government agreed in April 2001 to new "Guiding Principles" [governing export guarantees]. These guidelines appear to provide a valid initial screening mechanism to ensure coherence between German Government-sponsored exports and development policy. (II-46) | |
| <p>3. Information and analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As it progressively operationalizes its growing mandate for policy coherence, the BMZ [...] also calls upon specialists from key aid implementing agencies (e.g. GTZ or GDI) to carry out specific policy analysis and support. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BMZ has yet to sufficiently develop the analytical capacity necessary to carry out its substantive mandate [in matters of coherence]. (II-44) • The BMZ's staffing level and skill mix will have to be substantially rethought given the conceptual and organizational changes [assignment of higher priority tasks, e.g. poverty leadership, screening of new laws for coherence]. (II-59) • Because of the large size of and the sensitivities surrounding export credit schemes, it would seem appropriate, as a further confidence-building measure, to undertake an independent analysis of the extent to which the new guidelines are actually applied. (II-47) |
| <p>4. Policy coordination structures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany is one of the few DAC Member countries that has an independent development cooperation ministry, which is the BMZ, headed by a cabinet minister. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Germany thus has a permanent platform for advocacy of development cooperation, both in the political and public arena. (II-15)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMZ has been assigned the responsibility of leadership among actors in Germany and abroad for implementation of this strategy [Programme of Action 2015]. These actions will necessarily relate to numerous federal ministries. (II-56) • Since 1998, BMZ has also been playing a more important role in several interministerial committees, such as on export guarantees and the Federal Security Council. (II-15 f.) | |
| <p>5. Policy coordination processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMZ has taken on a variety of roles to ensure more systematic coherence, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – policy discussion within the cabinet by the minister, who is a full member, – the use of the new BMZ mandate to systematically review, for development coherence, all new laws proposed by the government. (II-44) | |
| <p>6. Political alliances and public advocacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coherence issue has been a topic of periodic debate within parliament over the last several years, but particularly since 1998. Parliament has periodically sought to further strengthen the BMZ position to influence overall government support for development policy coherence. (II-43) • As it progressively operationalizes its growing mandate for policy coherence, the BMZ has already learned the importance of alliances with developmentally involved German actors such as the Foreign Office, individual NGOs or NGO groups or specialized lobby groups. (II-44) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DAC encourages Germany to continue to use forcefully all opportunities for public advocacy of its development cause, particularly through the BMZ. (II-12) • Broad public understanding and support will be needed to implement the Programme of Action 2015. (II-19) |

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The programme was drafted by several ministries and civil society, including NGOs, unions and academics. (II-15) | |
| <p>The figures in brackets indicate the page numbers in the document cited.</p> <p>Source: OECD/DAC (2001d)</p> | |

In its 2001 report the DAC acknowledged in particular the following aspects:

- the explicit political commitment not only by the BMZ but by the German Government as a whole to the need for improved policy coherence,
- the justification and inclusion of the goal of enhancing policy coherence for development in strategy documents and guidelines, especially the Programme of Action 2015 for Poverty Reduction,
- Germany's commitment at international level to the promotion of policy coherence (e.g. the HIPC initiative, liberalization of access to the EU market for LLDCs),
- the fact that Germany has a separate development cooperation ministry and a development cooperation minister in the cabinet,
- the BMZ's increased involvement in the Hermes Export Guarantee Committee and (for the first time) in the Federal Security Council since 1998,
- the BMZ's awareness of the importance of political support from actors outside the government (e.g. NGOs) for the efforts to enhance coherence.

However, the report also points out that, in view of divergent interests, influential interest groups, domestic constraints and the BMZ's limited political base, the improvement of coherence is an ambitious task which will require sustained political commitment in the next few years. Besides the consistent implementation of the AP 2015, the DAC recommends:

- development of the analytical capacity needed by the BMZ to carry out the mandate associated with the Programme of Action (including the provision and training of the staff required for this purpose),

- an independent evaluation to determine how far the guidelines on the granting of export guarantees, which were amended in 2001 *inter alia* to reflect development aspects, have actually been applied,
- wide-ranging public relations work to generate the understanding and support needed for the implementation of the Programme of Action 2015.

Taken together, the positive features referred to in the DAC report and the recommendations it makes show Germany to be a donor country whose efforts to enhance policy coherence are clear-cut. The comparison with the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden and with the other nine DAC members considered in the previous chapter (see Box 6) reveals that Germany really does belong among the advanced countries with respect to efforts to enhance policy coherence.

8 Conclusions and recommendations for German development cooperation

8.1 Policy coherence as a complex management task

As the improvement of policy coherence calls for various levels of action to be taken into account, a number of tasks are involved:

- political: generation of political will and mobilization of political support in view of often differing objectives and conflicting interests,
- conceptual-strategic: formulation and justification of a system of objectives as the basis for defining and demanding contributions from other policies to coherence,
- substantive-analytical: identification of incoherences, indication of ways to improve coherence, indication of the cost or implications of continuing or unavoidable incoherences,
- structural: distribution of formal responsibilities and participatory rights, organization of political and interdepartmental coordination and agreement,
- procedural: practical shaping of political and interdepartmental coordination and agreement,
- administrative: provision of the manpower needed to perform the various coherence tasks.

Efforts to enhance policy coherence for development are subject to specific constraints, which should be taken into account from the outset:

- limited influence of development policy compared to other policies, which receive far greater domestic attention and/or support;
- incomplete information: development policy promotes development globally and in the partner countries in many areas which are influenced, in some cases adversely, by numerous policies of the industrialized countries; this multiplicity calls for information on the effects of policies covering an unusual thematic range;
- limited administrative capacities at times of scarcer manpower resources while the range of the BMZ's tasks increases.

Work on the enhancement of policy coherence for development is thus a complex management task under conditions of particular constraints. As action needs to be taken at different levels, reducing efforts to enhance policy coherence to individual aspects is not enough. Although it is true to say that coherence issues are (largely) a question of power, they are resolved on the basis not only of formal responsibilities but also of political commitment, a strategic concept, sound analysis, the mobilization of political support and, in view of the constraints mentioned above, the prioritizing of coherence problems in order of urgency.

8.2 Starting position for further steps to improve coherence

The comparison with other donor countries, the DAC's assessment of Germany's efforts to enhance coherence and the positive experience referred to by those interviewed in the BMZ show that quite some progress has already been made in the work to enhance coherence for development. Despite the problems that exist, the starting conditions for further improvements are therefore, in principle, favourable.

The favourable starting conditions include: the Federal Government's recognition of the goal of enhancing coherence for development at national and international level, the existence of a separate BMZ represented at cabinet level, the awareness at the BMZ's executive and working levels of

the need for improved policy coherence, a conceptual framework¹⁷¹ that sets the direction to be followed in enhancing coherence for development and explicitly refers to the shared responsibility of other policies, and practical experience of work to enhance coherence at the various levels.

These starting conditions must be maintained and exploited in the efforts to further enhance coherence for development. In this, both the OECD's general experience (see Chapter 5) and the specific efforts of other donor countries, whose experience is summarized in Chapter 6.6, may prove helpful. The following deliberations add further detail to this plea. They roughly follow the structure of Box 3.

8.3 The importance of political will and leadership

The experience of the forerunners in efforts to enhance coherence (the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden) and Germany's experience in recent years show that progress towards coherence for development depends to a considerable extent on the strength of the member of the cabinet responsible for development policy, and this in two respects:

- strength in the sense of political weight, which is, in turn, the outcome of various factors (e.g. backing within the party, position in the party leadership, ability to mobilize political support in and outside the cabinet, closeness to the head of government),
- strength in the sense of political commitment to development objectives and of vigorous efforts to achieve progress towards coherence; "vigorous" in this context means demanding contributions to coherence from other policies and not, for example, forgoing them in the hope that this will protect development policy against demands for coherence from other departments.

If the political will needed for progress in enhancing coherence for development is to be generated, the Federal Chancellor's support must also be obtained when important issues with a tendency to be controversial arise. This requires both the right feel for situations in which such support seems promising and prudent political management which, for example, takes advantage of a favourable moment (such as a prominent international con-

171 For further details see Chapter 8.7.1.

ference), wins allies in the cabinet and possibly at EU level and, not least, also makes it clear that the BMZ will actively support progress towards coherence. That this approach can be successful, but must be suited to the specific circumstances in each case, is evident from the two examples given above of the Federal Chancellor's announcement of the AP 2015 at the UN Millennium Summit¹⁷² and his decision in favour of increasing Germany's ODA/GNI ratio to 0.33 % by 2006 as agreed at EU level.¹⁷³ Another example is the appointment of the Parliamentary State Secretary in the BMZ as the Federal Chancellor's Commissioner for Africa with the task of coordinating the German position for the G8 discussions on cooperation with Africa.

The research community does not as a rule make any recommendations on details of the political management that is needed in practical situations to generate the necessary political will for progress towards coherence in a coalition government or the cabinet, let alone on the part of the Federal Chancellor. It is important, however, to emphasize the need for sufficient political will because, without it, efforts to enhance coherence at the other levels addressed in the following will have little success in the end.

8.4 Increasing the political weight carried by development policy and improving policy coherence by means of a law on development policy?

Like half the DAC members,¹⁷⁴ Germany does not have a law on development policy as such.¹⁷⁵ It has repeatedly been urged to increase the po-

172 According to the BMZ, Federal Minister Wieczorek-Zeul put the idea of a Federal Government Programme of Action for Poverty Reduction to the Federal Chancellor while they were on their way to the Millennium Summit in New York.

173 An important factor in the Federal Chancellor's agreement to increase the German ODA/GNI ratio despite the Federal Finance Minister's reservations was that a general consensus on the subject had been reached at EU level. According to statements by interviewees in the BMZ, however, such cases are the exception rather than the rule.

174 Eleven of the 23 DAC members have a law of this kind (in brackets the year in which the current version was passed): Austria (2002), Belgium (1999), Denmark (1998), Greece (1999), Italy (1987), Luxembourg (1996), Portugal (2003), Spain (1998), Switzerland (1976), United Kingdom (2002) and USA (1961). Although the EU does not have a specific law for its development cooperation, the Treaties of Maastricht (1992) and Amsterdam (1997) contain separate chapters on the EU's development cooperation.

litical weight carried by development policy, which is rather weak domestically, to expand its role as a cross-cutting task of all policies and thus to step up the call to enhance coherence for development by passing a separate law on development policy.¹⁷⁶

The most practical proposal in this respect was a bill on the development policy of the Federal Republic of Germany tabled in the *Bundestag* by the SPD's parliamentary party in 1994 and again in 1995, but rejected by the then coalition government of the CDU/CSU and FDP.¹⁷⁷ It detailed the objectives of the development policy, demanded that the Federal Government's policy should not be inconsistent with those objectives¹⁷⁸ and provided for all policies to undergo developmental impact assessment.

Whether a specific law upgrades development policy in the political play of forces and facilitates the achievement of the goal of policy coherence for development very much depends on actual conditions. This was also

The other eleven DAC members do not have specific laws on development policy. The parliaments of some of these countries (e.g. Norway and Sweden) have debated and approved, i.e. endorsed, government documents on the basic principles of development policy, which do not, however, constitute laws. Almost all the DAC members, including those with specific laws, have government documents on the basic principles of development policy. Source: DAC review reports of recent years.

175 The legal basis for German development cooperation is formed by the annual budget laws and agreements governed by international law.

176 The call for a law was voiced *inter alia* in the Memoranda on Development Policy submitted by groups of development experts before the 1994 and 1998 general elections (see Memorandum 1994, 1998), by the SPD's parliamentary party, which tabled an appropriate bill in the Bundestag in 1994 and 1995 (see SPD-Bundestagsfraktion 1995) and by the SPD Party Conference in Hanover in 1997 (see SPD-Parteitag Hannover 1997). On the initiative of the SPD's parliamentary party the Bundestag's Committee on Economic Cooperation had held a hearing on its development policy bill in the spring of 1994.

177 See SPD-Bundestagsfraktion (1995).

178 Section 21(1): "*The policy of the Federal Government shall not be inconsistent with the objectives and standards enshrined in this Act.*" The wording thus used to describe the goal of policy coherence for development is more concise than that used in paragraph 3 of the preamble to the bill: "*The Federal Republic of Germany shall (...) take account throughout its policy of the repercussions of its action for other countries and for the international community.*" The latter wording corresponds to the weaker wording of the requirement of coherence in the Treaty of Maastricht/Amsterdam (see Chapter 3.2).

noted by the DAC in a comparative analysis of its member countries' development policies (see Box 8).

Box 8: Advantages and disadvantages of specific laws on development policy: experience in the DAC member countries

"Some DAC Members have legislation governing their development cooperation programme. Whether a basic law is necessary, the extent of its coverage and whether it would favour improved aid effectiveness is country specific and a matter for consideration and debate within each country.

One value of having legislation is that parliamentarians must concentrate on development cooperation and provide a political stamp of approval for the programme. Having a basic law provides a long-term foundation for development cooperation, which is beneficial, but it can also create rigidities which may be difficult to remove once they have been established by law. The legislative process can become politicised and used to make development cooperation an arena for political contention. Thus, the flexibility of operating without a basic law, with development cooperation continually reviewed and approved by successive governments, may have some positive aspects.

The existence of a basic law has the advantage of setting out a framework for funding and operations of the programme and demonstrates clearly the long-term importance of development cooperation for a given country. But, obviously, some countries have achieved these goals through Cabinet decisions, White Papers and policy statements – which are not basic laws – and by relying on appropriations legislation for the legal authority to implement their programmes."

Source: OECD/DAC (1999, 26)

Development policy is strengthened by a law only if it does not otherwise have any long-term political protection and its fundamental objectives are in danger of being repeatedly altered or made subject to other objectives when governments change or coalitions are formed. A law, however, prevents this only if it has the backing of a large parliamentary majority and, if possible, a cross-party consensus, because laws passed by a small majority can be quickly amended when parliamentary majorities change.

A law may facilitate the assertion of demands for policy coherence for development if the cross-cutting nature of development policy and the responsibility shared by other policies for development in partner countries and at global level are not yet established politically elsewhere. This is, however, clearly the case in Germany, as pointed out in Chapter 3.1.

Although a law may even then reaffirm the goal of enhancing coherence for development and create an additional reference base, it cannot pre-empt implementation since that requires substantive reasoning and political negotiation. A law certainly cannot declare development objectives to be overriding objectives to which all other policies are subordinated since, as mentioned in Chapters 2.4 and 2.5, other policies have competing claims at the level of overriding objectives.

Conclusion: For achieving practical progress towards coherence a specific law on development policy would not bring a decisive additional benefit in the current situation in Germany and is not therefore a prerequisite.¹⁷⁹ Actual implementation is more important. A law on development policy should not, moreover, make commitments which interfere with the Federal Chancellor's or the Federal Government's responsibility for defining the departmental remit¹⁸⁰ or with the BMZ's executive responsibility.¹⁸¹

179 Two points need to be made here:

- This is not inconsistent with the statement in Chapter 3.2 that the Treaty of Maastricht or Amsterdam represents an important reference base in that it enshrines in law the requirement of coherence for development. This is true because, as mentioned above, various policies are the responsibility of the EU, the processes of political negotiation at EU level are even more complicated than at national level and, in view of the changing composition of the EU Councils of Ministers due to changes of government in the Member States, enshrining the requirement of coherence in the EU Treaties gives a clear and continuing signal.
- The new law on development policy in the United Kingdom referred to in Chapter 6.2 is not necessarily a precedent for a law on development policy in Germany. In the United Kingdom regularly recurring government spending requires parliamentary authorization in the form of a special law in addition to the budget law. See DFID (2002). The objectives of poverty reduction and sustainable development laid down in the International Development Act had previously been programmatically justified in the two White Papers of 1997 and 2000 and politically endorsed by the government. It is interesting to note, however, that the law explicitly earmarks British ODA for “*poverty reduction*” and “*sustainable development in one or more countries outside the United Kingdom*”, which gives DFID an additional instrument against possible domestic pressure to use resources for something other than development cooperation.

180 Thus the 1998 Memorandum called for a number of responsibilities for development previously assigned to other ministries to be transferred to the BMZ and for the new division of tasks to be laid down in a framework law on development policy. See Memorandum (1998, point 2). The broad lines of the federal ministers' portfolios are defined,

8.5 Increasing strategic competence and the capacity for active coherence work

8.5.1 Further development of the development policy concept from the coherence viewpoint

Progress towards coherence depends on a system of objectives as a frame of reference for the definition of coherence. As mentioned above and as acknowledged by the DAC,¹⁸² the German development policy has a considerable conceptual framework for this purpose.

Particular reference should be made to the understanding of development policy as part of global structural policy,¹⁸³ the Federal Government's Programme of Action 2015 for Poverty Reduction¹⁸⁴ and the Sustainability Strategy for Germany,¹⁸⁵ and also to the amended Political Principles for Arms Exports¹⁸⁶ and the revised Guidelines for the Granting of Export Guarantees.¹⁸⁷ These are Federal Government concepts or prescriptions and, as such, important reference bases for demands for coherence. But mention should also be made of the BMZ's many concepts, especially its sectoral, cross-sectoral, country and regional concepts.

When these conceptual foundations are used for coherence work, however, three aspects should be borne in mind:

pursuant to section 9 of the Rules of Procedure of the Federal Government, by the Federal Chancellor or, in the event of differences of opinion, by the Federal Government.

181 Section 18(2) of the bill tabled by the SPD's parliamentary party in 1995 provided: *"Together with the budget lines for development cooperation in the federal budget, the Federal Government shall submit to the Bundestag each year for a decision a framework plan with sectoral, regional and instrumental priorities and benchmark figures. Development cooperation decisions which greatly exceed those figures shall require the consent of the Bundestag."* SPD-Bundestagsfraktion (1995).

182 See Box 7.

183 Described in detail *inter alia* in the Eleventh Report on the Federal Government's Development Policy, 2001. See BMZ (2001a).

184 See BMZ (2001b).

185 Chapter F, "Assuming global responsibility"; see Bundesregierung (2002, 202–216).

186 See Deutscher Bundestag (2000).

187 See Hermes Kreditversicherungs-AG (2001).

- The conceptual framework is not static, but subject to changes, since there is a constant need for adjustment in the light of practical experience and the development debate in Germany and at international level,¹⁸⁸ and this also changes the frame of reference for efforts to enhance coherence. Demands for coherence for development must be guided, as it were, by a moving system of objectives. Coherence work does not therefore begin with the monitoring of other policies in the light of a set frame of reference, but with the ongoing review of this frame of reference with a view to defining the substance of coherence. A current example is the changing relationship and therefore the changing understanding of coherence between development policy and military actions.¹⁸⁹
- Although the Federal Government has acknowledged the goal of coherence for development on several occasions and explicitly included it in its concept, progress towards coherence depends not least on how this concept is fleshed out and where priorities are set throughout its implementation.
 - The Federal Government's commitment to the MDGs requires a definition of the German contribution to their achievement.¹⁹⁰ To elaborate an appropriate concept, a special unit for the Millennium Development Goals has been set up in the BMZ. The MDG agenda concerns both development cooperation¹⁹¹ and other poli-

188 The policy coordination of the donors in the DAC, the experience gained under the Poverty Reduction Strategies or the debate on the role of development policy in countries where conditions are difficult (failing states) should be considered in this context

189 See Klingebiel / Roehder (2004).

190 The Millennium Declaration (UN 2000) and the Road Map for its implementation (UN 2001) do not indicate how most of the MDGs, and especially the main goal of reducing extreme poverty, are to be achieved, let alone set out any recommendations or obligations for individual developing and industrialized countries. Conversely, however, the latter cannot rely on the argument that they are already contributing to the achievement of the MDGs with their development cooperation and other policies: they are rather called upon to specify their contribution, because otherwise the coordination within the donor community and with partner countries that is vital for the MDG project will be impossible.

191 This concerns a number of issues, e.g. priorities for certain MDGs, conceptual approaches for the German contributions to individual MDGs, the sector- and/or country-specific allocation of resources and cooperation with other donors.

cies¹⁹² and thus the coherence agenda, too. Depending on the priorities specified by the Federal Government, conclusions will have to be drawn as to the coherent contributions to be made by other policies.¹⁹³

- The AP 2015 defines ten areas of action, specifying a total of 75 actions, which concern both development cooperation and other policies. A number of measures have already been taken, and some progress has also been made in enhancing coherence (e.g. in the trade and agricultural policies).¹⁹⁴ The definition of the areas of action and planned actions in the course of the further implementation of the AP 2015 reveals grounds for demands for coherence to be addressed to other policies in the dual sense of overcoming incoherences and contributing to the achievement of the objectives set out in the AP 2015. The more concrete the terms in which the objectives pursued and the actions planned to this end are expressed, the more concrete the terms in which the contributions of other policies to coherence can be defined.¹⁹⁵

192 Contributions from other policies, yet to be defined, will be required in particular to achieve the targets under MDG 8, “Develop a global partnership for development”.

193 For example, research and health policy and patent protection rules in the case of MDG 6, “Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases”, environment policy in the case of MDG 7 and technology policy in the case of MDG 8, target 18 of which concerns modern information and communication technologies.

194 See the BMZ’s first interim report of June 2002 on the state of the implementation of the Programme of Action (BMZ 2002) and the second interim report presented on 10 March 2004 (BMZ 2004). Although the BMZ’s first interim report was criticized by NGOs for being entirely action-oriented (list of measures) rather than outcome-oriented, the progress towards coherence made in the sphere of agricultural policy was explicitly acknowledged. See GKKE (2003b), 4.

195 How far operationalization can go is evident from DFID’s Public Service Agreement (PSA) 2003-2006 on the British contribution to the achievement of the MDGs, which includes, as mentioned above, several joint targets of different government departments (see Chapters 6.2.2 and 6.2.5). Operationalizing the AP 2015 or the German contribution to the achievement of the MDGs through the setting of goals (e.g. reduction of absolute poverty or of child mortality in a country or region) and of goal achievement indicators and time horizons would have the advantage of enabling the intended outcome of the German contribution to be defined more clearly and for progress towards goal achievement to be measured. The problem is, however, that goal achievement does not depend solely or even primarily on the German contribution. This distinguishes the AP 2015 from, say, the Sustainability Strategy for Germany (see Bundesregierung 2002),

- Conversely, coherence aspects should be included in existing concepts that currently make no reference to them.
 - This is true of the BMZ’s many sectoral and cross-sectoral concepts that barely mention the demands for coherence for development addressed to other policies even though they form an excellent framework for them. Based on pooled experience and knowledge of development cooperation, the concepts set out guidelines for development cooperation measures in sectors or areas on which other policies often have a far greater influence than development cooperation. However, the concepts do not make use of the knowledge condensed in them to reflect the influence of other policies from a development viewpoint and to provide indications for shaping them more coherently, i.e. in a more development-friendly fashion.¹⁹⁶ As the concepts, most of which date back to the 1980s and 1990s, have in any case to be adjusted from time to time, coherence aspects should be explicitly addressed when the concepts are updated.
 - The BMZ’s country concepts, one of the main management instruments,¹⁹⁷ similarly lack a section on coherence issues, despite their virulence in many partner countries. Where this is the case, the country concepts should not only refer to the coherence problems but also consider the conclusions to be drawn from them for

which includes 21 measurable objectives, the achievement of which lies entirely within Germany’s sphere of influence. As DFID can already look back on two PSAs (1999/2000-2001/2002 and 2001/2002-2003/2004), the BMZ should have in-depth discussions on experience in this regard with DFID.

196 This concerns, for example, the sectoral concepts: “tropical forests” (which nonetheless refers to the important role of the trade and environment policies), “food aid and food security programmes” (agricultural policy), “fisheries and aquaculture” (fisheries policy), “refugee problems” (asylum policy), “vocational training” and “development cooperation in the university sector” (Green Card initiative, immigration policy) and “combating narcotics” (drugs policy).

197 “*The country concept is a management instrument and the basis for the country-related achievement of the BMZ’s development objectives. It forms the basis for medium-term cooperation with the developing country concerned, for coordination with the other donors and for the policy dialogue with the partner government, and it is meant to improve the transparency of the BMZ’s country-related development decisions.*” (underlining as in the original text) BMZ (1994).

the dialogue with the partners, for the shaping of development cooperation and for donor coordination.¹⁹⁸ The prescriptions for the elaboration of the BMZ's country concepts should provide for the inclusion of a section on coherence, in which the coherence issue is outlined and the BMZ's position in discussions both with other departments and with partner countries is briefly described. The EU is further advanced than the BMZ in this respect, the common framework for its country strategy papers containing a separate item entitled "Coherence".¹⁹⁹

8.5.2 Definition of a priority coherence agenda

Some coherence problems can be solved during the ongoing work between the BMZ and other departments. But where they are substantively more complex and/or politically more difficult to solve, greater efforts will be needed.

As coherence issues do not all arise at the same time, since the dimensions of the problems and the time horizons for dealing with them differ, and as

198 *Possible implications for the dialogue with the partners*: support for efforts to change industrialized countries' incoherent policies (e.g. subsidization of the export of agricultural products; cf. the Netherlands' "cotton diplomacy" to the benefit of West Africa or Federal Minister Wierzorek-Zeul's latest discussions in Benin on the effects of the USA's, Spain's and Greece's cotton subsidies) or the suggestion of countermeasures (e.g. higher tariffs on imports of subsidized agricultural products from industrialized countries).

Possible implications for development cooperation: If incoherences cannot be overcome in the short to medium term, development cooperation measures should be planned in such a way that their impact is not nullified by incoherent policies.

Possible implications for the donor dialogue: raising awareness of joint demands for changes to incoherent policies.

199 The common framework includes a section on coherence in Chapter 5, which states *inter alia* that the principle of coherence with other measures and activities of the EU must be upheld and that that section must, if appropriate, consider the links between development aid on the one hand and other Community activities – in such areas as fisheries, agriculture, trade, conflict prevention, food security and migration – on the other. Europäische Kommission (2000). According to a progress report on the implementation of the 2000 common framework, however, the country strategy papers compiled in accordance with that principle did not contain any sound coherence analyses. See Europäische Kommission (2002, 14, 20).

it is unlikely to be possible in either capacity or political terms to overcome them all at once, the BMZ should draw up a priority coherence agenda and define the goal (outcome sought), the result (output) and the intended approach for each coherence item on the agenda. Box 9 presents a number of general, i.e. non-item-specific criteria or test questions as examples, which are not necessarily exhaustive.

Box 9: Criteria for defining a priority coherence agenda

1 Screening of current coherence issues

- unresolved coherence issues arising from past and any future discussions on coherence between the BMZ and other departments (plus current checks with the units responsible for principles, institutions and sectors whether other coherence issues need to be discussed)
- coherence issues arising from the continued implementation of the AP 2015, i.e. from the setting of priorities within areas of action and the spelling out of individual actions announced in the AP 2015
- coherence issues arising from the concept for the German contribution to the achievement of the MDGs
- coherence issues that become topical because of international negotiations or conferences or are introduced into the debate by NGOs on a grand scale

2 Criteria for the prioritization of issues

- relevance of issues to development policy
- coherence issues for which there are objectively and politically prospects of change
- coherence issues for which alliances can be formed and campaigns possibly conducted
- temporal prioritization based on the chances of implementation (possibility of resolution in the short, medium or long term) and the development agenda (e.g. calendar of international negotiations)

3 Definition of goal (outcome sought) and result (output) of efforts to enhance coherence

- Precisely what substantive outcome is to be achieved? (what change to other, incoherent policies? what positive contribution to be made by other policies to the achievement of a given objective in the context of, say, the AP 2015 or the MDGs?)
- What output is planned for the achievement of the goal? (e.g. “coherence

dossiers” as in the Netherlands; workshops, events good for publicity and/or appearances by the BMZ’s minister and her deputies to discuss coherence problems; joint position of the departments for impending negotiations at EU or international level; joint position to be adopted by the BMZ and the departments responsible for development cooperation in other countries at international negotiations)

- What can the BMZ offer another department by way of analysis or sound arguments in order to make a positive contribution or to achieve a more coherent position?

4 Specification of the approach

- What expertise is needed? (clarification of any need for analysis)
- Where is the required expertise to be obtained? (see Chapter 8.5.5)
- How is the required expertise to be obtained? (see Chapter 8.5.5)
- How are the results of the analyses and the information obtained to be used? (for what activities and what output?; see point 2)
- How and at what level is the coherence issue to be addressed and handled in the various departments? (departmental meetings at desk-officer or higher level; handling by an interdepartmental working group or task force formed especially for the purpose)
- What political support can be mobilized and how? (other departments; parliament; NGOs; international alliances)
- What are the time horizons for each step?

8.5.3 Monitoring other policies

The screening of current coherence issues, as outlined in Box 9, gives the BMZ an extensive overview of the foreseeable coherence agenda, which it largely determines by prioritizing the issues to be considered and specifying the approach to be adopted.

It is not necessarily probable, but cannot be ruled out from the outset, that, regardless of this, completely new coherence issues will appear on the coherence agenda.²⁰⁰ Consequently, the goal of policy coherence for de-

200 One example is the Federal Chancellor’s Green Card initiative, which did not spend long at the interdepartmental stage and has raised questions from a coherence viewpoint.

velopment also requires the ongoing monitoring of other policies so that any incoherences may be identified early and, if necessary, included in the coherence agenda.

In principle, the need for such monitoring is undeniable if the goal of policy coherence is taken seriously. Questions arise, however, as to how it is to be carried out. During the development debate there have been repeated calls for the introduction of the developmental impact assessment (DIA) of other policies,²⁰¹ although statements have differed on precisely what is to be the subject and yardstick of DIA²⁰² and who is to carry it out.²⁰³ No indications of how DIA is to be undertaken are to be found. At best, parallels are drawn with statutory environmental impact assessments (EIAs)²⁰⁴ or with the practice of scrutinizing all measures adopted in the cabinet for their impact on the budget²⁰⁵.

However, these parallels arouse false expectations for several reasons:²⁰⁶

- EIAs are essentially project-related procedures that concern, in particular, investment projects. The assessment of the ecological, social

201 See *inter alia* Memorandum (1994, points 2.1 and 3.2) and (1998, 7); SPD-Bundestagsfraktion (1995, section 21); Schuster (1995, 25); SPD-Parteitag Hannover (1997, 35); Bundesfachausschuss Entwicklungspolitik der CDU (1997, point 9.c); Bohnet (1998, 105).

202 For example, the following are to be examined: “*Measures of other departments for compliance with the development objectives to be set out in a law [on development policy]*” (Memorandum 1994, point 2.1); “*all projects [of the Federal Government] in the areas of financial, monetary, economic, agricultural, trade, environment and technology policy for their economic, social and ecological effects on the developing countries*” (SPD-Bundestagsfraktion 1995, section 21(2)); “*To achieve coherence, the most important development-related measures adopted by the cabinet to secure the global future should undergo a developmental impact assessment (...)*” Bohnet (1998, 105).

203 For example, the Federal Government (SPD-Bundestagsfraktion 1995, section 21(2)); “*interdepartmental coordinating committee (chaired by the Federal Minister for Sustainable Development – BMNE)*” (SPD-Parteitag Hannover 1997, 35); “*preparatory coordinating body of the appropriate line ministers in the federal cabinet under the overall responsibility of the BMZ*” (Bundesfachausschuss Entwicklungspolitik der CDU (1997, point 9 c)); in some cases the question as to who is to carry out the DIA is also left open.

204 See Memorandum (1994, point 3.2).

205 See Bohnet (1998, 105).

206 For further details see Kürzinger (1996, 8–13).

and developmental impacts of applications for the granting of Hermes guarantees similarly concerns specifically definable projects (in this case, export transactions).²⁰⁷ The DIAs that have been called for, however, would concern other departments' or public institutions' policies or measures, which are not so clearly definable as equity projects, but have impacts over a far wider range that often defies accurate definition.

- For EIAs there are clear (if, in themselves, very complicated) lists of criteria. Despite all the difficulties associated with accurate forecasting, even impacts on budgets can be determined with respect to a single, measurable criterion (which happens to be probable costs). Similarly unambiguous and operationalized lists of criteria are not, however, available for “developmental impact”, although the MDGs and the AP 2015, for example, do provide more definite indications, and this for three basic reasons: because of the multidimensionality of development, because of the varied nature of ways to achieve development objectives (e.g. reduction of absolute poverty) and because of the previously mentioned complexity of development processes, which makes precise statements on links between causes and effects difficult.
- The introduction of EIAs in development cooperation has led to the creation of major administrative structures and operations for all bi- and multilateral donors. As a formalized procedure analogous to EIAs, DIAs would mean a hardly acceptable expense, since they would have to be applied to a very large number of very different policies and measures, whose impacts on developing countries and on global development can be determined, if at all, only with multidimensional systems of criteria (in view of the multiple objectives of development) and with considerable analytical capacities.

The coherence-related monitoring of other policies is therefore hardly conceivable as a formalized DIA procedure. A pragmatic, problem-oriented procedure, the stages of which are described in Box 10, would seem more realistic.

Box 10 begins by structuring only what, to some extent, is already being done in practice. It is important, however, to ensure information process-

207 Where there are indications of problematical impacts, provision is made for a multi-stage assessment procedure, which may be very extensive in certain cases. See Hermes Kreditversicherungs-AG (2001).

ing that is as efficient as possible, i.e. takes account of the workload of the substantively responsible units, and also effective, i.e. reveals relevant incoherences. For this three stages of information processing are proposed in Box 10.

Box 10: Monitoring of other policies from the viewpoint of coherence for development

- *Object of the monitoring:* Measures of the Federal Government and of the EU and international organizations in whose decision-making or supervisory bodies the Federal Government is represented (this includes not only EU policies, such as the common agricultural and fisheries policies, but also, for example, investment projects of the World Bank* and the IMF's policy in the area of indebtedness).
- *Monitoring yardstick:* Development objectives of the Federal Government or of the EU and international organizations in whose decision-making or supervisory bodies the Federal Government is represented; these objectives are not, however, an operationalized list of criteria, but require an analysis and assessment of each specific case.
- *Who monitors and assesses?* Mainly, but not only, the BMZ, where necessary with the help of outside expertise (see below); the goal of coherence for development applies in principle to all departments, which should therefore take such development viewpoints as those set out in the AP 2015 into account in their decisions; however, this is, in fact, to assign the BMZ an awareness-raising function.
- *Federal Government as a source of information:* Because of the cabinet principle and pursuant to sections 15 and 16 of the Rules of Procedure of the Federal Government (GO BReg)** and the Joint Rules of Procedure of the Federal Ministries (GGO),*** the BMZ is entitled to be informed of all matters which are considered and decided by the Federal Government and may concern the BMZ; to this extent there is no need for new legislation. The GGO as amended in 2001 signifies a procedural improvement in degree, but not in principle (see footnote 157).
- *Other sources of information:* It is not only its own observations and the information provided by other departments which are available to the BMZ. Information on the effects of other policies may also come from third parties, such as implementing organizations in development cooperation, other donors, NGOs, academic institutes and the media.

- *1st stage of information processing*: Forwarding of incoming information on effects of other policies to the substantively responsible divisions if it is not already available to them; if substantive responsibility cannot be clearly established, the information is forwarded to the proposed policy coherence unit (see Chapter 8.5.6); information is not always sent directly to the responsible divisions but, because of the different sources, to the cabinet office, the divisions responsible for basic principles, institutions, sectors and/or regions or to the minister and her deputies, for example.
- *2nd stage of information processing*: cursory assessment of the information by the substantively responsible division for any incoherence; if any suspicion of incoherence is then corroborated, discussion and specification of further action in the division or directorate; if there is a need for further assessment: involvement of the policy coherence unit to organize the necessary steps.
- *3rd stage of information processing*: If substantive responsibilities are not clear or there is a need for further assessment, the policy coherence unit should take over the matter and clarify the following points: what further information is needed for the assessment? Where is the information to be obtained? Who should be instructed, if necessary, to analyse the suspected incoherence (outside expert, working parties in the BMZ or between the BMZ and other departments, etc.)? When such analyses become available, discussion of further action together with the substantively responsible division.

* If provision has not already been made for project-related assessments.

** Section 15(1): “*All matters of general, domestic and foreign, economic, social, financial or cultural significance and in particular (a) all draft legislation, (b) all drafts of Federal Government regulations (...), (f) differences of opinion between Federal Ministers (...) shall be submitted to the Federal Government for discussion and decision*”; section 16(1): “*All matters submitted to the Federal Government shall be previously considered by the Federal Ministries concerned unless the urgency of a decision in a specific case necessitates an exception.*”

*** Section 19(1): “*In matters affecting the remits of more than one Federal Ministry, those Ministries will work together to ensure that the Federal Government speaks and acts consistently. Prompt and comprehensive involvement is the responsibility of the lead Federal Ministry. In simple cases, verbal involvement is sufficient, but must be recorded in the files.*”

8.5.4 Prerequisites for effective coherence work in the BMZ

On the one hand, conditions in the BMZ favour effective coherence work (key words: development policy conception, the BMZ’s own long experi-

ence, experience and expertise of the numerous implementing institutions, networking with other donors and international organizations, instruments for the procurement of expertise such as “sectoral projects” [*Sektorvorhaben*], Central Evaluation Programme and Research Programme). On the other hand, coherence concerns complex issues, the analysis and assessment of which make coherence work an ambitious task if any political decisions that may be necessary are to be taken. Coping with this task calls for:

- professional competence of the responsible divisions to (i) identify coherence problems, (ii) conduct coherence-related dialogue with other departments and (iii) assess analyses of coherence issues undertaken or obtained from elsewhere (e.g. from NGOs),
- time for these tasks alongside “day-to-day business”,
- staff continuity in the units so that the necessary competence and experience may be accumulated and also used,
- sufficient staff capacity for the sound processing of coherence issues in the BMZ, where necessary by working parties of the BMZ and other departments, but also in the Permanent Mission of Germany to the EU, for example;²⁰⁸ this capacity can be mobilized in various ways (e.g. relieving units of other tasks, reinforcing them with temporary specialists, using or forming thematic groups),
- coherence management to set and process the priority coherence agenda (Box 9) and to provide for the ongoing monitoring of other policies (Box 10).

8.5.5 Mobilization of necessary expertise

Coherence work calls for sound information on and analyses of the effects of other policies on development in the partner countries and on global

208 As a rule, the BMZ seconds one senior official to the Permanent Mission of Germany to the EU in Brussels; when Germany holds the EU Council presidency, he or she is assisted by a second official. It should be considered whether one official is enough to cope adequately with work on three fronts: Commission work (especially attendance of the meetings of the various development committees at EU level), parliamentary work (contacts with the European Parliament and its committees) and coherence work (other EU Councils of Ministers).

development or the contributions of other policies to the achievement of certain development objectives. As such information and analyses are not always available in the BMZ, a conscious effort must be made to obtain them. The question in this context is both *where* and *how* they are obtained:

- *Where*: implementing organizations; GDI; the BMZ's Scientific Advisory Council; other departments' scientific advisory councils;²⁰⁹ other academic institutes at home and abroad; NGOs; other donors, some of whom have significant analyses.²¹⁰
- *How*: screening of available information and coherence analyses, including those already carried out by other donors; briefing of the BMZ by experts; working meetings with experts; workshops or conferences to be attended by representatives of other departments, parliament, NGOs and academic institutes; tasks to be performed as part of the BMZ's Research Programme, the BMZ's Central Evaluation Programme or sectoral projects.

An example of an analysis of suspected incoherence commissioned by the BMZ is a GDI study of the effects of EU export refunds on the beef sectors of West African countries.²¹¹ The incoherence had initially been indicated by the evaluation of an Ivorian-German development project. When development NGOs took up the subject, the BMZ decided to commission an analysis and, by involving the Agriculture Ministry, succeeded in having the latter explicitly welcome the study.²¹²

209 *"Demanding payment of the 'debt' [of other departments as regards greater coherence] could be moved up the agenda by the discussion of coherence problems in the existing scientific advisory councils of the ministries concerned. Above all, it might be appropriate to bring together the advisory councils of the lead departments (...) for a thematically limited, well prepared, structured and results-oriented discussion of certain issues (...). The BMZ's Scientific Advisory Council might have a role to play here by taking the initiative."* Kürzinger (1996, 16).

210 See the comments on the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden in Chapters 6.2 to 6.4.

211 See Brandt (1995).

212 A letter from the Federal Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Forestry of 11 January 1994 contains the following statement: *"It is in the Federal Government's particular political interest to have the complex effects of these imports on the African agricultural and development policies, on the African consumer and food security policies and on*

The BMZ can also use the instrument of evaluation to examine aspects of coherence. The 2001 DAC peer review report on German development cooperation thus made the plausible recommendation that an evaluation be carried out to determine how far ecological, social and development aspects had been taken into account in the allocation of government export credit insurance, as had been decided in 2001 (see Box 7). Although the BMZ cannot decide to do this on its own, since overall responsibility rests with the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Employment, the ruling parties did agree in the 2002 coalition agreement that decisions on export guarantees should be transparent.²¹³

8.5.6 Establishing a policy coherence unit for the systematic preparation, support and appraisal of coherence work

The BMZ in fact already has various coherence commissioners and divisions concerned with coherence issues (leaving aside the sectoral and institutional divisions substantively responsible for individual coherence issues). Besides the heads of Directorates-General 2 and 3 and the official responsible for coherence in Division 03 (parliamentary and cabinet affairs), they are Divisions 04 (principles, conception and political planning of development policy) and 300 (AP 2015, cross-divisional questions of principle).

This capacity should be enough for an assessment of and a decision on coherence issues (possibly on the basis of a prior detailed analysis). It will not necessarily be enough, on the other hand, for efficient and effective management of coherence work. Management in this context means:

- organizing the processing of information (see Box 10),
- clarifying the objective and outcome of and approach to coherence work (see Box 9, points 3 and 4) together with the substantively responsible divisions,

German and European agriculture investigated by an objective and independent academic third party.” Quoted from Brandt (1995, IX).

213 “*In the promotion of foreign trade we will make decisions on guarantees transparent. World Bank standards will be maintained in decisions on guarantees, and violations of human rights will be investigated.*” Koalitionsvertrag (2002, Chapter IX, 9).

- initiating, supporting organizationally and sustaining the coherence work thus defined,
- organizing purposeful approaches to other departments, parliamentarians, NGOs, the media and multipliers on coherence issues,
- drawing up a detailed chapter on coherence for the periodic reports on the Federal Government's development policy and for the interim reports on the implementation of the AP 2015 to inform the Federal Government, parliament and the public.

It is proposed that a policy coherence unit consisting initially, for a trial period, of two persons should be set up to perform these tasks. It would not be responsible for substantive assessments but for the management tasks outlined above. It would act as a service unit for the substantively responsible divisions of the BMZ. It should also foster close exchanges with (i) comparable policy coherence units of other donors (e.g. the one in the Dutch Foreign Ministry²¹⁴ and the EU Commission's coherence advisers), (ii) the OECD Secretariat's coherence adviser²¹⁵ and (iii) research institutes with a profound interest in coherence issues.²¹⁶

8.6 Arranging policy coordination and interdepartmental agreement

8.6.1 Process- versus structure-oriented approaches to the improvement of policy coherence

The establishment of a government policy that is as coherent as possible is very largely a task for policy coordination and interdepartmental agreement. During the development debate it has repeatedly been proposed that coherence should be improved by means of new structures, i.e. through the creation of additional formalized coordinating fora and mechanisms. The

214 See the description of tasks in Box 5 and the proposals for a similar task force in Sweden in Chapter 6.4.

215 Currently, Alexandra Trzeciak-Duval, Special Adviser on Policy Coherence for Development, OECD Secretariat.

216 For example, the OECD's Development Centre, the Global Development Network, the Center for Global Development, Washington D.C. and the Expert Group on Development Issues (EGDI), Stockholm.

most prominent proposal along these lines called for the formation of a development cabinet chaired by the Federal Chancellor,²¹⁷ supplemented in some instances by an upstream coordinating body “for global development tasks” chaired by the BMZ.²¹⁸

In contrast, the view here is that there is no lack of opportunities for inter-departmental agreement and that it is a question of using them as efficiently and effectively as possible for coherence, i.e. optimizing the process of policy coordination and interdepartmental agreement. Only if structural obstacles are then encountered should thought turn to structural solutions.

8.6.2 On the question of a development cabinet or a special state secretaries’ committee for global development tasks

The expectation associated with a development cabinet is that it will improve policy coherence for development by declaring global structural policy to be the Federal Chancellor’s responsibility. The proposal for a development cabinet is obviously prompted by the existence of other cabinet committees, while the idea of an upstream coordinating body “for global development” presumably follows the example of a number of state secretaries’ committees set up to consider specific issues.

There are currently five cabinet committees.²¹⁹ They are chaired by the Federal Chancellor, with the Vice-Chancellor acting as vice-chairman, and the lead minister becomes acting chairman only when the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor are unable to attend. The proceedings are determined by

217 See *inter alia* Memorandum (1994) and (2002); Forum Eine Welt der SPD (1997, 7); Schleich (1998, 146); Köhler (2002, 181).

218 See Forum Eine Welt der SPD (1997, 7); Bundesfachausschuss der CDU (1997, point 9 c).

219 Reorganized by cabinet decision of 22 October 2002: Federal Security Council, Cabinet Committee for the New *Länder*, Cabinet Committee for Economic Affairs, Cabinet Committee for New Technologies and Cabinet Committee for the Environment and Health; see Busse (2003, 412). In practice, only the Federal Security Council is important. It also meets fairly regularly, while the others are convened only rarely.

the Federal Chancellor's Office.²²⁰ The cabinet committees must be distinguished from the state secretaries' committees for specific issues (currently five in number), including the State Secretaries' Committee for European Affairs (chaired by the Foreign Office) and the State Secretaries' Committee for Sustainable Development (occasionally known as the "green cabinet").²²¹

Whether a development cabinet or a special state secretaries' committee would increase the chances of an improvement in policy coherence for development seems questionable for several reasons:

- As a general rule, the decisive place for policy coordination is the cabinet, preceded by ongoing interdepartmental agreement at all levels in accordance with the GO BReg and the GGO. Cabinet committees and state secretaries' committees do not have the legal power to take decisions.²²² As coherence issues often stem from divergent interests and are therefore questions of power, a decision on them must ultimately be taken in the cabinet.
- As demands for coherence for development may affect policies of virtually all government departments, a development cabinet or a special state secretaries' committee would have to embrace either numerous departments or every other department concerned in a given case. As this already happens in the existing interdepartmental agreement processes, there would be a danger of added bureaucracy due to the creation of further committees.²²³

220 Laid down in section 1 of the Framework Rules of Procedure of the Federal Government's Cabinet Committees; see Busse (2001, 169).

221 The other three are the State Secretaries' Committees for Questions Relating to Secret Intelligence and Security, the New *Länder* and the Modern State – Modern Administration. See Busse (2001, 91f.).

222 See Maunz / Dürig (1983, Article 64), paragraph 42, and Busse (2001, 90). "*Cabinet committees are (...) not, under the Rules of Procedure of the Federal Government or even in the practice of government, a necessary or merely a frequently used preliminary to decision-making in the cabinet as a whole.*" Busse (1993, 417).

223 "*On the other hand, the importance of the cabinet committees must not be overrated. As a result of their (...) rules they are not, as coordinating instruments, as flexible as ministerial meetings convened on an ad hoc basis, where the preparation, participants and course of events need not be subject to set rules, but can be arranged to suit the occasion.*" Busse (1993, 417).

- Although a development cabinet would make development policy or global structural policy the Chancellor's responsibility, this would not necessarily improve coherence for development since the debate in that committee would be essentially controlled by the Federal Chancellor or the Chancellor's Office. In the political process it may be more propitious to gain the Federal Chancellor's support for a given aspect of development by political skill.²²⁴
- What was special about the "green cabinet" sometimes cited as an example was that the state secretaries' committee was set up to establish the Sustainability Strategy for Germany. The cabinet decision on the AP 2015, which is important for efforts to enhance policy coherence for development, was, however, taken some years ago.
- Besides the State Secretaries' Committees for European Affairs and Sustainable Development, which also consider development issues, there are already regular meetings of the permanent state secretaries to prepare cabinet meetings and of the parliamentary state secretaries (both chaired by the Federal Chancellor's Office).

8.6.3 Optimizing the process of policy coordination and interdepartmental agreement

Successful coherence work does not, in principle, require additional formalized institutional structures, but it does call for some optimization of the process through the active and flexible use of the existing opportunities for policy coordination and interdepartmental agreement. Important elements of process optimization are:

- continuation of the BMZ's talks with other departments on policy coherence,
- definition by the BMZ of a priority agenda for coherence for development,
- ongoing monitoring of other policies from the viewpoint of coherence for development,

224 Examples of where this has succeeded are the AP 2015 and the increase in the German ODA/GNI ratio to 0.33 % by 2006, both announced by the Federal Chancellor.

- discussion with the departments concerned of coherence problems identified in the previous three steps with the aim of finding a solution which is as coherent with development policy as possible,
- promotion of a culture of cooperation rather than insistence on strictly defined areas of competence (this concerns all departments),
- use by the BMZ of the monitoring function of the Federal Chancellor's Office.

The second and third steps (definition of the priority coherence agenda and ongoing monitoring of other policies) have already been explained. The other elements are briefly discussed below.

8.6.4 Function of the coherence talks

The coherence talks, as they have so far been conducted and may be continued, can achieve the following:

- identification of current coherence issues as seen by the BMZ and the other departments concerned,
- initial consideration of the coherence issues (with regard to both progress made and problems yet to be solved),
- raising the other departments' awareness of the BMZ's interest in coherence and the BMZ's awareness of the other side's views,
- agreement on action to be taken with respect to issues easily resolved,
- recording of more complex coherence issues and problems for the future coherence agenda.

The coherence talks thus have an exploratory, pre-clarification and initial awareness-raising function and are important in this respect, but where the issues are more complex or controversial, they cannot replace sound processing that is geared to political decision-making and so more binding in dealings between the BMZ and other departments and ultimately in the cabinet.

8.6.5 Interdepartmental handling of coherence problems

This concerns all levels, from desk-officer to minister and deputy minister level. According to those interviewed, the BMZ can make a major contribution to progress towards coherence if it (i) acts competently,²²⁵ (ii) offers other government departments expertise and sound arguments, (iii) not only backs up but also actively emphasizes its concerns, (iv) has the support of the BMZ's minister and her deputies in this, i.e. raises coherence issues at political level with commitment, and (v) where possible and necessary, mobilizes political support. This assessment is confirmed by the experience of proactive coherence work in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

It is important to foster working contacts and networking. For the analysis of more complex coherence issues and, where appropriate, the establishment of an agreed position for negotiations at EU or international level, it may be wise to form specific subject-related interdepartmental task forces, as has already happened on some occasions²²⁶ and has also been a common practice in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

8.6.6 Promotion of a culture of cooperation rather than insistence on strictly defined areas of competence

Departmental areas of competence are essential if there are to be delimitation of and respect for the political responsibility for the various areas of government action in the cabinet and outwardly and the responsibility for implementing the decisions taken. Formal responsibilities should not therefore be blurred (departmental principle).

On the other hand, each department is part of the Federal Government and therefore committed to interaction with a view to pursuing a common, in principle coherent government policy (cabinet principle). This is particu-

225 "Experience also shows (e.g. the technology debate in the context of the UNCED process) that technically competent inputs and constant presence can, even in the absence of formal responsibility, bring about something of a shift of emphasis towards development policy viewpoints and *de facto* (shared) responsibility." Kürzinger (1996), 15.

226 Examples are the interdepartmental Task Force on Global Public Goods formed on the BMZ's initiative and the Interdepartmental Group on Civil Crisis Prevention.

larly true of global structural policy, of which development policy is seen as forming part since it is very largely cross-cutting in nature and requires contributions from many other policies.

This being the case, the improvement of coherence for development requires, below the threshold of ultimate political negotiation and decision-making as a question of power, a form of cooperation among government departments that takes seriously the goal of coherence for development recognized by the Federal Government as a joint commitment and is geared to joint problem-solving. What is important in this context is a culture of interdepartmental cooperation which recognizes that “*only the common orientation of different policies and constructive interaction will lead on to the objective.*”²²⁷ The form which a culture of cooperation of this kind may take in practice is evident from the cooperation between the BMZ and the Federal Ministry for the Environment (BMU) (see Box 11).

As emphasized by the OECD’s general recommendations for coherence,²²⁸ a culture of cooperation of this nature can be promoted in different ways, examples being:

- exchanges of staff between departments (this is already happening to some extent),
- staff development planning geared to such exchanges,
- describing the tasks of the various divisions and staffing them in such a way that there is time for close coherence-related cooperation (extending as far as special task forces) with other departments and staff exchanges are facilitated.

As the BMZ as a whole is hardly likely to have any more staff available, ways of relieving the units of other tasks and involving implementing institutions in coherence work should be sought. The service function of the proposed policy coherence unit is also important.

227 Köhler (2002, 181).

228 See the key words referred to in Box 3: “*consultation-oriented culture*”, “*cooperative networking*”, “*interdisciplinary meetings*” and “*shared frameworks of understanding*”.

Box 11: Functioning division of labour between the BMZ and the BMU

Since the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 the BMU and BMZ have been able to agree on and to consolidate routines that facilitate coordination between the two departments and enable a joint approach to be adopted. These routines are based on each department's explicit recognition of the other's formal responsibility and professional competence.

For the negotiation and implementation of the Rio and Johannesburg environmental conventions, for example, it was agreed that responsibility should be shared, with the BMU generally taking formal responsibility for dealing with the substantive issues and the BMZ coordinating the financial aspects of implementation, i.e. support for the developing countries. The BMU is dependent on cooperation with the BMZ if it is to perform its global implementing remit. To avoid incoherences, the BMZ introduces the development perspective wherever adjustments to the BMU's position are necessary.

This approach usually makes it possible to withstand the developing countries' demands for further funds for the achievement of global environmental targets. These demands will continue to be problematical until the overall ceiling of the BMZ's Departmental Budget 23 is raised significantly.

The procedures for the planning of cooperation at bilateral level need to be improved. The BMU has concluded 22 bilateral agreements, including some with larger developing countries, with which the BMZ for its part has agreed focal areas of cooperation. To enable synergies to be identified and exploited, this process should be preceded by an intensive exchange of information between the two departments.

8.6.7 The BMZ's use of the monitoring and coordinating function of the Federal Chancellor's Office

The implementation of cabinet decisions is incumbent on the departments within the limits of their formal responsibilities. The Federal Chancellor's Office has a monitoring and coordinating function in this context, one of its tasks being to inform the Federal Chancellor of the work being done in the federal ministries, to ensure the Federal Chancellor's (and *de facto* the cabinet's) decisions are implemented and to coordinate the activities of the federal ministries.²²⁹

229 Referring to the tasks of the Chancellor's Office, the preface to the budget of the Federal Chancellor and the Chancellor's Office (Departmental Budget 04) states: "*The Fed-*

This means that the Chancellor's Office must ensure the implementation of the AP 2015 as adopted by the cabinet. As the AP 2015 explicitly provides for coherent contributions from various policies, the BMZ would be well advised to keep the Chancellor's Office fully informed of the implementation of the AP 2015 and, where appropriate, of any coherence issues that are difficult to resolve. Although the Chancellor's Office does not have any substantive responsibility and therefore no specific monitoring and coordinating function, its function being political, it must ensure the implementation of the AP 2015 in accordance with the objectives set by the cabinet and can therefore support the BMZ in its efforts to enhance coherence, where necessary.

8.7 Mobilizing domestic support

8.7.1 Parliament

Parliament is not automatically an ally in efforts to enhance policy coherence for development, since its Members, as "representatives of the whole people" (Article 38 of the Constitution), represent and articulate multiple interests as individuals, as members of parliamentary parties and in their totality, those interests being a major cause of policy incoherence. Parliament may, however, provide important political support if the significance of coherence for development as well as the consequences of incoherence can be made clear in parliament.

A great deal of work has already been done in this respect. The *Bundestag*, for example, set up a Commission of Inquiry into the Globalization of the World Economy, whose final report, as previously mentioned, emphasized coherence as a major prerequisite for the shaping of globalization. Other examples are the last two reports to the *Bundestag* on the Federal Government's development policy, which explained the goal of policy coherence for development, and statements by the BMZ's minister and her deputies in parliamentary debates.

eral Chancellor's Office is required to inform the Federal Chancellor of current general policy issues and of the work being done in the federal ministries. It is its task to prepare the Federal Chancellor's decisions and to ensure their implementation. The Federal Chancellor's Office also has the task of coordinating the activities of the federal ministries."

Raising parliament's awareness of the need for coherence for development is, however, a continuing task. Important targets for efforts in this area, which may, conversely, influence the decision-making process in parliament to the advantage of greater coherence for development, are the *Bundestag* committees, and not only the Committee for Economic Cooperation and Development (AwZ) but also other committees whose area of policy is relevant from the coherence viewpoint or which are concerned with globalization,²³⁰ the parliamentary parties' working groups on development and, not least, the rapporteurs on Departmental Budget 23 of the federal budget (BMZ budget), to whom it cannot be a matter of indifference if the effects of development cooperation are nullified by other policies.

With the help of the implementing institutions, the BMZ can appeal to parliament, the bodies referred to above and also individual Members in many ways: at political level through the BMZ's minister and her deputies, through the Federal Government's report on development policy, through the interim reports on the implementation of the AP 2015, by inviting Members to discussion meetings, etc. Conversely, parliament, too, has opportunities to consider coherence issues (e.g. topical debates, discussion in the AwZ and other committees, questions to the Federal Government).

8.7.2 Non-governmental organizations

Experience shows that development NGOs can provide major support in coherence work since they are able (i) to concentrate energies on procuring and disseminating information and on political education by focusing on one subject ("one-issue parties"), (ii) to obtain rapidly, through their international networks, information on the effects of a policy on developing countries and specific target groups in them and (iii) to attract, through their ability to conduct campaigns, political attention which a government cannot ignore. However, the work of NGOs is helpful in efforts to enhance coherence only if it is based on sound information, and even when this is

230 For example, the Foreign Committee's Subcommittee on Globalization and Foreign Trade.

so, certain other conditions sometimes need to be satisfied if the involvement of NGOs is to have the effect of improving policy coherence.²³¹

Where coherence issues are concerned, development NGOs have repeatedly voiced constructive criticism of the BMZ's efforts to improve policy coherence.²³² It is therefore important for the BMZ to examine and use the information provided by NGOs, to address coherence issues in the dialogue with NGOs and, not least, to use and support the significant role played by NGOs in public relations work in the development field by providing information (e.g. the BMZ's participation in debates and discussion circles organized by NGOs).

Cooperating with NGOs in this way does, however, have transaction costs, which must be borne in mind. They can be reduced by fostering the sometimes well-established cooperation with reputable NGOs, i.e. those with sound arguments, and by involving the proposed policy coherence unit in the management of NGO-related coherence work.

231 Two examples:

The EU's reduction of beef export subsidies in the mid-1990s was due not only to the campaigns conducted by German and other European NGOs, which criticized the adverse effects on West African countries in particular, but also to the GATT Uruguay Round negotiations and the reform of the EU agricultural policy initiated in 1992. In addition, the devaluation of the CFA franc depressed the West African countries' imports and therefore the distortions caused by the export subsidies. See Brandt (1995, VII).

Conversely, the criticism voiced publicly by NGOs (*Gemeinsame Konferenz Kirche und Entwicklung* – GKKE – and Transparency International) in the mid-1990s of the fact that bribes paid to foreign officials were tax-deductible was not enough on its own to force the Federal Government to amend the rules concerned: it was only when massive pressure was brought to bear by the USA and a number of other industrialized countries within the OECD on grounds of fair competition that the amendment was made. See Ashoff (1999, 144 ff.).

232 Besides the beef export campaigns of German and other European NGOs in the mid-1990s, there were, for example, the debt relief campaign conducted in the context of the Cologne G8 summit, the criticism levelled at the Federal Government's arms export policy (see inter alia GKKE 2003a) and the GKKE's comments on the implementation of the AP 2015 (GKKE 2003b), which, as has been mentioned, acknowledge the progress made towards coherence in the agricultural policy sphere.

8.7.3 Public relations work

A great deal of coherence work consists of informing and convincing “in the political arena”, which does not begin where political decisions are taken, but where interests are articulated. Informing and educating the public about development and coherence issues is therefore an important aspect of the efforts to enhance coherence.

The BMZ has already taken numerous steps in this direction, not least as part of the AP 2015 campaign (e.g. by setting up the 2015 Dialogue Forum).²³³ Similarly, if Germany is to contribute to the achievement of the MDGs, the public must be made more aware of them. In view of the importance of the AP 2015, not least for coherence work, the experience gained from the AP 2015 campaign should be analysed in due course within the BMZ and if necessary, i.e. if the BMZ’s information is not enough for an assessment, by means of an evaluation.

8.8 International cooperation

A considerable amount of coherence work concerns policies and measures on which decisions are taken at EU or international level, where, in other words, the BMZ or the Federal Government is not the sole actor. International cooperation with like-minded countries is therefore important. The BMZ has already engaged in such cooperation on many occasions, sometimes with the support of implementing institutions, and should continue to do so at all levels:

- at the level of the governments in EU Councils of Ministers or at international negotiations (e.g. G8, UN, international financial institutions, OECD),
- at the level of the ministers responsible for development policy (EU, DAC High Level Meetings, Utstein Group),²³⁴

233 For further details see BMZ (2004).

234 The Utstein Group is a loose discussion forum of the development ministers of Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

- at the level of directors-general (EU, DAC Senior Level Meetings), deputy directors-general, division heads and desk officers (networking),
- at the level of coherence advisers, where they exist,
- at the level of academic advisory groups and research institutes.²³⁵

An interesting example of networking was the Franco-German Working Group on Globalization set up by Federal Chancellor Schröder and President Chirac, in which, on the German side, the Foreign Office, the BMWi, the BMU and the BMZ were represented and which elaborated joint views on various problem areas.²³⁶ The initiative was interesting because two key EU countries were endeavouring to adopt joint positions. However, the working group has been inactive since the change of government in France in June 2002.

International cooperation also includes support for partner countries in their efforts to have the industrialized countries frame their policies more coherently. An example is the criticism voiced publicly by the Netherlands and, recently, by Federal Minister Wieczorek-Zeul of the cotton subsidies paid, in particular, by the USA, which have an adverse effect on West African countries.

235 See footnote 209.

236 See the document drawn up by the working group entitled “Global Governance in the 21st Century. A Franco-German View of Globalization.”

Bibliography

- Ashoff, G.* (1999): The Coherence of Policies Towards Developing Countries – The Case of Germany, in: J. Forster / O. Stokke (eds.), Policy Coherence in Development Co-operation, London: Frank Cass, 128–179
- (2002): Improving Coherence between Development Policy and Other Policies – The Case of Germany, GDI Briefing Paper, No. 1/2002, German Development Institute, Bonn
- (2003): Office note on the Experts' Meeting "The Coherence of Rich Countries' Policies on Developing Countries", organized by the OECD Development Centre and the Global Policy Project, 23–24 June 2003, Bonn
- (2004): Donor Coordination – a Basic Requirement for More Efficient and Effective Development Cooperation, GDI Briefing Paper, No. 7/2004, German Development Institute, Bonn
- Bendix, P.* (1987): Die Entwicklungspolitik der Niederlande, Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, Berlin
- Birdsall, N. / D. Roodman* (2003): The Commitment to Development Index – A Scorecard of Rich-Country Policies, Center for Global Development, Washington, DC
- BMI* (2000): Gemeinsame Geschäftsordnung der Bundesministerien, 26 July 2000, Berlin
- BMVEL* (2003): Aktionsplan Verbraucherschutz der Bundesregierung, Berlin
- BMZ* (1994): Allgemeine Erläuterungen für die Erstellung von Länderkonzepten zur Entwicklungspolitik (mit Mustergliederung), 7 February 1994, 130 - E 1200 4/94
- (1995): Zehnter Bericht zur Entwicklungspolitik der Bundesregierung, Entwicklungspolitik – Materialien, Bonn
- (1996): Entwicklungspolitische Konzeption des BMZ, in: BMZ aktuell, No. 72, Bonn
- (2001a): Elfter Bericht zur Entwicklungspolitik der Bundesregierung, BMZ-Materialien, No. 111, Bonn
- (2001b): Poverty Reduction – a Global Responsibility. Programme of Action 2015. The German Government's Contribution Towards Halving Extreme Poverty Worldwide, BMZ-Materialien, No. 108, Bonn
- (2002): Auf dem Weg zur Halbierung der Armut. Zwischenbericht über den Stand der Umsetzung des Aktionsprogramms 2015, BMZ Spezial, No. 53, Bonn
- (2004): Towards Halving Poverty. Second Interim Report on the Implementation of the Programme of Action 2015, BMZ Spezial, No. 80, Bonn

- Bohnet, M.* (1998): Stellungnahme anlässlich der Anhörung des Forums Eine Welt der SPD im September 1997 zum Thema "Reform der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit", in: E. Deutscher / U. Holtz / R. Röscheisen (eds.), *Zukunftsfähige Entwicklungspolitik. Standpunkte und Strategien*, Bad Honnef: Horlemann, 105–114
- Brandt, H.* (1995): Auswirkungen von Exporterstattungen der Europäischen Union auf die Rindfleischsektoren westafrikanischer Länder, German Development Institute, Berichte und Gutachten 1/1995, Berlin
- Bundesfachausschuss Entwicklungspolitik der CDU* (1997): Thesen zur Entwicklungszusammenarbeit als Beitrag einer Welt-Zukunftspolitik, in: *epd-Entwicklungspolitik*, No. 18/97, d22–d24
- Bundesregierung* (2000): Comprehensive Concept of the Federal Government on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building, 7 April 2000, www.auswaertiges-amt.de
- (2002): Perspectives for Germany. Our Strategy for Sustainable Development, www.bundesregierung.de
- (2004): Action Plan "Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building", 12 May 2004, www.auswaertiges-amt.de
- Busse, V.* (1993): Die Kabinettausschüsse der Bundesregierung, in: *Deutsches Verwaltungsblatt*, 108 (8), 413–417
- (2001): Bundeskanzleramt und Bundesregierung. Aufgaben, Organisation, Arbeitsweise, Heidelberg: Hüthig
- (2003): Änderungen der Organisation der Bundesregierung und Zuständigkeitsanpassungs-Gesetz 2002, in: *Die öffentliche Verwaltung*, 56 (10), 407–413
- Committee on Sweden's Policy for Global Development* (2002): A New Swedish Policy for Global Development, www.utrikes.regeringen.se
- Conference of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States* (2004): Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe (consolidated version of 29 October 2004)
- Deutscher Bundestag* (2000): Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung – Bericht der Bundesregierung über ihre Exportpolitik für konventionelle Rüstungsgüter im Jahr 1999 (Rüstungsexportbericht 1999), Anlage 1 a "Politische Grundsätze der Bundesregierung für den Export von Kriegswaffen und sonstigen Rüstungsgütern", Drucksache 14/4179
- (ed.) (2002): Schlussbericht der Enquete-Kommission "Globalisierung der Weltwirtschaft", Opladen: Leske + Budrich
- DFID* (1997): Eliminating World Poverty – A Challenge for the 21st Century. White Paper on International Development, London

- (2000): *Eliminating World Poverty – Making Globalisation Work for the Poor*. White Paper on Development, London
- (2002): *International Development Act 2002*. Introduction and Overview of the Act, www.dfid.gov.uk
- (2003): *DFID PSA 2003-06*. Public Service Agreement and Service Delivery Agreement, London
- Europäische Kommission* (2000): *Die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit der Gemeinschaft - Standardrahmen für die Länderstrategiepapiere*, Arbeitsdokument der Kommissionsstellen, SEK(2000)1049, Brussels
- (2002): *Fortschrittsbericht über die Umsetzung des Standardrahmens für die Länderstrategiepapiere*, SEK (2002)1279, Brussels
- European Convention* (2003): *Joint Position Paper on Development Co-operation in the new Treaty for the European Union* (signed by the Development Ministers of Austria, Belgium, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom, 1 May 2003), CONV 743/03, 15 May 2003
- European Council* (2003): *A Secure Europe in a Better World*. The European Security Strategy, Brussels
- Forster, J. / O. Stokke* (1999a): Introduction, in: id. (eds.), *Policy Coherence in Development Co-operation*, London: Frank Cass, 1–15
- (1999b): *Coherence of Policies Towards Developing Countries: Approaching the Problematique*, in: id. (eds.), *Policy Coherence in Development Co-operation*, London: Frank Cass, 16–57
- Forum Eine Welt der SPD* (1997): *Reformvorschläge zur Struktur der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit und Entwicklungspolitik*. Angebot zum Dialog, Entwurf für das Hearing zum gleichen Thema am 25.9.1997
- Genee, O.* (2003): *Policy Coherence for Development - A Dutch Approach* (Going Dutch and/or Dutch Courage), presentation at the Experts' Seminar organized by the OECD Development Centre and the Global Policy Project on "The Coherence and Impact of Rich Countries' Policies on Developing Countries", 23–24 June 2003, Paris
- GKKE (Gemeinsame Konferenz Kirche und Entwicklung)* (2003a): *Rüstungsexportbericht 2003*, GKKE-Schriftenreihe, No. 34, Bonn, Berlin
- (2003b): *Halbierung der extremen Armut*. Zweiter Bericht der GKKE zur Umsetzung des Aktionsprogramms 2015 der Bundesregierung, Berlin
- Hermes Kreditversicherungs-AG* (2001): *Ausfuhrleistungsgewährleistungen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Leitlinien Umwelt. Berücksichtigung von ökologischen, sozialen und entwicklungspolitischen Gesichtspunkten, 26 April 2001

- Hoebink, P.* (1999): Coherence and Development Policy. The Case of the European Union, in: J. Forster / O. Stokke (eds.), *Policy Coherence in Development Co-operation*, London: Frank Cass, 323–345
- Holmgren T.* (2003): Shared Responsibility - Sweden's Policy for Global Development, presentation at the Experts' Research Workshop "Quantifying the Impact of Rich Countries' Policies on Poor Countries", Center for Global Development, 23–24 October 2003, Washington, DC
- Hydén, G.* (1999): The Shifting Grounds of Policy Coherence in Development Co-operation, in: J. Forster / O. Stokke (eds.), *Policy Coherence in Development Co-operation*, London: Frank Cass, 58–77
- Klingebiel, S. / K. Roehder* (2004): Development-Military Interfaces. New Challenges in Crises and Post-Conflict Situations, GDI Working Papers, No. 5/2004, German Development Institute, Bonn
- Koalitionsvereinbarung* (1998): Koalitionsvereinbarung zwischen der SPD und Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, 20 October 1998
- Koalitionsvertrag* (2002): Koalitionsvertrag zwischen der SPD und Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, 16 October 2002
- Köhler, V.* (2002): Zur Zukunft des Auswärtigen Dienstes – aus der Sicht der Entwicklungspolitik, in: *E + Z Entwicklung und Zusammenarbeit*, 43 (6), 177–181
- Kürzinger, E.* (1996): Entwicklungsverträglichkeit, unveröffentlichte Stellungnahme des Deutschen Instituts für Entwicklungspolitik, Berlin
- Matthews, A.* (2004): Policy Coherence for Development – Issues in Agriculture, OECD, AGR/CA(2004)14, 29 October 2004, Paris
- Maunz, T. / G. Dürig* (1983): Kommentar zum Grundgesetz, 21. Lieferung, Munich: Beck
- McLean Hilker, L.* (2004): A Comparative Analysis of Institutional Mechanisms to Promote Policy Coherence for Development. Case Study Synthesis The European Community, United States and Japan, Room Document No. 7, OECD Policy Workshop "Institutional Approaches to Policy Coherence for Development", 18–19 May 2004, Paris
- Memorandum* (1994): Zur Verankerung der Nord-Süd-Politik in Parlament und Regierung. Forderungen an die Fraktionen im neuen Bundestag, Bonn
- Memorandum* (1998): Für eine Politik der nachhaltigen Entwicklung. Entwicklungspolitik als internationale Strukturpolitik. Forderungen an Bundestag und Bundesregierung, Bonn
- Memorandum* (2002): Entwicklungspolitik als Teil einer neuen Weltfriedenspolitik, Bonn

- Messner, D.* (2002): Nationalstaaten in der Global Governance-Architektur. Wie kann das deutsche politische System Global Governance-tauglich werden?, INEF Report 66, Duisburg
- Meyer, R.* (2003a): UK development cooperation – In the van of the reformers, in: *D+C Development and Cooperation*, 44 (3), 100–103
- (2003b): Dutch development cooperation reform – Getting the „development industry“ moving, in: *D+C Development and Cooperation*, 44 (3), 103–106
- Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken* (2002): General Memorandum on Policy Coherence, Coherence Letter, 28 March 2002 (Communication to the Dutch Parliament)
- (2003a): Mutual Interests, Mutual Responsibilities: Dutch Development Cooperation en Route to 2015
- (2003b): Policy coherence for development, 12 June 2003, www.minbuza.nl
- Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken / Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij* (2003): Memorandum on Coherence between Agricultural and Development Policy, The Hague
- Mkandawire, T.* (2001): Policy Coherence – Trends and Policy Implications for International Development Co-operation, Paper prepared by the Director of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development for the Parliamentary Commission on Swedish Policy for Global Development, Geneva
- Morgenroth, S.* (2003): Zusammenfassung und Auswertung der Vorlage der schwedischen Regierung an das schwedische Parlament "Shared Responsibilities – Sweden's Policy for Global Development", BMZ office note 411-E 6200-29, 1 September 2003
- Netherlands' Delegation (to the OECD)* (2002a): Communication on Coherence between Agricultural and Development Policy, DAC Senior Level Meeting, 12–13 December 2002, Room Document No. 10, DCD/DAC/A(2002)18/RD10
- (2002b): Communication on LDC Cotton Farming, DAC Senior Level Meeting, 12–13 December 2002, Room Document No. 11, DCD/DAC/A(2002)18/RD11
- Nicod, M.* (2004): Institutional approaches to promote policy coherence for development. Findings and lessons from DAC Peer Reviews, Room Document No. 8, OECD Policy Workshop "Institutional Approaches to Policy Coherence for Development", 18–19 May 2004, Paris
- Nohlen, D.* (2002): Globalisierung, in: id. (ed.), *Kleines Lexikon der Politik*, Munich: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 181–183
- OECD* (1999): Trade, Investment and Development – Policy Coherence Matters, Paris
- (2001): Untying Aid to the Least Developed Countries, OECD Policy Brief, OECD Observer, July

- (2002a): Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries. Monitoring and Evaluation 2002, Paris
- (2002b): OECD Council at Ministerial Level, 15-16 May 2002, Final Communiqué, PAC/COM/NEWS (2002)58, Paris
- (2002c): Governance for Sustainable Development. Five OECD Case Studies, Paris
- (2003): Policy coherence: Vital for global development, OECD Policy Brief, OECD Observer, July
- (2005): Policy Coherence for Development. Promoting Institutional Good Practice, Paris
- OECD/DAC* (1992): Development Co-operation (Efforts and Policies of the Members of the Development Assistance Committee) – 1992 Report, Paris
- (1996): Shaping the 21st Century – The Contribution of Development Co-operation, Paris
- (1997): Development Co-operation Review of the Netherlands, Development Co-operation Review Series, No. 24, Paris
- (1998): Development Co-operation Review of Germany, Development Co-operation Review Series, No. 29, Paris
- (1999): A Comparison of Management Systems for Development Co-operation in OECD/DAC Members, DCD(99)6, 5 July 1999, Paris
- (2000): Development Co-operation Review of Sweden, in: *The DAC Journal* 1 (4), I-3–I-80
- (2001a): The DAC Guidelines – Poverty Reduction, Paris
- (2001b): Development Co-operation Review of the United Kingdom, in: *The DAC Journal* 2 (4), I-5–I-100
- (2001c): Development Co-operation Review of the Netherlands, in: *The DAC Journal*, 2 (3), I-3–I-62
- (2001d): Development Co-operation Review of Germany, in: *The DAC Journal*, 2 (4), II-1–II-108
- (2002): Development Co-operation (Efforts and Policies of the Members of the Development Assistance Committee) – 2001 Report, in: *The DAC Journal* 3 (1)
- (2003a): Harmonising Donor Practices for Effective Aid Delivery. Good Practice Papers. A DAC Reference Document, Paris
- (2003b): Development Co-operation (Efforts and Policies of the Members of the Development Assistance Committee) – 2002 Report, in: *The DAC Journal* 4 (1)
- OECD/PUMA* (1996): Building Policy Coherence. Tools and Tensions, Public Management Occasional Papers, No.12, Paris

- (2000): Governance and Coherence. The PUMA Mandate, the Challenges and the Concept, PUMA(2000)7, 17 March 2000, Paris
- (2002): Improving Policy Coherence and Integration for Sustainable Development. A Checklist, Policy Brief, OECD Observer, October
- OECD Development Centre* (2003): Experts' Seminar "The Coherence and Impact of Rich Countries' Policies on Developing Countries" – Background Note, Paris
- Pedley* (2002): Changes in Strategic Influence – DFID's Contribution to Trade Policy, DFID Evaluation Department
- Picciotto, R.* (2005): Policy Coherence and Development Evaluation. Issues and Possible Approaches, in: OECD, Policy Coherence for Development in a Global Economy, Paris
- Regeringskansliet / Ministry for Foreign Affairs* (2003): Shared Responsibility – Sweden's Policy for Global Development, Government Bill 2002/03:122, 15 May 2003, www.utrikes.regeringen.se
- Rome Declaration on Harmonisation* (2003), in: OECD/DAC: Harmonising Donor Practices for Effective Aid Delivery. Good Practice Papers. A DAC Reference Document, Paris
- Schleich, B.* (1998): Stellungnahme anlässlich der Anhörung des Forums Eine Welt der SPD im September 1997 zum Thema "Reform der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit", in: E. Deutscher / U. Holtz / R. Röscheisen (eds.), *Zukunftsfähige Entwicklungspolitik. Standpunkte und Strategien*, Bad Honnef: Horlemann, 145–149
- Schuster, W.* (1995): Neuordnung der Entwicklungspolitik der BRD, in: *epd-entwicklungspolitik*, No. 14/15
- Siebold, T.* (1998): Kohärenz und deutsche Entwicklungspolitik. Problemfelder und Ansatzpunkte zur Verbesserung. Studie für die Gemeinsame Konferenz Kirche und Entwicklung (GKKE), Duisburg, Hamburg
- SPD-Bundestagsfraktion* (1995): Entwurf eines Gesetzes zur Entwicklungspolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland vom 29.6.1995, Deutscher Bundestag, Drucksache 13/2223
- SPD-Parteitag Hannover* (1997): Globalisierung und nachhaltige Entwicklung. Beschluss des SPD-Parteitags Hannover im Dezember 1997, abgedruckt in: E. Deutscher / U. Holtz / R. Röscheisen (eds.), *Zukunftsfähige Entwicklungspolitik. Standpunkte und Strategien*, Bad Honnef: Horlemann, 27–40
- Sprinz, D.F.* (2003): Internationale Regime und Institutionen, in: G. Hellmann / K.D. Wolf / M. Zürn (eds.), *Die neuen Internationalen Beziehungen. Forschungsstand und Perspektiven in Deutschland*, Baden-Baden: Nomos, 251–274

- United Nations* (2000): United Nations Millennium Declaration, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, A/RES/55/2, 18 September 2000, New York
- (2001): Road map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration. Report of the Secretary General, A/56/326, 6 September 2001, New York
 - (2002a): Report of the International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico, 18–22 March 2002, A/CONF.198/11
 - (2002b): Report of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa, 26 August – 4 September 2002, A/CONF.199/20
- Wiemann, J.* (2001): Antworten zum Fragenkatalog für die Sitzung der AG II der Zuwanderungskommission zum Thema Entwicklungspolitik am 14.3.2001, German Development Institute, Bonn
- Wolf, K.D.* (1994): Regimeanalyse, in: D. Nohlen (ed.), Lexikon der Politik, Band 6: Internationale Beziehungen (edited by A. Boeckh), Munich: Beck, 422–429
- World Bank* (2001): Global Economic Prospects and the Developing Countries 2002, Washington, DC
- World Trade Organization* (2001): Ministerial Declaration, adopted on 14 November 2001, Ministerial Conference, Fourth Session, Doha, 9–14 November 2001, WT/MIN(01)/DEC/1

Publications of the German Development Institute

Book Series with Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft

Neubert, Susanne / Waltina Scheumann / Annette van Edig / Walter Huppert (eds.): Integriertes Wasserressourcen-Management (IWRM): Ein Konzept in die Praxis überführen, p. 314, Nomos, Baden-Baden 2004, ISBN 3-8329-1111-1

Messner, Dirk / Imme Scholz (eds.): Aktuelle Herausforderungen für die Entwicklungspolitik, p. 410, Nomos, Baden-Baden 2004, ISBN 3-8329-1005-0

Brandt, Hartmut / Uwe Otzen: Armutsorientierte landwirtschaftliche und ländliche Entwicklung, p. 342, Nomos, Baden-Baden 2004, ISBN 3-8329-0555-3

[Books may be ordered through bookshops.]

Book Series with Weltforum Verlag

118 *Ashoff, Guido*: Der Entwicklungshilfeausschuss der OECD und die deutsche Entwicklungszusammenarbeit: ein Verhältnis auf dem Prüfstand, p. 182, Bonn 2000, ISBN 3-8039-0497-8

117 *Scholz, Imme*: Nutzung natürlicher Ressourcen zwischen Raubbau und Nachhaltigkeit: Sozioökonomische Bedingungen und unternehmerische Handlungsmuster, p. 446, Bonn 1999, ISBN 3-8039-0492-7

116 *Neubert, Susanne*: Die soziale Wirkungsanalyse in armutsorientierten Projekten. Ein Beitrag zur Methodendiskussion in der Evaluationspraxis der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, p. 139, Cologne 1999, ISBN 3-8039-0487-0

115 *Klingebiel, Stephan*: Leistungsfähigkeit und Reform des Entwicklungsprogramms der Vereinten Nationen (UNDP), p. 379, Cologne 1998, ISBN 3-8039-0483-8

114 *Hannig, Alfred*: Finanzsystemreformen. Konzept, Erfahrungen und Perspektiven am Beispiel Boliviens, p. 193, Cologne 1998, ISBN: 3-8039-0480-3

[Books may be ordered through bookshops.]

Reports and Working Papers

- 11/04 *Scholz, Imme et al.*: Sociedade civil e política ambiental na Amazônia. Os casos da berragem de Belo Monte e da rodovia federal BR-163, p. 85, Bonn 2004, ISBN 3-88985-272-6 (German edition: ISBN 3-88985-260-2 – Berichte und Gutachten 12/03)
- 10/04 *Qualmann, Regine et al.*: Negotiating Economic Partnership Agreements with the EU. Opportunities, Risks, and Negotiation Options for Tanzania, p. 70, Bonn 2004, ISBN 3-88985-270-X
- 9/04 *Goedeking, Ulrich*: Staatliche Regulierung des Engagements deutscher zivilgesellschaftlicher Organisationen und ihrer Partner in Entwicklungs- und Transformationsländern: Restriktionen und Reaktionsmöglichkeiten der deutschen EZ, p. 52, Bonn 2004, ISBN 3-88985-269-9
- 8/04 *Brandt, Hartmut*: Probleme und Tendenzen der Agrarpolitik in Subsahara-Afrika, p. 87, Bonn 2004, ISBN 3-88985-268-8
- 7/04 *Leiderer, Stefan*: Öffentliches Budgetmanagement in Entwicklungsländern: Analyseinstrumente und Ansatzpunkte der programmorientierten Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, p. 81, Bonn 2004, ISBN 3-88985-267-X
- 6/04 *Grävingholt, Jörn*: Krisenpotenziale und Krisenprävention in Zentralasien. Ansatzpunkte für die deutsche Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, p. 74, Bonn 2004, ISBN 3-88985-266-1 (English edition: ISBN 3-88985-273-4 – Studies 1)
- 5/04 *Klingebiel, Stephan / Katja Roehder*: Development-Military Interfaces. New Challenges in Crises and Post-conflict Cooperation, p. 48, Bonn 2004, ISBN 3-88985-263-7 (German edition: ISBN 3-88985-263-7 – Berichte und Gutachten 3/04)
- 4/04 *Rodenberg, Birte*: Gender and Poverty Reduction. New Conceptual Approaches in International Development Cooperation, p. 73, Bonn 2004, ISBN 3-88985-264-5 (German edition: 3-88985-257-2 – Berichte und Gutachten 9/04)

[Price: 9.63 Euro; may be ordered directly from the Institute or through bookshops. This publication series was terminated and superseded by the new publication series “Studies” starting November 2004]

New publication series from November 2004

Studies

- 10 *Schmidt, Petra*: Budgethilfe in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit der EU, p. 137, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-295-5
- 9 *Loewe, Markus*: Relevanz der Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) für die Länder des Nahen Ostens und Nordafrikas sowie für die deutsche Entwicklungszusammenarbeit mit dieser Region, p. 225, ISBN 3-88985-294-7
- 8 *Dussel Peters, Enrique*: Economic Opportunities and Challenges Posed by China for Mexico and Central America, p. 140, ISBN 3-88985-290-4
- 7 *Müller, Katharina*: Transforming the Latvian Health System: Accessibility of Health Services from a Pro-poor Perspective, p. 119, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-289-0
- 6 *Ashoff, Guido*: Der entwicklungspolitische Kohärenzanspruch: Begründung, Anerkennung und Wege seiner Umsetzung, p. 128, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-286-6 (English edition: ISBN 3-88985-299-8 – Studies 11)
- 5 *Demtschük, Elke*: Strategische Allianzen zwischen Wirtschaft und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, p. 121, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-285-8
- 4 *Grävingholt, Jörn*: Pseudodemokratie in Rußland. Der Fall Baschkortostan, p. 262, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-284-X
- 3 *Brüntrup, Michael*: Agrarwirtschaftliche Interessenlage und agrarpolitischer Handlungsbedarf subsaharischer Länder aufgrund der Agrarverhandlungen in der Doha-Runde am Beispiel Tansanias und Senegals, p. 187, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-279-3
- 2 *Herrfahrdt, Elke*: Landwirtschaftliche Transformation, Desertifikation und nachhaltige Ressourcennutzung. Fallbeispiel Usbekistan, p. 133, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-274-2

[Price: 10,00 Euro; may be ordered directly from the Institute or through bookshops.]

Discussion Paper

- 10/2005 *Scheumann, Waltina / Susanne Neubert*: Empfehlungen zur strategischen Orientierung der EZ im grenzüberschreitenden Gewässermanagement in Afrika, p.21, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-297-1
- 9/2005 *Grossmann, Malte*: Kooperation an Afrikas internationalen Gewässern: die Bedeutung des Informationsaustauschs, p. 39, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-296-3
- 8/2005 *Mostert, Erik*: How Can International Donors Promote Transboundary Water Management?, p. 34, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-293-9
- 7/2005 *Wirkus, Lars / Volker Böge*: Afrikas internationale Flüsse und Seen. Stand und Erfahrungen im grenzüberschreitenden Wassermanagement in Afrika an ausgewählten Beispielen, p. 65, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-292-0
- 6/2005 *Klaphake, Axel*: Kooperation an internationalen Flüssen aus ökonomischer Perspektive: Das Konzept des Benefit Sharing, p. 80, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-291-2
- 5/2005 *Jungnickel Rolf / Georg Koopmann*: Strengthening the Development Impact of UNCTAD's Investment Policy Reviews, p. 18, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-288-2
- 4/2005 *Neubert, Susanne / Lena Horlemann*: Empfehlungen zur zukünftigen strategischen Orientierung der deutschen EZ im Wasser- und Bewässerungssektor, p. 52, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-278-4
- 3/2005 *Klingebiel, Stephan / Stefan Leiderer / Petra Schmidt*: Programme Financing and Public Budgets. New Instruments and Starting-Points of Development Policy, p. 16, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-283-1
- 2/2005 *Klingebiel, Stephan*: How much Weight for Military Capabilities? Africa's New Peace and Security Architecture and the Role of External Actors, p. 28, Bonn 2005, ISBN 3-88985-282-3 (German edition: Discussion Paper 1/2005 – ISBN 3-88985-281-5)

[Price: 6.00 Euro; may be ordered directly from the Institute or through bookshops]

A complete list of publications available from DIE can be found at:

<http://www.die-gdi.de>