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Sub-Saharan Africa is currently the poorest sub-continent. Most of its 48 countries have little prospect of achieving the internationally agreed Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which would mean, for example, sharply reducing child mortality, which has for the EU long been mainly driven by children’s health services or suffering from malnutrition. In addition, and related to the resilience of poverty, governance is still weak in many African countries, though a number of them have made progress in terms of democratisation. And many are plagued by serious problems of public security or even civil war.

Africa is also a continent neighbouring Europe. The crises there inevitably have repercussions for the European Union (EU). One clear sign of this is the large number of Africans who try to bypass EU immigration controls and to reach Europe, seeking a better life as well as ways to support their relatives at home. Moreover, weak and failing states, many of which are in Africa, have come to be regarded as endangering international security — for example because transnational criminal or terrorist networks might operate from them. Thus Africa, which has for the EU long been mainly a case for development engagement, is now receiving increasing attention from foreign and security policy.

But a consistent European strategy to address Africa’s crises has been lacking. This is partly due to the fact that EU member countries are independent actors in important areas: The EU has only one common trade policy, but its development policy and the nascent Common Foreign and Security Policy are parallelled by corresponding national policies of member states, while immigration is chiefly a national responsibility. Also, policies of the European Commission in different areas may work at cross-purposes — for example agricultural subsidies, trade policy and development policy.

To remedy this, the European Commission, the Council and the Parliament in December 2005 signed a new common EU Africa Strategy. It is meant to be a guideline for all policies relevant to Africa of both the European Commission and the EU member states. While it centres on helping Africa achieve the MDGs, it puts considerable emphasis on peace and security as well as good governance. To what extent is this strategy a step forward, rather than a shopping list of already existing approaches? What are its strengths and weaknesses? Is the strategy likely really to make EU policies relating to Africa more coherent?

These were some of the questions dealt with at a conference organized by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, terre des hommes and World Economy, Ecology & Development (WEED) in Berlin in April 2006. The statements made at this conference and the discussions conducted there are presented in this publication. The annex documents the EU African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) and the discussions conducted there are presented in this publication. The annex documents the EU African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) and the discussions conducted there are presented in this publication.

Ralf Hexel, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung
Peter Eisenblätter, terre des hommes
Klaus Schilder, WEED
I. The EU Africa Strategy – A Convincing Response to the Challenges in the Partnership with Africa?

Siegmar Schmidt

On December 19, 2005, the EU Ministerial Council published an EU Strategy for Africa entitled: “The EU and Africa: Towards a strategic partnership”. After nearly 50 years of intensive development cooperation, this is the first EU political strategy for Africa. The aim of this contribution is the presentation of the strategy’s main contents according to the following key questions:

- Which aims, principles and instruments are contained in the strategy?
- Is the strategy a step forward on the previous EU policies towards Africa?
- Can the emphasis and priorities of the future EU policy for Africa be determined?
- Is the strategy realistic, i.e. is it an appropriate strategy to meet the challenges on the continent?

Since the EU Strategy for Africa did not emerge from a non-political sphere but resulted from internal EU dialogue as well as from external impulses, the development process of the strategy will be presented first. The EU commission’s extensive proposal on an Africa strategy is also of special significance for a further expansion of the strategy. The main emphasis of the presentation lies in the following chapter, which gives a detailed description of the contents of the strategy in several sections, including short comments. This section will refer primarily to the political areas of peace and security as well as human rights and governance. The areas development assistance, economic growth and trade as well as investing in people will be briefly summarized. In conclusion, the strategy will be embedded in the context of the EU policy for Africa and subjected to a critical review.

Background: the internal discussion and external impulses

The strategy is the result of the Union’s long-term efforts to formulate a coherent policy towards Africa that adequately meets the current challenges. In the one hand it is the result of an internal discussion and policy design process that lasted for several years. Different basic documents and statements from EU institutions emerged from this process. Among these were the EU Security Strategy in December 2003 and the European Consensus. On the other hand, the EU reacted to external impulses, especially the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). An important impulse for a conceptual revision of the previous Africa policy came from the British government towards Africa, which held the Council presidency and chaired the G8 summit at Gleneagles. The activities of the British government towards Africa had increased during recent years, as the constitution of the “Commission for Africa”, founded by Prime Minister Tony Blair in 2004, shows. Considering the strenuous negotiations on the Financial Framework 2007-2013, and its foreseeable failure, the Blair government has tried to achieve a positive balance for their Council presidency and strengthened their efforts to actively push for an Africa strategy in the Commission. The British initiative was supported by the general readiness of the EU member states (and the EU-institutions) to demonstrate unity after the Union’s split with regard to the Iraq question, and to prove the EU capacity to act on the neighbouring continent. Africa is also the continent with little or no conflicts of interest between the EU and the US so that there are possibilities for the EU to act.

The Millennium Development Goals defined by the UN in the year 2000 oblige the UN member states to make increased efforts, especially in reducing poverty, and improving health care and education. The aims – which included the reduction of poverty by half by 2015 – are said to be over-ambitious and thus cannot be met. The results so far indicate that the MDGs will not be met by African states, especially. The EU Security Strategy in December 2003 reaffirmed the EU aim to take over responsibility as a global player for international security. A main idea is the close interconnection between security and development: security is a prerequisite for development. Development is impossible if there are wars and violent conflicts. The indirect security threats from Africa include the worsened poverty situation in Africa, regional conflicts and the collapse of states. The EU explicitly mentions the conflict in the region of the Great Lakes. According to the EU, this conflict could promote extremism, terrorism and organised crime. Bad governance is considered one of the main causes for the collapse of the state in Liberia and Somalia. The Security Strategy relies on a combination of civil and military measures and instruments and clearly differs from the US’ National Security Strategy, which emphasises military instruments and “pre-emptive defence”. The EU Commission attempts to summarise the basics of European development co-operation (DC) in a document titled “The European Consensus” in July 2005 which received a lot of attention. The Commission especially emphasises that the EU’s DC (development co-operation) is a value-oriented policy based on human rights, democracy, rule of law and good governance. The Commission explicitly acknowledges the MDGs, which practically serve as guidelines and determine the direction of the EU’s DC. The Commission again refers to the interconnection between development and security. For the first time, the terminology of “difficult partnerships” is described extensively. The co-operation with a country is thus considered difficult if the authorities of the country concerned are thought to not to engage sufficiently in poverty reduction, if there are cases of weak governance, corruption and political oppression or the state institutions appear to be incapable of guaranteeing the citizens’ safety. This suggests a deviation from the previous principle of co-operation and a stronger differentiation of the DC towards groups of countries with similar status or individual countries. Thus, the Commission favours country strategies with a specific emphasis for each country. Additionally, the Commission calls for new concepts in certain areas, for instance in migration. On the whole, the European Consensus already contains several elements that were included in the Commission’s proposal and the strategy adopted in December.

The proposal by the EU Commission and the statement by the European Parliament

In October 2005, just shortly before the strategy was adopted, the EU Commission published an extensive proposal for the Strategy for Africa. The paper started with the sentence “Africa is on the move”. The most visible expression of the changes in Africa are the new elites and the efforts for continental integration within the framework of the African Union (AU), founded in 2002, as well as the new Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). These changes require a new adequate strategy from the perspective of the Commission. According to the Commission, the aim of the strategy is to create a comprehensive, integrated and long-term framework for its relations with the African continent. The document starts with an extended and differentiated analysis of the social, economic and political situation in Africa. In parts, this analysis...
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The European Parliament published a statement on the Commission proposals on October 27, 2005, only 2 weeks after their publication. On the whole, the EP welcomed the proposals and affirmed the necessity for an EU Africa Strategy. The EP called even more explicitly for a subtly differentiated strategy than that requested by the Commission. This differentiation is between well-performing states, which will receive budget help in co-operation by donors, and fragile states, where aid will be more concentrated in specific sectors. According to the EP, a "one size fits all" strategy will not achieve positive results. In the explanatory statement of the EP document, the Commission is indirectly accused of concentrating on its concept of functioning, well-performing states and neglecting the problem of how the structural stability of fragile states can be achieved. The areas of economy and trade are given considerably greater emphasis than the Commission's special focus on the area of security. However, the EP followed the Commission's opinion, and voted for a reinforcement of the Peace Facility for financing African peace-keeping missions within the context of the AU.

There is agreement with the Commission that there is a question of human rights and democracy as a basis of businesses. The text clearly reaffirms the use of political conditionality. The EP reminds the member states of their obligation to take note of the decision to terminate co-operation in the context of article 96 in the Cotonou Agreement.

The criticism of the lack of coherence between the EU’s DC and other EU policies and between the EU’s DC and the national development policies has already become almost traditional. This is substantiated in as much as the EP calls attention to the need to coordinate the Africa strategy with other forms of co-operation, such as the Cotonou agreement.

The EU Africa Strategy

Initially it is striking that the strategy is very short, covering only 7 pages of text in comparison with the extensive Commission proposal amounting to

The reaction of the European Parliament (EP)
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more than 40 text pages. Nevertheless, the demands set by the text are high. Firstly, the medium-term time horizon for the strategy is set up to the year 2015. Secondly, the year 2015 refers to a general objective set up against the backdrop of the MDGs. Thirdly, the strategy is valid for all of Africa, including North Africa. Fourthly, it sets out the political framework for the whole of the EU and thus provides binding targets both for EU policies as well as the national African policies of the member states. The strategy lists the following five areas for action:

- **Peace and Security**
- **Human Rights and Governance**
- **Development Assistance**
- **Sustainable Economic Growth, Regional Integration and Trade**
- **Investing in People**

### Peace and Security

Security is mentioned first to indicate its great importance. The significant value attached to peace and security is explained as being an elementary precondition only set against development as presented in the Commission document. The EU particularly declares itself ready to cooperate with the AU. The EU announces that it plans to replenish the Peace Facility which was already established in 2004 (until now with a budget of 250 million Euro) and to improve the capacities of the African Stand-by Force by training etc. Here, reference is made to the training programmes of some member states which are already running (France, Great Britain). Besides capacity improvement, the EU also agrees to support peace-keeping and peace-enforcement missions of the AU or subregional organisations such as Ecowas or SADC with military interventions within the framework of the CFSP and ESDP. The EU Battle Groups are specifically mentioned with regard to crisis missions. The civilian components of interventions (among others, police operations) will be strengthened and inter-operation between the emergency aid organizations of EU member states and other protagonists within the context of the ESDP Africa.

### Human Rights and Governance

Alongside security and peace, the EU considers respect for human rights and democracy (“Operation princípios”) as a precondition of effective institutions as a second essential precondition for successful development. The EU declares that it plans to continue the existing programmes, some of them quite extensive, such as the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), which is not explicitly mentioned in the text. This particularly includes measures to protect “vulnerable groups” (women, children), promoting the rule of law, including international jurisdiction, civil society, parliaments and monitoring of elections.

Nevertheless, some changes can be seen: the strikingly strong emphasis on good governance which will be within three areas: The EU will increase the financial means for the promotion of effective institutions and capacity-building from 35 to 50 million euros. This derives from the European Development Fund and should benefit the construction of capacities within national and AU frameworks. Additionally, the EU promises to support the PEF Building Commission that is based on the Brahimi Report for post-conflict reconstruction efforts, and to support programmes in the area of disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of former combatants, and in reforming the security apparatus of the countries. Additionally, the EU Code of Conduct for arms exports, and especially the export restrictions of 1998 for small arms will be made more effective, through, among other measures, improved border management but also by inclusion of non-EU states (possibly, for example, Belarus and Ukraine) from which weapons are delivered to areas of tension in Africa. Only the last part of this section is briefly devoted to fighting terrorism and good governance show. Like the Commission proposal, the Strategy assembles and reaffirms the previous declarations and documents and only seeks to complement existing efforts. The “revolution” in the EU Africa policy happened earlier. The provisions in the Lomé IV/2 Agreement of 1995 and the foundation of the EIDHR were important steps in the area of human rights, and the humanitarian intervention in Ituri in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The “revolution” in the area of security represented a kind of “ taboo break” that strongly relativised the previously held EU principle of “African solutions for Africa’s problems”. However, despite all the continuities and differences in political relations, some changes in accentuation can be observed, primarily in the area of promoting human rights and democracy: The Africa strategy contains no indication of how the Union should relate towards states that denies the principles of ”African solutions for Africa’s problems”, and requires a general rethink of the EU approach. The strategy means an enormous financial burden for the new member states that so far have only been able to provide small contributions to development aid, and requires a general rethink of the way countries in respect to their previous status as recipient countries. The evaluation of how the EU member states achieve...
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these ambitious financing targets, it will be important to carefully analyse the figures they provide. It is possible that both previous and new members will attempt to reach the promised amounts through ‘discretionary’ measures such as reallocation of payments, imputing debt relief and allocating previously promised means, etc.

The EU has additionally announced the 10th EDF, promising rapid implementation. The suggestions of the Commission to improve aid effectiveness by reducing bureaucracy and to reform the strongly complicated, time-consuming payment modalities are only addressed very indirectly in this announcement. In the economic area, the Council took up the Commission proposal for setting up an infrastructural partnership focusing on transport, information technology, energy and water supply. The wording on commercial relations remains vague: the EU reiterated its support for Africa in the context of the WTO Doha round and intends to complete the negotiations for Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) with African regional organizations by 2008 and to set up a free trade area with the Mediterranean states by 2010. In view of the currently extremely difficult negotiations on EPAs, these deadlines appear to be not very realistic at present.

The overall objective of the EU is to integrate Africa more strongly into the world economy, and this coincides with the aims of NEPAD. The establishment of a Euro-African ‘pilot scheme’ in the tradition of the EU ERASMUS Programme for the exchange between African and European students and teachers to contribute to a Euro-African university network was not adopted.

However, there is a strong emphasis on migration policy. Considering increasing numbers of refugees from Africa to Europe and the dramatic events in the Spanish enclaves in Northern Africa, the EU suggests an extended dialogue with the AU and announces further concrete steps. These steps are not explained. An interesting idea is that the African diaspora in Europe could provide a contribution to development.

In the area of tertiary education, the EU is ready to support the establishment of the AU Nyerere programme for student exchange. This student exchange programme provides an exchange for students between African countries.

The Commission's suggestion to enable a pilot scheme in the tradition of the EU ERASMUS Programme for the exchange between African and European students and teachers to contribute to a Euro-African university network was not adopted.

The overall objective of the EU is to integrate Africa more strongly into the world economy, and this coincides with the aims of NEPAD. The establishment of a Euro-African ‘pilot scheme’ in the tradition of the EU ERASMUS Programme for the exchange between African and European students and teachers to contribute to a Euro-African university network was not adopted.

In the last section of the document, the EU Commission mentions the implementation of the strategy as well as further steps. For the implementation of the strategy, detailed plans for action and indicators, that are to be set up in cooperation between the Secretariat of the European Council and the Commission, the progress in implementation and the aid volume targets are to be discussed in December 2006 and afterwards reviewed every two years.

a) No definition of European interests.

On page 7 the EU concludes that “Europe has a strong interest in a peaceful, prosperous and democratic Africa”, but there is no further explanation what the concrete interests are. Interests in security and ecology as well as trade and value interests are only indicated implicitly. The insufficient definition of the existing interests can contribute to a loss in legitimacy for politics in those countries that are not as involved in Africa for historical reasons. An example is the current German policy of German taxpayers’ money on the military mission in Congo. Several members of parliament from all political parties are sceptical about or even reject the mission since the government did not provide a sufficient explanation for the motives and aims of the mission.

b) Lack of country or region specific strategies.

A “one size fits all strategy” is problematic especially in the highly differentiated political and economic environment on the continent. The Council mostly ignores the discussion on the very heterogeneous development in Africa and the subsequent need for a differentiated strategy. This discussion was referred to extensively in the “European Consensus” and the Commission proposal. The Commission’s differentiation attempt with the term “difficult partnerships” is also not elaborated in the text. The issue of so-called fragile states and the “bad performers” is only mentioned briefly in the parliament as a matter of fact, but not discussed any further. Last but not least, the strategy ignores its own objective that the strategy should take into account regional and country-specific needs and African countries’ national strategies.” (p. 2).

c) “Shopping list” character.

To a high degree the strategy looks like a shopping list which lists many principles, aims and instruments without a clear structure. The strategy lacks any sequencing and priorities of the wide spectrum of measures. Unlike the Commission proposal, there is no attempt in this document to systematically link the aims and principles with the MDGs. On the whole, the strategy must be seen as a kind of general framework defining some general aims and principles in various sectors of the co-operation.

d) The adequateness and the success of the EU strategy depend to a large extent on functioning and effective African institutions.

A main pivotal point of the EU strategy is cooperation with African organisations, especially with the AU in the areas of peace and security and in the area of governance with NEPAD. In a difficult building and self-constitutional phase. Both the organisational infrastructure as well as financing are not subjective or far to reach the highly ambitious aims. This is especially apparent in the case of the AU Darfur Mission with 6000 soldiers who were unable to sustainably control the situation in the region. According to the EU, if the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisations (and also subregional organisations such as the SADC) is not strengthened, the EU Strategy will not succeed.

e) Lack of coherence between different regional EU policies

The EU Strategy for Africa is intended to be a strategy for the whole of Africa. Therefore, it acknowledges the new continental organisations such as the AU and NEPAD as well as the increased activity of North African states within these organisations. There are no existing agreements between the EU and different regions in Africa and with various African states, some of
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them adopted decades ago, and these agreements are affected by the strategy. For instance, the Cotonou Agreement, that is particularly important to Sub-Saharan Africa and the Trade, Deve-

lopment and Co-operation Agreement (TDCA) with South Africa. North African states are linked to the EU via the Barcelona Process or the Eu-

romed Programme and the European Neighbourhood Policy (Tunisia and Morocco at first) and Egypt is linked through a free trade agreement. With regard to establishing coherent poli-

cies, it will be necessary to synchronize these agreements and treaties with the EU Strategy for Africa and to ensure they are compatible with each other. However, the understandable intenti-

on of creating a strategy for the whole of Africa and thus also for North Af-

crica, which was not part of the Coto-

nou agreement to date, could be prob-

lematic. Secondly, it would require a restructuring of the Commission’s competences. For instance, there are clearer and stronger European inte-

rests in these countries than in small countries such as Lesotho and Mal-

awi in Southern Africa, because of the geographic situation and the status of these countries as emerging markets as well as the economic significance of these countries for Europe. For these reasons it will be difficult to follow consistent policies towards “Africa”. The competences within the European Commission have also not been direc-
ted towards an approach for the entire continent up until now. Currently, the Belgian Louis Michel is responsible for development co-operation within the Cotonou agreement and SSA, and Foreign Commissioner Benita Ferrero-

Waldner deals with Northern Africa.

In view of its contents, the strategy reveals few new points, since it is an at-

tractive kind of framework document. The declaration and the Plan for human rights, democracy and good
governance, and the “European Consen-

sus” are important. In this light, the

considerations, and the “European Con-

senus” for weak states? in: International Politics and So-
cial Partnership for Africa’s Development – strong institu-
tions for weak states? in: International Politics and So-
ciety Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft (IPG) (4) 2004, pp. 158-158

15 Chinas increased presence in Africa would also have to be taken into account. The economically moti-

vated immigrants (resources, trade relations) and the politically motivated interest (Terrorist questions) in Africa are a challenge for the EU and the US as well, since China does not adhere to the minimal standards of the donor states concerning human rights, democracy and good governance.
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more substantial and analytical Com-

mission proposal could be seen as a kind of background paper for the current or for a more elaborate strategy and of-

fer suggestions for a consistent strategy that can be implemented of continuing support for Af-

crica, as a political signal or politi-
cal symbol. The EU wants to continue
to take care of the continent’s fate and
grees to support positive approaches in Af-

crica.

Thirdly, the strategy does identify ad-

equate concepts for the challenges. This

includes a clear emphasis on peace and security issues. Only after decades has the conclusion that peace, security are prerequisites for development become prevalent in the DC as well, or, in the famous words of Willy Brandt, “with-

out peace, all is in vain”. Considering the challenges on the continent such as violent conflicts and the collapse of states, a strict separation of develop-

ment, foreign and security policy cannot be maintained and could even prove to be counterproductive. Because of different traditions and the logics of these policies, the conceptual implementation of this conclusion will be difficult. The EU has only just started at this point.

Furthermore, the continuity in foster-

ing human rights, democracy and good
governance could be seen positively and as an expression of the EU self-commit-
tion as a so-called community of values. Additionally, the high financial commit-

tments are listed with concrete figures. The degree of EU self-commitment has indeed increased with the inclusion of concrete financial commitments; however, they are no more than declarations.

The EU Strategy for Africa can be seen not as the end but the beginning of a process of redefining the EU’s poli-
cies towards Africa. From this perspec-
tive, the EU Africa Strategy marks the beginning of a process to achieve greater coherence, to tackle the main challenges and to increase the efficiency of the EU Africa policy. In the future, this would require the definition of European inter-

ests that also needs a prior analysis of the current political and economic develop-

ments on the continent. In this case, the Commission’s proposal, the parliaments’ considerations, and the “European Consen-
sus” are important. In this light, the
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In view of its contents, the strategy reveals few new points, since it is an at-
tempt to summarize well-known EU po-

cisions in a framework document.

Nevertheless, the strategy could be an important contribution to the Union’s Africa policies. The fact that there was an agreement on one strategy is already remark-
erable since there are diverging in-

terests among the member states, and the complex, fragmented formation process
Discussion

A. The Strategy’s Surplus Value

In the center of the debate were doubts about the actual surplus value of the EU Africa Strategy. Critics felt that it raised many subjects, like ownership, but did not really define them, and that repeated promises - for example to continue support to Africa or the new emphasis on peace and security - cannot already be counted as achievements. It was questioned whether the Strategy constituted a qualitative leap compared to earlier processes.

Professor Schmidt’s view was that the fact of having a strategy was already the first step forward. The Strategy as a reference document containing some concrete commitments lays the groundwork for further action, since, he noted, it was meant to be an ongoing process up to 2015. He underlined that such a Strategy could not be taken for granted bearing in mind that Europe has only limited economic interests in Africa and that the continent competes with other regions in the world for attention and resources. Prof. Schmidt concluded that even symbolic politics is not ineffective. His advice to NGOs was to observe carefully the distribution of finances and to examine the coherence between the Barcelona Process, the New Neighborhood Strategy, the Cotonou Agreement and the Africa Strategy.

A. Effective increase of funds in question

The question was also asked what funds will be at the basis of the nascent African security architecture. Professor Schmidt said the African Peace Facility (250 million euros) is mainly financed from the European Development Fund (EDF). He saw the amount as a relatively small basis to operate on, compared for example to the costs of the Burundi Mission, which amount to 123 million euros; but an increase in funds was expected. Thorsten Moritz remarked that it has to be examined very carefully whether this increase in funds is no more than creative bookkeeping – i.e. with projects already receiving funding merely being relabeled development aid, instead more money actually being made available.

A. NEPAD – Pressing for political reforms?

Another question concerned the future role of NEPAD and the effects of the African Peer Review Mechanism. Prof. Schmidt underlined that NEPAD could be an instrument to press for political reforms, but this depends strongly on what the Europeans as well as the Africans make of NEPAD. Concerning the Peer Review Mechanism, Schmidt saw the reports on the performance of the countries as the decisive element. The role of civil society and its inclusion in the Strategy was also discussed. Professor Schmidt remarked that civil society is not explicitly mentioned in the Strategy, apart from its emphasis on democracy.

A. Minimal consensus is a basis – but not one sufficient for a sound policy

The last question dealt with a comparison of the EU Africa Strategy to the EU Commission Paper that prepared the Strategy. Because of the heterogeneous interests of the member states, the Strategy has become a minimal consensus, Professor Schmidt stated. He regarded this compromise as a basis, but not one sufficient for a sound policy towards Africa.
II. Between prevention, sanction and intervention – Cooperation in security policy between EU and Africa

1. EU Support to Africa in the Field of Security: Darfur as a Test Case

Christian Manahl

The EU Africa Strategy, which was adopted by the Council in December 2005, is distinct from previous policy documents and conventions in two regards: it is comprehensive insofar as it combines security, development, trade and migration, and because it addresses Africa as a whole. The Africa Strategy therefore marks a turning point in the EU policy, which had earlier been ‘compartmentalised’ both in a geographical and a thematic sense.

The most important framework ruling the relations between the EU and sub-Saharan Africa have been the Cotonou Convention and its predecessors. The Cotonou Convention is a development partnership, although it does include political aspects. But it covers only the part of Africa south of the Sahara and also territories in the Pacific and the Caribbean. A whole set of institutional structures, the ‘ACP institutions’, has been built around this agreement. By contrast, relations with North Africa have been ruled by the Barcelona Process and its institutions.

While there is a certain logic in dealing with Europe’s Mediterranean neighbours in one single group, and addressing the development challenges of the sub-Saharan regions of Africa together with those of other regions with similar characteristics, there is also merit in looking at Africa as a whole. This is particularly true when it comes to issues such as security – including the growing challenge related to militant Islamist groups – and migration. Radical Muslims have found a fertile ground for spreading their message and for finding new recruits in the impoverished masses of Sahelian countries and Eastern Africa, and desperate migrants from sub-Saharan Africa use the easily accessible North African countries as a gateway to Europe. The EU Africa Strategy takes account of these new challenges, which call for a comprehensive and geographically inclusive approach to Africa.

The core idea relating to security in the EU Africa Strategy is African ownership.

As regards the specifically security related aspects of the Strategy, it is less innovative. It lists, in fact, a series of principles and strategic elements that have emerged in the political thinking and practice of the last couple of years. The core idea is ‘African ownership’. It finds its practical expression in the central role attributed to African (political) leadership in conflict management and conflict resolution, and to the African Union (AU) and sub-regional organisations in the operational implementation of peace-building activities.

The concept of African ownership has become so common that hardly anybody using it finds it necessary to define it and, in particular, to explain how it relates to one of the other principles spelled out in the Strategy: the concept of partnership. It should also be noted, in passing, that African ownership is a relatively new idea that has replaced the dominant concepts of the past decade: conflict prevention and early warning. In the light of events in the D.R. Congo, Eritrea and Ethiopia, Cote d’Ivoire, and Darfur, it would be difficult to argue that these concepts have been particularly successful. To analyze this relative failure of concepts with an unchallenged inherent logic, and their replacement by a concept with much less obvious merits, would deserve some academic and political attention.

I do not intend, however, to tackle this complex shift of paradigms in my short exposé. Neither is it my intention to attempt an exhaustive definition of ‘African ownership’. I shall rather demonstrate the practical implementation of this concept, as well as related ones from the Strategy, in the case of Darfur, and conclude with the observation that this experience obliges us to rethink this concept in the broader context of the existing - and evolving - international security architecture.

In Darfur, the AU had its monitors on the ground remarkably quickly. Darfur has been a show-case for the main security-related ideas of the Africa Strategy. In April 2004, when the Government of the Sudan and the rebel movements - the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) - signed a Humanitarian Cease-Fire Agreement, the world had not yet discovered the magnitude of the humanitarian and human rights disaster in Darfur, and was not ready for serious engagement by the United Nations, as the rebels had requested. Only the African Union was ready to deploy the monitoring mechanism referred to (but not defined in detail) in the N’djamena Agreement of 8th April 2004. The AU was swift putting its intention into practice and thus to live up to the ambitions expressed in the Charter of the recently founded organisation, which had replaced the OAU: In May, the AU invited international partners - notably the EU and the US - to a fact-finding mission, and before the end of that month, the modalities of the monitoring mechanism were negotiated in Addis Ababa and defined in a separate agreement signed by the Sudanese parties and the AU. Less than two weeks later, the Force Commander hoisted the AU flag in the future headquarters of the mission in El-Fashir, surrounded by a small group of observers from various African countries. This was a remarkably swift deployment, for which the AU deserves respect and recognition. Hardly any other organisation would have managed to be on the ground in such a short time.

Over the following year and a half, the mission grew from a small ob-
server group of 150 (party representa-
tives included) to a 7,000-strong peace
support operation. This was driven by
international pressure, following the
late discovery of the scope and gravity
of the Darfur crisis. The expansion of
AMIS (African Mission in Sudan), as
the mission has come to be known, had
been fast and furious. This inevitably
led to major shortcomings, which were
identified in two Joint Assessment Mis-
sions led by the AU. Not all of the de-
cencies were addressed, however, for
reasons mainly related to the AU’s lack
of experience and expertise, but also to
occasional disagreements between the
Force Commander and the ad hoc stra-
tegic headquarters - the ‘Darfur Inte-
grated Task Force’ (DITF) - that had
in the meantime been established in
Addis Ababa.

By the end of 2005, it was clear that
the parties were either not willing or not
able to respect the cease-fire, or incapable
of controlling the forces presumably
under their control. A reinforced interna-
tional presence was deemed necessary - prob-
ably for a couple of years - in order to
address the main and persisting security
challenge in Darfur: insecurity for civili-
ans. The AU mission, combined with
international pressure, had contributed to
a stabilisation of the military situation
and to improved access for humanitarian
agencies, and it had thus addressed the
‘mandate’ contained in the N’djamena
agreement. However, escalating bandit-
ry, inter-ethnic violence, the progressive
fragmentation of the rebel groups, and
the lack of Government commitment
to rein in the militias called Janjaweed,
created permanent insecurity for the ci-
vilian population outside the camps for
IDPs. The AU’s intervention at the
field level of the observer teams and among
the soldiers and officers in the
southern military units of the Janjaweed
had lentless attacks of the Janjaweed.

The AU and its Western donors had been
often unhappy, if not irritated by the
apparently unwanted advice of foreign
experts. In spite of these difficulties, there
was an unbroken commitment to the con-
cepts of African ownership and the AU-
EU partnership at the highest political
level. It was a difficult learning process
to find a balance between the AU’s wish to
be a partner in decision making, and the
interests of its international partners in
order to conduct meaningful planning.

Too much advice fell on deaf ears

The donors of AMIS rushed to the
mission’s rescue by offering dozens of mili-
tary advisors, while there were hardly any
African experts available in Addis Ababa to
receive such advice. What followed was
a bumpy and at times acrimonious rela-
tionship, in which European and Ameri-
can experts grew increasingly impatient
with the deficiencies of AMIS, notably
at the strategic level (in El-Fashir, Khar-
toum and Addis Ababa), and frustrated
by the lack of genuine partnership in the
improvement of two Joint Assessment Mis-
sions (in March and December 2005). The AU officials African
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AU’s role needs to be redefined within a global security architecture, where other players, notably the UN, but also sub-regional organisations, have a role to play.

Third, the international community should give some thought to the operationalization of the concept of the ‘responsibility to protect’. Little thinking has been done about a level or threshold that would trigger an international response, or about which degree of protection potential victims of political, ethnic or religious violence are entitled to. In more blunt terms: Is the limited protection of IDP camps, provided by AMIS in Darfur, enough? Is the international community obliged to do more, and by which means? And what about capacities? The spill-over of the Darfur conflict into Chad, or the risk of an expansion into other areas of the Sudan, should give us enough reason to think carefully about these questions.

The ongoing debate about the ‘blue-hatting’ of AMIS, and the expected transfer of responsibilities from the AU to AMIS offers a good opportunity to all involved - the AU, the UN, and the donors of AMIS - to analyse the AU intervention in Darfur and to discuss perspectives and principles for future cooperation.

**2. What is Required for Security and Crisis Prevention in Africa? An African Perspective**

Jeffery Isima

The EU-Africa Strategy is no doubt a comprehensive strategy aimed at supporting Africa to attain the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The Strategy rightly recognises the significance of peace and security (and good governance) as prerequisites for attaining the goals outlined in the Strategy document. This demonstrates a good understanding of one of the fundamental problems hindering development in several African countries. While the number of countries involved in armed conflict in Africa has been declining steadily in recent years, many of the post-conflict states are still quite fragile and are susceptible to further armed conflict. The document acknowledges this and has therefore articulated a strategy that will ensure EU involvement in the conflict cycle from ‘conflict prevention, via conflict management to conflict resolution and post-conflict reconstruction’.

This presupposes dealing with the root causes of conflict and supporting various efforts of the African Union (AU), especially its nascent peace and security architecture. The AU and the Regional Economic Communities (RECs), which form the pillar on which the AU’s strength is built, are the means through which the EU intends to channel most of its support, although under its principle of ‘subsidiarity’ national governments will also be supported.

EU relations with Africa date back to the series of the Lomé I Agreements, which started in 1975. However, these agreements were within the framework of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Countries initiative and dealt essentially with issues of trade and aid. Conflict prevention began to creep into EU-Africa relations from the mid-1990s with bilateral assistance from European countries in military training and peace support operations (PSOs). The Cotonou Agreement of 2000, which was reviewed in 2005, marked the first formal agreement also dealing with peace and security issues. In 2002, EU supported the transitional justice initiative in Rwanda. A watershed in EU assistance in the region occurred in 2003 when it launched a peacekeeping operation, ‘Operation Artemis’, in Bunia, a town in the Ituri region of the D.R. Congo. In 2004, the EU’s African Peace Facility (APF) was launched to support the AU (and the RECs) in conflict prevention. Totalling €250 million, the fund was meant mainly for peacekeeping and secondarily for building African capacity for PSOs. Thus the EU peace and security policy in Africa until this time was pursued in two directions: building African capacity for PSOs and building the EU’s capabilities for short-term intervention in conflicts in the continent. Yet, these interventions were based on broader EU-ACP relations, while EU policy towards Africa remained fragmented as special agreements were made with different countries. For instance, the EU has a special engagement with South Africa through the Trade, Development and Cooperation Agreement (TDCA), while the Maghreb countries have separate arrangements with the EU through the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership - since 2004 the European Neighbourhood Policy.
The aim of this contribution is to examine the peace and security component of the EU Strategy document against the backdrop of the emerging AU security architecture and the security situation in Africa as a whole. The objective is to examine to the extent to which the Strategy constitutes new efforts to tackle identified security problems in Africa and the extent to which it can actually address some of the key security problems on the continent.

The EU-Africa Strategy for Peace and Security: What is new?

The EU-Africa Strategy is of crucial importance for several reasons: it represents the first single policy document that provides an overall guideline for EU engagement and policy implementation in Africa; it has strong political status since it was approved at the highest level by the European Council; and it attempts to address the root causes of conflict, in Africa. With respect to conflict prevention, the Strategy envisages:

- A comprehensive approach to conflict prevention with integrated policies in the fields of security, development and democratic governance. These will include supporting national and regional strategies that address the root causes of conflict and supporting national and regional early warning systems.
- Support for African-led PSOs through the strengthening and replenishment of the EU Peace Facility for Africa.
- Support for disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and repatriation (DDRR) of former fighters in conflict states with a coordinated approach.
- Support for post conflict states through sustained and flexible policies and support for security sector reform (SSR).
- Tackling conflict resources, for example by supporting the Kimberly process.

While the Strategy appears to be comprehensive and supportive of national, regional and continental policies on peace and security, there are questions as to how it will be implemented in practical terms. A number of these questions, considered as very pertinent, are discussed below.

Additional money will be needed. Will it be taken from development aid?

Question number one is about financing the Strategy. There are two critical problems currently plaguing the peace and security programmes of the AU and the activities of the RECs: lack of funds and absence of the requisite capacity to execute some of the designed programmes. The EU Strategy relies considerably on the APF, which has supported the new AU security architecture well, especially with the funding of the operation in the Sudan. However the €250 million earmarked for the facility from the 9th European Development Fund (EDF) is now exhausted. The next source of funds for the facility is likely to be the next EDF, but this is not assured. Yet what the AU and the RECs need to execute their programmes is a reliable source of income to support the contributions from their members. In the absence of assured funding, planning becomes haphazard and the burden of sponsorship is shifted to overburdened regional powers (mainly Nigeria and South Africa). This is hardly the best way to maintain peace and security in a fragile environment.

Another problem regarding funding relates to the source and type of money for the peace facility. While the APF was no doubt a new and welcome development, the money provided for the facility was not new money. Rather it was pooled together by ‘shaving off’ a percentage of what was, in the EDF, due to be used for other purposes in African countries. This raises the question about the issue of increasing aid to Africa and the quest of EU member states (especially the oldest 15 members) to meet the target of raising official development aid (ODA) to 0.7 percent of GDP by 2015. Will the new aid be additional or will it be renamed “development aid” in order to meet the UN benchmark?

This is particularly important since until recently donor spending on peace and security in developing countries was not counted as development assistance. But there is an on-going debate within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), to which most EU members belong, on this issue. Some donor countries want current spending on certain security related assistance to be counted as ODA, others oppose this. The EU Strategy paper does not say anything on this question, but given that the APF derived its source of financing from already earmarked ODA funds, it will not be surprising if in the future the bulk of what will be counted as increased aid to Africa is actually made up of money already being spent in these countries for security purposes. Alternatively, the focus on peace and security might end up reducing overall aid and in particular the amount of assistance that goes into the social and economic sectors in poor countries. If this were to happen then the cause of development, for which peace and security are seen as prerequisites, would have been inadvertently defeated.

A related issue which has enormous implications for African states is military spending. A number of donors regard relatively high military spending in African countries as wasteful expenditure and therefore either withhold aid from countries accused of such practices, or cut aid for them completely. How is the current EU Strategy going to affect this approach to military spending? Donors have often linked a low level of military spending in poor states to eligibility for economic assistance. Yet emerging evidence suggests that a number of African states actually need to reform their military in order to enable them to tackle the myriad security problems plaguing their countries. Reforms are also needed to bring armies up to the standard for participation in the regional brigades of extra-regional forces that are supposed to form the bedrock of the African standby force, which is a major component of the emerging African security architecture. While the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD has already suggested that donors should refrain from imposing spending ceilings on military expenditure in recipient states, this is far from being heeded. The EU Strategy document is silent on this issue. Yet well-funded national armies, well-equipped by local standards, will go a long way in fending off a number of security issues that are the main concerns of the EU in Africa.
African civil society should be consulted more while constructing a security architecture

Question number four concerns policy coherence: Can the EU Strategy be implemented in a coherent manner, given internal conflict among EU institutions? The Strategy fails to state how the process of engagement will be overseen and coordinated. There is a history of disgusting the actual level of delivery on aid promises by European countries, and the European Commission is reluctant to criticise its members directly.

Capacity building for parliament is needed for the long-term success of an African security architecture

Capacity Building is the issue of question number five. Current efforts seem to be geared towards peacekeeping alone, even though other activities such as DDRR and SSR are mentioned in the Strategy paper. But there is a need to move away from peacekeeping to other areas of support such as capacity building in the legislative and regulatory institutions like national parliaments and the peace and security departments of RECs and the AU. These institutions are critical to the long-term sustenance of the peace and security architecture in Africa. A strong parliamentary committee on defence or security for instance will be able to challenge some of the excesses for which African security forces are known.

Concern number six: Africa has dwelled in terms of strategic importance. Conflicts in the continent are only given international attention when crises erupt, rather than striving for a conflict prevention approach which addresses the structural causes of crises.

(1) Question number seven relates to poor governance. The document does not mention sanctions on erring African states, but places much faith in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) to reign in such states. The case of Zimbabwe reveals the tendency of members to act outside the union when it suits their interests.

tation stipulated in the agreement. This weakened the credibility of the sanction; African leaders rallied to the support of President Mugabe. This shows that any consensus between the EU and Africa on governance issues is fragile.

Question number eight is about the debt burden of African countries. No mention of debt relief is made, apart from the commitment to the HIPC (highly indebted poor countries) initiative. Besides HIPC, not many countries were covered by the 2005 G8 debt deal. The debt burden is a source of structural violence and insecurity in Africa, and cannot be divorced from conflict prevention in the region.

Finally, the EU document is emphatic about the principle of African ownership. But with regards to security, do African institutions possess the capacity and expertise to own programmes? And to what extent is the principle of ownership mainstreamed across the EU’s security architecture and policy instruments towards Africa, such as SSR and DDRR?

What is needed for African security and conflict prevention

Proper consultation with the people through CSOs is crucial, particularly at the stage of developing the action plan for the implementation of the EU Strategy. There is also a need to support armed forces in African states through training and appropriate equipment. This includes removing the ceilings on spending for the military and instead focusing on the process by which the states arrive at the level of spending. Increased financial support to the RECs and the AU and the extension of that support from peacekeeping to other critical aspects of African security, including capacity building at both the national and continental levels, are called for. Also very crucial is the injection of new money into the financing of security in Africa instead of shifting off already committed money from ODA budgets.

Furthermore, there is a need for greater policy coordination within the EU on what constitutes development assistance and security assistance. This would require the deployment of a full range of policy instruments such as political dialogue and the use of envoys, which are part of the instruments of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy. In addition, conflict prevention should be mainstreamed across all instruments of assistance, rather than being seen as the specific activity. Finally, multinational corporations operating in Africa should be factored in when addressing conflict goods that feed the cycle of internal conflict and violence in the region.
3. The EU Strategy for Africa: Questions Raised for EU Development Policy

Olive Towey

On 16 December 2005, the European Council adopted “The EU and Africa: Towards a Strategic Partnership”. The seven-page document sets out “the steps the European Union will take with Africa between now and 2015 to support African efforts to build…a peaceful, democratic and prosperous future for all (its peoples)”. The intention of this Strategy is to provide a single reference point both for the European Commission and the 25 EU member states in their cooperation with Africa. In a communication to the European Council and the Parliament from October 2005, the European Commission presents the Strategy as a response to the challenge of achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in Africa and to recent political and institutional change at European and African level. The short document however provokes many questions as to the nature, status, scope and consequences of the new European Strategy for Africa.

The year which drew to a close with agreement on this Strategy was remarkable in terms of public and policy focus on overseas development. At international level, the convergence of the G8, the UN World Summit and the WTO negotiations provided a framework for the Global Campaign for Action Against Poverty (GCAP) and a policy agenda focussed on issues of aid, trade and debt. The UK Presidency of the EU in the latter part of 2005 had a particular focus on Africa, with the Commission on Africa setting the continent at the heart of its reflections on the global development challenge. At EU level, in a year of internal dissonance on many issues, 2005 paradoxically saw strong and united support from in the area of overseas development. The EU commitments agreed at the Meeting of the European Council in June, in advance of the UN World Summit in September, are worthy of particular note. For both the Commission and the Member States, 2006 and the years to come are about living up to and going beyond the promises made in 2005. Commitments on quantity and quality of ODA must be monitored and made real. The political will necessary to deliver on the MDGs must be sustained and strengthened. The European Strategy for Africa has potentially an important role to play in supporting and reinforcing each of these objectives. But we need to question, clarify and better understand its exact nature. For me it raises a number of questions.

The Strategy for Africa must be read together with other EU documents

The primary aims of the new EU Strategy for Africa are cited as “the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and the promotion of sustainable development, security and good governance in Africa”. It is said to be based on the principles of “partnership, equality and mutual accountability”; its underlying philosophy speaks of “African ownership and responsibility”, including “working through African institutions”. Before accepting these assertions, it is important to note that this Council document is not the single point of departure but one of a wider set of documents which together comprise the new Strategy. The elements of this Strategy each have their own political orientation and policy priorities.

In the follow-up to the December Council conclusions, the Commission and Council Secretariat began to work on implementation and cited four reference documents to be considered alongside the Council document. Among these are the communication of the Commission from October 2005, mentioned above, and a paper by Javier Solana from the same month. The latter concerns the peace and security aspects of the Strategy for Africa and the contribution that the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) can make. All five inputs must work in tandem, so the challenges of reconciliation and coordination emerge.

How will each of these processes be shaped, and who will be involved in ‘next steps’?

Existing Regional Agreements between Europe and Africa remain. It is important to recognise that the new Strategy does not replace the Cotonou Agreement, which provides a framework for the relationship between the EU and sub-Saharan Africa. The Euro-Mediterranean partnership with Northern African countries, since 2004 the European Neighbourhood Policy, will also continue to operate on the basis of its current framework, objectives and funding mechanisms.

Therefore the question which follows is exactly what impact the Strategy for Africa will have on these current agreements? What influence might it have, for example, on the next generation of Country Strategy Papers? Conversely, how will the principle of partnership enshrined in the Cotonou Agreement find expression in the new Strategy for Africa? These are just some of a myriad of issues to be debated.

How does the Africa Strategy relate to the Consensus on Development?

In terms of Europe’s development policy, it is worth considering the new Strategy alongside the “European Consensus on Development”, which was signed by the Parliament, the Council and the Commission in July 2005. While the latter has as its overarching objectives poverty eradication, sustainable development and achievement of the MDGs, the Strategy for Africa goes far beyond the development agenda and is a reflection of broader European foreign policy priorities. As with the regional agreements, the question is: How will each of these policy frameworks influence the other?

How will the principles of ownership, partnership and gender equality in the “European Consensus” be reflected in the Africa Strategy? And how will the issues of governance and security addressed in the Strategy reflect themselves in the dis-
Another very crucial point is that the European Strategy for Africa is not a Europe-Africa Strategy. It has been discussed at EU level principally and agreed by the European Council. There is an ambition on the part of the EU to "transform" it into a "joint" strategy. However, it is not (yet) a joint strategy, it is a European plan for Africa. African partnership and African ownership of any ‘joint’ strategy can only come about through a process of committed consultation – not only with governments but, if it is to have any credibility, with civil society too.

Civil society, both in Europe and Africa, should engage in the implementation of the Strategy

This process of consultation has not yet begun, and obvious questions include: whether the Strategy can be aligned with AU/NEPAD priorities and if so, how? What will be the process that makes this alignment possible? How is African civil society to be consulted and how inclusive will this process be?

Overarching these and other detailed questions is a more fundamental one: Will this Strategy be progressed towards its stated objectives in a manner true to stated principles (partnership, equality and mutual accountability) and its stated philosophy (African ownership and responsibility including working through African institutions)? It may be too early to tell.

I began by suggesting we need to question, clarify and better understand the expected nature of this new Strategy. The above questions give us some basis for this. As the institutions move forward with implementation, our debate among broader constituencies should continue. We need – in Europe and in Africa – to engage with, to be engaged with and to become part of the "next steps" as this European Strategy for Africa moves from rhetoric to reality.

Endnotes

enthusiastic. He also assessed police cooperation as reasonably good. But in the command structure cooperation generally was very difficult because of a strong reluctance on the part of the AU to accept a reasonable role for EU officers. In Manahl’s view the AU mission in Darfur (AMIS) was not a failure but a qualified success, although it showed the limits of the AU as a very young institution still building its capacities. He saw a high risk of overstretching these capacities and stated that the best solution would be to hand AMIS over to the UN.

If we see AMIS as a failure, we have to conclude that the EU—Africa Strategy in the field of security has failed as well because it was an implementation of the EU—Africa Strategy and its principle of African ownership, Manahl said. He deemed it necessary to re-evaluate the partnership between EU and AU, to clarify the respective roles and to enhance the capacities of the AU. The question should be: What is the AU able to do, what does the AU want the EU to do and what is the UN expected to do?

One risk addressed by the audience was the exclusive focus on the AU in the Africa Strategy. An alternative, complementary approach was proposed: the EU should also work together with regional organizations like SADC, ECOWAS and IGAD and build strategic partnerships with key players like South Africa, probably Nigeria and some countries in Eastern and Central Africa. On this Mr. Manahl remarked that regional organizations are still under construction and faced with structural difficulties. “That we should not exclusively focus on the AU - yes, I agree. But the regional organizations are not easy partners either. SADC is an obvious case because of the issue of Zimbabwe, but also remember that the IGAD commitment to the peace process in Somalia has caused more confusion than anything else. That doesn’t mean we aren’t interested in working with regional organizations. But we need a dialogue on exactly what they undertake and how they operate, and we have to weigh very carefully what their vested interests are.”

Mr. Goodison expressed doubts that development assistance will be used more effectively, noting that he was worried that Africa’s share of EU development assistance was bound to decline. A concern mentioned by Olive Towey was that the EU military and security sector is still under construction and faced with structural difficulties. “That we should not exclusively focus on the AU - yes, I agree. But the regional organizations are not easy partners either. SADC is an obvious case because of the issue of Zimbabwe, but also remember that the IGAD commitment to the peace process in Somalia has caused more confusion than anything else. That doesn’t mean we aren’t interested in working with regional organizations. But we need a dialogue on exactly what they undertake and how they operate, and we have to weigh very carefully what their vested interests are.”

Mr. Goodison emphasised his worries concerning the division of labour between the EU and its member states in various areas, particularly peace and security. Who is responsible for doing what? Who is setting policy priorities and objectives for missions? Is the commission acting like an additional member state or can it assume a different and special role?

Mr. Manahl agreed that there is a triangle between the Commission, the Council Secretariat and the member states and that there is a lot of internal jockeying for position and insistence on specific competences. But in view of the fact that there is as yet no European constitution and common foreign policy structure, the only possibility is to come to terms with the actual situation and to find ways of working together. In the medium term a decision needs to be taken on whether European military and conflict management structures should be developed and whether the EU should be turned into a political entity that is capable of action in the security around the world. Manahl remarked that the EU member states have not yet decided whether they want strong EU military structures apart from what exists in NATO.

Concerning tensions created by the division of labor between the Commission and the member states, Olive Towey pointed to the example of public opinion in Ireland. When things are going well, it is the member state that has made the right choices, but when things are going badly it is the politicians in Brussels who are responsible. This is similar to public perceptions of development policy, she said: “Development is also something out there. So in terms of the division of labor, if there was a greater clarity about the role of the Commission and the Council in development and in security, then there could perhaps be a debate that would bring people on board.”

The purpose of the Congo mission

The audience also questioned the usefulness of the Congo mission, with only 400 soldiers on the ground. The impression was that its main motive was to use any foreign military as possible in case things should go wrong, and that the EU followed specific interests in Congo and therefore wanted to have a sort of control over the elections. Mr. Manahl denied this. He argued that the main EU interest in Congo is that the elections do not become a political event destabilizing the Congo, i.e. they need to be conducted in as free and fair a manner as possible. “If the number of soldiers says anything about the importance of vested interests in play, than I would say, compared to the several hundred thousands of American troops in Iraq, a few hundred European soldiers in the Congo testify to a very low level of European interest”, he said.

But according to Mr. Manahl, the number of soldiers says anything about the importance of vested interests in play, than I would say, compared to the several hundred thousands of American troops in Iraq, a few hundred European soldiers in the Congo testify to a very low level of European interest”, he said.
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The audience also questioned the usefulness of the Congo mission, with only 400 soldiers on the ground. The impression was that its main motive was to use any foreign military as possible in case things should go wrong, and that the EU followed specific interests in Congo and therefore wanted to have a sort of control over the elections. Mr. Manahl denied this. He argued that the main EU interest in Congo is that the elections do not become a political event destabilizing the Congo, i.e. they need to be conducted in as free and fair a manner as possible. “If the number of soldiers says anything about the importance of vested interests in play, than I would say, compared to the several hundred thousands of American troops in Iraq, a few hundred European soldiers in the Congo testify to a very low level of European interest”, he said.
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people provided with a clearly defined mandate can sometimes tip the balance in a critical situation.

The audience remarked that one challenge the EU is facing is to build up long-term structural stability in the Congo instead of short-term military activism. A Marshall Plan for the Congo was demanded for this reason. On this point Mr. Isima agreed: “Rather than seeing European army deployments in Africa as negative, it is too small - necessary but not sufficient. African conflict zones require a Marshall Plan that brings about transformation of the structural conditions in Africa, an engagement that we saw in the former republic of Yugoslavia.” Mr. Isima continued by saying that since the year 2000 European security and military interest has grown in Africa: more deployments, more engagement, more support for the AU and regional organizations. But he took the view that in terms of the speed of response Africa is marginalized.

China in Africa

A last point brought up in the discussion was China’s growing strategic engagement in Africa, for instance as the most important shareholder in the Sudanese oil industry. In a somewhat provocative vein, Mr. Manahl called the engagement of China in Africa a state capitalism spreading investment. He underlined that a political dialogue with China is urgently called for. Although China has not shown much interest in this, a first meeting at which the EU will discuss Africa with the Chinese is planned to take place very soon.

III. Self-interest or fair partnership?

Economic and trade relations between the EU and Africa

1. Economic Partnership Agreements May Support Poverty Reduction If They Strengthen our Co-operation with Poor Countries

Alexis Valqui,
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)

If we want to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and in particular to eradicate poverty by 2015, this objective premises an average growth of at least 8 percent per year in Africa. Which preconditions have to be met to realize this growth rate? From our point of view these are two major conditions: On the one hand the investment climate and the framework of production have to be improved in African countries. On the other hand, Africa has to integrate much better and with more emphasis into the world economy to assure that the chances globalisation provides can be used much better. There is a sequence of effects: Trade can have its effects on growth and growth is an important contribution to the fight against poverty and in the end to the achievement of the MDGs.

But trade liberalisation does not automatically lead to an increase in exports, nor does more trade automatically lead to less poverty. What then is the role of trade in a development strategy? The aim cannot be a global and undifferentiated trade liberalisation. Trade liberalisation has to be integrated into a comprehensive development strategy. In many developing countries the preconditions are yet to be established to enable these countries to use and to increase the chances that existing markets provide. In this context statements like ‘trade instead of development’ are counterproductive. Individual steps towards trade liberalisation rather have to match the demands of a socially and also ecologically sustainable development in the countries concerned.

EPAs are a tool of trade policy and simultaneously of development policy

An important tool of the EU trade policy cooperation with developing countries in Africa is the so called Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) that apply to the whole of sub-Saharan Africa. For northern Africa there is a similar partnership (the Euromed partnership) and for South Africa here is the Trade Development and Cooperation Agreement (TDCA). Let me clarify here that the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) is not responsible for the EPA negotiations, as these are carried out by the European Commission, but the BMZ monitors the EPA process from the German perspective and from a development point of view.

What are the objectives of EPAs? They are a tool of trade policy and simultaneously of development policy. Let me explain this in greater detail. The EPAs are to contribute to the regional integration of the African, of the Caribbean and of the Pacific regions (ACP). What we observe in these regions is that barriers to trade within these regions are partly higher than they are between the North and the South. The EPAs should on the one hand contribute to the improvement of market access of ACP countries to the EU. On the other hand, they should entail a careful liberalization and opening of ACP markets which is asymmetric but mutual.
The German government hopes that EPAs will provide an impetus for institutional reforms in ACP countries, for the strengthening of good governance and for an increasing integration of trade aspects in national development strategies. EPAs combine actions in trade policies with a wide range of support from European development cooperation. The latter is meant on the one hand to assist ACP countries in strengthening their production and trade capacity and on the other hand to support their internal reform processes.

The EPA negotiations will be a major topic during Germany’s presidency of the EU

Where are we in these processes right now? Regional negotiations between the EU and the ACP countries began in 2003. EPAs are to enter into force in 2008, the proposals for the texts of future agreements have to be put on the table until the end of this year. In the first half of 2007 Germany will hold the EU presidency, where EPAs will be a major topic. If we consider EPAs not only as trade agreements but also as a process and a framework for strengthening our economic and political cooperation and our relationship with the ACP countries, then this process may have an important impact on sustainable development and in the end towards the achievement of the MDGs in Africa.

From the point of view of a civil servant in development cooperation, and commenting on the question whether EPAs are characterized by the EU’s economic self-interest or by a fair partnership, I have to say that EPAs focus on the partnership aspects, but in the end both objectives count. In respect of a coherent foreign policy, the achievement of meaningful development objectives is in Germany’s interest, as it is in Europe’s. I am not referring to the EU’s economic self-interest or by fair partnership. The two theses are the following:

• In contrast to general declarations which have been made, the EU has no real strategy towards Africa. Instead, there is at best a patchwork of different approaches. These approaches change in the course of time, and sometimes improvements (in the sense of consistency) can lead to aggravation in other areas.

• Therefore, there is no clear answer to this question – both are true, depending on which region, country and which sectors and relationships are being examined.

This is not meant as fundamental criticism of the EU policy towards Africa, since a complete elimination of all contradictions is probably not possible. However, there still is potential for improvements in some areas. The following text analyses the common trade policy that is fundamental to economic relations. Additionally, some related aspects of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) that are also community policy within the EU are considered, as well as development policy.

Africa’s Relevance for the EU

Trade relations with the EU are of extreme importance to the African continent. According to the World Trade Organisation (WTO), about 40% of African exports went to the EU in 2004 (25), and 45% of all imports originated from the EU. The most important African products are energy (fuels) and minerals (51%), manufactured products (34%) and agricultural products (15%). For the EU, on the other hand, economic relations with Africa are rather marginal: Only 2.5% of all exports and 2.5% of all imports.

However, these statistics do not show the enormous differences between the 53 countries on the African continent that are relevant to the economic and trade relations of the EU. First of all in terms of economic capability. In countries such as South Africa, Egypt, Nigeria or Morocco this capability is quite different from that in the large number of small countries that are mostly among the world’s poorest. The latter have only a very limited production base and usually have a highly unbalanced export structure, which is often dominated by either mineral or agricultural products.

Other characteristics that are decisive for relations with the EU, such as proximity to Europe and thus especially the pressure for migration from these countries, the importance of goods (especially oil and minerals, which are strategically important) and, recently, the security situation (especially if European security is at stake) – modify the relevance of relations of some countries with the EU.
Main Economic Agreements of the EU with Africa within the Framework of African Regional Integration

The EU and African countries are linked together by a vast number of different economic and trade agreements. The more recent agreements are so-called partnership agreements that regulate the core element of trade relations as well as a large number of other relations – economic, political, social and cultural. Regional integration has increasingly become both an aim and an instrument at the same time. The diversity between the different countries (see above) and the complexity of the African trade and economic communities are often called a “spaghetti bowl” (Fig. 1) and make any regional approach very difficult. This will be elaborated in more detail below.

3. The most important agreements for development policy are those with African ACP states, which are home to a large proportion of the world’s poor. All countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) (except Mauritania) belong to the ACP states. In addition to the colonial history of some of the EU member states, a variety of agreements have, since the 60s, tied the EU to ACP countries (Lomé I to IV, Cotonou). Their main economic features were and are one-sided trade preferences, stabilisation mechanisms for export income as well as development aid in the framework of the European Development Fund (EDF).

These agreements are not considered to have been very successful. They are often criticised because the selected preferences in agriculture are seen as a cause of the economic weakness of ACP states. However, this thesis cannot be maintained. According to the same logic, it could equally be claimed that as China or Vietnam, for instance, had conquered the markets of the industrial countries even before joining the WTO and without preferences (even despite the preferences for other countries), hence a facilitated or secure market access was not important for export success.

In fact, it is true that the ACP preferences of the EU exceed the usual EU preferences for all developing countries. Principally, these blocks all have special relevance for stability and security in the region. There are individual association agreements with every country – the liberalisation of trade relations is a core element in every case. Furthermore, regional trade integration is to be advanced and a Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Zone is to be established by 2010. Until now, however, integration (not only between the African countries) in this region has been rather minimal.

2. South Africa is economically the most relevant African country, accounting for 21% of all EU exports to the continent. At least for Southern Africa, it is politically also the most important. The EU interests are correspondingly of an economic and also of a geo-strategic nature. In 1999 an agreement on trade, development and co-operation (TDCPA) was launched, with plans for a mutual opening within 12 years. Liberalisation in agriculture met with strong resistance within some Southern EU member states, especially concerning wine and spirits, on which a separate treaty was signed. The development policy for South Africa is extensive and is covered by the EU budget, the EDF has a separate financing mandate for South Africa.

The Negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreements with African ACP States

Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) are currently being negotiated within the framework of the Cotonou Agreement for the purpose of rendering the trade relationships between the EU and the ACP countries more compatible with WTO rules and of providing stronger economic incentives. These are meant as regional free trade agreements between the EU and blocks of ACP countries. Principally, these blocks all have first to unite as customs unions and then, largely on the basis of reciprocity, gradually dismantle tariffs towards the EU. Reciprocity is a WTO prerequisite for free trade agreements. However, it
is not defined exactly. A general rule of thumb is that 90% of the goods trans
 transfers value need to be covered; an opening asymmetry (for instance 100% opening
 by the EU compared to 80% opening by the ACP blocks) is possible and probable
 in the case of the EPAs.

Alongside mutual reduction of tariffs, there are negotiations especially on region
 nal integration within the different regional groupings, and also, depending on the
different blocks, on non-tariff trade barriers, services, fisheries, customs proce
 dures, trade-related themes like investment or competition, etc. The EPAs are to be
 in force in 2008. The transition pe
 riods are also subject to WTO condi
 tionality - 12 to 30 years are currently being discussed. The African countries are ne
 gotiating in four blocks (ECOWAS plus Mauritania, EEA, a part of the COMESA
countries without Egypt), SACU-EPA (a subgroup of 7 SADC countries) and
 CEMAC plus Sao Tome). An option for alternatives to EPAs is actually provided in
 the Cotonou Agreement but has not been invoked up to now (see below).

Problems of Intensifying EU Trade Relations with Africa through Regional Agreements

The EU has selected a difficult and controversial path in choosing to set up
trade relations with Africa through re
 gional blocks. There is no precedent for
the integration of such economically
different partners. Additionally, the EPA
blocks do not exist as yet in the constel
lations mentioned above, nor have they
existed as economic communities. On
the contrary, there is a large variety of
different regional organisations, espe
cially in Southern and Eastern Africa,
with overlapping memberships (see Fig.
1). On average, each African country is
a member of four regional organisations.
The trade policy system objectives of
these organisations are often not com
 patible. Additionally, the proliferation of
different trade rules also often exacerba
tes the development of regional integra
tion and transnational trade, which is al
ready difficult and costly due to administra
tive, geographical, climatic and infrastruc
tural problems. Administra
tive problems, especially, lead to nega
tive selection on the part of merchants,
to monopolies sanctioned by the state
or to cartels and generally to increased trans
action costs.

Consolidation has proved to be extre
mely difficult for many governments.
Generally, regional agreements in Africa
often amount only to mere lip service,
and implementation is weak. Several re
asons contribute to this. The revenues
from trade are easier to levy than dome
stic taxes and duties. The state budgets
of many countries are to a large extent
still dependent on them (SSA: 52-58%,
industrial countries: < 2%). Additionally,
the states are young and are reluctant
to give up some of their limited de facto
national sovereignty. Foreign trade is ex
tremely vulnerable to corruption – each
regulation is a potential source of income
for politicians and civil servants and this
reduces incentives for their reduction. A
variety of half-hearted agreements retains
scope for national and individual discre
tion. Many of these regional agreements
(as also with the EU and the EPA) are
 driven by political motives and historical
alliances which substantially exceed eco
nomic objectives.

One of the main arguments for the
EPAs is that the inconsistencies and trade
obstacles of the existing initiatives will be
reduced and that regional integration will
be more strongly implemented at last.
However, the EPAs also lead to new
problems. The regional organisations
that negotiate the EPAs are mostly still
weak. They do not have sufficient spe
cial and personnel resources and are in
part only weakly integrated into national
political networks. The most sophisti
cated integration organisations – UE
MOA in West Africa, EAC and SACU
in Eastern and Southern Africa – are not
EPA partners. The admissions to the
current EPA negotiating blocks are not
all consistent. For instance, South Afri
can is the dominant partner of the oldest
tariff union in the world, SACU. The
other SADC countries were considered
only to a limited extent in the TDCG
negotiations between the EU and South
Africa (see above) and are now negoti
ating EPAs within the framework of a
reduced SADC group (South Africa is
only admitted here as an observer for
trade issues), which also includes some
non-SACU countries. Egypt, economi
cally the most important country of the
COMESA, does not belong to the ESA
negotiating group. Tanzania is a mem
ber in the EAC, the only tariff union
adopted in East Africa to date; however,
its negotiations the EPAs together with
some of the SADC countries – probably
because it has strong ties to South Afri
can corporations. The two other EAC
partners are negotiating EPAs within the
framework of the ESA group. It is also
clear that obstacles to trade between
the regional blocks can be kept as low as
possible, since the blocks often have arti
ficial external boundaries and lively trade
with each other.

A European Union trade policy offen
sive within the context of the WTO par
ticularly aggravates the EPA negotiations.
Most of the African ACP countries are
among the Least Developed Countries
(LDCs) as defined by the United Na
tions. Special trade preferences may be
granted to LDCs within the framework
of the WTO. In 2001, the EU corres
pondingly gave them market access free
of quotas and tariffs within the context
of the Everything-But-Arms (EBA) initi
ative. Thus, from a mercantile point of
view, these countries have no reason to
join an EPA and to open up their own
markets to the EU in order to gain access
to the EU market. Only the restrictive
Rules of Origin under the EBA initiative
and the relatively stronger uncertainty of
preferential market access compared with
contractually secure reciprocal market
access under EPAs are still considerable
market access incentives for this group
of countries. Overall, these incentives
to conclude EPAs are therefore only partly
sound for LDCs.

Some larger African countries such as
Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana or Cameroon
are not LDCs. There is at least one such
country in each of the regional groups.
For these countries, after the WTO wai
ver for unilateral ACP preferential access
has expired, the alternative way, instead
of EPAs, to gain EU market access would
be within the framework of the Genera
lized System of Preferences (GSP) of the
EU. But under the GSP all developing
countries are granted preferential market
access to the EU. This would entail redu
ced preferences for ACP countries since
in particular, the EU will not grant any
additional market opening to larger de
veloping countries with a high produc
tion potential for sensitive (agricultural)
products. But since the Cotonou Agree
ment firmly states that no ACP country
should be worse off in terms of market
access than it was before, the pressure
on the non-LDC countries to conclude
EPAs does not seem to be too severe, eit
her. But this could be deceptive: for all
ACP countries, a revised, more generous
GSP would mean a reduction in the re

Michael Brüntrup analyses the EPAs in the context of trade, development and regional integration.
The EU is conscious of this weakness in the argumentation, particularly with regard to LDC market opening, which is why it especially emphasizes the other negotiation topics of the EPAs. However, the EU is confronted with two negotiation topics of the EPAs. How? Regarding LDC market opening, which is the most sensitive issue, the EU is aware of the argumentation, particularly with regard to the learning effect from similar markets, as well as the easier readjustment process that enables them to cope with market changes. Therefore, the EU is likely to apply a more gradual approach to opening its markets to LDCs, with a focus on developing a more flexible and tailored approach to meet the needs of individual countries.

Issues (competition, investment, transparency in government procurement procedures)

The EU is also aware of the strong mercantilist views held by many ACP countries, particularly those with a strong agricultural sector. The EU is likely to address these concerns by negotiating agreements that include provisions for market access, investment, and transparency in government procurement procedures. The EU is also concerned about the potential for preference erosion by the implementation of the EPA provisions, which could undermine the support of the ACP countries for the EPA negotiations.

Credibility Problems of the EU in EPAs as a By-product of Internally Oriented Policies, Particularly Agricultural Policy.

The EU has not always gained credibility from developing countries, apart from the inconsistencies in trade policies mentioned above, due to side effects of internal policies, in particular the common agricultural policy (CAP). Restructuring of domestic subsidies to achieve less trade distortion and reduction of export subsidies primarily occurred under pressure from the WTO (and maybe because of resistance in the EU to steadily rising agricultural budgets and continuing decreases in the CAP). The inadequate CAP has played a role in the definition of agricultural policy. Restructuring of domestic subsidies to achieve less trade distortion and reduction of export subsidies primarily occurred under pressure from the WTO (and maybe because of resistance in the EU to steadily rising agricultural budgets and continuing decreases in the CAP). The inadequate CAP has played a role in the definition of agricultural policy. Restructuring of domestic subsidies to achieve less trade distortion and reduction of export subsidies primarily occurred under pressure from the WTO (and maybe because of resistance in the EU to steadily rising agricultural budgets and continuing decreases in the CAP). The inadequate CAP has played a role in the definition of agricultural policy.
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ly contradictory trade policy, together with the burden of agricultural (trade) policy which is inadequately interwoven with development policies. However, the EU has also had to deal with very different and, in part, very difficult partners. Thus it is also obvious that in the context of complex partnerships these trade policies are very strongly influenced by non-economic objectives and cannot be measured solely in terms of economic criteria.

Therefore, the analysis above leads to the following conclusion: the EU appears to underestimate the problems of introducing EPAs. At the same time, the EU has a credibility problem when it postulates a development-oriented set-up for the EPAs. This perception does not only emerge against the background of other trade agreements and negotiations but because EU trade, development and agricultural policies are not always coherent, and indeed, cannot always be...

Endnotes

1 In absolute numbers more poor live in South Asia, but there the relative proportions of the poor and the depth of poverty are considerably lower and the trend towards poverty reduction is positive, whereas in SSA between 1990 and 2001 (the last year for which comparative regional figures are given in the UN’s MDG report 2005) the trend is negative both relatively and absolutely.

2 South Africa has been an ACP country since 1998, but has not joined the trade and finance parts of the Lomé and the Cotonou agreements, and is not considered by the EU to be a developing country in the strict sense (http://www.bmz.de/de/weg/ue_ar/ue_wys/phiptama/index.html).

3 Preferences generally are looked at rather sceptically in the economic literature, nevertheless they are usually a dominant aspect of intra-state economic agreements.

4 Mercantile here means negotiating trade agreements with the objective of conquering export markets (of defensive interests) while protecting one’s own markets as much as possible (defensive interests). Seen from a welfare-economic viewpoint, a unilateral market opening is also of advantage for the national economy being liberalised, but it presupposes the theory of functioning markets and ignores adjustment costs.
3. Europe’s Quest for Economic Partnerships Agreements: More a Matter of Self Interest than of Partnership

Paul Goodison

We have been discussing that Africa needs to be more integrated in the global economy. Let me start by stressing that Africa is in fact integrated into the world economy. The key issue rather is the basis of its integration: How do we transform it in a such a way that Africans add more value to what Africans produce for national, regional and international markets, and that they create employment for Africans and growth in Africa, which is required to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)? That’s the starting point for Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) from the ACP point of view: How do these trade agreements support the structural transformation of African economies?

Africans recognize that they have the primary responsibility for getting their national and regional policies right to support that process. But they want to see a trade relationship with Europe which encourages that process and supports it - not one that undermines increased value addition in Africa for national, regional and international markets.

Some European corporations have advanced strategies for taking control of African industries

We have heard people say that the European Strategy towards Africa is at an early stage of development. But that is only true if you look at governments. When I look at European corporations in the agriculture and food sector I see them at a very advanced stage in their strategic thinking. Since the signing of the EU-South Africa trade agreement, two thirds of the South African dairy industry has come under European control, and South Africa is now the basis for gaining control of the regional dairy sector. For example, negotiations are currently taking place for the purchase of the major South African sugar company which controls the entire Malawi and Zambian sugar industries as well as half of Tanzania’s and more than a third of both Mozambique’s and Swaziland's sugar industries. Currently a French and a British company are fighting over who will get control over African sugar. It is quite amazing how 8.8 billion euros of restructuring support for the European sugar sector seem to find their way to Zambia, Tanzania, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland and South Africa.

The fisheries sector in Southern Africa is also dominated by European companies. For example, you find Dutch interest in it, and the tuna industry is dominated by the French overseas fleets in the Indian Ocean. And I am only talking about the agricultural sector here - not about the retail sector, not about mining.

So I am quite amazed when I hear people say that the EU is only interested in development and has no commercial interest. I wonder whether the European Commission and the member states are actually talking to European businesses who are actively involved in making money in Africa and out of Africa. So why do the EU and its member states pursue the signing of free trade agreements not only with African countries but throughout the globe? I have been asked to answer the question if the EU is guided by self interest or fair partnership. I would say 60 percent self interest, 40 percent fair partnership.

Flexibility towards Africa would compromise the EU’s global trade agenda

The EU has a single global trade policy agenda which is designed to promote jobs and growth in Europe. It does not only aim at the trade in goods, but also at the trade in services and at trade related areas. It pursues this policy by using two vehicles: multilateral trade negotiations in the World Trade Organization (WTO) and agreements with individual states or groups of states on free trade areas. If it does not move forward in one forum it shifts the weight to the other. As a European consumer and taxpayer I think the European Commission is doing a splendid job in promoting the interests of European industry through its free trade area policy. But the activist committed to promoting economic development is, as you see, loosing lots of hair because of this policy, and my beard was turning gray so I had to shave it.

Let’s take the obscure issue of geographical designations of origin. The EU wants to restrict the use of product names like Roquefort cheese or champagne: only producers from areas where these products originally come from, like the Champagne for champagne, shall be allowed to market their products under the famous names. The EU was trying to get this issue on the WTO agenda but failed. So it shifted the focus and insisted in having provisions on geographical designations of origin in trade agreements with Mexico and South Africa. When the EU gets these provisions in bilateral agreements, it goes back to the WTO and says: We should have international rules on this, because all these countries have signed up to it in bilateral agreements.

The point is that the EU has global trade policy objectives. If, in trade negotiations with Africa, it compromises the principles that underline those policies, then it undermines the integrity of the wider EU policy. That is why there is so little flexibility in the negotiations on EPAs. It is not because African markets are so important to European companies - though some of the markets certainly are in some sectors. Did you know for example that Africa takes one in ten exports of European cereal products now - not standard wheat and maize but value added cereal products like pasta, biscuits and flower?
EPAs are undermining the benefits of regional market integration

Limited flexibility is the first of two major issues that are important to EPAs. Africa needs flexibility in trade agreements so that regional markets are not just created on paper, but genuine trade flows occur between African countries, which then attract investment in new production capacity for regional markets. Therefore EPAs need to be structured in ways that give Africa enough space to build these markets. Asking them – like the EU does – to open up to European exports while they are still trying to build regional markets is fundamentally compromising the development benefits of regional integration.

The second major issue is building productive capacities in Africa. Here EPAs will entail huge adjustment costs. A Commonwealth secretariat study has estimated that some 9.3 billion euros are required for the ACP countries over ten years to finance central programs of restructuring. The EU is nowhere near considering to provide that level of assistance. It is not even willing to enter into the debate. And even if the European Commission got the money, it is simply not geared up to giving time sensitive support for economic restructuring which has to take its lead from the private sector. Its systems are designed for state to state collaboration in long term development programs like physical infrastructure programs. So we in Europe have to fundamentally rethink the division of labor between EU member states and the European Commission before supporting the African vision of structural transformation which underpins their approach to EPAs.

Flexibility required in the timetable of EPA negotiations

Angelo Mondlane underlined the need for flexibility in the negotiation of EPAs, because their aim is to support the development of African sub-regional markets. According to him, this presupposes giving the regional economic groupings in Africa enough time to build and consolidate. He explained that customs unions were in the process of being established in Southern Africa, but more time was needed for this. Any premature declaration of a customs union just because the EU demanded this for the sake of negotiating EPAs would cause serious problems.

Investment in the Agro-Industry?

Michael Brüntrup contradicted Mr. Goodison by saying that European investment in Africa was a good sign. It showed that investment in Africa is profitable and that local markets can be served by locally produced goods. According to him, the aim should be to build agro-industry and thus provide for more value added in Africa. Of course large and multilateral European companies should not be the only ones to do this. What is needed is a good investment climate and a competition policy in order not to create monopolies, he said. Mr. Brüntrup also emphasized the importance of linking local farmers to growing markets in urban areas as well as to local agro-industry, but he added that until now there have been no efforts in this direction on the part of the EU.

4. Discussion Panel 3

Development through Investment in the Agro-Industry?

On this issue Alexis Valqui remarked that the inflexible timetable of the EPA negotiations is a result of international trade law (which he deemed important for more justice in world trade). The preference system that the EU conceded to ACP states under the Lomé conventions is not reciprocal and therefore can no longer continue under the rules of the World Trade Organization (WTO). The WTO has granted a waiver, which means the system will be allowed to continue in place during reform negotiations, but only for a limited time.

Are alternative EPA draft proposals ignored?

Paul Goodison told the audience that the Eastern and Southern African region (ESA) had produced its own draft EPA proposal. He envisaged a ten-year moratorium on any reduction of tariffs on imports from the EU, followed by a twenty year period in which these tariffs should be progressively reduced for 60 percent of all these imports. Mr. Goodison accused the European Commission of simply ignoring the existence of these proposals. It chooses instead to debate a proposal for the SADC region based on the EU-South Africa trade development and cooperation agreement, which eliminates tariffs on 86 percent of all the EU exports over a twelve-year period. "The ESA draft conveniently never gets to peoples' desks and is dropped in the garbage bin, and we call that negotiations", Goodison said.

He also stressed that taxes on imports, mainly from the EU, their main trading partner, are the main source of govern-
ment revenue in many African states. These taxes are easy to collect; setting up alternative systems of taxation would be extremely difficult and costly. “There is no point in giving aid to these governments if we simultaneously pursue policies which destroy their revenue base without helping them to put alternative taxation policies in place. That it is a recipe for the collapse of health services, education services, agricultural extension work, road maintenance, and telecommunication systems in Africa”, Goodison said.

The double-edged effects of EPAs on regional integration

Mr. Brüntrup expressed the view that EPAs could as well have positive effects on regional integration. According to him, African countries have for many years been talking about regional integration, but little has been done concretely, so pressure seems to be needed and may be helpful for regional integration. EPAs may create such pressure on governments to become active on trade-related issues like investment, competitiveness and common standards.

Doubts were raised in the audience on this issue. It was remarked that attempts to negotiate multilateral agreements on new trade-related issues like investment protection have met with resistance in the WTO. The EU wants these issues to be included in EPAs, but the SADC group, for example, is only prepared to negotiate this if the exigencies of regional integration are taken into account and if negotiations do not overtax the capabilities of the ACP states. Mr. Brüntrup replied that this is consistent with a political decision of the African Union (AU) not to enter into negotiations on new trade-related issues in the WTO, but that a number of experts - African economists and also African delegates in EPA negotiations - seem to take a different view. Also, agreements on investment already exist in some regions, and they need to be harmonized. According to Mr. Brüntrup, there is an obvious need to stop capital flight and increase investment in Africa. Rules on investment and competitiveness would be helpful here, though not a solution in itself. He saw too few attempts on the part of the private sector and civil society to convince Africans instead of putting political pressure on them through EPAs.

Mr. Valqui underlined that in order to be compatible with WTO rules, trade preferences as provided for in EPAs between the EU and developing states must be mutual but not necessarily symmetrical, and they must cover 90 percent of trade. This means that 10 percent on each side or – in an asymmetrical arrangement – up to 20 percent on the side of poor countries may continue to be protected for perhaps decades. According to Mr. Valqui, studies indicate that this is sufficient to allow the protection of sensitive products in most ACP countries. Problems can, however, occur when the range of these products differs from country to country in one region, so that the range of sensitive products for all countries combined might be more than 20 percent of the region’s products, added Mr. Valqui.

Germany’s role in the EPA process

Concerning Germany’s influence on the EPA negotiations, Alexis Valqui explained that the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development is responsible in Germany, while in most other EU member states the ministries of economy or finance are in the driving seat. He underlined that Germany supports the development aims of EPAs but is confronted with the interests of 24 other member states, many of whom are enthusiastic about the opening up of the EU market.

In his final statement Paul Goodison doubted that the EU would make the huge funds available that are needed to support structural change in partner countries following trade reform, and make them available in time. He argued that already less and less money from the European Development Fund is going to agriculture or business development. “There is a massive decline of EU investment in productive areas where you need to put the money to support preparations for EPAs”, Goodison said.
IV. Shielding the EU or overcoming root causes? EU Africa policy between migration and development

1. Limiting Migration by Border Controls, or Enhancing the Development Effects of Migration - Two Contradictory Approaches in European Migration Policy

Torsten Moritz

We heard this morning that the migration chapter of the EU Africa Strategy is fairly disappointing. That does not mean that migration between Africa and Europe is low on the agenda – on the contrary. While we are discussing here, delegations of the EU and the African Union (AU) member states are meeting on expert level in Algiers in order to prepare the ministerial conference later this year on exactly the question of migration and development. At the same time, the International Labor Organization (ILO) has convened a high level working group which in Brussels is discussing labor migration as a task for involving migrants in development and integration.

The question is whether the EU Africa Strategy and the policies related to it are aimed at shielding the EU or rather at overcoming the root causes of migration. For the time being the jury is still out on that question. We have both tendencies. On the one hand, we would like to have the EU protected and create what is often called the fortress of Europe. On the other hand we have an impetus to say: we penalize countries who do not cooperate with us in migration questions by cutting development aid to them. It identifies a need to strengthen the cooperation on migration issues is not at all new. The Cotonou Agreement of 2000 between the EU and 78 African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) states includes the famous Article 13 on political cooperation and dialogue on migration. It goes to great lengths in describing the modalities of the readmission of people who have come to Europe through ACP countries or who are nationals of ACP countries. For the last four to five years, almost every European Council has discussed the connection between migration and development – very often with the connotation of saying: we penalize countries who do not cooperate with us in migration questions by cutting development aid to them. Also the Barcelona Process with North-ern Africa, which is being taken over step by step by what is called the European Neighborhood Strategy, aims at having a circle of friends around the EU - in terms of migration we could call it a buffer zone where immigration into the EU is managed from beyond its borders.

So the EU Africa Strategy does not come out of the blue. It is fairly short and very unspecific on what should be the EU strategy on migration towards Africa. Therefore I would like to highlight two documents which have been issued around the same time by the European Commission. The first is the conclusions of the Hampton Court Summit, the summit of the heads of state under the British presidency in October 2005, which was in December also taken up by the European Council. The second is the Communication on Migration and Development by the European Commission which has not yet been officially endorsed by the Council.

Two communications from the Commission with quite different approaches

The conclusions of the Hampton Court Summit have a strong focus on Africa that was influenced by the incidents in Ceuta and Melilla last year. It identifies a need to strengthen the cooperation on migration questions with Africa and all actors in Africa and mainly sees this cooperation from the perspective of limiting migration. It says a lot about enhancing border control, strengthening the capacity of the Euro- pean border agency, intercepting vessels in the Mediterranean and various other initiatives for enhancing migration control in the Mediterranean and for cooperation with countries in Northern Af- rica. The paper also mentions a balanced dialogue with the AU, but is very short in describing what this should exactly entail. It speaks of building capacity for migration management in countries of origin and transit, but this is a logic of containing migration. In a little sideline the paper describes the possibilities for legal migration, but as this is an issue which is still, with very few exceptions, in the national competence of EU member states alone, there is very little the EU can really offer here.

In the Communication of the European Commission on Migration and Development, we see a slightly different approach. It starts by saying migration is a fact, we had better live with it. It then tries to identify how migration can be a productive, positive factor for development in countries of origin. It comes up with arguments that are not completely new but have for the first time been lifted to such a high official level in the EU. One important question is: How can the diaspora of a specific country contribute to the development of that country? How can knowledge and mon- ey be transferred back to the country of origin in a way which supports sustain- able development in that country – a de- velopment which is really owned by the
people who come from this country or still live there? The second question is to look very specifically at remittances, that is at the money which people who have migrated from a country send back to it. It has been established that the amount of remittances is by far higher than anything which we can count as official development assistance. However, remittances, by their very definition, are private income. People have privately earned this money and are free to use it as they wish. So we cannot necessarily say we use it for development. However the Communication suggests that we look at the conditions under which remittances are sent back. At the moment it is mainly companies such as Western Union who make a lot of money out of it. If the costs of the transfers could be reduced, more money would potentially be available for development in the countries to which the money is sent. So the question is: Can we construct a financial transfer system which allows more remittances to be used for sustaining families, but also for investment? A last question is how do we address brain drain. The Communication says brain drain is a serious problem. We have more doctors for example from Malawi in Manchester than we have in Malawi. That is obviously a very serious issue with lots of repercussions on the economy and society of the countries of origin. So the paper tries to identify what we can do ensure that brain drain does not mean knowledge is completely lost in the country of origin, but is also put to use for the countries from which people come. The passepartout answer seems to be circular migration: People come for a certain period of time, then go back and take back the knowledge they have acquired. This seems to create a win-win situation. But a problem I see here is that you might revitalize the ‘Gastarbeiter’ (guest worker) concept. Personal life plans change and people who initially plan to stay abroad only for a specific period of time might end up not wanting to go back any more. So there are integration issues related to that, and the issue of circular migration is something that you need to look into more carefully.

European migration policy is fairly incoherent For me at the moment, European migration policy presents a fairly incoherent picture. That has to do with the different actors involved. We have on the one hand the logic of justice and home affairs ministers and the justice and home affairs department of the European Commission. It is still a predominantly restrictive logic: We would like to keep out borders as closed as possible, allow a very selective entry into the EU and cooperate with the AU and African partners on that. There also is a development logic which is more about the question: Cannot migration be a new issue we take on board in order to enhance development? At the moment a discussion is ongoing which of these two logics will become predominant or if there will be any way of combining the two. A colleague from the European Commission yesterday sent a report of the unit on immigration and asylum which says: Until now we have been speaking two different languages in development on the one hand, justice and home affairs on the other; we are beginning to understand each other now. This seems to indicate that there is still a long way to go before we come to productive cooperation and coherence in these issues. A last reminder that also relates to the situation of Ceuta and Melilla last year. Exactly during the time when European institutions were discussing how to stop migrants at the border of the Spanish enclaves, an AU delegation visited Brussels. Its president Alpha Omar Konaré clearly said: We are willing to discuss migration issues with the EU, but only if the EU discusses its trade policies, tariffs and agricultural subsidies with us. Beyond the logic of justice and home affairs and development respectively, we also have to look at the issue of trade, agriculture and coherence in EU policy, if we are serious about addressing root causes of migration.

2. The Migration Pressure is Caused by Africa’s Economic and Social Crisis

Mehdi Lalou

The question of migration is closely linked to the lack of rights and to the situation of deep economic, social and political crisis in Africa. A lack of democracy and of civil rights is common in most African countries - only some, like South Africa, Senegal, Mali and to some extent Morocco, have more or less democratic regimes. Moreover, there is a lack of public security in many sub-Saharan countries, a number are subject to civil war. Widening gaps between sub-Saharan Africa and the Maghreb, and between the Maghreb and Europe A symptom of the crisis is the economic gap between the Maghreb and sub-Saharan Africa. For example, in terms of per capita production, the gap between Mali and Algeria is now more than 1 to 7, so Malians are coming to Algeria for work. The gap between Chad and Libya is 1 to 27, between Nigeria and Tunisia about 1 to 12. At the same time we have a similar gap between the Maghreb and Europe: 1 to 14 between Algeria and the Netherlands, 1 to 10 between Tunisia and Italy and 1 to 18.5 between Morocco and France. Moreover, this gap has greatly widened, for example between Spain and Morocco: In 1973 it was 1 to 4, and we did not have migration from Morocco to Spain. Today the gap is 1 to 18. The number of Moroccans in Spain has accordingly increased from less than 33,000 in 1984 to about half a million today. This happened in spite of the partnership between the EU and most states of the Southern Mediterranean started in 1995, the so-called Barcelona process. Its main goals were to establish a common area of peace and stability, comprising the EU and the Maghreb, through a political and security dialogue; to create an area of shared prosperity through economic partnership and the gradual establishment of a free-trade area; and to bring peoples together and promote the understanding between cultures and migration through cultural exchanges between civil societies. We see today that these goals have not been achieved. And migration is the main problem today between the Maghreb and Europe, although migration in Africa is indeed still mainly inside the continent - only about 3 percent of immigrants to the EU come from Africa. The EU Africa Strategy is too optimistic about the situation in Africa What do we in Northern Africa think about the EU Strategy for Africa? Let me present three theses on this question. First, the EU’s analysis of the situation in Africa is not quite appropriate. The Strategy says Africa is on the move, international awareness of the situation in Africa has improved in recent years, and the continent is giving signs that there is real momentum for change. I do not agree with this and feel the situation is worse than described in the EU Africa Strategy. For example, Africa accounts for only about 2 percent of world trade and its share of global manufactured exports is almost negligible. The continent is receiving today less than 2.5 percent of global foreign direct investment, and three quarters of the added value produced with this investment is transferred
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out of the continent. Moreover, the main areas of foreign investment are monopo-listic sectors – either the exploitation of raw materials or public sectors like water, energy and communications. 40 percent of all Africans survive on less than one dollar a day, and only six out of ten Afri-can children go to primary school. Africa is also the continent which is the hardest hit by communicable diseases, in particu-lar HIV/AIDS, malaria and tubercu-losis.

Second thesis: The engagement of the EU in Africa is less strong than it appears. In 2003 the EU’s development aid to Af-rica totalled 15 billion euros, compared to 5 billion in 1985. This is significant. But we have to add that the EU compris-ed only 12 states in 1985 while it has 25 members now; gross national income in the EU is four to five times greater now than in 1985. Above this, a big part of the European aid flows back to Europe, because of conditions attached to it, and so benefits European enterprises or deve-lopment professionals.

Preventing irregular immigration is one of Europe’s major interests

Third thesis: European interests in Af-rica come into play that are not stated in the documents of the European Com-mission or the European Council. For us in Northern and Southern Africa, it looks like three interests are driving European Africa policies. First, the main interest of both the EU and its member states is to stop irregular migration from Africa to Europe and maybe promote what they call responsible migration. Second, some European states have a strong interest in African raw materials. And third, eco-nomically, European actors are mainly interested in strategic sectors where in vestment brings high and quick financial return. This means long-term develop-ment in Africa is not an important goal. If European policies remain unchanged, there is not much prospect for reducing the migration pressure in Africa.

Dietrich Thränhardt

 Attempts have often been made to use development aid to prevent migration. This simply cannot work because devel-opment does not lead to less migration; on the contrary, it will at least initially lead to more migration. If you introduce modern technologies, for example tractors, into agrarian societies, you reduce the need for rural labour, and this will cause surplus labourers to migrate. That is why the economic take-off in Germa-ny in the 19th century was accompanied by a huge emigration movement towards A1rea. Only after the industrialisation in Germany was accomplished in about 1800 did this emigration slow down and end. We are today witnessing the same phenomenon in Turkey: We see there a dramatic industrialisation process which generates rapid economic growth while at the same time a high number of peo-ple are prepared to emigrate, as the demo-graphic transition to lower birth rates is not yet accomplished.

Development cannot stop migration – it will rather increase it

 So development, at least in its early stages, always leads to more migration: Internal migration from traditional to modern, growing sectors of the economy (without which there cannot be develop-ment); and also emigration to foreign countries. Thus using development aid to counter migration is a flawed concept in so far as it attempts to counter the root causes of migration. It can only work if aid is used to bribe authoritarian regimes to prevent their citizens from emigrating.

Well-managed migration can benefit both the recipient country and the country of origin

This kind of win-win situation has been described in a report of the Indi-an parliament. The Global Commissi-on on International Migration initiated by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, whose report has recently been presen-ted in German translation, also strongly argues in this direction. Unfortunate-ly the German minister of the interior,
Mr. Schäuble, has politely ignored these arguments, sticking to his strategy of deterring immigration. This attitude is in general predominant among interior ministers and politicians concerned with internal security.

Of course allowing immigration does not always and automatically lead to win-win situations. This is, for example, clearly not the case with the high number of Malawian doctors working in Manchester. The emigration of African medical professionals to Great Britain, North America or Australia is of course very problematic and a heavy burden for health systems in Africa.

Remittances to poor countries from diaspora communities in rich countries are another important link between development and migration. Let me elaborate on this a little bit. The World Bank has calculated that globally these transfers are about two and a half times greater than official development aid. They are also more stable and reliable than and also more stable than private foreign investment. We may argue over what kind of transfers are more important for development. But we do know that a lot of overhead costs are associated with development aid, whereas remittances actually reach part of the population of poor countries and create demand which stimulates the economy.

Transfer of cultural values and attitudes

Furthermore, migration also leads to a transfer of cultural and social values and capabilities. In Bangalore in India you can see very clearly that migrants have also brought home modern attitudes. For example, corruption is in decline, the number of children per family is decreasing (whether we regard this as positive or not), and people who have worked in the US try to introduce modern business practices. Finally, migration may have an influence on political development, particularly in countries where opposition groups are not tolerated at home but can influence the situation from abroad.

In sum: migration cannot be prevented. The political task is to shape it in such a way as to bring about win-win situations. In the case of the EU's relations to Africa, the need is to devise strategies that combine migration and trade in order to promote development. For example, it is necessary to raise the productivity of African agriculture, and the exchange of personnel and knowledge can contribute to this. The same kind of exchange can be envisaged for the mining and mineral resources sectors, and of course for industry, which is the least developed sector in sub-Saharan Africa. In Europe the experience made with the controlled opening up of borders has been very positive. Forty years ago nobody would have imagined that you could totally open the borders between 25 European countries, which is the situation today. The strategy in the EU should be to gradually open up borders for other countries as well, beginning with permitting controlled immigration. In the long run, open borders are also possible in relation to Africa, but only in the long run. However, we can use immigration quotas and porous borders with individual African countries – Morocco and Tunisia are obvious candidates – to gradually move in this direction.
4. Discussion Panel 3

Shielding the EU or Overcoming Root Causes of Migration? EU Africa Policy between Migration and Development

All panelists agreed that migration must be seen as a fact; it cannot be stopped but rather has to be organized in a more prudent way. Different approaches to immigration on the part of the European Commission and its member states were debated: integration policy, asylum policy, development effects of migration, and cooperation with Maghreb countries in restricting immigration from Africa.

Migration policy after September 11th – back to space zero

One focus was the shift from development to security policy since 11th September 2001. Torsten Moritz explained: "The European Council in Tampere in October 1999 for the first time said we need a common immigration policy for the EU. Since then we have changed in a political climate in some EU member states and the agenda was: We need a pro-active immigration policy because we will need immigration. September 11th 2001 set the agenda back to space zero." According to Mr. Moritz, one conclusion after the terror attacks of September 11th was that the integration of immigrants had failed. But this was rather a result of the fact that politicians had not taken on board the fact that not just manpower but people with individual plans, with families, with a personality and their own wishes were coming to the EU.

Currently the priority is the integration of the new member countries

Dietrich Thränhardt explained why the European Commission has not yet elaborated a strategy to regulate migration or to establish a consistent EU integration policy: "The European Commission is still committed to the integration of the ten new member countries. They tell the older members, especially Germany and Austria: Open your boarders for Polish, Czech and Slovak migrants." But Mr. Thränhardt saw all European countries except Turkey on the verge of a demographic crisis, which means they depend on immigration to slow down the shrinking of their populations. However, innovative migration policies especially with respect to Africa, for instance exchange programmes between European and African universities, are still missing. He added that Africa – in comparison to Asia – is not seen as a valuable pool for immigrants going, for example, to institutions of higher education.

One important point concerned circular migration. Mr. Thränhardt and Mr. Moritz warned that strict visa regimes designed to reduce immigration have counter-productive effects: Immigrants will be more reluctant to travel to their home countries (which they need to do when they consider going back) once they fear they will not be allowed back into the EU. Entry restrictions are also an incentive for migrants to keep their nationality of origin and have two nationalities, i.e. so as to be able to travel more easily. Rather than restricting entry at the borders, the EU should give migrants the possibility of circular migration, Thränhardt said: “It is no contradiction to be integrated in Europe and still move back to your country of origin.” He demanded European policies to organize visa regimes and residence permits in such a way that people can easily return home while also strengthening reintegrating programs.

Putting North African states in the frontline of EU immigration restrictions

By instead trying to restrict border crossing from the south, the EU is, according to Mehdi Lalou, calling on Maghreb countries to act as a barrier between Sub-Sahara Africa and Europe. He argued that this cannot work for political reasons and counteracts attempts to bring all African countries together in the African Union. Mr. Lalou saw EU migration policy as attempt to install a barrier to development in the Maghreb. Moritz added that Morocco sent would-be immigrants who reached its border with Spain at the enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla into the desert under deplorable conditions. This was a reaction to pressure on Morocco from Spain, which in turn was reacting to pressure from other EU countries, to prevent immigration from Africa.

From the refugee situation in the Maghreb the discussion turned to the issue of asylum. So far each European state accepts asylum the decisions of other EU member states, and there are EU directives on asylum procedures and reception conditions. But a common regulation on the conditions under which asylum is granted is still missing, Moritz said. In theory everybody who manages to enter an EU member country has the right to launch an asylum claim. In practice, on the Italian island of Lampedusa or in Melilla, people are sent back without being given this chance, Moritz said. According to him, this is not an isolated case: "De facto we have no effective access to the asylum procedure. That is a general trend, it can happen to you in Germany, in Poland or wherever you go."

Development effects of migration: remittances and brain drain

Asking about the uses and limits of remittances for development, Torsten Moritz remarked that they can contribute to development in countries of origin, probably mainly on local or regional level. But remittances cannot finance national health systems or physical infrastructure like electricity. Here official development assistance is still needed. Remittances also tend not to flow to the
poorest countries or areas because some social mobility, a minimum of capital and a certain amount of social contacts is needed to organize migration, and thus the least developed countries usually do not generate huge migration flows to the EU.

According to Mr. Lahlou, the migration debate in the EU is too strongly focused on highly skilled migrants. The de facto immigration of people working in lower skilled jobs is not sufficiently taken into account. These migrants often come to Europe under irregular circumstances, in some states their status may afterwards be regularized. Other, regular ways of organizing this immigration into lower skilled jobs are necessary, said Mr. Moritz.

The audience was of the opinion that every country needs human resources and therefore the brain drain should be stopped and qualified workers should be supported in developing countries. Mr. Lahlou agreed. He viewed the economic and financial disparities between Europe and Africa as a major cause of migration that Europe needed to address. According to Lahlou, South Africa in the south and the Maghreb with Egypt in the north, which are more developed than the rest of Africa, could help Europe support social development in Africa. Unfortunately, North Africa, according to him, has its own problems. Lahlou agreed to a remark from the audience that the Barcelona Process has failed: It had led neither to more investment in the Maghreb nor to less social inequality. For Lahlou this was chiefly due to a lack of democracy and good governance in the Maghreb. He would like Europe to play a role in improving this. But he found Europe’s messages in this field contradictory. He cited as an example the fact that the EU advocates human rights while some of its member countries are assisting Libya, Tunisia or Algeria, whose serious human rights problems are well known, in the building of detention centres for migrants.

According to Mr. Moritz, the migration debate in the EU is too strongly focused on highly skilled migrants. The de facto immigration of people working in lower skilled jobs is not sufficiently taken into account. These migrants often come to Europe under irregular circumstances, in some states their status may afterwards be regularized. Other, regular ways of organizing this immigration into lower skilled jobs are necessary, said Mr. Moritz.

The audience was of the opinion that every country needs human resources and therefore the brain drain should be stopped and qualified workers should be supported in developing countries. Mr. Lahlou agreed. He viewed the economic and financial disparities between Europe and Africa as a major cause of migration that Europe needed to address. According to Lahlou, South Africa in the south and the Maghreb with Egypt in the north, which are more developed than the rest of Africa, could help Europe support social development in Africa. Unfortunately, North Africa, according to him, has its own problems. Lahlou agreed to a remark from the audience that the Barcelona Process has failed: It had led neither to more investment in the Maghreb nor to less social inequality. For Lahlou this was chiefly due to a lack of democracy and good governance in the Maghreb. He would like Europe to play a role in improving this. But he found Europe’s messages in this field contradictory. He cited as an example the fact that the EU advocates human rights while some of its member countries are assisting Libya, Tunisia or Algeria, whose serious human rights problems are well known, in the building of detention centres for migrants.

The Strategy deals with European policies towards Africa in the areas of peace and security, of human rights and governance, and of development, economic growth and trade. The first – security – is given much importance as a precondition for progress in other areas. This integrated approach was not disputed in principle during the conference. Concerns were raised, however, that the EU should not fund its support for peace operations from already earmarked development aid but make additional money available. The principle of “African ownership”, which is very prominent in the Strategy’s approach to peace and security, was identified as potentially problematic: Here the EU relies heavily on African organisations, the African Union (AU) in the first instance. Yet the AU is still building its capacity, and it is not clear that these organisations will rise to the challenges of regional security – even with assistance from the EU. Similarly, in the field of human rights the EU Strategy relies heavily on peer reviews among African states, an approach that does not seem to work in cases like Zimbabwe.

In the area of development, growth and trade, the EU is negotiating Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) with four regional groupings of African states. They follow the principle of mutual free trade rather than giving EU trade preferences to ACP countries. Doubts were raised during the conference that this approach may actually undermine regional markets in Africa and diminish state revenues that, in many African countries, depend on tariffs on trade. Furthermore, huge investments in productive sectors in Africa are necessary if the continent is to benefit from EPAs. The Strategy promises an increase in aid to Africa, but it seems unclear whether the EU is prepared to make enough funds available in time to cover these needs. Besides, the effects of the EU Agricultural Policy on poor countries are not addressed in the EU Africa Strategy.

The conference also discussed European migration policies. It was stressed that the aim should be to manage them in such a way that they benefit Africa as well as Europe. This is, however, not the current policy in Europe; a restrictive
approach to immigration has again been predominant since the terror attacks of September 11th, although the Commission – but not the Council – seems to be reassessing this. The EU is pressuring Northern African states to prevent migrants from reaching Europe. This is unlikely to work in the long run and may even run counter to attempts to promote democracy and human rights in Northern Africa.

One of the biggest doubts about the EU Africa Strategy is the extent to which its integrated approach – an achievement in principle despite its shortcomings – will really be politically implemented in such a way as to make practical policies more coherent. This will not be possible without going against some vested interests in the EU and its member states and restructuring competencies of EU institutions. So the EU Africa Strategy may – if things go well – be the beginning of a process that will gradually make Europe’s approach towards Africa more consistent and coherent.
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VII. Annex

1. “The EU and Africa: Towards a strategic partnership” (Council of the European Union)

COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION
Brussels, 19 December 2005
1560/05 (Press Release)

THE EU AND AFRICA: TOWARDS A STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

The European Council, at its meeting on 15 and 16 December, adopted the following text:

"Introduction: Our Vision
1. Europe and Africa are bound together by history, by geography, and by a shared vision of a peaceful, democratic and prosperous future for all their peoples.

The EU and Africa: Towards a strategic partnership – Press Release

1.506/05 (Press Release)
2. This strategy sets out the steps the European Union will take with Africa between now and 2015 to support African efforts to build such a future. It is a strategic approach to development which takes into account regional and country-specific needs and African countries' national strategies. Its primary aims are the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and the promotion of sustainable development, security and good governance in Africa.

3. The strategy builds on important progress made by the Africans themselves. Its core principles are partnership based on international law and human rights, equality and mutual accountability. Its underlying philosophy is African ownership and responsibility, including working through African institutions.

**Peace and security**

4. Without peace there can be no lasting development. Without African leadership to end African conflicts, there can be no lasting peace. So we will:

   a) Work with the African Union (AU), sub-regional organisations and African countries to predict, prevent and manage conflicts, including by addressing its root causes, and to keep the peace in Africa's own continent. In particular, we will strengthen the Africa Peace Facility with substantial, long-term, flexible, sustainable funding. We will help develop African capabilities, such as the AU's African Standby Force, and will build on existing initiatives by Member States to provide training and advisory, technical, planning and logistical support.

   b) Provide direct support to African Union, sub-regional or UN efforts to promote peace and stability through Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) activities, and military and civilian crisis management missions, including potential deployment of EU battlegroups; continue implementation of the ESDP Africa Action Plan; and develop the dialogue with Euromed countries.

   c) Enhance our support for post-conflict reconstruction in Africa, so that we secure lasting peace and development. We will support in particular the new UN Peacebuilding Commission; the strengthening of African states; and Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration, and Security Sector Reform programmes in African states.

   d) Redouble our efforts to stem the illicit flow of weapons, including small arms. We will encourage others to adopt minimum common standards and associate themselves with the EU Code of Conduct on arms exports, discourage transfers which contribute to instability, develop ways to share and act on information on illegal trafficking and support border management controls and an international arms trade treaty.

   e) Join with African states to counter terrorism worldwide. We will provide technical assistance, enhanced information sharing and support to the AU Anti-Terrorism Centre in Algiers and continue to support the implementation of international anti-terrorism agreements.

**Human Rights and Governance**

5. Successful development requires adherence to human rights, democratic principles and the rule of law, and effective, well-governed states, and strong and efficient institutions. We will:

   a) Protect and promote human rights, including the rights of women, children and other vulnerable groups; help to protect democracy and the rule of law in Africa, including through capacity-building for judicial systems, national Human Rights Commissions and civil society organisations. The substantial funding under EC and member states' bilateral programmes will be maintained.

   b) Support good governance programmes at country level and help build the capacity of the African Union and Africa's regional and national institutions, building on the £ 35 million already allocated for this purpose under the Africa Peace Facility and the £ 30 million under EDF 9.

   c) Support, through political dialogue and consultations with African partners, African efforts to monitor and improve governance, including through supporting the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)'s African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). This should result in the first round of completed reviews a year from 2006 being achieved and the development of a Governance Initiative to support national reforms triggered by the APRM process. Develop a governance facility in the European Neighbourhood Partnership Instrument.

   d) Support the fight against corruption, human trafficking, illegal drugs and organised crime and promote transparency to meet the aspirations of African citizens and to ensure Africa's wealth benefits its people. This will include helping improve public accountability and financial management systems in Africa, early ratification by all EU member states and African partners of the UN Convention on Corruption, assisting proper management of conflict resources including timber as well as mineral resources, support to the Kimberley Process and to the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) so that eleven African countries begin implementation of the EITI by July 2006.
Development Assistance

6. If Africa is to meet the challenge of development, sound policies and good leadership must be backed by increased, sustainable and predictable financial flows at a level consistent with our ambitions. We will:

a) Increase our aid, by delivering our collective commitment to give official development assistance 0.7% of GNI by 2010, with half of the additional €20 billion going to Africa, and 0.7% of GNI by 2015 in the case of the 110 Member States, whilst other MS will strive to increase their ODA to 0.35% by 2015.

b) Secure more effective and predictable EU financial assistance for Africa, including by reaching early agreement on a successor to the 9th European Development Fund as soon as possible and ensuring adequate resources for North Africa in future EC budgets.

c) In order to help to reach the 0.7% target for development assistance, implement on a voluntary basis, innovative financing mechanisms, such as a contribution on airline tickets or through financing the International Finance Facility for Immunisation.

d) Support the proposal, agreed in principle with the International Financial Institutions, to cancel outstanding debts owed by Heavily Indebted Poor Countries that qualify by helping to meet the costs. This is expected to deliver in total further debt relief of up to €42 billion for African countries.

e) Support the proposal, agreed in principle with the International Financial Institutions, to cancel outstanding debts owed by Heavily Indebted Poor Countries that qualify by helping to meet the costs. This is expected to deliver in total further debt relief of up to €42 billion for African countries.

f) Make aid more effective, by ensuring early implementation for Africa of our EU and international commitments, as agreed in Paris in March 2005.

Sustainable Economic Growth, Regional Integration and Trade

7. Rapid, sustained and broad-based growth is essential for ending poverty in Africa. We will:

a) Facilitate a better-connected Africa, to itself and the rest of the world, including by establishing an EU/Africa Infrastructure Partnership, which will be complementary to the new Infrastructure Consortium for Africa and include existing initiatives on transport and to facilitate peoples' access to water and sanitation, energy and information technology.


c) Help to integrate Africa fully into the world trade system, by pressing for a successful outcome to the Doha Round of world trade talks that is ambitious, maximises development gains, ensures special differential treatment, addresses preference erosion and makes trade work for the poor, and extends duty and quota-free market access for Least Developed Countries to all industrialised country markets.

d) Provide increased aid for trade, building on 'the Community's commitment of €1 billion per year by 2010.

e) Agree Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) with Africa's regional groupings by 2008 that are instruments of development, promote regional integration, improve African access to European and regional markets; support asymmetric and flexible implementation of EPAs; and reduce non-tariff barriers. We will closely monitor EPAs so that they help achieve development objectives; and also resolve efforts to complete by 2010 agreement on an EU-Mediterranean Free Trade Area.

f) Help African countries comply with EU rules and standards, establish clear rules for services, simplify rules of origin and make them more development-friendly.

g) Support Africa in countering the effects of climate change in accordance with the EU Action Plan on Climate Change and Development, and in protecting its environment, through a range of policies, by combating desertification and ensuring the sustainable management of its forests, land and biodiversity fisheries and water. Such support includes, for example, €500 million for the EU Water Facility and €220 million for the Energy Facility under EDF9.

---

1 The full text, accompanied by the relevant minutes statements, is set out in the Conclusions of the Council of 24 May 2005 (Ref 9266/05).
Investing in people

8. A successful Africa requires a well-educated, healthy population and the full empowerment of women. We will:

   a) Support African efforts to ensure that all children have free primary education of good quality by 2015, including through the implementation of Africa’s Education for All programme, with increased resources for the Fast Track Initiative, such as the € 63 million agreed under ED9, and through the plan agreed at the 2005 Barcelona Summit.

   b) Promote development of Euro-Africa networks of universities and centres of excellence, including through the establishment of a new exchange programme (the Nyere Programme) for students in Africa.

   c) Provide predictable, multi-year financing for health systems in Africa so that all Africans have access to basic healthcare, free where governments choose to provide it and in support of African governments’ goal of allocating 15% of their public budgets to health.

   d) Enhance our support for the fight against infectious diseases, including by providing further EU contributions to the Global Fund for AIDS, TB and malaria, thereby maintaining the EU’s share of global contributions (at least 59%). We will continue to support research and development of drugs for AIDS and other curable diseases, and help countries deliver prevention strategies and universal access to HIV treatment and care for all who need it by 2010, through further support for the EU Programme for Action for AIDS, TB and malaria, and support fair access to drugs under WTO patent protection rules.

   e) Improve food security for the most vulnerable, by helping EU 8 million Africans out of hunger by 2009 through country-led safety-nets for chronically food insecure populations who rely on humanitarian programmes.

   f) Maximize the developmental benefits and minimize the negative aspects of migration and strengthen protection for refugees, through engaging in balanced dialogue and cooperation with the AU, other African organisations and states on a broad range of migration issues. In particular this means addressing the root causes of migration, fostering links with development and promoting co-development and combating illegal immigration. We will take this forward through a series of concrete priority actions as agreed by the European Council.

9. Europe has a strong interest in a peaceful, prosperous and democratic Africa. Our strategy is intended to help Africa achieve this. We commit to:

   a) Deliver on this strategy. We will review progress on its implementation at the December 2006 European Council, and at least every two years thereafter. Our Ministers will discuss and oversee the development of detailed delivery and monitoring plans for this purpose, based on timelines and indicators proposed jointly by the Commission and Council Secretariat. In 2004, the Council will review implementation of the aid volume targets agreed in May 2003 and thereafter, on the basis of monitoring reports from the Commission.

   b) Develop this strategy, in partnership with the African Union, NEPAD and other African partners, respecting the principles of African ownership, the importance of working more closely with Africans in multilateral fora, and in coordination with multilateral partners.

   c) Building on the Cairns Summit, enhance the EU’s political dialogue and broader relationship with Africa and its institutions, and hold the second EU-Africa Summit in Lisbon as soon as possible.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Co-development involves migrant communities in the EU contributing to the development of their countries of origin
Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) was founded in 1925 as a political legacy of Germany’s first democratically elected president, Friedrich Ebert. As a cultural non-profit institution, it is committed to the ideas and basic values of social democracy. In its extensive activities, the foundation serves the following aims:

• furthering political and social education of individuals from all walks of life in the spirit of democracy and pluralism,
• facilitating access to university education and research for gifted young people by providing scholarships,
• contributing to international understanding and cooperation.

The FES maintains its own representatives in 70 countries of Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. The foundation engages in projects in the fields of sociopolitical development and economic and social promotion. The FES sees its activities in developing countries as a contribution to:

• promoting peace and understanding between peoples and inside the partner countries,
• supporting the democratisation of the State and society and strengthening the civil society,
• improving general political, economic and social conditions,
• reinforcing trade unions,
• developing independent media structures,
• facilitating regional and worldwide cooperation between states and different interest groups - gaining recognition for human rights.

Further information: www.fes.de

terre des hommes

terre des hommes, founded in 1967, is an aid organisation focusing on children and supporting about 350 projects in 28 countries. These include school and training projects, initiatives for street children, working children, child prostitutes and refugee children. It also runs food security and healthcare programmes.

terre des homes helps people to liberate themselves from oppression and economic hardship. It seeks to empower them to try out their own ideas about a life lived in dignity. We do not send outfield workers, preferring to promote local initiatives. With money, advice and networking facilities.

terre des homes endeavours — through campaigns, lobbying and publicity — to influence German political and business circles in the interest of children suffering hunger, exploitation or the aftermath of war.

terre des homes endeavours — through campaigns, lobbying and publicity — to influence decision makers in the interest of children suffering hunger, exploitation or the aftermath of war. Terre des homes action groups are groups of volunteers in 150 German towns and cities. They work on development-related issues at the local level, organising events, sitting on refugee councils and raising funds for projects. The regional offices of terre des homes guarantee the direct contact to the partner organisations, efficient accompaniment and local co-ordination of projects.

Further information: www.tdh.de

World Economy, Ecology & Development (WEED)

WEED was founded in 1990 to boost the advocacy in the Federal Republic of Germany of alleviating global poverty and resolving international environmental problems. WEED campaigns for a course correction in international economic and development policies that would put more emphasis on social justice and environmental sustainability. Its aim is to create more awareness in this respect and develop and implement concrete political alternatives. WEED systematically analyses global economic, environmental and socio-political issues, linking the vision of a socially equitable and environmentally sustainable society to action and policy reform.

WEED is active in the following areas:

• the international debt crises
• IMF & World Bank policies, projects and programmes
• reform and democratisation of international financial markets
• international trade and investment policy (WTO)
• corporate accountability
• international and European environment and development policy

Further information: www.weed-online.org