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Development and relations with the ACP States: Europe in action for 50 years

In addition to being an area of solidarity within its own borders (i.e. regarding regional and social support, cohesion policy), the European Union is leading the way in promoting international solidarity, particularly in the case of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States.

This cooperation policy with the poorest countries of the world was launched 50 years ago at a time when Europe’s founding fathers were adamant about promoting peace and prosperity in the interest of overall stability. Consequently, millions of people have benefited from this development cooperation policy and its schemes to, for example, combat hunger, provide access to water, and build schools and hospitals. All of these initiatives are a reflection of the values that are the essence of the European enterprise: solidarity, respect for human rights and the rule of law.

After 50 years, now is the time to make an assessment, draw lessons and look towards the future. The assessment is that millions of lives have been saved, people are living in a more dignified way and economies are developing, primarily thanks to Europe. The EU has become a major player in world politics and an indispensable development partner of many developing countries.

The lessons are many and have led to relations with the ACP States being recast in the light of the partnership’s key principle. Signed in the year 2000, the Cotonou Agreement is based upon this idea, consolidated by the adoption of the European Consensus on Development which was adopted in 2005. This Consensus meant that a European vision (of Member States and the European Commission) was defined, based on shared values, joint goals and principles, and greatly increased resources.

The keys for development are to be found in an array of policies focused on governance, accountability and the adoption of an effective aid system, sector-specific strategies and trade. The key component of development is good governance and the ACP States can count on firm European Commission support and further incentives to encourage them to commit to this approach. Good governance is of fundamental importance; the States need to guarantee each citizen impartial access to courts, administration, health, education and the opportunity to enjoy fundamental freedoms.

The way forward for the development process will be in our ability to take on board all the major problems in the same spirit: globalisation, climate change, energy access, migration management and a knowledge-based society.

The European Union believes that development is dependent upon a dialogue between partners in a bid to meet all the challenges of a globalised world. If the problems of poor countries are overlooked today, the problems of security, health and the economy will be intensified tomorrow because all regions of the world are now interdependent.

This is Europe’s message for the future: taking joint action with its partners to ensure development in the interest of all.

On behalf of the ACP States, I take this opportunity to congratulate the European Union (EU) on its 50th anniversary as a political and economic entity. Since the Treaty of Rome was signed on 25 March 1957, the EU – the most successful regional integration process ever attempted – has become a major player in world politics and an indispensable development partner of many developing countries.

National interests do drive the policy initiatives of individual countries. However, the success and endurance of the EU has shown that both national and collective interests in an integrative setting need not be mutually exclusive. Therein lies a characteristic of the EU which demonstrates that unity in diversi- ty is possible. This is an invaluable lesson for the 79-member ACP Group, given its size and far-flung geographical locations around the world.

The European Union has maintained its commitments to the ACP States. This is remarkable considering the challenges that it has to face as it expands its bloc boundaries, confronts new trading arrangements at home and abroad, and attempts to cope with emerging geopolitical challenges in a globalising world. The 10th European Development Fund is one of the latest illustrations of the EU’s willingness to sustain development endeavours for the ACP States.

The ACP Group agrees that the Economic Partnership Agreements can be effective and efficient tools to achieve this objective, especially if they were truly development-oriented. To do so needs a strong and permanent political impetus. The ACP Group is confident that this underlying political commitment is shared by both the ACP and the EU, and will continue to be the main framework to steady our rich and dynamic partnership.

Once more, a happy 50th birthday to the European Union!
The need for Cotonou

When Europe’s founding fathers began to negotiate the future Treaty of Rome, with the objective of reconciliation and reducing the prospect of further conflict as experienced in two world wars, there was little reason to think the text would include a chapter on relations with Africa. There was even less reason to believe that half a century later, relationships would include almost 100 different countries around the globe and be a universally recognised model.

As with negotiations on other agreements, those on the current Cotonou Agreement were tough. Since coming into being, Cotonou’s newest aspect, the gradual implementation of the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs), which implies a shift from a relationship of aid to one of trade partners, has caused feelings to run high. EPAs, which came into force on 1 January 2008 for a number of ACP countries, are seen by some as diluting the altruistic nature of ACP-EU relations that could weaken, in turn, lead to the splitting up of the ACP Group into disparate, isolated regions.

It is not the first time that innovations in the Lomé-Cotonou Conventions have startled the prophets of doom. There was the time when political dialogue incorporated democratic progress into cooperation. Scepticism also occurred over the considerable opportunities given to non-state actors in cooperation, civil society and the private sector.

A few years on, those who were initially the most nervous about these features of cooperation now see them as having made progress by contributing to positive democratic developments in ACP countries. Several crises have been handled skilfully, such as the recent coup d’état in Fiji and a short time ago, the unrest in Côte d’Ivoire. The entry of Cuba into the ACP Group and the situation in Zimbabwe are also cases in point.

The need for Europe is well demonstrated; the need for the ACP-EU partnership cannot be denied, if only for the commitment to its founding principle: equality between donor and recipient. It provides a guarantee for the future.

The 1st European Development Fund (EDF) was the financial envelope allocated by the European Community to the Association, an instrument that was to become the backbone of Europe’s political aid around the globe and be a universally recognised model.

By Hegel Goutier
However, by the beginning of the 1970s, Europe’s development policy was still at a crossroads, with questions being raised about the direction to take, highlighting cooperation with Africa and openings towards other regions. A memorandum of the European Commission put forward the options.

In January 1973, the United Kingdom (plus Ireland and Denmark) joined the European Community. This membership was to put everything in a new light. One of the protocols of the Act of Accession opened the door to an extension of European development policy to an array of Commonwealth countries. These were countries not just in Africa, but in the Caribbean and the Pacific too.

As of August 1973, twenty-one Commonwealth nations were invited to negotiate an association or trade agreement with the European Community that would possibly involve a duty-free trade agreement for their products. They also included the non-Commonwealth countries of Ethiopia, Sudan, Liberia, Equatorial Guinea and Guinea-Bissau.

The rethink brought forward a pragmatic solution. The ‘Association’ would continue on a provisional basis with amendments to be made in accordance with the status of newly independent African States. Each State could choose whether to remain a member. In the end, just one “Guinea-Conakry” made the decision to leave although it would later return in 1975 to sign the 1st Lomé Convention.


At first it was all about trade. The Yaoundé Convention was essentially concerned with free trade areas and under its umbrella European products received preferential treatment on the markets of the associated African countries and vice versa. This free trade agreement was also backed up by a financial assistance package – the 2nd and 3rd EDFs for Yaoundé I and Yaoundé II. The 2nd Yaoundé Convention (1971–1976) was signed in 1969.

As soon as Yaoundé I was signed, the newly independent English-speaking countries voiced a strong dislike to a convention they saw as ‘shaped’ to preserving links between France and its former territories. Their concerns were shared by EEC members such as Germany and the Netherlands who, since the signing of the Treaty of Rome, had been inclined towards a development policy with a broad spectrum. To bring about these changes, a special bilateral agreement was signed with Nigeria in 1969 but was never ratified due to the civil war in Biafra. Another agreement, separate from the Yaoundé Convention, the Arusha (trade) Agreement, was signed in 1969 with three East African countries – Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. This agreement, implemented on 1 January 1971, at the same time as the Yaoundé II Convention and for the same period of time, brought these three countries into the convention. Mauritius joined the Yaoundé II Convention at a later stage in 1972.

The negotiations that were opened between the European Community and the African countries were to prove a unique experience. These were countries not just in Africa, but in the Caribbean and the Pacific too.

As of August 1973, twenty-one Commonwealth nations were invited to negotiate an association or trade agreement with the European Community that would possibly replace the Yaoundé Convention. All the independent nations of sub-Saharan Africa, except South Africa, were present at the negotiating table. They also included the non-Commonwealth countries of Ethiopia, Sudan, Liberia, Equatorial Guinea and Guinea-Bissau.

The negotiations that were opened between the European Community and this group of around 45 countries were to prove a unique experience. All these newly independent countries were used to meeting within large frameworks such as the UN or the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), where the only matters discussed were political. Now, however, they had to agree on questions very close to everyday realities on the benefits of an agreement with the European Economic Community (EEC). Not surprisingly, there were many differences of opinion between French and English speakers, between large and small countries, between geographical regions. The sheer size of Nigeria, for example, seen even then as a future oil giant, was a concern for some.

The negotiations began at the end of July 1973 with a deadline set on the expiry of Yaoundé II at the end of January 1975. The Lomé Agreement was signed immediately after the deadline at the beginning of February 1975 by 9 EEC and 46 African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States.

More than developing relations with their European partners, it was relations between each other that initially mobilised the African...
Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. Third-world thinking bound them together and forged their common interests, and they surprised the Europeans by announcing in the spring of 1974, through their spokesman Babacar Bia (cited by Tom Glaser in the special edition of The Courier, March–April 1990), with regard to the Lomé IV Convention: “You have before you not three groups expressing harmonised positions with one voice, but a single group of ACP countries which want to recognise their common destiny and the unshakeable desire to achieve positive results at these negotiations.”

This is how the ACP Group was born and its constitution was finalised with the ratification of the Georgetown Agreement of 6 June 1975, just a few months after the signing of Lomé I on 28 February 1975 by 44 ACP countries. These States had made a genuine political choice of their own, contrary to the frequently held belief that it was a decision taken under outside pressure.

Lomé I (1975–1980) retained the strong agricultural infrastructure, while at the institutional level, Lomé moved forward by creating common institutions between donor countries and recipient countries: the EU–ACP Council of Ministers, the CDB (Centre for Development of Industry), later the CDE (Centre for the Development of Enterprises), and the CTA (Technical Centre for Agricultural Cooperation).

The negotiation process was speeded up, and the ACP countries had to make a choice: in the institutional field, to continue with the Lomé conventions or to switch to a new type of cooperation that would reflect the new reality of the world. It was not easy, for the ACP countries had to face the economic pressures of the oil crisis, the closing of the Suez Canal, the challenge to the world order presented by the rise of China, and the economic and political challenges of the new world economy.

A new momentum to the ACP countries was given by the wish of the Europeans to reactivate the industrial order of the 19th century, when the ACP countries were considered as a colonial complement for the European market. This new type of cooperation, which was called the Lomé Convention, was the result of a new definition of the cooperative relationship between the ACP and the European countries.

The mid-term review of the convention was an even more important turning point. The fall of the Berlin Wall changed the geopolitical map overnight and Europe was looking at reunification. Also, the good times looked like they were over as two oil crises in a row shook the world’s economies and the populations of wealthy countries had a new concern: the erosion of their material security. Moreover, it was becoming increasingly clear that aid had not greatly improved the development of certain countries, especially in Africa. Worse than that, many of them had actually become poorer. On the eve of the Lomé IV negotiations these worries and concerns were all too clear in Europe.

The negotiators of the 12 European Member States and 68 ACP countries could not ignore these new realities. Negotiations were difficult but the final agreement included a chapter on human rights. From now on, human rights would be a fundamental clause in relations between the two sides, with the consequence of suspended cooperation for any country that violated them.

At the same time, control over the use of funds became ever stricter. That was the stick. The carrot was that the convention would be valid for double the period, a total of 10 years, with the aim of providing a better continuity of development programmes. There was also support for countries needing to make painful structural adjustments, as well as for the diversification of ACP economies, their regional cooperation projects and the promotion of their private sectors.

The mid-term review of the convention was a lot more extensive than planned, for example giving greater priority to the political dimension.

Cotonou gave a bigger role to civil society and the private sector (which were to be involved as a new set of cooperative players) and refined development strategies by awarding priority to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It also prioritised regional integration of the ACP countries and brought in the idea of flexibility enabling additional resources to be granted to countries that use their funds most efficiently. Another pillar of the convention was an extension of political dialogue to include consolidation of peace and conflict resolution as well as conflict prevention.

The revision of the Cotonou Agreement in 2005 brought the opportunity for political dialogue between partners.

The EUFOR mission to support the Blue Helmets in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2006 and support for the African Union (AU) mission in Darfur, both authorised by the ACP and using available European Development Funds, bears witness to the usefulness of this Cotonou innovation. Another symbol of political dialogue was the joint meeting between the European Commission and the Commission for African Union in October 2006. It was the first time in its history that the Commission had met outside the EU.

With the announcement of Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) under Cotonou, it seemed that cooperation between ACP-EU countries had turned full circle. Free trade had been mooted under the Yaoundé Convention. Long debates ensued about whether or not to continue cooperation in the conventional way because the revised Cotonou Agreement brought about a fundamental change by stating that EPAs should be concluded by the end of 2007, the reason being that preferences granted by the EU to the ACP contravened the World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules.

The aim is to facilitate the harmonious integration of ACP countries into the world economy, where competition is much fiercer than in the Lomé–Cotonou process. This leap into the unknown has left some ACP countries and European civil society actors puzzled.

It has been recognised that cooperation is a work constantly in progress. It has already proved itself and will continue to provide an element of security in a world full of uncertainty.
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Adapting to the notion of Pan-Africanism

In 1965, following the great wave of independence, 18 countries – all French-speaking except for Somalia – signed a cooperation agreement with the six countries of the European Community – ... Later, the second Yaoundé Convention marked a major step in assisting African countries move towards industrialisation.

Saharan African countries, 16 from the Caribbean and 15 from the Pacific (see synoptic table p.28). The objectives of the ACP Group are economic, political, social and cultural ties. The ACP grouping currently numbers 48 sub-Saharan African countries, 16 from the Caribbean and 15 from the Pacific (see synoptic table p.28). The objectives of the amended Georgetown Agreement are eradication of poverty, sustainable development of its members, their gradual integration into the world economy, peace and stability in a free and democratic society, and greater ACP integration overall through cementing economic, political, social and cultural ties.

A summit of Heads of State of the 79 ACP countries top the decision-making pyramid but since its meetings are infrequent, decisions are often in the hands of the ACP Council of Ministers. This ordinarily meets twice a year but special sessions gathering a limited number of ministers on a particular topic assemble when necessary. For example, at the end of 2007, there were frequent meetings of ACP ministers responsible for sugar in the wake of the EU’s denouncing of the Sugar Protocol.

A bureau of the Council of Ministers, consisting of ministers from each of the four African regions, the Caribbean and the Pacific, and the rotating President of the Council and outgoing and incoming Presidents, looks after the Council of Ministers’ agenda (see separate article on the activities of all ACP-EU institutions).

ACP Secretariat

ACP ministers take major policy decisions and elect every five years a Brussels-based secretary general, currently Sir John Kaputin from Papua New Guinea, who guides the work of the Brussels-based ACP Secretariat comprised of nationals from the ACP States. These are technical experts and administrative staff who work in all areas of the ACP-EU partnership from commodities to culture.

The ACP Committee of Ambassadors of Brussels-based diplomatic staff from each ACP state sets an agenda and backs up the work of the Council. It works closely with the ACP Council and can take decisions and resolutions by a consensus of its members.

It reports on its activities to the ACP Council and it too has a coordinating bureau at Ambassador level, of the same nine-country composition as the Council’s bureau.

The ACP States interact with other EU bodies in reaching joint decisions (see article on the institutions p.15-16). The EU’s 27 Member States have their own tiered decision-making process and its joint bodies also interplay with EU institutions to take decisions affecting all 79 ACP and 27 EU Member States of the partnership.

ACO-EU Joint Assembly does not take binding decisions but issues opinions on EU strategies towards the ACP States whereas joint decisions can be taken at meetings of ACP and EU Ministers (see separate article on ACP-EU institutions).

A Parliamentary Assembly of ACP Members of Parliament meets a statutory twice a year prior to its biannual meetings with 79 members of the European Parliament who represent the 27 EU Member States. These gatherings, known as the Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA), generally take place once every six months rotating between ACP and EU states.

The ACP-EU Joint Assembly does not take binding decisions but issues opinions on EU strategies towards ACP nations and its debates on policies in ACP nations are often timely and always lively. Other EU and ACP institutions often take the lead from the JPA’s own initiative reports, which are full of very useful factual research, often drafted jointly by an ACP parliamentarian and an EU counterpart. Exchanges with attending senior EU officials are frank and there is much media interest in the gatherings.

In retrospect, we can all be grateful to France for its insistence but, says Frisch, Europe’s development policy is not the result of rational consideration. Rather, it is an historical accident.

Sometimes the real significance of an event only becomes clear with the passage of time. For Dieter Frisch (Director General for Development at the European Commission 1982 – 1993) the first milestone event was the signing of the Treaty of Rome in 1957. Why? Because the Yaoundé Convention of 1965 would never have taken place if the French, during the negotiations on this treaty, had not insisted on the inclusion of the overseas countries and territories that were then under their control.

In 1965, following the great wave of independence, 18 countries – all French-speaking except for Somalia – signed a cooperation agreement with the six countries of the European Community – the Yaoundé Convention. This convention led to the creation of the first European Development Fund and the introduction of a free trade regime between these 18 countries and Europe. Later, the second Yaoundé Convention marked a major step in assisting African countries move towards industrialisation.

Adapting to the notion of Pan-Africanism

Dieter Frisch recalls that the Pan-African institutions of the time criticised Europe for maintaining and consolidating a “colonial structure”...
that constituted an “obstacle to the Pan-African movement.” At the Commission, and also in Bonn and The Hague, opinion was that it was time to open up cooperation to some of the English-speaking African countries such as Nigeria and Kenya and looking beyond that, to the rest of the world. This was the stepping off point for a development policy worthy of the name.

There was a shift, from a policy that Frisch describes as “honest, benevolent paternalism” to a policy based on responsible partnership, inspired by the European Commissioner Claude Cheysson. His basic view was that “The time when we told them what to do is over.” Frisch said Cheysson was famous for saying, “the European Development Funds, it’s your money – use it for your priorities and if you need technical advice, we are here to help you.”

However, this was not an easy call, owing to opposition from French-speaking African states who feared that an increase in the number of beneficiaries would affect the financial and commercial rights they had already gained. The then Senegalese President Léopold Sédar Senghor led this protest, even being prepared to fully maintain the commercial regime of Yaoundé, that gave preferential treatment to European goods in the markets of French-speaking Africa.

The English-speaking African states did not want to give this kind of preferential treatment to the European Community and Frisch recalls that they didn’t like the term “association” at all, in their opinion. Eventually, the term “association” was abolished and replaced by the ACP-EEC Lomé Agreement, under which the Africans continued to enjoy preferential treatment on the European market, but the special conditions for Europe on the African market were removed. Several developments then took place, the first being the Caribbean and Pacific states joining with Africa to achieve greater bargaining power in negotiations with Europe. Indeed, in 1975, a number of ex-British colonies, from the Caribbean and the Pacific alongside with the English-speaking African states, became partners of the European Union as signatories of the Lomé I Agreement, two years after the United Kingdom joined the EEC.

Lomé brings about a real revolution

The first Lomé Agreement brought about a series of revolutionary changes. At that time they were talking about Lomé “from Peking to Washington,” recalled Claude Cheysson in an interview with The Courier published in 1977.

In Frisch’s view, the most important change was the preferential trade regime that provided non-reciprocal access for ACP products to the European market. Then came Stabex (see p.23), the European Community’s contribution to creating a new global economic order. However, throughout these North-South discussions, demand for the stabilisation of the price of commodities was met with ideological objections from those who argued it was not compatible with a true market economy.

“It was technically and politically inconceivable.” Frisch explained. But at the same time, Cheysson’s team wanted to do something. According to Ghebray Berhane (Secretary General of the ACP Group 1990-1995), a participant in the Lomé negotiations as ambassador of Ethiopia, one of the major achievements was that the ACP countries gained access to the European market and the European Development Fund increased year after year. “That is why the agreements are considered to have fully satisfied both parties,” he said.

Added Frisch, “And the group to group relationship provided a much better political balance – because North-South relationships are by definition unequal - by bringing together both rich and poor countries. But such a large number of countries negotiating together is not at all easy,” explained Frisch.

Finally, the Community framework provided what the former Director General called a “significant political plus-point;” due to the fact that the politically-neutral Community was cooperating with states practicing a market economy as well as countries close to the now defunct Soviet bloc. This turned, a weakness – its lack of responsibility in foreign policy –, into a strength. And although EU Member States deployed a policy that may have seemed a little schizophrenic, they succeeded in holding talks with countries and political figures with which they did not have bilateral relationships. For example, the Community held official discussions with several heads of liberation movements well before the independence of these countries. Leaders such as Sam Nujoma, of the South-West African Peoples Organisation, formed in 1960, was received by the Commission in 1978, twelve years before Namibia’s independence.

An ideological shift: the political dialogue

“The third Lomé Agreement marked a significant change in approach concerning the management of financial and technical cooperation,” said Frisch. The Commission realised that results were not always good enough and improvement was needed. But it was not easy to change tack and say, “We are partners and we want this to work, so let’s engage in real dialogue on policies. By saying that we don’t mean ‘political dialogue’ in the modern sense, meaning discussion on weapons of mass destruction, for example.” “What the Commission wanted, on the eve of the signing of the 3rd Lomé Agreement (1985), under Commissioner Edgar Pisani, was to open dialogue on development policies. The agreements that were concluded involved reciprocal commitments. That approach was different from that of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which, said Frisch, had introduced “this wretched concept of conditionality,” that came across “like a diktat from outside.” The Pisani team did not believe that reform imposed from the outside – not wanted by the government or accepted by the people - was feasible. However, the introduction of political dialogue into the third Lomé Agreement was not without difficulties: Frisch remembers the time it took to convince a Tanzanian minister that he represented his country rather than a new kind of IMF mission.

Frisch also recollects post-agreement discussions with the former Ethiopian dictator, Mengistu Haile Mariam, to convince him to offer price incentives for small peasant farmers, a concept that was completely at odds with the Marxist ideology of the Addis Ababa regime of the day.

Ghebray Berhane revealed how the ACP countries responded to the idea of political dialogue by saying, “you introduce conditionality and that is your right. We are not against it. But you have to have the means to achieve your goals if you want the ACP to accept certain conditions.” In any case, Berhane, like Frisch, believes that the EAC-ACP negotiations were real negotiations. “We were side, believes that the EEC-ACP negotiations were real negotiations. “An anecdote, which Berhane gave exclusively to the Courier, underlines his feelings. He said: “During the negotiations, which went on until four o’clock in the morning, the Europeans had deliberately chosen small rooms in the European Council building which only had room for ministerial spokespersons. The experts found themselves sidelined. A colleague and I went into the...
interpreters’ booth next to one of these rooms from where we followed the discussions. From our vantage point we were able to slip a piece of paper to the ACP negotiators. The talks on the EDF amounts and the products to be included went on until the end of the third Lomé negotiations. The EU Council security staff noticed that a room was being used by people who shouldn’t have been there and they almost frog-marched us out”. They wanted to get rid of the troublemakers!, says Berhane laughing.

“This is common practice when the negotiations reach their political stage. Yet, I can assure you that there has never been any intention to marginalize the ACP negotiators”, he points out.

But Lomé had an impact in other ways, not least, according to Frisch, that this form of cooperation – in particular Lomé’s inclusion of English and Portuguese-speaking countries – had an effect on other cooperation agreements. He recalled that it was in the wake of the first Lomé Agreement that the initial cooperation agreements between the EU and the Mediterranean countries were made and that for Asia and Latin America appeared in the European budget for the first time. Claude Chissay only refers to “the extension of Lomé to the south of the Mediterranean.”

Maastricht: the great watershed

Dieter Frisch believes that the Maastricht Treaty, which came into force in November 1993, was another major turning point. Coming four years after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the signing of the 4th Lomé Agreement, it was the first EU Treaty to include a chapter on development cooperation. But more importantly it marked a break with previous policy. Before the 4th Lomé Agreement everyone was welcome to join the club, even Mengistu’s Ethiopia was accepted which would be unthinkable today.

“This Treaty also contributed to the inclusion of foreign and security policy into the Community’s external relations and the need for coherence between these policies and development policy,” noted Frisch. Moreover, the second pillar of the Treaty, enshrining the common foreign and security policy, forced European partners to harmonise their actions in areas ranging from security and the environment to trade and development.

This led to an analysis of the respective roles and importance of the policies in relation to each other and this debate continues today. There is a tendency to make peace and stability a development condition and the question remains as to whether military or quasi-military action should be financed with funds earmarked for development. Frisch himself believes that it should come from the CSFP (EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy) budget. The same applies to migration – only symptoms are being dealt with and a “wall” is being built around the Community. But, what’s really needed is to tackle poverty and provide people with decent living conditions in their own countries. When home office ministers understand that development policy can prevent mass migration, measures can be taken to benefit both sides. Development policy, which has been sidelined for so long, must be seen as offering mainstream solutions.

The institutions responsible for the implementation of the Cotonou Agreement are the ACP-EU Council of Ministers, the ACP-EU Committee of Ambassadors and the Joint Parliamentary Assembly which groups representatives from the European and the Parliaments of the ACP States.

The ACP-EU Council of Ministers

Comprised of ministers of the ACP States and members of the EU Council of Ministers and the European Commission, it is presided over in rotation by a European minister and an ACP minister. The ACP-EU Council examines and takes into account resolutions and recommendations of the ACP-EU JPA. It also meets with the economic and social partners and other civil society stakeholders. Decision of the Council can be binding.

Find out more: www.acp.int/en/parliamentary_assembly_e.htm

The ACP-EU Committee of Ambassadors

This is formed of permanent representatives of the EU and the European Commission alongside ambassadors to the EU of the ACP States and is alternately chaired by an ACP or a European minister. The Council meets once a year and whenever the presidency deems it necessary. Its mission is to conduct political dialogue, adopt policy guidelines and take decisions to apply the Agreement as well as to resolve problems that present obstacles for the implementation of cooperation.

The Council examines and takes into account resolutions and recommendations of the ACP-EU JPA. It also meets with the economic and social partners and other civil society stakeholders. Decisions of the Council can be binding.

Find out more: www.acp.int/en/parliamentary_assembly_e.htm

The Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA)

This is one of the most original institutions of ACP-EU cooperation. It is made up of an equal number of representatives from the European Parliament and the parliaments of the ACP States; however the latter are often replaced by the ambassador of the country in question. Its role is to promote democratic processes through dialogue and consultation, facilitate better understanding between the peoples of the EU and the ACP States, and generate public interest in development issues. It debates and then submits resolutions and recommendations to the Council of Ministers with the aim of achieving the objectives of the Cotonou Agreement. It also seeks to strengthen regional integration in the ACP countries and cooperation with the parliaments of the ACP countries and the Pan-African Parliament.

Find out more: www.acp.int/en/parliamentary_assembly_e.htm

The Centre for the Development of Enterprise (CDE)

A joint ACP Group and EU institution created in 2000, in the framework of the Cotonou Agreement, the CDE manages (under European Commission supervision) the Pro €Invest partnership programme that allocates €100M from the European Development Fund. Its aim is to support the development of ACP private sector companies, with particular emphasis on encouraging technology transfers.

This led to an analysis of the respective roles and importance of the policies in relation to each other and this debate continues today. There is a tendency to make peace and stability a development condition and the question remains as to whether military or quasi-military action should be financed with funds earmarked for development. Frisch himself believes that it should come from the CSFP (EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy) budget. The same applies to migration – only symptoms are being dealt with and a “wall” is being built around the Community. But, what’s really needed is to tackle poverty and provide people with decent living conditions in their own countries. When home office ministers understand that development policy can prevent mass migration, measures can be taken to benefit both sides. Development policy, which has been sidelined for so long, must be seen as offering mainstream solutions.
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Find out more: www.egi.europa.eu

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Charged with implementing EU common policies, including development policy (a competence it shares with the individual Member States), the European Commission is the EU’s executive body responsible to the European Parliament and as such is guardian of the Union treaties, initiator of legislation and engine for the harmonisation of European policy in this field. It is the Commission that manages the European Development Fund (EDF) that has a global budget under the 10th EDF of €22.6 billion for 2008–2013.

Find out more: www.ec.europa.eu

ACP SECRETARIAT

Set up by the Georgetown Agreement (1975), the ACP Secretariat, based in Brussels, is charged with the administrative management of the ACP group. It is responsible for implementing the group’s international policy as well as organising and coordinating cooperation programmes

Find out more: www.acp.int

THE EUROPEAN INVESTMENT BANK (EIB)

An EU body granting long-term loans, the EIB is one of the principal development partners for most of the ACP countries and overseas territories and territorial entities with constitutional links with the EU dating back 50 or more years. In particular, it manages the Cotonou Investment Facility (€1.7 billion) as well as contributions out of its own funds (€2 billion). It has five regional offices in ACP countries: Dakar (West Africa), Nairobi (East and Central Africa), Pretoria (Southern Africa), Fort-de-France (Caribbean) and Sydney (Pacific).

Find out more: www.eib.org

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE

A consultative assembly of European economic and social partners, the Economic and Social Committee (ESC) allows its voice to be heard through formal opinions submitted to the Council, the Commission and the European Parliament, including the field of development policy. Its external affairs section follows up relations between the EU and its partners in the rest of the world, including the ACP zone. This is done through the intermediary of a Monitoring Committee, a Joint Consultative Committee and a Contact Group. Close relations with the economic and social partners in the ACP countries have been established to discuss matters of common interest and the strengthening of civil society. Article 6, Chapter 2 of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement, mentions economic and social partners, including trade union organisations among the non-state actors of cooperation. Article 6 does not mention explicitly the ESC, which is a European institution. However, the role of the ESC has been strengthened by the 2000 Cotonou Agreement. Protocol I to this Agreement, EU and ACP Ministers made this body responsible for organising meetings with ACP-EU economic and social interest groups. It is considered as the architect of civil society’s participation in ACP-EU relations.

Find out more: www.eesc.europa.eu

THE TECHNICAL CENTRE FOR AGRICULTURAL COOPERATION (CTA)

Set up by the Georgetown Agreement (1975), the ACP Secretariat, based in Brussels, is charged with the administrative management of the ACP group. It is responsible for implementing the group’s international policy as well as organising and coordinating cooperation programmes

Find out more: www.cta.int

ACP-EU

Under former ACP-EU Conventions, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) were allocated funds under decentralised cooperation for project implementation but dialogue on EU policies towards ACP nations was not cemented into the agreements.

Under Cotonou, a broad range of non-state actors, north and south, are not only recipients of aid but consult with EU institutions on a full range of policies towards ACPs as an integral part of the partnership accord.

Sebban applauds what Cotonou set out to do in terms of a greater say for NGOs and an increase in their project funding – 15% of the 10th European Development Fund (EDF) (2008–2013) is allocated to civil society. The influence of ACP NGOs on EU policy often depends on how well organized they are locally. Florent Sebban points out that, in Cameroon, NGOs have organized Les jeudis de Cotonou, (Cotonou Thursdays) which meet every Thursday just to discuss the convention.

The influence of ACP NGOs on EU policy often depends on how well organized they are locally. Florent Sebban points out that, in Cameroon, NGOs have organized Les jeudis de Cotonou, (Cotonou Thursdays) which meet every Thursday just to discuss the convention.

And there is always a plethora of position papers by civil society on Cotonou at each ACP-EU Parliamentary Assembly, especially on the EPAs.

The platform of ACP businesses, already established in 1998, bringing ACP and EU companies closer to embark on joint investment schemes is active in many fora, including the December 2007 meeting of African and EU Heads of State in Lisbon. An ACP-EU local government platform was also set up in 2001 by mayors and representatives of existing ACP local government associations to heighten the advocacy of local government in ACP-EU cooperation.

D.P.N.

The Technical Centre for Agricultural Cooperation (CTA)

Set up in 1983 within the framework of the Lomé Convention, the CTA’s mission is to carry out tasks conferred by these institutions and by the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly. It helps implement the decisions taken by these bodies and assists them, as well as the joint bodies set up in the framework of the ACP-EU Partnership Agreements.

Find out more: www.cta.int

Non-State Actors - Bigger Players in Cotonou

With partnership at the core of Cotonou, civil society in all its diversity has been attributed a more prominent role and bigger say in ACP-EU cooperation, 2000–2020.
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Community-based organisations from the ACP group of countries staged their first forum in 2001. Dr Natallie Corrie-Kordas, the ACP Secretariat expert in charge of Humanitarian Affairs and Civil Society, recalls that “the event signalled the genesis of a dynamic process where, for the first time, representatives of civil society organisations from Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific recognised the importance of developing a common understanding of the challenges and opportunities inherent in the Cotonou Agreement. This resulted in the sustained resolve to secure increased levels of participation in the process of the implementation of a wide range of development activities.”

Since then, the ACP Group of States and its Secretariat have set about ensuring that all projects and programmes include special provisions for civil society organisations to become fully involved in the 9th EDF-sponsored projects.

The main priority of civil society organisations was the challenge to become organised then strengthen the required structures, in order to become more involved in projects financed as part of the ACP-EU cooperation. To facilitate this process, and at the initiative of the ACP Group and its Secretariat, a joint ACP-EU Eligibility Criteria for non-state actors was defined and politically endorsed in December 2002. These criteria, inter alia, encouraged civil society organisations to be fully transparent, to manage their activities in a responsible and accountable manner and, in particular, to cater to the specific development needs of the local population. To assist in understanding the ‘rules’, the ACP Secretariat published a User’s guide for non-state actors, which set out in detail the rules for non-government players (e.g. community-based organisations), and the conditions in place to ensure their effective participation in all activities related to the Cotonou Agreement.

At the second forum in 2006, community-based organisations made it clear that they were keen to participate in policy dialogue as well as EDF projects and programmes. The ACP Declaration and Plan of Action made specific reference to the ACP-EU facilities (energy, water and natural disasters), the global effort in combat AIDS, the consultative processes of the EPA negotiations, the development of cultural industries, and so on. The immediate challenge which remains, therefore, lies in its ongoing efforts to become a legal and politically recognised entity, and to create a holistic all-ACP Civil Society Forum.

ACP civil society now must become recognised as a political entity both within its constituency as well as vis-à-vis key government players”, stresses ACP’s Dr Natallie Corrie-Kordas, who remains optimistic in her analysis. “This should not be too daunting a task because the 9th EDF development programmes underway show that ACP States have already paved the way to ensure that special provisions are in place to encourage a more involved and participatory role of community-based structures that are well organised within the ACP States”, she adds.

The answer to this call for a more organised structure of an all-ACP civil society will be forthcoming during the next meeting of the forum, scheduled for 2008.

One of the issues facing European Commissioner Louis Michel when he took office was how to express in concrete terms the considerable sums allocated to cooperation with ACP countries – €13.5 billion for the period 2002-2007 and €22.6 billion for 2008-2013. A closer look behind the figures shows a number of undeniable successes in EU-ACP cooperation.

A case in point is Mauritius, a principal beneficiary of the Sugar Protocol. By being paid considerably more than the going global rate for its sugar exports to the EU, the country has been able to diversify its economy into textiles, tourism and service industries. Furthermore, the free and non-reciprocal access to European markets for Mauritian textiles has seen the manufacturing sector take off. Also, the European Investment Bank (EIB) has financed innovative technologies to make the most of local resources like the Bellevue coal-bagasse combined cycle power station.

In the Seychelles, EDF money has been targeted at improving living conditions among the local population. Equally, in its July/August 1997 edition, The Courier highlighted the positive results of this cooperation in Barbados, a country which has invested heavily in people and now enjoys a higher human development index than some European countries. A success story that is down to local leadership with the wisdom to allocate European funds to education, both university and skills teaching, which has produced a workforce trained for growth sectors like tourism and communication technologies.
In Congo-Brazzaville, Liberia and Djibouti, EU funds have been used to distribute that most precious of all commodities – peace. This is thanks to the financing of programmes for the demobilisation and rehabilitation of combatants after civil wars. In Mali, the European Commission recorded a major success by financing development programmes in the north of the country that also played a role in preventing conflict by making the people involved understand that the government of Bamako and the EU didn’t mean them to be left behind in their quest for a better day-to-day existence. In the Democratic Republic of Congo, the supervision of democratic elections by EUPOL was another sign that EU Member States’ aid can make a significant and lasting impact on a nation.

Countries such as Tanzania, Rwanda and many others are indebted to the EU for the construction of their main trunk roads. In Liberia too, the EU contributed to reconstructions by financing the re-establishment of the electricity grid after the civil war. In Uganda and St Vincent, the EU has invested in the renovation of school buildings.

All these examples are testimony to the diversity of sectors, actions and countries – the on-the-ground ‘theatres’ of ACP-EU cooperation. A more complete round up should include the fact that the number of African countries which have held pluralistic elections has risen from three to forty between 1973 and 2005, with, in the majority of cases, European support. Another example: thanks to the Centre for the Development of Enterprise (CDE), the Ethiopian company Dire Industries multiplied its production of shoes by 16 to 2,500 pairs a day between 2004 and 2007 and its staff has grown five fold over the same period.

The EU’s and other donors’ interventions have helped the enrolment in African primary schools to rise from 72% to 93% in 2004. The EU’s and other donors’ focused attention on HIV/AIDS is also beginning to pay off. In the last two years, 28 of the 36 countries reporting data are showing reductions over time in HIV prevalence. F.M.
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ments from 2.2% to 3% of gross national income by 2010, two-thirds of which should be financed by the private sector.

R&D has become an established feature of new strategies developed by the EU in the field of cooperation. This is clearly illustrated by the new EU-Africa partnership recently adopted at the Lisbon Summit in December 2007 which gives a major role to research, particularly in the fields of agriculture and food security, and information and communication technology. In the past, the EU’s approach to R&D was to give priority to a vertical involvement within a specific programme (namely INCO on international cooperation). It also funded sub-regional agricultural research organisations in Africa (through the EDF) as well as agricultural research programmes under the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), financed out of the Food Security budget. The new Seventh R&D Framework Programme (FP7) (2007-2013) has adopted a horizontal approach that includes specific mechanisms to enable developing countries to participate based on their real needs. This last development is important, as it was only possible to pay out €80M of the €285M foreseen in the INCO programme under the FP6 agreement (2002-2006).

The Cape Town Declaration has, however, not lacked constructive follow-up. In May 2003 the ACP-EU Council approved this new approach and decided to allocate an EDF grant of €30M to strengthen the science and technology capacities in the ACP countries (see below). M-M.B.

Aids, malaria, tuberculosis: the clinical counter-offensive

In 2001, in partnership with scientists and health officials in the most affected countries, the EU launched a major clinical research programme to halt the progress of three transmissible pandemics that were ravaging sub-Saharan Africa. The EDCTP (European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Programme on poverty-related diseases) project aims to increase and coordinate clinical trials using new vaccines and forms of treatment in the fight against Aids, tuberculosis and malaria. The EU contributed €200M to implementing the EDCTP initiative in addition to national and international funds. The challenge is formidable as each pandemic adopts different forms and poses problems of diagnosis, treatment and prevention which are also dependent on specific local conditions, both geographic and social. For example, plasmodium falciparum, which is present across the whole of Africa, is a very severe form of malaria that is proving increasingly resistant to known anti-malaria medicines and is responsible for an ever-growing mortality rate among newborns and pregnant women. To counter this it is necessary to test new combinations of treatment and to try possible new vaccines, and at the same time develop new generations of protection based on insecticides. In the case of Aids, the genetic diversity of the HIV virus in Africa poses a major problem, as the use of complex forms of preventative or therapeutic vaccines that are the subject of intense research in the developed countries are, at present, unrealistic for Africa. Research and clinical trials therefore focus on forms of prevention/treatment/vaccination that are adapted to the supply and consumption capacities of the poor countries. Finally, in the face of the resurgence of a particularly acute and multi-resistant form of tuberculosis, there is not only a lack of new medicines but also of the research to develop them in the first place.

Trade protocols and EPAs

Introduced as part of the first Lomé Convention (1975–1980), trade protocols have become one of the characteristics of EU-ACP cooperation, significantly promoting economic development. For example, the banana protocol ensured exemption from customs duties for specific quotas, primarily exported by Caribbean countries. Equally, under the sugar protocol – which expires in two years’ time – 18 ACP exporting countries can sell a quota of 1.3 million tonnes on the EU market at a guaranteed price which is aligned with internal European prices that are considerably higher than the price on the global market. This protocol has promoted economic development in countries like Mauritius, Fiji, Guyana and Barbados. Finally, the meat protocol provides for a reimbursement of 90% of the tax on beef imports from several southern African countries, in particular Botswana and Namibia.

During 2008, the new Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) between the EU and all six ACP regions should come into force, and the trade protocols and current non-reciprocal preferential regime will disappear to be replaced by a new reciprocal but asymmetric trade regime. In other words, the EU will offer duty-free and tariff-free entry into its market as soon as EPAs come into force, except for sugar and rice which are subject to a short transition period. ACP countries, on the other hand, will scale back tariffs on imports from the EU gradually over the next 25 years. Simply put, Europe will speed up the opening of its markets while at the same time the ACP market openings are designed to encourage investment, employment and boost growth.


Stabex is the abbreviation for the fund for the stabilisation of export revenue from agricultural products, introduced as part of Lomé I. It has compensated for losses in revenue from exports of products to the EU by ACP countries as a result of fluctuations in prices on the global market. This is on the condition that the losses represented a significant portion of their trade balance. The major beneficiaries of Stabex have been the large-scale producers of cacao, cotton, coffee, groundnuts and tea. Since 2000, this compensation mechanism has been replaced by another called Flex, which stands for the compensation fund for the short-term fluctuations of export revenues, triggered by both losses of these revenues and the subsequent deterioration of the public deficit.


The Sysmin fund, introduced under the Lomé II Convention, has enabled countries dependent on particular minerals to receive loans, and subsequently grants, to maintain their production capacity and, if necessary, to diversify their economies. The principal beneficiaries have been Zambia, the Democratic Republic of Congo (then called Zaire), Guinea-Conakry and Jamaica.

This instrument has been replaced by the Flex (see the paragraph above on Stabex). The EU’s support to the ACP mining sector has also been provided so far through the European Investment Bank (EIB). F.M.
The future of ACP–EU cooperation

W hat form will future cooperation between the EU and the ACP countries take? Glensy Kinnock, co-president of the Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA), responded to that question by considering the immediate future: finalising the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs).

Over the course of 2008, Glensy Kinnock will be following the progress of the EPA negotiations, observing that so far, the agreements already signed with various ACP regions only concern trade in goods. Because of that it is still difficult to gauge what the impact of the agreements on the countries will be. Kinnock also explains that the EPA negotiations have created a certain bitterness on the part of some ACP countries, and that if they were to receive the slightest sense of betrayal, they could easily turn to other partners – China, India, or, in the case of the Caribbean countries, the United States.

Former French prime minister and member of the European Parliament, Michel Rocard thinks that it would be fitting if the conditions imposed on aid being made available focused primarily on issues like “putting an end to arbitrary arrests, the elimination of the use of torture in certain countries, independence of the judiciary and effective controls on the police”, because we must remember that “pluralistic democratic elections are the apotheosis of a system whose end point is democracy, but they are never the beginning”.

“A dictatorship cannot be transformed into a democracy, but a dictatorship can be transformed into enlightened despotism, and represent a move forward that defines what follows,” concludes Rocard.

Referring to Africa in particular, Kinnock says she is convinced that relations with the EU will “grow and deepen”. “What we must do on the European side is quite simply take our responsibility seriously and work together to bring people out of poverty.” She adds, “Political will is all we need to secure change.” She points out that progress has already been made. Cross domestic product figures are rising, inflation is falling and the flow of direct foreign investment is increasing.

Added to that, the percentage of primary school-aged children receiving full-time education in Africa has risen from 71% to 93% between 1991 and 2004. Kinnock emphasises the unique character of the

EPA dialogue

The Cotonou Agreement envisages dialogue between the ACP and European Union (EU) countries in international bodies. The World Trade Organisation (WTO) is one of those international bodies. WTO rules, these agreements must cover “substantially all trade” although the degree of market access is open to interpretation. In April 2007 the EU put its offer on the table to open its market to all imports from ACP nations from 1 January 2008, apart from sugar and rice. Due to the sensitive nature of these products in the global marketplace, the EU proposed longer liberalisation timetables for both commodities.

NGOs in particular have voiced reservations about harmful competition for domestic products and some ACP governments fear import tariff revenue losses in signing up for an EPA. At the end of December, only one regional group, the 14-member Cariforum (Cariforum) is: Antigua & Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St Kitts & Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname, and Trinidad & Tobago. D.P.

EPAs: Trade for regional growth and prosperity

The six regions of the ACP group: Central Africa, East Africa, Southern Africa, West Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific, were expected to conclude Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) with the EU by 31 December 2007. Tailor-made for each region, the EPAs free trade terms are to replace the existing waiver for Cotonou’s trade preferences in the World Trade Organisation (WTO), which expired at midnight on 31 December 2007.

EU officials stress the innovative nature of these regional accords which go far beyond opening access for goods and products. On the table are also trade in services, public procurement and investment, and changes to the rules of origin to add value to ACP merchandise.

EU aid to underpin EPAs is an important chapter in the agreements. In addition to the €22.682 billion from the 10th European Development Fund (EDF) for ACP states over five years (2008-2013), the European Commission has agreed to an additional €1 billion to help trade in developing countries until 2010 and a further €1 billion from the EU’s 27 Member States, of which half has been earmarked for ACP nations.

EU officials say that EPAs will fast-forward regional integration in each ACP which will lead to an increased foothold on the global economy and eventually bring greater growth and prosperity.

The centrepiece of the agreement is open access to one another’s markets. Under WTO rules, these agreements must cover “substantially all trade” although the degree of market access is open to interpretation. In April 2007 the EU put its offer on the table to open its market to all imports from ACP nations from 1 January 2008, apart from sugar and rice. Due to the sensitive nature of these products in the global marketplace, the EU proposed longer liberalisation timetables for both commodities.

Referring to Africa in particular, Kinnock says she is convinced that relations with the EU will “grow and deepen”. “What we must do on the European side is quite simply take our responsibility seriously and work together to bring people out of poverty.” She adds, “Political will is all we need to secure change.” She points out that progress has already been made. Cross domestic product figures are rising, inflation is falling and the flow of direct foreign investment is increasing. Added to that, the percentage of primary school-aged children receiving full-time education in Africa has risen from 71% to 93% between 1991 and 2004. Kinnock emphasises the unique character of the
Cotonou Agreement; she calls it a very special agreement, which links the two sides and defines many aspects of development.

As for the future of the ACP group itself, Glynis Kinnock asserts that the ACP countries are a strange hybrid. But the mixture is a mixture that works, resulting in a remarkable solidarity that shows during the JPA sessions. On this part, the former secretary general of the ACP group, Ghebray Berhane, says that in the past, the ACP countries wanted to convince themselves that the ACP’s raison d’être wasn’t necessarily the cooperation agreement with the EU, but the Georgetown Agreement. Unfortunately, they were unable to give the agreement sufficient substance as trade between regions was almost negligible. That said, he adds that during negotiations with the EU, the ACP countries came to realise that coming together with unified negotiating positions gave them a great advantage.

The new shape of cooperation with the EU, with its distinct agreements with different ACP regions, constitutes a major challenge. The ACP countries now need to find a new momentum and a new ambition in their discussions with Europe, whilst retaining their unity. This new momentum, says Berhane, will come in discussions on the major challenges that cannot be dealt with on a purely regional level, such as climate change or other global issues that confront all of us.

Former EU Director General for Development, Dieter Frisch points to a new reality that will undoubtedly characterise EU/ACP relations in the future: the politics of development are coming out of their isolation. Indeed, European interior ministers in charge of migration issues and their colleagues in foreign affairs are increasingly coming to recognise a common thread between immigration policies and development questions.

As a final word, former Senegalese trade minister, Seydina Oumar Sy, is of the opinion that Africa’s first priority is to reconsider the situation, take a good look at itself and begin to take the necessary steps to becoming a dependable partner in the global economy. Africa must take charge of its responsibilities and rely primarily on its own strengths. Only if Africa shows itself capable of producing sound and convincing plans, and is able to demonstrate a common willingness to implement them, will it, in his view, receive the necessary external support to complement its own efforts and make them effective.

The debate, of course, is still open.

The 10th edition of the European Development Fund (EDF) will see more focus on regional programmes to underpin the implementation of the European Partnership Agreements (EPAs) and also ‘incentive amounts’ for good governance.

The EC Development Directorate General for Development in consultation with numerous stakeholders, the individual strategy papers for the 78 African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States map out €22.682 billion of development spending over five years under the 10th European Development Fund (EDF) (2008–2013).
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The ACP–EU Agreements

1957 – Treaty of Rome. Convention of Application - EDF 1

EEC (12 countries): France, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, Federal Republic of Germany, Netherlands, Denmark, Ireland, United Kingdom, Greece, Spain and Portugal

EEC (6 COUNTRIES) PARTNERS (31 OCTS)

As before

1963 – Yaoundé I Convention - EDF 2

EEC (6) AASM (Associated African States and Madagascar) (197)

As before

1969 – Yaoundé II Convention - EDF 3

EEC (6) AASM (Associated African States and Madagascar) (19)

As before

1975 – Lomé I Convention - EDF 4

EEC (15) ACP (70: 47 Africa, 15 Caribbean, 8 Pacific)

1976 – Revised Lomé I Convention - EDF 5

EEC (15) ACP (78*: 48 Africa, 15 Caribbean*, 15 Pacific)

As before, plus

1980 – Lomé II Convention - EDF 6

EEC (12) ACP (46: 45 Africa, 13 Caribbean, 8 Pacific)

As before, plus

1985 – Lomé III Convention - EDF 7

EEC (12) ACP (66: 45 Africa, 13 Caribbean, 8 Pacific)

As before, plus

1990 – Lomé IV Convention - EDF 8

EEC (12) ACP (77: 48 Africa, 15 Caribbean, 8 Pacific)

As before, plus

1995 – Revised Lomé IV Convention - EDF 9

EEC (13) ACP (77: 48 Africa, 15 Caribbean, 8 Pacific)

As before, plus

2000 – Cotonou Agreement - EDF 10

EEC (15) ACP (77: 48 Africa, 15 Caribbean, 14 Pacific)

As before

2005 – Revised Cotonou Agreement - EDF 11

EEC (25) ACP (77*: 48 Africa, 15 Caribbean, 15 Pacific)

As before

Note: * indicates that the EEC and ACP have signed a Convention. ** indicates that the EEC and ACP have signed an Association Agreement. The dates in parentheses indicate the year in which the Convention or Association Agreement was signed. The list of countries in the ACP group is subject to change, and new countries may be added or removed at any time.

The ACP–EU Agreements

Africa – Caribbean – Pacific

The ACP–EU Agreements cover a multitude of countries across three continents: Africa, the Caribbean, and the Pacific. This agreement aims to foster economic development and cooperation among these nations. The list of countries can be found in the following sections:

Africa
- Angola
- Benin
- Botswana
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cameroon
- Cape Verde
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Comoros
- Congo (Republic of)
- Côte d’Ivoire
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Djibouti
- Egypt
- Eritrea
- Ethiopia
- Gabon
- Gambia
- Ghana
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Haiti
- Kenya
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Mali
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mozambique
- Namibia
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Rwanda
- Senegal
- Sierra Leone
- South Africa
- Sudan
- Swaziland
- Tanzania
- Togo
- Tunisia
- Uganda
- Uruguay
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

The Caribbean
- Antigua and Barbuda
- The Bahamas
- Barbados
- Belize
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Grenada
- Guyana
- Jamaica
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Suriname
- Trinidad and Tobago

The Pacific
- American Samoa
- Cook Islands
- Fiji
- Kiribati
- Marshall Islands
- Micronesia
- New Caledonia
- Niue
- Palau
- Papua New Guinea
- Samoa
- Solomon Islands
- Tonga
- Tuvalu
- Vanuatu

The European Union

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- United Kingdom

The lists of countries published by The Courier do not prejudice the status of these countries and territories now or in the future. The Courier uses maps from a variety of sources. Their use does not imply recognition of any particular boundaries nor prejudice the status of any state or territory.
50 years
of ACP–EU Cooperation