

Participation of Civil Society in the Preparation of the Cooperation Strategy of the EU-ACP Agreement in Benin

A civil society perspective

Prepared by

Emmanuel Gahou and Aurélien Atidegla
*Groupe de Recherche et d'Action pour la Promotion de
l'Agriculture et du Développement*
(GRAPAD)

in cooperation with
Eurostep

**Groupe de Recherche et d'Action pour la Promotion
de l'Agriculture et de Développement (GRAPAD)**
04 BP 1119
Cotonou
BENIN
Tel: + 229 32 48 83
Grapad@intnet.bj

Eurostep
115 rue Stévin
1000 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel: +32.2.231 1659
admin@eurostep.org

Monitoring the application of the ACP-EU Cooperation Agreement

In June 2000, the European Union signed a cooperation agreement with the ACP group of African, Caribbean and Pacific states and the 15 members states of the European Union. The Cotonou Agreement, as it is known, provides a framework for cooperation between the European Union and the 78 ACP states until the year 2020. As the successor of the Lomé Convention, the new Agreement covers broader aspects of cooperation between the EU and the ACP states and includes trade, aid and political dialogue.

One of the leading elements of the Cotonou Agreement is the recognition of the role of non-state actors within the general scope of the Agreement. This recognition is backed by provisions for the involvement of non-state actors, including civil society organisations, in all aspects of the Agreement's application. This report is part of an initiative by the civil society organisation to monitor the implementation of this Agreement. The initiative is based on the belief that it is important to reinforce the independence of non-state actors in order to ensure their effective participation.

European NGOs and the civil society organisations in the ACP countries must conduct this monitoring initiative together. The first point examined was the degree of real participation by non-state actors, and in particular civil society organisations, in the setting out of the Country Strategy Documents and the National Indicative Programmes for EU support of individual ACP countries.

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACP	Africa, Caribbean & Pacific
CS	Cooperation Strategy
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EC	European Community
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EDF	European Development Fund
EIB	European Investment Bank
EU	European Union
FOSAC	Forum des ONG Béninoises pour le suivi de l'Accord de Cotonou
GRAPAD	Groupe de Recherche et d'Action pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture et du Développement
MEF	Ministry for Economic Affairs and Finance
MTIPE	Ministry for Trade, Industry and Promotion of Employment
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
PS	Permanent Secretariat

WAMU
WTO

West African Monetary Union
World Trade Organisation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. The Cotonou Agreement, civil society participation and the preparation of the Cooperation Strategy Document
2. The European Union and Benin: a brief overview of previous conventions
3. The methodology used for gathering experiences
4. Results of the evaluation mission
 - 4.1. Awareness on the part of CSOs of the Cotonou Agreement and the dialogue process for the cooperation strategy document
 - 4.2. Dialogue and transparency in the preparation of the Cooperation Strategy Document
5. Recommendations

Conclusions

Annexes

Participation of Civil Society in the preparation of the Cooperation Strategy in Benin

Introduction

This report describes the broad outlines of the state of play in Benin of the cooperation strategy in the context of the Cotonou Agreement. After a brief explanation of the methodology used in the evaluation mission, this report presents the results obtained and offers a few recommendations to the various participants.

In response to the growing demand for participatory approaches, the ACP countries and the European Community highlighted in the Cotonou Agreement the complementary role and the contributions of both state and non-state actors in the development process. That was instrumental in opening up the partnership between the ACP and the EU to a broad range of non-state actors. Article 4 of the Agreement stipulates that civil society is a non-state actor and as such must be informed and consulted when cooperation priorities and policies are designed and formulated.

The *Groupe de Recherche et d'Action pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture et du Développement* (GRAPAD), convinced of the need to help overcome the shortfalls observed in the new operational aspects of the Cotonou Agreement, has been cooperating with *Eurostep* (a consortium of European NGOs) and 4 other national NGOs from Uganda, Cameroon, Tanzania and the Dominican Republic, in a lightweight pilot assessment designed to devise criteria for evaluating consultation with civil society on the preparation of the country cooperation strategy documents.

1. The Cotonou Agreement, Civil Society participation and the preparation of the Cooperation Strategy Document

The Cotonou Agreement was signed on June 23, 2000, in the city of the same name. It replaces the Lomé Convention and is a framework for cooperation between the ACP Group and the European Union with the aim of reducing poverty and achieving sustainable development.

The decision to set poverty reduction as a chief objective of cooperation and development strategies presupposes that all of society's actors will take part so that the conditions will be set for greater equity and so that the poor will also benefit from economic growth.

The new Agreement will have a duration of 20 years and is designed to draw up, via a programming process, a country cooperation strategy (CS), although the deadline for the CS expired in June 2001. The cooperation strategy then serves as the foundation for the preparation of the National Indicative Programme (NIP), which defines the areas for cooperation between each ACP state and the EU. The draft cooperation strategy must be examined by a quality control mechanism in the EU before its final approval and signature. In that process, special attention must be paid to the role of civil society.

The spirit of the Agreement conveys the idea that the participation of non-state actors should not be limited merely to local development support but should include dialogue on the subject of general and sectoral policies and programming. That is why it is necessary for non-state actors to take part in the definition of sectoral strategies and priorities in the ACP states and the EU.

It is therefore important to introduce appropriate tools so that the involvement of non-state actors attains a high profile and so that compliance with the provisions in the Cotonou Agreement can be evaluated and measured in each of the ACP states.

2. The European Union and Benin: a brief overview of previous conventions

Cooperation between Benin and the European Union started in the 1960s through the first European Development Fund (EDF). The successive EDFs covered five-year periods and included both programmable and non-programmable aid. Programmable aid was allocated under the National Indicative Programmes (NIP) and was made known at the start of each EDF period. Non-programmable resources included one-off aid such as food and emergency aid, the stabilisation of export income (STABEX), risk capital managed by the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the Structural Adjustment Facility (SAF). In addition to these various aid packages, Benin also benefited from EDF financing under regional cooperation and aid from the European cooperation budget. One example of the latter is co-funding with non-governmental organisations. Annex 5 shows the evolution of EU aid via EDF, in Euros, excluding regional cooperation.

In the Lomé IV bis, Lomé IV and Lomé III Conventions, corresponding to the 8th, 7th and 6th EDF, respectively, the accent was placed, in terms of attainment of objectives, on communication infrastructure, health, rural development and support for structural adjustment.

3. The methodology for gathering experiences

Given the need to collect information on specific points in order to have an accurate view of how the cooperation strategies in most of the ACP countries are being completed, fundamental work¹ has been done that will serve as a reference for each partner entrusted with evaluation work.

Consequently, the methodology decided by GRAPAD consists of identifying a limited but representational number of main category of actors involved in the consultation process and to hold a semi directional interview with each one on the guidelines that were based on the aforementioned reference work.

In addition to the information received from these guidelines, good use was made of the results from recent meetings or gatherings held to discuss the application of the Cotonou Agreement, in which the FOSAC and the GRAPAD took part as a focal point of the ACP-Civil Society Forum.

In that way, the main thematic groupings and networks of NGOs, consumers' associations and women's organisations operating in Benin were directly or indirectly contacted. Seven civil

¹ See annex 2

society organisations and two government institutions handling the Agreement's management were contacted during this survey period (see annex 3).

As a result, through the surveys that took place between October 27 and November 5 2001, most of the target institutions and organisations were contacted. The results of these consultations are presented in the next section.

4. Results of the evaluation mission

In general, and on the basis of the interviews conducted, it emerged that no organised, representative structure from civil society and no non-state actors took part, directly or indirectly, in the drafting of any cooperation strategy document alongside the state. That corroborates the statement made by the ACP Ministers during their meeting held in December 2001 in Brussels with ministers and officials from the ACP states responsible for cooperation between their countries and the European Union. At that time, they said that, *civil society does not appear to be organised or structured at national level for significant consultation on the programming process.*²

In most cases, the institutions involved were not well informed of the consultation process for the cooperation strategy and in the best of cases, some of the people questioned said they had only sketchy knowledge of the Cotonou Agreement.

The results and conclusions presented below summarise the sentiments of the various actors, but these positions will be fine-tuned later, in light of the focal role that GRAPAD has and continues to play through the national body set up at the start of 2001, called the *Forum des ONG Béninoises pour le Suivi de l'Accord de Cotonou* (FOSAC).

4.1. Awareness on the part of CSOs of the Cotonou Agreement and the dialogue process for the cooperation strategy document

More than half of the non-state actors questioned confirm that they had been informed of the Cotonou Agreement by local and foreign radio and television at the time the Cotonou Agreement was being negotiated.

Some of these same actors asserted that they had been amply informed and that they had obtained the text of the Agreement from the workshops organised by GRAPAD, in particular the one held in March 2001, which focused on NGO's and other non-state actors' awareness of the facts enabling them to play their role and contribute alongside the state to the process that was the prerequisite for the National Indicative Plan (NIP).

In the end, the actions carried out by GRAPAD were the only ones that helped certain social actors in Benin to gain knowledge of the Cotonou Agreement. The state conducted no significant action to disseminate the contents of the Agreement to non-state actors, despite its good intentions.

² See the Pro Active File - PAF – N° 254 (PAF is a magazine prepared by *Eurostep* (www.eurostep.org) regularly providing information on EU-ACP cooperation activities.

The other people questioned, while they did not offer precise answers, did say that the Agreement concerns *cooperation relations between African countries and the European Union, whose headquarters is in Brussels, and that it brings together African ministers to discuss international trade and human rights in Africa.*

To sum up, information of the Cotonou Agreement and how it concerns non-state actors in the preparation of the strategy document was not available to these same actors, nor was it available to the organisations that were fortunate enough to participate in the sectoral consultations held under the Poverty Reduction Strategy Document (PRSD)³.

4.2. Dialogue and transparency in the preparation of the Cooperation Strategy Document

The interviews conducted by the ACP-EU Permanent Secretariat⁴ (PS) did not elucidate further what had been done by the state, in particular concerning the consultations on the cooperation strategy in Benin, for the simple reason that the body entrusted with leading the process is the National Authorising Officer (the Ministry for Economic Affairs and Finance), which is best qualified to speak on it. Unfortunately, it was not possible at that time to hold a session with the ministerial officials responsible for the European Development Fund (EDF).

Furthermore, efforts begun around three months ago to obtain that information from the EU Delegation were unsuccessful. According to the EU Delegation, all information on the process is in the hands of the government of Benin and the Delegation cannot overstep its remit. The upshot was that no government official could say whether or not the consultation process had been started or had evolved towards the preparation and approval of the Cooperation Strategy Document.

The government's reaction appears to coincide with the response that the Commission gave to *Eurostep* and that was reported in the Pro Active File No. 253 to the question of whether the preliminary cooperation strategy documents should not be made available, given the fact that the process needs to be transparent. The Commission answered that the documents cannot be made available until they have been approved and signed.

That demonstrates that certain officials, while they express the desire for openness, have failed to translate that desire into deeds.

Nonetheless, the Benin government should be credited with some achievements that have helped FOSAC's and others to get involved. According to the ACP-EU Permanent Secretariat, others would have been brought into the partnership along with the non-state actors, in keeping with the spirit of the Cotonou Agreement, had not certain events disrupted the scheduling proposed and approved by the Council of Ministers⁵. Following are some relevant achievements by the Benin government:

³ This document is to be used as a reference for the preparation of the cooperation strategy document.

⁴ Permanent Secretariat of the Interministerial Commission created by decree 91-256 of November 15, 1991, including nearly all the ministers and being responsible for monitoring ACP-EU relations.

⁵ The mission members wanted to receive a copy of the decision taken by the Council of Ministers, but they were turned down.

- ^ A large meeting, organised by MICPE on June 11 on the position of the Benin government concerning the WTO and ACP-EU cooperation.

This gathering, chaired by the Minister himself, brought together all the services, structures and departments representing the state, as well as some representatives of civil society organisations. FOSAC was fully involved, for the first time, and was represented by some NGOs and member networks. The gathering was an opportunity for exchange and for disseminating information on how the Benin government, through the ACP-EU Secretariat, has been taking the lead.

- ^ The organisation, by MICPE (PS/ACP-EU) of a second meeting on June 15, 2001, on the application of the Cotonou Agreement.

This meeting was limited to a few representatives of FOSAC who examined with the ACP-EU Permanent Secretariat the strategy to pursue in order to achieve the rapid approval of the Agreement by the Benin parliament. That on its own is a significant achievement.

A seminar, which was the subject of a communication approved by the Council of Ministers, had been scheduled for the end of November 2001. It was to focus on broader dissemination of the Cotonou Agreement's provisions. So far the seminar has not taken place.

According to the ACP-EU Permanent Secretariat, FOSAC will be called upon to ensure broader participation by CSOs in Benin.

At the subregional level, two meetings were planned, one sponsored by CEDEAO and the other by UEMOA, but only the first actually took place, in July, during which the focal point of the *Forum de la Société Civile ACP* in Benin took part as an observer. In addition, preparations were made in Benin for the negotiations that will lead to new trade agreements, which in turn will require serious internal preparation, including the dissemination of information, and the launch of an impact study for Benin on the creation of a free trade zone.

Lastly, the evaluation mission received details about the membership of the two main interministerial commissions, one of which will be working on ACP-EU cooperation and the other on the WTO. The first commission has set up a 7-person standing committee, made up exclusively of ministerial departments, while the second brings together private sector representatives, in addition to the concerned ministers. A revision process, to secure greater synergy between these commissions, will be initiated, focusing on their membership.

Consequently, instead of planning on the creation of new structures for management purposes, the aim would be to give broader authority to the ACP-EU Permanent Secretariat so that it can improve its coordination via a merger of the two commissions and greater representation of civil society.

5. Recommendations

Thanks to the efforts by GRAPAD since 1998 when the post-Lomé negotiations got underway, which led in March 2001 to the creation of FOSAC, the initial stages of dialogue and

consultation have been observed, in particular on the actions already undertaken by MICPE and the ACP-EU Permanent Secretariat and the activities planned thereafter. We expect to see more fruitful contacts from the National Authorising Officer.

Even so, while the preparation of the cooperation strategy document would have moved ahead without the sought-after involvement of civil society, we can expect, in light of the preceding, that missed opportunities will be made up.

Therefore, efforts must be made on all sides to ensure that this incipient dialogue will gather strength and become institutionalised. To achieve that, we would recommend the following:

➤ **For the European Commission and the ACP Secretariat**

- accelerate the introduction of reforms planned for the main management bodies of the Agreement (Delegations and National Authorising Officer) that should facilitate the execution of the Agreement;
- make known the transformations and changes underway in the Commission and in the Delegations that are able to facilitate the involvement of civil society;
- support the application of the action plan to reinforce ACP civil society that was adopted at the conference held in July, 2001, in Brussels;
- examine the possibility of including in the NIPs capacity-building in civil society as a compulsory priority, in light of the role that the NIPs play in the Agreement's application;
- create regional observatories to monitor relations between governments and civil societies.

➤ **For the European Commission Delegation and the Government**

- support the holding of information and exchange sessions on the new provisions governing relations between the EU Delegation and other actors concerned by the Agreement;
- back the strengthening and broadening of the existing platform (FOSAC) via a gradual expansion to include all components of civil society;
- introduce an appropriate institutional framework and a permanent institutional mechanism for coordinating the various actors involved in the Agreement's application;
- create room in the cooperation strategy or in the NIPs for the ongoing examination of the needs and concerns of civil society;
- create a secretariat or recruit an agent for the Delegation, as soon as possible, to manage relations between the Delegation and the non-state actors, as is stipulated in the Agreement's application provisions.

➤ **For civil society**

The members of civil society should do the following in order to facilitate the effective application of the aforementioned recommendations:

- get organised and call for, whenever necessary, their members' involvement in the application of the Agreement;
- inform grassroots populations about the opportunities in the Agreement for their development so that they may benefit from the Agreement's support as soon as possible;
- set up an officially-recognised democratically elected platform to work with other actors involved in the Agreement's application;
- draw up an action plan assessing their essential needs and negotiate their inclusion in the National Indicative Programme.

Conclusions

It would appear that the participatory approach advocated by the new EU-ACP Agreement has yet to become common practice of the various parties involved.

This situation could be blamed on the usual problems caused by the Agreement's new provisions. They may have caused some disruption in the delegations and in the work of the National Authorising Officer, who will have to take on board deep organisational reforms and management mechanisms for the Agreement.

The very tight calendar set out for preparing the national cooperation strategies without prior study of the consequences on the real involvement of non-state actors may explain the few snags observed in the process.

In any event, the study has helped us to understand that the consultation process in Benin has not always taken place as planned in the Cotonou Agreement. Most of the non-state actors are still on the sidelines of the process, owing mainly to a lack of information and preparation.

ANNEX 1

A BRIEF PRESENTATION OF GRAPAD

1. Name and foundation: *Groupe de Recherche et d'Action pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture et du Développement*, created in 1989 in Cotonou, Benin

2. Names and positions of officials

Aurélien C. Atidegla: agronomist and socio-economist, President of the Board of Directors

Emmanuel Gahou: agronomist, Executive Director

3. GRAPAD's mission: to contribute effectively to improving the life of the disadvantaged populations and promoting the full development of men and women.

4. Main areas for action

- Promotion of decentralised financial systems and SMEs and SMIs.
 - Food security: funding of microprojects able to generate income, community infrastructure, health and nutritional education.
 - Education and training
 - Decentralisation, democracy and good governance
- Management of projects (identification, preparation, realisation, application, follow-up and evaluation) in various areas pertaining to development.
- Design and realisation of studies and action programmes in the following areas:
 - Formative Action Research
 - Informal Education
 - Participatory Institutional Diagnostics
 - Democracy and Good Governance
 - Analysis and promotion of farm and agri-industrial sectors.

In the field of networking, GRAPAD has helped to set up several thematic networks in which it holds responsibilities at national and subregional levels. Following are some examples of networks and professional associations, all of which are operational:

- the *Groupe National de Travail sur l'Education Non Formelle* in Benin is an initiative by the *Association pour le Développement de l'Education en Afrique* (ADEA), sponsored by leader

agencies such as UNESCO, *Coopération Suisse*, the *Club du Sahel* and the Commonwealth Secretariat.

- the *Forum des ONG Béninoises pour le Suivi de l'Accord de Cotonou* (FOSAC)
- the *Consortium ALAFIA (Association Nationale des Praticiens de la Microfinance)*.
- the *Réseau de Développement d'Agriculture Durable au Bénin* (REDAD)
- the *Réseau Béninois pour la Gouvernance Démocratique* (RGD)
- the *Espace d'Accompagnement de la Créativité Sociale en Afrique de l'Ouest* (ACRESO) bringing together institutions such as *INADES Formation* in Abidjan, ENDA GRAF, FRAO, RENAPOP, *Sahel Ingénieurs Conseils* in Senegal and CENAFOD in Guinea. A subregional programme is underway with the financial support of the European Union.
- Member of the *Comité d'Orientation du PREFAL / SNV* and the *Renforcement des ONG du Littoral*
- Member of the *Conseil BINGOS / AFRICARE* (a capacity-building project for civil society organisations) for the 1996-1998 period
- Member of the *Comité d'Orientation du PILSA (Projet d'Interventions Locales pour la Sécurité Alimentaire)* (PILSA – World Bank and DANIDA) from 1994 to 1997.
- Representative of the Focal Point of the *Réseau Africain de Communication Participative pour le Développement* (ARCOPAD).
- Focal point for the alliance and the draft Earth charter for a responsible, pluralistic world of solidarity/ *Projet caravane africaine pour la paix et la solidarité*.

ANNEX 2

CRITERIA FOR MEASURING CONSULTATIONS WITH CIVIL SOCIETY ON THE COUNTRY SUPPORT STRATEGY PROCESS

- 1) Information/awareness of the dialogue process around the Country Support Strategy paper process
 - a. How widespread did ACP and EU government actors distribute information on the Country Support Strategy process and the related foreseen consultations?
 - b. Through which media?
 - c. How timely was this in relation to the scheduling of the preparation of the Country Support Strategy paper?
 - d. What in your view is the best mode for distributing information on this process?

- 2) Consultation
 - a. Was there an invitation from your government to consult with civil society actors on Country Support Strategy Process?
 - b. Did civil society attempt to initiate consultations with your government on this process?
 - c. Did the European Commission Delegation attempt to initiate or facilitate consultations between your government and civil society actors? If so how?
 - d. Was there a selection process of civil society actors for these consultations? If so who was responsible making this selection and under what criteria?
 - e. If the answer to any of the first three questions is yes, did consultations actually take place?
 - f. If consultations took place, how wide a grouping of civil society did your government attempt to consult with?
 - g. How timely were consultations in relation to the scheduling of the preparation of the Country Support Strategy papers, i.e. before actual government drafting of the Country Support Strategy papers?
 - h. How long was the period set aside for consultation with civil society organisations for the preparation of the Country Support Strategy papers?
 - i. What modes/channels for consultations were used?
 - i. Systematic set of meetings scheduled before hand
 - ii. Ad hoc meetings
 - iii. A single meeting
 - iv. Written correspondence
 - v. Correspondence via the telephone
 - vi. Electronic discussion via the Internet
 - j. Did your government attempt to create new or utilise existing structures such as committees or taskforces with representation from civil society to inform its position on the Country Support Strategy papers?
 - k. Did civil society attempt to create new or utilise existing structures such as Non-state actor fora or national NGO committees etc. for these consultations?

1. What in your view is the best mode for consultations with civil society on this process?
- 3) Level of dialogue and transparency
 - a. Was consultation aimed merely at giving information on Country Support Strategy paper process to civil society or was it aimed at exchanging views on input and positions for the Country Support Strategy papers?
 - b. What was the role of civil society in the analyses choice of national priorities and focal areas?
 - c. Did civil society organisations receive written or oral responses to positions, input or question they put forward for the Country Support Strategy paper process?
 - d. Was there an opportunity for civil society to submit written comments/questions/positions on the Country Support Strategy paper process?
 - e. Were civil society organisations informed about how the positions they put forward were fed into the system of decision-making by their governments on the Country Support Strategy paper process?
 - f. Have civil society organisations been able to see the end product of the consultations with them, i.e. the draft Country Support Strategy paper?
 - 4) If consultations did not take place
 - a. What were the obstacles?
 - i. Point of view of delegation
 - ii. Point of view of Commission
 - iii. Point of view of civil society
 - b. What measures have been taken or need to be put in place to address this situation?

ANNEX 3

ORGANISATIONS CONTACTED

- *Ministère des Investissements Publics et de l'Aménagement du territoire (MIPA)*
- European Commission Delegation at Yaoundé,
- *Centre International d'Etudes Forestières et Environnementales (CIEFE)*
- *Centre d'Accompagnement de Nouvelles Alternatives de Développement (CANADEL – ONG)*
- *Forum de Développement des ONG du Cameroun (FONGDEC) and the Association pour la promotion des Initiatives Communautaires (APICA-ONG)*
- *Association Française des Volontaires du Progrès (AFVP)*
- *Coalition des ONG pour la Sécurité Alimentaire et le Développement Rural (COSADER-ONG)*
- ANACLAC-ONG
- Mr Ebalé Salomon, member of civil society and university professor,
- Mrs Abiba, peasant leader at Foubot,
- German Development Cooperation – Ministry for the Economy and Finances (GTZ-MINEFI)
- *Organisation pour le Développement Economique des Communautés (ODECO-ONG)* , at Yaoundé
- *Association Enfants, Jeunes et Avenir (ASSEJA-ONG)*
- The Cameroun /European Union coordination unit

QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS

IDENTIFICATION

Name of the
NGO: _____

Contact
details: _____

Person(s) questioned:

Responsibilities:

Length of interview:

AWARENESS OF THE COTONOU AGREEMENT AND THE DIALOGUE PROCESS FOR THE COOPERATION STRATEGY DOCUMENT

1- Are you familiar with the CA? Yes No

2- If yes, when and on what occasion did you learn about the Agreement?

3- Did you know that the application of the CA includes the preparation of a country strategic cooperation document?

Yes No (If yes, go to question 5)

4- If not, what do you know about the Agreement’s obligations for the ACP countries and do you know what is being done in this area in Benin?

5- Has the strategic document already been prepared in Benin?

Yes No Don’t know (If yes, go to question 7)

6- If no/don’t know, from what institution is information on the process underway available?

7- When was it prepared?

8- Who prepared it?

9- When and how did you obtain information on this subject?

a- I took part in the entire process

b- I participated in the preparation process

c- I was invited to a restitution/validation/approval session for the document (please specify)

d- I was informed by(indicate the person or entity) via written correspondence/telephone/Internet (delete as appropriate)

e- Other (please explain)

THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

10- Did you receive an invitation from the government to consult with civil society actors on the preparation of the cooperation strategy document?

Yes

No

Don't know

If yes, please explain

11- Did civil society try to initiate consultations on the process with the government?

Yes

No

Don't know

If yes, please explain

11- Did the European Commission Delegation try to initiate or facilitate consultations between the government and the civil society actors?

Yes

No

Don't know

Please explain your response.

12- Which civil society actors were consulted during the preparation of the cooperation strategy document?

14- Who selected them? _____

15- Explain how they were selected. What were the criteria?

16- Please indicate the other people and/or institutions who were informed along with yourself. _____

17- What is your opinion on the way in which you received the information on the strategy document?

18- Did you really take part in the consultation? Please explain.

19- When, in relation to the planning and preparation of the cooperation strategy document, did the consultations take place?

20- How much time was reserved for consultations with the civil society organisations for preparing the cooperation strategy document⁶? _____

21- What means and methods were used for the consultations?

- *regularly scheduled meeting planned in advance;*
- *ad hoc meetings;*
- *one meeting only;*
- *written correspondence;*
- *by telephone;*
- *electronic discussion by Internet.*

22- Did the government create new structures or did it use existing ones such as commissions or working groups with civil society representation in order to convey its position on the cooperation strategy document?

Yes No Don't know

23- Did civil society create new structures?

Yes No

If so, which ones? _____

If not, did civil society use existing ones such as fora for non-state actors or national NGO committees, etc., for these consultations? _____

24- In your opinion, was the method used for consulting civil society on this process efficient?

Yes No

If not, what other method for holding consultations with civil society would have been more efficient? _____

⁶) See note

MEMBERS OF THE SURVEY TEAM

1. Mr Atidegla, Aurelien, socio-economist
2. Mr Gahou, Emmanuel, agronomist
3. Miss Idohou, Olga, environmental geographer
4. Mr Ahouissoussi, André, socio-economist

ANNEX 3

Summary table of organisations selected for the survey

Actor category	Organisations / Institutions concerned	Observations
State actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Ministère de l'Industrie du Commerce et de la Promotion de l'Emploi (MICPE) <i>which oversees the ACP-EU Permanent Secretariat</i> → Ministère des Finances et de l'Economie (MFE) <i>which is the National Authorising Officer</i> → European Union Delegation at Cotonou 	<p>The ACP-EU PS was interviewed in person</p> <p>Not available during the period</p> <p>Not available during the period, but the results of a FOSAC meeting in May 2001 with the Delegation were utilized.</p>
Non-state actors	<p>→ Civil Society Organisations Réseau de Développement d'Agriculture Durable (REDAD); Réseau des ONG béninoises de Santé (ROBS); Fédération Nationale des Associations de Femmes du Bénin (FENAFB); Conseil des ONG en Activité au Bénin (CONGAB); Réseau des ONG Béninoises pour la Gouvernance Démocratique (RGD); Consortium ALAFIA (Association Nationale des Praticiens de la Microfinance du Bénin); Association Nationale des Consommateurs du Bénin (Que Choisir – Bénin ?)</p>	<p>All these organisations were interviewed</p>

ANNEX 4

LIST OF ATTENDEES

Re: Benin's position in relation to the WTO and ACP-EU Cooperation

Date: June 11 2001

N°	Last and first names	Structure	Contacts	Observations
01-	Laleye, Claude	CEBENOR	30 10 36	Private sector
02-	Boukari K., Belco	Chambre d' Agriculture	337288	Private sector
03-	Soglo, Alain	Chambre d' Agriculture	33 7288	Private sector
04-	Ndiaye, Magaye	ADEX	31 78 21	Private sector
05-	Akotegnon, Claude	DDI/MICPE	3013 85	
06-	Koudjrohede, Louis	R/DANA	21 2670	
07-	Quenum C., Sègnon	D/OBOPAF	33 73 72	
08-	Eyisse, Fatiou	(MICPE) GC	3070 25	
09-	Agbogladja, H.Isidore	Coopérative La Synthèse	30 78 87	
10-	Pierre Egble A	Convergence 2000	29 02 00 95 16 24	
11-	Gore, M. Amadou	SRM/D/PECHES MAEP	33 15 51	
12-	Hounsounou, Gabriel	D/PECHES	33 15 51	
13-	Gboagada, Charles	DAGRI/MAEP	21 32 90	
14-	Dossa Sossavi, Edmond	CBCE	30 13 20	
15-	Ezin, Maurille	DPP (MICPE)	30 70 19	
16-	Gouthon, Henri Jean-Claude	CNEX	30 07 02	
17-	Agossa, Bonaventure	D/Mines/MMEH	31 47 78	
18-	Tidjani, Chakirou	SG/CCI	31 24 57	
19-	Gahou, Emmanuel	GRAPAD	32 48 83	
20-	Loko, Raffet	ASNIB	94 07 26	
21-	Houssou, Pascal	DACE/DCE	05 85 93	
22-	Djakpo, Paulin	CPI/MECCA-PD	30 00 30	
23-	Marcelle Attiogbe da Silveira	ACP-UE PS/MICPE	30 70 10 /26	
24-	Ida Sofie Belling	EU Delegation	31 26 17	
25-	Jean Louis Lacube	EU Delegation	31 26 17	
26-	Akomedi, Tassi	MICPE	30 03 73	
27-	Sehoueto, Lazarre	Ministre MICPE	300373	
28-	Ohin, Jacob Gb.	DPP/MAEP	30 02 89	
29-	Agbato, Aurélien	DPP/MEHU	31 46 63 96 22 43	
30-	Zinsou, Jean-Francis	DAE/MAEIA	30 19 63 30 82 95	
31-	Djokpe, Hervé	MAEIA/DE	30 19 63 30 82 95	
32-	Tokolo, Pierre Claver	DCRE/MECCAGPD	30 42 18	

33-	Awounou, Richard	GIRD/CCIB	33 16 22	
34-	Agbadome, S. Antoine	DCE/MICPE	30 70 26	

LIST OF ATTENDEES

Re: Application of the Cotonou Agreement

Date: June 15,2001

Civil Society

N°	Last and first names	Structure	Observations
01-	Dossou Dossa, Bernard	QUE CHOISIR BENIN	
02-	Agbogladja, Houénafon Isidore	Coopérative la SYNTHÈSE	
03-	Pierre Egble A	C2000	
04-	Da Silveira, Marcelle	ACP-UE PS/DLE	
05-	Agbadome, Antoine	DCE	

ANNEX 5

<p style="text-align: center;">EU AID FROM THE EDF (In Euros, excluding regional cooperation)</p>

EDF	PROGRAMMABLE AID	NON- PROGRAMMABLE AID	TOTAL
1	20 100 000		20 100 000
2	22 800 000		22 800 000
3	23 300 000	3 300 000	26 600 000
4	40 600 000	20 700 000	61 300 000
5	47 100 000	11 000 000	58 100 000
6	89 500 000	31 200 000	120 700 000
7	93 800 000	41 300 000	135 100 000
8	120 500 000	56 750 000	177 250 000
	457 700 000	164 250 000	621 950 000

From the 2000 annual report, European Commission Delegation