Dear CONCORD Members and Partners,

2011 was a year of both challenges and opportunities for CONCORD, and a time in which the confederation successfully continued implementing its strategy, engaged with new partners and remained a vocal representative of its membership towards external actors.

CONCORD influenced the European policy on several levels: it mobilised members on the Agenda for Change and engaged in institutional processes related to its development and follow up, it set up a strong advocacy approach towards the next multi-annual financial framework of the EU, which will significantly affect the way development cooperation is done in the next years to come. Moreover, policy coherence for development was high on the agenda, culminating in CONCORD’s second Spotlight report in November 2011, and highlighting the obligation of EU policy-makers to ensure the effective implementation of human rights and greater progress towards eradicating poverty in developing countries, as well as the need for EU to take the leadership in promoting policy coherence for development internally and externally.

CONCORD continued advocacy for ever greater quality and quantity of aid, through its AidWatch report, and also played a prominent role before, during and in the follow up to the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effec-
tiveness in Busan, coordinating and informing the European CSO representatives and engaging with the European institutions and national delegations. Another institutional process that took up considerable energy in 2011 was CONCORD’s key role is shaping the debates around the structured dialogue with EU institutions; CONCORD leadership has been acknowledged by the institutions and the other CSO platforms – one, albeit not the only success, was to replace the terminology of “non-state actors” in favour of “civil society organizations”. With a forward-looking attitude, CONCORD also engaged in the discussions on the post-MDG agenda, by hosting the International Secretariat of the Beyond 2015 campaign and engaging in related discussions.

Of course, CONCORD has achieved much more than that in the past year, and I invite you to look at the pages of this report for details and for inspiration for future work. The growing number of participants in our working structures and events shows that what we do is important and relevant for our members, and that it makes a difference. Allow me to take this opportunity to – on behalf of the Board and the Secretariat – sincerely thank all members for incessantly contributing through working structures and other channels – your expertise, skills and dedication are indispensable elements of a thriving and successful platform. This is what makes us and it makes us stronger!
CONCORD ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2011

AIM 1: INFLUENCING THE EUROPEAN UNION

1.1.1. Holding the EU and its Member States to account

1.1.2. Influencing external and domestic policies and practices

1.1.3. Proactively develop an agenda for the European Union

AIM 2: CONCORD AND CIVIL SOCIETY

1.2.1. Enable NGOs in Europe to inform, educate, engage, and mobilise European citizens for sustainable development and international solidarity

1.2.2. Defending and promoting the rights, roles and responsibilities of civil society at local, national, European and global levels

1.2.3. Advocating for an enabling environment for development NGOs

1.2.4. Support CONCORD members in improving quality & effectiveness
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CONCORD MEMBERS
at the end of 2011

NW  Action Aid International
    www.actionaid.org
NW  ADRA
    www.adra.org
AS  ALDA
    www.alda-europe.eu
NW  APRODEV
    www.aprodev.eu
NP  Austria: Globale Verantwortung
    www.globaleverantwortung.at
NP  CONCORD Belgium
    www.concordeurope.org
NP  Bulgaria
    BPID www.bpid.eu/en
NW  CARE International
    www.care.org
NW  Caritas Europa
    www.caritas-europa.org
NW  CBM International
    www.cbm.org
NW  CIDSE
    www.cidse.org
NP  Cyprus: CYINDEP
    www.cyindep.org
NP  Czech Republic
    FoRS www.fors.cz
NP  CONCORD Denmark
    www.concorddenmark.dk
NP  Estonia: AKU
    www.terveilm.net
NW  EU-CORD
    www.eucord.org
NW  Eurostep
    www.eurostep.org
NP  Finland: Kehys
    www.kehys.fi
NP  France: Coordination SUD
    www.coordinationsud.org
NP  Germany: VENRO
    www.venro.org
NP  Greece
    www.dev-ngos.gr
NP  Hungary
    HANG www.hand.org.hu
NW  IPPF European Network
    www.ippf.org
NW  Islamic Relief Worldwide
    www.islamic-relief.com
NW  Handicap International
    www.handicapinternational.be
NP  Ireland: Dochas
    www.dochas.ie
NP  Italy: ONG Italiane
    www.ongitaliane.org
NP  Latvia: Lapas
    www.lapas.lv
NP  Luxembourg: Cercle
    www.cercle.lu
NP  Malta: SKOP
    www.skopmalta.org
NP  Netherlands: Partos
    www.partos.nl
NW  Oxfam International
    www.oxfam.org
NW  Plan International
    www.plan-international.org
NP  Poland: Grupa Zagranica
    www.zagranica.org.pl
NP  Portugal: Plataforma ONGD
    www.plataformaongd.pt
NP  Romania: FOND
    www.fondromania.org
NW  Save the Children International
    www.savethechildren.org
NP  Slovakia: MVRO
    www.mvro.sk
NP  Slovenia: SLOGA
    www.sloga-platform.org
NW  Solidar
    www.solidar.org
NP  Spain: CoNgDe
    www.congde.org
NP  CONCORD Sweden
    www.concord.se
NW  Terres des hommes IF
    www.terredeshommes.org
NP  United Kingdom: BOND
    www.bond.org.uk
NW  World Vision International
    www.wvi.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>FULL NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDWATCH</td>
<td>Working group and process of monitoring official European development aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDE</td>
<td>Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (European Parliament)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACG</td>
<td>Better Aid coordination group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN EUROPE</td>
<td>Climate Action Network Europe, European network on climate change and energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODEV</td>
<td>Development working group of the Council of the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Cotonou Partnership Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCG</td>
<td>Civil Society Contact Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>ACP-EU Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI</td>
<td>The European Commission’s Development Cooperation Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAR</td>
<td>Development Education and Awareness Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEEP</td>
<td>Project: Developing Europeans’ Engagement for the Eradication of Global Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVE</td>
<td>Development Committee of the European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Directorate-general of the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG DEVCO</td>
<td>European Commission, Directorate General for Development and Cooperation – Europe Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Development education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>European Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEAS</td>
<td>European External Actions Service of the European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIDHR</td>
<td>European Instrument for Democracy &amp; Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPAS</td>
<td>Economic Partnership Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPAN</td>
<td>Enlargement, Pre-Accession and Neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>Group of the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats) (European Parliament)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPLO</td>
<td>European Peace-building Liaison Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAID</td>
<td>The European Commission’s EuropeAid cooperation office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVF</td>
<td>Evert Vermeer Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbr.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDR</td>
<td>CONCord working group on funding for development and relief NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDI</td>
<td>Gross domestic income (formerly GDP: gross domestic product)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCAP</td>
<td>Global Call to Action Against Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLF4 BUSAN</td>
<td>4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Busan South Korea 29 Nov-1 Dec 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTA</td>
<td>International Trade committee of the European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISG</td>
<td>International Steering Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEGS</td>
<td>EU-AU experts’ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPA</td>
<td>EU/ACP Joint Parliamentary Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPS</td>
<td>Members of the European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Mid-term Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO/NGDO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation (NGDOs: development and humanitarian aid NGOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>National platform (national association of development NGOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSA/LA</td>
<td>Non State Actors/Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Network of NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>Policy coherence for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPE</td>
<td>Group of the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats) and European Democrats (European Parliament)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;D</td>
<td>Group of Socialists and Democrats (European Parliament).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD</td>
<td>Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIALOG</td>
<td>Project to raise awareness, in countries applying for accession to the EU, on development coope-ration and humanitarian aid policies and to involve NGOs from these countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGASS</td>
<td>United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

ABOUT CONCORD

CONCORD is the sole European Confederation of Development and Relief NGOs. Its national associations and international networks represent over 1800 NGOs which are supported by millions of citizens across Europe.

CONCORD leads reflection and political actions and regularly engages in dialogue with the European institutions and other civil society organisations. It is part of the Global Call to Action against Poverty, Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness, and Spring Alliance.

MISSION, VISION, AIMS, APPROACHES

CONCORD’s vision is of a world in which poverty and inequality have been ended; in which decisions are based on social justice, gender equality and upon our responsibility to future generations; where every person has the right to live in dignity, on an equal basis, free from poverty and sustainably.

CONCORD’s mission is implemented by CONCORD members who work together to ensure that:

- The EU and Member States are fully committed to comprehensive policies and practices which promote sustainable economic, social and human development, aim to address the causes of poverty, and are based on human rights, gender equality, justice and democracy;

- The rights and responsibilities of citizens and organised civil society, to influence those representing them in governments and EU institutions, are promoted and respected.

CONCORD’s main aims are:

- To promote the rights and responsibilities of citizens, development NGOs and, where relevant to CONCORD’s influencing agenda, civil society as a whole - to act in solidarity with those living in poverty and to influence their representatives in governments and EU institutions.

Six approaches underlines CONCORD strategy:

- Human rights and gender equality will underpin all our advocacy work.

- Strengthening CONCORD’s political engagement with the institutions.

- Developing strategic alliances with Southern, European and Global coalitions.

- Supporting the organisational development of CONCORD’s members.

- Ensuring that CONCORD collective decision-making combines efficiency with confederation ownership, and supports active participation of all members in CONCORD activities.

- Basing CONCORD work on members’ energies, supported by a secretariat; balance our income sources to ensure our independence and sustainability, and manage finances prudently.

CONCORD STRUCTURAL CHANGES IN 2011

Board, staff and members

Board: Izabella Toth (CIDSE), Rilli Lappalainen (Finnish NP), Marius Wanders (World Vision) and Carlos Cabo (Spanish NP) were elected to join the Board, replacing Daniel Verger, Andrea Maksimovic and Eduard Soler Cuyas, whose mandate had ended. See Annex nr 1

Secretariat: In 2011 CONCORD put in place a slightly different structure. The Secretariat is led by the Director, with support from the Management Team (the Head of Policy and the Head of Confederation...
Affairs) and an Executive Assistant, also working on our relationships with our Southern Partners.

The Policy Team is now responsible for all policies of CONCORD - under both Pillar 1 (“what we say”) and Pillar 2 (“who we are”). There are now three Policy Coordinators (AidWatch, PCD, and MFF/Pillar2) supported by two Policy Officers.

Confederation Affairs are responsible for membership (including statutory issues), communications, capacity building and Finance & Administration. This department is supported by a finance officer, a human resources officer and an office & events assistant (the last two on part time). This team is led by a Finance and Administrative Coordinator.

Other policy support is provided by short term professional placements and interns – with the support of their universities – and through clear Memorandum of Understanding between CONCORD and the academic institute.

Membership: CONCORD welcomed three new members: Romanian national platform FOND, Islamic Relief Worldwide, Handicap International and 1 associate member ALDA, the Association of Local Democracy Agencies. See Annex nr 7

CONCORD bodies/Working structures

No new body has been created in 2011, and the existing working structures continued to deliver on the priorities of CONCORD, which is presented in detail in the following pages. In addition, two projects have been on-going throughout the reporting year:

- (DEEEP “Developing Europeans’ Engagement for the Eradication of Global Poverty is a three-year project, co-funded by the European Commission, and aiming at strengthening the capacities of NGDOs to raise awareness, educate and mobilise the European public for worldwide poverty eradication and social inclusion. The project was initiated by the DARE Forum, in 2003, and is currently managed by a consortium of 5 European NGOs (Plan Finland, Oxfam Italia, ITECO, Think Global and HAND). More information on DEEEP and its activities are available on: http://www.deeep.org

DEEEP

TRIALOG aims to strengthen civil society and raise awareness of development issues in the enlarged European Union. The TRIALOG project started in March 2000 and is now in its fourth phase (2009-2012). In 2011, one of the main events was the Central Training; the annual gathering of all EU12 platforms for mutual exchange and updates on their respective situations. Each year the event focuses on a different topic. In 2011, TRIALOG took advantage of the ongoing EU presidency in Hungary and organised the event in cooperation with the Hungarian NGO platform and DemNet, focusing on the Transition Experience of the EU Member States that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007. Representatives of candidate countries were also invited. Another big event was the Partnership Fair in September 2011, which brought about 120 civil society representatives together from across the EU to work on possible projects for the NSA-LA Development Education call. The Partnership Fair lay the foundation for a variety of projects and partnerships which were eventually submitted to the EC. Furthermore TRIALOG continued with its capacity building activities such as training and support of platforms on upcoming presidencies, platform building seminars in Croatia and Macedonia, a study visit to Brussels and supporting EU12 participation in CONCORD Working Groups. For more information see: http://www.trialog.or.at
General assembly:

The June General Assembly 2011 welcomed into the CONCORD constituency three new members: Romanian national platform FOND, Islamic Relief Worldwide, Handicap International and 1 associate member ALDA, the Association of Local Democracy Agencies. This brought CONCORD membership to 26 national associations and 18 international networks, plus 1 associate member.

In the context of annual part-renewal of the Board Izabella Toth (CIDSE), Rilli Lappalainen (Finnish NP), Marius Wanders (World Vision) and Carlos Cabo (Spanish NP) were elected to join the Board.

A special feature in 2011 was the participation of Southern partners. The International Forum of National Platforms (FIP) attended, with NGO networks and platforms such as CONGAD (Senegal), Mesa de Articulacion (South America), REPAOC, (Africa), INFID (Indonesia), VANI (India) present.

A public debate was also held at the General Assembly, inviting author and international activist Susan George to give a speech on the link between economic growth, development and poverty eradication. Moreover, members were presented the success stories of the year. The new Beyond 2015 campaign was introduced, to engage NGO’s in the debate on the post MDG agenda.

On formal matters, the General Assembly unanimously adopted the 2010 report on the work of CONCORD, approved the financial report, as well as the membership fees for 2012.
AIM1: INFLUENCING THE EUROPEAN UNION

CONCORD aims to influence the EU’s policies and practices so that the Union and its Member States enhance social justice, equality and human rights throughout the world. To influence policies and practices, CONCORD draws upon its Engagement Strategy with EU institutions to identify and target key decision makers as well as decision making bodies. This often means a multi-pronged approach that draws on the strength of CONCORD as a Confederation – using National Platforms to push at national levels on EU issues, using Networks and Brussels-based organisations to push at the European level, and drawing on CONCORD’s good working relationships with the Development Committee of the EU Council, with Parliamentarians, and with key officials at different levels. Equally important is CONCORD’s use of the experience and expertise of its members and bringing this into policy discussions, and using other tools – research, publications etc – to influence policy.

In 2011, the CONCORD AidWatch Report called Challenging Self-Interest – Getting EU aid fit for the fight against poverty’ reminded European Member States that they are off-track to meet their aid quantity and aid effectiveness commitments and need to refocus their aid policies towards poverty eradication.

1.1.1. HOLDING THE EU AND ITS MEMBER STATES TO ACCOUNT

EU Presidencies

With the ‘trio presidency program’, as known previously, still in place, recent institutional reforms, including the creation of the position of High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the Commission, has shifted influence away from the Presidencies to the High Representative.

The Treaty of Lisbon has reduced the importance of the Presidency significantly, by officially separating the European Council (EU heads of state or government) from the Council of the European Union, thus terminating the capacity of the head of state or government of the member state holding the Presidency to be President of the European Council. Simultaneously it split the foreign affairs Council configuration from the General Affairs configuration and made the High Representative the chairperson, and this role is no longer played by the foreign minister of the Presidency country. In the current EU constitutional framework, the Council of the EU retains the task to actively engage in negotiating legislation among member states and among the EU Council and the European Parliament, although the most difficult dossiers are subsumed by the President of the European Council.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- EU to push its priorities to the Presidencies of the European Union and to request regular meetings with the Development Ministers so that the voice of civil society is heard;
- To stress the necessity of effective dialogue between the European institutions and the Civil Society organisations, transparency and NGO access to Council documents.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- Struggled to have the same level of access – at Council and Development Minister levels – as it has had in the past. In previous years, CONCORD has been invited to present at the informal council of development ministers. However, in 2011, this access was denied;
- continued to use Council and Head of States meetings as an opportunity to push on its messaging, but regretted the lack of direct access to Ministers;
- Advocated for a wide range of policies, such as financing, sustainable agriculture and food sovereignty, policies to address climate change and the promotion of decent work. The platform organised several large awareness raising activities as well as seminars, conferences and advocacy meetings.
In 2005, EU Member States committed themselves to the collective goal of devoting 0.56% of their gross domestic product (GDP) to official development assistance (ODA) by 2010, while by 2015 they are collectively due to reach the goal of 0.7%. Individually, the 15 older Member States committed to reach 0.51% by 2010 and 0.7% by 2015, whereas the 12 newer MS have promised to achieve 0.17% by 2010 and 0.33% by 2015.

**WHAT CONCORD WANTS**

- meeting 2010 and 2015 European aid quantity targets with genuine aid resources and ensuring there are no further cuts to aid budgets in the face of the financial crisis;
- agreeing binding year on year timetables which show how European governments will reach aid commitments and demonstrate with regular financial reports how they are being implemented;
- ending inflation of aid budgets with debt cancellation, refugee and student costs and stopping discussions on widening the definition of ODA to include other items such as climate change financing, security or migration;
- reject attempts to loosen the OECD definition of ODA to include financial contributions which do not specifically focus on poverty reduction.

**WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE**

- published its annual AidWatch report. The report was launched during the Structured Dialogue Conference in Budapest on the 18th of May and in Brussels on the 19th of May, just before the Foreign Affairs Council, in which the Council Conclusions: First Annual Report to the European Council on EU Development Aid Targets were released. The publication was launched simultaneously across Europe by many CONCORD members;
- made an important media impact: more than 230 media hits were registered in 11 EU countries, including in some key newspapers and radios, while the Development Commissioner welcomed the report in his blog;
- published a position paper on the EU Member States’ ODA budgets in 2011 which was used as a reference document in the Commission Staff working paper - EU Accountability Report 2011 on Financing for Development - Review of Progress of the EU and its member States;
- contributed to the analysis of the OECD aid figures;
- organised a 3-days capacity building seminar in Vienna in February, of which a full day was dedicated to aid quantity. In September, AidWatch held a brainstorming meeting to discuss – among others – a new inflated aid methodology. In October, we organised another AidWatch plenary meeting to further discuss and strategize our aid analysis;
Aid effectiveness

Compliance with the amount of aid committed is not enough. In order to unlock fully the potential of ODA, it is crucial to also address the quality of aid. Some international initiatives and documents such as the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action have tried to tackle some aid quality issues but they have fallen short of being a comprehensive solution. Moreover, many of the commitments have not yet been met. At the end of 2011, the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness took place in Busan, South Korea, delivering a ‘Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation’, addressing some but not all of these shortcomings. This in spite of the fact that, given the detrimental impact of the financial crisis on the most vulnerable, quality of aid is even more crucial as evidence continues to demonstrate that when delivered well, aid can make a valuable difference to people’s lives.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- EU governments to demonstrate progress on European and international aid effectiveness targets by implementing the Accra Agenda for Action and Paris Declaration at the national level in consultation with developing countries;
- EU Member States to build on their experience from Paris and Accra to lead donor efforts to agree on concrete and time-bound commitments in Busan and to develop an ambitious post-Busan architecture and monitoring framework;
- Specific issues to be addressed include transparency, gender, (democratic) ownership, conditionality, accountability, untied aid, use of country systems, technical assistance, predictability, non-politically motivated aid, the division of labour and CSO enabling environment;
- all European policies to be coherent with development objectives, including in the crucial areas of trade, climate change, migration and food security.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- Constantly advocated for improvements in the quality of aid alongside the call for reaching aid quantity targets. The AidWatch Working Group wrote several policy briefings, position papers and reactions on aid effectiveness, always including analysis and specific asks or recommendations;
- the AidWatch report 2011 had a strong coverage of aid quality issues (focusing on democratic ownership, transparency and gender), as well as recommendations in the run up to the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan;
- AidWatch was well represented during the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, coordinating and informing the European CSO representatives and organising discussion meetings with the Commission, the MEP delegation, and various national delegations;
- beyond the national and European level, CONCORD was also engaged in the international aid effectiveness agenda, as an active member of the global CSO alliance “Better Aid” and of its Coordinating Group (BACG). Through the BACG, the CONCORD AidWatch working group was engaged in the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness of the OECD, as well as in the ‘Sherpa’ group responsible for the finalisation of the Busan Outcome Document. CONCORD contributed to the preparation of BetterAid position papers on various issues.
South Korea, Busan, December 2011 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness
New tendencies in EU-ACP relations after the Lisbon Treaty and in the framework of the modernisation of the EU development policy

The debate in the development scene was dominated by the EU decision to “modernise” its development policy. The new vision on development of the European Commission is the communication on the “Agenda for Change”, which came out in early 2011. In parallel, the implementation of institutional changes as set in the Lisbon Treaty took place. These evolutions had a clear impact on the work of the CONCORD Cotonou Working Group. Next to holding the potential for positive impact, the group also raised a number of questions and reflections on threats regarding EU development cooperation, the ACP-EU partnership, and ACP ownership.

In case of the institutional reform, the reference to the ACP group, in place since the 1992 Treaty of Maastricht, has not only been removed from the Lisbon Treaty but was left without proper follow up resources within the EEAS and DG DEVCO. All of this has a severe impact on the way political dialogue is and will be organised, on aid programming and on the future of the EU-ACP partnership.

The EU has committed to strengthen civil society’s role in development through several important agreements and statements, notably the CPA. However, in practice EU decision-making on development policy and aid programming continues leaving civil society actors feeling excluded and denying them their role as main interlocutors between governments and citizens, both in developing countries and in Europe. The different reviews undertaken this year offered an opportunity to assess the progress made and the bottlenecks in this regard.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- ensure that the eradication of poverty and inequality remains at the core of EU-ACP cooperation and that this is reflected in the governing framework; the fundamental principles and the spirit of the Cotonou agreement should be preserved; moreover, the EU puts the principles of equal partnership, democratic ownership and transparent dialogue into practice in future agreements with the ACP countries, joint regional strategies and EPA negotiations;
- the EU to turn the participation of civil society organisations and parliaments into reality and communicate with the latter in a transparent way, in due time, about the programmation of the 11th EDF. This must be done with consideration for the priorities of partner countries, and their populations while strengthening the capacities of civil society organisations to monitor public policies through the allocation of targeted and sufficient resources to national platforms;
- the 11th EDF to be negotiated in the framework of an effective global aid and development strategy that allows the ACP states to gradually free themselves from aid;
- the EU to ensure effective coherence of its policies in the framework reforms related to the Lisbon Treaty related reforms, and rethinks and amends its trade relations with ACP countries by taking into account their own development policy and poverty eradication objectives;
- the ACP governments to strengthen their solidarity in international negotiations as well as their commitment to regional integration processes in order to build dynamic economic and commercial spaces that allow the creation of value addition chains and decent employment for their populations;
WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- The Cotonou working group participated in the EU-ACP Joint Parliamentary Assemblies in Budapest (spring) and in Lomé (autumn): a lunch debate was organised with a view to exchange views with the parliamentarians; a stand ensured the dissemination of policy documents; an effort for capacity-building of the ACP civil society participants was undertaken. In Budapest the focus was on the new trends in EU-ACP relations, the Agenda for Change and the reforms due to the Lisbon Treaty were discussed. A capacity building was organized for the NGOs and partners present at the JPA as well as for the Hungarian Civil society. In Lomé advocacy focused on the importance of Policy Coherence for Development as reply to the new tendencies and the second report on PCD was launched;

- Policy and thematic briefings (in French and in English) have been updated, used for advocacy and capacity-building at the EU-ACP Joint Parliamentary Assemblies. These were briefings on budgetisation of the European Development Fund, policy coherence for development, climate change, the Africa-EU Strategy, the revision of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement, the Intra-ACP funds, gender, the mid-term review of the 10th EDF, food security, the new tendencies in EU-ACP relations;

- In October an international seminar was organised on the future of EU-ACP relations. Around fifty civil society organisations working on public policy and development issues from more than twenty ACP and EU countries met in Brussels in the framework of a week of activities around the central issue of the future of the EU-ACP relations in a changing environment, finishing with a joint declaration. Also discussed were programming, the implementation of the Cotonou Agreement as well as trade relations and political dialogue with officials of the European institutions as well as with the ACP secretariat present in Europe;

- Regular dialogue was held with the European institutions in particular the EEAS and DEVCO, but also with the European Parliament.

Joint Africa-EU Strategy: towards a people-centred partnership

In 2007 the European Union (EU) and the African Union developed a co-owned ‘strategy’ which would reflect the needs and aspirations of the peoples of Africa and Europe. The goal of this joint strategy was to develop a political vision and practical approaches for the future partnership between the EU and the African continent based on mutual respect, common interests and the principle of ownership. The strategy’s rolling three-year Action Plan focused on eight “partnerships”: Peace and Security; Democratic Governance and Human Rights; Trade, Regional Integration and Infrastructure; the MDGs; Energy; Climate change; Migration, Mobility and Employment; Science, Information Society and Space.

The Strategy states that, with a view to a people-centred partnership, an appropriate and prominent place needs to be defined in the institutional partnership for civil society and other non-state actors and Parliaments. On the operational level, the implementation of concrete activities and projects continues to rely almost exclusively on the European Commission’s initiative and expertise and on the European Development Fund (EDF) through its intra-ACP and regional envelopes. Consequently, the political dimension of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement (CPA) and the programming of the EDF tend to converge with the orientations and priorities set up in the Africa-EU Strategy.

Furthermore, the mandate of the 2010 revision of the Cotonou Agreement included provisions to adapt the agreement to the new reality in Africa and to the existence of the Africa-EU Strategy and the role of the African Union. In particular, the European Commission envision to reinforce the role of the AU as an actor in the Agreement with the risk of weakening the ACP/EU institutions and the EU-ACP political dialogue while upgrading the political role of and dialogue with regional (Africa, Caribbean and Pacific) and sub-regional institutions.
The institutional architecture and implementation both offers opportunities and raises challenges for the engagement of civil society, in particular with the establishment of joint EU-AU experts’ groups (JEGs) on the each partnership, to which civil society organisations (CSOs) would be invited to participate.

**WHAT CONCORD WANTS**

- the Africa-EU Strategy priorities not to weaken the principles and values promoted in the CPA;
- the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly to be regularly informed on the process in implementation of the strategy;
- Space to be given for parliamentary and citizens engagement and scrutiny in the implementation of the Strategy and the Action Plan. The capacities of the CSO, particularly in Africa, should be reinforced;
- more involvement of African regional organisations and Sub-Saharan in the strategy and in the work of the informal JEGs to be ensured;
- labour between Africa and the EU, and between the 2 Commissions and Member States to be better divided;
- the implementation of the Strategy not to rely on the EDF only but on adequate and additional funding;
- an in-depth dialogue between Africa and the EU to be rooted in mutual accountability and respect, concerning objectives like good governance, promotion of all human rights and transparency on both continents;
- Policy dialogue between the EU and AU to be the main objective of the strategy; the Joint Africa EU Strategy should be conducive to policy coherence for development.

---

**WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE**

- The political approach of CONCORD is based on its experience and analysis about the implementation of the Strategy. CONCORD remained the official civil society representative organisation in the EU Implementation Teams and the Joint expert Groups for the partnership on the MDGs and on Trade, Infrastructure and Regional integration;
- Several members of CONCORD were actively involved and contributed to the cross-sector civil society Steering Group monitoring the implementation of the Strategy. The Steering Group is the main interlocutor of EU institutions on the JAES and maintain a regular dialogue with DG DEVCO and the EEAS on the implementation of the strategy and the participation of civil society. The Steering Group also interacts directly with the African CS Steering Group and the African Union Economic and Social Committee.

---

**HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis**

In 2001, for the very first time, world leaders acknowledged that HIV&AIDS is not just a health issue but a “global emergency and one of the most formidable challenges to human life and dignity” (UN General Assembly Special Session (UNGASS) on HIV&AIDS). One year earlier, they made HIV/AIDS part of the Millennium goal 6 to make progress in the fight of deadly diseases by 2015. In 2006, the UN Member States committed to achieve universal access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support by 2010. The 2011 UN General Assembly High Level Meeting on AIDS reviewed progress and adopted a new Political Declaration that includes new commitments and bold new targets which will create momentum in the AIDS response.

The European Commission and EU Member States worked together at the High-Level Meeting to
ensure that the Political Declaration reaffirmed the full realisation of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all as an essential element in the global response to the HIV epidemic, including in the areas of prevention, treatment, care and support. By signing the Political Declaration, the EU and its Member States also committed to “redouble efforts to achieve, by 2015, universal access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support as a critical step towards ending the global HIV epidemic.”

Collectively, the European Commission and the EU Member States have contributed substantial financial resources to the global AIDS response in the last decade. The EU is the largest donor to the Global Fund, having provided 52% of its resources from 2002 to 2010. The Commission alone contributed slightly over $1.2 billion (€882 million) from 2002 to 2010 and should meet $1.3 billion (€956 million) by 2013. With the adoption of the European Consensus on Development the AIDS response became an objective in its own right and one of five cross-cutting areas to be mainstreamed into all EU development policies. The EU defined its role in the HIV response in a comprehensive framework, the ‘European Programme for Action to Confront HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis through External Action 2007–2011’ (PfA) which has now come to an end. In its conclusions adopted in November 2009 on Progress on the PfA, the Council invited the Commission to initiate a broad consultative process with Member States and other stakeholders for the preparation of a geographically comprehensive PfA for 2012 and beyond based on an assessment learnt from EU action’. In its statement for World AIDS Day 2010, the EU stated that it will initiate the abovementioned process for the preparation of a new Programme of Action. However, since then, nothing has been undertaken and the European Commission has indicated on World AIDS Day 2011 that it will prepare a programme for action on global health in the course of 2012, which will tackle the three diseases along with other health priorities.

**WHAT CONCORD WANTS**

EU should scale up political and financial commitment for sustainable impact on HIV/AIDS, Malaria and TB by:

- ensuring EU member states realise their 0.7% ODA contribution with 0.1% earmarked for health;
- developing a renewed and updated strategy and operational plan on HIV and AIDS in external action aimed at honouring the commitments on HIV and human rights it made when signing the Political Declaration on HIV and AIDS;
- prioritising support for human rights-based HIV programming. It should consolidate technical coordination between the different aid instruments, including through long-term investment to support the capacity development of non-governmental organisations working to serve the needs of vulnerable and marginalised populations. It should also demand accountability and sensitivity from the health sector;
- strengthening political and financial support for research and development for new preventive technologies;

EU should promote effective country responses by:

- working with partner countries to develop and support implementation of country-led strategies to confront the 3 diseases with meaningful engagement of civil society;
- supporting the strengthening of health and social protection systems and solving the crisis of human resources for health through contributing to better alignment of financing mechanisms with other donors and by promoting adequate fiscal space for social sectors;
- involving people living with, most at risk for, and affected by the three diseases in the design, implementation and monitoring of programmes & services.
Develop effective division of labour and partnerships to confront the diseases through:
- pursuing greater policy coherence to meaningfully contribute to the realisation of the right to health. In particular, the EU should not impose any provisions in free trade agreements with third countries that limit access to essential medicines;
- putting more emphasis on managing for results and mutual accountability in the division of labour between donors and making optimal use of available health expertise within European Member States and EU Delegations;
- supporting and facilitating dialogue between partner country governments and civil society at the country level on the development and implementation of comprehensive and evidence-based national health strategies, which promote gender equality, human rights and the needs of vulnerable and marginalised populations;
- the European External Action Service making full use of its potential to become a progressive force for advancing human rights within the EU’s HIV response at global and country levels. Notably, it should engage more EU delegations in a policy dialogue with national governments and in the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Country Co-ordinating Mechanisms (CCMs).

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE
- advocated for the renewal of the European Programme for Action to Confront HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria through External Action Beyond 2012;
- influenced the EU positioning at the 2011 UN High Level Meeting on AIDS and the outcomes of the Political Declaration;
- provided significant input to the EU Statement for World AIDS Day 2011 which placed human rights at the centre of EU approaches to HIV/AIDS and called for the continuation of EU work, the reinforcement of effective high-quality interventions and closing the existing gaps in all fields;
- gave input in several policy processes, among which the EC consultation on the future of EU budget support and on the future EU research framework “Horizon 2020’, the EU position for the High Level Meeting on AIDS;
- raised several parliamentary questions to the European Commission and the Council on the EU commitment towards MDG 6, notably at the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly and on World AIDS Day.
**Neighbourhood and pre-accession**

The EU devotes 45% of its external action budget to its neighbourhood and countries of the Western Balkans and Turkey. With the 2011 revolutions of the Arab Spring and renewed interest in the Eastern Partnership during the Polish Presidency of the EU, increased attention has been directed towards this region of the world. CONCORD works to influence policies in the regions from a development perspective and advocates for the empowerment of civil society in the regions through its working group on Enlargement, Pre-Accession and Neighbourhood (EPAN).

**WHAT CONCORD WANTS**

- the EU regional initiatives in the neighbourhood such as the Union for the Mediterranean and the Eastern Partnership to contribute to the sustainable development of the region with civil society playing a key role;

- the EU to engage European and local civil society as central actors in the European policies that affect the regions’ development;

- civil society within Europe and around its borders to work together to improve European policies that affect the development of countries in the region, through coordinated advocacy and lobbying activities.

**WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE**

- responded to the situation in North Africa with a statement in March 2011 and continued to monitor EU policy that affects the region. The group contributed to a consultation on the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) in the same month;

- wrote position papers on the Neighbourhood policy following the European Communication in May 2011, and on current and future plans for the EU’s Pre-Accession Policy, and disseminated them;

- met twice in 2011, and joined efforts with the Polish platform to organise a seminar on democracy and development in November. Speakers from the EEAS and EC shared information about the new European Endowment for Democracy and the Neighbourhood civil society facility, joined by representatives of NGOs and think tanks who shared their views on the extent to which democracy has been supported by EU development policies;

- was happy to see that the past years of lobbying had paid off and the European Commission launched the neighbourhood civil society facility;

- joined forces with CONCORD’s working group on FDR to produce a statement on the neighbourhood civil society forum, which was responded to personally by Commissioner Štefan Füle;

- participated in the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum, the Black Sea Forum and other international fora to communicate CONCORD positions and share experiences and ideas.
1.1.2. INFLUENCING EXTERNAL AND DOMESTIC POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Policy Coherence for Development: a renewed mobilisation in 2011

Coherence is about ensuring that the external impacts of other – internal and external – policies of the European Union (EU) do not undermine the aims and objectives of EU development co-operation. There is no point in the EU pursuing policies that have a particular goal if it also pursues policies which contradict that goal. Improved coherence is also very important for ensuring the effective use of Community resources and good governance, as well as for the credibility of the EU in general.

The principle of coherence is supported by successive treaties of the European Union since 1993 as well as by the European Consensus on Development. Development co-operation alone cannot meet the needs of developing countries. In recognition of this, in 2005, the EU identified Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) as a key concept in achieving poverty eradication and advancing the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Since 2005, both the European Commission and the Member States have made important commitments for improving the coherence of national and EU policies. However, despite increasing awareness of the potentially harmful external impact of some European policies on people in developing countries, these policies are all too often inconsistent with the EU’s broader and longer-term economic, social and political interests in the world. Doing no harm at home might be in conflict with development prospects abroad. Doing some good at home will not be enough to prevent the – perhaps unintended – counterproductive effects of domestic policies on development efforts in developing countries.


WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- to make PCD a reality, stronger political will from the highest governance level in the EU and the Member States is urgently needed. Commission President Barroso must walk the Lisbon talk, as guardian of the EU treaties;
- PCD to entail the active co-ordination and moulding of policymaking processes with the aim of identifying and prioritizing synergies between EU policies that are likely to have a positive impact on sustainable development and Human Rights;
- pro-poor and sustainable development policies to prevail over short-term, narrow or elite European interests. International development is in the EU’s interest;
- policy-making processes to be transparent and accountable. PCD provides opportunities to
strengthen participative, responsive and transparent policy making as well as accountability for policy-making and policy impact. Accountability is towards EU tax-payers (for the spending of public money in incoherent policies) and towards partner developing countries;

- existing tools and new mechanisms to be developed and a budget allocated for their implementation. In particular, more systematic ex-ante and ex-post assessments, monitoring and complaints mechanisms should be put in place. More evidence-based PCD is needed to ensure that policy-making must be more rooted in the reality of the (intended and unintended) impacts of EU policies;

- the voices of individuals and their representative organisations affected by EU policies in developing countries to be heard with the view to correct harmful and incoherent policies as a matter of accountability;

- the EU institutions and the EU Member States to work together to raise awareness, strengthen their capacities and use more effective and ambitious PCD mechanisms;

- the European External Action Service to implement the PCD principle, and notably play a role in monitoring the impact of EU policies in developing countries.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- issued the second Spotlight report in November 2011, after an intensive period of preparation by a group of members involved in different CONCORD thematic working groups in cooperation with other specialised CSO networks. In this context, notably, a preparatory workshop on human security was organised jointly with EPLO in Stockholm in April 2011;

- presented the report in Brussels to the public and media, with the contribution of Members of the European Parliament and the Commission representatives as speakers. Events were also organised in Sweden, Finland, Poland and Denmark where the report was disseminated;

- PCD and the Spotlight report were also the central focus of CONCORD’s lunch-debate organised at the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly meeting in Lomé, Togo in November. Again, PCD was an aspect of the CONCORD seminar at the 2011 European Development Days in December, in Warsaw, Poland, focusing on the post-2015 development framework;

- the full report was translated into French, Estonian and Spanish, and the executive summary also into German, Swedish and Czech. PCD country profiles were provided for Belgium, the Czech Republic and Sweden;

- PCD was a cornerstone of the approach of CONCORD in major policy documents produced this year such as our reaction to the Agenda for Change, the setting up of the European External Action Service, the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy. CONCORD also contributed with remarks to the OECD consultation on the future OECD Development Strategy, focusing on PCD.
PCD Spotlight report launch, Brussels, November 2011 - from the left Laura Sullivan (ActionAid), Leonard Mizzi (EC), Laust Gregersen (Concord Denmark), Rilli Lappalainen (Concord Board-Kehys)

PCD Spotlight report launch, Brussels, November 2011 - MEP Birgit Schnieber-Jastram PCD Special Rapporteur and Olivier Consolo Director of Concord
Trade and Development: Focussing on the Need?

While organising an online consultation on trade and development in preparation of a Communication on this issue, the EU Commission surprised with its proposals to remove trade preferences from about fifty developing countries and to end preferential market access for ACP countries that have not begun to ratify EPAs by the end of 2013.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- CONCORD finds that the Commission’s proposal for a reform of the Generalised System of Preferences (GSP) does not “focus on the need”. Using the income criterion only is not a good way to identify need or competitiveness. Taking away preferences from countries is not a good way to help poor countries. Studies show that the poor will benefit the least from the proposed reform;

- GSP must remain accessible to all developing countries. No developing country whether classified as low, high or middle income should be excluded automatically from the GSP. The current GSP already contains a sectoral graduation mechanism that provides for an instrument to ensure that countries with high competitiveness in one or several sectors do not continue to enjoy trade preferences for sectors where they are no longer required. This graduation mechanism could be improved further;

- if countries are to be removed from the GSP scheme then the income criterion should at least be combined with other criteria. Vulnerable upper middle income countries should not be removed. Adequate transition periods for the phasing out of preferences for graduating countries must be included in the scheme to reduce the negative impact of graduation;

- countries in regions that consist mainly of LDCs should receive the same treatment as the LDCs (i.e. EBA) in order to support regional integration efforts;

- The monitoring of the compliance with human rights, labour and environmental conventions must be enhanced for both the general and the incentive (GSP+) arrangement. Transparency and submissions from third parties like civil society and trade unions must be part of the formal monitoring process;

- ACP countries must not be put under pressure to conclude EPAs. The market access offered under Market Access Regulation 1528 must be maintained as long as negotiations continue.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- included remarks, analysis, and recommendations on trade and development issues in its policy reactions to institutional documents;

- the Trade Reference group organised a seminar on the GSP in April and formulated preliminary and comprehensive recommendations, including proposals for amendments to the draft regulations to the Development and Trade Committee of the European Parliament. It also participated in consultations organised by the European Commission;

- submitted a contribution to the online consultation on trade and development;

- actively worked on the issues within the CONCORD CAP task force with manifold inputs on specific agricultural trade aspects that became part of CAP related letters, position papers, meetings, etc.;

- contributed to the trade assessment of the PCD report by the EU Commission.
The impact of policies on global Food Security

Feeding the world is more a political than a technical problem. It is poverty rather than food shortages that are keeping close to one billion people hungry. The solution starts therefore with increasing the purchasing power of the hungry, 80% of whom are engaged in farming activities. Thus the key question leaders must answer is not how to produce more food to meet tomorrow’s demands from a growing world population, but: who will produce more food? Another vital question is how to produce more responsibly given the global environmental challenges of climate change and the preservation of natural resources. Key to both answers are smallholder farmers. And supporting smallholder farmers to produce food sustainably and sell it at remunerative price is also central to building viable local economies in developing countries.

In 2011, the reform process of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) towards 2013 has continued, offering opportunities to question its negative impact on developing countries’ agriculture and food security.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- EU aid to agriculture to be targeted at smallholder farmers who are the most at risk;
- EU to ensure and monitor that the UN Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land is respected across all relevant policies;
- EU to assess the impacts of the Facility on developing countries and determine whether it is an appropriate response to the challenge of global food insecurity;
- EU Aid to not only be used for buying seeds and fertilizers because this would not promote sustainable agriculture or long-term solutions to the crisis;
- EU to collaborate to improve governance, transparency and oversight of global food markets at both international and domestic level;
- EU to collaborate to bolster the global food reserve system by establishing buffer stocks on local, national and regional level. These buffer stocks must target public procurement from smallholder and women farmers, they can help to support small-scale agriculture.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- actively engaged in the preparation of the civil society Forum ahead of the 37th session of the CFS in Rome (October); members of the European Food Security Group met with the DG Development in Brussels and in Rome with the EU delegation to the CFS, to influence the EU position on the issues of price volatility, investment in land, etc. Meanwhile, the EFSG supported the newly created Civil Society Mechanism for relations with the CFS, by organising the meetings of the Western European branch and reaching out to interested.

- EU to collaborate to improve governance, transparency and oversight of global food markets at both international and domestic level;
- EU to collaborate to bolster the global food reserve system by establishing buffer stocks on local, national and regional level. These buffer stocks must target public procurement from smallholder and women farmers, they can help to support small-scale agriculture.

EU aid to agriculture & the reformed global governance

The decision to reform the FAO’s Committee on World Food Security (CFS) to transform it into an inclusive, authoritative global forum deliberating on food issues with the mission of ensuring the global right to food is an important step. It is essential that the EU makes every effort to defend this new and still fragile policy space. In this respect, the EU should especially support the autonomous Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) and consult with its own civil society in determining the positions it takes in the CFS.

The 37th session of the FAO Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in October 2011, was the first one to take place under the reformed regime.
80% of the world’s hungry are engaged in farming activities
Migration and development

Although the EU adopted a consolidated Global Approach to Migration in 2005 which takes account of development, its levels of competence in the areas of migration policy and development policy are different; as are the objectives of these policy areas. Moreover, EU Member States also have their own historical privileged or preferred relations with third countries, generating parallel bilateral agreements. This complex institutional situation is conducive to a lack of coherence of European (EU and national) policies vis-à-vis the development objectives set in the EU Treaties.

The European Union claims that it aims to minimise the negative effects of migration for the benefit of both recipient countries and the migrants’ countries of origin and to make migration a positive factor for development through the promotion of concrete measures aimed at reinforcing its contribution to poverty reduction. However, the debate on migration and development in the EU is more oriented towards preventing migration to Europe and creating incentives for countries of origin to manage and control migration than towards extending to third countries’ nationals the freedom of movement.

‘Making migration work for development’ is one of the five ‘global challenges’ retained by the European Commission in its Work Programme for PCD for the period 2010-2013.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- EU to adopt a systematic human rights-based approach in migration policies, founded in the international human rights framework. Thus, EU Member States must ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of Migrant Workers & Families;

- EU to end conditionalities to EU aid related to migration flow control. It should mainstream migration into its development strategies and programmes and support developing countries’ strategies to retain highly skilled workers, e.g. through development programmes aimed at improving local employment opportunities and decent working conditions;

- the level of flexibility and ethics in labour migration policies and practices to be improved by facilitating real mobility for both highly and low-skilled migrant workers, through flexible residency and extension of the possibilities of multi-entry visas; the recognition of foreign qualifications of migrants; binding measures for the effective ethical recruitment of migrant workers in social sectors in order to minimize the risk of brain drain, in particular in the health sector;

- migrants’ integration in European host societies plays a fundamental role in the creation of cohesive social environments that can prepare the ground for sustainable co-development. EU policies must better address the linkages between migrants’ social inclusion, non discrimination and integration strategies for the benefit of the countries of destination and countries of origin.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- continued its regular dialogue with the pan-European network EU-NOMAD and other CSOs through active involvement in the newly created cross-European networks CSO contact group on migration and development;

- the ‘ad hoc’ group on migration and development in CONCORD participated in the stakeholders conference organised jointly by DG Development Cooperation and DG Home Affairs in April, and then submitted a contribution to the DG Development Cooperation Discussion Paper on Migration and Development as part of the review of the Global Approach to Migration. This group and EUNOMAD also prepared the migration chapter of CONCORD’s Spotlight report on PCD 2011.
**Human Security**

The security and development agenda materialised at EU level with the Council Conclusions on Security and Development and again on EU response to situations of fragility in 2007. They stem from the recognition that “there cannot be sustainable development without peace and security; and that without development and poverty eradication, there will be no sustainable peace”. However, since then, there has been little progress to put this nexus in practice, while global military spending is on the rise and four EU Member States are on the top ten list of the biggest military spenders.

The EEAS was introduced to help conduct and coordinate the EU’s foreign affairs and security policy. At the same time, the EEAS will be closely involved in aid programming.

**WHAT CONCORD WANTS:**

- The EU to adopt rights-based foreign policies and fair and mutually beneficial cooperation with third countries, with human security and justice considered as basic entitlements, and in compliance with the obligation of Policy Coherence for Development;

- EU aid to be based on needs and not driven by regional and global security concerns. There should also be no further erosion of the civilian character of development cooperation and ODA;

- All EU external policies to be conflict-sensitive and adopt a holistic human security concept. Guidelines and monitoring mechanisms should also be established for all public and private investment in developing countries, and in conflict-prone countries in particular;

- Conflict prevention to become central to EEAS interventions;

- The enforcement of EU policy on control of exports of military technology and equipment to be reinforced and the EU should push for legally binding international standards for the import, exports and transfers of conventional weapons.

**WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE**

- Human security was identified as a thematic priority for CONCORD work on Policy Coherence for Development for the period 2011-2012. A workshop was organised in Sweden in April, bringing together CONCORD members and the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office. The workshop helped strengthen the capacity of Swedish and European CSOs to analyse EU foreign and security policies within the framework of PCD and identify the key issues for the human security chapter;

- A smaller group of people involved in the workshop prepared the human security chapter of the Spotlight report on PCD 2011.

**Natural Resources Management**

The EU is one of the actors pursuing aggressive strategies to access resources. Europe is highly reliant on the import of this resource base on which to build its growth and wellbeing. This dependency forms the basis for significant interaction and trade with developing countries and poses both opportunities and challenges in terms of Policy Coherence for Development (PCD).

On the one hand, the EU encourages monetisation and free trade of natural resources. On the other, it recognises the need for this to go in tandem with the abilities of countries to realise their people’s rights through adequate transparency, right to information and ultimately rights to food, land, and other natural resources.
WHAT CONCORD WANTS:

- EU to revise its 10% target in the Renewable Energy Directive;
- EU to ensure that policies that assist in driving global trends such as the grabbing of land and water, include strong sustainability criteria that cover both social and environmental aspects equally comprehensively;
- EU to encourage the value-added process of raw materials and natural resources in developing countries;
- instead of promoting the unilateral Raw Materials Initiative as it is today, the EU should support a transparent international process for the world community. The aim should be to address how to cooperate in managing raw materials in order to reduce global over-consumption and transfer knowledge on the sustainable management of resources.

1.1.3. PROACTIVELY DEVELOP AN AGENDA FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION

2011 built on many policy discussions that began in 2010 – discussions and issues that collectively are shaping a new way of looking at development:

a) In 2010, the Commission had launched a number of consultations, including the Green Paper on Development Policy in support of Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development – increasing the impact of EU development cooperation. This consultation process has resulted in the so-called Communication on the Agenda for Change CONCORD submitted a response to this consultation and was positive on the outcome but continued to follow more detailed negotiations.

b) The review of the Common Agricultural Policy, and the implications for developing countries;

c) 2011 saw the conclusion of the Structured Dialogue process. Work is still being undertaken on the follow-up to this process;

d) CONCORD did not formally submit a response to the consultation on budget support (but its members did). However, since the consultation CONCORD has drafted a position so that it could respond to the communication.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- the work on Natural Resources Management was identified in 2011 as a key and cross-cutting PCD issue; chapter 3 of the Spotlight report was devoted to this issue and entitled Natural Resources – the right to enjoy and benefit from natural resources;

- CONCORD members agreed that within the topic of Natural Resources Management - Raw Materials should become a bigger priority in CONCORD’s work, and have prepared the ground for a more structured approach to be developed in 2012.
These discussions have taken place in a very difficult context in 2011. Many national governments have been feeling the impacts of the financial/economic crisis and have had to implement budget cuts in their own countries. The value-added of the EU has been questioned and a number of member states did not have strong leadership or they have had very conservative leadership.

**WHAT CONCORD WANTS:**

- CONCORD welcomed the strong commitment in the Agenda for Change to eradicate poverty, the focus on coordinated EU action at country level and the prominent focus on governance and human rights. Moreover, the Agenda for Change is much more nuanced and broad in its approach to Development then the Green Paper presented by the EC in 2010.

- the Agenda for Change should set the new agenda needed to revitalise Europe’s global influence on poverty eradication. The EU should recognise that growth in unregulated markets does not always translate into inclusive growth without specific policy interventions. Therefore the Agenda for Change should emphasise and support peoples’ ability and right to choose and influence their development path rather than presenting a growth model. A focus on economic growth and a reliance on ‘trickle down’ effects of private sector development alone, without full consideration of environmental impacts and resource constraints, will serve to deliver unsustainable development and will fail to reduce inequality;

- the EC must acknowledge that Europe’s global role is also driven by offensive self-interest e.g. in the ACP trade negotiations and the new raw material policy. Policy coherence is therefore not an “add-on” – but a “way of working”, which must be in the absolute centre of Europe’s development policy objectives. Poverty eradication and Policy coherence are closely linked, as stated in article 208 in the Lisbon treaty. “Our Agenda for Change” must therefore include a strong focus on division of labour with the EC being the driver of Policy Coherence for Development in Europe and among member states;

- the Agenda for Change lacks focus and concrete commitments. The strategy does not outline how it will be implemented and how it will inform and be coherent with the existing work of institutions charged with delivering European development policy and practice. Furthermore, the strategy does not outline how new approaches, such as differentiation, working with the private sector etc will keep Europe focussed on the core aim of poverty reduction. These new approaches should not be implemented without strong evidence that they deliver poverty reduction. Otherwise, Europe is moving away from the commitments it has made to the world’s poor.

**WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE**

- mobilised its members to respond to the consultation on the Agenda for Change;

- worked closely with Commissioner Piebalgs’ cabinet on a range of issues, focussing on policy coherence for development, ‘inclusiveness’, the need for the Agenda for Change to be people-focussed and taking a human rights-based approach;

- participated as a presenter in the stakeholders meeting at which the Commissioner presented the Agenda for Change. Many CONCORD members attended, and CONCORD participation dominated the meeting;

- held a number of discussions with the Working Party on Development, with the Development Committee of the European Parliament, and at Member State level (through our National Platforms, and through Permanent Representations in Brussels);

- welcomed Commissioner Piebalgs to a Policy Forum meeting for him to present the outcomes of the consultation to the members.
The Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) will define the EU budget from 2014 to 2020. This exercise is of particular importance as it will lock in the EU main policy priorities for 7 years. All aspects of the EU budget are up for negotiation. It is not only the EU budget and the instruments to implement it that are at stake but more broadly the EU integration process and ambitions and the future role of EU in a variety of policy areas including foreign policy, development and climate change. The MFF will thus shape the future of EU development assistance and the credibility of the EU as a major player in international development.

In June 2011, the EC published its general proposal for the 2014-2020 EU Budget. In December 2011 it published its proposal regarding the future funding instruments for external action. The EC proposals (for the general budget and the funding instruments) are now up to negotiation with the Member States and the European Parliament until end of 2013. The new MFF should enter into force on 1 January 2014.

**WHAT CONCORD WANTS:**

- the EC proposes to increase the EU budget to €96 billion for external action in 2014-2020 and this would see additional funds going to poverty programmes. Member States and the European Parliament must support the EC’s proposals on budget allocations for development during the MFF negotiations. We must ensure that in the next MFF sufficient resources are allocated to enable Europe to meet its international commitments, including the MDGs and the 0.7% of GNI target for ODA;

- the poverty eradication is the main objective of development. The focus on economic growth should not threaten aid to the world’s poorest and the support to social sectors such as health and education;

- 19 Upper Middle Income Countries in Asia and Latin America are set to lose out on EU funding in the next MFF. CONCORD asks the EC to ensure that aid is focused on the poorest people and the sectors most in need in the world. An over-reliance on macro-economic data averaged at the national level hides the reality of poverty and inequality within countries. Aid should not be instrumentalised for EU strategic interests;

- increases in funding are set for civil society organisations (CSOs) in the future EU development budget. The EC proposals recognise that civil society organisations are independent actors in their own right. All institutional actors must recognise that CSOs are key to democratisation and fostering good governance in developing countries while playing a key role in enabling poor populations to defend their rights;

- climate funding could double or even triple from current levels, to between €1 and 2 billion annually. This could be a major breakthrough. But the EU will have to clarify that this money will be additional to development expenditures and make sure that a better balance is struck between mitigation efforts and currently under-funded adaptation support to poor communities affected by climate change.
Beyond 2015

Campaigning for a global development framework after the Millennium Development Goals

The CONCORD 2009 – 2015 strategy sets out its overall objectives in relation to a post-2015 global development framework: “A CONCORD manifesto, strategy and vision for shaping the development agenda beyond 2015, agreed by the General Assembly as being of high quality”.

On the international level, the UN will lead a process of national, regional and global consultations from 2012, under the auspices of a UN Task Team and a High Level Panel (due to be established after Rio + 20 in June 2012). The Rio + 20 Summit and the 2013 MDG Summit will be defining moments for the post-2015 process, and it is thus important that Concord members effectively engage with both processes in order to influence the debate.

On the European level, a European political position will be influenced by the 2013 European Report on Development.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS:

- a post-2015 global framework aimed at both developed and developing countries, and adapted to the roles and responsibilities of each one;

- a comprehensive global framework for the post-2015 period, which not only addresses those crucial policy areas such as development, human rights, trade, finance, security, energy, agriculture, environment, consumption and production patterns, but also the inter-linkages between them;

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- put in place a MFF taskforce, composed of members of several working groups and representatives of national platforms. This taskforce closely follows the negotiations on the MFF and produces the main CONCORD positions on the issue, mainly regarding development and external action;

- produced in 2011 several papers and positions on the MFF: Principles Paper on the EU MFF 2014-2020 (January); Toolkit for national platforms on the MFF (April), 4 pager: CONCORD general position on the MFF (July); Preliminary recommendations on funding instruments in the 2014-2020 MFF (Sept);

- issued press releases on the MFF (June and December) following the publication of the EC proposals on the EU Budget and the future external action instruments. CONCORD press releases were featured in key international and European newswires, reported in different languages across the world and widely shared in the EU institutions;

- sent a letter to the College of Commissioners on CONCORD 4 deliverables for development policy in the MFF negotiations (February). CONCORD also sent a template letter to its national platforms so they could contact their governments in view of the General Affairs Council in November.

- met with many key institutional players from the European Commission, the European Parliament, the Council and the External Action Service.
- a process for the formulation of a post-2015 framework which is open, inclusive, participatory and responsive to the people most affected by poverty and injustice;
- improved policy coherence of the Union’s internal and external policies and used as springboard and catalyst for the post-MDG era;
- ensure that European civil society reaches a common European position on the post-2015 framework in 2012.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE
- agreed to host the International Secretariat of the Beyond 2015 campaign;
- organised detailed discussions on the post-2015 framework during the 2011 General Assembly and Policy Forum meeting in June;
- created a Beyond 2015 European hub, which aims to create a European civil society position on a post-2015 development framework in 2012;
- organised a panel on the post-2015 framework at the European Development Days in Warsaw in December 2011;
- CONCORD members in Finland and Denmark organised Beyond 2015 discussions with national civil society as well as politicians;
- met with the team leading on the European Report on Development 2013;
- CONCORD members CIDSE and Bond organised detailed discussions on Beyond 2015 at the World Social Forum in Dakar, leading to the campaign’s Essential Must Haves;
- made a presentation at the Informal Council of Ministers;
- participated in the Review Summit.

AIM 2: CONCORD AND CIVIL SOCIETY

As in 2010, 2011 has not been easy for NGOs and Civil Society Organisations as development actors. The space for civil society has been shrinking in many countries and the gap between political commitments and reality has increased. Several EU member states have drastically cut funding to NGDOs but legal and regulatory requirements are increasing. International solidarity has come under pressure and tendencies to instrumentalise development – and development actors – for other aims continue to be a major threat.

CONCORD’s efforts to respond to these challenges have mainly focused on:
- Actively engaging and coordinating civil society participation in the Structured Dialogue (Quadrilogue) process with EU institutions on the involvement of CSOs and Local Authorities in EC development cooperation. This process concluded in 2011;
- Leading the European process of the Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness and hosting its global secretariat. CONCORD members actively participated in discussions in the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan;
- Piloting European NGO’s vision and ambitions in the field of Development Education and Awareness raising.

Direct and indirect outcomes of this endeavour include many concrete proposals for EU institutions to improve ways of working with CSOs, the Istanbul Principles on CSO Development Effectiveness, the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, and a pan-European study on Development Education and Awareness Raising published by a multi-stakeholder group.
1.2.1. ENABLE NGOS IN EUROPE TO INFORM, EDUCATE, ENGAGE, AND MOBILISE EUROPEAN CITIZENS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY

Development Education and awareness rising

Development education is an active learning process, based on the values of solidarity, equality, inclusion and co-operation. It enables people to move on from simply being aware of international development issues and sustainable human development to personal involvement and informed action, thanks to a better understanding of the causes and effects of world problems.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS:

- CONCORD’s Development Awareness Raising and Education (DARE) Forum, with the support of DEEEP (Developing Europeans’ Engagement for the Eradication of Global Poverty) aims at putting Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR) - and its relevance in facing current and future global challenges - high on the European political agenda;

- to achieve that, it strives to strengthen the capacities of NGDOs to raise awareness, educate and mobilise the European public for worldwide poverty eradication and social inclusion.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

Strengthen Development Education awareness towards European Institutions:

- as part of the Structured Dialogue, the European Commission published in 2011 the “DEAR Study”, a comprehensive reflection on the role and added value of development education, including a set of recommendations to improve EC practice in this field. DEAR is also prominently mentioned in the Structured Dialogue conclusions, and some of the DEAR study recommendations are already implemented. CONCORD contributed intensively to this process, and many concerns of the confederation are reflected in the recommendations;

- the first European Parliament hearing on Development Education, including a keynote speech of Commissioner Piebalgs and two CONCORD speakers further increased the momentum towards more ambitious DEAR policies;

- members of the European Development Education Multistakeholder Process, co-chaired by CONCORD, adopted new Terms for Reference for a new mandate until 2013 in order to strengthen information sharing and political recognition of DEAR.

Strengthen DEAR within Civil Society:

- the CONCORD DARE Forum launched a position paper “Development needs Citizens”, outlining the role of DEAR and citizen participation in the development discourse;

- a series of seminars and events stimulated debate and reinforced CONCORD members’ capacities in the field of DEAR. These include: the Development Education Summer School on “Quality and Impact”, including an international conference, a seminar on “values and frames” in engaging with the public, a seminar on “Building Global Civil Society”, an academic panel at the EADI general conference, a conference on DEAR and formal education and a contribution to the CONCORD panel on “Beyond 2015” at the European Development Days.
1.2.2. DEFENDING AND PROMOTING THE RIGHTS, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CIVIL SOCIETY AT LOCAL, NATIONAL, EUROPEAN AND GLOBAL LEVELS

Accra Agenda for Action rising

The Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (BPEDC) was agreed in December 2011 by donors, partner countries, South-South cooperators, private sector as well as by civil society organisations at the fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, South Korea. Civil Society Organisations were more present in these discussions than ever before and even had a negotiator, a so-called sherpa, at the table.

From the perspective of CONCORD the BPEDC contains a number of important commitments geared towards strengthening the political space and capacities of CSOs to contribute to development processes.

The BPEDC recognises that the “Civil society organisations (CSOs) play a vital role in enabling people to claim their rights, in promoting a rights-based approach, in shaping development policies and partnerships, and in overseeing their implementation. They also provide services in areas that are complementary to those provided by states”. Moreover, the BPEDC specially refers to ensuring the enabling environment to maximise the contributions of the CSOs to development as well as encourages the CSOs in the implementation of the Istanbul Principles and the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS:

- to use the BPEDC as a political tool in the engagement with the European Institutions;
- paragraph 22 of the BPEDC to be respected and the EU to show concrete leadership in its implementation;
- EU donors and governments, including the European Institutions, to provide enabling environments for CSO;
- CONCORD members to address their effectiveness individually and collectively in line with the Istanbul Principles and International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- it was involved in the organisation of 5 Open Forum country consultations in Europe, including Ireland, Luxembourg, France, Norway and Italy. The involvement ranged from providing guidance and inputs in the preparation process, to channeling funding from the Open Forum pooled fund to local organisers, to facilitating information exchange between Open Forum stakeholders, to direct participation in the actual consultation;
- organised an Open Forum regional consultation for Europe, to provide a regional perspective for the Open Forum process and take stock of achievements to date. The consultation was attended by more than 60 CSO representatives from across Europe;
- prepared a summary report of the results of all European Open Forum consultations;
- actively participated in the Open Forum Global Assembly end June in Siem Reap, Cambodia;
- mobilised its members in the run-up to Busan for the Busan Civil Society Forum and HLF4. In Busan CONCORD organised a European caucus meeting, coordinated the European positions and fed into the BetterAid process. The Secretariat also informed its members about the latest developments in Busan, shared intelligence and strategised for members to advocate with their respective government representatives;
- continued to host the Secretariat of the Open Forum in 2011.
Tax issue

Since the coming into force of the current Financial Perspectives 2007-2013, within the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) and the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), taxes including VAT were considered as ineligible project costs by the EC. The non-eligibility of taxes effectively means that EC grant beneficiaries unable to negotiate full tax exemptions in-country (in Europe and in partner country) were faced with paying these taxes themselves (in addition to the already high co-financing share), with core funding or with funding from other donors.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS
- in the current Financial Perspectives 2007-2013, the amendments regarding taxes, proposed by the EC under the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the instruments, needed to be approved by the European Parliament and the Council. This vote took place on 1 December 2011. This will allow now taxes to be eligible if the grant beneficiary can prove that there was no possibility of tax exemption or refund in the country where operating;
- ensure the amendments regarding VAT are communicated widely and properly by the EC Headquarters to all EU Delegations in developing countries, so the rules are applied correctly and in a homogenous way by all;
- in the next Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020, taxes to be considered as eligible project costs in all the external action funding instruments, including the DCI and EIDHR.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE
- followed up on the complaint to the European Ombudsman against the EC on the non-eligibility of taxes under the DCI and EIDHR, lodged in 2010 jointly with the Human Rights and Democracy Network. Since then, the EC has tried to improve the situation: a new Practical Guide (PRAG) was issued in November 2010 with the possibility for taxes to be part of the co-financing share (as accepted costs) and clear guidelines were sent to all EU Delegations early 2011 on how to help grant beneficiaries get tax exemption in the country. The decision of the Ombudsman was received in August 2011 saying that the EC had not committed any instance of maladministration. Nevertheless, even if the final response of the Ombudsman was not positive, the complaint put strong pressure on the EC to actually improve the situation for the grant beneficiaries;
- produced several update notes as well as a guide on the interpretation to the treatment of taxes (May 2011) to help the members and individual NGOs deal with this tax issue;
- held meetings with several EC interlocutors to provide evidence and explanations why it was important to have taxes eligible.
1.2.3. ADVOCATING FOR AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT NGOS

**Structured Dialogue**

The Structured Dialogue (SD) process was launched in March 2010 and concluded in May 2011 in Budapest-Hungary. It was a multi-stakeholders’ process made up of 3 institutional actors on the one hand (EC, EU governments and European Parliament) and representatives of CSOs platforms and Local Authorities on the other hand. The SD process aimed at: (i) building consensus on the role to be played by CSOs & LAs in development; (ii) finding ways to improve the effectiveness of CSO & LA involved in EC cooperation and (iii) exploring ways to adapt EC programmes and aid delivery mechanisms.

The Structured Dialogue - SD provided a concrete opportunity for change, by jointly identifying ways and means to improve the effectiveness of all actors involved in EC development cooperation.

**WHAT CONCORD WANTS**

- The outcomes of the SD to be linked to on-going and future political processes and discussions, particularly the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2014-2020. The policy engagements should be reflected in the future instruments and funding conditions as from 2014;
- the EC promised to publish a new Civil Society Communication in 2012 (to replace the one from 2002). This new Communication should clearly reflect all the outcomes of the SD as well as the importance and multiple roles of CSOs in development;
- establishment of an institutionalised dialogue between CSOs & LA and EU institutions in Brussels and most importantly at country level;
- the EC to use an appropriate mix of funding mechanisms, including modalities and selection procedures – to go beyond the calls for proposals. The future EC delivery mechanisms should respond effectively to the needs of both European NGOs and our partners in the field, and that these modalities should allow for strengthened and more effective collaboration between the EC and Civil Society actors.

**WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE**

- worked in a Structured Dialogue taskforce, composed of members from different CONCORD working groups. This taskforce has facilitated the consensus building within the constituency and has engaged in the dialogue with the EU institutions and the other CSO platforms;
- played a key role is shaping the debates; its leadership has been acknowledged by the institutions and the other CSO platforms. The SD process has been an opportunity for EU CSO platforms to work more together and CONCORD has been facilitating the coordination of the CSO platforms in order to agree upon common goals and shared positions;
- to the acknowledgement of some important global principles, for example the Rights Based Approach and the democratic ownership;
- the “Southern” involvement in the SD process, which has brought a more complete perspective and ownership to the process;
- succeeded in the abandoning of the terminology “Non State Actors” in favour of “Civil Society Organisations”.

-
Predictability of calls for proposals

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) wanting to get funding from the European Commission usually receive it from the different Thematic Programmes and instruments: Non-State Actors and Local Authorities (NSA-LA), Food Security, Environment, Migration and Asylum, Investing in People and European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR).

The calls for proposals of the Thematic Programmes and Instruments are either published through global calls (managed at Brussels – Headquarters level) or through in-country calls (managed at EU Delegations level).

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- continued good practice of publishing yearly updated forecasts of calls for proposals, at Brussels level as well as in-country level;
- avoiding as much as possible the delays in publishing calls for proposals and ask the EC Headquarters and the EU Delegations to stick to the published forecast tables in order to have enough predictability regarding the launch calls for proposal;
- CSOs to be invited to take part in genuine consultation with EU Delegations on the focus and priorities for the Annual Action Plans (AAP) for the Non-State Actor Thematic programme and other AAPs for calls which focus on civil society;
- EU Delegations to continue their efforts for increased communication with CSOs, including respecting the right of all applicants to get expanded feedback on failed proposals; with the provision of up to date statistics on the outcomes of calls for proposals and any other information relevant to calls, so that CSOs can make informed decisions and make quality, targeted proposals.

Financial Regulation Review

The Financial Regulation (FR) is the EU’s pivotal point of reference for the principles and procedures governing the establishment and implementation of the EU budget and the control of the European Communities finances. The Implementing Rules (IR) contain detailed and more technical rules, essential for the day to day application of the FR.

In May 2010, the EC published its proposal for a new Financial Regulations, and the text has been reviewed and commented by the European Parliament (EP) and the Council since then. As soon as a stable version of the FR is agreed, the EC can start working on the IR. We expect that the FR and IR to be finalised and adopted by September 2012.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- Our main recommendations regarding the FR review (e.g. eligibility of taxes, in kind contribution, level of administrative costs, record keeping for audits, etc.) to be taken into account into the final text of the FR and the IR;
- the adoption of the FR and IR not to be delayed further and be effective as of September 2012 at the latest.
WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- jointly with other CSO platforms, CONCORD met with several Members of the EP, Permanent Representations in Brussels as well as staff from the EC to present our main recommendations regarding the FR Review;
- in June 2011, the CSO working group (which includes CONCORD) managed to bring in seven amendments for the second reading of the draft document at the Budget committee of the EP;
- the latest EP’s draft compromise, discussed in September 2011 and voted in the EP plenary in October, has taken on board many of the recommendations made by CONCORD and other civil society platforms.

1.2.4. SUPPORT CONCORD MEMBERS IN IMPROVING QUALITY & EFFECTIVENESS

Partly induced by the national and European contexts, partly by the global process “Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness”, CONCORD and its members have continually invested efforts in 2011 to build common agendas on NGOs’ quality and effectiveness. Many national NGO platforms have – supported by CONCORD Secretariat - organised consultations with their constituency on principles and mechanisms for CSO development effectiveness, a joint understanding on NGO impact has been built and CONCORD is now equipped to advocate for enabling conditions for CSOs in development.

CSO development effectiveness working group

The working group’s main focus since its creation is on the effectiveness of CSOs (as opposed to the effectiveness of governments and donors in official aid delivery), including on the roles and identity of NGOs in development and on the enabling environment which is required if CSOs are to realise their full potential in development.

CONCORD members had from the onset identified a number of areas that they deem crucial in the debate on CSO development effectiveness: CSOs as donors; building partnerships with Southern partners; safeguarding autonomy from official donors and government; sustainability; demonstrating impact etc. Overall, there is broad consensus that the effectiveness of CSOs must be measured against the impact that they bring about in the lives of the poor and marginalised.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- facilitate mutual learning among European CSOs, including through identification of good practices and lessons learned;
- facilitate a process towards defining shared principles and context-relevant implementation guidelines and mechanisms to improve the development effectiveness of CSOs;
- dialogue with the Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness, including by providing a European contribution to the global process;
- provide support to CONCORD’s existing political dialogue and to the political dialogue of CONCORD members.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

The CONCORD working group on CSO effectiveness has:

- participated in the Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness, notably its Global Assembly in Siem Reap in June 2011, to engage in a dialogue with global civil society;
- participated in the Open Forum regional consultation and fed into the consultation report which, together with the other regional consultation reports, fed into the International Framework;
- convened a meeting in November 2011 in Brussels to prepare for Busan HLF4.
2. STRATEGIC APPROACHES

CONCORD’s work is supported by 6 cross-cutting approaches detailed in the strategic plan 2009-2015:

1. Human rights and gender equality will underpin all our advocacy work.
2. We will strengthen our political engagement with the institutions.
3. We will develop strategic alliances with Southern, European and Global coalitions.
4. We will support the organisational development of CONCORD’s members.
5. We will ensure our collective decision-making combines efficiency with confederation ownership, and supports active participation of all members in CONCORD activities.
6. We will base our work on members’ energies, supported by a secretariat; balance our income sources to ensure our independence and sustainability, and manage finances prudently.

Each approach is detailed in several aims and specific expected achievement allowing assessment. The first outcomes are expected in 2011 and the final ones in 2015 at the end of the strategic plan.

Approach 1:
Human rights and gender equality

2.1.1. HUMAN-RIGHTS BASED APPROACH

The Human-rights based approach (HRBA) builds on the belief that all human beings have certain rights which cannot be taken away from them and which enable them to make claims on others when their rights are being denied or violated. Human rights touch upon every aspect of life. They are about giving every human being the chance to live free from want, from fear and from discrimination.

A human-rights based approach creates a framework for a more inclusive, participatory way of doing development, and highlights the accountability of governments and other development actors to fulfill obligations and responsibilities towards their citizens according to international commitments.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS
- an understanding of Human-Rights Based Approaches;
- their application to CONCORD’s works ensuring that all CONCORD policy frameworks and internal policies and practices are based on this;
- to influence EU institutions to reflect HRBA in their policies and practices.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE
- the Human Rights Based Approach task force has drafted a paper on the HRBA. This paper explicitly addresses women’s rights.
2.1.2 GENDER

Gender equality and women and girls’ empowerment are central to poverty, inequality eradication and sustainable development. The European Union (EU) must ensure that its policy commitments to gender equality are systematically put into practice, demonstrating political will and leadership in the consistent championing of gender equality and women and girls’ empowerment issues.

WHAT CONCORD WANTS

- improved political leadership and commitment to ensure the effective integration as well as specific actions on the promotion of gender equality and women and girls’ empowerment within the development policies and activities of the European Commission;
- increased allocation of financial and human resources in order to reach the goal of gender equality;
- improved coherence between policies that impact on gender and development;
- increased dialogue with civil society, particularly with women. Civil society’s participation in political dialogue and in the programming of aid at country level is most important;
- increase awareness-raising on gender issues and development within CONCORD and in its advocacy activities;
- the European Action Plan on Gender Equality of the European Commission to contain monitoring mechanisms and evaluations tools. It should refer to the existing international commitments.

WHAT CONCORD HAS DONE

- Participated in the member states consultation on the Gender Action Plan, also attended by Michele Bachelet (Head, UNWomen) and Commissioner Piebalgs. CONCORD participated in several informal intimate discussions with the leadership of UN Women (with Michele Bachelet and Lakshmi Puri, Deputy Head of UN Women);
- CONCORD – with WIDE and the European Women’s Lobby – finalised a position paper towards the EU budget process.

Approach 2: Political engagement with the institutions

2.2.1. DEVELOPING CONCORD’S ABILITY TO ENGAGE WITH THE INSTITUTIONS

Over the years CONCORD has established regular, predictable and high-level engagement with the EU institutions. 2011 has seen both opportunities and threats to this engagement. Acknowledging the changing environment, and to capitalise on its good relations with the institutions, CONCORD finalised an engagement with the EU institutions task force to put in place a strategy that will help CONCORD, and particularly its working groups, to be more strategic in their relationships with the institutions. Engaging with the institutions has also been influenced by a number of factors:

- a Commissioner for Development, who is open to meeting and discussing with CONCORD, who has taken on some of our language, but who still see economic growth as the answer to development;
- a ‘High Representative’ for Foreign Policy – who has ‘development’ within her mandate, but has not yet demonstrated capacity or interest in development issues, nor an understanding of Policy Coherence for Development;
- lack of political will for Policy Coherence for Development;
- a struggling leadership in the EEAS and DG DEVCO;
- uncertainty around decision-making and the struggle to keep ‘development’ on the agenda;
- the diminishing role of the Presidencies of the Council of the EU.

CONCORD has built three opportunities for dialogue with the President of the European Commission: one for the leaders of its constituency (see “High Level Leadership Forum” and “Spring Alliance” below).

2.2.2. IMPROVE STRATEGIC ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN EUROPEAN NGOS AND THE INSTITUTIONS

The Council and EU member States

CONCORD engages with the Council and EU member states:
- at the National level, through CONCORD’s national platforms
- at the European Level, through the Working Party on Development (CoDev) and individual representatives of the CoDev
- at ministerial level at the Informal Council of Development Ministers and at other opportunities

CONCORD’s National Platforms also meet regularly with their national ministries. National Platforms discuss many ‘national’ issues of importance, but they also discuss European issues. The AidWatch process facilitates many member states to engage with the national ministries – on aid quantity and quality issues - and additionally National Platforms undertake specific lobbying on specific issues which are being discussed in the Council.

As in previous years, under the Presidencies, CONCORD has made a presentation and held an exchange of views with the Working Party on Development (CoDev). These meetings are held every six months and are an opportunity to talk directly with representatives of members states working at the EU level to influence debates. The timing is such to try an influence on the Spring and Autumn packages. In 2011 the focus was on the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, the EU budget (the MFF), and the Agenda for Change. As a part of the process of advocating on Council Conclusions, delegations from CONCORD also meet regularly with Member States’ Permanent Representations in Brussels.

Polish EU presidency

In terms of programme Polish presidency planned to focus on several issues such as security (migration – FRONTEX reform, food – modernisation and increasing competitiveness of CAP) stronger integration for economic growth (common market, strengthening SME) and finally concept of open Europe meaning support to accession countries.

In foreign affairs policy, related to Arab spring, focus was on promoting democracy and transformation towards it; following that, Poland successfully lobbied for the establishment of a European Endowment for Democracy at EU level and established several processes at national level. Unfortunately through underlining the role of democracy, Polish administration marginalised development cooperation issues and focused rather on Eastern Neighbourhood policy. A case in point is that although Poland was present and active during HLF4 Busan negotiations, as a non-DAC member it did not have much influence on negotiations and gave way to the European Commission entirely.

For the first time, the European Development Days were held in a EU12 country, which is undoubtedly a success. It brought to attention the issue of democracy as a basic development condition; the event was on a much smaller scale than in the past which allowed for more in-depth discussions and networking.

It seems that on CONCORD priority advocacy topics (Agenda for Change, MFF, PCD), Polish administration was not playing a leading role. However, CONCORD made a statement concerning the outcome of Busan at the November Council and its
positions were taken into account during most of the presidency period. In the course of preparation to the Forum in Busan, the Polish platform acted as an intermediary between CONCORD and the Polish administration.

Internally, the Polish administration tried to structure the Polish Aid programme; it successfully advocated (with strong support from Grupa Zagranica) for the adoption of a legislative act on development cooperation, which entered into force in January 2012. It also started consultations on the Multiannual Programing.

**The European Commission**

- In 2011, CONCORD participated in many formal and informal consultations with different parts of the European Commission, particularly DG Development but also DG Environment, DG Climate, DG Trade, DG Budget and others, also providing briefings and inputs into policy discussions. CONCORD still struggles to have a meaningful dialogue with the Commission, however, the willingness to meet and discuss issues is improving and CONCORD has established good working relationships with a number of units particularly in DG DEVCO. The Commission clearly acknowledges CONCORD as the main interlocutor on Development. However, at a more political level, the Commission is increasingly looking beyond CONCORD, particularly using the Structured Dialogue process to reach beyond CONCORD (even though CONCORD clearly demonstrated its leadership role throughout this process).

**European Parliament**

CONCORD works with both the European Parliament Committee on Development as well as bilaterally with MEPs. It twice yearly meets with the Political Coordinators of the Committee on Development for an exchange of views and in 2011 has had discussions on the Agenda for Change; the EU Budget, Busan and the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness and the Structured Dialogue process. CONCORD has also worked with the EP to support their role of scrutiny (sending out a voting alert to all MEPS).

CONCORD has continued to work closely with the European Parliament on Policy Coherence for Development and has engaged with the standing rapporteur on PCD.

Members of the European Parliament have been mobilised on the occasions of the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assemblies held in Lome, Togo, at the African launch of CONCORD’s PCD report.

**European Economic and Social Committee (EESC)**

In its opinion of 22/09/2010, the EESC mentioned CONCORD Aid watch report in article 4.3 of its “Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on the ‘Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on “Supporting developing countries in coping with the crisis”’.

In 2011 CONCORD has been mainly contributing to the work of the EESC through the inclusive process ahead of RIO +20. CONCORD was indeed mandated by EU CSO networks to lead the work on this topic vis-à-vis the EESC.

**Other institutions:**

CONCORD also works with other international institutions. It focuses mainly on the European aspects of their policies or on their reform, since this could affect the weight of the European Union in such international government bodies. More specifically, CONCORD is member of the Board of the North South Center which is an institution linked to the Council of Europe focussing mainly on Development Education.
OECD

CONCORD participated in a stakeholder meeting with the OECD/DAC Peer Review Committee evaluating EU development. We were disappointed that the discussions were limited to the EU’s relationship with civil society and that CONCORD’s participation was extremely limited. However, CONCORD provided considerable policy input after the meeting.

Throughout 2011, CONCORD represented the global CSO platform BetterAid in the Task Team on Mutual Accountability of Cluster A of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness. CONCORD also participated in the meetings and deliberations of the Task Team on Civil Society Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment (also Cluster A).

Regular contacts have been taken throughout 2011 with the OECD PCD unit. CONCORD’s Spotlight report on PCD was published on the new OECD webplatform dedicated to PCD. CONCORD also contributed to the OECD consultation on its new Development Strategy, in which PCD is set as a priority.

FAO

In 2011, the European Food Security group (EFSG) of CONCORD continued to monitor the reform of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) of the FAO (see related sections in the report). In particular, CONCORD played an active role in organising the meetings of the newly-created Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) to the CFS, for the Western Europe region. EFSG members also actively participated in the Civil Society Forum and the consecutive 37th Session of the CFS in Rome on 17-22 October. Ahead of the CFS session, EFSG members had a series of consultations with EC and MS officials to prepare inputs in the EU position on the issues on the agenda of the Committee (e.g. land tenure and international investment in agriculture, nutrition).

Approach 3: Alliances

2.3.1. ALLIANCES WITH CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE SOUTH

The CONCORD strategic framework (2009 – 2015) states that CONCORD will:

- Build alliances with civil society in the South, prioritizing regional and continental coalitions to strengthen our influence on EU policies affecting sustainable development
- Actively seek, build and consolidate alliances with coalitions of civil society organizations and other appropriate actors with whom we share ambitions or objectives for the European Union
- Participate, representing our members, in the work of global civil society alliances on CONCORD’s priority issues
- During 2011, several joint actions of CONCORD and Southern Civil Society Organisations carried on this strategy. Apart from the established partnership with Mesa and REPAOC, VANI the Indian platform, and INFID the Indonesian platform were approached.

The established partnership with the Latin American platform Mesa de Articulación and the West African platform REPAOC was reinforced through the signing of new Memorandum of Understanding in which CONCORD and its partners agreed on joint upcoming priorities and identified areas for collaboration. One important area on which CONCORD, Mesa and REPAOC foresee to focus our common work on is the review of the Millennium Goals and the setting of a Beyond 2015 development framework. Other thematic priorities for our collaboration with REPAOC have been identified including the making of a joint narrative on development, climate change, the quality and quantity of Official Development Assistance (ODA), The Cotonou Agreement (including the Economic Partnership Agreements – EPAs), The EU-Africa strategy...
and the role of civil society in cooperation policies and the political space given to it. Other thematic priorities for our collaboration with Mesa have been identified including the fight against inequalities, the political and commercial agreements between EU-Latin America, the making of a joint narrative on development and the role of civil society in cooperation policies and the political space given to it.

To facilitate the implementation of these MoUs, a Reference Group has been formed to develop a long term approach for our partnerships. The objectives of this Reference Group are to concentrate on Coherence, Coordination and Communication of actions between the members and on the common Strategy.

The aspiration to jointly work on a setting of a post MDG development framework showed off in the seminar CONCORD, Mesa and REPAOC organized together on the World Social Forum in Dakar, Senegal, in February 2011. The discussions centred around an analysis on what political dynamics and solution we want in the Post-MDG era, how to incorporate “lessons learned”, what kind of development we need for the North and South to tackle the roots of poverty and inequalities and what the minimum standard of legitimacy for a post-MDG framework is. The seminar attracted over 60 participants.

CONCORD invited its partners to attend our annual General Assembly in June 2011. Both representatives from REPAOC, Mesa, VANI (the Indian CSO platform), INFID (the Indonesian platform) and Interaction (the US platform) were participating in seminars and other activities related to the GA making it an opportunity to strengthen our contacts with leading CSO platforms globally.

CONCORD and Mesa started to prepare for joint actions at the VI Euro-Latin American-Caribbean Civil Society Forum that will be held in Santiago de Chile in end of September 2012 including the process of issuing a joint declaration towards the VII Summit of Heads of State and Government of the European Union, Latin America and the Caribbean. It will contain some considerations and proposals addressed to the governments of the European Union (EU), Latin America and the Caribbean.

In May, a CONCORD delegation attended the 21st session of the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly in Budapest, Hungary. CONCORD carried out very successful advocacy work on two axes: the effects of the common agricultural policy and the future of EU-ACP relations in the context of the Lisbon Treaty. The following Joint Parliamentary Assembly organized in Lomé, Togo, in November was also attended by a CONCORD delegation carrying out several activities together with the Togolese NGDOs. In order to create a debate on coherence issues and to launch the CONCORD Spotlight Report on Policy Coherence for Development CONCORD held a working lunch together with ambassadors, parliamentarians, members of ECOSOC and CSOs. A capacity building workshop on the Cotonou agreement was also held with more than 50 participants from Togolese NGOs, peasant platforms from other West African countries and officials from the Togolese administration.

2.3.2. CONSOLIDATION OF ALLIANCES AT EU LEVEL

Spring Alliance

CONCORD – along with the EEF, the Social Platform and ETUC – are members of the Spring Alliance. In 2011 the Spring Alliance continued to focus its work on the Europe 2020 Strategy and its flagship initiatives. For more information: http://www.springalliance.eu.

CSCG

CONCORD is member of the Civil Society Contact Group (CSCG) which brings together the biggest platforms of European NGOs platforms from different sectors: Green 10, Human Rights and Democracy Network, European Women’s Lobby, European Forum for the Arts and Heritage, European Public Health Alliance, EUCIS-LLL for life-long learning, Culture Action Europe, CONCORD and the Social Platform. For more information: www.act4europe.org
North-South Center

A memorandum of understanding exists between CONCORD and the Council of Europe related to cooperation on development education, human rights and development cooperation. Different working groups of CONCORD (Africa-EU, Gender, Migration, Enlargement and Development Education Forum) are involved in this partnership.

Climate Action Network Europe (CAN-E)

CAN is Europe’s leading network working on environment and climate issues with 129 members in 25 European countries. In 2011 CONCORD has continued to cooperate with CAN on issues of common interest. For more information: http://www.climnet.org

EU CSO group on international development

CONCORD led the EU Civil Society Group on International Development. This group brings together many (almost 15) other sectors that work on development, but for whom development is not their core mandate (eg the Youth sector, the Environment, the Political Foundations, the Women’s movement, the Trade Unions, the Fair Trade movement). CONCORD has actively included the EU CSO Group on International development membership in key political discussions.

CTA

CONCORD took part in the “development briefings” held in Brussels by the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (ACP/EU) such as the Briefing n° 20 ‘Financing Agriculture and Rural Development in ACP countries’, on 15 September. These meetings brief around 100 key people on issues linked to rural development in the context of ACP-EU cooperation. They are also a platform for informal dialogue and networking between the various agents of development. For more information: http://brussels.cta.int

Other organisations

CONCORD continued to invite other Civil Society partners in its activities when it is relevant or participated in joint activities such as at decentralised seminars and Quadrilogue meetings where CONCORD met with ITUC, Local Authorities, Cooperatives Europe, ENoP. It also worked with Interaction (the largest alliance of U.S.-based international NGO) on Food security.

CONCORD is one of 25 members of the governing body (Global Facilitation Group), the regional coordinator for the Open Forum in Europe as well as the fiscal agent and head of the consortium of the Open Forum (outside the EC grant). For more: www.cso-effectiveness.org

2.3.3. CONCORD PARTICIPATION ON GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY ALLIANCES

As foreseen in its multi-annual strategic plan, CONCORD participated in the work of global civil society alliances on CONCORD’s priority issues and played an important part in the dynamic of some processes such as the Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness.

Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness

The Open Forum brings together civil society organisations from around the world to discuss, share learnings and innovate around effective CSO development practice. Through a three-year global consultation process in over 70 countries around the world, civil society developed the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness, which is the consolidated global statement on 1) the principles that guide our work, 2) what CSO accountability means for us, and 3) the minimum standards for an enabling environment for CSOs. The International Framework serves both a political statement from the sector on our own effectiveness as development actors (which was also officially acknowledged by governments and donors and included in the
outcome document of the 4th High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, South Korea) as well as a long term reference for CSOs around the world, to guide their effectiveness work. The international Framework is accompanied by two toolkits to support the implementation and contextualization of CSO development effectiveness efforts.

The Open Forum is led by a Global Facilitation Group that is composed of 29 member organisations representing all regions of the world (including CONCORD), and the secretariat of the Open Forum is currently hosted by CONCORD.

For more information: www.cso-effectiveness.org

**GCAP Europe**

The Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP) is an alliance of trade unions, community groups, faith groups, women’s and youth organisations, NGOs and other campaigners working together across more than 100 national platforms. GCAP Europe (Russia, Belgium, Hungary, UK, Germany, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia and the Netherlands) is very active. In November it contributes to a demonstration, circling the European Parliament of Brussels with a human chain all dressed in white to symbolise the white ribbon. It calls for action by the world’s leaders to meet their promises to end poverty and inequality.

**BetterAid**

BetterAid unites over 700 development organisations from civil society, and has been working on development cooperation and challenging the aid effectiveness agenda since January 2007. BetterAid led many civil society activities including in-country consultations, studies and monitoring towards the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (HLF-4) in Busan, South Korea in 2011.

BetterAid is an open platform, and participating organisations can get involved in discussion and policy influencing opportunities on a wide range of issues to deepen aid and development effectiveness. BetterAid drafts policy and positioning papers in participatory processes, and promotes their messages through advocacy activities on an international and national level. BetterAid is member of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness at the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee, where it represents the voices of global civil society.

CONCORD is an active member of the Coordinating Group of BetterAid, and in 2011 continued to contribute to its advocacy and policy development.

For more information: http://www.betteraid.org

**APPRAOCH 4: ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT**

**2.4.1. SUPPORTING MEMBERS IN STRENGTHENING THEIR OWN CAPACITIES**

CONCORD aims at supporting its members to strengthen themselves, so that the national platform in every Member State can act as the primary influencer of its national government and politicians on EU sustainable development policy and practice; and that networks are as effective as possible in influencing EU institutions.

**Activities to strengthen members’ capacities**

CONCORD organised many introductory sessions for new members of working groups in order to catch up with the group’s concerns and state of work. A specific “CONCORD Induction Day for new directors of member organisations” was also held on 31 August bringing together 22 individuals.

CONCORD has received study visits from 5 national NGO platforms (SE, DK, FI, AT, L) and CONCORD Staff/Board visited 11 member organisations (7 national platforms – L, DE, RO, IRL, LIT, UK, FR - and 4 to network members – Adra, Wide, Eurodad, Caritas).

CONCORD continued to be strongly involved in
DEEEP and TRIALOG projects through financial contributions (outside the EC grant), participation in the management (DEEEP) advisory group (TRIALOG) and a joint CONCORD-DEEEP-TRIALOG planning session.

2.4.2. ENABLING MEMBERS TO SUPPORT AND LEARN FROM EACH OTHER

CONCORD wants to enable its members to support and learn from each other, so that individual NGOs can engage better in their networks and national platforms, and that the networks and platforms are themselves sustainable, in a way that strengthens CONCORD’s impact & efficiency.

The main impact in this field came through the Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness. By engaging in this global process proposed by CONCORD, many members have started consultation processes with their constituency and thereby enlarged their mandate / field of work and enabled their members to engage from a new, additional angle. Several member organisations could mobilize additional funding and thereby sustain themselves. There was much exchange and peer learning among CONCORD members on these processes.

Approach 5: Leadership and participation in CONCORD

2.5.1. ENSURING THAT ALL MEMBERS HAVE THE OPTION OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION

CONCORD wants to ensure that all members have the option of active participation in all CONCORD activities, through strengthening their capacities to contribute, writing documents in plain language, and – where appropriate – funding.

As in the past, CONCORD held to its founding principle of an inclusive platform for collective action. Through different processes, even non-members, NGO networks from other sectors (like WWF, HRDN, Red Cross, etc) could participate in several CONCORD processes and events.

2.5.2. ENSURING EACH WORKING GROUP IS OPEN TO ALL MEMBERS

CONCORD makes sure that each Working Group is open to all members who wish to participate, operates with a high degree of autonomy, actively builds trust from other parts of the confederation, and is effectively held to account.

Policy forum leadership

The diversity of the membership of the Policy Forum is seen as its core strength, bringing together NGO representatives from the Member States, from the thematic and faith-based networks and from NGO alliances and families, culminating in a wealth of experience and political intelligence. Given its membership, the group acts as CONCORD’s ‘political spearhead’, discussing and sharing political intelligence and coordinating CONCORD’s policy work, thereby being in a position to effectively advise and support the CONCORD membership and the Board.

Openness of the groups

All CONCORD Working structures have individual Terms of Reference with common criteria regarding participation and representation. All CONCORD Working structures are open to all its members. CONCORD’s solidarity principle ensures that no member is excluded from CONCORD Working structures due to financial constraints. All Terms of Reference are approved by CONCORD Board.

Although some groups receive full support of CONCORD secretariat, all the working groups and sub-groups of task-forces are member-led. See annex 7 for a full description of the groups and to find out who is the chair amongst CONCORD members.

Annual figures for members’ activity at Confederation level
The total number of participants in CONCORD activities in 2011 was 1770, an increase from 1299 in 2010 (+36%), and an increase from 1132 in 2009 (+56%).

Participation figures are based on the number (and lists) of participants to each meeting and event organised by CONCORD in a given year.

Those figures nevertheless do not reflect the direct work that many members of CONCORD do on “Europe/CONCORD agenda” vis-à-vis their national/international constituency: i.e. annual meetings organized at national level on EU issues (sometimes in direct collaboration with CONCORD).

The difference in participation between categories:
- National Platforms: 821 participants
- Networks: 453 participants
- Non CONCORD member: 348 participants
- CONCORD secretariat: 145 participants
- Associate member: 3 participants (1st associate member as from June 2011)

The high level of participation from our National Platforms highlights their importance/relevance to CONCORD on a pan-European level.

The use of conference calls, as encouraged by CONCORD, has notably increased and thereby reducing overall costs and our carbon footprint.

2.5.3. LEARNING FROM SUCCESSES

CONCORD has processes to learn from successes in combining the strengths of networks, national platforms, a facilitative secretariat and associated projects, to create the best synergies for CONCORD’s impact.

CONCORD concluded the implementation of recommendations from the different evaluations done in 2011. Much energy was put in the discussion of reshaping CONCORD’s identity and brand.

Content wise, it has been difficult for CONCORD to identify its successes. 2011 has been the second year in which CONCORD had a thorough reflection and analysis of its success stories (June 2010-June 2011). A summary of this analysis was produced and widely discussed with members and stakeholders.

Many working groups and processes in CONCORD have built their work on past successes. CONCORD’s engagement in the Structured Dialogue was based on the evaluation of the Palermo process, CONCORD’s preparation of inputs for the next EU MAFF is a continuity of the past work on Financial Perspectives performed and assessed in 2004/2005, AidWatch is continuously assessing and improving its report, campaign and mobilisation. The second PCD spotlight report was also built on learning and assessment from the first such report in 2009, including the policy work in the European Parliament on the Common Agricultural Policy.

2.5.4. EMPOWER CONCORD’S REPRESENTATIVES TO SPEAK FOR CONCORD

CONCORD tries to empower its representatives to speak for CONCORD confidently, on the basis of established Policy frameworks but with the flexibility to adapt to political circumstances, and consolidate means of holding them to account.

Striving for transparency and accountability, the Board of CONCORD gives specific mandates (often with Terms of Reference and reporting obligation) to individuals representing the Confederation in external bodies. Major mandates given in 2010 include:
- Rilli Lappalainen (Board member) in the Executive Council of the North-South Center
- Rilli Lappalainen (Board member) Steering Group of the Joint Management Agreement between the North-South Center and the EC
- Rilli Lappalainen (Board member) as co-chair of the Multi-Stakeholder Group on Development Education on behalf of CONCORD
- Simon Stocker (Eurostep) and Olivier Consolo (Director) representing CONCORD in the Civil Society Contact Group
- Jake Bharier (former Board member) in the Consortium Management Committee of the Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness
- Carlos Cabo (Spanish NP) in the Global Facilitation Group of the Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness
- Niina Pitkanen (Finnish NP) in Better Aid Coordinating Group
- Johannes Trimmel (Board member) and Andreas Vogt (CONCORD Secretariat) in TRIALOG Advisory Group
- Andreas Vogt (CONCORD Secretariat) in DEEEP Management Group

2.5.5. EMPOWERING THE BOARD AND DIRECTOR TO TAKE DECISIONS

To ensure proper leadership, the confederation empowered the Board and Director to take decisions and consult as appropriate, and consolidate means of holding them to account.

In its way toward the new strategy 2009-2015, CONCORD is reviewing the ‘division of labour’ between the different bodies of the confederation. While building a transparent, inclusive and open platform for joint action remains the top priority of CONCORD, the Board members have been clarifying the respective roles and responsibilities. Several documents and processes are participating in this clarification: the new mandate of the Secretariat, the Terms of Reference of the management team within the secretariat, the adaptation and review of the Portfolio within the Board (fitting now with the new Strategic Framework), the annual assessment (via questionnaires) engages by the Board on its role and achievements in 2011, etc. The aim of these internal processes is to reinforce the confidence among the membership that CONCORD is in a position today to be, depending on the situations & expectations, inclusive, efficient or representative at the right level. The recent mid-term review of CONCORD’s strategy shows that members are globally confident that a good balance has been built over the last three years between leadership and consultation.
Approach 6: CONCORD resources

2.6.1. ENSURING CONCORD’S INDEPENDENCE

CONCORD needs to ensure its independence, sustainability and its ability to match its ambitions with resources by achieving a balance of income from members, European Commission, income generation and other grant makers that match CONCORD values, while building a level of reserves sufficient to meet cash flow, statutory and social requirements.

Therefore, in 2011 CONCORD signed a contract with the Gates Foundation that provides funding for 36 months (Oct 2011 – Sept 2014). The Gates funding is an opportunity for CONCORD to strengthen its capacities and impact at a critical moment that will set European Development policies & funding for the next 10 years. The support is for work that Concord has already agreed to in its 2009-2015 Strategic Plan but which has been constrained by limited financial and human resources. Support will increase the capacity of the members and at the same time allow the Secretariat to increase its support to the working groups. The Gates funding focuses on two issues: Quantity and Quality of Aid (AidWatch), and the EU Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF task Force). Communications, capacity Building and coordination cross-cut the proposal.

2.6.2. MAINTAINING A CORE BUDGET

Since its establishment, CONCORD General Assembly made it very clear that the confederation had to maintain a core budget primarily financed by membership and predictable operational grants from the European Commission and to develop fundraising for project based activities with clear governance and management rules.

Regarding the expenses, the budget is build and followed-up using cost-accounting. Working groups expenses are monitored through this tool.

The General Assembly approved a budget process in 2010 for 2011. The aim was to ensure a more open, transparent and inclusive budget process, with the Board (as per its mandate) approving the budget.

2.6.3. ENSURING THE COMMITMENT OF MEMBERS

The commitment of members and their members to providing specialist personnel and finances needed to deliver CONCORD plans effectively is the key as it is for CONCORD to account to its members for effective use of these resources.

2.6.4 ENSURING THAT THE SECRETARIAT HAS THE MANDATE, SKILLS, APTITUDE

CONCORD’s approach regarding its Secretariat, is to make sure that it has the mandate, skills, aptitudes, knowledge, management quality and resources to facilitate the confederation appropriately to achieve this strategy. CONCORD is taking steps to follow up on the recommendations stemming from the external assessment of the secretariat. Moreover, 2011 was the year particularly devoted to launching the discussion on CONCORD branding and communication strategy.
Communications

NEWSLETTERS
Concord redsigned its newsletters, making more user friendly versions available directly in email.

Member to Member: Every 2 weeks, featuring members events, job vacancies, work calendar and news on publications.

EU Monitoring: Every week, featuring a roundup of the latest EU development news, with a full list of EU funding opportunities for NGOs.

PRESS COVERAGE
From TV interviews to newspaper reports, 2011 marked the highest year of media coverage for Concord’s reactions and publications. Right across Europe and abroad, we put EU development policy and what affects it in the spotlight. Through collaborative work across the membership, press relations helped increase the visibly and impact of our message, which were featured in both European, national and international level press. Highlights include the AidWatch and Policy Coherence for Development reports, reported in major news broadcasters such as BBC World, AFP and Al Jazeera. Press reactions were also coordinated on topics such as the new Agenda for Change for EU development policy and the Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectivness.

SOCIAL MEDIA
A social media presence was set up at Concord for the first time, with new Twitter and Facebook accounts, which proved popular to update and share news with members and stakeholders.

www.facebook.com/concordeurope
www.twitter.com/concord_europe

WEBSITES
A dedicated AidWatch website was launched in 2011, which features pages national aid levels and tools to compare between countries.

http://aidwatch.concordeurope.org

A microsite for the launch of the Spotlight on Policy Coherence for Development was made, with further developments set for 2012.

http://coherence.concordeurope.org

A review of the current website was undertaken in 2011 with the view to launch a new version in 2012.

www.concordeurope.org
“China should not put off the European Union to stand up for transparency, rights based approaches and democratic ownership. Several EU member states have pushed for further weakening of aid commitments on aid transparency. EU member states are not effectively standing up for some of the basic commitments on untying aid,” said Gideon Rabinowitz of Concord, an aid campaigning group.

**EU to cut aid to 19 emerging countries from China to Brazil**

**Trop de politiques de l’UE incohérentes avec l’aide au développement**

27/11/2011

**EU realigning aid towards domestic goals, say NGOs**

20/05/2011
3.1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION AND FINANCIAL STRATEGY

CONCORD’s current financial strategy is based on CONCORD’s Strategic Plan 2009 – 2015, which includes the following Strategic Approach No 6:

“As a confederation, CONCORD’s aims are achieved through its members, who are facilitated by a Secretariat and led by a Board and Director. CONCORD’s objectives can be achieved only through marshalling the expertise of our members and their members, and through the commitment of members and funders to the financial support of CONCORD. Our human and financial resources must be used prudently to enable CONCORD to be independent, sustainable and effective.”

The outcomes for 2011 are set in the Strategic Plan as:
- Income sufficient for the ambitions of our strategy;
- A balance of income between members, EC and others achieved; and
- Reserves satisfactory – 25 to 40% of annual expenditure.

**Summary of results**

In accordance with the above, our aim is to cover our expenses, and to restore our reserves to a prudent level, so far as that is possible.

During 2011, excluding the results of the Open Forum for CSO Effectiveness, CONCORD’s total core income amounted to €1,356,450 (2010 €1,315,998) and our core expenditure amounted to €1,249,033 (2010 €1,268,580), giving rise to a surplus of €107,417 (2010 €47,416).

Our income was 102% of that budgeted, expenditure was 97% of budget and the surplus achieved of €107,417 compares to the budget of €32,493. During this year our income increased by €62,488 thanks to the grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which accounts to the bulk of the excess of the actual surplus over the budgeted surplus for the year.

Our reserves now stand at €255,451 (2010 €148,033) being 20.5% of actual expenditure (2010 11.7%). Under our Strategic Plan, reserves are set at between 25% and 40% of our annual expenditures, despite this very satisfactory result for 2011, we still have some distance to go to achieve the desired level of reserves.

CONCORD’s accounts also include the results of the Project Open Forum for CSO Effectiveness, which are detailed at 3.6 below. This project, which is due to be finalised during 2012, is operated by CONCORD on the basis that it will result in neither profit nor loss for CONCORD.

3.2 ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES AND FUNDING BY MEMBERS AND THE EC

The accounts of CONCORD are expressed in Euro and are maintained on a historical cost basis, in compliance with international accounting standards and the legislation on associations applicable in Belgium.

The core operational budget of CONCORD covers the cost of the secretariat; the costs of studies, consultancy and communication and the costs of the various member working bodies (working groups, general meetings, seminars etc.)

Subject to the travel reimbursement rules, the budget allows for the participation of at least one representative per member at such meetings, covering travel and accommodation expenses, as well as the general costs of organising such meetings such as hire of meeting rooms, interpretation, translation, reports etc.

This core budget is financed by members and co-financed by a grant from the EC, which is not applicable to all of CONCORD’s expenditure.
### 3.3 EXPENDITURE AND INCOME
YEAR TO 31ST DECEMBER 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Fees</td>
<td>485.000</td>
<td>450.000</td>
<td>448.522</td>
<td>433.710</td>
<td>461.288</td>
<td>439.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Contributions</td>
<td>13.500</td>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>68.343</td>
<td>78.642</td>
<td>68.440</td>
<td>172.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>36.950</td>
<td>86.000</td>
<td>65.614</td>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>17.642</td>
<td>7.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Members &amp; NGOs</strong></td>
<td>535.450</td>
<td>576.000</td>
<td>582.480</td>
<td>542.352</td>
<td>547.370</td>
<td>618.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Grant</td>
<td>700.000</td>
<td>700.000</td>
<td>691.345</td>
<td>700.000</td>
<td>719.490</td>
<td>673.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Subsidy</td>
<td>12.500</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>28.579</td>
<td>51.000</td>
<td>98.315</td>
<td>98.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Public Funds</strong></td>
<td>712.500</td>
<td>750.000</td>
<td>691.345</td>
<td>728.579</td>
<td>770.490</td>
<td>772.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates Foundation</td>
<td>481.113</td>
<td>62.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>22.500</td>
<td>18.034</td>
<td>41.262</td>
<td>42.021</td>
<td>34.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Income</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>3.805</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>4.381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Private Funds</strong></td>
<td>503.613</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82.626</td>
<td>45.067</td>
<td>45.235</td>
<td>39.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>1.326.000</td>
<td>1.356.450</td>
<td>1.315.998</td>
<td>1.363.095</td>
<td>1.430.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel and meeting costs</td>
<td>166.635</td>
<td>163.722</td>
<td>176.681</td>
<td>172.827</td>
<td>240.401</td>
<td>306.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; logistics</td>
<td>78.900</td>
<td>85.295</td>
<td>50.210</td>
<td>29.840</td>
<td>55.596</td>
<td>50.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External services</td>
<td>230.465</td>
<td>116.903</td>
<td>116.843</td>
<td>127.342</td>
<td>193.919</td>
<td>131.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total allocatable costs</strong></td>
<td>476.000</td>
<td>365.920</td>
<td>343.733</td>
<td>330.009</td>
<td>489.916</td>
<td>488.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>940.282</td>
<td>722.587</td>
<td>713.453</td>
<td>692.090</td>
<td>739.012</td>
<td>732.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overheads</td>
<td>111.400</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td>89.699</td>
<td>108.318</td>
<td>99.279</td>
<td>80.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>115.000</td>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>102.148</td>
<td>111.655</td>
<td>114.795</td>
<td>110.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other external services</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>26.508</td>
<td>14.832</td>
<td>2.112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total staff and overhead costs</strong></td>
<td>1.181.682</td>
<td>927.587</td>
<td>905.300</td>
<td>938.571</td>
<td>967.918</td>
<td>925.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td>1.657.682</td>
<td>1.293.507</td>
<td>1.249.033</td>
<td>1.268.580</td>
<td>1.457.834</td>
<td>1.414.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/deficit - Core Activities</td>
<td>93.881</td>
<td>32.493</td>
<td>107.417</td>
<td>47.418</td>
<td>-94.739</td>
<td>15.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ç</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.080.919</td>
<td>1.313.466</td>
<td>194.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.080.919</td>
<td>1.313.466</td>
<td>194.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.080.919</td>
<td>1.313.466</td>
<td>194.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>453.383</td>
<td>721.675</td>
<td>24.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294.438</td>
<td>169.902</td>
<td>2.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.902</td>
<td>221.350</td>
<td>119.381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>776.722</td>
<td>1.112.927</td>
<td>146.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>181.307</td>
<td>163.875</td>
<td>41.230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.967</td>
<td>17.997</td>
<td>3.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.374</td>
<td>14.528</td>
<td>3.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.549</td>
<td>4.140</td>
<td>-730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304.197</td>
<td>200.540</td>
<td>48.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.080.919</td>
<td>1.313.466</td>
<td>194.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Income and Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>€1,363,095</td>
<td>€1,457,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>€1,315,998</td>
<td>€1,268,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>€1,356,450</td>
<td>€1,249,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.1 EXPENDITURE

We have succeeded in reducing our total expenditures for the last 3 years (2009 - €1,457,834; 2010 - €1,268,580 (down 13%); and 2011 - €1,249,033 (down a further 2%)) while keeping at least the same level of activities. The 22% decrease in overhead costs this year compared to last year has been reallocated to both Members’ Working Groups and Staff. At the same time we have also kept the level of Membership fees stable.

By comparison with 2010, as regards our expenses:

- The cost of members’ working groups/bodies are up €13,724 (+ 4.2%)
- Staff costs are up €21,363 (+ 3.1%)
- Other overhead costs are down €54,634 (-22.2%)
- **Total expenses are down** €19,547 (-1.5%)

Expenses per category

1 Except for Beyond 2015 for which part of the staff costs is directly allocated to the Beyond 2015 expenses.
ALLOCATED EXPENDITURES PER ACTIVITY

CONCORD uses analytical codes to directly allocate costs to its activities (excluding staff costs and other overhead). For 2011, the split between the different activities are such:
### 3.3.2 INCOME

We are trying to keep down the level of membership fees as much as possible: 2009 - €461,288; 2010 - €433,710 and 2011 - €448,522.

#### Income per origin

- **EC Grant**: €691,345 (51%)
- **Membership fees**: €448,522 (33%)
- **Gates Foundation**: €62,488 (5%)
- **NGO Contributions**: €68,343 (5%)
- **Other Income**: €20,138 (1%)
- **Other Private Funds**: €65,614 (5%)

By comparison with 2010, our income:

- Membership fees are up €14,812 (+3.4%)
- Other income from NGOs are up €25,315 (+23.3)
- EC grant is down €8,655 (-1.2%)
- There was no public subsidy this year, last year €28,579 –
- Income from the Gates Foundation €62,488 +
- Other income down €24,930 (-55.3%)
- Total income was up €40,451 (+3.1%)
## 3.4 BALANCE SHEET AT 31ST DECEMBER 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intangible assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible assets</td>
<td>8,801</td>
<td>8,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial assets</td>
<td>20,585</td>
<td>20,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LONG TERM ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,386</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,540</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors</td>
<td>252,309</td>
<td>243,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>1,067,520</td>
<td>335,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued income/deferred expenses</td>
<td>17,898</td>
<td>17,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORT TERM ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,337,728</strong></td>
<td><strong>596,810</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,367,114</strong></td>
<td><strong>625,350</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term creditors</td>
<td>198,420</td>
<td>264,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued expenses / deferred revenues</td>
<td>904,442</td>
<td>204,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term liabilities</td>
<td>1,102,862</td>
<td>469,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for liabilities</td>
<td>8,801</td>
<td>8,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>255,451</td>
<td>194,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income and expenditure - accumulated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(46,633)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEMBERS’ EQUITY</strong></td>
<td>255,451</td>
<td>148,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FINANCING</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,367,114</strong></td>
<td><strong>625,350</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intangible and tangible fixed assets are written off over 3 and 5 years respectively. Although their accounting value is relatively immaterial, much of the equipment still has a useful life.

The long term financial assets comprise a deposit account which holds a payment of 3 months rental by way of a rental guarantee.

Cash and accrued expense have both increased because of carried-over from the
- Open Forum €166,160 +
- ICCO €36,866 +
- Gates €695,941 +
- Beyond 2012 €4,046 +
- Advance Membership contributions €1,260 +
- Unrealised exchange revenue €168 +
- Total €904,442
The table below shows the original fees charged to members and the subsequent amount agreed as being payable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>NP/NW</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Voted by GA</th>
<th>Invoiced fee 2011</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>€500</td>
<td>€ -</td>
<td>€ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARENGUKOOSTÖÖ ÜMARLAUD</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>€630</td>
<td>€630</td>
<td>€630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKOP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>€1.060</td>
<td>€1.060</td>
<td>€ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEK PLATFORM FOR DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>€1.590</td>
<td>€1.590</td>
<td>€1.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATAFORMA PORTUGUESA DAS ONGD</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€3.104</td>
<td>€3.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAND</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPAS</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>€3.785</td>
<td>€878</td>
<td>€878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRUPA ZAGRANICA</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVRO</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€1.875</td>
<td>€1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOGA</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYINDEP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>€3.880</td>
<td>€1.200</td>
<td>€ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td>€9.000</td>
<td>€9.000</td>
<td>€9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDE*</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td>€9.270</td>
<td>€ -</td>
<td>€ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU CORD</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td>€9.540</td>
<td>€9.270</td>
<td>€9.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLIDAR*</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td>€9.540</td>
<td>€5.000</td>
<td>€5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EURODAD*</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td>€9.540</td>
<td>€ -</td>
<td>€ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td>€10.600</td>
<td>€10.600</td>
<td>€10.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLE DE COOPERATION DES ONGD DU Lux.</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>€11.130</td>
<td>€11.130</td>
<td>€11.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>NP/NW</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Voted by GA</td>
<td>Invoiced fee 2011</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBALE VERANTWORTUNG</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td>€11.130</td>
<td>€11.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPF - EN</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.720</td>
<td>€12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCHAS</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.720</td>
<td>€12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIONAID INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.720</td>
<td>€12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEHYS RY</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.720</td>
<td>€12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN EUROPE</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.720</td>
<td>€12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVE THE CHILDREN ALLIANCE</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.720</td>
<td>€12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLDVISION INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.720</td>
<td>€12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXFAM INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.720</td>
<td>€12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROSTEP</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.720</td>
<td>€12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€12.985</td>
<td>€12.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPROGRAM (CONCORD BELGIUM)</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td>€16.430</td>
<td>€16.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCORD DENMARK</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>€16.430</td>
<td>€16.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONGDE</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>€16.430</td>
<td>€16.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCORD SWEDEN</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>€16.430</td>
<td>€16.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COORDINATION SUD</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>€20.670</td>
<td>€20.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIAZIONE ONG ITALIANE</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>€20.670</td>
<td>€20.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTOS</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>€20.670</td>
<td>€20.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRODEV</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€20.670</td>
<td>€20.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARITAS EUROPA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€20.670</td>
<td>€20.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDSE</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€20.670</td>
<td>€20.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Under negotiation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>NP/NW</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Voted by GA</th>
<th>Invoiced fee 2011</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VENRO</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>€26.500</td>
<td>€20.085</td>
<td>€20.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOND</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>€26.500</td>
<td>€13.250</td>
<td>€13.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€4.770</td>
<td>€4.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€2.500</td>
<td>€2.500</td>
<td>€2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLAMIC RELIEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€4.770</td>
<td>€4.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>€494.217</strong></td>
<td><strong>€453.520</strong></td>
<td><strong>€423.992</strong></td>
<td><strong>€423.992</strong></td>
<td><strong>€423.992</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCORD CONTRIBUTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€(5.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO “BEYOND 2015”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€448.520</td>
<td>€423.992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 FINANCIAL REPORT ON THE
PROJECT “OPEN FORUM FOR CSO
DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS”

3.6.1 GENERAL OVERVIEW

The Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness is a multi-year project that started in July 2009 and was originally projected to end in March 2012. The proposed budget for the three years of the project was set for €2,991 Mio, out of which 94% of the funding was secured (approximately €2.8 Mio) from 13 different donors.

Each one of these donors contributed to a pooled fund managed by a group of CSOs (the “CSO Management Group”, representing both BetterAid and Open Forum Processes) and a group of donors (the “Donor Coordination Group” chaired by SIDA, CIDA, DfID and ADA). The guidelines and basic principles of the management of the funds as well as the responsibilities of each group are described in a Memorandum of Understanding.

This is a very innovative and pioneering example of collaborative and CSO-centered funding approach, where CSOs and donors collaborate pool their efforts to support an international CSO process.

The activities and work plan of the Open Forum are implemented by a Consortium of five CSOs (including CONCORD for the Europe regional activities).

Together, the five Consortium members implemented the regional-level activities and covered outreach activities to all types of CSOs working in development around the globe. Each Consortium member is responsible for a specific world region, with the global coordination and thematic work coordinated by the Global Secretariat.

Consortium members work on the following areas within their respective region:
- Undertaking of the national consultations in their region
- Communication and outreach to development CSOs
- Support of political dialogue efforts
- Fundraising and fund management
- Monitoring and evaluation

The relations and responsibilities within the Consortium are guided by a Memorandum of Understanding that sets out principles, reporting obligations as well as guideline for financial and programmatic management and bilateral contracts between CONCORD and the other Consortium Members. Based on this MoU, CONCORD has signed bilateral contracts with each Consortium Member.

2 An interim contract with DFID covered 100% of the expenses of the first Global Facilitation Group meeting in Prague, Czech Republic in June 2009. Even though this contract is outside the formal reporting, it has been added to the total expenses and revenue of the Open Forum for the period 2009-2011.

3 The core activities ended in December 2011, but final reporting and some of the Donors’ final disbursements will happen in early 2012.
CONCORD is also the lead of the Consortium of the Open Forum (chaired by the former CONCORD Treasurer, Jake Bharier, upon specific mandate of CONCORD Board) and is the fiscal agent of the Open Forum. It is also the physical host and employer of the Open Forum Secretariat that is made up of 3 persons: the Global Coordinator, the Finance and Administration Officer, the Communication and Advocacy Associate and 1/5 of a full time accountant.

In this role as lead Consortium member, CONCORD oversees the activities of the Consortium. In addition, CONCORD supports the Global Secretariat with the coordination of fundraising and fund management of the Open Forum. Furthermore, CONCORD is the contracting organization for CSOs and official donors. When channeling funds to Consortium partners, CONCORD enters into bilateral agreements with various contractors that set out the purpose of the transfer and reporting requirements.

3.6.2 FINANCIAL REPORT OF 2011

For 2011, actual spending was €1.080 Mio out of a budget of €1.249. Savings were made thanks to tight expenses control mechanisms, including careful travel prioritization, organization of conference calls replacing face-to-face meetings, or innovative solutions such as the use of free United Nations Volunteers for translations of key documents.

Together with the 2010 carry-over and additional resources received throughout the year, the Open Forum was able to save 8.4% of its multi-years’ budget (or €236,058) that will fund a large part of the Transition Period towards a new unified CSO structure with its complementary process, Bette-rAid, in September 2012.

All the details of the 2011 Finance and narrative report can be found following this online4:

http://www.cso-effectiveness.org/-donors-and-funding,019-.html
### CONDENSED 2011 REPORT

1. **International advocacy engagement (meetings and consultations)**
   - GFG meeting
   - Management: Research contracts on specific aspects related to CSO development effectiveness and consultancy support to synthesise and analyse outcomes of consultation process
   - Political/multi-stakeholder dialogue: International travel costs to participate in conferences, meetings and seminars
   - **Sub-total International advocacy engagement (meetings and consultations)**

2. **Staff support and programme management**
   - Staff Support (Coordinator (full-time) + Outreach Officers (part-time))
   - Overhead costs related to staff working space (small office supplies, computer, telephone, stationery, rent for office space etc.)
   - Consortium Meeting/Drafting Workshop
   - **Sub-total Staff support and programme management**

3. **Communication and outreach**
   - Travel expenses outreach officers and Consortium coordinator
   - Communications and Campaigning Associate
   - Translations of key documents: i.e. outcome reports from Global Assemblies
   - Printing and distribution
   - Web site maintenance
   - **Sub-total Communication and outreach**

4. **Regional, country, thematic/sectoral and international consultations and workshops: this budget does not include around 10 consultations in OECD countries that are financed by CSOs themselves**
   - Country consultations
   - Regional capacity-building workshops
   - Thematic/sectoral consultations
   - Global Assembly
   - 1 High-Level Leadership Meeting
   - **Sub-total Regional, country, thematic/sectoral and international consultations and workshops**
   - **Sub-total 1 + 2 + 3 + 4**
   - Fiscal management: this includes the salary of a 4/5 Finance Officer, a 1/5 accountant, costs for external audits and other costs related to the management of the funds
   - **TOTAL**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 Workplan</th>
<th>2011 Expenses</th>
<th>2011 balance vs total budget</th>
<th>2011 Variance versus Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>€80,000</td>
<td>€47,264</td>
<td>€32,736</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€36,000</td>
<td>€43,354</td>
<td>€(8,354)</td>
<td>124%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€25,000</td>
<td>€20,452</td>
<td>€4,548</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€140,000</td>
<td>€111,070</td>
<td>€28,930</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€193,116</td>
<td>€180,019</td>
<td>€13,097</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€40,029</td>
<td>€20,588</td>
<td>€19,442</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€15,000</td>
<td>€3,256</td>
<td>€5,744</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€248,145</td>
<td>€209,863</td>
<td>€38,282</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€10,000</td>
<td>€5,221</td>
<td>€4,779</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€12,000</td>
<td>€23,053</td>
<td>€(11,053)</td>
<td>192%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€15,000</td>
<td>€24,148</td>
<td>€(9,148)</td>
<td>161%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€12,000</td>
<td>€19,360</td>
<td>€(7,360)</td>
<td>161%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€5,000</td>
<td>€3,996</td>
<td>€1,004</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€54,000</td>
<td>€75,779</td>
<td>€(21,779)</td>
<td>140%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€63,500</td>
<td>€39,481</td>
<td>€24,019</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€105,000</td>
<td>€117,414</td>
<td>€(12,414)</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€161,900</td>
<td>€145,687</td>
<td>€16,213</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€300,000</td>
<td>€235,167</td>
<td>€64,833</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€56,000</td>
<td>€56,437</td>
<td>€(437)</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€686,400</td>
<td>€594,186</td>
<td>€92,214</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€1,128,545</td>
<td>€900,898</td>
<td>€137,647</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€120,000</td>
<td>€89,121</td>
<td>€30,879</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€1,248,545</td>
<td>€1,080,019</td>
<td>€168,526</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Open Forum was able to save €236,058 out of its total multi-years funding of €2,824,101. The activities started late 2009, continues in 2010 with the bulk of the 70 consultations undertaken by Civil Society to input into the development of the Istanbul Principles and the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness, followed by more Advocacy activities towards the OECD 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness during the year 2011. 2012 is foreseen to be focusing on the implementation of the Istanbul Principles.

### 3.6.3 OPEN FORUM FINANCIAL REPORT FOR 2009-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Advocacy engagement</td>
<td>€61.469</td>
<td>€55.018</td>
<td>€111.070</td>
<td>€227.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support and Programme Management</td>
<td>€61.027</td>
<td>€243.623</td>
<td>€209.863</td>
<td>€514.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Outreach</td>
<td>€3.668</td>
<td>€41.192</td>
<td>€75.779</td>
<td>€120.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td>€80.714</td>
<td>€885.115</td>
<td>€594.186</td>
<td>€1,540.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Management</td>
<td>€7.681</td>
<td>€88.517</td>
<td>€89.121</td>
<td>€185.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>€194.558</td>
<td>€1,313.465</td>
<td>€1,080.019</td>
<td>€2,588.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESSOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€2,824.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVERINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€236.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPEN FORUM EXPENSES BY YEAR AND TYPE OF ACTIVITY

- Fiscal Management
- Consultations
- Communication and Outreach
- Staff Support and Programme Management
- International Advocacy engagement
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Board members at the end of 2011

PRESIDENT: Justin KILCULLEN Irish National Platform

VICE PRESIDENT: Joanna MAYCOCK ActionAid International

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD: Harry GODDARD Plan Ireland
Gerard KARLSHAUSEN Belgian National Platform
Rilli LAPPALAINEN Finnish National Platform
Ad OOMS Dutch National Platform
Johannes TRIMMEL Austrian National Platform
Izabella TOTH Dutch National Platform
Marius WANDERS International World Vision
Carlos CABO Spanish National Platform
CONCORD organisational chart - 2011

STRATEGIC AIM 1

CSO Forum (not yet in place)

Sub-groups
- Xiaomi
- Financial
- Regulation
- Thematic programs
- Budget
- Quadrilogue

Sub-groups
- School curricula
- Code of conduct
- Images
- Funding

Sub-groups
- Aid
- Trade

Sub-groups
- Advocacy group
- Media and Communications group
- Report group

Int Project
Open Forum on CSO-eff

Project DEEEP

FACILITATION + COORDINATION + CAPACITY BUILDING

STRATEGIC APPROACHES:
- Human rights and gender equality
- Political engagement

Alliances
- Organisational development
- Leadership and participation
- Resources
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

BOARD

STRATEGIC AIM 2

Convenors Forum (meeting on AdHoc basis)

Policy Forum

EU Presidency Task Force

Policy Coherence for Development Task Force

Sub-groups

Instrument for preaccession Neighbourhood & Partnership Instrument

Rights based approach

Gender WG

HIV/Aids WG

EPAN WG

Trade WG

Migration Thematic

European Food security WG

Climate change Task Force

Food, Agriculture Trade & Environment Forum

Project TRIALOG

SECRETARIAT

GOVERNANCE BODIES

COORDINATION BODIES

WORKING BODIES

PROJECTS

CORE GROUPS

THEMATIC GROUPS

TASK FORCES
ANNEX 3

CONCORD Action Plan 2011

AIM 1: INFLUENCING THE EU
To influence the EU’s policies and practices so that the Union and its member states enhance social justice, equality and human rights throughout the world.

1.1 HOLD THE EU & ITS MEMBER STATES TO ACCOUNT
Hold the EU & its Member States to account, so that they deliver & go beyond their promised on international development policy, aid and other financing in the context of the MDGs, with the quantity & quality needed to sustainably enhance social justice, equality & human rights.

ANNUAL PRIORITY

Future of development policies / EU institutional reform
EU Multiannual financial framework 2014-??
Road to Busan / holding EU to account on progress towards 2015 aid commitment: target
Promoting policy coherence for development / food and agriculture

KEY ACTIONS IN 2011

Road to Busan
a) In 2011, Aidwatch will give additional emphasis on aid quality issues (end of Paris Declaration)
b) CONCORD will be active and present in Busan and will conduct advocacy towards EU institutions and member states in the run up to Busan HLF 4.
c) CONCORD will advocate for future EU development policies (EU consensus, green papers, etc) to remain focused on poverty eradication and the fight against inequalities. CONCORD will contribute to the policy making processes with evidence-based positions.
d) European External Action Service: CONCORD will monitor the implementation of the institutional reform at Brussels and delegation levels, to ensure that structures are able to deliver policies effectively and in an accountable manner.
e) Engaging with the European Presidencies: CONCORD will facilitate the coordination, communication and exchange of experiences between the national platforms of the countries which will hold the Presidency of the EU during 2011 (Hungary and Poland), taking into account the chances coming through the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty

EU Multiannual financial framework 2014-??
f) CONCORD will influence the negotiations for the next MFF to ensure that the structure and funding levels are appropriate and sufficient to enable the EU to deliver on its development commitments

Other Priorities
g) CONCORD will publish a 2011 Aidwatch report monitoring aid quantity and quality throughout the EU

WHO

a,b: AidWatch and CSO Effectiveness working group,
c,d,e: Policy Forum; Policy Forum Steering Group and other working groups/task forces as relevant; Board; Secretariat
f: MFF Task Force; Policy Forum Steering Group, National Platforms, Board
a-f: Secretariat and Members

RESOURCES REQUIRED

Secretariat support to working groups. Board guidance and member commitment. Priorities and resources will determine input and level of response. Activities under h will depend upon institutional reforms
May depend on additional fundraising (for AidWatch component)
1.2 INFLUENCE OTHER EXTERNAL & DOMESTIC POLICIES & PRACTICES

Influence other external & domestic policies & practices so that they reflect the EU’s global responsibility to enhance social justice, equality & Human rights.

1.3 THE EU’S GLOBAL RESPONSIBILITY

Proactively develop an agenda for the EU’s global responsibility, sustainable development & democracy-building policies, & resourcing beyond 2015, & effectively influence EU institutions to adopt it.

Policy Coherence for Development

a) CONCORD will publish a second PCD report around food and agriculture and the EU external action in the context of the EEAS.
b) CAP reform: CONCORD will lobby for the future EU policy does not harm smallscale farmers in developing countries (as a follow-up to the EC communication on food security issued in March 2010) and respects the right to food. In the framework of PCD, CONCORD will mobilize the European Parliament on the issue of the external impact of the CAP (Standing Rapporteur on PCD and EU-ACP Joint Parliamentary Assembly).
c) Climate change: ensure that the EU’s commitments to fast-start funding for climate change and to longer-term finance, in the context of post-Cancun, meet the needs of the developing world and reflect the historical responsibility of the EU (climate justice)
d) CONCORD will react to the EC communication on migration and development due for July 2011

a-c: PCD Task Force; EFSG; Climate Change Task Force; PoFo SG; Policy Forum, National Platforms Board; Secretariat

a) Climate financing: CONCORD will ensure that current and future EU commitments on climate financing are new and additional to previous development commitments; CONCORD will monitor the second EU report on fast-stat financing due in 2011 ahead of COP 18 in South Africa.
b) Innovative financing: CONCORD will continue advocate for innovative sources of financing for development including a global financial transaction tax.
c) G8/G20: CONCORD will ensure that agricultural commodities and market volatility are addressed in the context of the French Presidency of the G8/G20, with link to agriculture and right to food.
d) Global Europe: CONCORD will monitor and if possible influence future communications on Europe’s role as global actor (Global Europe).

a-d: Policy Forum; PoFo SG; PCD Task Force; Climate Change Task Force; National Platforms; Secretariat

c-d: Work will reflect political opportunities.
AIM 2: CIVIL SOCIETY

To promote the rights and responsibilities of citizens, development NGOs and, where relevant to CONCORD’s agenda, civil society as a whole to act in solidarity with those living in poverty, and to influence governments and EU institutions.

2.1 Enhance the capacity of CONCORD members to enable NGOs in Europe to inform, educate, engage, and mobilise European citizens for sustainable development and international solidarity.

2.2 Encourage & enable CONCORD’s members, and through them European NGOs, to play their part in defending and promoting the rights, roles and responsibilities of civil society at local, national, European and global levels.

ANNUAL PRIORITIES

Future of development policies / EU institutional reform
EU Multiannual financial framework 2014-??
Road to Busan / holding EU to account on progress towards 2015 aid commitment: target
Promoting policy coherence for development / food and agriculture

KEY ACTIONS IN 2011

Quadrilogue process and EU Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-??

Other Priorities

a) Development Education Multi-Stakeholder Group: if its mandate is renewed, CONCORD will actively engage in it, including raising the profile of DE at institutional level.
b) European Development Days: CONCORD will be active and visible, and will support its members in participation in these days
c) CONCORD will strengthen the focus on quality in the field of Development Education and Awareness raising.

Future of development policies / EU institutional reform

a) CONCORD will monitor the implications of the deconcentration process (EU delegations) and its contribution to improve quality and efficiency of actions EC funded and CSO implemented actions in country

Other priorities

b) CONCORD will follow up on the tax eligibility under EC grants (DCI/EIDHR), specifically with regards to the Ombudsman and European Parliament.

WHO

a&c: Development Education Forum with the support of DEEEP and CONCORD Secretariat.
b: CONCORD Secretariat, member organisations

RESOURCES REQUIRED

Continued engagement of stakeholders of the MSH group and new mandate, DEEEP Summer School,

Inputs from CONCORD constituency’s partners / field offices
Openness of Ombudsman, European Parliament and other institutions
2.3 Advocate for an enabling European & international environment for development NGOs to reach their full potential and impact, including

- more and better EU funding for quality work by EU-based NGOs and southern civil society
- EU regulation of European development NGOs

Together with its members, and where appropriate with other CSO networks, CONCORD will build common positions on EC development cooperation with CSOs. CONCORD will continue its engagement in the structured dialogue process, to ensure that outcomes reflect CONCORD positions and are taken up for the MFF and future instruments.

Road to Busan

a) CONCORD will contribute to the international CSO discussions and positioning on enabling environment for CSOs, through the OpenForum
b) CONCORD will raise awareness among / advocate towards EU development stakeholders on enabling environment for CSO

EU Multiannual financial framework 2014-??
c) CONCORD will influence the negotiations for the next MFF to ensure that the structure and funding levels are appropriate and sufficient to enable the EU to deliver its development commitments

Future of development policies / EU institutional reform
d) Financial regulation review: CONCORD will ensure that the NGO perspective is taken into account for the financial regulation review.

a-b: CONCORD CSO EFF WG, supported by Secretariat and OpenForum staff
c: CONCORD’s Quadrilogue Taskforce and MFF Taskforce, both supported by various other WGs
d: FDR WG

Road to Busan

a) CONCORD will contribute to the international CSO discussions and positioning on CSO Development Effectiveness, through the OpenForum
b) CONCORD will raise awareness among / advocate towards EU development stakeholders on CSO Development Effectiveness
c) CONCORD will accompany its members in conducting national consultations on CSO development effectiveness

d) Financial regulation review: CONCORD will ensure that the NGO perspective is taken into account for the financial regulation review.

Other Priorities
e) Support participation in regional CSO Development Effectiveness Seminar
f) Support CONCORD members in engaging with their respective national government to monitor implementation of PCD frameworks; engaging in a dialogue with the OECD about PCD chapters in the DAC Peer Reviews

a,b,c,d: CSO Development Effectiveness Working Group; CONCORD Secretariat and Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness
e: PCD Task Force

EC and member states ambitions to bring the Aid Effectiveness agenda forward, openness towards CSO needs regarding their environment.

2.4 Support and accompany its members in improving the quality and effectiveness of EU NGOs, in particular in European advocacy.

Resources are available for national / regional and thematic processes on CSO Development Effectiveness in Europe, the Open Forum is sufficiently funded.
STRATEGIC APPROACHES

STRATEGIC APPROACH 1: HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY

We are committed to setting our own work in the context of human rights and gender equality, and influencing the EU institutions to reflect human rights and gender equality in their policies and practices.

ANNUAL PRIORITY

Ensuring ongoing Institutional commitment to gender equality and human rights within the EU’s policies and practices Reinforcing CONCORD’s capacity to deliver on this.

KEY ACTIONS IN 2011

a) Ongoing political input into the preparation and implementation of the EU Gender Action Plan, and the subsequent development by Member States of specific strategies for action.

b) Through its Working Group on Gender, CONCORD will also monitor international commitments on gender equality including the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, and the UN Millennium Development Goals

c) CONCORD will continue mainstreaming the HRBA throughout its working structures, a guide will be prepared

WHO

Gender Working Group; HRBA Task Force; Board; Secretariat, National Platforms

RESOURCES REQUIRED

Will depend on capacity of Working Groups/task forces
STRATEGIC APPROACH 2: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT WITH INSTITUTIONS

CONCORD will strengthen its political engagement with institutions.

Maintaining a high quality dialogue with the three EU institutions
Establishing a high-level political engagement with the new Commissioners and the High Representative, within the framework of the European External Action Service

a) CONCORD will articulate a strategy for engaging with EU institutions
b) CONCORD will try to meet the Development Ministers within both Presidencies
c) CONCORD will renew its engagement with the new institutions (European External Action Service, DEVCO)
d) Collaboration with the European Commission around the EU Development Days
e) CONCORD engages with the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (through BetterAid and OpenForum)
f) CONCORD will coordinate European CSO/NGO engagement in the newly-established Civil Society Mechanism to the FAO Committee on World Food Security
g) CONCORD will pursue dialogue with the OECD on PCD national frameworks and practices

Working Groups, Board, Members and Secretariat

Will depend on strength of members and ability to access information

STRATEGIC APPROACH 3: ALLIANCES

CONCORD cannot achieve our aims alone. We need to work in alliance with other parts of civil society, and where appropriate other actors, in Europe and in the rest of the world.

Playing an inclusive leadership with other Civil Society Organisations on development issues
Review CONCORD engagement with other CSO on specific issues (climate change, Spring Alliance, Civil Society Contact Group)
Implement the Memorandum of Understanding with CONCORD’s Southern Partners (Repaoa and MESA)

a) Participation as a member of the Spring Alliance and the Civil Society Contact Group
b) Continuing to build alliances and pursue our process to ‘engage with Southern Civil Society’ (with specific focus on Asia), including joint event at WSF
c) CONCORD is active part of the International Forum of national NGO platforms (WSF event), BetterAid and OpenForum
d) Facilitation of the informal EU CSO Group on International Development
e) CONCORD will explore partnering with platforms of EU local authorities in development

All: CONCORD Board, secretariat & members

Human and financial resources in member organisations, Board and Secretariat
STRATEGIC APPROACH 4: ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CONCORD’S MEMBERS

If our aims are to be achieved, CONCORD needs to be able to influence EU institutions as effectively as possible, ensure legitimate influence and support in every EU member state, support effective and representative work by development.

ANNUAL PRIORITY

Building the capacity of CONCORD’s members to engage on ODA issues with a focus on the media.

Develop a plan for capacity building and raise the resources necessary to implement it.

KEY ACTIONS IN 2011

a) CONCORD will organise two ODA capacity building seminars for its members (engaging with governments on aid issues, ODA analysis)
b) CONCORD will join efforts regarding capacity building with the 2 associated projects DEEEP and TRIALOG
c) CONCORD will implement recommendations of EC evaluation and Communication evaluation

WHO

a: Secretariat, Members
b: Secretariat, DEEP and TRIALOG, National Platforms
c: Secretariat and Board

RESOURCES REQUIRED

A: main funding secured (FdF)
c: increased secretariat capacity
STRATEGIC APPROACH 5: LEADERSHIP & PARTICIPATION IN CONCORD

To deliver our aims in this strategic framework, CONCORD needs processes for participation, consultation, leadership and representation, that focus members’ energy on the work itself and limit internal processes to those necessary for collective ownership, participation and coherence of policies. With a combination of trust and strong frameworks for transparency and accountability, leaders and representatives must be able to take initiatives, consult when they need to, and be held to account for doing so appropriately.

STRATEGIC APPROACH 6: CONCORD’S RESOURCES

As a confederation, CONCORD’s aims are achieved through its members, who are facilitated by a Secretariat and led by a Board and Director. CONCORD’s objectives can be achieved only through marshalling the expertise of our members and their members, and through the commitment of members and funders to the financial support of CONCORD. Our human and financial resources must be used prudently to enable CONCORD to be independent, sustainable and effective.

Increasing the quantitative and qualitative engagement of members in CONCORD processes

- a) One induction seminar for new directors of member organisations
- b) Start implementing a leadership capacity development programme - “fellowship programme”

Rebuilding CONCORD’s reserve

- a) Development of strategy to diversify financial resources
- b) Development and communication of processes and procedures
- c) Implement recommendations of EC audit and evaluation

a: Board, Director and Secretariat
b: Board, Director and Secretariat

b) additional funding must be mobilized
Description of the political working groups (end of 2011)

POLICY FORUM:

CONCORD’s ‘political spearhead’, discussing and sharing political intelligence and coordinating policy work.

Sub-group: Presidencies of the European Council, EU institutional reform, Human Right Based Approach task force (Chair: Judit Almasi F.I Terre des Hommes (judit.almasi@tdh.ch), MDGs.

- Co-Chairs: Ester Asin (CARE), and Birte Hald (Danish NP)
- Contact secretariat: Klavdija Cernilogar klavdija.cernilogar@concordeurope.org
  Tel. +32 2 743 87 81)

Policy coherence for development (PCD) coordination group:

Set up in 2007, the role of this Coordination Group is to promote policy coherence for development in all the EU and national policies; to ensure coordination of CONCORD’s engagement towards the EU institutions on PCD; to raise awareness within the Confederation and European civil society in general about the PCD agenda; to implement where appropriate advocacy strategies developed by other working groups; to build-up policy and advocacy capacity of members vis-à-vis their Member States on PCD and to share the best practices; to coordinate the initiatives led by the platforms when necessary; to provide a space within CONCORD for analysis / experience sharing on PCD; to strengthen CONCORD’s capacity to raise cases of (EU) policy incoherencies; to ensure that there is a comprehensive and regular dialog between the EU and its Southern partners on policy coherence for development.

Its develops analytical, methodological and training tools for CONCORD to be able to mainstream a PCD approach within all the policy areas and advocacy work of CONCORD; and to build-up the capacity of CONCORD members on PCD. It coordinates a biennial report (Spotlight). It works in close link with the thematic groups (food security, trade, climate change, etc.).

- Chair : Rilli Lappalainen (Kehys, Finish NP)
- Contact CONCORD Secretariat:
  Blandine Bouniol
  Blandine.Bouniol@concordeurope.org
  Tel: +32 2 743 87 61).
Trade reference group (part of PCD issue):

The Trade reference group is a forum where European development NGOs work together to influence and promote an EU trade agenda that is coherent with the overall objectives of EU development policy (sustainable development and poverty eradication) and contributes to the achievement of the UN Development Goals. The group monitors trade regional agreements, particularly the Economic Partnership Agreements in the framework of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement, EU trade relations with the rest of the world (regional and bilateral FTAs), the EU global strategy for trade, etc. The group engages with DG Trade in the framework of broader European coalitions (European trade network, Seattle to Brussels, etc.)

- Chair: Karin Ulmer, APRODEV
  k.ulmer@aprodev.net
- Contact CONCORD Secretariat:
  Colin Kampschoer
  Colin.Kampschoer@concordeurope.org
  Tel: +32 2 743 87 74

Climate Change and Development task force (part of PCD issue):

A task force was set up in January 2009. CAN is a key partner of CONCORD in this process, the latter providing the development perspective in the climate change debate, and vice-versa. Focus is on: financing adaptation to Climate change (looking at funding mechanisms proposals), climate Justice, adaptation and mitigation, low carbon development.

The group remains for the time being a task force and develops ad hoc policy initiatives when appropriate. The core issues that the task force continues to look at: climate financing, adaptation and development, coherence of climate/environmental policies with EU development policies, and the link between climate change and development in general.

- Contact CONCORD Secretariat:
  Colin Kampschoer
  Colin.Kampschoer@concordeurope.org
  Tel: +32 2 743 87 74

Migration & Development ‘ad hoc’ group (part of PCD issue):

In the context of the growing work on policy coherence, a group of members have initiated an ad hoc group on migration and development issues. The aim of this informal group is to share analysis on migration and development issues and coordinate members’ initiatives in this field – for example, policy analysis and advocacy on the EU Global Approach to Migration and participation in the annual Global Forum on Migration and Development. (GFMD). The group maintains a level of capacity within the Confederation that feeds into CONCORD’s project on PCD (biennial report). The group also feeds in the CSO contact group on migration and development, co-founded by CONCORD and facilitated by EUNOMAD, the European network on migration and development.

- Contact CONCORD Secretariat:
  Blandine Bouniol
  Blandine.Bouniol@concordeurope.org
  Tel: +32 2 743 87 61

European Food Security Group (EFSG: part of PCD issue):

The aims of the Food Security Group are designed in particular to feed political advocacy with practices. The group has created two ‘preparatory committees’, which offer a representative forum of European NGOs involved in policy as well as practical issues related to food security, and acts as a reference group in promoting a structured and regular dialogue between NGOs, the European Institutions and relevant international stakeholders. It intends to demonstrate the impact of NGO programmes and expertise, in particular vis-à-vis the most vulnerable groups. The group also aims at providing updated information and policy argu-
ments on food security to be integrated, wherever relevant, in common CONCORD policy and lobbying activities.

- Chair: Stineke Oenema (ICCO, the Netherlands, member of APRODEV)
  Stineke.oenema@icco.nl
  Tel: +31 3 06 92 79 47

- Contact CONCORD Secretariat:
  Blandine Bouniol
  Blandine.Bouniol@concordeurope.org
  Tel: +32 2 743 87 61.

AidWatch:

AidWatch is a pan-European lobby and campaigns initiative monitoring and advocating on the quality and the quantity of ODA provided by the EU member states and the European Commission. The AidWatch network is an active group of aid experts from across the 27 EU Member States, working collectively to hold EU Member States to account on their aid quality and quantity commitments. Each year, the AidWatch Initiative publishes a European-wide report analysing the qualitative and quantitative performance of each EU Member States and the European Commission according to international and EU pledges on aid. The initiative also carries out ongoing lobby, research and campaigns activities on a wide range of aid related issues throughout the year.

- Steering Group: Joanna Rea (BOND), Caroline Joy Kroecker – Falconi (World Vision), Pauliina Saares (Kepa/Kehys), Luca de Fraia (ActionAid Italy) and Zuzana Sladkova (AidWatch Coordinator)

- Contact secretariat:
  Zuzana Sladkova AidWatch Coordinator
  zuzana.sladkova@concordeurope.org
  Tel: +32 2 743 87 72)

Cotonou Working Group:

The group focus its work on: civil society participation and strengthening the links with ACP organisations; the evaluation of the 10th European Development Fund (EDF) programming process; the monitoring of the EDF regional programming process; on lobbying and fostering the links with the Joint Parliamentary Assembly; on the forthcoming mid-term review of the ACP country strategy papers.

- Chair: Wiske Jult wiske.jult@11.be

EU-Africa Working Group:

The reference group was set up in 2007 on ad hoc basis to deal with the EU-Africa strategy process. The status of the group has been formalised in 2008 and Terms of reference have been adopted.

The group should follow some actions related to the implementation of the EU-Africa strategy in 2009: involvement of CSO in the implementation of the strategy, a CONCORD “internal” mapping and linking better with the work of other working groups, particularly Cotonou, and other

- Contact: Vice Chair: Karine Sohet - APRODEV k.sohet@aprodev.net

Gender Working Group:

CONCORD has identified the strengthening of gender & development awareness and advocacy work within CONCORD and at EU level as a cross-cutting issue and key to achieving CONCORD’s strategic objectives. The overall objective of the Gender WG is to ensure that gender is at the centre of EU Development Policy. This work is done through gender and development advocacy and lobby work and by engaging in structured dialogue with EU. The group also advises CONCORD bodies on how to raise awareness and build gender competence on EU development issues.
HIV and AIDS Working Group:

This group had its terms of references approved by CONCORD Board in September 2008 and has established a work plan, mainly focused on the review of the Commission’s Action Plan on HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

- Co-chairs: Karen Schroh, Plan International karen.schroh@plan-international.org
  Elena D’Urzo, IPPF EN edurzo@ippfen.org
- Secretariat Contact: Klavdija Cernilogar klavdija.cernilogar@concordeurope.org
  Tel. +32 2 743 87 81

MFF Working Group

The MFF taskforce was set up in October 2010 to follow-up the negotiations regarding the European Union Multiannual Financial Framework - MFF 2014-2020. The objective of the MFF taskforce is to develop clear CONCORD positions on the next MFF in order to lobby European Institutions and make sure the CONCORD positions on foreign and development policies and funding are taken into account.

- CoChairs: Cécile Benhamou, Care benhamou@careinternational.org
  and Lars Bosselmann, CBM lars.bosselmann@cbm.org
- Contact secretariat: Elise Vanormelingen evanormelingen@concordeurope.org
  Tel. +32 2 743 87 93

Development Awareness Raising and Education (DARE) Forum:

The DARE Forum brings together practitioners and experts of Development Education, Awareness Raising (DEAR), Global learning and campaigning from most EU member states and a number of INGOs. The group meets bi-annually to establish common strategies to increase the impact of and support for Development Education and Awareness Raising activities in Europe. The Forum has a steering group and five subgroups: Advocacy, Formal Education, Quality & Impact, Youth & Children and Communication.

- Chair: Marie-Hélène Kaber, Estonian National Platform mari@humanae.ee
- Vice Chair: Nicole Ikuku, Luxembourg National Platform astm@astm.lu
- Contact CONCORD Secretariat/DEEEP: Tobias Troll t.troll@deeep.org
  Tel. +32 (0) 2 743 87 88

CSO Development Effectiveness:

This working group aims at supporting the efforts of CONCORD members to address, improve and demonstrate the effectiveness of European NGOs in development. The working group’s main focus will be on CSOs’ own effectiveness, including on the roles and identity of NGOs in development and on the environment that is needed to allow CSOs to realise their full potential in development. The group will link up CONCORD’s membership with the Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness.

- Chair : Heloise Heyer, Coordination Sud heyer@coordinationsud.org
- Contact Secrétariat : Daniel Nuijten dnuijten@concordeurope.org
Enlargement, Pre-accession and Neighborhood (EPAN):

The group brings together members from all over the EU and candidate countries to monitor the implementation of the European Neighbourhood Partnership Instrument (ENPI) and the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) of the European Union as well as supporting CSO strengthening in the European neighbourhood and Western Balkans. Members of the group are involved in the Eastern Partnership civil society forum and publish regular policy statements that have received personal responses from Commissioner Stefan Fule.

- Chair: Valery Pandzharov, Bulgarian National platform VPandzharov@mtsp.gov.mk
- Contact CONCORD secretariat/TRIALOG (until September 2012): Rebecca Steel-Jasinska Trialog@concordeurope.org tel: +32 (2) 743 87 78

Funding for Development and Relief (FDR) Working Group:

The policy work of the FDR Group focuses on European Union - NGO funding policies and priorities, on the allocation of funds to these priorities and on the European funding process and organisation. The FDR has a steering group and 3 subgroups: de-concentration, financial regulations, geographic and thematic instruments.

- Co-Chairs: Alexandra Makaroff, Plan International Alexandra.Makaroff@plan-international.org and Annette Wulf, German NP Annette.Wulf@welthungerhilfe.de
- Contact secretariat: Elise Vanormelingen evanormelingen@concordeurope.org Tel. +32 2 743 87 93

Structured Dialogue Taskforce

The overall aim of the Structured Dialogue Process is to redefine a strategy for the partnership between the European Commission and the civil society organisations in development cooperation. The SD taskforce works on the involvement of CONCORD in the Structured Dialogue process and its follow-up (e.g. new EC Communication on CSOs). The taskforce is composed of representatives from 6 working groups (FDR, DEF, Policy Forum, CSO effectiveness, AidWatch, Cotonou) and a Board member.

- Chair: Ester Asin (Care) Asin@careinternational.org
- Contact secretariat: Elise Vanormelingen evanormelingen@concordeurope.org Tel. +32 2 743 87 93)
CONCORD POSITIONS and STUDIES in 2011 (chronological order)

2. The post 2013 Multiannual Financial Framework of the EU: Why it is a priority for CONCORD in January 2011
3. CONCORD answer to the Common Agricultural Policy consultation - 25/01/2011 January 2011
4. CONCORD full response to Green Paper on Development - 01-2011 January 2011
5. LETTER to EU Council Spring Alliance calls for sustainable energy future - 21-01-2011 January 2011
7. Survey on Local Authorities in development - 09/02/2011 February 2011
8. AidWatch Briefing ‘Between Austerity and political will’ 2011 - 22/02/2011 February 2011
9. CONTRIBUTION TO THE REVIEW OF THE FINANCIAL REGULATION The external aid perspective 3 February 2011
11. CONCORD comments on the draft 2012 EU Budget - 28 April 2011
13. CONCORD submission on Discussion Paper on Migration and Dev_30/05/2011 30 May 2011
14. EWL, WIDE and CONCORD Statement on post-2013 MFF and EU financing instruments May 2011
15. CONCORD interpretation treatment of taxes 2010 PRAG ENG- May 2011
17. ACP joint parliamentary assembly Budapest New tendencies in EU-ACP relations after the Lisbon Treaty: Drifting away from development –Briefing of Concord Cotonou WG - 16-18 May 2011
22. ACP EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly Budapest CONCORD Cotonou WG Briefing paper “Food security” 16 – 18 May 2011
23. ACP EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly Budapest CONCORD Cotonou WG Briefing paper “Climate change” 16 – 18 May 2011
25. Concord-AidWatch analysis of the first draft Busan Outcome Document 29 June 2011
27. CONCORD comments on transfer of appropriation n° DEC 20/2011 07 July 2011
28. CONCORD AidWatch reaction to the European Parliament report on the HLF4 on Aid Effectiveness August 2011
29. CONCORD - AidWatch response to the first draft Busan Outcome Document 26 August 2011
30. CONCORD AidWatch reaction to the European Commission’s Communication Proposal for the EU Common Position for the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Busan September 2011
31. CONCORD preliminary recommendations on funding instruments in the 2014-2020 MFF 6 September 2011
32. AW position paper on EU common positions for HLF-4 in Busan October 2011
33. Concord Reaction to the Communication “Agenda for Change” October 2011
35. Spotlight report on EU Policy Coherence for Development 7 November 2011
36. Analysis Mapping of European NGOs in the Mediterranean Region November 2011
37. Mapping of European NGOs in the Mediterranean Region November 2011
38. ACP-UE Assemblée parlementaire paritaire 22ème session – Lomé 21-23 November 2011
39. CONCORD response to OECD consultation 30 November 2011
40. Briefing and recommendations by the Trade Reference Group of CONCORD on the reform of the Generalised System of Preferences (GSP) December 2011
Monitoring the activities of CONCORD members in 2011

Participation to CONCORD activities for year 2011*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Non Concord member</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>Associate member</th>
<th>CONCORD Secretariat</th>
<th>Grand Total 2011</th>
<th>year 2010</th>
<th>year 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aidwatch</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond 2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building/leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotonou</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO effectiveness</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE Forum</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPAN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Taskforce</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management (Building)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFF</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Forum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/New working processes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Forum</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrilogue</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern engagement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total 2011</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*number of attendees
ANNUAL FIGURES FOR MEMBERS’ ACTIVITY IN 2011 AT CONFEDERATION LEVEL

The total number of participants in CONCORD activities in 2011 was 1770, an increase from 1299 in 2010, and 1132 in 2009. Participation figures are based on the number of participants who attend each meeting and event organized by CONCORD during the year.

THE DIFFERENCE IN PARTICIPATION BETWEEN THE CATEGORIES:

National Platforms: 821 participants
Networks: 453 participants
Non CONCORD member: 348 participants
CONCORD secretariat: 145 participants
Associate member: 3 participants

The high level of participation from our National Platforms highlights their importance/relevance to CONCORD on a pan European level.

The use of conference calls, as encouraged by CONCORD, has notably increased and thereby reducing overall costs and our carbon footprint.

PARTICIPATION TO CONCORD ACTIVITIES FOR YEAR 2011

Non Concord member - 348 (CONCORD projects, Governments (institutions + ministeries), Media, Southern Partners and Experts)

Overall participation has increased by 36.3% since 2010 and a further 56.4% since 2009

Participation by National Platforms account for 46.4% of the grand total in 2011

Participation by Networks account for 25.6% of the grand total in 2011

Participation by non CONCORD members account for 19.7% of the grand total in 2011

TOP FOUR PROCESSES/ACTIVITIES:

Policy Forum - 199
Aidwatch - 166
(Open Forum - 151)
PCD - 131
General Assembly - 127

TOP FIVE PARTICIPATION:

Non Concord member - 348 (CONCORD projects, Governments (institutions + ministeries), Media, Southern Partners and Experts)

Italy - 82 (59 of which came from the Open Forum consultation process in Italy)

Belgium - 78
Ireland - 66
France - 64

BOTTOM FIVE MEMBER PARTICIPATION:

ALDA - 3
Malta - 4
Greece and Romania - 5
Islamic Relief - 8
Bulgaria and Handicap International - 9
New CONCORD members 2011

ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL DEMOCRACY AGENCIES (ALDA)

SHORT BACKGROUND

The Association of Local Democracy Agencies (ALDA) was founded in 1999 on the initiative of the Council of Europe’s Congress of Local and Regional Authorities to coordinate a network of Local Democracy Agencies (LDAs) already in existence since 1993. ALDA works on the promotion of good governance and citizen participation at the local level and believes that development of good governance and civic participation locally is a major instrument for peace and development.

WHERE IS ALDA BASED?

155 members from around 30 European, candidate or potential member states.

ADDRESS: ALDA c/o Maison des Associations, Place des Orphelins 1/A, 67000, Strasbourg, France

Tel: +33 3 90 21 45 93
Fax: +33 3 88 41 27 51

Website: www.alda-europe.eu

Name of Contact Person (secretariat): Peter Sondergaard

E-mail: peter.sondergaard@aldaintranet.org
Phone: +32 274 201 61

MAIN FIELDS OF ACTION

Development and development education with special focus on promoting good governance and citizen participation at the local level and encouraging cooperation between local government and civil society in the field of development.

SPECIAL FIELDS OF INTEREST FOR ALDA

Capacity-building for local and regional authorities, decentralisation, European integration, Promotion of citizen initiatives for sustainable development at the local level, youth participation, human rights, migration, equal opportunities, active citizenship and volunteering.

Citizen participation in the decision-making process, International cooperation in the field of development, supporting cooperation between different kinds of local actors in the field of development.

REGIONS/COUNTRIES WHERE ACTIONS ARE IMPLEMENTED

European Union member states, South East Europe, Post-Soviet states (especially Belarus and South Caucasus), Turkey and Mediterranean region (Morocco, Algeria, Israel)
Handicap International is an independent international aid organisation working in situations of poverty and exclusion, conflict and disaster. Working alongside persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups, our action and testimony are focused on responding to their essential needs, improving their living conditions and promoting respect for their dignity and their fundamental rights.

WHERE IS HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL BASED?

The Federation is constituted of 7 organisations: Switzerland, Luxembourg, France, Germany, United Kingdom (for the nationals of a Member State of the European Union), Canada, and USA.

(Handicap International Belgium is currently discussing its future membership in HI Federation. This shall be decided during the next HI-Belgium general assembly of June 2011.)

difference : 14 avenue Berthelot 69361 Lyon cedex 07 tel: +33 4 78 69 79 79 fax: +33 4 78 69 79 94

Website:
http://www.handicap-international.fr/ : for information on Handicap International’s activities overseas

Name of Contact Person (secretariat) : Alexandra MEGE

E-mail: amege@handicap-international.org
Phone: +33 4 78 69 79 99
Fax: +33 4 78 69 79 90

MAIN FIELDS OF ACTION

Through its actions, HI mainly targets the following types of beneficiary populations:

- populations at risk of diseases, violence or accidents liable to cause disability;
- vulnerable populations and in particular disabled persons and persons living with chronic disabling diseases;
- refugee populations, populations living in disaster areas or populations displaced by crises, conflicts and catastrophes, and especially those persons among them who are vulnerable, injured and disabled;
- populations threatened by weapons, munitions and explosive devices during or in the aftermath of military conflicts.

SPECIAL FIELDS OF INTEREST FOR HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL

Handicap International’s main themes of work are:

- Health
- Prevention
- Rehabilitation
- Economic inclusion
- Social inclusion
- Education
- Local development
REGIONS/COUNTRIES WHERE ACTIONS ARE IMPLEMENTED

Albania, Germany, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia

Federation of Russia (Including the Caucasus of the North)

In Central Asia: Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan

North Africa: Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia

Iraq (Including Iraqi Kurdistan), Jordan, Lebanon, Palestinian Territories, Yemen

In Central America and South America: Brazil, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua

In West Africa: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Chad, Togo

In Southern Africa, Central and Eastern: Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Uganda, Democratic Republic. of Congo, Rwanda, Somaliland / Puntland, Sudan, Tanzania

In the Indian Ocean: Madagascar

In South Asia: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan

In Southeast Asia: Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam
ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE

SHORT BACKGROUND

Islamic Relief provides support regardless of religion, ethnicity or gender and without expecting anything in return. Working in over 25 countries, we promote sustainable economic and social development by working with local communities to eradicate poverty, illiteracy and disease. We also respond to disasters and emergencies, helping people in crisis.

WHERE IS ISLAMIC RELIEF BASED?

Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom

Address: 19 Rea Street South, B5 6LB Birmingham, United Kingdom

Tel: +44-(0)121 605 5555
Fax: +44-(0)20 7401 3480
Website: www.islamic-relief.com

Name of Contact People (secretariat): Yasmin Hussein E-mail: Yasmin.Hussein@irworldwide.org

MAIN FIELDS OF ACTION:

Islamic Relief’s emergency teams are ready to respond to humanitarian disasters in the shortest possible time. The priority is to provide as many people as possible with the basic necessities of food, water, shelter and medical treatment. After the emergency phase, IR assesses possibilities of rehabilitation and long-term development. The emergency preparedness programmes help communities to survive conflicts and natural disasters. Islamic Relief works closely with communities to identify their needs and provide relevant livelihoods training. Projects include interest-free loans, cash-for-work schemes and developing small businesses, such as vegetable and dairy production. Islamic Relief works directly with communities to ensure its education programmes are relevant to their needs. Projects are aimed at both adults and children and include building and equipping schools, holding literacy classes and teacher training.

SPECIAL FIELDS OF INTEREST FOR ISLAMIC RELIEF

- Poverty
- Environment
- Conflict Transformation
- Promoting responsible lending & microfinance
- Reproductive Health
- Trade
- Hunger
- Disaster Preparedness

REGIONS/COUNTRIES WHERE ACTIONS ARE IMPLEMENTED

Africa: Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Somalia, Sudan
Asia: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Pakistan and Kashmir
Europe: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chechnya, Kosovo
Middle East: Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Palestine, Yemen
THE ROMANIAN NGDO PLATFORM - FOND

SHORT BACKGROUND

After an extensive process initiated back in 2005, 34 non-governmental organizations decided, in October 2006, to set up the national development cooperation platform FOND.

FOND was legally registered in March 2007 as Federation, according to the Romanian legislation.

WHERE IS FOND BASED?

The Romanian NGDO Platform has 42 members located in Romania (Bucharest, Botosani, Brasov, Cluj-Napoca, Constanta, Iasi, Timisoara, and Satu-Mare).

Address: 2K, Splaiul Independentei, sector 3, Bucharest, Romania

Tel: 0040 734 325 662
Fax: 0040 021 310 01 80
Website: www.fondromania.org

Name of Contact Person (secretariat): Adela Rusu (platform coordinator)

E-mail: office@fondromania.org / adela.rusu@fondromania.org Phone: 0040 734 325 662

MAIN FIELDS OF ACTION

Within development cooperation, most of the 42 NGOs are engaged and/or interested in developing projects in the following sectors: development education, education and professional training, poverty reduction, child rights and child protection, democracy, good governance and human rights, health (HIV/AIDS).

SPECIAL FIELDS OF INTEREST FOR FOND

- European Neighborhood Policy
- European Transition Compendium
- Aid Effectiveness
- Development Education

REGIONS/COUNTRIES WHERE ACTIONS ARE IMPLEMENTED

South East Europe, Black Sea Region, Africa, Middle East, Asia
Statutory Auditor’s report 2011 to the General Assembly

CONCORD AISBL

STATUTORY AUDITOR’S REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MEMBERS ON THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2011

In accordance with the legal and statutory requirements, we report to you on the performance of the mandate of statutory auditor which has been entrusted to us. This report includes our opinion on the financial statements together with the required additional statements and information.

Qualified audit opinion on the financial statements, together with an emphasis of matter paragraph

We have audited the financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2011, prepared in accordance with the legal and regulatory requirements applicable in Belgium, which show a balance sheet total of € 1,367,114 and a profit for the year of € 107,419 for the financial year.

The board of directors of the company is responsible for the preparation of the financial statements. This responsibility includes: designing, implementing and maintaining internal control relevant for the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatements, whether due to fraud or error; selecting and applying appropriate accounting policies; and making accounting estimates that are reasonable in the circumstances.

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with the legal requirements and the auditing standards applicable in Belgium, as issued by the Institute of Registered Auditors (“Institut des Réviseurs d’Entreprises / Instituut der Bedrijfseislers”). Those standards require that we plan and perform our audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement.
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RSM Belgium is an independent member firm of RSM International
an alliance of independent accounting
and consulting firms.
In accordance with those standards, we have taken into account the organisation of the Association from the administrative and accounting point of view, as well as the procedures of internal control.

The responsible officers of the Association provided us with clear answers to our questions for explanations and information. We have examined, on a test basis, the evidence supporting the amounts included in the financial statements. We have assessed the accounting policies used, the significant estimates carried out by the Association, as well as the presentation of the financial statements as a whole. We estimate that the work we carried out provided us with a reasonable basis for expressing our opinion.

An outstanding debt of €16,600 shows an overdue of several months and no provision was accounted for bad debts.

In our opinion, the financial statements as of December 31, 2011 give, under exception of the matters described in preceding paragraph, a true and fair view of the company's assets, liabilities, financial position and results of operations in accordance with the financial reporting framework applicable in Belgium.

The financial statements have been established with the continuation of the activities in mind. This presumption shall be justified only to the extent where the Association continues to receive financial support from its members and subsidies from the European Commission, or if it succeeds in gaining access to other financial resources.

Additional statements and information

The association's compliance with the law applicable in Belgium to non-profit making associations (law of June 27, 1921) and the articles of association are the responsibility of the board of directors.

Our responsibility is to supplement our report with the following additional statements and information which do not modify our audit opinion on the financial statements:

- Without prejudice to formal aspects of minor significance, the accounting records were maintained in accordance with the legal and regulatory requirements applicable in Belgium;

- There are no transactions undertaken or decisions taken in violation of the articles of association or the law applicable in Belgium to non-profit making associations (law of June 27, 1921) that we have to report to you.

- The provision entitled « provision for depreciation of assets » for an amount of €8,801 represents the future depreciation on the tangible assets.
There is no separate bank account for the European grants. The possible surplus cash amounts are being invested globally; the financial income, however, is insignificant.

Brussels, April 23, 2012

The Statutory Auditor,

Sociëteit RSM InterAudit, represented by Laurent Van der Linden, Partner
Secretariat staff movements in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Depart</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alina Burlacu</td>
<td>10.01.11</td>
<td>30/06/11</td>
<td>étudiante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maja Drca</td>
<td>10.01.11</td>
<td>10/07/11</td>
<td>étudiante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magda Elena Toma</td>
<td>10.01.11</td>
<td>18/02/11</td>
<td>policy officer + personal assistant</td>
<td>contrat CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Varnormelingen</td>
<td>01.01.11</td>
<td>31/05/11</td>
<td>modification de tps de travail 5jours/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>semaine jusqu’au 31/5/11 au lieu de 4 jours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Philippart</td>
<td>01.04.03</td>
<td>31/01/11</td>
<td>Communication officer</td>
<td>CDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfonso Martinez Saenz</td>
<td>01.01.11</td>
<td>31/07/11</td>
<td>PCD + Aidwatch</td>
<td>Convention d’imersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilherme Kessler</td>
<td>14.02.11</td>
<td>31/05/11</td>
<td>Aidwatch report</td>
<td>consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houfrane Ahamed</td>
<td>31.01.11</td>
<td>31/04/2011</td>
<td>consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Kozhaeva</td>
<td>15.02.11</td>
<td>15/08/11</td>
<td>Open Forum</td>
<td>Convention immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magda Elena Toma</td>
<td>10.01.11</td>
<td>18/02/11</td>
<td>contrat CDD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfonso Martinez Saenz</td>
<td>01.01.11</td>
<td>20/03/2011</td>
<td>PCD + Aidwatch</td>
<td>Convention d’imersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Kampschôer</td>
<td>18.04.11</td>
<td>17/10/11</td>
<td>PCD + Aidwatch</td>
<td>Convention d’imersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondot Maryne</td>
<td>23.05.11</td>
<td>31/08/11</td>
<td>Direction assistante</td>
<td>étudiante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Puglisi</td>
<td>20.06.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
<td>CDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathalie Bekier Djerf</td>
<td>08.06.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive assistant &amp; Partnership officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Léo Williams</td>
<td>14.06.11</td>
<td>31/12/11</td>
<td>Beyond 2015 and Policy Forum + head of CONCORD</td>
<td>CDD 6 mois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alina Burlacu</td>
<td>06.07.11</td>
<td>5/10/11</td>
<td>Communication assistante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- = Consultant present at Concord
- = Intern or volunteer
- = Staff that have left CONCORD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Date de naissance</th>
<th>Date de fin</th>
<th>Poste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maja Drca</td>
<td>10/01/11</td>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>étudiante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondot Maryne</td>
<td>23/05/11</td>
<td>31/08/11</td>
<td>Direction assistante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romain Philippe</td>
<td>06/04/09</td>
<td>31/08/11</td>
<td>PCD policy Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Kozhaeva</td>
<td>15/08/11</td>
<td>31/08/11</td>
<td>Open Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convention immersion reconduite -&gt; 31/8 puis contrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Kozhaeva</td>
<td>01/09/11</td>
<td>31/01/12</td>
<td>Open Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Vives</td>
<td>01/09/11</td>
<td>30/11/11</td>
<td>FDR - MFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Carpenter</td>
<td>06/09/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blandine Bouniol</td>
<td>12/09/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD policy Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Vanormelingen</td>
<td>01/09/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator MFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonne Poissonnier</td>
<td>20/09/11</td>
<td>31/01/12</td>
<td>Aidwatch 50 % + Policy 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Romana Minniti</td>
<td>28/09/11</td>
<td>31/03/12</td>
<td>stagiaire communication étudiante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julieta Gonzalez Ocampo</td>
<td>03/10/11</td>
<td>28/11/11</td>
<td>Volontaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Kampschöer</td>
<td>18/04/11</td>
<td>31/01/12</td>
<td>PCD 50 % + Open Forum 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alina Burlacu</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>5/10/11</td>
<td>Communications Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Vogt</td>
<td>31/10/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz Berger</td>
<td>23/10/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuzana Sladkova</td>
<td>21/11/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aidwatch coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klavdija Cernilogar</td>
<td>13/12/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuela Houtart</td>
<td>01/11/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>avenant : modif salaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Bartlett</td>
<td>22/03/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinateur CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaelle Nicodeme</td>
<td>1/01/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/12/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>prolongation convention d’immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Romana Minniti</td>
<td>01/12.11</td>
<td>31/01/12</td>
<td>convention d’immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterina Attiani</td>
<td>05/12.11</td>
<td>5/03/12</td>
<td>étudiante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Williams</td>
<td>14/06.11</td>
<td>31/12/11</td>
<td>Beyond 2015 and Policy Forum + head of CONCORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meagen Baldwin</td>
<td>01.10.08</td>
<td>31.12.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Action Aid International</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>EU-CORD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>