



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 06.05.1999  
COM(1999)218 final

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION  
TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

ON

**COMPLEMENTARITY BETWEEN COMMUNITY AND MEMBER STATE  
POLICIES ON DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	THE NEED FOR GREATER COMPLEMENTARITY.....	4
1.1.	The obligation to achieve results.....	4
1.2.	The obligation to ensure quality and effectiveness .....	4
2.	THE AIMS OF COMPLEMENTARITY .....	5
3.	PREREQUISITES FOR GREATER COMPLEMENTARITY.....	5
3.1.	Political will .....	6
3.2.	Co-ordination mechanisms.....	6
3.3.	National development strategy.....	7
4.	MAIN FORMS OF COMPLEMENTARITY.....	8
4.1.	Complementarity at country level.....	8
4.1.1.	Structural adjustment support.....	8
4.1.2.	Support for sectoral policies and projects.....	9
4.2.	Complementary management of human resources.....	10
4.2.1.	Better distribution.....	10
4.2.2.	A larger critical mass.....	11
5.	IMPLEMENTING METHODS .....	11
5.1.	Effectiveness/concentration.....	11
5.2.	Effectiveness/comparative advantages .....	11
6.	NEW INITIATIVES .....	12
6.1.	In the short term.....	12
6.1.1.	An iterative process .....	12
6.1.2.	Other measures .....	14
6.1.3.	Supporting measures .....	14
6.2.	In the medium term .....	14
6.2.1.	National development strategies.....	15
6.2.2.	Future Community programmes.....	15

## SUMMARY

*The European Union, as the main supplier of funds at world level (including Community aid, which in 1997 amounted to 20% of European aid) should be given a higher profile in international discussions.*

*The Member States, like the Community, are under pressure to reduce the volume of official development assistance; they must improve the quality and efficiency of their operations and are now under an obligation to produce visible results.*

*Greater complementarity between Member States' aid and Community aid is an ideal means of obtaining better results and greater visibility.*

*The communication refers first of all to the main objectives of complementarity, namely: improving the impact of European aid through optimum use of the EU's human and financial resources, and through Community aid providing "value added" in relation to Member States' bilateral aid.*

*The communication then describes the main conditions for ensuring greater complementarity: strong political will, operational co-ordination mechanisms, and a development strategy of the recipient country itself, which together will help ensure that Community aid is defined and targeted with reference to Member State aid.*

*The communication then describes the main forms of complementarity at operational level and in the management of human resources and implementing methods: apportioning sectors and/or targeting, comparative advantages and areas where the Community has its own value added.*

*New initiatives are proposed:*

- *in the short term there are: systematic exchange and joint analysis of existing documents on strategies for supporting beneficiary countries; reflection on the redefinition of the roles of existing committees, simplification and harmonisation of procedures, strengthening of links between headquarters and links at the field level. It is proposed that Member States who so wish be associated with annual reviews of Community programmes of aid to the ACP countries.*
- *in the medium term, the Commission and the Member States must help the beneficiary countries to draw up their own national strategy documents, and this should mean that the Community support strategies will reflect the Member States' priorities and the Community's at the same time. This process should lead gradually to the drawing-up of truly European strategies.*

Official development aid from the European Union, including aid from Member States and aid managed by the European Commission, represents between half and two thirds of total ODA world-wide.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, European co-operation policy benefits developing countries in Asia (including the New Independent States), Latin America, the Mediterranean, Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific, and Eastern Europe (e.g. Albania).

But the European Union's political influence in this branch of its external policy fails to match its position as the world's biggest donor. It should be able to bring greater weight to bear in international fora and adopt a higher profile.

The Union's partners in development, be they recipient countries or bodies (NGOs), expect this higher profile and a clearer presentation of the European identity in view of a more effective development cooperation.

If we are to make real progress in this direction, we must ensure greater complementarity between aid provided by the Member States and that provided by the Community. This could be done by coordinating as far upstream as possible, thus ensuring better quality and more effective aid, to which both the Member States and the Community are committed.

## **1. THE NEED FOR GREATER COMPLEMENTARITY**

### **1.1. The obligation to achieve results**

Like most donors, the Member States and the Community are under pressure to make reductions in the amount of aid they give to developing countries. In both Europe and the developing countries, the public is demanding visible results if aid is to continue. Hitherto the impact of aid has too often been measured in terms of the amount of funding mobilised. Now, however, the assessment takes into consideration the results of the developing countries' aid-funded projects or policies and their viability (the result-oriented approach).

### **1.2. The obligation to ensure quality and effectiveness**

The needs of developing countries, particularly the poorest and their most vulnerable people, continue to grow. To fulfil their commitments to countries with which they maintain a special relationship, the Member States and the Community have to improve the quality and effectiveness of their operations. But both recipients and donors have to cope with an excessive proliferation of uncoordinated projects and requests for aid, a situation which has begun to undermine the effectiveness of aid.

---

<sup>1</sup> See annexed Table.

## 2. THE AIMS OF COMPLEMENTARITY

The main purpose of complementarity is to ensure that Community aid supplements Member State operations, thus:

- significantly improving the impact of European (Community and Member State) aid in developing countries by using human and financial resources more efficiently and lessening the likelihood of duplication of effort and inconsistency;
- raising the European Union's political profile in the field of development cooperation.

Complementarity must be achieved in respect of the objectives of Article 130u of the Treaty on European Union:<sup>2</sup>

- sustainable economic and social development;
- smooth and gradual integration into the world economy;
- campaign against poverty ;
- developing and consolidating democracy, rule of law and respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Member States have a part to play in implementing these objectives as well as the Community.

The Community and its Member States have accepted various commitments set out in the Declarations and Action Plans of several international United Nations conferences, and Article 130u(3) of the Treaty on European Union contains an undertaking to uphold these commitments.

## 3. PREREQUISITES FOR GREATER COMPLEMENTARITY

Any effort to improve the complementarity of operations will call for:

- firm political will on the part of the Commission and the Member States to exploit the synergies and savings to be obtained from a more coordinated approach;

---

<sup>2</sup> Article 177 of the Treaty of Amsterdam.

- the existence of a mechanism for operational co-ordination between the European Union (Member States and Community), the recipient countries and other donors;
- a medium-term development strategy for the recipient country, as an important factor allowing the Community to define and position its activities vis-à-vis those of the Member States.

### 3.1. Political will

This is expressed in the first instance in Title XVII (Development Cooperation) of the Treaty on European Union itself.

The broad outlines of a coordination procedure between the Community and the Member States to ensure greater consistency and complementarity between operations by the year 2000 were set out as early as November 1992 in a Council declaration.<sup>3</sup>

In a resolution of 1 June 1995 on complementarity, the Council set out how this could be achieved, in particular "by taking account, on an individual basis and where appropriate, of, among other things, the comparative advantages of their respective actions." The Council also recognised that "coordination, within a coherent and comprehensive framework, was the best instrument for achieving complementarity."

In that context the Commission welcomes the Council's intention, as stated in the Guidelines adopted in March 1998, to increase the exchange of information between Member States and the Commission. This will entail continuation of the work already under way for this purpose on both sides.

Complementarity must not affect the visibility of either participant. Public opinion at local and at European level, should be made more aware of the Member States' contributions to Community aid. Any joint action between the Member States and the Community should be so presented that complementarity within the European Union enhances rather than diminishes the visibility of the Member States, by reinforcing the European dimension of their identity.

### 3.2. Co-ordination mechanisms

Since 1992, the Council has adopted several conclusions, resolutions and guidelines on strengthening co-ordination between the Community and the Member States<sup>4</sup> with a view to maximising the value added by such co-operation in the recipient country. Following a pilot phase in six countries,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Declaration of the Council and of Representatives of Governments of the Member States meeting in the Council, on aspects of development cooperation policy in the run-up to 2000 (18 November 1992).

<sup>4</sup> November 1992, May 1993, December 1993, June 1997 and March 1998.

<sup>5</sup> 1994-1997 in Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Peru.

**operational co-ordination** was extended to cover all developing countries in line with the new guidelines the Council adopted in March 1998.<sup>6</sup>

The progress already achieved on the ground has been enhanced further by the increasing prominence of the sectoral approach rather than the traditional project, particularly in fields such as health, education, drugs, transport and communications, decentralisation policies and food security.

The sectoral approach, often coordinated with other participants such as the World Bank, helps rally the Community and its Member States around a joint support programme. This approach, in which the governments of the recipient countries take responsibility, helps avoid duplication of effort and ensure greater consistency between the support measures granted by different donors. It generally fosters the principle of "ownership".

Also since 1992, the Council has adopted about thirty resolutions, applicable to both the Community and the Member States, defining priorities for sectoral policies (health, education) or thematic approaches (food security, poverty alleviation). Taken together, these resolutions<sup>7</sup> help ensure greater consistency between different contributions at operational level, particularly on horizontal issues such as gender or the environment.

Where **humanitarian aid** is concerned, coordination and complementarity between ECHO, the Member States, NGOs and other partners has become much more effective.<sup>8</sup> In countries in crisis or at war the need for rapid reaction entailing strong political cohesion (consistent message) provides an incentive for coordination.<sup>9</sup>

**Meetings between the Directors General** for Development of the EU and meetings between Member State and Commission experts are held regularly on an increasingly wide number of subjects.

### 3.3. National development strategy

In its partnership for development strategy<sup>10</sup> the OECD's Development Aid Committee (DAC) recommends encouraging recipient partner countries to draw up development strategies for themselves ("putting the recipient countries in the driving seat").

---

<sup>6</sup> Guidelines for strengthening operational coordination between the Community and the Member States in the field of development cooperation (9 March 1998)

<sup>7</sup> See annexed list.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. the aid provided in Central America in the wake of hurricane Mitch.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. Liberia and Nigeria.

<sup>10</sup> Paris, January 1998

The usefulness and content of **national country strategy papers**<sup>11</sup> has been discussed at various meetings.<sup>12</sup> The feeling is that national strategy papers should take into account all macro-economic and sectoral analyses produced by the World Bank and IMF (to avoid duplication of effort), adding the political strategy dimension specific to the country in question, geared to sustainable development.

National development strategies should be drawn up in strict accordance with the principles of sovereignty, partnership and ownership, within the framework of a broad dialogue conducted by the recipient country with representatives of civil society and all donors. It is essential to apply the principle of ownership at this stage because it makes the recipient countries responsible for deciding whether cooperation projects are appropriate in the light of their own development aims.

The various donors' support strategies should not only take account of the national strategies but reflect the same principles of ownership and partnership.

#### **4. MAIN FORMS OF COMPLEMENTARITY**

In operational terms, complementarity is pertinent at two main levels at country level during implementation, and at EU level for human resources management.

##### **4.1. Complementarity at country level**

###### *4.1.1. Structural adjustment support*

Where support for macroeconomic and structural reform programmes is concerned, complementarity is mainly financial. The fact that there is only one government programme (approved by the World Bank/IMF) and that the type of operation is appreciably the same for all donors (balance of payment support followed by budget aid) means that the question of who does what does not arise, except as regards economic and social policy dialogue in connection with the appraisal and implementation of the programme of support for reform.

The World Bank and IMF take the lead in the dialogue conducted with each government to define the programmes and arrange for their implementation, except in cases where the Commission acts as lead donor for all or part of a particular adjustment programme. Broadly speaking, given the large amounts the EU Member States contribute to these institutions and the scale of their bilateral and Community programmes, they should be able to speak louder and maintain a higher profile in this dialogue.

---

<sup>11</sup> Not to be confused with the documents setting out individual donors' support strategies.

<sup>12</sup> EU experts (Stockholm, June 1998), Directors-General for Development (Vienna, October 1998), multilateral agencies (DAC, Paris, December 1998).



This is the case with the Special aid Programme for Africa (SPA), where satisfactory mechanism for donor co-ordination with the World Bank/IMF was set up as long ago as 1987. The Commission and the Member States will continue to play an important part in this forum by virtue not only of their financial weight but by their conceptual input. At country level this influence has not always been brought to bear to the same extent, particularly regarding more effective programme "ownership" by recipient countries, the importance of the regional dimension and the pace of reforms.

A forthcoming Commission communication assessing past and future support for structural adjustment in ACP countries will propose ways of improving this state of affairs, particularly with a view to ensuring better coordination between the Member States within the World Bank/IMF and thereby increasing the EU's influence. However, it can already be said that Community support for structural adjustment is an essential component of Community intervention.

#### *4.1.2. Support for sectoral policies and projects*

This depends on whether the recipient country has defined a sectoral policy suited to its needs and capabilities. If it has, the Commission's contribution takes the form of budget aid, provided that the situation regarding management of public finances is satisfactory. The issue of complementarity then arises in the same way as for macroeconomic and structural adjustment support.

Where support is provided in the form of projects or programmes, greater complementarity between Member State and Community activities can be ensured either by a **breakdown** of areas of activity (sectoral or geographical) or by a coordinated **concentration** of operations (within a sector or geographical area).

#### **Breakdown**

- **Breakdown in different sectors**<sup>13</sup> would ensure a European presence in a larger number of priority sectors and reduce the risk of duplication of effort. But care must also be taken to avoid spreading the EU's efforts too thinly (dispersion) or making a given recipient country too dependent on a single donor (spheres of influence). Financing measures could be kept separate and mobilised in accordance with different timetables. The overall coherence of the various EU operations would be addressed in the country's development strategy.
- **Breakdown within a single sector but at different levels**<sup>14</sup> could strengthen EU support for a given sectoral policy. Here financing could be separate but the operating timetables would be more interdependent.

---

<sup>13</sup> Or different regions of the country.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. central government or local health departments; primary/technical/higher education.

The requisite coherence between measures of the same type would come from sectoral policy guidelines laid down by the Council and/or the DAC.

### **Concentration**

**Concentration on a single programme and sector** could achieve significant results more quickly mobilising a greater volume of financing. This approach also ensures a wider spread of partners for the recipient country. The question of consistency between the individual aid contributions then becomes crucial. Alignment of implementation schedules entails stricter coordination, cofinancing is preferable to parallel financing, and the designation of a leader can be considered.

Each approach has its pros and cons and the right choice (of one approach or a combination, sector by sector) depends on various criteria, the main ones being:

- the government's policy in the sector concerned, depending on whether simple financial support is being provided for a sectoral policy or if there is a need to encourage major reform;
- operations by other donors;
- the comparative advantages of each Member State and the Commission, particularly in terms of human resources actually available on the spot (and the support capabilities of their respective central departments);
- the EU's visibility.

But these criteria are such that they can only be appreciated by the representations in each country, and then only on a case by case basis, in line with the principle of differentiation.

## **4.2. Complementary management of human resources**

Taken together the Member States and the Commission have at their disposal a large pool of highly-skilled staff offering expertise in many fields. This diversity of human resources represents a clear wealth. However, its scattered nature constitutes a handicap. It must therefore be put to the best possible use either by improving allocation of the resources thematically, sectorally and/or geographically or by pulling it together to obtain a critical mass better representing European skills.

### **4.2.1. *Better distribution***

Every EU Member State has highly competent teams of staff but each team can only carry out development activities in a few countries. However, more effective coordination could ensure greater complementarity in their work, if only by cutting down overlapping.

#### 4.2.2. *A larger critical mass*

More systematic networking between Member State and Commission experts, and more frequent meetings and joint missions, could lead to better sharing of information and know-how (knowledge management) and thereby increase the EU's analysis, evaluation and planning capability.

### 5. IMPLEMENTING METHODS

The requirement for greater effectiveness results in each donor concentrating its operations in just a few sectors (doing less but better). This is where complementarity comes in, taking account also of the criterion of comparative advantage in a given situation (doing better by working together).

#### 5.1. Effectiveness/concentration

The need to get results coupled with the exigencies of genuine partnership with the recipient country means that aid has to be concentrated in just a few sectors. But in implementing this approach there are two pitfalls to be avoided:

- support for key sectors drying up because all donors are concentrating on the same sectors;
- a single donor monopolising a given sector, making the recipient country too dependent on that donor (spheres of influence).

#### 5.2. Effectiveness/comparative advantages

The question of the comparative advantages of one source of aid over another prompts the following considerations.

In the first place, the principle of using different support strategies for different countries means that each donor has to be fairly flexible about its area of activity. If they are too rigidly demarcated from the outset in the light of comparative advantages at a given moment in time, donors would probably be deflected from activities where they consider their presence is important and their available expertise would be under-utilised.

It is not easy to lay down criteria for defining comparative advantage by sector or theme because the priorities and capabilities of different donors change over time and complementarity will differ depending on whether we are considering objectives, areas of activity or instruments of development co-operation.

Allocating areas of activity between Member States and the Community from the outset could militate against the principle of ownership by recipient countries, and European donors' current general remit would not necessarily allow it.

Greater complementarity must therefore be sought case by case and country by country. Whilst fulfilling commitments towards each recipient country, this might mean one donor relinquishing certain activities to other donors which clearly have specific comparative advantages.

Within these constraints, the Commission will seek to play to its strengths in areas where it can add value in its own right by providing support for:

- political and institutional reform (democratisation, human rights, good governance, conflict prevention);
- establishment of comprehensive political, economic, financial, social and cultural partnerships between the EU and countries or regional groups with the aim of paving the way for stable political and social development and enhancing the EU's relations with its neighbours;
- economic and sectoral policy reform (particularly in health, education and training), combined with structural adjustment;
- trade policies;
- regional integration processes, particularly through trade liberalisation and the creation of transport, energy and information infrastructures;
- food security policies.

But the Commission must also relate its activities more visibly to the objectives of poverty eradication and sustainable development, via a small number of large-scale initiatives targeting the poorest sections of society.<sup>15</sup> For this purpose it should strengthen its partnership with European and southern NGOs so as to ensure that their experience, innovations and operational capacity are used to best advantage.

## 6. NEW INITIATIVES

As coordination between the Community and the Member States remains the best way of ensuring complementarity between their respective cooperation policies, the following initiatives are planned to strengthen it.

### 6.1. In the short term

#### 6.1.1. *An iterative process*

- Like the Community, most Member States base their aid programmes on country strategies. In accordance with the guidelines on operational coordination issued in March 1998, **more systematic exchange and joint examination of these strategy papers** will make it possible:

---

<sup>15</sup> But this does not rule out pilot or demonstration projects, e.g. on the environment.

- to share the analysis of the potential and constraints of each country;
- to help identify points of convergence between approaches, existing areas of complementarity and scope for enhancing it.
- For the Asian, Latin American and Mediterranean countries, this process will cover not only country strategies but multiannual financial programming, i.e. projecting annual budgets for specific countries and priority sectors over a period of years. This could provide a valuable basis for greater complementarity between Member State and Community development work.
- As regards relations with the ACP countries, in May 1998 the Commission initiated a series of annual reviews of Community aid programmes for individual countries. **The Commission is prepared to throw this review process open to participation by any Member States wishing to help identify the practical scope for achieving greater complementarity.** Ideally, the process would involve central departments, local representations and recipient countries, and any resulting changes to strategies or gradual programme adjustments would have to be discussed by the existing Committees in-line with their new responsibilities.<sup>16</sup> Year by year these reviews would make it possible to update forecasts and assess the degree of complementarity between measures supported by Community programmes and those supported by the Member States and other donors.

In the interests of effectiveness, Community aid would concentrate on a necessarily small number of national priorities selected from among those most closely reflecting the three priorities set out in Article 130 U of the Treaty on European Union<sup>17</sup> and the Council guidelines.

The results would be evaluated using monitoring, impact and, possibly, performance indicators for each sector of operations selected. The indicators, possibly be based on the DAC indicators, on which there seems to be consensus, would have to be approved by the recipient country and the Member States.

This regular joint exercise would enable the Community and the Member States concerned constantly to measure the impact of their own aid contributions in the light of the political, economic and social objectives of the country concerned.

An iterative process of this type should gradually lead to greater complementarity in the EU's activities, whilst complying with each Member State's own procedures.

---

<sup>16</sup> ALA, MED, ACP; see below.

<sup>17</sup> Particularly poverty alleviation.

### *6.1.2. Other measures*

The Commission is engaged in ever closer dialogue with other large-scale bilateral donors (USAID, Japan, Canada, Australia) and multilateral donors (the World Bank, IMF, UNDP and other UN agencies etc.), and will keep the Member States informed of the outcome and seek to associate those which so desire in the processes of defining and implementing specific measures.

Similarly, in relations with countries in or emerging from crises, where the often dramatic situation calls for a consistent political message as well as effectiveness in an emergency, the Commission will seek to involve the Member States more closely and raise the political profile of EU operations.

### *6.1.3. Supporting measures*

- Adjustment of the role of the ALA, MED and ACP Committees. The Council and the Committees themselves are considering the possibility of analysing the strategies and sectoral approaches for each country and region instead of the present procedure of examining projects and programmes.

- Simplification and harmonisation of procedures. The Joint Relex Service for the Management of Community Aid to Non-Member Countries (SCR) has already embarked on the major task of simplifying and harmonising the procedures of the Relex DGs. The next stage will be to undertake a similar exercise with the Member States. This work should pave the way for later harmonisation with other institutions (the World Bank and UN agencies).

- Decentralisation, in the sense of an internal transfer of responsibilities at country representation level. Some Member States have already introduced this measure, which is generally seen as a good thing provided certain conditions are met. In particular, it has to be backed up by a matching devolution of decision-making powers and human and financial resources. In the interests of EU-wide operational coordination the level of decentralisation should be comparable for all representations.

- Strengthening of links between Commission and Member State departments, by means of regular meetings between desk officers and experts and measures to improve information on the ground, e.g. more intensive use of electronic communications systems (setting up of networks, websites and information exchange forums).

## **6.2. In the medium term**

This process is based on national development strategies and could be gradually intensified as future Community aid programmes are developed.

### 6.2.1. *National development strategies*

The Commission's proposal is (a) to provide support,<sup>18</sup> jointly with the Member States, for the preparation of national strategy papers for all countries that so desire, and (b) to supply a comprehensive framework within which national (public and private) activities and all external aid can be coordinated.

Support from the Community and the Member States could be:

- **methodological**, by extrapolating inter alia from the recommendations of the meeting on country strategies held in Stockholm in June 1998. The methodological aspect could allow the inclusion of a long-term forecasting dimension as part of a regional integration strategy. The work could be started in the existing Committees and continued with the World Bank and the other members of the DAC, or vice versa, depending on the country concerned.

- **technical and financial**, in the form of contributions to the preparation of strategy papers in those countries that so desire. It will be essential at this stage to apply the ownership principle and to respect each country's sovereignty, since this makes the recipient country responsible for subsequently evaluating the desirability of any cooperation project in the light of its own development objectives.

### 6.2.2. *Future Community programmes*

Once they have received political ratification, the national strategy papers would provide a framework within which all donors' support strategies could be organised. They would make it possible to identify clearly where Member State and Community programmes best complemented each other so as to make European aid as a whole more effective and more visible.

These future Community strategies would have to be discussed with the Member States present in the country concerned.

They would then be presented for analysis and approval by the Programming Committees acting in accordance with their new responsibilities.<sup>19</sup> Since the analysis of each country's potential and constraints would be shared with the Member States, it would be possible to determine the priorities and expected results collectively, which would help the political and technical dialogue with the government concerned and the other donors.

Since the drafting process would take account of the procedures and constraints of all parties and the support strategies would then be progressively adjusted during the annual reviews, they would reflect

---

<sup>18</sup> In line with the principles stated by the Council (partnership, ownership) and the DAC.

<sup>19</sup> ALA, MED, ACP.

increasing complementarity between the Member States' and the Community's respective priorities.

This should also ensure greater complementarity between Member States' own operations, which together account for 80% of the total EU official development assistance,<sup>20</sup> and could lead in turn to the gradual formulation of European strategies.

---

<sup>20</sup> Aid provided by the Community represents only 20%.



## OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

## Net Payments

EU Member States	1997		1996	
	in million dollars	%	in million of dollars	%
Germany	5913	22%	7601	24%
Austria	531	2%	557	2%
Belgium	764	3%	913	3%
Denmark	1637	6%	1772	6%
Spain	1234	5%	1251	4%
Finland	379	1%	408	1%
France	6348	24%	7451	24%
Ireland	187	1%	179	1%
Italy	1231	5%	2416	8%
Luxembourg	95	0,4%	82	0,3%
Netherlands	2946	11%	3246	10%
Portugal	251	1%	218	1%
United Kingdom	3371	13%	3199	10%
Sweden	1731	7%	1999	6%
<b>Total EU</b>	<b>26618</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>31292</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Of which: EC</b>	<b>5261</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5455</b>	<b>17%</b>
Other DAC members	in million dollars	%	in million dollars	%
Australia	1076	5%	1121	5%
Canada	2146	10%	1795	7%
United States	6377	30%	9377	39%
Japan	9358	44%	9439	39%
Norway	1306	6%	1311	5%
New Zealand	145	1%	122	1%
Switzerland	839	4%	1026	4%
<b>Total other members</b>	<b>21247</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24191</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total all DAC members</b>	<b>47865</b>		<b>55483</b>	

Table 2

EU Member States	1997		1996	
	in million dollars	%	in million dollars	%
<b>Total EU</b>	<b>26618</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>31292</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>Of which: EC</b>	<b>5261</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>5455</b>	<b>9.83%</b>
<b>Other DAC members</b>	<b>21247</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>24191</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>Total all DAC members</b>	<b>47865</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>55483</b>	<b>100%</b>

(source DAC)

List of <b>sectoral and thematic</b> communications from the Commission to the Council and Parliament and corresponding Council resolutions, declarations et conclusions		
	European Commission	Council of the European Union
<b><u>Family planning</u></b>	<b><u>Communication of 4/11/92</u></b>	<b><u>Resolution of 19/11/92</u></b>
<b><u>Poverty alleviation</u></b>	<b><u>Communication of 16/11/93</u></b> COM(93) 518 I	<b><u>Resolution of 2/12/93</u></b>
<b><u>AIDS</u></b>	<b><u>Communication of 7/01/94</u></b> COM(93) 473	<b><u>Resolution of 6/05/94</u></b>
<b><u>Health</u></b>	<b><u>Communication of 24/03/94</u></b> COM(94) 77	<b><u>Resolution of 6/05/94</u></b>
<b><u>Food security</u></b>	<b><u>Communication of 4/05/94</u></b> COM(94) 165	<b><u>Resolution du 25/11/94</u></b>
<b><u>Education and training</u></b>	<b><u>Communication of 26/11/94</u></b> COM(94) 399	<b><u>Resolution of 25/11/94</u></b>
<b><u>Structural adjustment</u></b>	<b><u>Communication of 27/10/94</u></b> COM(94) 447	<b><u>Resolution of 1/06/95</u></b>
<b><u>Regional Integration</u></b>	<b><u>Communication</u></b> COM (95) 219	<b><u>Resolution of 1/06/95</u></b>
<b><u>Development research</u></b>	<b><u>Working paper</u></b> SEC (95) 814	<b><u>Declaration of 1/06/95</u></b>
<b><u>Integrating gender issues</u></b>	<b><u>Communication of 18/09/95</u></b> COM (95) 423 final	<b><u>Resolution of 20/12/95</u></b>
<b><u>Linking emergency, rehabilitation and development aid</u></b>	<b><u>Communication of 30/04/96</u></b> COM (96) 153	<b><u>Conclusions of 28/05/96*</u></b>
<b><u>Environmental assessment</u></b>	-	<b><u>Resolution du 28/05/96*</u></b>

\* Formally approved on 15 July 1996.

<u>Decentralised cooperation</u>	<u>Communication of 1/03/96</u> COM (96) 70	<u>Conclusions of</u> <u>28/05/96*</u>
<u>Conflict prevention in Africa</u>	<u>Communication of 6/03/96</u> SEC (96) 332	<u>Conclusions</u> <u>and Common</u> <u>Position of</u> <u>02/06/97</u>
<u>Migration and development</u>	<u>Working paper of 06/03/96</u>	<u>Conclusions of</u> <u>28/05/96*</u>
<u>Human and social development</u>	<u>Working paper of 9/10/96</u> SEC (96) 1827	<u>Resolution of</u> <u>22/11/96</u>
<u>Crisis and gender</u>		<u>Conclusions of</u> <u>22/11/96 *</u>
<u>Campaign against anti-personnel landmines</u>	<u>Working paper of 5/11/96</u> SEC (96) 2035	<u>Resolution of</u> <u>22/11/96</u>
<u>Scientific and technological research</u>	<u>Communication of 25/04/97</u> COM (97) 174	<u>Resolution of</u> <u>5/06/97</u>
<u>Information society and development</u>	<u>Communication of 15/07/97</u> COM (97) 351	<u>Conclusions of</u> <u>28/11/97</u>
<u>Microfinancing</u>		<u>Resolution of</u> <u>28/11/97</u>
<u>Anti-poverty campaign</u>		<u>Conclusions of</u> <u>18/05/98</u>
<u>Gender issues</u>		<u>Conclusions of</u> <u>18/05/98</u>
<u>Democratisation and the rule of law</u>	<u>Communication of 12/03/98</u> COM(98) 146	<u>Conclusions of</u> <u>30/11/98</u>
<u>Conflict prevention</u>	<u>Non paper of 07/98</u>	<u>Conclusions of</u> <u>30/11/98</u>
<u>Indigenous peoples</u>	<u>Working paper of 05/98</u>	<u>Resolution of</u> <u>30/11/98</u>
<u>Microfinance and poverty reduction</u>	<u>Communication of 05/98</u> COM(98) 527	<u>Conclusions of</u> <u>30/11/98</u>
<u>Solidarity to confront AIDS</u>	<u>Communication of 03/07/98</u> COM(98) 407	
<u>Tourism</u>	<u>Communication of 14/10/98</u> COM(98) 563	<u>Resolution of</u> <u>30/11/98</u>
<u>Private sector in the ACP countries</u>	<u>Communication of 20/11/98</u> COM(98) 667	

(\*) formally approved on 15 July 1996

ISSN 0254-1475

COM(1999) 218 final

# DOCUMENTS

EN

11 01 06

---

Catalogue number : CB-CO-99-212-EN-C

---

Office for Official Publications of the European Communities  
L-2985 Luxembourg

20