



TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN
COLÁISTE NA TRÍONOIDE, BAILE ÁTHA CLIATH

THE
UNIVERSITY
OF DUBLIN



University College Dublin
An Coláiste Ollscoile, Baile Átha Cliath

Policy Coherence for Development:

**What institutional framework will support a coherent agenda for
development in Ireland**

Christine Matz & Eoghan Molloy
TCD/UCD Masters in Development Practice Students

Research prepared for Trócaire
In coordination with Ms. Tara Bedi, Policy Officer

TRÓCAIRE
Working for a Just World

This report forms part of the Irish NGO Placement module of the Msc. in Development Practice at Trinity College Dublin and University College Dublin. The authors would like to thank the policy team at Trócaire and particularly Ms. Tara Bedi for her guidance and suggestions during the preparation of our research study. Additionally, our invaluable meetings with Michael King, Institute for International Integration Studies Trinity College and Michael O'Brien, Trócaire, as well as our conversation with Ms. Carol Hannon, Inter-Departmental Committee for Development, contributed greatly to our research and we are grateful for their time and thoughts.

Christine Matz and Eoghan Molloy

Msc. in Development Practice

Trinity College Dublin/University College Dublin

December 2011

Contents

CONTENTS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	7
BACKGROUND	8
IRISH INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR PCD	8
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT	9
<i>Analysis of IDCD and Their Meetings</i>	9
INFORMAL PCD MECHANISMS	11
OECD-DAC PEER REVIEW IRELAND 2009	12
IIS REPORT	13
PARLIAMENTARY OVERSIGHT	14
ASSESSMENT AND INDICATORS	15
ROLE OF NGO'S IN IRISH PCD	16
EXAMPLES OF PCD STRUCTURES FROM OTHER EU MEMBER STATES	16
THE NETHERLANDS	17
SWEDEN	18
COMPARISON WITH IRELAND'S PCD MECHANISMS	20
1. EXPLICIT POLICY STATEMENTS OF INTENT	20
2. ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS	21
3. KNOWLEDGE-INPUT AND KNOWLEDGE-ASSESSMENT MECHANISMS	22
RECOMMENDATIONS	22
REFERENCES	26
APPENDIX A	29
<u>SUMMARY OF IDCD MEETING MINUTES: 12/04/2007 – 10/11/2010</u>	29
APPENDIX B	45
IDCD TERMS OF REFERENCE	45

Executive Summary

This report examines Ireland's commitment to policy coherence for development and reviews the current institutional structures that address PCD issues. Following the White Paper on Irish Aid in 2006, Ireland recognised the need for a more coherent approach to development assistance and in an attempt to address policies which impact the developing world, set up the Inter-Departmental Committee on Development in 2007. An analysis of the IDCD and their meetings is undertaken along with information from OECD-DAC Peer Review Ireland (2009) and the Institute for International Integration Studies Reports to assess the PCD structures and their functioning in Ireland. This is followed by an analysis of the institutional structures and mechanisms for PCD in the Netherlands and Sweden. These structures are compared with Irish PCD mechanisms under the framework of the three categories of mechanisms identified by the Evaluation Study of the European Centre for Development Policy Management (Mackay, J. et al, 2007).

Our analysis of the Inter-departmental Committee on Development (IDCD) found that PCD structures in Ireland are more reliant on informal mechanisms and relationships between Irish Aid and government departments; however, these informal PCD mechanisms can only achieve so much and also raise issues of transparency in operations. Parliamentary oversight could be a means of improving PCD mechanisms and transparency, yet it has not been developed here in Ireland. Since its inception, the IDCD has been formally represented only two times before the Oireachtas.

Furthermore, assessment and evaluation are fundamental aspects of any PCD mechanism; however, the IDCD has not yet adequately met this Term of Reference. The now defunct Advisory Board for Irish Aid (ABIA) has commissioned a report on PCD indicators for Ireland which the IDCD is currently reviewing as a means of monitoring and evaluating Irish policies.

We found that the partnership between the Irish Government and NGOs has been rather productive and healthy on certain specific thematic areas, yet the role of NGOs in promoting development objectives with the IDCD could be enhanced.

The report also examines PCD structures in Sweden and the Netherlands. The Netherlands has a specific policy coherence for development Team within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which ensures that Dutch policy on sustainable development and the reduction of extreme poverty in developing countries is both effective and coherent. Sweden adopted a groundbreaking Policy for Global Development (2003) which provides a legislative foundation for PCD. There have been problems with implementation of this Bill, however, and Sweden is currently undertaking reformative measures to correct this.

Following the analysis of structures in the Netherlands and Sweden, they along with Ireland

are scrutinized using the ECDPM's three mechanisms for promoting PCD which include:

1. Explicit policy statements of intent;
2. Administrative and institutional mechanisms;
3. Knowledge-input and knowledge-assessment mechanisms

From our analysis of Ireland's institutional PCD structure, it is apparent that attempts have been made to adopt all three PCD mechanisms, although the level to which these have been achieved is not yet optimal. We suggest eight recommendations that the Irish government could implement in order to bolster Ireland's institutional structures for policy coherence for development. These recommendations include:

- Policy Reform
- Usage of Monitoring and Evaluation
- Development focal points within Government Departments
- Parliamentary Oversight
- Partner Country Engagement
- Increased partnership with NGO's on PCD
- Assign responsibility for PCD to the Dept. of the Taoiseach
- Relocation of Irish Aid

The paper concludes with recognition of the steps made to develop Ireland's PCD mechanisms; however, we caution that PCD not get sidelined in light of the current economic situation in Ireland, particularly as Ireland's development aid budget is under increasing pressure.

Introduction

Ireland's relationship with the developing world takes many forms. Development aid is a critical dimension of this, but it is by no means the only important interaction. In an interdependent world, relationships with developing countries involve an increasing number of government departments from Enterprise, Trade and Innovation seeking opportunities for Irish commerce; to the Justice Department dealing with asylum and migration; to Environment dealing with climate change financing; to Agriculture and the granting of farm subsidies; to Finance involvement in taxation policies overseas. Goal 8 of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) states that developed countries will ensure that all policy areas work to achieve the other seven MDGs. Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) is therefore essential for ensuring that Ireland and the European Union implement policies across a range of areas which support, or at the very least, do not undermine overseas development objectives. PCD seeks to represent the interests of the poorest developing countries within developed country policy-making processes and seeks to ensure that investments in overseas aid are not undermined by damaging non-aid policies¹. Furthermore, policy coherence can provide a positive re-enforcing environment for development to take place, and can complement and enhance ODA-effectiveness.

Given Ireland's changed economic circumstances, particularly when the development aid budget is under increasing pressure, it is arguable that the PCD agenda has become even more important². Ireland has made commendable progress over the years in supporting development cooperation and enhancing PCD by way of creating the Inter-Departmental Committee on Development (IDCD). However, in this paper we caution that PCD not get sidelined in light of the current economic situation in Ireland. It is imperative that The Government continues to progress the enhancement of PCD mechanisms by strengthening the institutional capacity of the IDCD to adequately coordinate policy coherence with development objectives. The recommendations we have outlined in this report would, if implemented, serve to enhance Ireland's institutional mechanisms for PCD by helping to promote greater sharing of information and collaboration across government departments. At the same time, NGOs and developing country partners need to become more involved in ensuring Ireland's policies do no harm in developing countries. Finally, the adoption of a coherent set of indicators for assessment of policy coherence would place Ireland at the forefront of evaluative PCD measures and we therefore encourage the IDCD and Irish Aid in their pursuance of this objective.

This report initially examines Ireland's commitment to policy coherence for development

¹ Barry, et al (2009): p. 207

² Barry, F. et al (2011): p.9

and reviews the current institutional structures that address PCD issues. Structures which exist in the Netherlands and Sweden are also analysed to see the impact they have had on development in their own countries and how these elements may be feasible to introduce in Ireland. The PCD mechanisms of each country are assessed with respect to the three categories of mechanisms identified by the Evaluation Study of the European Centre for Development Policy Management (Mackay, J. et al, 2007). These mechanisms are as follows:

1. Explicit policy statements of Intent;
2. Administrative and institutional mechanisms;
3. Knowledge-Input and Knowledge-Assessment Mechanisms.

Background

The concept of PCD entered into European development discourse in 1992 with the signing of the Treaty of Maastricht (Treaty of the European Union). This Treaty identified coherence, coordination and complementarity, the “three C’s” as key concepts and guiding principles for European development cooperation. It imposed a legal requirement on the European Community to try and improve the coherence of European policies promoting development. Increased acceptance of the importance to promote PCD continued to be developed through subsequent treaties and more measures were taken over time. The Treaty of Lisbon (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union), which became effective in 2009, extended PCD as an obligation for the whole Union. Article 208 states that all EU policies must be in support of developing countries' development needs, or at least not contradict the aim of poverty reduction and eradication.

Irish institutional Framework for PCD

In relation to an explicit statement of policy intent for PCD in Ireland, the White Paper on Irish Aid (2006) is explicitly devoted to development cooperation policy in Ireland. It identifies policy coherence for development as one important principle of development cooperation by saying, “We will work for a coherent approach to development across all government departments. Within Irish Aid itself, we will work to ensure coherence across the wide range of development assistance instruments employed and to minimise and eliminate inconsistencies and contradictions³.” The practical implications of this explicit mention of coherence for development in the White Paper were such that an Inter-Departmental Committee on Development (IDCD) was created in 2007.

³ White Paper on Irish Aid, 2006: p. 09

Inter-Departmental Committee on Development

The IDCD is chaired by the Minister of State for Trade and Development, and in his/her absence by the Director General of Irish Aid. Its members consist of representatives from each government department or ministry. The Secretariat of the Committee is provided by the EU Multilateral Policy Section of Irish Aid. The published Terms of Reference (TOR) of the IDCD outline its role in providing a forum for inter-departmental coherence and also to make best use of expertise across the public service in Ireland's development aid programme. It states that the role of the Committee is of a consultative and advisory nature and performs certain actions to fulfil this role⁴. In this capacity, the IDCD provides an administrative and institutional mechanism for ensuring PCD across government departments. However, our analysis of the IDCD and the minutes of IDCD meetings has shown that this role needs to be strengthened.

Analysis of IDCD and Their Meetings

The IDCD has met thirteen times since its inception in 2007. The minutes of these meetings are published on the Irish Aid website along with Annual Reports, two of which (2008 & 2009) are also available. Appendix A of this report is a summary of IDCD meeting activities. These meetings took place on average three times per year and were attended by representatives from each government department. General attendance was good across departments. The actual consistency of representation by individual attendees varied between departments and over time. Some departmental representatives were consistently present while other departmental representatives changed from meeting to meeting.

It is clear from our analysis of the minutes of these meetings that the initial meetings were focused primarily on knowledge gathering and information sharing. The Committee received no less than fifteen presentations from various agents throughout this initial period. While only one of these presentations was given by a NGO (Dóchas), there were no presentations made by any representatives of Irish Aid's nine partner countries. The calibre and range of topics presented at the meetings was sufficiently varied. These included a presentation by Mr. Otto Genee on the Dutch institutional mechanisms on Policy Coherence for Development, several presentations by the Institute for International Integration Studies (IIIS) at Trinity College Dublin as well as individual departmental presentations on various topics related to PCD and development. Education and knowledge dissemination may have dominated many of the initial meetings, but by the ninth meeting there was an evident shift in focus to the practicalities of assessment and monitoring of PCD.

⁴ Terms of Reference of the IDCD

It is notable that in the second IDCD meeting in November 2007, then Minister of State for Development Mr. Michael Kitt proposed the establishment of subgroups, two of which—one on Skills Sets and the other on Multilateral Organisations—were already reporting to the Committee by the fourth meeting in February 2008. The subgroup on Skills Sets was commissioned with increasing developmental awareness across government departments and was successful in hosting lunchtime educational seminars in each Department throughout its existence.

While this sharing of information between Departments is welcome and is one of the IDCD's roles in their TOR, greater effort is needed to move beyond education and awareness-raising as primary functions of their operations to other roles in their TOR, such as recommending actions to promote greater policy coherence across the government. It might be suggested that the IDCD and/or Irish Aid adopt a stronger approach in pursuing specific policies within the government. However, it is first necessary to ensure that the IDCD and Irish Aid have sufficient political backing and institutional support to effectively address any inconsistencies and potential conflicts between departments that might adversely affect developing countries.

The second subgroup on Multilateral Organisations aimed to ensure a coherent inter-departmental approach to Irish policy in multilateral organizations, particularly the United Nations. They were also charged with assessing the representation of Irish Nationals in multilateral organisations and proposed a number of ways to increase this representation. This subgroup has less clear objectives and therefore its success at promoting developmental careers amongst Irish nationals and its coherence in dealings with multilateral organisations cannot be so clearly determined.

The IDCD has extensively reviewed two reports from the IIS, which were commissioned by the Advisory Board for Irish Aid (ABIA) which has since disbanded. The first of these, 'Policy Coherence for Development: The State of Play in Ireland' provides a comprehensive view of potential incoherencies in Irish policy with respect to overseas development.

At its ninth meeting in July 2009, the IDCD requested that government departments compile statements on policy coherence based on the recommendations of the IIS Scoping Report. While some progress had been made in compiling these statements, by the twelfth meeting in November 2010, the Deputy Director General of Irish Aid Mr. Michael Gaffey, conceded that political events had perhaps overshadowed the exercise.

The Committee has generally been able to meet their TOR, although one role which is still to be developed is the monitoring and evaluation of Government policy activities that have direct implications for the situation in developing countries. Neither the IDCD nor Irish Aid have implemented any form of indicators or impact assessments for measuring Irish policy coherence

performance, although they have commissioned a second report from the IIIS, 'Policy Coherence for Development: Indicators for Ireland,' which is soon to be published⁵. This report provides detailed suggestions for possible indicators of PCD for Ireland.

It is evident from our analysis that there were no meetings of the IDCD between November 2010 and September 2011. This was a period of tumultuous political events including a general election and subsequent change in government. We would advise, however, political events not overshadow the PCD agenda and that the IDCD continues to build on the progress achieved to date.

Informal PCD Mechanisms

While the IDCD provides a formal institutional mechanism for PCD and has facilitated the publishing of several reports, it has yet to play an active role in actual policy assessment and review. At present, the PCD structures in Ireland are more reliant on informal mechanisms and relationships between Irish Aid and government departments. A 2008 OECD Policy Brief, 'Policy Coherence for Development – Lessons Learned', explicitly states that "informal mechanisms have tended to be seen as sufficient" for Ireland, with its "compact government and short lines of communication"⁶.

An evaluation study of twelve EU Member States (Mackie, J. et al 2007) conducted by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) recommended that the importance of such informal mechanisms should not be underestimated and that the use of such linkages both internally within government and externally with other stakeholders should be encouraged at all levels⁷.

Mackie (2007) suggests that the Irish system is an example of how informal PCD mechanisms can be efficient and effective, although the same study cautions that such mechanisms do not guarantee that sufficient staff time and capacity is allocated to securing adequate knowledge input and assessments of PCD⁸. It goes further in suggesting that the complexity and time consuming nature of the processes required to promote PCD mean that informal processes are clearly insufficient on their own. There is therefore a need for both an informal PCD system and a formal PCD system made up of several complimentary mechanisms working in tandem⁹.

It might be added that the reliance on informal systems results in a lack of transparency in relation to policy negotiations as evidence of such is not evident in the IDCD minutes and is therefore not publicly accessible. Furthermore, the relocation of Irish Aid's offices to Limerick, away from other government departments and NGOs could have an adverse effect on the informal

⁵ King, M., Matthews, A., 2011

⁶ OECD Policy Brief, 'Policy Coherence for Development – Lessons Learned', December 2008: p.5

⁷ Mackie, J. et al, 2007: p.16, p.32, p.72, p.78

⁸ Mackie, J. et al, 2007: p.32

⁹ Mackie, J. et al, 2007: p.72

communication networks upon which Irish PCD mechanisms are reliant. Similar concerns relating to the Irish government's 'decentralisation' plan were expressed in the OECD-DAC Peer Review, 2009¹⁰.

OECD-DAC Peer Review Ireland 2009

The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) conducts periodic reviews of the individual development cooperation efforts of OECD members. The policies and programmes of each member are critically examined approximately once every four or five years and the information is disseminated through a Peer Review report. The most recent Irish Peer Review on 24 March 2009 was prepared with examiners from Italy and New Zealand. This Review contains the main findings and recommendations on improving development structures and strategies along with identifying good practices. A specific chapter devoted to analyzing Ireland's policy coherence for development is included in the report, which reviewed Ireland's commitments and efforts to PCD.

The Review recognizes Ireland's progress on policy coherence since the last Review and commends them for their creation of the IDCD in 2007 following the White Paper on Irish Aid in 2006. The Review acknowledges that dialogue among government officials on PCD issues has increased since its creation; however, many gaps and opportunities for improving the Irish structure remain.

According to the DAC, Ireland's political commitment to PCD is not questioned; however, this commitment has not yet translated into an integrated policy framework drawing consensus from the highest levels of government as well as Parliament. They suggest institutionalised reporting to Parliament on PCD would help facilitate this process¹¹. For this to happen, the Oireachtas in general, and the Joint Foreign Affairs Committee in particular, need to play a stronger role in formal PCD mechanisms¹².

As previously mentioned, Irish Aid acts as the IDCD's Secretariat; however, according to the Peer Review, they lack the required institutional capacity to conduct research and analyse policies for coherence or to trace policy coherence impacts once these have been identified¹³. Irish Aid relies on outside sources for specific analytical inputs and research relevant to its policy agenda. Specifically, ABIA has provided independent policy advice and commissioned research most notably from the IIIS. The IDCD has reviewed and discussed the reports in their meetings; however, to what extent they have absorbed or implemented the recommendations is yet to be determined.

As part of the decentralization process of the Irish government, Irish Aid was moved out of Dublin in 2008 to Limerick. A large number of staff were lost as a result of this relocation. The DAC

¹⁰ OECD DAC Peer Review, Ireland 2009: p.27

¹¹ OECD DAC Peer Review, Ireland 2009: p.13

¹² OECD DAC Peer Review, Ireland 2009: p.31

¹³ OECD DAC Peer Review, Ireland 2009: p.12

notes that this has been a major challenge for Irish Aid particularly in terms of responding to the loss of expertise, capacity, and institutional memory¹⁴. It is also worth noting that no IDCD meetings have been held at Irish Aid in Limerick.

The DAC Peer Review also raises concern that the move of Irish Aid's headquarters away from Dublin could make it more difficult to ensure that all government policies are considered for their coherence with development objectives. The move poses challenges in terms of maintaining close linkages with other government departments, embassies and other organisations and NGOs based in Dublin¹⁵. As previously mentioned, the IDCD relies heavily on informal networks in the promotion and proliferation of PCD. This raises the question as to whether the relocation is good for informal mechanisms and to what extent has the relocation led to inefficiencies in government policy coherence as a result.

IIIS Report

The Institute for International Integration Studies at Trinity College Dublin was commissioned by the Advisory Board for Irish Aid to compile a report on policy coherence for Development in Ireland. This report, 'Policy Coherence for Development: the State of Play in Ireland' was published in 2009 and provided the first systematic assessment of PCD across Irish Government departments. The authors collected information from government departments as well as from NGOs in assessing PCD issues in relation to Irish policies.

The Report concludes with 91 recommendations with respect to specific policies across the thematic areas of Agriculture; Trade; Fisheries; Migration; Environment; Finance; and Security. Eight of these recommendations refer specifically to institutional innovations that would promote the PCD agenda¹⁶. The IIIS Report on Policy Coherence for Development was presented to the IDCD during their eighth meeting on 21 May 2009. Since then, the IDCD has made attempts at adopting some of these recommendations:

- **Focused annual objectives** – There is no direct evidence of formal annual objectives in the IDCD minutes after 2009, however, it should be noted that since this time, there has been increased follow-through from meeting to meeting, with objectives set for the preceding meeting rather than annual targets.
- **Development Impact Assessments (DIA's)** – there has been no movement by the government to adopt DIA's. This is most likely due to economic restraints.
- **Departmental training** - while the subgroup on Skills Sets was effective in providing

¹⁴ OECD DAC Peer Review, Ireland 2009: p.27

¹⁵ OECD DAC Peer Review, Ireland 2009: p.12

¹⁶ Barry et al (2009): p.155-165

Departmental training throughout 2008 and 2009, it appears that this subgroup has completed its mandate. As such, it might be recommended that this subgroup is revived along with the subgroup on multilateral organisations and that departmental training on development issues becomes a standard ongoing process.

- **Policy Research** - Policy research has continued through external agents such as the IIS at Trinity College Dublin.
- **Partner Country Engagement** - As yet, there has not been adequate partner country engagement, and there has been no direct representation of partner countries to the IDCD.

The final three recommendations - Parliamentary Oversight; Civil Society Engagement; and the Adoption of a set of Indicators for assessment of PCD – are discussed in greater detail below.

Parliamentary Oversight

The IIS report explicitly recommends parliamentary oversight as a means of improving PCD mechanisms in Ireland¹⁷. This echoes the afore-mentioned recommendations of the OECD-DAC Peer Review in 2009. Notwithstanding these recommendations, PCD has been explicitly mentioned in Dáil debates only once, in October 2010¹⁸. Asked if it was the intention for the IDCD to report to the Oireachtas, then Minister of State for Overseas Development, Mr. Peter Power answered affirmatively and it was suggested to the Minister that the Committee pursue this into the future.

Following on from this assurance, PCD was the topic of discussion of a Joint Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs in May 2010 before which the Deputy Director of Irish Aid Mr. Michael Gaffey was invited to report on the workings of the IDCD. Nonetheless, the IIS report suggests that as PCD is a policy agenda that spreads across a number of Oireachtas Committees, and not just the Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs, more stringent parliamentary oversight may be needed¹⁹.

It might also be noted that the White Paper on Irish Aid invited the Oireachtas to rename the 'Joint Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs' as the 'Joint Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs and Irish Aid'²⁰. It was suggested that this would better reflect the greater role that the work of Irish Aid has within Ireland's foreign policy. The Committee has since been renamed as the 'Joint Oireachteas Committee on Foreign Affairs and Trade', although the recommendation to include 'Irish Aid' in the name has not been adopted.

¹⁷ Barry, F. et al (2009): p.163

¹⁸ Dáil Eireann Debate Vol. 718 No.1

¹⁹ Barry, F. et al (2009): p.163

²⁰ White Paper on Irish Aid, 2006: p.105

Assessment and Indicators

The White Paper on Irish Aid outlines the commitment to improving the policy coherence of Irish policies with its development objectives across the whole range of government departments. However, the means of measuring the progress towards this commitment have not yet been implemented. Assessment and evaluation are fundamental aspects of any PCD mechanism (Mackey, J. et al 2007; Keijzer, N. 2010) and this is reflected in the explicit mention of monitoring and evaluation in the Terms of Reference of the IDCD. As was previously suggested, the IDCD has not yet adequately met this term of reference.

However to this end, the ABIA has commissioned a second report on policy coherence for development from the IIS which focuses primarily on Indicators for Ireland²¹. The IDCD has reviewed draft versions of this report however, the final report has yet to be published at the time of writing. The IIS report on indicators represents the first attempt to quantitatively measure policy coherence for an EU member state and goes a long way in providing a framework upon which PCD can be assessed. The report presents and discusses 52 indicators across eight policy areas. The IDCD is currently reviewing the proposed indicators and it is as yet unclear as to the extent to which these will be adopted.

Moreover, it is less clear as to how these indicators will be effectively employed within the Irish system for PCD. The capacity of the IDCD to effectively assess and monitor any set of indicators may need to be further strengthened and a clearly defined institutional mechanism for indicator-based assessment of PCD has yet to be instigated.

The first IIS report 'Policy Coherence for Development: The State of Play in Ireland' recommended the use by all government departments of development impact assessments (DIA's) as a means of ex-ante policy evaluation²². Such measures would require a reliable set of indicators such that the forecasting of possible effects of different interventions could be determined at the policy design phase. However, such measures would also require rigorous training of departmental officials across all government sectors and the practical feasibility of conducting DIA's may therefore be questionable in the current economic climate.

The IIS report also recommended that engagement with Irish Aid partner countries be strengthened and encouraged. Such engagement with partner countries would constitute a viable means of assessing policy impacts on developing countries. As yet, however, the IDCD has not received formal presentations from partner country representatives and the developing country 'voice' has yet to enter into the Irish PCD institutional structure.

²¹ 'Policy Coherence for Development: Indicators for Ireland', King, M., Matthews, A., 2011

²² Barry, F. et al (2009): p.163

Role of NGO's in Irish PCD

Despite the recommendations of the first IIS report²³, engagement with civil society on the issue of policy coherence for development has been somewhat lacking. As noted earlier, the only NGO to present in an IDCD meeting was Dóchas, who did so during the fourth meeting. It certainly seems feasible that organizations could engage more with the IDCD in their work by bringing forward the voices of the public by working in partnership with policymakers. They could raise awareness and sustain the visibility of PCD on national and international levels.

Efforts have been made in Sweden to the effect that civil society organisations (CSOs) have published three *coherence barometers* – the last one in 2010 - that monitor how well government policies are fulfilling the ambitious objectives of the Policy for Global Development (PGD) in different areas. In Ireland, while the first IIS Report highlights certain areas where PCD issues may arise, it does not provide the detailed analysis and evaluation of each issue which would be necessary to sustain the case for a change in the direction of domestic policy. For many issues, such an analysis remains to be done. This is perhaps an area where Irish NGO's could contribute to the PCD discourse; however, a current lack of resources and sufficient capacity might hinder such an undertaking.

The partnership between the Irish Government and NGOs has been rather productive and healthy on certain specific thematic areas such as the Hunger Task Force. This partnership is strengthened by the Irish Aid Multi Annual Programme Scheme (MAPS), whereby several NGOs receive direct funding from the Irish government. However, it might be suggested that NGOs need to take a more active role in presenting to the IDCD, specifically on matters concerning policy coherence. It may also be suggested that Irish Aid needs to take a more proactive role in inviting NGO's to add their voice to the PCD discourse in Ireland. For example, where potential conflicts or inconsistencies arise between government departments, the NGO 'voice' could be utilised by Irish Aid to promote certain developmental objectives to the IDCD.

Examples of PCD Structures from other EU Member States

The afore-mentioned evaluation study of twelve EU Member States (Mackie, J. et al 2007) conducted by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) identified specific 'mechanisms' for promoting PCD. We have chosen to evaluate the PCD institutional structures of Ireland, Sweden and the Netherlands with respect to the mechanisms identified therein. These mechanisms can be divided into three categories:

²³ Barry, F. et al (2009): p.163

1. *Explicit policy statements of intent* - With regard to explicit policy statements of intent, Sweden provides the best example of a legislated commitment to PCD by way of its pioneering Policy for Global Development (PGD).
2. *Administrative and institutional mechanisms* (such as inter-departmental coordination committees and specialist coherence units) - The Netherlands is exemplary in this regard insofar that it has a designated Policy Coherence Unit which acts as an administrative and institutional PCD mechanism.
3. *Knowledge-input and knowledge-assessment mechanisms* (information and analysis capacity) - As yet, there is no best practice model for analysis and assessment, although perhaps Ireland could take a leading role in this regard with respect to the current work underway on creating a database of PCD indicators.

It is worth noting from the outset that no one country has achieved excellence in all three mechanisms. The area of Policy Coherence for Development is still in its formative stages at an international level. Sweden has a strong legislative basis for PCD but falls short in relation to institutional implementation and assessment. Likewise, The Netherlands has a strong institutional and administrative framework for PCD but has limited policy statements concerning policy coherence and has failed to implement adequate assessment and analysis mechanisms. It is imperative therefore that Ireland draws from the experiences of other countries such as Sweden and the Netherlands in developing effective mechanisms for PCD in Ireland.

There follows a brief overview of the respective PCD mechanisms of the Netherlands and Sweden and these mechanisms will then be compared to the Irish system in terms of their suitability and applicability in an Irish context.

The Netherlands

The Policy Coherence for Development Unit of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Netherlands was set up in 2002. This unit has provided a strong administrative and institutional mechanism for PCD in the Netherlands. The Unit reported to and advised the Minister for Development Cooperation and acted as a spearhead in promoting PCD within the country and on the EU level. They disseminated specific PCD dossiers, encouraged increased cooperation between ministries, and screened new policy proposals for their impact in developing countries.

The Netherlands is now revising its approach to development cooperation, formulating new policies and strategies following several political changes and reforms in 2010. As part of these government reforms, the Policy Coherence Unit was merged with the Ministry's Effectiveness and

Quality Department to form the Effectiveness and Coherence Department (DEC) and continues to lead on mainstreaming development issues across Dutch government policies. The DEC ensures that Dutch policy on sustainable development and the reduction of extreme poverty in developing countries is both effective and coherent. The themes for which the DEC holds special responsibility are cooperation with developing country governments and budget support. The DEC has three divisions: Development Policy and Coherence Division (DEC/OC), Quality of Aid Division (DEC/KH), and Public Sector Division (DEC/PS).

Within the Effectiveness and Coherence Department, a specific Policy Coherence for Development Team was formed made up of a staff of four policy advisers who work closely with other divisions within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on specific coherence issues. The team is led by the head of the DEC and reports directly to the Director-General for International Cooperation and the Minister for International Cooperation.²⁴

Although the Netherlands has no formal legal framework for PCD in government policies, nor do they have statute law for development cooperation; they aim for policy coherence in which Dutch and EU efforts are in line. Where the Netherlands system falls short is in relation to explicit policy statements of intent as well as Due to the new Department being only in its early stages of inception, little information exists outside of basic information provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs website. This year's OECD-DAC Peer Review of the Netherlands notes that they have been very successful in the past dealing with PCD but cautions the country not to lose momentum now that significant changes have just been implemented. The Netherlands also has not completely developed knowledge-assessment mechanisms. Currently they have no formal monitoring system to assess the impact of their policies on development²⁵.

Sweden

In 2003, the Swedish parliament adopted a new and groundbreaking *Policy for Global Development* such that policy coherence for development was placed at the heart of Sweden's approach to development. The Bill encompasses all areas of policy and proposes one common objective: to contribute to an equitable and sustainable global development. The PGD has been shaped around this overarching goal, which is to be attained through a more coherent policy and increased collaboration and coordination with other countries and actors.

Prior to drafting the PGD legislation, the Swedish Parliament created in 1999 'The Parliamentary Committee on Swedish Global Development Policy' or 'GlobKom'. This Committee organised meetings, hearings and conferences, approximately thirty of which took place during the

²⁴ OECD DAC Peer Review, Netherlands 2011: p.36

²⁵ OECD DAC Peer Review, Netherlands 2011: p. 37

three years of the Committee's existence. Committee members also undertook journeys to developing countries as well as to Geneva, Washington D.C. and EU Member States. Extensive background research was commissioned resulting in over 50 reports and an interactive website. The Committee's work resulted in its final report, 'A more Equitable World without Poverty', upon the findings of which the Government based its Bill on the Policy for Global Development²⁶.

The Minister for International Development Cooperation is responsible for coordinating Swedish development policy as well as coherence among the policy areas for development at the Government Offices. The Department for Development Policy at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs is responsible for the coordination of Sweden's Policy for Global Development. All policy areas and ministries share the responsibility for the implementation of global development policy.

In terms of monitoring and evaluation, the policy led to the establishment of the Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV), although the agency's mandate was restricted to evaluating development co-operation. The Dept. for Evaluation (UTV) of SIDA (Swedish Institutional Development Agency) evaluates exclusively SIDA-financed activities, mostly through external consultation. In effect, however, actual monitoring and reporting of progress on the coherence aspect of the policy has been reliant on self-evaluations by the individual ministries with no external scrutiny. As yet, Sweden has not identified indicators for the monitoring of the PGD nor has it formally engaged external assessors²⁷.

Civil Society has provided comprehensive PCD monitoring of Swedish policy in the *Coherence Barometers* which were compiled by various NGO's and Civil Society Organisations [See Appendix C]. The Barometer reports grade specific policies across government departments in an accessible and user-friendly format and provide an exemplary model for civil society engagement in PCD for NGO's in other countries. There has been strong media interest in the barometer reports and the resulting

Swedish development cooperation



Sources:
 ○ OECD/DAC Peer review 2005
 ○ Daily newspaper Göteborgsposten, 30-05-2007.
Ministerna inte lika villja än mer (The ministers are not more willing)
 ○ Daily newspaper Dagens Nyheter, 26-10-2007.
Modra avna vill slopa bidragsvärd (The conservatives want to abolish the ODA goals)
 ○ Government bill 2006/07:1, 2007/08:1. *Badge bill for 2007 and 2008. Expenditure area 7.*



Sources:
 ○ Government bill 2005/00:1, 2006/07:1, 2007/08:1. *Badge bill for 2006, 2007 and 2008.*
 ○ *Gomilla Caravan in the parliament chamber 14 December 2006 speech, 205.*
 ○ Parliamentary inquiry service 2006/1972.
 ○ *Keeping Europe's promises on Financing for Development. Conclusions of the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, G.A.E.C., 12 May 2007.*
 ○ *Practical how working group in the run-up to OECD Summit, 2007. Paper 7.*
 DAC/DAC/2007/23/REV1
 ODA eligibility of inflow, debt and country registration. High Level Meeting, 3-4 April 2007.

OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE VOLUME
BACKGROUND: Already in 1968 the Swedish parliament reached a decision that Swedish Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) should be 1 percent of the gross national income, GNI. Sweden is, and has for a long time been, an example of a generous, well co-ordinated, high qualitative and effective ODA. According to the OECD evaluation in 2005, Sweden is a "well-respected donor country" with a high international reputation. Many other countries within EU are far from the internationally set goal of 0.7 percent in ODA.
 If the UN Millennium Development Goals are to be reached, the donor countries must increase the volume of ODA and improve coordination and quality. ODA is imperative in creating opportunities for poor people to combat poverty. Support to the work for human rights, gender equity and democracy are important components in poverty eradication.
 In the run-up to the 2006 election the Christian Democrats and the Swedish Liberal Party vowed to live up to the promise of allocating 1 percent of GNI. The Centre Party was however not as clear and the Conservative Party opposed the 1 percent level.

SWEDISH POLICY: Sweden continues to be a pioneering country by allocating 1 percent of GNI to ODA. These are, however, entries in the budget that make the statistics misleading, as described below. It is also of concern that the Swedish Minister for Development Cooperation is often quoted as opposing the 1 percent level. She had said that the level is "a curse" and claims that a volume goal in conflict to the policy to secure high quality ODA.

INFLATED AID
BACKGROUND: What is accounted for as ODA is regulated by OECD's Development Assistance Committee, DAC. However, some of these allocated costs, e.g. debt cancellations and costs for the first year of refugees in a country, ought not be accounted for as ODA. The right to asylum is regulated in international conventions and is obviously an obligation that all countries should fulfil, but today an increase of refugees to Sweden results in a reduction in aid. For the world's poor and most indebted countries it is imperative to have their debts cancelled, both for the reason of redress and to increase the country's financial capacity to develop. However, to finance debt cancellation with ODA funds means that poor people are denied the promised ODA. This ODA should not finance debt cancellations; was established in the resolutions adopted at the UN Summit on financing the UN Millennium Development Goals in Monterrey in 2002, which Sweden is committed to.

SWEDISH POLICY: Sweden uses ODA to finance both refugees' first year in Sweden and the cancellation of export credit debts, despite the fact that Sweden, at a meeting of the EU Ministerial Council in 2006, promised to live up to the Monterrey commitment.

Inflated aid	2005	2006	2007	2008
ODA-4 budget, million SEK	23 746	23 099	30 139	32 018
Export credit debts, million SEK	-	425	1 500	500
Refugee reception in Sweden, million SEK	1 072	1 212	1 745	2 102
Percentage of ODA-4 budget	4.51	5.33	10.77	6.59

The proportion of ODA used to receive refugees has more than doubled over the last two years. During 2007 the Government chose to value debts to be cancelled in a new way. The debts originated from export credits from the 1950s that were given to Swedish companies investing in coastguard boats in Liberia and power plants in Democratic Republic of Congo. The new model includes e.g. unpaid interests and amortization, and thereby the maximum possible amount could be accounted for as ODA. The actual costs were however only a few percent of the accounted amount and the difference, over a billion SEK, was saved in the state budget.

Image 1. Page from Swedish Coherence Barometer Report 2008 showing 'smiley' indicator system.

²⁶ GlobKom 2001, p. 13
²⁷ OECD-DAC Mid-term Pt

dialogue with politicians and government officials has meant that topics such as “inflation of aid” and irresponsible lending became debated issues in parliament.

According to the barometer report, Sweden remains a world leader in terms of overseas development assistance (ODA) by allocating 1 percent of GNI to ODA, and has been consistent in seeking to encourage exports from poor countries by pushing for a reduction in import tariffs in developed countries and advocating ‘aid for trade’ policies. However, despite the strong legislative base for policy coherence, Sweden has had mixed results in implementing other commitments. Incoherencies still remain with regard to issues such as the Swedish arms trade, inflated aid, irresponsible lending and conditionalities on poor country policies. Without other building blocks in place, relating to systematic inter-departmental coordination and incentives and a framework for monitoring and reporting progress, Sweden has found it more difficult to achieve coherence in some policy areas than in others. This led to a significant rethink of practical implementation and in its 2008 communication on the implementation of the PGD, the Swedish government presented a reformed policy that aimed to be more results-based. This was followed by a subsequent communication in 2010 which proposed further amendments to implementation measures of the PGD.

The Swedish government’s efforts in institutionalizing PCD have been highly commended in the OECD-DAC Peer Review of Sweden in 2009. Sweden is recognized as being at the vanguard of donors committed to development. The OECD-DAC peer review affirms that Sweden has a strong policy and legislative basis for PCD, however, it notes that implementation has been challenging, most notably in the area of monitoring and reporting. The Peer Review also noted that there was a lack of sufficient awareness of the Policy for Global Development outside of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Nonetheless, the Peer Review praises the recent acknowledgement by the Swedish government of these shortcomings and the subsequent reformative measures which have been proposed.

Comparison with Ireland’s PCD mechanisms

1. Explicit Policy Statements of Intent

From our analysis of Ireland’s institutional PCD structure, it is apparent that attempts have been made in Ireland to adopt all three PCD mechanisms, although the level to which these have been achieved is not yet optimal. In terms of a policy statement of intent, the White Paper on Irish Aid outlines Ireland’s commitment to achieving policy coherence for development and it is from this commitment that the IDCD was created in 2007. The Terms of Reference of the IDCD also clearly

outline the commitment of that Committee to ensuring policy coherence with the development objectives of the White Paper on Irish Aid. However, these policy statements do not amount to substantive legislation, as is the case in Sweden where the Policy for Global Development (2003) provides a legislated policy foundation for Sweden's development efforts. Sweden's policy for global development concerns all government ministries and is not framed solely in the context of the development department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The scope of Ireland's policy statements, therefore, may fall somewhat short in comparison with Sweden's overarching PGD.

While a legislated policy statement would be optimal for Ireland, given the expensive and time-consuming nature of the work carried out by The Parliamentary Committee on Swedish Global Development Policy (GlobKom) in preparation of Sweden's PGD Bill, it may not be feasible at present for Ireland to adopt a similar undertaking. Nonetheless, Ireland could draw on the best practice model as set out by Sweden, thereby mitigating some of the expense of pre-legislation preparation. In the Netherlands, the first explicit mention of policy coherence was in 2002 and the original Policy Coherence Unit was set up soon after. Several other policy statements of intent have been made in the years since. The Review of the White Paper on Irish Aid, which is underway at present, could potentially lead to a re-evaluation of Ireland's policy stance in relation to PCD, and it is imperative that Irish Aid use this opportunity to restate their commitment to achieving policy coherence for development.

2. Administrative and Institutional Mechanisms

The IDCD in Ireland does provide an *institutional mechanism* for PCD; however, the capacity of this committee may need to be strengthened. The Netherlands' obvious institutional strength lies in their Effectiveness and Coherence Department. A similar unit could be feasible to introduce in Ireland. While this would require additional staff capacity and financial support, the gains in effectiveness and efficiency across all government departments would far outweigh the expense. Similarly, while the financial viability of screening policies to identify their impacts may be difficult currently, the IDCD's future role in PCD would be significantly enhanced by implementing mechanisms to systematically screen proposals and target specific coherence dossiers. In the case of Sweden, while the Policy for Global Development provides a strong legislative background for PCD, a lack of administrative and institutional mechanisms has resulted in insufficient implementation of the Bill.

3. Knowledge-Input and Knowledge-Assessment Mechanisms

All three countries in our analysis fall short with regard to assessment and analysis. The IDCD, by way of receiving presentations and creating the subgroup on Skills-Sets which hosted lunchtime educational seminars, has been somewhat effective in terms of *knowledge-input and information-sharing*. However, Ireland falls short with regard to *knowledge-assessment* mechanisms for PCD. The IDCD has yet to live up to its stated TOR with regard to monitoring and assessment, although it has commissioned a second IIS Report 'Policy Coherence for Development: Indicators for Ireland' which will be the first report of its kind from an EU Member State.

Sweden has also been faulted by the OECD-DAC Peer Review for an apparent lack of appropriate monitoring and assessment mechanisms. However, like Ireland, research in Sweden is currently underway to identify a set of PCD Indicators. The Netherlands also has not completely developed knowledge-assessment mechanisms. Currently they have no formal monitoring system to assess the impact of their policies on development²⁸. It might be suggested that the current work underway by the IDCD in collaboration with the IIS in Trinity College Dublin on creating a set of PCD indicators for Ireland could place Ireland in a leading position in the area of PCD assessment and analysis. It is therefore imperative that such work continues despite political changeover and ministerial reappointments.

Recommendations

We propose the following eight recommendations which, if implemented, would strengthen and enhance Ireland's institutional structures for PCD. In terms of achievability, our recommendations have been considered in light of the current economic climate and their implementation, therefore, should not pose significant fiscal costs to the Irish Government.

1. Policy Reform

The explicit policy underpinning Ireland's PCD mechanisms is in need of reform. We suggest that PCD is too broad and important an issue to be included solely in the White Paper for Irish Aid. The case could be argued for more ambitious legislated policy in the field of PCD, which would provide an over-arching framework for policy coherence with far-reaching effects across all government departments. However, we recognize that the immediate practicalities of such an undertaking may not be entirely feasible given the current economic climate. It is therefore imperative that Irish Aid's commitment to achieving PCD is clearly restated in the current Review of the White Paper on Irish Aid which presents a valuable opportunity for re-evaluating Ireland's policy

²⁸ OECD DAC Peer Review, Netherlands 2011: p. 37

statements in relation to PCD. This should be complimented by a re-assessment of the Terms of reference of the IDCD, which need to be more ambitiously defined in order to increase the committee's capacity.

2. Usage of Monitoring and Evaluation

The adoption of a coherent set of indicators for assessment of policy coherence would place Ireland at the forefront of evaluative PCD measures and we therefore encourage the IDCD and Irish Aid in their pursuance of this objective. Working towards adopting measures to assess impacts can help ensure PCD. Effective procedures and mechanisms must be in place so that policies can be effectively implemented and assessed as to how they are performing. This information is important to policy makers and can help them to refine or reprioritise policy instruments and objectives as needed to maintain their coherence over time. Therefore we recommend that the valuable research conducted by the IIS on indicators and assessments be utilised by Irish Aid and the IDCD. This could be accomplished by creating another subgroup within the IDCD with the specific task of monitoring and evaluation of policy coherence for development.

3. Development focal points within Government Departments

At present, responsibility for development issues in the Irish Government rests solely within the Department of Foreign Affairs and Irish Aid. We propose that a 'Development Focal Point' or Representative is assigned within each government department, upon whom rests the responsibility for development issues concerning their respective departments. Sufficient time and resources should be allocated to these individuals so that they have adequate capacity to deal with the relevant issues. These Focal Points should then represent their respective Departments on the IDCD. From our analysis of the minutes of the IDCD meetings, it can be deduced that departmental representation on the Committee varied from meeting to meeting, whereas a designated Departmental Development Representative would ensure consistency. A similar system of development representation across government ministries has worked in Sweden and has been praised by the OECD-DAC peer Review of Sweden (2009).

4. Parliamentary Oversight

Notwithstanding the recommendations of the IIS Report (Barry et al., 2009), there has been insufficient parliamentary oversight of PCD mechanisms in Ireland. We suggest that the IDCD should submit an annual report to the Oireachtas. This should precipitate an annual debate on PCD in the Dáil.

5. Partner Country Engagement

From our analysis of the IDCD meeting minutes, it is clear that there was little if no engagement with Irish Aid's nine partner countries. It is important to remember the principle rationale for engagement with developing countries is about ensuring basic human rights rather than Irish national interests. Developing country's perspectives need to be directly incorporated in the policy development process. Such engagement could take the form of evaluative case studies within partner countries whereby the impact of Irish policy incoherencies, particularly in agricultural and trade policies, could be assessed in a developing country context. This will help maximize the positive impact of Ireland's approach to development cooperation and minimise the possible negative impacts resulting from policy incoherencies.

6. Increased partnership with NGO's on PCD

We recommend that both Irish Aid and NGOs work together in greater collaboration to achieve a stronger approach in promoting development concerns at a policy level. To this effect, the advocacy of NGO's could be utilized by Irish Aid through facilitating NGO involvement with the IDCD in pursuing certain development agendas where there is potential for conflict between government departments. Similarly, NGOs need to take a more proactive stance in seeking engagement with the IDCD. NGOs could also provide a valuable evaluative service in the form of a coherence barometer report, similar to the Swedish collaboration.

7. Assign responsibility for PCD to the Dept. of the Taoiseach

In the absence of overarching legislation, we suggest that ultimate responsibility for PCD should rest with the Department of the Taoiseach, thereby ensuring an all-of-government approach to policy coherence. At present, it is not clear whether Irish Aid has sufficient political backing and institutional support to effectively address any inconsistencies and potential conflicts between departments that might adversely affect developing countries.

8. Relocation of Irish Aid

As discussed previously in this report and mentioned by the OECD-DAC Peer Review, the relocation of Irish Aid outside of Dublin was not only politically a contentious issue but also probably inhibited the informal networks upon which the IDCD relies so heavily. Due to there being a current review of decentralization within the whole Irish government, now is also a good time for assessing the effectiveness of a decision to move Irish Aid and the IDCD back to Dublin. In order to further

development coherence in Ireland, having the main body located in close proximity with the other government departments could be advantageous into the future, although we recognize that the economic feasibility of such a move may be questionable in the current climate.

References

Barry, F., King, M., Matthews, A. (2009) "Policy Coherence for Development: The State of Play in Ireland." A Scoping Report commissioned by the Advisory Board for Irish Aid. Available: http://www.tcd.ie/iiis/documents/discussion/pdfs/PCD_report.pdf.

Barry, F., King, M., Matthews, A. (2010). "Policy Coherence for Development: Five Challenges". *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, Vol. 21: 207–223. Available: http://www.ria.ie/getmedia/75992320-25e1-42e4-ac97-9fe5a2a4f538/15.ISIA_21_Barry-et-al_207.pdf.aspx.

CONCORD (2009). "Spotlight on Policy Coherence." Brussels: CONCORD. Available: http://coherence.concordeurope.org/pdf/Concord_Report_15_AW_LORES.pdf.

Engel, P., Keijzer, N., van Seters, J. and Spierings, E. (2009). "External Evaluation of the Policy Coherence Unit of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Summary." Maastricht: ECDPM Discussion Paper 91. Available: www.ecdpm.org/dp91.

GlobKom (Kommittén om Sveriges politik för global utveckling) (2002) "A more Equitable World Without Poverty: Report by the Parliamentary Committee on Sweden's Policy for Global Development." Swedish Government Official Reports SOU 2001: 96.

Government Bill (2003) "Shared Responsibility: Sweden's Policy for Global Development (PGD)." 2002/03:122 Available: <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/45/20/c4527821.pdf>.

Government of Ireland (2006). "White Paper on Irish Aid." Available: <http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/whitepaper/assets/White%20Paper%20English.pdf>

Government Offices of Sweden (2010). "Policy for economic growth in Swedish development cooperation, 2010-2014." Available: <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/14/21/50/c4a39b1d.pdf>

Government Offices of Sweden (2010). "Meeting Global Challenges – Government communication on policy coherence for development." Available:

<http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/15/27/91/ea0dc207.pdf>

Droeze, F.H (2010) "Policy Coherence for Development: The World Beyond Aid."
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague.

Houses of the Oireachtas (2010) "Taxation, Development and Policy Coherence:
Discussion with Irish Aid, Department of Finance and Revenue." Parliamentary Debates:
Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs.
Available: <http://debates.oireachtas.ie/FOJ/2010/05/26/00004.asp>.

Houses of the Oireachtas (2010) "Priority Questions – Overseas Development Aid." Dáil Éireann
Debate *Vol. 718 No. 1*, Tuesday 12th October, 2010, Dublin. Available:
<http://debates.oireachtas.ie/dail/2010/10/12/00006.asp>.

Irish Aid (2007, 2008, 2009) Inter-Departmental Committee on Development Meetings Minutes
Available: http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/parters_irish.asp.

Irish Aid (2008) "IDCD Annual Report 2008."
Available: http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/parters_irish.asp.

Irish Aid (2007) "The Terms of Reference of the IDCD." Available:
http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/partners_irish.asp

Keijzer, N. (2010) "EU Policy Coherence for Development: from moving the goalposts to results-
based management?" Discussion Paper No. 101, ECDPM Available: www.ecdpm.org/dp101.

King, M., Matthews, A. (2011) "Policy Coherence for Development: Indicators for Ireland. A Report
commissioned by the Advisory Board for Irish Aid." *Unpublished Manuscript*.

Lisbon Treaty (2008) "Article 208." Available at <http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-the-functioning-of-the-european-union-and-comments/part-5-external-action-by-the-union/title-3-cooperation-with-third-countries-and-humanitarian-aid/chapter-1-development-cooperation/496-article-208.html>.

Mackie, J. et al (2007) "Evaluation Study on the EU Institutions & member States' mechanisms for Promoting Policy Coherence for Development." Studies in European Development Co-operation Evaluation 7. Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers. Available: <http://www.three-cs.net>.

Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2011) "Policy Theme Departments." Available: <http://www.minbuza.nl/en/ministry/organisational-structure/policy-theme-departments.html>.

OECD (2008) "Policy Coherence for Development: Lessons Learned." Paris: OECD Policy Brief. Available: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/32/8/41866464.pdf>.

OECD (2009). "Building Blocks for Policy Coherence for Development." Paris: OECD Policy Brief. Available: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/14/53/44704030.pdf>.

OECD/DAC (2009) "DAC Peer Review of Ireland- Full Report." Available: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/50/1/42704390.pdf>.

OECD/DAC (2011). "DAC Peer Review of Netherlands- Full Report." Available: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/4/23/49011988.pdf>.

OECD/DAC (2009). "DAC Peer Review of Sweden - Main Findings and Recommendations." Available: http://www.oecd.org/document/1/0,3343,en_2649_34603_43278401_1_1_1_1,00.html.

OECD/DAC (2011). "DAC mid-term review of Sweden." Available: <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/17/30/04/40322a14.pdf>.

Sandahl, J. Ed. (2008) "Swedish Coherence Barometer 2008." Forum Syd: Stockholm. Available: <http://www.concord.se/upload//Barometer%202008%20eng.pdf>

Appendix A.

Summary of IDCD Meeting Minutes: 12/04/2007 – 10/11/2010)

- Since its inception in 2007, the IDCD has met 13 times.
- The minutes from 12 of these meetings are available at http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/partners_irish.asp
- These meetings took place on average 3 times per year. However, the interval between consecutive meetings varied from less than 2 months to as long as 9 months.
- The minutes reveal that throughout the 12 meetings, the IDCD has received over 15 presentations on various development-related issues. The majority of these presentations were given to the IDCD in the initial eight meetings. The frequency of presentations reduced thereafter.
- Only one of these presentations was given by an NGO, Dóchas. This occurred during the fourth meeting, 26/02/2008: “Being a Champion for Development – Enhancing PCD”.
- The minutes show how the IDCD instigated the creation of two subgroups: the subgroup on skills-sets; and the subgroup on multilateral organisations.
- The subgroups reported to the IDCD at each meeting and were generally successful in carrying out their respective functions.
 - The subgroup on skills-sets organised educational lunch-time seminars across government departments in which there was strong interest
 - The subgroup on multilateral organisations conducted research into Irish representation in multilateral organisations and proposed a number of actions which could promote careers in development amongst Irish Nationals.
- Each government department is represented on the IDCD. Attendance by departmental representatives has been good, however, the individual representatives may differ from meeting to meeting. The consistency of nominated representatives varies between departments.
- The IDCD commissioned two external reports from the Trinity College Institute for International Integration Studies (IIIS): PCD: The State of Play in Ireland, followed by an upcoming report on PCD Indicators and Assessment.
- In 2009 (ninth meeting) the IDCD commissioned each government department to compile a statement on policy coherence based on the recommendations of the IIIS scoping report.
- The IDCD was invited to address the Joint Oireachtas Committee on Foreign Affairs in 2010 in relation to its work and specifically in relation to taxation and development.

Date	Location	Meeting Activities	Commitments/ Proposed Actions
First Meeting: 12/04/2007	Department of Foreign Affairs, Iveagh House	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Speech from Minister of State, Conor Lenihan T.D. 2. Departmental Presentations from Agriculture and Food; Enterprise, Trade, and Employment; Justice; Community, Rural and Gaeltach Affairs; Transport; Environment, Heritage, and Local Government; Communications, Marine, and Natural Resources 	<p>Strengthen coherence in the Government's approach to development</p> <p>Make best use of the expertise and skills available across the public service</p> <p>Suggested that retired civil servants might be of assistance in reference to constraints on capacity and resources</p>
Second Meeting: 06/09/2007	Conference Room 1, Irish Aid	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Speech from Minister of State, Michael Kitt T.D. 2. Presentation on Dutch PCD from Mr. Otto Genee, Director of the Policy Coherence Unit in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands 3. The draft Terms of Reference of the Committee were agreed with one amendment from Political Division, Department of Foreign Affairs 4. The Synthesis Report was approved by the Committee with one amendment from the Department of Agriculture 	<p>"an integrated approach to development across all Government Departments" is a stated priority in the new Programme for Government</p>

5. Minister's proposed approach to the work of the Committee

Discussed the establishment of one or more sub-groups at the third Committee meeting; to invite personnel from the Institute of International Integration Studies in Trinity College Dublin to present to the Committee at the third meeting; and to invite members of the NGO community to present to the Committee at the fourth meeting

Third Meeting:
27/11/2007

Conference Room 1, Irish Aid

1. Speech from Minister of State, Michael Kitt T.D.

2. Presentation by Professor Alan Matthews- Policy Coherence for Development and the IIS Framework Agreement with the Advisory Board for Irish Aid (ABIA)

3. Draft Work Programme circulated for review

4. Draft Paper on Proposed Sub-Groups circulated

The Secretariat would write to Departments to get a nomination for relevant personnel to sit on a Skills Sets sub-group. The Department of Finance recommended that sub-groups, when formed, should feedback to the main Committee with research findings and/or to report on work undertaken

5. Mr. McLaughlin, Multilateral UN Section Irish Aid, briefed on Irish Aid activities within the UN Context as well as inter-departmental co-operation and funding towards UN bodies

A joint approach to UN activities by relevant Departments and Irish Aid, e.g. Health, could be looked at in the Multilateral Organisations sub-group

6. Update on the EU Report on Policy Coherence for Development and Council Conclusions

Fourth Meeting: 26/02/2008	Conference Room 1, Irish Aid	<p>1. Speech from Minister of State, Michael Kitt T.D.</p> <p>2. Presentation by Dóchas - Being a Champion for Development – Enhancing PCD</p> <p>3. Presentation by Mr. Bob Bradshaw, Department of Finance – Ireland and the World Bank</p> <p>4. Reports from Sub-Groups</p> <p>A. Mr. Hegarty, Irish Aid, reported on the Multilateral Organisations Sub Group meeting which had been held at the end of January. The Departments of Justice; Agriculture; Defence; Finance; Social and Family Affairs; and Foreign Affairs (Political Division) are represented on this Sub Group.</p> <p>B. Mr. Gormley, Irish Aid, reported on the Skills Sets Sub Group meeting which had been held in early February. The Departments of Health; Education; Communications, Energy and Natural Resources; Enterprise, Trade and Employment; and Finance are represented on this Sub Group.</p> <p>5. The draft Work Programme which had been discussed at the November meeting was agreed subject to the addition of a reference to a presentation on Health matters being made to a future Committee meeting.</p>	<p>Target of reporting to the Minister of Foreign Affairs by next June</p> <p>The Sub Group agreed to identify gaps and opportunities with a view to elaborating a strategy for the placing of Irish nationals within the staff of multilateral organisations; and recognised the general need for enhanced co-ordination between Departments on a day to day basis.</p> <p>The Sub Group planned to conduct an audit of existing technical skills transfer. The Sub Group also planned to make a proposal to the next meeting of the Committee in relation to awareness raising on development issues in Government Departments.</p>
Fifth Meeting: 16/04/2008	Conference Room, Iveagh House	<p>1. Speech from Ronan Murphy, Director General, Irish Aid</p>	

2. Presentation by Mr. Michael King, Senior Research Officer with the Institute of International Integration Studies, Trinity College

3. Reports from Sub-Groups

A. Mr. McLaughlin, Irish Aid, updated the Committee on the work of the Multilateral Organisations Sub Group

Plan to circulate a paper regarding a strategy for placing Irish personnel in organisations, concentrating on the five main UN bodies, in advance of the next meeting of the group to be held in late May/early June. Will hold a brainstorming event on careers in the development sector to be held in the Irish Aid Volunteering and Information Centre on Upper O'Connell Street in the Autumn.

B. Mr. Gormley, Irish Aid, reported on the Skills Sets Sub Group meeting which had been held in early April

Plan to pilot a series of awareness raising lunchtime seminars: 'An Introduction to Global Development and Ireland's role' in the six Government Departments represented on the Sub Group. A consultant had been retained to conduct an audit of existing technical cooperation with a view to developing criteria/guidelines in this regard, drawing from international best practice, and identifying gaps in the area of technical co-operation. This work was scheduled to continue until October next and the Sub Group would report back to the Committee at that stage.

4. Presentation by the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government on Environment issues in the context of development policy

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>5. Submission from Dóchas recommendations on how they felt the Committee could ensure greatest impact</p> | <p>Correspondence would be given further consideration during 6th Committee meeting</p> |
| <p>6. DG Murphy outlined the IDCD's commitment to present an Annual Report to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dermot Ahern by end June</p> | <p>The Committee agreed that the IDCD Secretariat would produce a draft based on the outline and circulate to Members for comments with a view to finalising at the Committee's June meeting</p> |
| <p>7. Update on EU developments on Policy Coherence for Development</p> | |

Sixth Meeting:
19/06/2008

Conference Room 1, Irish Aid

1. Mr. Peter Power, T.D. Minister of State for Overseas Development presented the draft Report which had been circulated to Members and outlined its main recommendations
2. Mr. McLaughlin, Irish Aid, updated the Committee on the work of the Multilateral Organisations Sub Group which had examined a preliminary study regarding a strategy for placing Irish personnel in such organisations, concentrating on the five main UN bodies

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>3. Mr. Gormley, Irish Aid, reported on the Skills Sets Sub Group meeting held on 12th June. Mr. Gormley also noted that the presentation which the meeting received from Traidlinks had been very helpful in clarifying issues involved in technical assistance</p> | <p>The Sub Group engaged to conduct an audit of existing technical co-operation with a view to developing criteria/guidelines for technical cooperation, drawing from international best practice with a final report due by the end of September. They planned that the Director General of Irish Aid would write to Assistant Secretaries with responsibility for Personnel/Training functions in eight pilot Departments with a view to organising the overseas development awareness raising lunchtime seminars which the IDCD agreed at its April meeting</p> |
| <p>4. Consideration of the correspondence which had been received from Dóchas, as a follow up to their presentation to the February meeting of the Committee</p> | <p>Dóchas should be provided with a copy of the IDCD's Report and that the Secretariat could meet them in order to apprise them of the IDCD's consideration of their recommendations</p> |
| <p>5. Mr. Gormley, Irish Aid, reported that Ireland had scored well in the 2008 Commitment to Development Index (CDI) for Africa, being ranked 2nd overall in this first regional variant of the CDI which focused on Africa</p> | <p>Mr. Gormley suggested that consideration be given to inviting a representative of the CGD to address either the IDCD or one of its Sub Groups</p> |
| <p>6. Update on recent developments on Policy Coherence for Development</p> | |
| <p>7. Presentation on OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Officials</p> | <p>Suggested that the IDCD could have an awareness raising role with regard to this Convention and suggested that the Department of Justice be invited to provide an information session on the Convention at a future meeting</p> |
-

Seventh Meeting: Room 1, Irish Aid
23/10/08

1. The Committee received a presentation Report of the Hunger Task Force
 There was agreement that follow up to the recommendations was key and Mr. McMahon informed the Committee that a new Food Security Unit located in a new Thematic Sectors Section in Irish Aid would be tasked with this

2. Outline of developments on OECD DAC Peer Review A delegation from Ireland visiting the OECD in Paris to 2009 (due to be published March 2009), given by Mr Michael Gaffey, new Deputy Director General of Irish Aid
 finalise the report in late March 2009

3. Follow up to the First Annual Report to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
 First Recommendation of the First Annual Report to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, to be paired with Recommendations of the upcoming IIS Report. It was agreed that on publication of the IIS Report the Secretariat would liaise closely with the eight priority Departments in order to devise statements which reflected existing work and also took on board IIS recommendations, as deemed appropriate by the relevant Departments.

4. Report from Multilateral Organisations Sub Group - Mr. Frank Flood, Irish Aid Volunteering and Information Centre, updated the Committee on ongoing work in the area of Careers in Development
 The next steps were (1) to identify in which agencies Ireland is underrepresented and which we should focus on and (2) to work with a number of agencies on hard to fill positions. The Committee felt there were opportunities for further liaison with professional bodies. A workshop with Non-Governmental Organisations on general development careers was planned for before Christmas

5. Report from Skills Sets Sub Group - Success of International Development Awareness Raising Luncheon Seminars in Departments of Agriculture, Health, and Enterprise

The Sub Group had considered a consultant’s draft report ‘Technical Assistance and Irish Aid Public Sector Skills Audit’. The final report could be presented at the next meeting of the Committee. Also, The next seminars were planned for the Office of Public Works on November 24th and Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government on 25th November

**Eighth Meeting:
21/05/09**

Conference Room, Iveagh House

1. IIS Report “Policy Coherence for Development: The State of Play in Ireland”The Committee received a presentation on this draft report from Professors Frank Barry and Alan Matthews of the Institute for International Integration Studies (IIS), Trinity College Dublin

Suggested that the Committee hold a full debate on the approach to take in relation to the report at the next IDCD meeting

2. Report from the Skills Set Sub Group

Given the changed economic context since the report was commissioned, it was decided that the sub-group would continue to work on explicit, specific and concrete recommendations on public sector technical cooperation which would clearly outline resource implications. Also, The next International Development Awareness Raising Luncheon Seminar was planned for September in the Department of Education and Science

3. 2009 EU PCD report and future EU approach to PCD
Carol Hannon updated the Committee on PCD developments at EU level

4. Follow up to the first Annual Report of the IDCD and preparations for the 2008/09 Annual Report

Ms. Hannon advised that a first draft of the Annual Report would be presented to the Committee at its next meeting, with a view to having it finalised in the early autumn. Departments were invited to submit any relevant information for the Annual Report

**Ninth Meeting:
22/07/09**

Conference Room, Iveagh House

1. IIS Report "Policy Coherence for Development: The State of Play in Ireland" - Discussion

2. Departmental Statements on PCD - recommendation in the first IDCD annual report that Departments would prepare a statement on policy coherence based on the recommendations of the IIS scoping report.

It was agreed that the draft statements would be prepared before the next IDCD meeting

3. The secretariat circulated a note on PCD developments at OECD level

4. Reports from Sub Group

5. Index of Policy Coherence Indicators
The chair informed the committee that the IIS, as part of the next stage of their research on policy coherence, are undertaking work on developing a PCD Scorecard to monitor progress on policy coherence

Proposed that a sub-group of the IDCD should liaise with the IIS on this work on indicators and produce a draft index for the IDCD

6. The secretariat circulated an outline of the second IDCD report

**Tenth Meeting:
26/11/09**

Conference Room, Iveagh House

1. Departmental Statements on PCD -

a new time frame for the completion of the statements with submission of drafts to the IDCD by early 2010 was agreed.

2. A draft 2009 IDCD annual report was circulated

3. Report from Skills Sets Sub Group -

Mr. Austin Gormley, Chairman of the Skills Sets Sub Group, presented a report on the development awareness seminars. Feedback from participants was positive but many thought the seminars too short and Mr. Gormley noted the sub group may have been overly ambitious in what they were trying to achieve in the seminars with such a short space of time

It was agreed that two final seminars should be held in the Department of the Taoiseach and the Department of Defence in 2010. It was also noted that while Irish Aid does not have the capacity to organise formal training courses, external short-term/evening course in development and training may be of interest to departmental staff

4. Discussion on Climate Change - Mr. Dominick O'Brien, of the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government, updated the committee on his department's position for the Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen

5. Report from the Multilateral Sub Group - Mr. Gervin highlighted the need for the multilateral sub-group to be re-energised. Ms. Nicola Brennan, Multilateral Section, Irish Aid proposed that the Departments of Health and Education should join the Committee whose membership currently comprises the Departments of Foreign Affairs, Justice, Finance, Agriculture, Defence and Social and Family Affairs. The committee should then focus on developing a more strategic whole of government approach to multilaterals with a focus on UN System-wide coherence

The subgroup proposed a number of different ways for Departments to increase development awareness including: hosting development exhibitions from the Irish Aid Volunteering Centre; including references to relevant global development on their website or intranet pages and links to Irish Aid website; and/or nominating a focal point on overseas development awareness raising. Irish Aid will circulate an e-news bulletin; provide links on the Irish Aid website to Departmental website pages on their own development efforts and assist Departments to display temporary exhibitions or posters on the work of Irish Aid

6. Mr. Michael King, Institute for International Integration Studies TCD, updated the committee on the process of developing a set of indicators to track Ireland's performance on policy coherence for development

Eleventh Meeting: Conference Room, Iveagh
03/06/10 House

1. Mr. Gaffey informed the meeting that the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs (JCFA) had invited Irish Aid and the Department of Finance to appear before it to report on the progress made by the IDCD and specifically on policy coherence issues relating to taxation

2. Mr. Dominick O'Brien and Mr. Owen Ryan, Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DEHLG), updated the group on progress on Climate Change post the UNCCC COP 15 meeting in Copenhagen in December 2009

3. IDCD Annual Report - draft review

DoD and DETI indicated that they would have additional inputs. It was agreed that these would be incorporated and the draft re-circulated for approval by silent procedure.

4. Departmental Statements on PCD
Departments gave updates on their progress to date

5. Report from the Multilateral Subgroup - A proposal for The Irish Aid Volunteering and Information Centre will implement the pilot over a period of 12/18 months in a systematic approach to Irish recruitment to the United Nations has been submitted to the Irish Aid Senior Management Group. consultation with other sections in Irish Aid, Political Division and with the Permanent Missions. Ms. Hannon, IDCD Secretariat, requested that Departments who engage with multilaterals send details of their relationship with the organisations and the name and contact details for the relevant contact in the Department.

6. Report from Skills Sets Sub-Group - The sub-group has also followed up on the decision to adopt an incremental and targeted approach by meeting with the Hunger Task Team in Irish Aid and with the Department of Agriculture to try and identify how Irish expertise in the agriculture sector could support our work in this area in our programme countries. The last of the development awareness seminars will be held in the Department of Defence when a suitable date can be agreed. Ms. Hannon suggested that the formulation of Departmental Statements could be used as an opportunity to highlight links between a Department's own policies and strategies and development outcomes by having a briefing session with relevant staff

7. Ms. Hannon informed the Committee that Mr. Michael King from the IIS Trinity has started work on the development of index of PCD indicators for Ireland

Twelfth Meeting:
10/11/10

(1) Ireland's response to Global Hunger
Ms Barbara Cullinane, Director Thematic Sectors and Special Programmes, Irish Aid, gave a brief presentation on Ireland's response to global hunger.

In relation to the IDCD, important areas are the work of the skill set group in facilitating cooperation between the DAFF and Irish Aid, scaling up efforts to support communities to adapt to climate change including agroforestry and crop diversification, and research especially in the areas of biofuels and GM crops. NGOs and civil society groups had also raised concerns about the impact of trade on food security and Mr Farrell highlighted the need for more evidence-based research in this area. Ms. Carol Hannon, DFA, highlighted the Hunger Envoy's identification of the need for more evidence based analysis and identification of the impact of trade and other policies on food security and hunger in the developing world especially in relation to the CAP post 2013 and the EU's new trade policy. It was agreed that hunger, as a national priority issue, should remain on the agenda of the IDCD.

(2) Departmental Statements on PCD -
Four Departments reported on progress,

While Mr. Gaffey welcomed the work to date all agreed that the process may be overtaken by political events.

(3) Indicators for Policy Coherence for Development -
Mr. Gaffey reported that the Institute for International Integration Studies (IIIS) is in the final stages of the PCD indicators project.

A draft version was circulated, Departments can then draw on the study to identify indicators to monitor their progress on PCD. Ms. Hannon noted the study will provide a baseline for independent monitoring of Ireland's progress on PCD. The IDCD will report annually on Ireland's progress and should thus identify relevant and appropriate indicators which could form the basis of such a report.

(4) Policy Coherence for Development at EU and OECD
Ms. Hannon reported that she attended meetings at the EU and OECD on policy coherence for development in September and October

(5) IDCD 2011 Workplan
Michael Gaffey outlined areas for work in 2011

these included PCD indicators, building a national profile on Global Hunger, preparations for the climate change conference in Cancun.

Appendix B

IDCD Terms of Reference

Inter-Departmental Committee on Development

Terms of Reference

Purpose

The purpose of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Development (IDCD) is to serve as an inter-departmental forum which will ensure greater coherence on development policy across all Government Departments and harness potential expertise and skills across the public service to benefit Ireland's development aid programme, in line with the commitments in the White Paper on Irish Aid and the Aid Effectiveness Agenda.

The Minister proposes that the role of the Committee shall be consultative and advisory and that the Committee may make recommendations aimed at:

- strengthening coherence to ensure that policies across Government departments are as far as possible consistent with our aim to reduce global poverty; and
- increasing cooperation between relevant stakeholders and policymakers at the highest levels of Government to make the best use of expertise and skills available across the public service in development matters.

In performance of this role, the IDCD shall:

- Share information between Departments in areas where there is potential to assist developing countries and make recommendations accordingly;
- Monitor and evaluate in the context of overall Government policy activities in various policy areas that have implications for the situation in developing countries. Examples include policies related to trade; migration; health; climate change impacts and adaptation, education; local government; gender; international investment; international finance; international security; and environmental and natural resource issues.
- Seek independent advice as necessary;
- Recommend actions to promote greater policy coherence for development across relevant government departments.
- Monitor and take account of work being done in the field of policy coherence, including by the Advisory Board for Irish Aid and in like-minded countries, with a view to progressing Ireland's engagement in policy coherence;
- Draw up a work programme with a view to progressing the Committee's goals; and
- Report annually to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Minister of State for Overseas Development and make recommendations as appropriate.

