

Franco-British Council

Development Aid Policies

Report of a seminar held at the Banque de France, Paris

19 February 2004

Jean-Marie Le Breton

Franco-British Council
British Section
Victoria Chambers
16-18 Strutton Ground
London SW1P 2HP

Telephone: 020 7976 8380
Fax: 020 7976 8131
Email: info@francobritishcouncil.org.uk
[http:// www.francobritishcouncil.org.uk](http://www.francobritishcouncil.org.uk)

© Franco-British Council British Section 2003

cover design by Dominique Ozturk
printed in Britain by TKO Print

ISBN 0 9546952 0 8

The author

Jean-Marie Le Breton is Secretary-General of the French Section of the Franco-British Council

English translation by Jane Craine

The Franco-British Council, British Section wishes to thank Jean-René Bernard, membre du Conseil de la politique monétaire de la Banque de France for enabling the seminar to be held at the Banque de France.

Contents

Report on the seminar	<i>Jean-Marie Le Breton</i>	
Introduction		4
I Evaluation of Development Aid policies in the two countries		4
II The Millennium Development goals and provision of financing		6
III NEPAD		8
IV Which institutions?		10
Conclusions		12
14		
Annexes		
I Notes on the IFF (International Financial Facility) meeting on 8 April in Paris		14
II British participants		15
III French Participants		16
IV Agenda		

Introduction

The Franco-British Council seminar on development aid in France and Britain on 19 February 2004 opened at 9.15 a.m. in the *Galerie dorée* in the Banque de France with Sir Richard Jolly and M. Michel Camdessus as joint chairmen. They both emphasised that the meeting was timely. M. Camdessus noted that each time the two countries had wished to win acceptance for a point of view they both shared, they had been heard. Sir Richard Jolly said that they should identify mutually agreed options without failing to learn from past experiences, even those that may have been disappointing.

I - Evaluation of Development Aid policies in the two countries

It was in this spirit that the seminar began with the first agenda item, an assessment of mutual efforts. Sharon White presented the assessment of the UK's effort, emphasising the good cooperation that had developed with French counterparts. The objective of DfID (The Department for International Development) is to reduce poverty, to maintain peace, to confirm the fight against AIDS as a priority, to promote a clean water policy urban and rural areas, and to make Africa a priority.

These aims must be set within the context of 2005, the year when Britain takes on the presidencies of the G8 and of the European Union (second half-year) and also the year when we assess how far the Millennium development goals have been achieved, one third of the way through the time scale. During its EU presidency Britain will be in a position to use its weight and influence.

In Mrs White's view a lot remains to be done, including in the field of Franco-British co-operation. This was proceeding appropriately, particularly in the International Financial Facility project (IFF). She considered that Nepad (The New Partnership for Africa's Development) was a useful instrument for dialogue between the donor countries and the recipient countries.

According to Claude Blanchemaison, who agreed with Mrs White, 2005 will be a crucial year. Achievement of the Millennium goals, which would require greater cooperation between France and Britain, is a long way off. France is moving towards the goal of 0.5% of GDP for state aid in 2007 and 0.7% in 2012. In 2003, state aid was 6.6 bn. Euros, much of this accounted for by debt cancellation. (Mrs White had given the figure of £3.5bn. for British aid.) A considerable portion, amounting to 2/3 of French state aid, is bilateral, with 70% of aid going to Africa. The same proportion was reported by Mrs. White in the case of the UK.

M. Blanchemaison said that French State aid comes from the Foreign Ministry and the Finance Ministry. The French Development Agency (AFD *l'Agence française de développement*) is the key operator. Judgements are made by the *Comité interministériel pour la Coopération internationale et le développement* (CICID) which meets about once a year. This body defines policy and priorities. It is supported by the *Haut Conseil pour la Coopération internationale* which maintains links with civil society. Fifty-four states receive priority aid. The Foreign Ministry has 2000 expatriate technical assistants on the ground, whose knowledge of local issues is essential.

French aid is being influenced by Nepad and is placing stronger emphasis on partnership. The Millennium goals are kept in mind, with the aim of integrating aid into a regional framework. The priorities remain education, health, AIDS, rural development, water and infrastructure. Of course the first requirement for development is the maintenance of peace.

The general discussion on the assessment of mutual effort opened with questions on the definition of a true partnership (Roger Williamson) and on the effects of urbanisation policies (Edwige Avice). The use made of human resources was also regarded as important.

Cahsai Berhane, describing his responsibilities in the European Union, questioned the reasons for what he considered to be the failure of the partnership between the EU and the ACP (African Caribbean and Pacific group of states). He deplored the poor use of human resources. He saw a contradiction between the EU's common agricultural policy and the interests of the developing countries. He proposed the employment of retired specialists to train future managers in developing countries at a lower cost.

There are impediments, which have the effect of reducing development aid. To overcome these difficulties, Jacques Godfrain proposed that the money allocated for aid should not be included in the objectives of the stability pact. It would be advisable to achieve better cooperation between the multilateral aid institutions. Lastly, money sent by emigrating workers can be used for local development projects

The majority of poor people in developing countries work on the land. Yves Berthelot said that priority should be given to rural development, encouraged by price levels that provides sufficient reward. But the products in question have no economic significance: either there is overproduction or they only exist as a result of specific aid. Therefore problems of aid should be examined in the context of commercial policies.

Emmanuel Fagnou raised the issue of whether transparency with regard to aid and cooperation between states were sufficiently under the control of Parliaments. He asked about British experience of these matters.

British aid is based on separate plans for the fight for development and the fight against poverty. Some countries live off international aid but things are improving (Mrs. White). Are the rich countries doing what they should in the field of education? The UK is trying to identify instruments for financing and for reforming trade. Nevertheless it is doubtful whether progress will be made before 2005, because of the American elections.

Mr. Brake, M. Coleman, M. Blanchemaison and M. Godfrain replied to the questions about parliamentary control. The Committee on development aid in the UK is multiparty. Its members follow the business of DfID, carry out on the spot investigations if the need arises, and ensure the transparency of the work. Thus the MPs reach a level of expertise which makes them a force to be reckoned with. M. Godfrain pointed out that in France parliamentary groups fostering international friendship play an important role in North-South relations. Also the aid budget is not a matter for a vote along party lines. Members of the opposition who are against it simply abstain.

M. Blanchemaison recalled the main lines of French policy: the fight against poverty, training of human resources, education and health. In his view the Lomé system (trade and aid pact) is quite effective. The speed of payments by the EDF (European Development Fund) has improved. The cooperation between the EU and the ACP states is contractual, which is certainly a positive factor. Of course a big debate is going on about how to reconcile the objectives of the common agricultural policy and those of development aid. But is trade liberalisation a better solution? Won't the weakest be worse affected than others won't?

M. Camdessus expressed reservations about the possibility of excluding the sums given as GDA (Government Development Aid) from the calculations of the stability pact.

Mrs White said that to make state aid more effective it is necessary to measure its impact, making more precise studies to appreciate what succeeds and what fails, without ignoring the social consequences.

Whilst drawing conclusions from what had currently been achieved by state aid, Sir Richard Jolly noted that the Millennium goals were not the first example of a large-scale mobilisation on behalf of the poor countries. In 1961 President Kennedy launched a world initiative the UN Development Decade. In spite of setbacks and some scepticism, positive results were achieved. An increase in the economic growth of developing countries to 5% per annum by 1970 was set as the goal. In the event, average growth (5,5%) exceeded the goal, and countries with some two thirds of the population of developing countries achieved or exceeded it. Many other global goals have also shown considerable success. For example, smallpox has been eradicated; infant mortality has dropped considerably. A few goals have shown little progress: maternal mortality, adult literacy, and the goal of increasing aid of all developed countries to 0,7% of their GNP. In spite of progress, co-ordination between UN institutions remains inadequate.

As well as this co-ordination, civil society should have greater involvement, and its wishes should be taken into account by UN agencies (M. Camdessus).

II - The Millennium Development goals and provision of financing

Richard Dowden asked how we would be judged on our ability to fight poverty. Our grandparents abolished slavery. Will we be able to achieve the Millennium goals? Is not expenditure on arms more than fifteen times greater than expenditure on development? As someone who had travelled a lot in the countries of the south and approached the problems in an undogmatic way, the speaker felt he was in a position to say that in Africa in particular aid had not been successful. Those to be helped must direct development and not the other way round. The provision of aid can only have negative consequences if the society receiving it does not know how to use it. Leaving aside those for whom development aid has become a career, the money given out delay changes, which ought to enable the eradication of poverty without creating a Mafia-like group of nouveaux riches. Actually the obstacles to business are more serious than delays in delivering aid.

For Jean-Pierre Landau the Millennium project is to be congratulated on providing precise development goals for the first time. However the goals are under-financed

(from 30 to 100 bn. dollars). Transfers of resources should be increased by at least 30%. But aid budgets are under considerable pressure.

In this respect the Chancellor of the Exchequer's idea of creating the International Finance Facility (IFF) is supported by the French government. It should allow the wealth produced by globalisation to be mobilised and increase financial provision by 60%. It will also be necessary to ensure that the poor countries are capable of taking up the aid.

In seeking to be effective one must take account of the particular local conditions in the countries in question.

In reply to Mr Dowden's comments, M. Landau feared the pessimism that might result from too much criticism of the way aid functions. Even if the advances expected to be brought by trade development occur, poor countries will still need aid – for example for education.

In the course of the general discussion on this theme some pessimism was expressed, especially about finance, or when criticising the naivety shown when some projects were adopted. But as a whole the trend is not negative (Mr. Aegison and Mr. Rogerson). Effectiveness must justify the volume of aid and particular attention must be paid to good governance in the recipient countries.

Mme Avice pointed out that it is difficult to reconcile projects on the ground with macro-economic data, and this is characteristic of all aid. Each project must be "tailor made" through liaison with local operators and agents. Enthusiasm for aid must be maintained. In this respect the UN and its institutions play an essential role. (Derek Osborn). Rather than enthusiasm waning, civil society must be more involved in transfers to poor countries.

Tim Craddock, the UK Ambassador to UNESCO, reported on his experiences in the least developed countries. He was very much in favour of close cooperation with France on specific projects in Africa. The continent where the two countries had been rivals must now be the place in which rivalries were overcome. The interest of Africans should come before the interests of the former colonial powers. When Rwanda was mentioned, Françoise Crouigneau highlighted the tragic nature of the genocide. Mr Brake said that it was difficult to estimate all the positive and negative results of aid.

However, there is no doubt that on the whole advances have been made. Micro-economic failures cannot hide the overall successes for which the UN can claim obvious responsibility. Now 25% of industrial production comes from the third world, which could only claim a tiny percentage not so long ago (Yves Berthelot). This shows that the NGOs are mobilising themselves, civil society in the poor countries is organising itself, regional commercial restrictions are helping some types of production to take off, and that activities are continuing on a long-term basis.

A Franco-British meeting on the IFF will take place on 8 April (M. Landau). France has a lot to learn from British development policy. While so many initiatives are being proposed, one must remember that the financing of aid must be structured differently in different fields. Some must be adapted to specific needs, for example in education or health.

It is up to those in developing countries to respond to the requirements of development. Imposing on them what they have to do through the presence of senior civil servants in charge of programmes decided on in the donor countries is probably not the best solution (Mr. Dowden).

III - Nepad

In his introductory remarks James Oporia-Ekwara emphasised the central role of the recipient states. Africa is the continent which has the highest number of weak states or states in crisis in the whole world, which explains the critical attitude adopted towards aid to the continent. In these circumstances, Nepad (The New Partnership for Africa's Development) offers an opportunity to reinvent a strong African state, which must be national, sovereign, democratic and efficient.

The debate on the role of Nepad continues whilst the process runs the risk of settling into the routine round of meetings. The speaker emphasised the excellent work done by the Economic Commission for Africa, in spite of the fact that in the 1980s this organisation was somewhat marginalised.

Mr. Oporia-Ekwara stressed that importance must be given to training at university level and to research. The advance of pan-African awareness was due to the commitment of intellectuals. As a counterpoint to elementary training, a priority of the World Bank, university research can produce an endogenous culture. This is exemplified by the CODESRIA in Dakar (Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa), despite the fact that this body receives little support from France and Britain.

The main weakness of Nepad is insufficient backing by the United States. American geopolitics gives priority to South Asia and central Asia, though the appearance of new oil-producing countries in West Africa is modifying this approach. African security, which used to be undertaken by France and Britain, is becoming an American preoccupation, as the visits of President Clinton and President George W. Bush show. Imperialism seems to have returned to Africa.

M. Camdessus recognised that Africa had gone through some difficult decades, but they were less difficult than one had feared thanks to the Bretton Woods institutions. It is true that these institutions have been very hostile to the cancellation of the debts of the poorest countries, but positions have changed, and the institutions have corrected their mistakes. Their initial points of view were far apart, but there has been a rapprochement. Nepad represents significant progress. For the first time, the whole of Africa unanimously approves of this system. More remains to be done to make Nepad belong to Africa and to civil society.

Several priorities were reiterated: the first is, of course, peace; the second is that the state must become both more effective and more democratic; the third is Nepad, which must overcome its initial drawback of having been created by the Heads of State. Nepad must mobilise the NGOs. Since the Economic Commission for Africa has changed its policy, it can contribute positively. Research must be re-integrated into the African universities. America is not losing interest in Nepad. The French and the Americans have consulted one another on this subject.

In order to go beyond mere words, substance must be given to the IFF, otherwise finance will not be made available. Perhaps France and Britain should make a start together. We must also support initiatives like that of the African Development Bank to provide access to water and water resource management for 80% of the rural population of Africa.

François Gauthier said that to make Nepad and its activities a concrete reality it is essential to act at regional level. The progress made in the Niger basin shows a concrete regional achievement linked to cooperation between France and Britain.

Mr. Berhane recalled the historic dimension, asking whether we could benefit from an analysis of our experiences. He asked whether we were capable of organising ourselves and of taking action without blaming the outside world for our failures.

Lionel Fontagne questioned whether commerce and aid were to be regarded as alternatives. In his view, the determining factor in boosting growth is institutions, and these are inadequate in Africa. Their mediocrity results in lost opportunities for growth in several areas. Institutions change from the inside, not from the outside. Nepad's strength is to have understood this. Now commerce and aid are not such opposites. Certainly commerce creates wealth, but one must not forget that the poor countries import large quantities of food products. The opening up of boundaries can have a negative result.

Anne Corbett said that university research is a very important topic. The universities have a big role in development and transfer of technologies.

As the writer of a UN report entitled "The New Agenda for the Development of Africa", which concluded that there was an opportunity to make use of Nepad, M. Berthelot emphasised the excellent work of the Economic Commission for Africa.

André Lewin raised three problems:

- What should one think about the African process of judgement by peers launched at Kigali?
- Do the NGOs feel that they will be marginalised within the broader and more vague concept of "civil society"? In fact the role of the NGOs in delivering aid is essential.
- The interaction of the various elements of cooperation between France and Britain reveals the separate agendas of the two countries.

The danger in aid policy is that the North decides what is suitable for the South. Even Nepad has been perceived as a top down structure (Mr. Osborn). Nothing can work without the strong support of African civil society, which makes state aid effective. One must bear in mind that Nepad was created by a meeting of the G8. (Mr. Dowden).

Without the firm commitment of African intellectuals there will be no progress. Research must take place in African universities, which will be the best support of these intellectuals and the best vector for the strengthening of the African state, accepted as legitimate because it stems from Africa itself. Otherwise the African states will be puppets controlled by imperialisms (Mr. Oporia-Ekwaro).

The major problems of our time include the link between aid and commerce, deficiencies in institutions, university studies and the maintenance of peace. In some cases, such as the prevention of conflicts, there will be no appropriate rapid response. This is what makes Nepal so useful as a place for discussing priorities or national requirements. It is also vital for the French and the British to work together (M. Camdessus).

IV - Which Institutions?

The problem of parliamentary oversight was raised by Mr. Colman, who thought that the institutions administering aid should remain responsible to the national parliaments. Within the European Union, the Commission is difficult to oversee. The Council for General Affairs / External Relations (CAGRE) should not lose sight of these problems; on the contrary it ought to give them priority. Aid is no longer tied, but donors still have a tendency to favour their former colonies. Countries that have legislation on investments should be encouraged. The IFF should enable a partnership with the private sector to be established.

Jean- Christophe Chouvet pointed out the paradox that whereas the French and the British administer similar sums for aid, share the same analyses, and similar practices and experiences, their institutions are very different in terms of structural organisation. The UK separates development aid from foreign policy, but France does the opposite. In France the Finance Ministry administers half of the aid. This requires co-ordination by an interdepartmental body, the Comité interministériel pour la coopération internationale et le développement (CICID), which also liaises with civil society.

In Britain, Parliament has more powers and the NGOs are more powerful. Another difference is the way European aid is included in the budget and the different ways the two countries use this aid. The two states maintain their national strategies. The British seek to influence the policy of the Bretton Woods institutions. It might be possible to increase the collective weight of Europe within these institutions to bring the two points of view closer. In spite of everything, the analyses of the two countries are very close.

M. Camdessus recalled that for a long time the UK was the real number 2 of the Bretton Woods institutions. Now others have taken that place, whilst France and Britain, who each have 5% in the budget of the two organisations, are closer to each other. London has always given its support – at times critical- to both the IMF and the World Bank.

In M. Fagnou's view, the French model is probably not the most suitable. Two ministries share responsibility for international development. The Ministry of Finance's supervision is very tight, whereas the CICID does not meet often enough. French aid lacks unity and control.

Mr Allen said that the way to get the measure of the difference between aid and helping governments can be found through good state governance. Aid is noticeably concentrated in certain regions. Political life in Africa lacks clarity. Aid is obtained by doctoring the data on viability and effectiveness. Some regions suffer from withdrawal of investments simply because governments are not involved.

Mrs White spoke about the separation of the Foreign Office and DfID. The Labour government has enabled resources to be allocated to the Development Agency. The effectiveness of aid is taken into consideration. DfID is well informed. Exchanges between France and Britain might give valuable information on the sectors in which effective work was being carried out. We should take advantage of a new European Commission to further develop our common ideas.

Lord Radice felt that closer co-ordination between the two countries should allow the better use of resources.

Returning to the theme of parliamentary oversight, Mr Osborn thought that MPs might analyse the wishes and commitments of the beneficiary countries, and that this might show them the merits and inadequacies of aid. In response, Mr. Colman explained the situation with regard to South Africa.

Returning to the issue of similarities and differences of aid policy in the two countries, Mme Avice suggested that development aid should enable a content to be given to the common foreign policy of the EU, which contributes to almost 50% of aid. Also, security and development could be brought closer, or rather security could be considered as both resulting from and necessary for development. The image of Europe in this sector requires some general policy directions to be drawn up.

On this point Mr. Berhane expressed some hesitation. The differences between France and Britain are rather definite. The truth is that the two countries cooperate within Europe but act according to their interests. Out of 25 bn. in European aid, 20 bn. is not taken up. This is the area in which the cooperation between the two countries should take shape.

According to Mr Rogerson, without the help of the two countries nothing can be done, and everything can be done if they are in agreement. Their action should not be limited to the EU, but should extend to the Bretton Woods institutions. He noted that aid would be much more effective in a country like India where levels of poverty and misery are broadly equivalent to Africa's.

M. Debrat stressed that the effectiveness of aid depends on the choice of the instrument and the efficiency of the transfer, and that the two need to be compatible. It is also necessary that the beneficiary state is in a position to take advantage of the aid, and is sufficiently open to change. This means that a broad package of measures is needed.

France's aid programme is structured around an action programme (government spending on the fight against poverty) and is part of the framework of national strategies. To be effective the aid programme must be long-term, have contractual links with the beneficiaries, and develop through efficient channels. The aid project is more limited and specific and can make use of private finance.

When choosing between grants and loans, one must remember that loans are always preferable. In fact the equation that a gift = fighting against poverty is a false one. One should not be too dogmatic. Sometimes lending for education and health and providing grants to poor producers can be the right thing to do.

The problem of improving local social relations is linked to two channels. The NGOs are able to develop their relationship with civil society, a channel which is underused by the French authorities. The other way is the mobilisation of emigration savings.

Finally there is the problem of governance and conditionality. At the European level, governance can mean the political régime itself. For the sponsor, governance is the simpler concept of good management.

Everything depends on achieving appropriate sustainable benefit from aid through actions of economic and social development. This is how a sponsor may judge the efficiency and governance of a state.

Patrick Watt asked a number of questions: What are the best vectors for aid? What is aid for? Are the challenges of a technical nature? What are the objectives? Is aid legitimate? The big question is the final one: how can aid be justified?

Is the real justification of aid eradicating poverty, or turning the beneficiary states into poor countries receiving handouts? The global coherence of aid is affected by contradictions. Should one choose aid, market protection, or deregulation? Of course aid is only one aspect of the problem. Moreover aid is inadequate in volume and inadequately directed to the Millennium Development Goals. A considerable portion of aid is spent on professionals.

Mr Watt advocated a more “humble” attitude on the part of the donors, who should listen more to the “poor”, and consult the NGOs who represent civil society. His view was shared by Arabella Fraser, who highlighted the conservative attitude of the IMF, and by Mr Berhane who stressed the urgency of opening a real dialogue, though it may be too late for this. Mr. Craddock did not agree. He was disappointed by the pessimism shown by Mr. Watt. In six years DfID had achieved a considerable track record, including in the field of cooperation with France. He called on participants to make proposals for developing Franco-British dialogue.

Conclusions

In concluding the seminar, Sir Richard Jolly summarised observations, which had been inspired by the debates on aid policy, Nepad, financial mechanisms, research, the role of the Parliaments and partnership within the EU.

- 1) The discussion had emphasised the need for improvements in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP), to encourage the participation of civil society. There was a desire for a better use of existing resources in the organisations connected to the United Nations and for bilateral Franco-British collaboration in the beneficiary countries.
- 2) Nepad should encourage the strengthening of the state in the beneficiary countries. It was a matter of working in line with the market and not of usurping its role. Any approaches, which might hark back to the colonialist era, must be avoided.

- 3) Sir Richard Jolly suggested that too much money was being spent on meetings and committees. He emphasised that M. Berhane's proposal to use the expertise of retired people (in teaching, for example) could be worthwhile.

He noted that everyone agreed on the importance of financial mechanisms.

- 4) Research at local level must be a priority to enable a class of committed intellectuals to emerge. The World Bank and the EU are making recommendations about university research.
- 5) Parliaments must have an increased role in surveillance, and in making a critical examination of parity between the French and the British. Aid effort must be increased, as it must reach 0.7% of GDP in 2012.
- 6) The views of the two countries must move closer together as far as cooperation within the EU is concerned. At the moment the British prioritise market forces, whilst France advocates maintaining protection for developing economies which are still weak. There is a need to explore where rapprochements can be made. The two countries do not have to make decisions on behalf of others, but to open themselves up to the views of their respective partner.

M. Camdessus accorded a high priority to Nepad as an instrument of dialogue on aid. This should be recognised as one of the elements bringing the two countries closer together. 2005 will be a very important year.

The partnership with Nepad should be used to re-establish a coherent aid policy, to strengthen the effectiveness of aid, to fix practical priorities consistent with the Millennium goals, and to enable governance to be improved.

M. Camdessus derived some useful observations from the seminar about the standardisation of business law in the beneficiary countries, the role of NGOs and civil societies, the role of the UN, the fight against AIDS, and the problem of water in rural areas.

The two countries must help Africans through practical proposals aimed towards maintaining peace and at making Africans aware that peace is a priority.

The French are ready to make progress on the problems of commerce, the IFF, and measuring the effectiveness of aid, realising that this is a hard battle, and that we must listen to the views of the countries concerned.

The session was closed after brief speeches by the joint Chairmen of the Franco-British Council, Lord Radice and M. Jacques Viot.

Summary note on subsequent meeting of over 55 countries (including France and Britain), 35 ministers, the President of the World Bank, Acting Managing Director of the IMF, United Nations Under-Secretary General for Economic Affairs and heads of multilateral organisations and non-governmental organisations on 8 April 2004 in Paris

This group gathered to discuss how to mobilise additional resources, using innovative financing approaches, to help poor countries meet the Millennium Development Goals.

The discussion concluded that:

- 1) Aid can, and has been, used effectively to support sustained pro-poor growth and poverty reduction. Effective aid can be a catalyst for private sector investment by establishing the right conditions for growth, for example through infrastructure investment.
- 2) Developing countries can absorb substantial additional resources now.
- 3) Country ownership of credible poverty reduction strategies, together with investment in institutional capacity, are key to the absorption and effectiveness of aid.
- 4) Progress towards the principles of aid effectiveness agreed at Rome in March 2003 is too slow.

Donors need to move faster to:

- Increase the predictability of aid
- Support the priorities in poverty reduction strategies
- Harmonise procedures

Mozambique's recently agreed miraculous memorandum, a framework for aid harmonization encompassing 14 bilateral and multilateral donors, shows what can be done.

The Group looks forward to further discussion of these issues at:

- 1) The Poverty conference in Shanghai in May 2003
- 2) The World Bank and IMF Annual Meetings in September 2004
- 3) The Paris Forum on Aid Effectiveness in March 2005

Innovative Financing Approaches

The discussions concluded that new mechanisms must:

- 1) Deliver a critical mass of effective aid needed for simultaneous and sustainable investment across sectors.
- 2) Provide predictable multi-year donor commitments.
- 3) Support country-owned poverty reduction strategies.

The group explored in detail a range of options, in particular the proposal for an International Finance Facility, and new systemic approaches to financing, such as international taxes.

It was agreed that:

- 1) Additional and more effective resources are urgently needed to achieve the MDGs by 2015.
- 2) In the short to medium term the IFF is a feasible financing solution that could provide the necessary, critical mass of predictable, long-term aid flows.
- 3) Further exploration of new systemic approaches is needed.

The Chairs looked forward to the outcome of:

- 1) On-going work by WHO, UNICEF, The Vaccine Fund and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to use IFF principles to increase resources available for immunisation, as one important step, among others, to demonstrate the benefits of frontloading aid.
- 2) The French and Brazilian Governments. working groups on new financing approaches.
- 3) A meeting of world leaders in New York on 20th September to consider innovative financing mechanisms, proposed by President Lula.
- 4) The International Task Force on Global Public Goods

Discussions will continue through:

- 1) Official level working groups contributing to the World Bank and IMF's report to the 2004 Annual Meetings.
- 2) A UK hosted Ministerial Forum during the UK's G8 Presidency.

British Participants

Co-Chairman:**Sir Richard Jolly**

Chair UNA – UK

Honorary Professorial Fellow, IDS

Gunnar Aegisson

Advocacy Manager

British Overseas NGOs for Development
(BOND)**Dr. Tim Allen**

Programme Director

Development Studies Institute

LSE

Dr BerhaneSpecial Assistant to the Secretary-General,
Africa, Caribbean Pacific Group**Tom Brake MP**Liberal-Democrat spokesman on
Development**Tony Colman MP**Labour, member of Select Committee on
International Development**Dr. Anne Corbett**

Vice-Chairman, Franco British Council

LSE Visiting Fellow, Journalist

Tim Craddock

Counsellor Development

British Embassy, Paris

Richard Dowden

Director, Royal Africa Society

Arabella Fraser

Research Team

Oxfam UK

Sir John Holmes

British Ambassador, Paris

Ann Kenrick

Secretary-General, Franco-British Council

Mary LunExecutive Assistant to Director of Policy
Division, DfID**James Oporia-Ekwaro**Director, Centre for Africa Public Policy
Studies**Derek Osborn**

Chair UNED-UK

(UN Environment & Development)

Lord Radice

Chairman, Franco-British Council

Catherine Rawlinson

Assistant to Secretary-General

Andrew Rogerson

Research Fellow

Overseas Development Institute

Patrick WattPolicy Officer, Aid and Accountability,
ActionAid**Sharon White**

Director of Policy Division, DfID

Kaye Whiteman

Former Editor in Chief, West Africa

Dr Roger Williamson

Associate Director, Wilton Park

Formerly with Christian Aid

Observers**Teresa Dumasy**

Second Secretary Africa,

British Embassy, Paris

Ben GreenTeam Leader, Liaison and Effectiveness,
Performance and Effectiveness Dept. DfID**Kirsteen Hall**Second Secretary Development & Environment,
British Embassy, Paris

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS FRANCAIS
Politique d'aide au développement en France et en Grande-Bretagne

Coprésident :

Michel CAMDESSUS

Ancien Directeur général du FMI
Gouverneur honoraire de la Banque de France

Edwige AVICE

Ancienne Ministre
Présidente directrice générale de la Financière de Brienne

Jean-René BERNARD

Membre du Conseil de la politique monétaire de la Banque de France

Yves BERTHELOT

Ancien Secrétaire général adjoint de la CNUCED
Président du Comité français de solidarité internationale (CFSI)

Claude BLANCHEMAISON

Directeur Général de la Coopération internationale et du Développement
Ministère des Affaires étrangères

Sylvie BLUMENKRANTZ

Sous-directeur de la Section française du Conseil franco-britannique

Hervé BOLOT

Directeur de Cabinet du Ministre délégué à la Coopération et à la Francophonie

Jean-Christophe CHOUVET

Directeur adjoint des Affaires économiques et financières
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères

Françoise CROUIGNEAU

Rédactrice en chef international,
« Les Echos »

Jean-Michel DEBRAT

Directeur général adjoint
Agence française pour le développement

Emmanuel FAGNOU

Directeur exécutif
Coordination SUD

Lionel FONTAGNE

Directeur du CEPPII (Centre d'études prospectives et d'informations internationales)

Francois GAUTHIER

Conseiller technique au cabinet du Premier ministre

Jacques GODFRAIN

Ancien Ministre
Député de l'Aveyron

Jean-Pierre LANDAU

Ministre conseiller pour les Affaires financières à l'Ambassade de France à Londres

Jean-Marie LE BRETON

Secrétaire général de la Section française du Conseil franco-britannique

André LEWIN

Ancien Ambassadeur

Rémi MARECHAUX

Conseiller technique au Cabinet du Ministre délégué à la Coopération et à la Francophonie

Stephen SMITH

Rédacteur en Chef adjoint de la séquence internationale « Le Monde »

Laurent VIGIER

Chargé de mission à la cellule diplomatique de la Présidence de la République

Jacques VIOT

Président de la Section française du Conseil franco-britannique