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MAIN ISSUES FOR THE REVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION POLICIES AND PROGRAMME OF SWEDEN

(Note by the Secretariat)

This addendum to the main report [see DCD/DAC/AR(2000)2/18] has been drawn up in consultation with the Delegations of the UNITED KINGDOM and the UNITED STATES, which have been designated as examiners, and will be used as a basis for discussion at the meeting of the Review of Sweden, scheduled for 5 October 2000.

Contact: Ms Kaori Miyamoto, Tel (33-1) 45 24 90 09, Fax (33-1) 44 30 61 44
MAIN ISSUES FOR THE REVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT POLICIES AND PROGRAMME
OF SWEDEN

I. General framework and allocations

a) Poverty reduction
Could the Swedish delegation describe the relation between the overarching goal of poverty reduction and the six objectives of the Swedish development programme? Is there a risk that poverty reduction efforts are being diluted by a focus on these six objectives as ends in themselves? (Paragraphs 9, 53, Section 1.5, paragraphs 120-122, Section 6.6 of the draft main report)

b) International Development Goals (IDGs)
How could Sweden give more explicit focus to the IDGs in its aid operations? How does the Swedish delegation assess the contribution of its development assistance to meeting these goals? (Section 1.5, paragraphs 122, 170-172)

c) Official development assistance (ODA) volume
Sweden already plans to increase ODA to 0.81% of GNP by 2003. How does the Swedish delegation assess the prospects for reinstating its long-standing goal of 1% within a specific time-frame, which would send a strong message to other donors on Sweden’s commitment to international development? (Section 2.1)

d) Programme countries
To what extent does the Swedish delegation share the assessment of the review team that the focus on 18 “programme countries” is less effective than it could be because of the dispersion of activities across more than 100 countries? How does the delegation view the inter-linkage between bilateral country programmes and the range of funding sources outside these frameworks, which are disbursed without any geographical limitation? How could long-term development and poverty reduction in Sweden’s programme countries be ensured within the increasing trend towards supporting humanitarian aid and conflict prevention? (Paragraphs 29-32, Section 3.6)

e) Sustainability and exit strategies
How does Sweden intend to respond to the challenge identified in the report of defining clearer guidelines for sustainability and exit strategies? (Paragraph 15)
f) **Multilateral co-operation**

Sweden’s multilateral efforts are substantial, both as a financial contributor to some United Nations agencies and as a proponent for institutional reform. How is Sweden working to improve multilateral co-operation, and how does it plan to pursue this agenda during its presidency of the European Union in 2001? (Paragraphs 5-7, Sections 2.3 and 6.2)


g) **Non-governmental organisations (NGOs)**

Sweden channels around one-third of direct bilateral ODA (USD 400 million) via NGOs. How does Sweden ensure that these funds are used in accordance with the overall priorities of the aid programme? (Section 2.4, paragraph 53)

II. Synergies within the aid programme, policy coherence and public education

a) **Democracy and human rights**

How does Sweden ensure that its activities in democracy and human rights adhere to its policies and guidelines? How are monitoring and evaluation of these activities carried out? (Sections 3.6 and 6.4, Paragraph 97)

b) **Infrastructure**

Could the Swedish delegation discuss the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency’s (Sida) activities using credits, guarantees and loans in infrastructure, particularly how they fit into country programming? (Paragraphs 33-34, Section 3.3)

c) **Policy coherence**

What is Sweden’s assessment of the 1995-96 reorganisation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs? What mechanisms are in place to ensure coherence between policies on export credits, trade, environment and the untying of aid with poverty reduction? (Paragraph 79, Box 2, Sections 4.4 and 4.5, Paragraphs 105-106)

d) **Parliamentary commission**

What impact can be anticipated from the work of the Commission of Inquiry into Swedish Policy for Global Development? (Paragraphs 8, 80, 133 and Box 2)

e) **Public opinion and information**

Given the traditionally high levels of support for development assistance in Sweden, does the Swedish delegation see cause for concern in the recent slight weakening in support? What action are the authorities considering to ensure public support remains high? Are there lessons regarding the high levels of public support in Sweden for other DAC Members? (Sections 1.1, 4.8)

III. Aid management and implementation

a) **Decentralisation**

What are the results from the delegation of responsibility to integrated embassies in the three pilot countries? How is Sweden responding to the challenge in cost and staffing implications of decentralisation? (Paragraphs 111-113)
b) **Staffing issues**
A challenge faced by all donors is how to ensure that staff are equipped to deal with multiple and cross-cutting issues. How is Sweden addressing the problem of “mainstreaming fatigue”? (Paragraphs 78, 119)

c) **Poverty reduction targeting**
Sida is following up on its own findings that over 10% of its disbursements and 20% of its activities are “not having any effect on poverty.” What are some of the key reasons for these findings? (Paragraphs 121-122)

d) **Evaluation systems**
How is Sida following up on the findings and recommendations from the recent study on the usefulness of evaluations? (Paragraph 131, Box 3)

e) **Institutional guidance and involvement of civil society**
Could the Swedish delegation describe the role of the Expert Group on Development Issues (EGDI)? Could the delegation explain the reasons for discontinuing the Secretariat for Analysis of Swedish Development Assistance and compare its former role with EGDI? (Paragraph 128)

f) **HIV/AIDS**
What are the plans for Sweden to mainstream the new HIV/AIDS strategy? (Box 1)

g) **Research co-operation**
How is Sida working to ensure that bilateral research activities are better integrated into country programming? (Section 3.5, Box 1: last paragraph)

h) **Gender equality**
How could monitoring and reporting of gender equality mainstreaming become more systematic? Could gender equality be given more prominence in the Sida and MFA annual reports, as is given to other cross-cutting issues? (Paragraph 78, Section 6.5)

i) **Promoting ownership**
The draft Secretariat report commends Sweden for adopting innovative approaches in promoting ownership of aid activities by developing countries. What lessons has Sweden learned that it can share with other DAC Members? (Section 6.1)

j) **Sector-wide approaches (SWAps) and harmonisation of donor procedures**
What is Sweden's experience so far in the collaboration with the other Nordic countries, like-minded groups and multilateral organisations in SWAps? Is the harmonisation of procedures reducing transaction costs and producing benefits for the recipient country? (Paragraph 114, Section 6.2)