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ACROPOLIS

• Funded by both ARES-CCD and VLIR-UOS.
• Aims to support the decision-making of the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation (DGD) by evidence-based research.
• Brings together policymakers and researchers
• Terms of Reference
• Steering Committee: DGD, DGB, BTC, NGO, IA, Cabinet
HISTORY

• Groupe de Recherche en Appui aux Politiques de Paix (2004-2014)
• Aid Effectiveness in Fragile Contexts (2014-2017)
• Governance for Development (2017-2018)
CONSORTIUM
TEAM
THEME
Only a global partnership of state, private and civil society actors will be able to achieve the SDGs.
The Three Musketeers

All for One and One for All
RESEARCH PROJECT

• ToR : Policy Support DGD
  – Integrated Country Policy (ICP)
  – 3D-LO
    → Comprehensive Approach

• Outputs
  – 3 evidence papers
  – 2 case studies
  – 1 concept note
WORKSHOP

• Kick-Off
• Where are we now?
  ➢ Literature review
  ➢ Survey
• Where are we going from here?
  ➢ Common language
  ➢ Road map
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PART I

WHERE ARE WE NOW?
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Why does it matter?

What is in a name?

What is called for?
A series of engagements...

- Paris declaration on aid effectiveness (2005)
- Accra Agenda for Action (2008)
- Busan partnership for effective development co-operation (2011)
- Addis Ababa Agenda for Action
- Sustainable Development Goals
- World Humanitarian Summit

To improve effectiveness
To leverage additional finance
To better meet people needs in fragile contexts
To achieve sustainable development
...towards more integration

- Alignment
- Coordination
- Harmonization

- Inclusive ownership

- Global partnership

- 2005
- 2008
- 2011
- 2015
- 2016

- Multi-stakeholders (public-private) partnerships
- Global partnership for an integrated approach

More global approaches
ICP as a Belgian label

Collaborative approaches between hum and dev
Why does it matter?
What is in a name?
What is called for?
Politique pays intégrée

Integrated country policy

Geïntegreerd landenbeleid

PPA

ICP

GLB
Various labels...

Politique intégrée
Geïntegreerd beleid
Integrated policy

Politique de développement intégrée
Geïntegreerd ontwikkelingsbeleid

Programmation
pays intégrée
Geïntegreerd landenprogrammatie
Integrated country programming

Programme intégré
Geïntegreerd programma
Integrated program

Approche intégrée
Geïntegreerd aanpak
Integrated approach

Approche programmatique intégrée
Programmatorische geïntegreerd aanpaak
...various connotations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Politique intégrée</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>governmental cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-governmental cooperation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related to NGA-reform</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multilateral cooperation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private sector</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>specific sectors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humanitarian aid</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>specific contexts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why does it matter?

What is in a name?

What is called for?
Five dimensions

- WHY
- WHAT
- WHERE
- WHO
- HOW
Why to integrate?
The basic assumption of ICP

WHY

INTEGRATION
- To capitalize on complementarities
  - To seek for synergies
  - To strengthen collaboration
  - To strengthen coordination
  - To enhance consultation
  - To build mutual trust
  - To favor mutual strengthening

ICP

EFFECTIVENESS
- To better prioritize and target aid
  - To improve coherence
  - To ensure ownership
  - To maximize impact and achieve results
  - To mobilize (additional) resources
  - To use resources more efficiently
  - To reduce risks
  - To improve accountability
What issues are concerned by an ICP?

- **Sub-sector** integration
- **In-sector** integration (sector-wide approach)
- **Cross-sector** integration (multi-sector approach)
- **Transversal** thematic integration
- ...

WHAT
What territories are covered by an ICP?

- Local-based integration
- Country-based integration
- Regional-based integration
- …
Which (development) actors are included in the ICP?

**Multilateral actors**
- UN
- EU
- ...

**Governmental actors**
- DGD
- BIO
- Local authorities
- CTB
- federated
- Public actors

**Non-governmental actors**
- CSO
- Local CSO
- IA
- Private actors

**WHO**

**IN-CHANNEL**

**European actors**

**International actors**

**Belgian actors**

**Partner country actors**

**CROSS-CHANNEL**
How deep does the ICP go? (1)
Levels and processes involved...

- Consulting
  - Learning
  - Exchange of information
  - Division of labour
  - Shared best practices

- Coordinating
  - Taking into account other actors' visions
  - Shared frameworks
  - Shared procedures
  - Shared resources

- Harmonizing
  - Common vision
  - Joint strategy
  - Joint frameworks
  - Joint initiatives

- Pooling
  - Joint training
  - Joint resources
How deep does the ICP go? (2)
Means and instruments mobilized

**RESOURCES**
- Human
- Financial
- Technical
- Knowledge
- …

**INSTRUMENTS**
- Meetings
- Working groups
- Task forces
- …

- Call for proposals
- Delegated cooperation
- …
Dilemmas and questions to solve

**WHY**
- does integration always deliver effectiveness?
- should other criteria be considered in building ICP?

**WHO**
- who does align with who?
- how to avoid “instrumentalization”?
- are some actors (to be) more integrated than other?

**HOW**
- how deep to go at what level?
- are there appropriate resources and frameworks?
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Comprehensive approach
(3D – LO)
Why does it matter?

What is in a name?

What is called for?
CA (3D – LO): why does it matter?

- Integrating Post Cold War Security and Development
- Widening a systemic approach
- Key issue in fragile contexts
- Horizontal coherence of interventions overseas
- Pragmatic necessity to coordinate actors
Why does it matter?

What is in a name?

What is called for?
Various labels...

From Negative Peace *(freedom from fear)* to Positive Peace *(freedom of want)*

Whole of government approach
 Approche pangouvernemantale

3D
 Diplomacy
 Development
 Defence

merging
 Security & Development

3D - LO
 Diplomacy
 Development
 Defence
 Law & Order
...various connotations

- **Who** is in there? An (un)avoidable **focus on security**?
- HQ vs. field
Why does it matter?

What is in a name?

What is called for?
CA (3D – LO) same as ICP: How deep does it go? (1)
Levels and processes involved...

- **Consulting**
  - Exchange of information
  - Learning

- **Coordinating**
  - Division of labour
  - Shared best practices
  - Taking into account other actors’ visions

- **Harmonizing**
  - Shared frameworks
  - Shared procedures
  - Shared resources
  - Common vision

- **Pooling**
  - Joint strategy
  - Joint frameworks
  - Joint initiatives
  - Joint training

**STRATEGIC**

**OPERATIONAL**
CA (3D – LO) same as ICP How deep does it go? (2)
Means and instruments mobilized

**RESOURCES**
- Human
- Financial
- Technical
- Knowledge
- …

**INSTRUMENTS**
- Meetings
- Working groups
- Task forces
- …
- Call for proposal
- Delegated cooperation
- …
Dilemmas and questions to solve (1)

Development focus

- **How far** does it reach? With **whom**? Which **actors**?
- Under which **funding**?
- Under which common **strategy / objectives**?
- Under which **leadership**?
Dilemmas and questions to solve (2)

• (why) is it necessary / relevant?
Dilemmas and questions to solve (3)

from
« greater than the sum of its parts »
to
« living apart together »
?

40
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Survey results
# SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Purposeful Sampling for Qualitative Analysis</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Identification and selection of information-rich cases related to the phenomenon of interest (with the most effective use of limited resources)</td>
<td>ICP CA (3D-LO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Combination of maximum variation and snowball sampling</td>
<td>35 stakeholders → contact person → resource persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Saturation (internal), no generalization (external)</td>
<td>Shared patterns that emerged out of heterogeneity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SURVEY

Facts vs. Perceptions

• Mapping of all facts = impossible
  • (non-exhaustive and dynamic list of reforms)

• Mapping of perceptions = interesting
  • Disparity between ‘on paper’ and ‘in reality’
SURVEY

It’s not *reality*, it’s *your reality*
## Participants / Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICP</th>
<th>3D-LO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • 70 participants  
  • 35 = ICP ; 35 = ICP + 3D-LO (CA)  
  • Awareness: Yes = 55; No = 15 | • 48 participants  
  • 13 = 3D-LO ; 35 = 3D-LO + ICP (CA)  
  • Awareness: Yes = 30; No = 14; NA = 4 |

DGD  
MFA  
Embassies/Field offices  
Ministry of Defence  
Federal Police  
Immigration office  
EEAS  
NGO  
BTC  
Vlir-UOS  
Vlanderen Development  
Bio  
Finexpo  
Trade Union  

DGD  
MFA  
Embassies/Field offices  
Ministry of Defence  
Federal Police  
Immigration office  
EEAS  
NGO  
BTC
**Steps taken**

- **Different levels**: commitment, strategic, structural, programmatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICP</th>
<th>CA (3D-LO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ACC/CSC (most frequent answer)</td>
<td>• Comprehensive approach <strong>working group and Strategic note</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FBSA</td>
<td>• <strong>Policy coherence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enabel reform: ongoing</td>
<td>• Coordination and consultation (task forces; geographic focus: Great Lakes, Sahel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic notes (envir., gender, fragility, comprehensive approach)</td>
<td>• New D5 direction in DGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotion of private sector</td>
<td>• 3D-LO analysis in new cooperation programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forum of Belgian actors / Field meetings / information sharing</td>
<td>• Unified careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint programming in EU context (Niger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New instructions to Embassies for pre-analyse (S, BF, P, G, TZ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ACROPOLIS G4D research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Experiences BE actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICP</th>
<th>CA (3D-LO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - ACC/CSC  
- BFFS (Tanzania, Mali)  
- Basisallocatie Synergie  
- Forum of BE actors  
- Coordination at programme/field level  
  - BTC/APEFE/VVOB (Rw)  
  - BTC/NGAs | - Interdepartemental collaboration (HQ / field)  
  - Briefings/debriefings/information sharing  
  - Joint missions  
  - Training programmes  
- Coordination structures  
  - Focus: geographic (Sahel, GL); strategic; programmatic  
- Programmes (incl. Bottom-up initiatives)  
  - BTC/SSR  
  - BTC/Defence  
  - eg. PARSIB |
Guiding principles

**ICP**
- Need for a clear and transparent vision and objectives
- Start from a common objective and gather complementary actors
- Ownership of stakeholders (not top-down)
- Respect/autonomy: mandates, objectives, values
- Transparent coordination and information sharing

**CA (3D-LO)**
- Need for a clear and transparent vision and objectives
- Collaboration between actors
  - Interests/priorities
  - Responsibilities
- Programme management
  - Flexibility
  - Coordination
- Information management
  - Transparency
  - Real time
Actors involved

ICP

• ‘List’ approach
  – Ministries/Administration (Dipl, Def, Dev, Just, Pol, Imm, Trade), NGO, BTC, BIO, Fed, IA, TU, private sector, EU, International actors, etc.

• All ‘relevant’ actors (?)

CA (3D-LO)

• ‘List’ approach
• All ‘relevant’ actors (?)

Shared key questions/issues

• Case-by-case/context-driven
• Comparative advantage
• Management
• Timing/programme sequence ➔ ‘organisation’ issues
## Organization

### ICP
- Leadership (local/DGD?/context-based)
- Compulsory/optional
- Formal/informal
- Multi-actor platforms/partnerships
- Facilitation (administration)
- Transparent communication/dialogue
- ‘Light’ / + strategic than administrative / need basis

### CA (3D-LO)
- Leadership (Ministry?/context-based)
- Coordination structure
- Permanent v. ad-hoc structures
- Multi-level coordination
- Politics-administration coordination
Strengths

Dimensions: political; institutional; operational

ICP

• Efficiency and effectiveness
  – + funds/- costs
• Coherence
• Commitment
• Visibility
• Legitimacy/participation
• Dialogue/division of labour

CA (3D-LO)

• Efficiency and effectiveness
• Coherence
• Commitment
• Leverage
• Credibility
• Interpersonal relations/dialogue
Weaknesses

ICP

- No strategic vision
- Different agendas/values/roles and org. cultures
- Lack of communication
- Administrative (no value added)
- Lack of commitment
- BE centered
- Mistrust/competition/visibility
  - Unequal partners
- Less flexible/slow
- Transaction costs
- Different time horizons/prog. cycles

CA (3D-LO)

- No real long-term strategy
- Institutional (siloes’) cultures
- Discursive/declaratory
- Lack of coordination (HQ/field)
- Discontinuity/permanent change
- Mistrust (‘zero sum game’)
- Transaction costs
- Resources and capacities
- No flexibility
- Interpersonal (not institutional)
Opportunities

ICP

- **International momentum** (SDG, EU, new challenges - migration)
- **BE commitment/awareness**
- ENABEL reform
- Mutual acceptance of actors’ diversity (diaspora, 4th pillar)
- Existing frames (JSF)
- More dialogue and information sharing

CA (3D-LO)

- **International momentum** (SDG, EU, new regional challenges - Sahel)
- **BE commitment** (coherence)
- BE international presence (Embassies)
- Joint training/analysis
- Budget constraints
Risks

ICP

- Instrumentalisation/politisation/mistrust
- No common objective
- Less autonomy/innovation/initiative
- Competition
- ‘Crowding out’ actors and sectors
- Transaction costs
- Loss of flexibility
- BE centered
- Loss of momentum/support (int. and national level)
- Partner country capacity/strategy

CA (3D-LO)

- No common vision
- Instrumentalisation/politisation
- ‘Office politics’
- BE centered
- Loss of political support
- Resources and coordination capacity
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COFFEE BREAK
PART II

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?
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Common Language?

Road Map
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GOVERNANCE NETWORKS

State

Society

Market
1. HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

• Origins: 1990’s
• Hierarchies, markets, networks
• Democratic & Effectiveness Deficit
• Development Policy
• Fragile Situations (Liberal Peace)
• 2 caveats
2. THEORETICAL EVIDENCE

- Self-Interest
- Wicked Problems
- The ‘right thing’ to do
- Politics
3. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

DO THEY WORK?

DEMOCRATIC DEFICIT

EFFECTIVENESS DEFICIT
1. EFFECTIVENESS DEFICIT

- Intangible outputs
- Dispersed outputs
- Non-attributable outputs
- Dynamic goals
- Multiple goals
- Vague and diffuse goals
## 1. EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+</th>
<th>LEARNING (ADDED VALUE)</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated knowledge</td>
<td>Substantial complexity</td>
<td>Negotiated nonsense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary use of resources</td>
<td>Strategic complexity</td>
<td>Higher transaction costs and duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher trust and support</td>
<td>Institutional complexity</td>
<td>Lower trust and support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. DEMOCRACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link between top-down representative and bottom-up participatory democracy</td>
<td>Co-optation and instrumentalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve problem-solving through bottom-up participation</td>
<td>Lack of publicity and transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce just policies through inclusion of affected actors</td>
<td>Reduction of the potential for democratic control and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a medium for political empowerment, widen the scope of political contestation</td>
<td>Atomization and fragmentation of public policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transform antagonistics relations into agonistic ones</td>
<td>Unequal patterns of political inclusion, influence and empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of the scope of political contestation through the development of strong hegemonic discourses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

Common Language?

- Principles
- Criteria
EFFECTIVENESS DEFICIT

Complementary Stakeholders

Exchange/pool/coordinate resources

Aligned Policies

CRITERIA:
- Joint Imagebuilding
- Negotiated Knowledge
- Goal Intertwinement
- Transaction costs and duration
- Quality of the process
- Inclusiveness of the process
- Internal/external trust/support

DEMOCRATIC DEFICIT

Affected Stakeholders

Mobilize support

Legitimate Policies

CRITERIA
- Political monitoring
- Representative membership
- Principle of affectedness
- Democratic rules and procedures
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BELGIAN GOVERNANCE NETWORKS ?
SURVEY

- “Can you share relevant experiences that can contribute to an integrated country approach or comprehensive approach?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th># EDGES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cabinet Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Cab FA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cabinet Internal Affairs</td>
<td>Cab IA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cabinet Defence</td>
<td>Cab DEF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cabinet Cooperation</td>
<td>Cab COOP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belgian NGO</td>
<td>B-NGO</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>16,1</td>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>International NGO</td>
<td>I-NGO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Local NGO (partner country)</td>
<td>L-NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>Partner Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Administration Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Adm FA</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Administration Internal Affairs</td>
<td>Adm IA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13,5</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Administration Defence</td>
<td>Adm DEF</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13,7</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Administration Cooperation</td>
<td>Adm COOP</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>16,1</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Belgian Development Agency</td>
<td>BTC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Multilateral institutions</td>
<td>Multi's</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bilateral donors</td>
<td>Bilaterals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Institutional Actors</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Federated Entities</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Belgian Investment Company</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4th Pillar Initiatives</td>
<td>4P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Local Administration (partner country)</td>
<td>L Adm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Partner Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Local Private Sector (partner country)</td>
<td>L PS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Partner Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Belgian Embassy (partner country)</td>
<td>Embassy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>739</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CA (3D-LO) vs. ICP
#3 Belgian Links
#2 International Links
#1 Absent Market
#Absent Local Links
#Absent Political Links
#2 Satellite Links
CONCLUSIONS

- Belgian experiences with governance networks?
  - C.A
  - JCA/JSF
  - BFFS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>Complementary Actors</th>
<th>Affected Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.A.</td>
<td>Complementarity limited to GA, common goals still to be defined, clear willingness</td>
<td>Intention to involve broader stakeholders (NGA, universities), absent link with affected constituencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCA / JSF</td>
<td>Complementarity limited to NGA, broad list of goals, mixed willingness (top-down)</td>
<td>Consultation of affected constituencies (limited to local NG partners), but no priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFFS</td>
<td>Complementarity between GA, NGA, and international agencies, clearly defined common goal, higher willingness (bottom-up)</td>
<td>Both local GA and NGA are involved as affected constituencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>LEGITIMACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Echange, pool, coordinate resources</td>
<td>Mobilize support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.</td>
<td>Too early, but focus on informationsharing, negative coordination, alignment (national/international, less focus on innovation)</td>
<td>To early to asses, but no intention to mobilize support from affected constituencies (belgo-belge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCA / JSF</td>
<td>Informationsharing, negative coordination, more mapping than innovation, learning fund</td>
<td>Consultation of affected constituencies (limited to local partners, belgo-belge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFFS</td>
<td>Pooling resources, positive coordination, sometimes higher transaction costs / duration</td>
<td>Mobilize support through local GA and NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>LEGITIMACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.</td>
<td>Too early to assess</td>
<td>To early to assess (but strengthening legitimacy through representative/participatory democracy no priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCA / JSF</td>
<td>Minimal alignment</td>
<td>Minimal effect (focus exercise was Belgo-Belge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFFS</td>
<td>Aligned policies and service provision through joint programming</td>
<td>Potential effect by bringing GA and NGA together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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