

## ACP-EU COTONOU AGREEMENT

---

**AFRICAN, CARIBBEAN AND  
PACIFIC GROUP OF STATES**

---

**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

---

**Brussels, 3 June 2013**

**ACP/21/001/13**

**ACP-UE 2104/13**

### **OUTCOME OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

of: 37th session of the ACP-EU Council of Ministers  
on: 14-15 June 2012  
in: Port Vila, Vanuatu

---

Subject: Outcome of proceedings of the 37th session of the ACP-EU Council of Ministers  
on 14-15 June 2012

---

The ACP-EU Council of Ministers held its 37th meeting in Port Vila, Vanuatu, on 14-15 June 2012 under the chairmanship of H.E. Mr. Alva BAPTISTE, Minister for Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Civil Aviation of Saint Lucia and Co-President of the ACP-EU Council of Ministers.

The meeting was co-chaired for the European Union by H.E. Mr. Christian FRIIS BACH, Minister for Development Cooperation of Denmark.

The European Commission was represented by Mr. Andris PIEBALGS, Commissioner for Development.

The EEAS was represented by Mr. Martin DIHM, Head of the EU Delegation in Papua New Guinea.

The European Investment Bank was represented by Mr. Patrick WALSH, Director of the Africa, Caribbean, Pacific - Investment Facility Department.

## ITEM 1

### ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

[ACP/21/001/12 - ACP-UE 2111/12]

The Council adopted the agenda.

## "A" ITEMS

## ITEM 2

### ADOPTION OF

- **Outcome of proceedings of the 36th session of the ACP-EU Council of Ministers held on 31 May 2011**

[ACP/21/003/11 - ACP-UE 2124/11]

The Council approved the outcome of proceedings of the 36th session of the ACP-EU Council of Ministers.

## ITEM 3

### INFORMATION ON

- **ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly: activities in 2011**

The Council took note of the results of the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly sessions which took place in Budapest and Lomé in 2011, as well as of the latest session of the Assembly which took place in Horsens, Denmark in May 2012. The Council discussed the practical implications of the provisions on the increased cooperation and coherence between the Joint Parliamentary Assembly and the ACP-EU Council brought about by the second revision of the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement. The Council invited the two Co-Secretariats to jointly reflect on how to implement these new provisions and to draft a report on the activities of the Council, with a view to its adoption at the next ACP-EU Council meeting and its subsequent submission to the Joint Parliamentary Assembly.

## "B" ITEMS

### ITEM 4

#### TRADE COOPERATION

##### - **ACP Ministerial Declarations on specific products**

The Council took note of the ACP declarations on sugar, kava, bananas, cotton, cocoa and tobacco (see Annex I).

##### - **Report from the 10th Joint Ministerial Trade Committee**

The Commission provided an oral report from the 10th Joint Ministerial Trade Committee, which was held on 12 December 2011. The Commission reported that the ACP States and the EU had exchanged views on a broad range of issues affecting the ACP-EU trading regime, at multilateral and bilateral levels, including the impact of agreements with third parties.

The ACP side recalled in this context the Commission communication on trade and development, which, in the ACP view, placed the focus on trade and investment-led growth, the protection of international property rights and foreign direct investments as key contributors to growth. ACP countries believe, however, that the growth agenda should take account of the social and environmental externalities of the developing countries. The ACP side rejected the notion of differentiation among members of the ACP Group when designing and implementing EU policies, except where this had been discussed and agreed upon in the context of the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement or adopted in the past such as in the case of the "Everything but Arms" facility. The ACP side regretted that the communication did not address the unique situation of small island developing states and suggested that special provision be made to accommodate their situation. On aid for trade the ACP side suggested that there should be a move beyond simple capacity building and technical assistance for the real needs of developing countries to additional support that could help to consolidate production, improve vertical linkages and integration, lower production costs within regions and, in general, promote regional trade.

The ACP side noted that the communication called for more commitment to refrain from protectionism and to refrain from the use of export taxes and export restrictions on food, raw materials and natural resources. However the ACP countries intend to take all necessary measures to take advantage of their raw materials with a view to diversifying their economies and moving up the value chain.

In conclusion, the Council took note of the report from the 10th Joint Ministerial Trade Committee.

- **EPAs – state of play and perspectives**

The Commission provided a brief overview of the EPAs being negotiated and informed the Council of the recent provisional application of the interim agreement with the ESA signatory countries. The Commission stressed that a new dynamic was witnessed in the negotiations and they were advancing reasonably well.

The ACP side declared that their position had been well articulated by ACP Ministers at the meeting of the Joint Ministerial Trade Committee in December 2011 and requested that the Commission withdraw the proposed amendment to Regulation 1528/2007, for the reasons stated at that meeting. The ACP side declared that the ACP States concerned were pursuing negotiations in good faith and with the hope that a mutually beneficial agreement would be reached. The ACP side recalled certain global and regional developments which had influenced the EPA negotiations: stalemate in the Doha Round which the ACP side had hoped would modify the provisions of the regional trade agreements, and inject flexibility to enable LDCs to conclude free trade agreements (FTAs) with developed countries and ACP regions, as well as the process of building FTAs and Customs Unions in Africa. The ACP side declared that no ACP State or WTO member had complained about the granting of duty-free quota-free market access to ACP States that were still negotiating an EPA.

The representative of Tonga outlined the state of play of EPA negotiations with the Pacific region, invited the Commission to step up its engagement in the process and declared that the region was committed to concluding an agreement.

The representative of Luxembourg, while taking good note of the need for flexibility on both sides, underlined the importance of bringing negotiations to a conclusion and emphasised that Regulation 1528/2007 was conceived only as a temporary solution.

The representative of France re-emphasised the need for an urgent conclusion of the EPA negotiations.

In conclusion, the Council took note of the exchange of views on the state of negotiations of the Economic Partnership Agreements and the way forward.

## **ITEM 5**

### **MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT**

- **Report from the ACP-EU dialogue on migration and development to strengthen the operational aspects of ACP-EU cooperation in the area of visa, remittances and readmission**

The ACP side acknowledged the reinforced cooperation that had been seen during the dialogue on migration and development, which had led to concrete results.

The EU side recalled the fruitful dialogue which had presented a unique opportunity to intensify ACP-EU cooperation in the field of migration and emphasised the need to continue the dialogue to address the outstanding issues. The EU side strongly supported the recommendations included in the draft report from the dialogue.

In conclusion, the Council adopted the draft report and its recommendations, as set out in document ACP/28/044/12 - ACP-UE 2115/12.

## ITEM 6

### RIO +20

#### - **Exchange of views and adoption of a possible joint resolution**

Following the exchange of views, the Council adopted a Joint ACP-EU Declaration on "Rio + 20" (ACP/22/002/12 - ACP-UE 2118/12).

## ITEM 7

### DEVELOPMENT FINANCE COOPERATION

#### - **Oral Report and follow-up to the meeting of the Development Finance Cooperation Committee (Ministers) (14 June 2012)**

The EU President of the ACP-EU Ministerial Development Finance Cooperation Committee presented the report on the meeting, which took place on 14 June 2012 in Vanuatu.

The Council adopted the report of the ACP-EU Ministerial Development Finance Cooperation Committee (see Annex II) ) and agreed with the recommendations made by the DFC Committee, particularly in relation to the modification of Annex II to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement and to the review of the Intra-ACP envelope (see items 8 and 9 of the Agenda).

## ITEM 8

### DECISIONS

#### - **Revision of Annex II of the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement**

Following a presentation by the European Investment Bank explaining the technical aspects of this revision, the Council adopted the decision on the revision of Annex II to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement (ACP/21/003/12 - ACP-UE 2112/12). This will ensure the financing of projects related to Technical Assistance in ACP countries until the end of 2013.

- **Accession of South Sudan to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement**

The ACP side recalled the situation in South Sudan and welcomed that State's request to join the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement.

The EU side took note of the ACP presentation and expressed strong support for South Sudan's request for accession to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement. The EU side deplored the fact that the Republic of Sudan had not ratified the revised ACP-EU Partnership Agreement and invited the authorities of the Republic of Sudan to do so. The EU side expressed deep concern over the conflict between the Republic of Sudan and South Sudan and strongly supported the efforts of the African Union's High Level Panel to resolve issues of contention between the two countries.

In conclusion the Council adopted the decision on the accession of South Sudan to the revised ACP-EU Partnership Agreement (ACP/21/002/12 - ACP-UE 2114/12). The Council invited the authorities of South Sudan to deposit with the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, at their earliest convenience, an act of accession to the Agreement.

**ITEM 9**

**REVIEW OF THE INTRA-ACP ENVELOPE**

The Commission provided information regarding the result of the review and outlined its proposal with regard to the replenishment of the Intra-ACP envelope.

In line with the recommendations of the Ministerial DFC Committee (see item 7 of the Agenda), the Council agreed that both Parties would take the necessary steps in order to speed up the procedure and adopt a decision by the ACP-EU Committee of Ambassadors, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 6 of Annex 1b to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement.

## ITEM 10

### ACP-EU DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AFTER 2013

#### - **State of play of preparations of the multi-annual financial framework 2014-2020**

The EU side clarified that it had not yet been settled whether the ACP-EU cooperation would continue to be financed through a separate fund, as proposed by the Commission or via the EU budget. Nevertheless preparatory work on an Internal Agreement establishing an 11th EDF had started in order to prepare the ground, should the EU Member States agree to leave the EDF outside the budget. The EU was still discussing this matter and was not in a position to give any kind of information on the amount for the cooperation after 2013. Exact figures for cooperation with ACP countries would not be decided before the end of 2012. After this, the EU side would be ready to negotiate with the ACP side a new financial protocol which would be attached to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement, and would cover the period 2014-2020.

The ACP side, referring to the 10th EDF performance review (see item 11 of the Agenda), pointed out that according to paragraph 7 of Annex 1b to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement that review was intended to contribute to a decision on the amount of the financial cooperation after 2013. It recalled that ACP States had signed the second revision of the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement without any indication of the multi-annual financial framework.

The Council took note of the state of play of preparations of the multi-annual financial framework 2014-2020.

#### - **Agenda for change: future of the EU development cooperation policy**

The Commission presented the content of the Commission's Communication on the Agenda for Change, and its possible implications for EU-ACP relations.



The ACP side expressed its concern with regard to the inclusion of the element of graduation, linked to a differentiated approach with respect to access to resources. The ACP Group asked the EU to refrain from taking any unilateral measures that would modify the legal framework of the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement as signed in June 2010.

The Council took note of the presentation by the Commission and of the observations made by the ACP side.

## **ITEM 11**

### **PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF THE 10TH EDF**

#### **- Exchange of views**

The Commission presented the main findings of its analysis, which considered the current state of the 10th EDF programmes and assessed the degree of realisation of commitments and disbursements as well as the results and impact of the aid provided through the 10th EDF.

Under this item, the European Investment Bank provided updated information on the implementation of the Investment Facility.

The EU side informed the Council that it had made its assessment of the 10th EDF performance in Conclusions adopted by the Council of the EU on 14 November 2011. This assessment acknowledged that the financial performance of the EDF had improved over the past three years in terms of commitment and expenditure. At the same time the EU recognised the difficulties in attributing progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals to the various funding sources. Finally, the EU believed that monitoring and evaluation systems, including performance indicators, should be strengthened, in order to improve systems and procedures for reporting on results and impact.

The ACP side emphasised that both Parties should make the best of the conclusions of this review in order to better prepare for the programming and implementation of the next financial framework.

The Council took note of the results of the 10th EDF performance review.

## **ITEM 12**

### **DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION OF THE ACP-EU COUNCIL OF MINISTERS**

The Council decided to hold the 38th session of the ACP-EU Council of Ministers in Brussels in 2013, on a date to be mutually agreed by the Co-Secretariats.

## **"C" ITEMS**

## **ITEM 13**

### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The representative of Mali outlined the political situation in his country and requested assistance from the EU and ACP States in resolving the crisis.

The ACP side enquired when the operational budget of the Centre for the Development of Enterprise would be released. The Commission assured the Council that a decision on the release of the budget was imminent.

The representative of Vanuatu declared that in the ACP's opinion the Pacific EIB Regional Office should be established in an ACP country. The representative of the EIB informed the Council that the Bank was conducting a review of locations of its regional offices which could result in relocation of some of the offices.

## ITEM 14

### "SUSTAINABLE ENERGY FOR ALL" INITIATIVE:

#### - Exchange of views

The Council held an informal exchange of views on the "Sustainable Energy for All" initiative and its possible implications for the ACP-EU Partnership.

---

ACP/63/014/12

SEDV/VG/dn

**ACP STATEMENT ON SUGAR TO THE 37<sup>TH</sup> ACP-EU COUNCIL**

---

Delivered by H. E. Mr. Jagdish Dharamchand Koonjul  
Ambassador of Mauritius in Brussels

PORT VILA, VANUATU, 14 JUNE 2012

Mr Co-President,

Thank you for the opportunity to make this statement on sugar on behalf of the ACP.

Mr Co-President,

As you are aware the ACP sugar suppliers suffered a staggering loss of approximately €1.75 billion from the cumulative price cut of 36% brought about by the EU sugar regime reform which started in 2006. In recognition of the socio economic hardships which would be brought about by this reform, the EU provided more than 1.2 billion euros in the form of accompanying measures to assist ACP sugar industries implement restructuring plans involving huge investments in a bid to improve their long-term sustainability, profitability and competitiveness on the market. Whilst this did not fully mitigate the losses suffered by the ACP, we were and continue to be grateful to the EU for the accompanying measures support initiative in the sugar sector.

Mr Co-President,

Some beneficiary countries have however been facing serious difficulties in the implementation and acquisition of these funds under the AMSP. Indeed, it is becoming a matter of urgency for these constraints and difficulties to be addressed so that the funds are fully utilized and not forfeited. Fiji is one clear example and there are some others countries as well. We call on the EC to identify the appropriate process to ensure that the funds earmarked for Fiji under the AMSP are immediately released to assist the affected farmers and the sugar industry, as a whole, in the adjustment and adaptation process in this country. Likewise we request that the challenges faced by the other sugar supplying countries be urgently addressed to ensure that they also have prompt access to these resources. We also wish to reiterate that the ACP Sugar supplying States have the collective capacity to fully utilise the available resources. Any unutilized funds should therefore be reallocated. It is also important for the EC to recognise that some other ACP which now have access to the EU sugar market may also require assistance to formulate and implement an appropriate sugar-sector development strategy as part of their efforts to ensure sustainable development for the benefit of their population.

Mr Co-President,

The international financial situation and the ongoing crisis in the Euro zone have had a serious impact on the revenues of the ACP States which largely rely on export earnings from the EU. We would therefore like to propose that we start discussions on ways and means by which an Integrated Commodity Development Programme could be designed and funded under the next multiannual financial framework. Such a programme should be endowed with sufficient resources from the appropriate financing instrument, and benefit the Sugar sector by addressing value-addition and supporting the formulation and implementation of diversification strategies.

We also wish to seek the prolongation of the support to the ACP Sugar Research sector beyond the end of the current 13 million euro ACP Sugar Research and Innovation Programme in 2013.

Mr Co-President,

When the sugar regime was deeply reformed in 2005, both Commissioner Fischer Boel and the then EU Council President (UK Minister Margaret Beckett) explained that stakeholders would have a predictable and stable environment for many years to come on which they could base their investments. This was most welcome as the cane sector, not only has a long crop cycle, with investment of very specific nature at both farm and processor levels, and also because the very high capital-intensity of processing requires long term predictability and should not be exposed to fluctuations in volumes and prices.

As a matter of fact in the context of the upcoming Common Agricultural Policy reform, we have been calling for the ACP suppliers to be provided with:

- fair, stable and remunerative EU market prices;
- a guarantee and priority of access;
- long-term predictability with continued preference assured by adequate border measures and robust mechanisms for market management; and,
- a balanced market;

We were therefore very dismayed by the Commission proposals on the new CAP released on 12 October 2011 wherein it called for an end to the EU sugar and isoglucose quotas in 2015 – a proposal which in our view will have adverse impacts on the ACP sugar suppliers. Various studies, including the Commission's own impact study, have highlighted that such a proposal, which would deprive the Commission of essential market management tools, would result in market instability and significant price fluctuations. A recently conducted independent analysis by Landell Mills (LMC) for DFID concluded that the absence of EU sugar quotas would cost ACP/LDC sugar suppliers up to EUR 850 million in revenue loss up to 2020.

Such further reduction in revenue will negate the rationale behind the heavy investment being made by the ACP with the assistance of the EU accompanying measures support programme and could simply lead to the death of the sugar sector in certain of our countries.

This would call into question the basic concept of policy coherence for development to which the EU is attached in relation to its trade and development objectives and which seeks to avoid collateral damage to developing countries and to remove contradictions between the EU's internal policies and development objectives.

Mr. Co-President,

The ACP Group has made several representations to the EU and the Commission in this regard and we note that the Commission has commissioned a fresh impact assessment for the sugar sector as a follow up of the initial study on which the Commission's proposal was based. We wish here to express our appreciation to the Commission for inviting the ACP, as observers, to the meeting of the Advisory Group on Sugar on 9th July 2012 at which the new report will be presented.

Mr Co-President, there is ample justification and support for the EU quotas to be maintained beyond 2015. Indeed the European Parliament, on 23 June 2011, adopted a resolution on CAP towards 2020: "*meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future*", in which it recommended that "*the 2006 sugar market regime be extended at least to 2020 in its existing form*".

We are also aware that the rapporteur of the European Parliament Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development on the Common market organisation, in line with that resolution will again recommend in his upcoming report the maintenance of the EU Sugar quotas until 2020. We therefore call on the EU Member States to adopt, in the co-decision process, the same position so as to preserve market stability and ensure that producers derive a reasonable and predictable revenue in both cane and beet sugar sectors.

Mr Co President,

The ACP Sugar Group expects the European Union to fully comply with the binding commitments made in the revised Cotonou Partnership Agreement (CPA) and full/interim Economic Partnership Agreements. Under the current circumstances, we intend to seek formal and meaningful consultations with the EU on the impact of the CAP reform as provided for by Article 12 of the Cotonou Agreement. We cannot agree with the suggestion made by the Commission in recent correspondence to us that joint technical meetings or other similar meetings are tantamount to formal consultations.

Mr Co President,

In conclusion, the ACP Sugar exporting States wish to reiterate the message conveyed at our last Joint Council namely that the EU should show coherence in its development, agricultural and trade policies and ascertain that EU funded development initiatives and market access opportunities offered to us are not jeopardized by measures taken on either the domestic or the international fronts.

I thank you for your attention.

**ACP/67/020/12**

**SEDV/VG/dn**

**ACP STATEMENT ON KAVA TO THE 37<sup>TH</sup> ACP-EU COUNCIL**

---

Delivered by Hon Meltek Sato Kilman Livtuvanu  
Prime Minister of Vanuatu

PORT VILA, 14 JUNE 2012



*Co-Chairs,  
Honourable Ministers,*

You will notice that this is the first time that the issue of Kava is being raised at this level in our discussions. This is certainly no accident.

However, it would have been an unforgiveable mistake on the part of this country, if we were to host a meeting of this level, with our valuable partner, the European Union, and not seize the opportunity to raise an issue so dear to our hearts.

Of course, and unfortunately, the ACP Group has expressed concerns about the ban of kava products to the EU market from Pacific ACP States for almost 10 years now.

The situation has now reached a stage where we need to take urgent action to avoid seeing one of our major cultural features, which we transformed into an economic asset, being slowly brought to naught.

You have certainly now understood, since your arrival in Port Vila, that Kava is an extremely important crop, not for Vanuatu alone, but for the entire ACP Pacific Communities, and which has the sympathy and support of the entire ACP Group.

Just three months ago, at this same venue, we organized a High-level Conference on Kava, from 12 to 15 March 2012, which led to the adoption of a roadmap for the sustainable development of the sector in the Pacific ACP countries concerned.

This meeting and the roadmap adopted constitute a fundamental phase in our battle to obtain equitable treatment in the legitimate case we have been advancing for some ten years now.

Since June 2002, countries in the European Union, led by Germany, imposed bans on kava products when the German Federal Institute for Drugs and Medicinal Devices (BfArM) decided to withdraw licenses for all products containing kava and/or kava's active ingredient – kavain - on grounds of their hepatotoxicity.

Unfortunately, and as is customary for this kind of issue, following Germany's decision, several other European countries (including Austria, Switzerland, France, Netherlands and the UK) followed suit, placing bans on kava imports and/or asking producers to voluntarily recall their products.

You can well imagine that the effects of the bans themselves, plus the product recalls and consequent negative publicity, have greatly disadvantaged the kava industry in the South Pacific, as kava exports to the European and US markets virtually came to a halt in 2002.

As you might well imagine, too, it will take more than that for the Countries from this part of the world to give up the fight. The Pacific countries affected by the Kava ban, which I wish to commend here, have been actively involved in finding a solution to this problem since the introduction of the ban in 2002. As part of these efforts, and in addition to bilateral, regional and multilateral consultations, a number of studies have been commissioned, including some supported at Intra-ACP level, to address the problem from various angles, particularly from the legal, scientific and trade perspectives.

We were sincerely disappointed, at certain points, to receive as the sole response from the European Commission that the issue goes beyond the authority of the EU as such, and must, therefore, be taken up with individual EU Member States.

Nonetheless, persisting in our quest, we received confirmation, included in the findings of studies funded in the framework of our partnership, that although the ban was initiated by certain EU Member States, the European Commission possesses the authority to address the issue, given its repercussions on trade. As a result, the ACP Group decided to consider this ban as a trade issue to be addressed at EU level rather than at the national level.

To give you a comprehensive overview of the situation, I would like to recall that due to the calming and relaxing properties of certain active ingredients of the plant, kava extracts have been used for the development of herbal medicinal products for the treatment of mostly situational anxiety, in particular in Europe, where kava was exported.

When the decision was taken to revoke the marketing authorisations in June 2002, it was based on the discussion of cases of liver disease which were ostensibly related to the use of kava products. It has since been scientifically proven, however, that the *de facto* “ban” on kava-based medicinal products, is not really related to any alleged liver toxicity of kava extracts.

Once this was discovered, the authorities which had introduced the ban suddenly changed their minds, and moved from revocation to the suspension of marketing authorisations in May 2005, referring to doubts regarding efficacy rather than safety. This means that the authorities were now just considering a factor to be negatively affecting the risk-benefit ratio, even when the safety level was actually acceptable.

I hope that you will concur with us on the striking inconsistency in the apparent change of paradigms from questioning the safety of kava to questioning its efficacy, and that we can all agree that the alleged inefficacy could not serve as a basis for banning Kava product imports in a specific market.

We have made several representations to the relevant EU Member State Authorities, with limited success. The German Authority, which initiated the ban, has constantly refused to provide appropriate room for consultations with the ACP countries concerned, to allow them the opportunity for comprehensive discussions.

In a bid to bring this lengthy process to an end, the ACP Group is now calling on the European Union to ensure that the ACP countries concerned are granted the opportunity to engage in an appropriate exchange of views with the authorities of the countries that have banned the import of kava and kava products into their territories.

We would also like to urge the European Commission to use its good offices to facilitate the consultation process and we demand that a specific timetable be rapidly agreed for conducting the consultations envisaged.

If, at the end of these consultations, no sound and irrefutable scientific proof justifying the ban on the import of kava or kava products is found, we request that all interdiction measures be immediately removed by the States that had introduced them.

Failing this, **Co-Chairs**, and albeit with considerable reluctance, the ACP States concerned reserve their right to raise the issue in the appropriate multilateral fora - a step that will certainly have the full support of the ACP Group.

We sincerely hope not to reach this stage. In the meantime, and taking into account the importance of the issue for the ACP Pacific States which, for once, have a collective issue to raise, the ACP Group encourages the European Commission to open discussions with the ACP Secretariat to consider setting up an appropriate support programme to assist with the formulation and implementation of an economically sustainable strategy for the ACP kava sector.

**I thank you.**

**ACP/67/015/12**

**SEDT/VG/dn**

**ACP STATEMENT ON BANANAS TO THE 37<sup>TH</sup> ACP-EU COUNCIL**

---

DELIVERED BY HONOURABLE EMMANUEL NGANOU DJOUMESSI  
MINISTER OF THE ECONOMY, PLANNING AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF CAMEROON

PORT VILA, VANUATU, 14 JUNE 2012

*Co-Presidents,  
Honourable Ministers,*

It is with particularly marked interest in the future, that the ACP Group presents the situation in the banana sector in ACP countries to the joint Council, and consequently calls on the European Union to act promptly to provide lasting solutions to our shared concerns.

This presentation will focus on the following: 1) progress in the setting-up of the Banana Accompanying Measures and 2) the situation on the international banana market, as well as the consequences for market access for ACP countries.

### **1. Banana Accompanying Measures**

Here, the ACP Group has noted with satisfaction that the Regulation of the European Parliament and Council establishing the Banana Accompanying Measures (BAM), was finally adopted on 13 December 2011, thereby opening the way for the disbursement of the 190 million euros promised to the ACP banana-exporting States in the framework of the Geneva Agreement on the Trade in Bananas, initialled on 15 December 2009.

Noting the initiatives taken by the European Union to facilitate the setting-up and implementation of the programme which is meant to assist in reforming the banana sector in the ten (10) main ACP exporting countries, we were somewhat concerned to learn that the actors involved in this facilitation exercise, particularly our representatives in Brussels, were not sufficiently or adequately informed of the process. We regretted the fact that at the of African Stakeholders' Meeting held in Accra on 25 and 26 January 2012, the opportunity was not taken, despite requests from the ACP States, to share experiences with the countries of the Caribbean region, especially those which had no previous experience in managing sectoral support programmes of this kind.

We are calling for the organisation of meetings with Brussels-based representatives to take stock of the setting-up of the accompanying measures, identify potential difficulties and, together, consider possible solutions so as to ensure that the programme is implemented within the prescribed timeframe.

More specifically, the banana-producing ACP countries harbour grave concerns regarding the reduction of the resource commitment timeframe to two years, instead of four years, initially planned. We fear that this shortened timeframe will increase the risk of poor absorption by the countries concerned.

Taking this risk into account, we consider it of paramount importance to make all the necessary arrangements to increase the chances of rapid and effective use of the available funds. We are calling on the European Union, therefore, to take the necessary steps to refrain from demanding any co-financing from the beneficiaries of support programme in the ACP countries. We wish to recall, in this regard, that the financial capacity of the ACP actors in the sector has been significantly reduced due to critical investments that had to be made to enhance the competitiveness of the banana sector to counter the negative effects of EU trade commitments to banana-exporting third countries and the delays experienced in the provision of the BAM.

We are calling on the European Commission, therefore, to demonstrate flexibility in implementation of the MAB, so as to enable maximum disbursement of the allocated resources and to ensure that all the resources are used collectively and not forfeited.

The ACP Group is also worried about the European Commission's statements implying that no consideration could be given to providing additional support for the sector once the accompanying measures had ended. Such a position would be in contradiction with the provisions of the Regulation of the European Parliament and Council which established the BAM. The regulation specifies that the BAM programme and the progress made by the countries concerned shall be the subject of an assessment, which shall include recommendations on any measures to be taken and the nature thereof. It is, in fact, a rendez-vous clause which has been agreed and outlined in the European Commission's letter of 15 December 2009 to the Minister/ACP Spokesman for Bananas in the framework of the arrangements for the conclusion of the Geneva Agreement on Trade in Bananas of December 2009, and subsequently formalised in the revised Cotonou Agreement of 2010, for all aid programmes set up to address the problem of preferences erosion.

We consider it essential, therefore, to request that the European Union respect this rendez-vous clause and envisage the actual assessment of the implementation of the BAM before taking any new decision regarding bananas.

## **2. Situation on the international banana market and market access conditions for ACP countries**

We remain concerned at the continued multiplication of trade agreements proposed by the European Commission with rival countries or regions of the ACP countries in the export of bananas.

We are particularly concerned at the European Commission's proposal to set exceedingly high import volume ceilings for Central American countries and Andean States. Such ceilings will, most certainly, nullify the performance of the safeguard system envisaged in the trade agreements between these countries and the European Union.

In this regard, the ACP countries wish to reiterate the need for the European Union to ensure that the policy coherence to which it refers in the Cotonou Partnership Agreement and in the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU is respected, particularly in the negotiation of trade agreements with territories that are competing with the ACP countries in the export of bananas.

The ACP partners are therefore calling on the EU institutions to ensure that sufficiently long adjustment periods are granted to ACP countries, prior to the entry into force of any new agreement that could lead to further erosion of the benefits offered by the current trade regime under which ACP bananas are imported into the EU.

Finally, the ACP countries wish to stress, once again, the imperative need to review the situation in the ACP banana sector, in the light of the new risks to competitiveness as represented by the additional trade benefits proposed by the EC to third states that are rivals of ACP banana-producing countries.

This, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the ACP Group's Statement on Bananas as presented by the Minister of the Economy, Planning and Regional Development of Cameroon.

*Thank you for your kind attention.*

**ACP/67/017/12**

**SEDT/VG/**

**ACP STATEMENT ON COTTON TO THE 37<sup>TH</sup> ACP-EU COUNCIL**

---

DELIVERED BY HONOURABLE EMMANUEL NGANOU DJOUMESSI  
MINISTER OF THE ECONOMY, PLANNING AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF CAMEROON

PORT VILA, VANUATU, 14 JUNE 2012



*Co-Chairs,*

*Honourable Ministers,*

This 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the ACP-EU Joint Council is yet another occasion for us to recognise the opportunity that we have - the ACP Group and the EU – to work together to influence the policies that have an impact on the international cotton market. It is also an opportunity for us to identify the support available for the sector and to make new decisions on the actions to be undertaken to defend a sector in which millions of farmers in ACP countries are becoming increasingly poor. Yet, apart from what we know already, a viable cotton sector also contributes to food security in production areas.

As regards international cotton market policies, we primarily wish to discuss how cotton will be dealt with in the framework of the reform of the EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), and briefly comment on the new US Farm Bill.

We have had the opportunity in other fora to express our deep disappointment regarding the legislative proposals for the post-2013 Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) released by the European Commission on 12 October 2011, which do not accommodate the ACP Group's request to move from 65% to 100% decoupling of domestic support for European Union cotton farmers.

Yet, we have made every effort to explain the need for the European Union to apply a 100% decoupling to domestic subsidies for cotton production in the EU, using the opportunity offered by the current reform of the EU agricultural policy.

We have heard the “constitutional” argument advanced by the European Commission and we are also mindful of the desire to avoid worsening the situation for those European farmers already severely affected by the crisis that is ravaging many European Union countries.

We wish, first of all, to underscore that it is becoming increasingly evident that the European Commission's argument for maintaining the decoupling at 65%, based on the Greek accession protocol (subsequently used for Spain, Portugal and Bulgaria) is weakening since, according to the protocol, the coupled payments which facilitate support for production in the targeted countries were meant to maintain a manufacturing chain in these countries. However, more and more, we are realising that in reality, the vast majority of unprocessed cotton being exported has been produced under these conditions.

It should also be noted that if from a legal standpoint, the coupled payments for cotton are not export subsidies, the current situation indicates that they have a rather similar effect. Finally, we must recall that although the European Commission maintains that European production is residual and accounts for a rather small share of the international market, it appears that the European Union produces as much cotton as a country like Burkina Faso, at a cost which makes it the most highly-subsidised cotton in the world, per kilo produced, excluding the environmental cost involved.

We wish to reiterate our appeal to the European Union to ensure ambitious treatment for cotton by applying 100% decoupling of support for European cotton producers, taking into account the fact that the average decoupling rate in EU agriculture is set at 90%. We call on the EU, in so doing, to identify alternative instruments, other than the coupled support, to assist the European cotton producers, including by providing aid for diversification towards other viable production or activities.

Such an approach would enable us to be in conformity, not only with Article 12 of the Cotonou Agreement, on the Coherence of Community policies and their impact on the implementation of the Agreement, but also with the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Lisbon Treaty), particularly with regard to Article 7 which reaffirms that the EU shall ensure consistency between its policies and activities, taking all of its objectives into account, as well as Article 208, which reaffirms that the EU shall take *“account of the objectives of development cooperation in the policies that it implements, which are likely to affect developing countries.”*

We wish to reassure our European Union partners that the same efforts are being made in respect of the authorities of the United States of America in order for the current reform of the Farm Bill to also be seized as an opportunity to bring their support for the cotton sector into full compliance with the WTO rules and to remove the distortive subsidies granted to their cotton farmers.

In so doing, we commend the continued efforts of the cotton-producing countries to reform the cotton sector internally, including by adopting regional and national strategies to streamline the sustainable development of this sector and its contribution to the economic stability of States, as well as to rural development and food security.

At this point, we would like to quickly address the aspect concerning the support required by the sector. We wish, first of all, to thank the European Union for the new support programme for the cotton sector at the intra-ACP level. We wish to encourage the EU to continue and increase its support for the implementation of the regional and national cotton strategies which have been designed as an effort by ACP cotton-producing countries to demonstrate their own commitment to finding a sustainable response for the competitiveness of their cotton sector.

*Thank you.*

---

**ACP/67/019/12**

**SEDT/VG/**

**ACP STATEMENT ON COCOA TO THE 37<sup>TH</sup> ACP-EU COUNCIL**

---

DELIVERED BY HON. ALHAJI MUHAMMAD MUMUNI,  
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS & REGIONAL INTEGRATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF GHANA

PORT VILA, VANUATU, 14 JUNE 2012

***Co-Presidents,***

***Honourable Ministers,***

The ACP Group has been following ongoing discussions within the European Union with a view to amending *Regulation (EC) 1881/2006, setting maximum levels for certain contaminants in foodstuffs*. It is in this context that earlier this year, a proposal was made for the EU Standing Committee on Food Chain and Animal Health to adopt amendments which include setting new extremely low thresholds for Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) for Cadmium in cocoa and chocolate products within the European Union.

Allow me, first of all, to place on record that the ACP Group will always support any measures designed to achieve a high level of health protection and well-being, particularly for the most fragile segments of the population, especially children. While recognizing the right of the institutions of the EC to take measures to protect human health, it is necessary to preserve the integrity of the decision-making bodies by avoiding actions which are not founded on empirical evidence, suspicious in character, likely to cause dispute, grave and immediate negative socio-economic implications for poor farmers in cocoa producing countries.

In February this year, the ACP Group requested the European Commission to defer its decision on the matter to allow due process for the adoption of the new Maximum Residue Limits within the context of ACP/EU partnership and also to allow adequate time for sound scientific research and data to inform the decision.

Preliminary research findings on the matter strengthened our conviction that adequate time is required to confirm the necessity of having a new regulation on Maximum Residue Limits for Cadmium in cocoa and chocolate products within the European Union. A critical element to be considered in the preliminary research findings is the divergence of views between two highly reputable EU Food Safety control Institutions. Interestingly, while the European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) concluded its findings on the need to reduce exposure to Cadmium at population level by setting a new Maximum Residual Limits for Cadmium in cocoa and chocolate products, the research findings from the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES) concluded that enforcement of new Maximum Residual Limits as proposed by DG Sanco will have no significant impact on consumer exposure.

In addition, an analysis of the research findings indicates that the results were sensitive to the methodology used. It is obvious that consumption patterns of Cadmium might differ, depending on population, age, the country concerned, consumption levels and the type of chocolate products consumed. These varying circumstances could lead to different levels of exposure to Cadmium, through consumption of cocoa and chocolate products.

Consequently, the ACP Group is of the considered opinion that there is the need to ensure proper balance between the necessary and appropriate levels of health protection and the minimum negative impact. Even if the Maximum Residual Limits are envisaged for cocoa powder and chocolate products, they will definitely place a further burden on ACP producers who would have to ensure that the raw materials used in the process are proven "safe" enough for the processors. Undoubtedly, the new regulation will have devastating effects on farmers in ACP countries, without providing guarantees for additional protection for consumers in the EU Member States or any other country.

Given the most likely impact of increased poverty and the absence of any case reports on Cadmium-related health issues caused by the consumption of chocolate and other cocoa products, it is proposed that any decision on the issue be further postponed to allow joint work on setting triggers for necessary and appropriate levels of Cadmium to support an eventual decision on the matter.

Furthermore, the ACP Group recommends additional studies to be conducted to ascertain, more realistically, the effect of Cadmium on human health within different European countries and among different age groups and to adopt a standard methodology in so doing.

An agenda to work towards the reduction of contamination of cocoa beans, especially the environmental sources of contamination as well as the creation of awareness for overexposed populations to change their diet, may be useful.

Should new Maximum Residual Limits be required, it would be necessary to ensure that the limits are set at a level that would not endanger consumers' health, while limiting any negative impact on cocoa trade as far as possible. Furthermore, an appropriate moratorium as prescribed by the Cotonou Agreement would be required before the enforcement of the regulation, in order to reduce the impact.

In conclusion, the ACP Group of States would like to count on the support of the European Union in this important matter.

*Thank you for your attention.*

---

**ACP/67/021/12**

**SEDV/VG/dn**

**ACP STATEMENT ON TOBACCO TO THE 37<sup>TH</sup> ACP-EU COUNCIL**

---

DELIVERED BY H E MRS BRAVE NDISALE  
AMBASSADOR OF MALAWI IN BRUXELLES

PORT VILA, VANUATU, 14 JUNE 2012

*Co-Chairs,  
Honourable Ministers,*

You will recall that when the issue of tobacco was raised for the first time in a Joint ACP-EU Ministerial meeting, it was at the 9<sup>th</sup> Joint Ministerial Trade Committee in 2010. This is to say that our interest here, once again, is on the application of fair and clear trade rules, to allow ACP States to derive appropriate benefits from investments made in the production and trade of a product whose legality has not yet been challenged.

The ACP Group needs to recall that the vast majority of its membership, 74 States out of 79, are signatories to the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control and are supporters of its broad objectives, mainly the need to protect people's health against the consumption of tobacco products.

As we explained during the JMTC meetings, our concerns are related to the adoption of guidelines for certain Articles of the World Health Organisation Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (WHO-FCTC), specifically Articles 9 and 10, which form part of the provisions targeting demand reduction, and Articles 17 and 18, which are expected to identify ways in which the affected tobacco leaf-producing countries can seek economically viable alternative industries to tobacco-growing.

We find ourselves in a situation where actions are being taken, on the one hand, to limit production by requesting the ban of the use of flavours and ingredients in tobacco products to reduce their attractiveness to smokers, while on the other hand, nothing is being done to provide appropriate viable alternatives to the producers and the producing countries.

You will recall that during the 10<sup>th</sup> ACP-EU Joint Ministerial Trade Committee Meeting in December 2011, the ACP Group made a statement underscoring the risk that partial adoption of the guidelines could also pave the way for countries or entities like the EU to now prepare national regulation to enforce the recommendations included in said guidelines. We are pleased to note that the EU has decided, for the time being, not to take any further action in implementing the guidelines for Articles 9 and 10, as adopted at the COP-4. We have noted, nonetheless, that immediately after COP-4 in November 2010, Brazil proposed a piece of legislation modeled on the draft FCTC guidelines, which was passed on 15 March 2012.



The ACP Group is cautioning against the potential implications for several ACP Member States of the finalization of guidelines on Articles 9 and 10 on principles other than those adopted in the FCTC, particularly for their farmers, rural livelihoods, employment, manufacturing sectors, the duty-free segments of their tourism industry, government revenues, and overall trade and development. Indeed, it seems to us that the necessary sound scientific and irrefutable evidence must still be presented by the FCTC or by countries supporting the guidelines for Articles 9 and 10 in their current form, to prove that flavoured tobacco products are more appealing than unflavoured tobacco products, knowing that if this were so, it would be difficult to understand why unflavoured tobacco products are sold in evidently larger quantities than flavoured products.

The ACP Group would like to recall that alternative types of legislation exist which address possible flavour appeal, where only strongly flavoured products with a specific taste are banned, or only a specific short list of flavours is banned, like in EU Member States.

We are deeply concerned that if the guidelines are confirmed and implemented in their current form by the FCTC parties, all the production of Burley and Oriental Tobacco and at least 25% of the production of Virginia Tobacco will completely disappear because it will be impossible to produce flavoured American blends, and ACP countries will be the most negatively affected.

As committed members of the WHO-FCTC, ACP States are mindful of preserving the integrity of its decision-making process and avoiding the risk of any decision taken by the Conference of Parties being met with suspicion, and opening the way for disputes, while provoking serious and immediate adverse economic effects for many ACP countries.

In view of the above, the ACP Group is requesting the support of its EU Partners for the following:

1. To urgently write to the WHO-FCTC Secretariat, in preparation for WHO-FCTC COP-5 to be held in Seoul, from 12 to 17 November 2012:
  - i. to oppose the approval of draft guidelines for Article 6 of the WHO-FCTC and any attempt to impose uniform measures or set values on taxes for all countries, on the grounds that countries must maintain their sovereign right to establish and collect taxes in accordance with their national needs and interests, and that necessary policy space must therefore be given to every State;
  - ii. to oppose the approval of additional guidelines for Articles 9 and 10 of the WHO-FCTC, on the grounds that, among others things, these guidelines are incomplete and that finalising them at this stage would therefore be premature; and

- iii. to issue an urgent call for the identification of adequate policy options on alternative livelihoods to tobacco growing, since the economies of many countries are heavily dependent on the tobacco trade and the current proposals are based on assumptions which are flawed, and the mechanisms referred to therein do not provide support for diversification from tobacco.
2. To advocate for the re-opening of the partial guidelines for Articles 9 and 10 the WHO-FCTC adopted at COP-4, with the aim of renegotiating final guidelines in a more balanced and harmonious manner for the different types of tobacco products, as the guidelines in their current form might violate international trade agreements on technical barriers to trade as they address design and descriptive characteristics instead of addressing product performance.
3. To open discussions with the ACP Secretariat with a view to identifying a support programme under the existing instruments, to assist the ACP countries concerned to formulate and implement, where applicable, an economically sustainable diversification strategy, which offers an alternative to tobacco growing and other options for the use of this product.

I thank you.

---

**ORAL REPORT**  
**ON THE OUTCOME OF THE 21st MEETING**  
**OF THE DEVELOPMENT FINANCE COOPERATION COMMITTEE**  
**(MINISTERS)**  
**HELD IN PORT VILA, 14 JUNE 2012**

**(Presented to the ACP-EU Council of Ministers**  
**Port Vila, 15 June 2012)**

**Mr Co-Chair,**

It is my task to present to you a summary of the results of the 21st meeting of the ACP-EU Development Finance Cooperation Committee, which took place here in Port Vila at Ministerial level on 14 June 2012.

Regarding the main questions, the outcome of the meeting can be summarised as follows:

The Committee started its session by taking note of the **Report of the 27th meeting** of the ACP-EU Development Finance Cooperation Committee, held in Brussels at Authorised Representatives level on 25 April 2012, presented by the EU side on behalf of both Parties. Then it went through the substantial points of the Agenda that I am now presenting.

#### **A. Mid-Term Review of Regional Cooperation and prospects on End of Term Review**

The Commission reported shortly on the state of play of the **Mid-Term Review (MTR) of Regional Cooperation** with a special focus on Intra ACP Cooperation.

The Committee took note of the information provided by the Commission and of the observations made by the ACP Side.

Regarding the Regional MTR, the Committee noted the low implementation rate of the regional programmes, and underlined the importance to maintain a constant dialogue between regional organisations and EU Delegations in order to ensure adequate implementation and that needs be duly taken into consideration.

In relation to the End of Term Review, the Committee invited the Commission to launch a consultation with ACP's Regional Organisations on the guidelines in order to allow them to submit their contributions in due time.

## **B. Increasing the Intra-ACP resources**

Both Parties agreed to take the necessary steps in order to speed up the procedure and make the decision adopted by the ACP-EU Committee of Ambassadors, in line with the provisions of paragraph 6 of Annex 1b to the Cotonou Agreement.

The Committee called on the Co-Secretariat and the Commission to continue their efforts and to submit their results to the Committee of Ambassadors for approval as quickly as possible.

## **C. The Multiannual Financial Framework for post 10th EDF**

The EU side recalled the state of play of the internal discussions in this respect, namely:

- The Commission proposals concerning a possible 11th EDF and the Multiannual Financial Framework for the ACP-EU Cooperation after 2013 have been tabled, but the EU has not yet established its position on either issue.
- It is not settled yet whether ACP-EU cooperation will continue to be financed through a separate fund, as proposed by the Commission, or via the EU budget. As the EU is currently discussing this matter, it is not in a position to give any kind of information on the amount for the cooperation with ACP countries after 2013. Exact figures for the cooperation will not be decided before the end of 2012.

The ACP side expressed its regrets on the delay for the EU to establish its position in this respect. The ACP side has always held the view that in the partnership, the EU has an essential role to play, and political responsibility to assume. While acknowledging the EU's current economic and political difficulties and its past efforts, it remains important to ensure that the recent crises do not call into question the validity of this commitment. This political determination will demonstrate to the rest of the world that in the face of irreversible globalisation challenges, there is still a place and prospects for a true ACP-EU partnership capable of making a contribution and providing a concrete and effective response to attaining the objectives of lasting peace, security and the eradication of poverty.

The Committee took note of the state of play provided by the EU and of the concerns expressed by the ACP side.

#### **D. The EU Development Policy: Agenda or change**

The Commission made a presentation of its Communication on the new approach of EU Development Policy, the 'Agenda for Change', which aims at significantly increasing the impact and effectiveness of EU development cooperation through support of good governance and inclusive and sustainable growth. Special attention will be given to a differentiated approach to partnerships with different countries, greater concentration at country level, innovative financial tools, and stronger alignment to partner countries' strategies.

The EU side furthermore indicated that the principles contained in the Conclusions adopted by the Council of the EU on 14 May 2012 will guide the design and implementation of external action instruments under the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020. It also affirmed that the new approach will not be in contradiction with Article 2 of the Cotonou Agreement. No decision has yet been taken on the application of differentiation to ACP countries.

The ACP side :

- expressed concern with regard to differentiation and strongly recommended that consultations under Article 12 of the Cotonou Agreement be continued on this important issue.
- asked the Commission to refrain from taking any unilateral action that would alter the legal framework of the Cotonou Agreement as signed in June 2010.

In addition, some ACP delegations included suggestions to make special provision for Small Islands Developing States and a request for the challenges faced by Middle Income Countries to be taken into consideration.

The Committee took note of the Commission's presentation, the concerns expressed by the ACP delegations and the position of the EU side.

#### **E. New approach of the EU to Budget Support in favour of third countries,**

The Commission presented the substance of its Communication on Budget Support. This Communication foresees the modernizing of the approach and a move to a contractual relationship that can take the form of good governance and development contracts, sector reform contracts and state-building contracts in fragile and transition situations. The predictability of Budget Support should be improved by using clear, simple and measurable indicators.

More emphasis will be placed on fundamental values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law as well as accountability and transparency.

The EU side recalled that its views on Budget Support are indicated in the Conclusions adopted by the Council on 14 May 2012. Budget Support must be designed and implemented so as to effectively support poverty reduction and promote sustainable development. It must be aligned with country strategies and targeted where it is needed most, where domestic resources are insufficient and where it can have the greatest impact. It should reflect the specific goals, benefits and risks, as well as feasibility in each partner country, in the mix with the other support modalities.

The ACP side recommends that EU Budget Support

- be aligned with the development policies and priorities of the ACP countries;
- be focused on results jointly defined within the framework of policy dialogue; and
- it called upon the European Commission to refrain from taking any unilateral measures and adhere to the legal framework of the Cotonou Agreement.

The Committee took note of the opinion expressed by both sides.

## **F. Modification of Annex II of Cotonou,**

The EIB presented and clarified the technical aspects of the Commission's proposal for amending Annex II chapter 1, of the Cotonou Agreement dealing with the terms and conditions of financing the Investment Facility and the EIB Own Resources. The objective of the proposed Decision is to increase from 10% to 15% the part of the envelope for interest rate subsidies which can be used, by the Bank, for project-related technical assistance.

Both Parties stated their readiness to adopt the decision.

The Committee decided to recommend that the ACP-EU Council adopt this decision.

## **G. Programme of Work for 2012-2013**

**(ACP/81/025/12-ACP-CE 2105/12)**

The Committee adopted its Programme of Work for the biennium 2012-2013.

**Mr Co-Chair,**

This concludes the Report I have had the honour and the pleasure of presenting to you on the 21st meeting of the Ministerial Development Finance Cooperation Committee.

---