



GÖTEBORG UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GLOBAL STUDIES

# Sweden's Policy for Global Development

---

- A paper product or a powerful tool?

Gothenburg University

School of Global Studies

Master thesis in Global Studies

30 HP

Author: Malin Stråle

Supervisor: Lennart Wohlgemuth

Date of submission: 2012-01-27

## **Abstract**

In 2003, the Swedish Policy for Global Development (PGD) was adopted. Through the PGD, Sweden has made a very strong, ambitious and quite unique commitment that all policy areas should comply with the goal of an equitable and sustainable global development. To achieve this, a poor peoples' perspective on development and a rights perspective should permeate the actions by all actors involved in the fulfillment of the PGD.

The aim of this study is to further contribute with empirical data to the field of research regarding the relevance and impact of the PGD on Swedish policies and its implementation. In order to narrow down the field of investigation, the focus has been on trade and migration, as they are two policy areas identified by the Swedish government as crucial for combating poverty and areas in which Swedish policies can have an impact on global development.

The research has been realized through interviews with administrative officials at the Government Offices working with the PGD, in general as well as in the areas of trade and migration. To complement these discussions, interviews with experts from civil society have also been conducted. Together with secondary material in the form of reports on Swedish and EU performance, the interviews form the base of the study. The research takes its standpoint in a theoretical framework of policy coherence for development.

The results indicate that there are positive progresses in terms of greater institutionalization of the PGD and an increased awareness on the importance of development issues across the areas of migration and trade as well as on a general basis. However, great challenges still remain in strengthening the institutional structures, political commitment and analytical capacity in order for the PGD to truly achieve its value as a guiding principle across all Swedish policy areas. A continuous dialogue on what constitutes development and how to best achieve it is furthermore required.

Key words: Swedish Policy for Global Development (PGD), trade, migration, EU, policy coherence, development, rights perspective, perspectives of the poor

## **Acknowledgments**

For this master thesis I owe recognition and appreciation to a number of people. First, I would like to extend my gratitude to the respondents who took precious time from their daily work to let me interview them and thereby enabled this research. I would also like to extend a very humble thank you to my supervisor Lennart Wohlgemuth for ever so kindly guiding me through the process of thesis writing.

Without the constant love and support from my family and friends, this thesis would never have been completed. Through both loving moral support as well as exchange of ideas, you have all been my heroes. Thank you.

## Abbreviations

ACP	- African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States
CONCORD	- European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development (plus Swedish platform)
CSO	- Civil Society Organization
EBA	- Everything But Arms
ECDPM	- European Centre for Development Policy Management
EEAS	- European External Action Service
EPA	- Economic Partnership Agreements
EU	- European Union
GAM	- Global Approach to Migration
GCIM	- Global Commission on International Migration
GDP	- Gross Domestic Product
GFMD	- Global Forum for Migration and Development
GSP	- Generalized System of Preferences
LDC	- Least Developed Countries
MIC	- Middle Income Countries
OECD	- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECD-DAC	- The Development Assistance Committee of Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCD	- Policy Coherence for Development (EU)
PGD	- Swedish Policy for Global Development
SADEV	- Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation
UN	- United Nations
UNCTAD	- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNHCR	- United Nations Refugee Agency
WTO	- World Trade Organization

# Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	6
1.1 Aim.....	8
1.2 Research question .....	8
1.3 Disposition.....	8
1.4 Background and previous research .....	9
1.4.1 A new beginning.....	11
1.4.2 Trade.....	12
1.4.3 Migration .....	13
1.4.4 Previous research .....	14
2 Method .....	15
2.1 Literary sources .....	16
2.2 Interviews.....	17
2.3 Delimitations .....	20
3 Theoretical Framework .....	21
4 Results .....	26
4.1 Migration.....	26
4.2 Trade.....	32
4.3 PGD in general.....	38
4.3.1 Strong political commitment.....	39
4.3.2 Institutional co-ordination .....	41
4.3.3 Analytical capacity .....	44
4.4 The EU .....	48
5 Analysis and final discussion .....	50
5.1 Migration.....	51
5.2 Trade.....	52
5.3 PGD in general .....	54
5.4 Future research .....	58
List of References .....	59

# 1 Introduction

”Policy coherence is not an academic or an intellectual issue. It’s not a technical or administrative matter. It is about the possibility to work in a direction towards a vision that poverty can be eradicated, unjust structures can be combated, people can have influence over their own lives and human beings, women and men, girls and boys, having the right to a life of dignity. So we have to keep in mind what this is all about.” (Nilsson 2006)

In the last decade, global issues such as climate changes, recurrent economic crises, migration, the war on terrorism, etc. have pushed the limits for what development is, as well as how it should and can be achieved. Different political areas are forever intertwined and what were once national political decisions are now recognized as having international implications and vice versa. Regionally in Europe, the influence of the EU’s regional politics over its national members’ is now stronger than ever in terms of issues such as trade, agriculture, security and migration. In the last years, economic crises have been shaking the outmost foundation of the European Union. Simultaneously, the economic geography of the world is rapidly being restructured as new economic actors are taking place on the international arena (UNCTAD 2011, p. 44-46). China, India and Brazil are just some of the new important actors both in relation to traditional economic and political dominants such as the US and Europe but also in relation to increased South-to-South co-operation. Similarly, the “new geography of poverty” is being discussed as more countries have risen above the definition of Low Income Countries (LDC) and become Middle Income Countries (MIC) (Kanbur & Sumner 2011). Poor people, usually considered to be rural population in LDC’s, are now becoming more and more urbanized and living in MIC’s. Poor are now increasingly present even in countries traditionally considered as Middle or High Income Countries.

All in all, these changes have altered the view on how to achieve development. Instead of isolating development aid from other policy areas, the concept of coherence has grown stronger in the last decades. The OECD recognizes that aid is still important but that “mutually supportive policies across a wide range of economic, social and environmental issues” (OECD April 2010) are essential in order to ever fulfill the global goals of international development. How coherence should be interpreted and implemented are however still in debate. Different countries have chosen different approaches on how to tackle the concept of coherence.

In 2005, the European Consensus on Development was adopted wherein Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) is embedded (European Commission: Policy Coherence for

Development). 12 policy areas were highlighted as priority in which to achieve coherence in order to reach the Millennium Development Goals. In 2009, the PCD was re-focused into five priority areas. Even though the policy is in place, much effort is still required until the policy is truly implemented and effects can be seen in terms of substantial results (Concord Europe 2011, p.7). The internal interests of the EU are still at times at collision with global development interest. However, to achieve global development can also be seen as an enlightened self-interest. Birgit Schnieber-Jastram, the Standing Rapporteur for Policy Coherence for Development in the European Parliament, writes in the foreword to the latest *Spotlight on EU Policy Coherence for Development* by Concord Europe that “I think that in order to guarantee Europe’s long-term success in a fast-changing world, we will probably have to sacrifice some special interests”. (Concord Europe 2011 p.5)

Swedish foreign policies are strongly intertwined with the European Union. Much development cooperation aid is channeled through the EU and issues of security, trade, migration, agriculture, etc. are entirely or partially decided upon an EU-level. Sweden was nevertheless a forerunner in terms of policy coherence by the adoption of the holistic approach of the Swedish Policy for Global Development (PGD) already in 2003. Through the PGD, Sweden has made a very strong, ambitious and quite unique commitment that all policy areas should comply with the goal of an equitable and sustainable global development. The Swedish PGD has also to a certain extent been an inspiration to other countries as well as the EU in adopting strategies for policy coherence for development. Nevertheless, committing to such a broad policy will, and has, also opened up for critique both in terms of the success of implementation as well as of the actual political commitment.

When I started my university studies in 2004, the PGD was still new and exciting. It was presented as something that could revolutionize how Sweden perceived development and how to achieve it, as well as set an example on the international agenda. Nevertheless, over the following years, there have been numerous accounts by Swedish and international civil society organizations demonstrating that there are still contradictions in what policy coherence for development is meant to achieve and how. The civil society therefore argues that the PGD is still far from successful. Even though in some aspects and circles there is still a vivid debate regarding the PGD, there are other indicators that the awareness of PGD is to some extent falling into oblivion. Because of these mixed messages, my interest was awoken into investigating the relevance and current status of the Swedish Policy for Global Development.

## **1.1 Aim**

The aim of this research is therefore to further contribute to the field of research regarding the relevance and impact of the PGD, in terms of coherence and implementation of Swedish development policies on other policy areas. In order to narrow down the field of the investigation, the focus will be on trade and migration, as they are two policy areas identified by the Swedish government as crucial for combating poverty and areas in which Swedish policies can have an impact on global development. The analysis will be made through interviews of current and previous official administrators at the Ministries in question, along with interviews with representatives from Swedish civil society organizations. Combined with the material found in previous reports by international institutions such as the OECD, CSOs as well as the actual PGD and the following communications by the Government, I am hoping to create a better picture on the relevance and impact of the PGD.

## **1.2 Research question**

The research question of this master thesis is:

*What relevance and impact has the Swedish Policy for Global Development had on Swedish policies and the implementation thereof, in general and in particular on migration and trade since its initiation until today?*

## **1.3 Disposition**

The chapter *Background and Previous Research* gives a brief introduction to the development of the Swedish Policy on Global Development from its initiation until today as well as the issues of trade and migration in relation to the PGD. The chapter also places this study in the context of previous research made. After this, the chapter *Method* is presented in which I describe the methodological choices made. Following the chapter on method is a chapter on the *Theoretical Framework* of policy coherence of development used as a theoretical base in this study.

The chapter named *Results* is divided under the three sub-headings: *Migration, Trade and PGD in general*. In this section I present the results of the interviews conducted, combined with the findings from the literary sources. Finally, the chapter *Analysis & Final discussion* is presented in which my results are reviewed and discussed in relation to the theoretical

framework and the research question that has guided this thesis. Some final thoughts regarding the research as well as future possible research topics are also included.

#### **1.4 Background and previous research**

Swedish international development aid took its beginning in 1962 with the proposition 1962:100 following a period of enhanced international solidarity during the end of the 1950's and the beginning of the 1960's (Danielson & Wohlgemuth 2005 p. 519-521). However, it soon became evident that aid was not enough to address the global development issues of poverty but that other political areas had just as an important part to play, both in not reversing the effects of aid but also to advance the combat against poverty. Thoughts regarding consistency within and between all political areas were evoked already during the 1970's but did not form into concrete actions or policies until later (Odén & Lundquist 2007, p. 5).

The same concerns were of course also discussed internationally and for instance the OECD-DAC has been an important institution in establishing the term "policy coherence for development". The first initiative was taken in 1991 and in 1996 they acknowledged policy coherence to be the key to achieve more effective development co-operation (Odén & Lundquist 2007, p. 2). The discussion has then been further elaborated in various documents and OECD-DAC has ever since been one of the strongest advocates for policy coherence for development.

In Sweden, questions about consistency and joint political action were raised again in the light of the elaboration of the Millennium Development Goals. In 1999, a parliamentary committee, the Globkom, was created to investigate how to create a Swedish policy on global development. The result of the Globkom was a report on how Sweden could contribute to an equitable and sustainable development by both its development aid as well as by creating coherence within all other political areas to support the developmental goals (SOU 2001:96). Following the report, the Social Democratic Government presented the bill *Shared Responsibility – Sweden's Policy for Global Development* (PGD) (Gov. bill 2002/03:122) in 2003, which was later adopted, with some amendments, through a consensus by all the political parties in the Swedish Parliament. The overarching aim of the PGD is that all policy areas, not just aid, shall contribute to an *equitable and sustainable global development* (Gov. bill 2002/03:122 p. 7&19). In other words, synergies between different political areas as well as

conflicts of interest should be identified in order to ensure that all political areas, within their separate fields, will strive towards an equitable and sustainable global development. The motive is solidarity with poor people in the world (Gov. bill 2002/03:122 p.18) It is further stated that:

“A rights perspective will permeate the policy, which means that the measures taken towards equitable and sustainable development are compatible with respect for human rights.

The policy will also be based on the perspectives of the poor, which means that poor people’s needs, interests, capacity and conditions should be a point of departure in efforts to achieve equitable and sustainable development (Gov. bill 2002/03:122 p. 19)

The whole-of-government approach, emphasizing such a strong standpoint stating that all policy areas should work for an equitable and sustainable global development, has positioned Sweden at the vanguard of international development co-operation. Many countries and international institutions have therefore shown great interest in the progress and implementation of the PGD. Furthermore, the increased coherence perspective should also permeate Sweden’s policies and actions in regards to bilateral and multilateral institutions such as the UN, the EU and other international institutions. As an increasing part of Sweden’s development cooperation as well as political decisions affecting poor people are made through the EU, it is stated that Sweden shall act for that EU in its politics takes full responsibility for an equitable and sustainable global development (Gov. bill 2002/03: 122 p.15-17).

Since the initiation of the PGD, the Government has had an obligation to report on the progress and results in a Communication to the Parliament every year. The frequency of reporting was later changed to every second year. In parallel to these Communications, shadow-reports have also been published by a coalition of Swedish CSO’s in which they grade the performance of the Government in complying with the PGD. In parallel, there have also been various academic researches as well as reports by CSOs regarding the PGD in general or specific topics and their relation to the PGD. OECD-DAC has also performed two Peer Reviews (2005 and 2009) as well as a mid-term review (2011) on the development co-operation efforts of Sweden, in which evaluations of the progress of the PGD were included (this will be further presented in the chapter *Results*).

In 1992, the Maastricht Treaty of the European Union established the development co-operation policy of the EU and thereby presented the three C’s: coherence, co-ordination and complementarity (Odén & Lundquist 2007, p. 6). With the Maastricht Treaty, a legal

requirement was made on the European Community of the time to increase the coherence aspects of the policies promoting development (Keijzer 2010, p. v). As previously mentioned, the European Commission, the European Council and the European Parliament adopted the European Consensus for Development in December 2005 in which the principles for Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) were established (European Think-tank group, 2010, p. xii). As part of this, 12 policy areas were given priority in the work towards the fulfillment of the Millennium Development Goals. However, inspired by Sweden (see *A new beginning*), the PCD was in 2009 restructured into five priority areas, namely: trade and finance, climate change, food security, migration and security in order to make the policy more feasible and measurable (European Commission: Policy Coherence for Development). Policy coherence for development (PCD) was later made a treaty requirement through article 208 in the Lisbon Treaty (Concord Europe, 2011, p.11&17) The Lisbon Treaty, which entered into force in December 2009, regulates the fundamental functioning and cooperation of the European Union (Europa-Lissabonfördraget). Through the Lisbon treaty the obligation of the PCD was therefore extended to the whole of the European Union. Article 188D in the treaty states that: “The Union shall take account of the objectives of development cooperation in the policies that it implements which are likely to affect developing countries” (in Keijzer 2010, p. v).

A report on the progress of the EU PCD is published every two years, making the report of 2011 the third one presented (EU 2011 Report on Policy Coherence for Development, p. 9). However, a general established view is that the European policy coherence for development has still “remained more of an aspiration than a reality” (European Think-tank group 2010, p. xii).

#### **1.4.1 A new beginning**

Even though Sweden has been praised for the initiative of adopting such a far-reaching policy, the various national and international reports already mentioned have exposed that there has still existed a lack of political ownership, lack of implementation strategies as well as a general lack of knowledge of the practical significance of the PGD perspective for the policy to be truly successful. In order to address this critique, the current coalition government announced an updated version of the PGD in March 2008 (Gov. communication 2007/08:89 p. 8). This “new start” as it was called, *Global Challenges – Our Responsibility*, is meant to further concretize the PGD and to launch a renewed engagement, as well as an increased

effectiveness, in the implementation of the perspectives of the PGD within all policy areas. The Government Communication of 2010 states that

“Events in recent years have clearly shown how meeting these global challenges are vital to development in the world, and particularly for the extent to which people are able to improve their lives in developing countries. It has become clear that all policy areas and policy instruments at the Government’s disposal must be used in a coherent and cohesive way to ensure that Sweden’s contribution to global development is as effective as possible. The Government is constantly striving to resolve conflicts between objectives and to address synergies between policy areas – in Sweden, the EU and the international arena alike – in such a way that the developmental impact of government policy as a whole is enhanced.” (Gov. communication 2009/10:129 p. 5)

The new start of the policy establishes that Sweden’s policy for global development is based on two pillars: effective development co-operation and a coherence policy (Gov. communication 2009/10:129, p. 4). The work for an equitable and sustainable global development shall still be guided by a poor people’s perspective on development, meaning “the needs, circumstances, interests and priorities of poor women, men and children” and the human rights perspective, implying the principles of “non-discrimination, participation, openness, transparency, responsibility and accountability” (Gov. Offices web-site, Sweden’s Policy for global development).

In order to further concretize and make the efforts more efficient, the different focal areas were concentrated into six main global challenges. These six challenges are believed to be vital to address in order to achieve an equitable and sustainable global development. They are moreover areas in which Sweden is expected to have an impact on global development. The six challenges are oppression, economic exclusion, climate change and environmental impact, migration flows, communicable diseases and other health threats and finally conflict and fragile situations. (Gov. Communication 2007/08:89). Within each of these challenges, three focal areas are identified.

Since the initiation of the new start, one more Government Communication has been published in 2010 and the next is due this year 2012.

#### **1.4.2 Trade**

Trade, and more specifically free trade, has ever since the original PGD of 2003 been considered as crucial for poverty reduction and for achieving an equitable and sustainable global development. This has also permeated the new start of 2008. According to the 2010

trade policy declaration presented by the Minister of Trade Ewa Björling, export trade represents about half of the Swedish GDP (The Swedish Trade Policy Declaration 2010, p.1). Free trade and investments are considered to be crucial for the economic growth and welfare of Sweden but also as means for the global combat against poverty, as well as the promotion of human rights, peace and stability around the world (Ibid). In the new start of 2008, trade falls into the global challenge of economic exclusion and is enhanced as vital for global development. The private sector is highlighted as essential in their role as “drivers of growth” (Gov. communication 2008, p. 20 & 23-25).

Much of the regulations regarding trade are no longer subject to national decisions but decided upon at an EU-level. Free trade agreements and association agreements are being negotiated on a bilateral and regional level between EU and other countries and groups of countries (The Swedish trade policy declaration 2010, p. 5). According to the Swedish trade declaration, the role of Sweden within the EU is to ensure “as ambitious, comprehensive and beneficial free trade agreements as possible, respecting the developmental level of the partner countries.” (Ibid, p.5)

### **1.4.3 Migration**

By 2010 there were around 214 million international migrants in the world (International organization for migration, Facts and figures). Approximately 90% of them were considered to be migrant workers and their families (Concord Europe 2011, p. 59). In addition to this, 15.4 million people were considered to be refugees and 27.5 million internally displaced. In 2010, migrants were estimated to have sent \$440 billion to their home countries through remittances. \$325 billion of these remittances were sent to developing countries (International Organization for Migration, Facts and figures). The majority of all migrants and refugees remain in their neighboring countries, which are often developing countries themselves. Figures from 2010 furthermore estimate that the EU hosts approximately 31.8 million immigrants (Concord Europe 2011, p. 57). Migration was identified already in the original PGD as important for global development and was subsequently identified as one of the six challenges in the new start. In the PGD of 2003, it was stated that migration is a question of development, both for the country of origin as well as the receiving country as people migrate to other countries in order to work, for education or for research (Gov. bill 2002/03:122 p. 39-40). The creation of international regulations of migration is therefore essential to ensure that all parties benefit from migration and to ensure the rights of the immigrant.

In the 2008 new start, three focal areas were identified: *labour immigration to Sweden and the EU, remittances and the transfer of skills and knowledge to developing countries*, as well as *protection and durable solutions for refugees*. It was also acknowledged that migration is a complex area and that coherent actions across different policy areas are therefore essential. Actions regarding climate change, poverty reduction, security and defense to resolve conflicts, development cooperation, trade, exchange of education and research, etc., are all issues related to migration. For example conflict resolution might prevent people from having to leave their home countries due to conflicts, just as environmental politics can prevent negative environmental impacts that force people to migrate (Gov. communication 2007/08:89).

The European Union is currently working on a new common migration policy (European Commission Home Affairs (a)). At the moment, EU's Global Approach to Migration (GAM) is the strategic framework for the external dimension of migration. It is based on three overarching goals: improving the organization of legal migration and mobility, preventing and reducing irregular migration in an efficient yet human way and finally strengthening the synergies between migration and development. The protection of asylum-seekers and refugees as well as the rights and dignity of migrants are also said to be central element of the Global Approach to Migration (European Commission Home Affairs (b)).

#### **1.4.4 Previous research**

As formerly mentioned, there have been various academic research as well as advocacy reports by a number of Swedish and European CSO's regarding the performance of policy coherence for development both at a Swedish level as well as at a European level. Some, such as the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), OECD-DAC Peer Reviews for both the EU and for Sweden, Concord's Spotlight on coherence reports for Europe and the Coherence Barometer for Sweden, have focused on policy coherence on a general level or on specific countries or cases. Academic researchers that are often mentioned when speaking of policy coherence for development are Forster & Stokke, Piciotto and Hoebink. Swedish researchers include Odén & Lundquist, Hydén and Odén & Wohlgemuth. Others have focused on specific topics in order to highlight the existent or non-existent coherence with the PGD. Some of this research will be further drawn upon in the chapters *Theoretical Framework* and *Result*. By focusing on the perceived experiences of the impact of the PGD by the administrative officials working closest to the formation of the policies, combined with literary primary and secondary material regarding policy coherence for

development on both Swedish and European level, I am hoping that this research will contribute with empirical research and yet another piece of the puzzle.

## **2 Method**

A qualitative research method has been used as this was considered to be the most appropriate in order to encapsulate the research question. Qualitative methods put an emphasis on processes (Bryman 2008:394) which is the theme of this research as the aim is to investigate how the process of implementing and working with the PGD in different policy areas have developed over time and its impact today. Primary sources are used in form of the interviews conducted as well as official Government documents. Reports published by various researchers and institutions as well as CSOs constitute the secondary material. Primary sources are always preferable to secondary sources as the later always imply the risk of reaching data that is biased, misinterpreted or simply collected with another purpose in mind than the research you will conduct (Esaiasson et al 2009, p.319). The validity of the study is however increased by using various sources that each contributes to the question posed.

The semi-structured in-depth interviews conducted with key respondents are as mentioned primary sources and form the main foundation for the analysis. This is also in line with qualitative research methods which use the perspectives of those being studied as the point of orientation instead of the investigator's (Bryman 2008:393). Similarly, an open approach has been used as the concepts drawn from the theory as well as previous research and accounts of political events will work as guidance for the focus of the interview questions, but not in order to apply a highly structured research guide (Bryman 2008:394). The point is to capture the interviewee's views on the process of the PGD (see *Interviews*). The interviews are complemented by primary and secondary literary materials which form the background as well as part of the analyzed material (see *Literary sources*).

A research can never be fully generalized and even less so a qualitative research where the analysis is based on a limited number of interviews and documents (Bryman 2008:391). Some writers claim that there are generalizations made, or rather moderatum generalizations which are more limited and tentative than quantitative research (Bryman 2008:392). However, the study do not pretend to draw any all-embracing general conclusions but hope to highlight some indicators that will be valuable as a contribution to the puzzle of the implications of the PGD on current Swedish politics.

Another critique against qualitative research is a lack of transparency on how the conclusions of a study are reached (Bryman 2008:392). I hope to avoid this critique by, as thoroughly as possible, explain the steps of my research and the data used for my analysis in order to increase the reliability of the study.

The aim of this research is not to evaluate the exact impact of the PGD on the areas of migration and trade down to the very final effects on the field of a certain policy decision as this would have required more extensive resources and a different focus. The idea is rather to see how the administrative officials working closely with the PGD on a policy level perceive the impact and relevance of the policy on Swedish policies in general and on their particular field, combined with the points of views presented by the CSOs on the progress made. The original intent was to use trade and migration as the focal areas for this research and through it highlight general aspects concerning the PGD. However, while collecting material and performing the interviews, it became apparent that much of the respondents answer concerned general aspects of the PGD rather than merely focusing on trade and migration. Due to this, the study will still use trade and migration as exemplifying areas of the impact of the PGD, but a re-design has been necessary to give the general aspects much more space and consideration. As both trade and migration are complex fields covering many different policy areas ranging from agricultural aspects, to investments, to labour issues, to financial issues, etc., it has not been possible to include every single aspect. The choice was made to focus mainly on the perspectives arisen in the interviews and these have in turn been limited according to what is described in *Interviews*.

## **2.1 Literary sources**

The literary sources used are primary sources in form of official Government documents such as the Government bill “Swedish Policy for Global Development” (2002/03:122) as well as the Government communications following that. The Government communication of 2008 (2007/08:89) that was launched as a “new start” and the last Government communication 2009/10:129 have formed the basis for the summary of the objectives as well as the lineation of the results achieved. These have formed the main sources for information of what has happened on a Swedish level in terms of the PGD and in relation to migration and trade. Furthermore, secondary sources such as other evaluation reports have been studied, for example reports on EU-coherence and the OECD-DAC Peer Reviews on Sweden (2005, 2009). To broaden the picture and to gain insight in some critical aspects of policy coherence,

secondary sources such as the Coherence Barometers published by a coalition of Swedish CSOs within Concord Sweden have been included. These have been used in order to capture a critical view of some of the issues that might not be highlighted in the reports published by the Government itself.

As much of Swedish politics regarding trade and migration now occur on an EU-level, the study has therefore related to Sweden's acting in these negotiations. Due to the limitations of a master thesis, I have had to rely on secondary sources for information and evaluation of actions and measures on an EU-level. As the focus of the thesis did not lie on the evaluation of the effects of the measures taken by the EU, this was not perceived to be a problem. The main sources were reports by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) and Concord Europe. Two reports, "Spotlight on policy coherence" by Concord Europe, a network of more than 1600 European INGO: s, were also used to provide further information of the challenges of European coherence policies.

The critique against using reports such as the Coherence Barometer and Spotlight on Policy Coherence might be that they represent certain aspects of policy coherence based on the interests of the organizations in question. However, a similar argument can be made as the official communications and reports published by the Government might present an equally slanted image in order to highlight the positive aspects of their work. The two might consequently therefore complement one another.

## **2.2 Interviews**

As it was important for the study to focus on the perceived processes of integrating the PGD on a general policy level, a random selection of respondents could not be made but rather a purposive sample had to be used in which key persons were identified (Repstad 1999: 67). Administrative officials were chosen as they are responsible for preparing the material for the politicians as well as to implement the political decisions taken. They are therefore likely to have good insight in the process and impact of the PGD. The respondents were consequently elected according to their area of expertise at the Government Offices, within the area of development or the particular field of migration and trade. As the aim was to gain insight into the views of how the PGD is being used and implemented as well as conflicts of interests and negotiations, it was important to get the views both from officials working at the Department of Development Policy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as officials at the department

of International Trade and the Ministry of Justice. The choice was also made to interview people who were currently working or had previously worked with the general overview and coordination of the PGD, in order to gain a perspective of the development of the PGD over time. In addition to this, two interviews were performed with representatives from two civil society organizations with the purpose of getting yet another, perhaps more critical, view on Sweden's performance regarding policy coherence for development. By interviewing people with different points of departure at different departments as well as representatives from CSOs, the intent is to increase both the validity and the reliability of the results of the study. All in all, eleven respondents were interviewed. The main focus in the research has been on the interviews with administrative officials.

The interviews were semi-structured in depth interviews. Semi-structured interviews allow the researcher to guide the interview while at the same time opening up for new aspects presented by the respondent either regarding the research topic in itself or unforeseen aspects of the questions posed (Bryman 2008:393). The challenge is of course to strike a balance between guiding the interview in order to gain the information needed, without entering into aspects completely out of the research field, while at the same time being perceptive for new interesting aspects. In order to gain this balance, the questions were grouped under different headings. This allowed me to keep track on the different important aspects that I wanted to grasp while at the same time allowing for the respondent's interpretation of the issue (Repstad 1999: 64f).

Four of the interviews were performed over the phone, the rest through personal meetings. The length of the interviews varied due to the time available. The interviews lasted between 30-60 minutes, with the majority around 45 minutes. This of course had the implication that not all the questions could be posed to all the respondents but rather had to focus on the main aspects of interest in that particular interview. In an ideal world, more respondents would have been interviewed from other Ministries such as the Ministry for Rural Affairs, the Ministry of for Employment, etc. and also authorities such as the Migration Board and the National Board of Trade, politicians both in Government as well as in opposition. However, due to delimitations of the study itself and the time constrains of a master thesis for contacting and making arrangements within respondent's busy schedules, especially with the end of the year coming up, I appreciate the respondents that actually took time. Similarly, ideally the interviews could have been twice the length but as the people interviewed had limited time at their disposal, I felt constrained to push it too far. However, as the answers given often turned

out to point in the same direction, I still feel that I achieved a satisfactory level of knowledge regarding the issues (Esaiasson 2009 p. 260). On a few occasions, additional calls were made to the respondents in order to clarify on certain issues brought up during the interviews. Together with material collected through the literary sources, I am hoping to be able to paint as an accurate picture as possible.

The question of anonymity proved to be a challenge in this thesis. Three of my respondents required to be anonymous which had the implication that all respondents had to be made anonymous. Anonymity is not only the absence of names but implies that the answers are non-traceable to the respondent in question which was specifically required by one of the respondents. Due to the fact that there are only a limited number of persons interviewed and that they are all working in a limited field with close relations between one another, it has been very difficult to acquire this and has required a lot of effort. A few of the respondents required to see the quotes and accounts used from their interviews, which proved positive as it increased the reliability of their answers. In retro perspective, complete anonymity should perhaps never have been offered to the respondents as this has also affected the transparency of the results of this thesis. However, the respondents who did not require anonymity might on the other hand have felt restricted in their ability to speak freely which can also prove a restriction to the study.

As taking notes can prove a challenge both in regards to keeping focus on the conversation and new aspects being introduced by the respondent as well as in the accuracy of the quotations, it was important to use a tape-recorder during the interviews conducted face-to-face. All those respondents agreed of a tape-recorder being used.

All the interviews were transcribed either from the recorded data or immediately from the notes taken during telephone-interviews as immediate transcription facilitates the reliability of the answers given. As the interviews were held in Swedish, they had to be translated to English in the report. As this is consistent throughout the report, it has not been stated in relation to every quote but instead clearly accounted for it here in the section about interviews. Furthermore, for the sake of comprehension, all the little speech pauses, inconsistent accessory sentences and humming sounds that form part of a natural conversation but are not relevant for the messages that the respondents are trying to communicate, have been removed. Longer removed passages are marked with brackets (...).

## 2.3 Delimitations

As the Swedish policy for global development is such a vast topic in itself, many different points of departure for investigating this field could have been chosen. However, given the limited time frame as well as resources for a master thesis, strict delimitations were necessary. The two areas of migration and trade were chosen due to that they are two of the policy areas highlighted as particularly important in the PGD. Especially the later has furthermore been an issue of constant debate by CSOs. It would have been interesting to include more areas; however this would not have been feasible. To have two rather than one will however allow for some kind of comparison to be made. Even within the two areas migration and trade, delimitations had to be made. The two areas cover many different aspects directly or indirectly, such as agricultural policies, private trade and industry, raw material policies, integration policies, climate change policies, etc. To include all of this would have required twice the amount of time and number of words of this thesis. However, as a broader view of the challenges of if and how the PGD permeates Swedish politics was sought after, the choice was made not to focus the research on one specific aspect like for instance the regulations of Swedish pension fund investments, or EU fishery policies but rather on the more general level of policy development and implementation. As previously described, the research will focus on the impact of the PGD as perceived by the respondents and have therefore been guided to a large extent by the topics raised during the interviews. It would have been interesting to follow the results of the PGD all the way down to the agencies, companies, organizations and eventually the poor people affected by it. However, this sort of massive undertaking would have required additional human and financial resources, as well as time, which is not at my disposal.

The study focuses on policy coherence within in the Swedish two-pillar development policy. Development assistance and policy coherence are closely related as the idea is that all policy areas should work in the direction of global development and in line with, or at least not in contradiction, to development assistance. In some sections aspects of aid will briefly be mentioned when this seems relevant; however, the research focuses on policy coherence.

### 3 Theoretical Framework

There are various definitions of coherence depending on the topic discussed. The concept of coherence has for instance been used in the academic field of physics explaining “the ‘constant phase relationship’ of waves” or in philosophy stating “the truth of a proposition consists in the coherence of that proposition with all other true propositions”. (Picciotto, R. 2004, p.4)

However, the concept of coherence is still in the process to be thoroughly defined within the social sciences and a single clear definition and theory is still therefore somewhat difficult to find (Picciotto 2005, p. 9, OECD 2005, p. 27). The synthesis of this theoretical framework is therefore created with the help of previous discussions on the different theoretical orientations as well as practical implications of policy coherence for development. Coherence is of course not limited only to the development sphere but can be applied internally or between various other policy areas (Forster & Stokke 1999, p. 23-24). When talking about policy coherence, the essential question is therefore for whom and for what policy coherence is to be achieved? (OECD 2005, p. 28). Even though policy coherence could be applied to any policy formation and implementation, and with whichever goal, the concept is today however often strongly associated with the development agenda and in this research will be used as such. In accordance with the process of better defining policy coherence for development, both as a tool and as a theory, the website “International Platform on Policy Coherence for Development” was launched by the OECD in November 2011. The platform is to be used as an interactive tool to which different stakeholders such as OECD members, CSOs, the private sector, researchers and partner countries can contribute for a further advancement of the concept and its application (OECD: Better Policies for Development). The launch of the platform can be seen as symptomatic for the whole discussion of policy coherence for development as the concept as a theory and the concept as a tool is developed simultaneously. The OECD has also played a pivotal role in this process as they have been able to synthesize the progresses made by drawing on the experiences of their members. Through these experiences and through the incorporation of academic research on the field, the OECD has also been able to function as an enhancer of further advancement.

The idea of policy coherence for development has been present ever since aid was first introduced (Forster & Stokke 1999, p.2). It emerged from a rationale to increase the effects of aid and to avoid the effects of conflicting interests and values that might affect negatively on

aid. The OECD recognizes that development assistance is not enough to reach the Millennium Development Goals but that other financial flows and consequently other policy areas are equally, if not more, important (OECD 2005, p. 30). However, those very same conflicting interests, both at national and international level, combined with political systems with subsystems, creates great obstacles for a complete coherence to ever be achieved. (Forster & Stokke 1999, p. 3) Much of the recent discussion around policy coherence, and in particular policy coherence for development, began with the high-level DAC meeting in 1991 and the Maastricht Treaty of 1992. The interest for policy coherence is based on two aspects: effectiveness and quality. *Effectiveness* to improve the effects of development aid, and *quality* to make sure that potential cases of interference and incompatibility are identified, as well as enhancing the complementarity between different policies (ECDPM & ICEI, p.14). However, within the Maastricht Treaty as well as other documents, there is sometimes a tendency to equal coherence with consistency, which Pablo Aguiar Molina argues is a mistake. Molina refers to Tietje who argues that:

“[...] coherence and consistency are by no means identical concepts: they in fact have very different meanings. Consistency in law is the absence of contradictions; coherence on the other hand refers to positive connections. Moreover coherence in law is a matter of degree, whereas consistency is a static concept. Concepts of law can be more or less coherent, but they cannot be more or less consistent – they are either consistent or not” (Tietje 1997, p.212 in Molina, Undated, p. 242)

Jacques Forster and Olav Stokke defines a coherent policy as

“a policy whose objectives, within a given policy framework, are internally consistent and attuned to objectives pursued within other policy frameworks of the system- as a minimum, these objectives should not be conflicting; where strategies and mechanisms are attuned to the objectives, they should, as a minimum, not conflict with the objectives or with the intentions and motives on which these are based; and where the outcome is corresponding to the intentions and objectives, it should, as a minimum, not conflict with these” (Forster y Stokke 1999, p. 23-24).

OECD-DAC was originally focusing mainly on the synergies of policy coherence when they in 2001 stated that “Policy coherence... involves the systematic promotion of mutually reinforcing policies across government departments and agencies creating synergies towards achieving the defined objective” (quoted in OECD 2005, p. 27) and further continued in the DAC Journal, *Development Co-operation 2001 Report* that:

“Policy coherence means different policy communities working together in ways that result in more powerful tools and products for all concerned. It means looking for synergies and complementarities and filling gaps, between different policy areas to meet common and shared objectives” (OECD 2005, p. 27).

However, a broad unofficial working definition later acknowledged that policy coherence is not only about creating synergies but also avoiding contradictory, negative effects.

“Policy Coherence for Development means working to ensure that the objectives and results of a government’s (or institution’s) development policies are not undermined by other policies of that government (or institution), which impact on developing countries, and that these other policies support development objectives, where feasible.” (OECD 2005, p28)

In consistency with this, Molina argues that evaluations of policy coherence for development is often built around investigating the “level of consistency that exists between a donor’s aid policy and its other policies that may have implications for it” (Molina, p. 244). Notwithstanding this first dimension, policy coherence also implies having a “logical sequence of the decisions taken in a particular policy” meaning that the objectives as well as the political and administrative structures have to be in accordance with each other (Ibid.). Furthermore, another aspect is that there has to be a “correlation between the statements and declarations and the actual policy performance, in other words, the difference between what is said and what is done” (Ibid.). Finally, there has to be a temporal dimension of policy coherence, constituting a regular behavior during a period of time. As Molina further argues, this does not imply that “the conduct has to be exactly the same all the time but that new policy initiatives do not have a negative impact on past ones” (Ibid). To sum it up, Molina builds on and elaborates on the definition by Forster and Stokke to outline policy coherence to be

“/.../ a policy whose objectives, strategies and mechanisms are attuned; these objectives should reinforce each other, or as a minimum, not conflict between them. Objectives should be strengthened by the intentions or motives on which they are based; the policy outcome should correspond to the intentions and objectives, and reinforce the other policies pursued within the policy framework of the system, or at least not having a negative impact on them. New policy initiatives promote, or at list not conflicting with, past political initiatives.” (Molina, p. 244-245)

As pointed out by Piciotto, policy coherence is often considered essential for a government to gain voters’ trust and confidence as strong and firm. Nevertheless, within realpolitik, different political options have to be weighed in and short term gains versus long term gains have to be

considered (Piciotto 2004, p. 4). Even though not explicitly referring to the term of power, Forster and Stokke (1999, p. 17) are also acknowledging that there is a constant competition and co-operation between different stakeholders with contrasting values and interests, stakeholders who have varied political weight and not the same access to decision-making. Even more so, referring to Professor L. Alan Winters, Piciotto claims that within this bargaining between interests, it is often difficult to identify the “here” of policy coherence as there are “multiple dimensions - and uncertainty prevails about the links between policy levers and policy impacts. In the real world, politicians strive to construct a working consensus among diverse interests in uncertain operating environments” (Piciotto 2004, p. 4). In the same spirit, Forster and Stokke (1999) argues that

“Policy formulation and implementation at an international or national level involve many systems which may relate to each other both horizontally and vertically. Within each system, a predominant “world view” prevails, based on the overall objectives pursued and an ever-shifting balance between the values and interests of major stake-holders. These systems are themselves part of wider systems. What is considered a rational choice will be system-specific and may, accordingly, vary from one system to another” (Forster and Stokke 1999, p. 25).

Due to this, they state that “The point of departure therefore becomes all-important.” (Ibid.)

Policy coherence does therefore not necessarily imply that a decision will always be made in coherence with the stated policy but rather that when an incoherent decision is made, it has to be informed, making sure that the incoherent decision is a conscious and intended one in opposite to an unintended (Molina p: 245, Forster & Stokke 1999, p. 24-25). Intended incoherence is defined as “when a government consciously accepts that it cannot achieve the objectives of a particular policy due to conflicting interests or priority accorded to another policy” (Hoebink referred to in OECD 2005, p. 29). By making an intended decision and acknowledging the conflict, the government at least has the possibility to apply mitigation measures to counteract the negative outcome. Unintended incoherence, on the other hand, is when there is no proper evaluation of the results before and after a policy decision is being made. Due to a lack of knowledge, there is therefore no perception that the decisions made are actually incoherent. As a result, mitigation measures are not even on the agenda and the decisions taken can therefore have a negative impact on development (OECD 2005, p. 29). An important aspect is therefore also to keep the decision process transparent so that other actors such as NGO’s and opposition will have the chance to monitor the Government’s decisions (Molina p. 245).

When talking about policy coherence for development, five areas are most often highlighted as key areas for achieving this. These are (Piciotto referred to in OECD 2005 p. 30, Odén & Lundquist 2007 p.2):

- Internal coherence –consistency concerning goals and objectives, modalities and protocols of a government’s development policy.
- Intra-government coherence – that decisions made within the policies that are significant for developing countries should be evaluated to ensure that these do mutually contribute to development or at least do not contradict development objectives.
- Inter-governmental coherence – That the policies and actions of different OECD countries regarding specific countries or issues should be consistent with each other in order to avoid that they contradict, obstruct or fail to support each other.
- Multilateral coherence – That the policies and actions of bilateral donors and multilateral organizations are consistent.
- Donor-recipient coherence – That the policies of donor countries and recipient countries are in accordance with each other in order to reach mutual development goals. The receiving countries should therefore “be encouraged to set up policies that allow them to take full advantage of the international climate to enhance their economic and social progress” (Odén & Lundquist 2007, p.3)

The focus of this research will be on the second aspect, intra-government coherence, as my interest revolves around the issue of coherence within the areas of trade and migration in relation to the PGD.

Furthermore, there are three interrelated mechanisms considered to be crucial to achieve policy coherence for development (Odén & Lundquist 2007, p. 3):

- “Strong political commitment” – that the political leadership (government and parliament) need to be fully committed to coherence, having clearly specified the policy objectives, the priorities and which criteria to be used for evaluating the advancement.
- “Institutional co-ordination, through an adequate institutional architecture, transparency and flexibility” – that the system should have the structures for “adaptation to a changing environment, early warning of incoherence, mechanisms for

dialogue and resolving disputes and an administrative culture that promotes inter-sector co-operation and systematic dialogue among different political communities” (Ibid.)

- “Adequate analytical capacity and effective systems for generating, transmitting and processing relevant information” – crucial to evaluate the human and financial alternatives and resources necessary to achieve the stipulated goals. (Ibid.)

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Migration

As previously mentioned, migration was included already in the original PGD of 2003 even though its position then was not very strong. However, when the new start were to be launched in 2008, there were many debates concerning which policy areas that would remain as the six challenges. Migration was one of the challenges finally included in the new start which gave the issue a reawakening (respondents 5 & 10).

“When it comes to the engagement on paper, it helped a lot because we could then point to that this was important as the political leadership had identified it as a global challenge and that meant that you had to try and work with it” (Respondent 10).

Even though the PGD has helped raise the issue of development perspectives in the political debate around migration and established it as a responsibility for the entire Government, there is however still questions regarding how far the implementation has reached (Respondent 10). Three issues within the migration field were presented as areas in which Sweden could contribute more specifically to the connection between migration and development. As earlier described, these are *Labour immigration to Sweden and the EU (later re-named Circular migration to and from Sweden and the EU)*, *Remittances and the transfer of skills and knowledge to developing countries*, as well as *Protection and durable solutions for refugees* (Gov. communication 2009/10:129 p. 36). These are not the only areas that the development perspective is meant to permeate but due to Sweden’s own political interests in labour immigration, as well as the intent to focus the PGD and the scope of the Communications, these were the areas selected to be highlighted in the new start of the PGD (Respondent 5 & 10). Migration is in itself in many aspects a trans-boundary issue with many different policy areas involved. *Protection and durable solutions for refugees* is an area that to a certain extent falls outside the box of development as it is rather an issue of human rights and protection. It

is therefore a security issue at the Government Offices and dealt with at an EU-level as well as through the UNHCR, which is the reason that it has not been particularly touched upon in this thesis. The interviews and the analysis has instead focused on the two areas *Circular Migration to and from Sweden and the EU* and *Remittances and the transfer of skills and knowledge to developing countries* as well as a general discussion on the progress of policy coherence within the field of migration.

As with policy coherence issues in general, the international discourse concerning migration and development has evolved in recent years (Respondent 5). Migration is furthermore one of the five prioritized areas of the EU in their Policy Coherence for Development (European Commission, Policy coherence for development).

In 2003, the UN initiated the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) which published its report in December 2005 (International Organization for Migration: About the GCIM). Co-chair was the former Swedish Minister for Development Co-operation and Migration, Jan O. Karlsson. The GCIM became very important as the developmental aspects of migration were put much higher on the agenda (Respondent 4). One of the outcomes of the GCIM was the creation of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD). Sweden has been one of the most active states in the GFMD and will chair as well as host the conference that will be held in 2014 (Respondents 3, 4 & 5). Sweden has, according to the respondents, been very active within this forum in pushing for policy coherence for development. As an example, Sweden issued a survey among the members in the GFMD in which questions were raised about how different countries work with policy coherence at a national level when it comes to practical arrangements such as workgroups, preparation of issues between departments, etc. The survey was considered to be an effective way of increasing knowledge and co-operation within and between countries (Respondent 5). Both the Ministry of Justice and the Department for Development Policy at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs are to be equally involved in preparing the agenda for the GFMD-conference hosted by Sweden in 2014, a result of having a common PGD-policy (respondent 3, 5&10). Equally, the theme of the conference, development perspectives of migration, can also be seen as a result of an increased co-operation and dialogue. However, as pointed out by some of the respondents, the importance is now to initiate thorough discussions about the agenda and content of the conference to make sure that the development perspective discussed emerges from a common Swedish standpoint on development (Respondent 3&10).

In December 2008, Sweden adopted a new labour immigration policy which is considered to be one of the most open and liberal laws on labour immigration in the world as it is not dependent on quotas or point-systems decided upon by authorities, but rather on the need of the employer (Respondent 5, OECD 2011, p.11). A recent evaluation of the Swedish labour immigration law by the OECD states that:

“Given the absence of skill requirements, salary thresholds, and limits on the number of permits issued and the renewability of permits, Sweden appears to have the most open labour migration system among OECD countries” (OECD 2011, p. 11)

The law is not restricted to include only highly-educated workers but does also apply to workers with less education as it is considered that Sweden will need workforce in all sectors of society in the future. This has been a unique position within the EU and has therefore created a great amount of attention and interest (Respondent 5). The EU Global Approach to Migration that was adopted in 2005, with one of the three pillars concentrated on migration and development, has been criticized for prioritizing border security, the attraction of skilled manpower to cover the needs of the EU as well as re-admission (Concord 2011, p. 60-61). Within the EU a Blue Card work permit has also been developed that is meant to harmonize the admission procedures for highly qualified workers from outside of Europe in order to attract highly skilled workforce to a Europe facing a shortage of labour in the future (Barosso 2007). The position of the EU has been deeply criticized by CSO's and also by developing countries for risking accelerating “brain-drain” from developing countries as well as “brain-waste” among highly-qualified workers employed in low-qualified jobs (Concord 2011, p. 59). A double strain is therefore put on developing countries as they both lose their most qualified workers to other countries and as the amount of the remittances sent home by these migrant workers is reduced due to the fact that they are forced to accept work under their qualifications. To tackle these issues demands efforts both in the developing countries concerning the push factors such as lack of decent work opportunities, poverty, climate change, conflicts, etc., as well as efforts of integration on the labour market in the countries of destination (Concord 2011, p.59-60). With its labour immigration law, Sweden holds a somewhat different view than many other countries within the EU by not wanting to focus on specific sectors and also for wanting to attract labour immigrants with different levels of education, not only the highly-skilled (Respondent 5). However, despite this presumed opening up for labour immigration to all sectors, there is still a debate about the actual effects on the developing countries. Sweden is, along with many other countries in the developed

world, facing an ageing population and thereby labour shortages in the future (OECD 2011 p. 11). The aim of a Swedish labour immigration law is of course first and foremost to promote the Swedish labour market and to attract much needed workers. Nevertheless, the point of highlighting migration and more specifically labour migration in the new start of the PGD is to include global development perspectives at this policy area. As argued by one of the respondents, this new labour immigration law will still not facilitate for low skilled workers from developing countries as these are very seldom attractive for employers in Sweden (Respondent 10). Employers are searching for highly-educated workers which will automatically exclude many people and sometimes even whole countries that lack these workers. There are some sectors for low-skilled workers that have attracted people from developing countries. However, low skilled workers arriving to Sweden in the search for employment does not in itself guarantee any development in the developing countries, especially if the conditions for the workers are harsh and wages low (Respondent 10). During the last years, reports have disclosed how low-skilled workers, such as berry-pickers, have come to Sweden to perform work that has turned out to be insecure as well as underpaid, leaving them with more debts and problems than before. The stories of exploitation of low-skilled workers are examples of unwanted consequences and no development effects for developing countries. To simply argue for the beneficial aspects of the new law for developing countries on the basis that the law includes both high- and low-skilled workers is therefore not enough. The law needs to be further developed and complemented by progressive actions in terms of facilitation of remittances, etc. in order to truly achieve a developmental effect for the developing countries (Respondent 10).

From the regulations regarding labour immigration, ideas about circular migration were highlighted (Respondent 5). In 2011, a Parliamentary Committee for Circular Migration and Development presented their final report on how to develop a Swedish policy on Circular Migration and Development. The Committee consisted of political representatives from all parties in the Parliament as well as experts and employees from various ministries and departments. In the report, circular migration in terms of labour migration, international students, remittances, transferable social benefits, etc., were discussed from a developmental perspective of both Sweden and the countries of origin. The thinking presented in the report is also considered to be quite unique within the EU. "There are steps forward, we are not isolated and it is not as if the rest of EU wants to close the borders, but still, we are actually quite unique in our way of thinking" (Respondent 5). According to the respondent, there is

often a strong connection made within the EU between circular migration and temporary labour immigration, in other words seasonal workers or bilateral agreements between a specific country and the EU for labour immigration during a shorter period of time. With the Swedish Parliamentary Committee Report on circular migration, the idea has evolved to include a more developmental perspective and instead focus on what obstacles there might be for a more free movement across borders. The same position has also been a strong pursuit by Sweden within the EU (Respondent 5). For instance, during the Swedish EU-presidency 2009, Sweden hosted a conference in Malmö called “Labour Migration and its Development Potential in the Age of Mobility” where two round table discussions were held regarding labour immigration and circular migration with invited researchers as well as government and institution representatives. The aim was to show the demographic need for labour immigration to the European Union (Respondent 5). Having a more secure work permit reduces the risks the migrants might face if choosing to go back and forth to their country of origin, or to other countries for employment, as the possibility to re-enter in the quest for work is not jeopardized (Respondent 5). In the latest *Spotlight on EU Policy Coherence for Development* – report by Concord Europe (2011), circular migration is highlighted as crucial for the future of the EU Global Approach on Migration (GAM). The ideas put forward in the Swedish report on Circular migration and development are therefore considered to be rather progressive and the actual existence of the investigation itself is also considered as a positive measurement in the right direction (Respondent 3, 5 & 10). However, the proposals of the Swedish report are yet to be implemented. The following step is to examine which suggestions are actually conceivable to turn into law proposals, in accordance with financial policies, tax policies, social insurance policies, integration policies and labour market policies (Ibid.)

One of the issues raised in the interviews was that Sweden does not have any separate policy on migration and development co-operation. The proceedings for creating such a policy were taken several years ago but the process has been stalled, possibly due to earlier critique by the DAC that Sweden already has too many policies (Respondent 10). Whether or not the lack of a separate policy on migration and development cooperation poses a problem is debated. One of the respondent claimed that this imply that decisions have to be taken more ad-hoc and that the possibilities for pursuing a development perspective regarding migration towards other departments therefore becomes more difficult (Respondent 3). According to the respondent, a policy on migration and development cooperation would perhaps enable a clearer analysis of

the effects of the migration politics pursued by Sweden. This would allow for improved analysis of how the development perspective is reflected in the performance of other authorities outside the direct development cooperation but also projects financed by aid that are executed by authorities outside the traditional development cooperation sphere. However, another respondent argued that even though it might be more difficult, the lack of a development cooperation policy on migration should not pose a problem as the development perspective should be implicit in all policy areas, regardless if there was any pronounced development cooperation policy connected to that area (Respondent 10). According to the same respondent, several other countries within the EU have adopted policies for aid and migration but this has sometimes led to a belief that migration is only a concern of aid. Instead, Sweden has received praise for putting an emphasis on a whole-of-a-government approach. The above outlined discussion is related to the discussion of the interrelation between aid and policy coherence which will be further elaborated in the sub-chapter on the PGD in general.

In line with other interviews about different perspectives and interests at different departments, one of the respondents maintained that one of the problems with implementing a PGD perspective on migration is that the issues raised within the PGD

“(…) are not so much about Sweden's well-being as it is about supporting the development of other countries. That is of course not the same agenda as the majority of the departments who rather treats how Sweden will be better: how Sweden will improve in taking care of migrants in terms of labor or in terms of refugees. You must not forget that it's basically two different perspectives that you work with” (Respondent 3)

One of the main challenges highlighted by all the respondents is in correspondence to what is described above; there is a need for constant communication concerning the definition of development and how it is to be enhanced within different policy areas. It is a risk that

”(…) the PGD is a policy of the entire Government about development, but different policy areas reads it to suit their own purposes. (...) We don't want to compromise with Swedish migration policies but we are very keen to talk about development” (Respondent 10).

Consequently, it is essential to acquire greater knowledge and impact assessments about the actual effects of the decisions taken by one policy area on the wider issue of development in developing countries. For instance, having labour immigrants coming to Sweden might be beneficial for the Swedish labour market but this does not automatically promote development and reduce poverty in developing countries.

All the respondents seem to agree upon that remittances and the role of diasporas have been one of the most difficult areas within the migration section of the new PGD. This is to a large extent due to a general lack of knowledge about the role of the diaspora in terms of transfer of skills, money and knowledge as well as a lack of knowledge about the effects of remittances. There is yet no establishment of practical arrangements regarding remittances. According to one of the respondents there is no clear political signal to add more resources on research on this or to work more closely with actors within the diaspora (Respondent 3). Within the issue of remittances, one of the goals is to establish a web-site for how money can be transferred most efficiently, as has been done within the EU. This has yet to be accomplished in Sweden. One of the problems regarding remittances is that there is no real ownership of the question. Migration is in many aspects a transcending issue which involves several levels and actors not traditionally associated with migration policies or development policies (Respondent 5&10). In this case, in order to create a web-site with information about channels for remittances, contacts were made with the Ministry of Finance who did not feel comfortable enough with developmental aspects to deal with the issue. Nonetheless, this is neither a matter which can be easily solved by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs itself as it concerns financial transactions and the implementation of regulations to avoid the risk of unwanted transactions (Respondent 10).

## **4.2 Trade**

According to the interviews with the respondents from the CSOs, trade was one of the reasons for the first discussions of policy coherence for development ever to reach the agenda. This was due to that trade policies and the development aid policies, especially within the EU, were found to be in such obvious opposition (Respondent 9). Today, trade is highlighted by the Government official respondents, as well as by the DAC Peer Review 2009, as the area in which the implementation of the PGD has had the most progress. There is believed to exist a well-established dialogue and cooperation between the different actors involved in the Government Offices and concerned authorities, as well as a well-founded analytical capacity about development aspects of trade (DAC 2009, p. 33ff & Respondents 1, 2, 6, 7&8). Apart from a specifically appointed focal point responsible for the coherence issues, every administrative official has an assignment to apply a developmental perspective on their specific area (Respondent 6). The department is furthermore responsible for elaborating on the policies and directions for development assistance efforts within the area of trade as well

as managing funds for the Doha Development Agenda fund (Respondent 7 & 8). All in all, the structure and capacity is therefore emphasized as exemplary to other departments (respondent 7).

Sweden has ever since the initiation of the first PGD, and well before that, advocated strongly in favor of free trade as a means for economic growth which is in turn seen as a prerequisite for poverty reduction. The 2003 bill argues that both export and import is important for the development of a country, particularly developing countries that still hold a very small share of the world's global market. Openness to trade, investments and business enterprising is therefore considered to be crucial (Gov. bill 2002/2003:122, p. 27). One of the main entry points for the relationship between trade and development was the possibilities for developing countries to access the European market. In 2001, during the Swedish presidency, the initiative *Everything but Arms* (EBA) was developed which gave duty- and quota free access to the EU market for the least developed countries (Respondent 6). The EBA is also part of the Generalized System of Preferences-system which in turn gives reduced or eliminated tariffs including for developing countries that are not part of the least developed countries. Within the Generalized System of Preferences, there are ongoing discussions on how to best target the poor considering the "new geography of poverty", previously mentioned in the *Introduction*, meaning that an increasing amount of poor people today live in middle-income countries rather than developing countries (Respondent 7).

The Swedish position on free trade has not changed in the new start of 2008. Sweden has thus acted consistently within the EU and in the WTO for the elimination of all tariffs and other barriers for free trade (Mini-barometern 2010, p. 9). Notwithstanding, the Swedish CSOs have criticized the traditionally strong position of free trade, which is considered as the means for economic growth and in turn leading to poverty reduction. The Government position on free trade and the conviction that a dialogue is well established between the different departments has also been criticized by CSOs for obscuring the conflicts of interests that they claim exist between development for poor people and the positions on trade. As one respondent argues "It has been very difficult to work with this issue and get any response on that there might be other opinions on which kind of trade policy that actually leads to development" (Respondent 9).

Sweden, being a small country with limited power by itself, has always considered international institutions and regulations to be crucial for a successful free trade. The

negotiations within the WTO regarding international trade regulations or frameworks have therefore been regarded as vital (Respondent 8) and Sweden has according to the respondents worked consistently together with other like-minded countries within the EU for the development perspective to be sincerely included (Respondent 6&7). However, the negotiations in the Doha development round have been stalled for a number of years meaning that no real progress has been achieved (Respondent 6). In December 2011, a ministerial meeting was held in Geneva where ideas on how to move forward were presented.

Due to the stagnation of the Doha development round, more focus has been placed on regional trade negotiations such as the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPA) with Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific (ACP). The EPAs themselves were initiated due to the fact that the previous agreements were not in consistency with WTO regulations, by giving one-sided preferences to the ACP-countries, and were therefore considered unjust in relation to other developing countries (Respondent 8). Swedish and international CSOs have expressed highly critical opinions regarding the negotiation procedures of the EPA-agreements (Respondent 9 & 11).

“(…) the points of departure of the PGD, the rights perspective and the poor peoples’ perspective, have in some cases not been followed as they [the EU and Sweden] have several times ignored the critique by the [developing] countries about the negative effects of the agreements and, according to us, the PGD has therefore many times been deviated from. Even though reasoning about coherence exists within trade issues, this has many times failed to be completed in the Swedish positions.” (Respondent 11).

Especially criticized has been the lack of policy space for the ACP-countries (Respondents 9&11), particularly in relation to creating laws and regulations regarding trade related issues such as foreign investments, immaterial rights and foreign service companies (Concord 2010, p. 10). Sweden has furthermore pushed very hard, even harder than many other European countries, for including issues such as investments and public procurement in the EPA-agreements. This position has been criticized by CSO’s as several African countries have very little to gain from including these issues (Concord 2010, p. 9).

When asked about the EPA-agreements, the Government Official respondents in question all retorted that they believed the content of the agreements to be in accordance with Sweden’s position; that free trade is a prerequisite for a developmental friendly perspective (respondents 6, 7&8) and that issues such as increased transparency in public procurement and regulations regarding investments were welcomed by the developing countries (Respondent 8). However,

there were also some acknowledgments to that the processes of the negotiations might have been pushed too rapidly and that more considerations must be taken to the capacities of these states (Respondent 8, 9). In the EPA-agreements, both trade and development co-operation are negotiated simultaneously with the intention that one should support the other. For instance, aid supported capacity building activities regarding trade and standards are pursued in order to ease the way for developing countries to apply the new trade regulations. This has been criticized by CSO's but does not appear to bear negative connotations for the Swedish political position. Rather, the argument made is that it has been complicated to present the package in a clear and comprehensive manner as the structure of the EU implies that the Commission, who negotiate the EPA-agreements, does not hold decision-power over development aid (Respondent 8). The respondent also believed that the Swedish position in the EPA-negotiations had become more flexible in recent years towards the processes, in response to the critique presented, but that the conviction about the benefits of the content still remains (Respondent 8). The same opinion was supported by another respondent who detected certain differences from a very strong position on free trade since the last government shift towards a slightly more nuanced position of more flexibility today (Respondent 7). At the moment, the future of the EPA-negotiations is uncertain as the negotiations have run into several obstacles and very few have come to a conclusion. As pointed out in a recent evaluation on EU PCD: "At a time when emerging powers such as China, Brazil and India are engaging with developing countries on a 'mutual benefit' basis, the EU hence runs the risk of seeing its own ambitions become the greatest threat to its international credibility and legitimacy" (Keijzer 2010, p. 1)

As shown, trade policies are governed by the EU, implying that Sweden has to negotiate its position through the EU rather than directly with developing countries. Sweden's own policy space is therefore restricted to what is decided upon in accordance with the other member countries. As stated by several of the respondents, this creates challenges as not all member countries agree on the same strategies or have the same interest in applying a developmental friendly perspective on trade (Respondents 6&7). The coherence might be strong within Sweden between different policy areas but when negotiating in the EU, it becomes more difficult to agree upon common strategies and frameworks (Respondent 8).

"If you take sustainable development as an example, there are some European countries that are pushing for this by arguing for 'level playing fields,' meaning that we should impose requirements of sustainability on products imported to the EU. This in turn leads to trade

barriers for developing countries as they can't fulfill these standards or at least not demonstrate that they do. So, by this you could use sustainable development as a means to create protectionism which hinders development in developing countries. It is complex and not everything is what it seems" (Respondent 7).

Standards and technical regulations for trade have therefore received increased attention in the later years, as these are recognized as having great impact on developing countries possibilities to export. A lot of effort is consequently made through aid or technical assistance aiming to assist the developing countries with these issues (Respondent 6). Trade with services has also been put in the spotlight lately as an increasing part of trade regards services rather than products, which is yet not reflected in the EBA and GSP for instance (Respondent 6).

Among several of the respondents, there is a common conviction that a strong political commitment exists to implement coherence and the perspectives of the PGD within the policy area of trade (Respondents 1, 2, 6, 7 & 8). The same respondents claimed that trade is the area in which the perspectives of the PGD are most visible and has been so for the longest period of time. However, as pointed out by the respondents the problem might not be so much the coherence perspective but different opinions about what signifies a development friendly strategy and the actual implementation of it. One area in which this was exemplified was within bilateral and regional free-trade agreements between the EU and developing countries.

".../ there might not be so much the problem of the coherence policy, but that you might have different opinions about what is conducive to development which of course happens very often. We may think that it is developmentally friendly to have broad free trade agreements that cover many different categories, not just goods but also services, investments, etc., while others may find that this is to put too much pressure on developing countries, that we move too fast, that we go beyond the WTO regulations or that which is agreed upon in the WTO. So there are different views on things (...), what we may think is an advantage for developing countries, others interpret as that we are making unreasonable demands." (Respondent 6)

Another difficulty emphasized is the great distance between what is decided upon on a policy level regarding global trade regulations and the perspectives supposed to guide the policy decisions, namely poor peoples' perspective on development and the rights perspective. These tend to become very abstract without proper analysis. One of the respondents reflect that:

"(...) I think that is one of the great challenges that we have. What does this mean, how do we put in into practice, how do we interpret it? (...) there are so many layers in between that you have to reach in order to actually work with this, and then trade policies might not be the right

tool but instead more directed interventions for instance within development aid might be more relevant for actually working with these issues, like the perspectives of the poor.” (Respondent 8)

One of the greatest challenges for the future in the area of trade is the changed world economic order with new actors such as China, India and Brazil entering the scene.

“This sets quite new demands and challenges for the developing countries as well as for us. We can’t do as much when we don’t have as great share [of trade with developing countries]. We can give technical support but decisions about trade alleviation do not achieve the same effect if trade is not made with us anymore” (Respondent 6)

In relation to the changes in the world economics, the EU has been criticized by CSOs of too aggressively trying to secure its place on the world market, both in terms of securing raw material to European industries as well as having markets in which to sell the finished products and services of European companies (Concord 2009, p. 13). The question of guaranteeing raw materials to European high-technology industries is an issue with implications for developing countries as Europe and Sweden strive to import these materials without any trade barriers. This has created numerous conflicts as developing countries want to protect their raw material by applying export tariffs in order to develop their own industries.

“There is a tension in this and especially when the EU, quite inconsistently, says that ‘we want to import raw materials from you without tariffs but if you want to export processed products, we will apply tariffs because we want to protect our own processing industry’. On the Swedish side, we are at least consistent in that we want to have free trade on both raw material and processed products (...) But there is a difficulty in this, that you have to find a balance between our own desire to import raw material and in the same time admit that this [tariffs] could be an instrument that might work” (Respondent 8)

In January 2012, the European Commission will publish a new communication on trade and development to supplement the Communication on EU trade policy that was established a year ago. The respondents report that Sweden has pursued that the Communication should be more progressive by focusing on what should be done instead of what has been done as well as applying a policy coherence perspective rather than just development aid (Respondent 6&7).

### 4.3 PGD in general

As the topics brought up during the interviews regarding the general impact of the PGD on Swedish policies are many and diverse, I have chosen to organize it under the three sub-headlines *Political commitment*, *Institutional co-ordination* and *Analytical capacity* which are also interrelated mechanisms highlighted in the theoretical framework as important for policy coherence for development.

As previously mentioned, policy coherence and development cooperation are more clearly divided into two separate but corresponding pillars in the new start of the PGD. According to the Government, the coherence policy aims to ensure that all policy areas are working in the same direction towards an equitable and sustainable global development. The development assistance or aid is working towards creating conditions for poor people to improve their living conditions. The two pillars have to cooperate and support each other to achieve results in the same direction (The Government Offices: Bistånd och utveckling).

The previous as well as the current Government has acknowledged in the various communications to the Parliament that the task to implement the policy coherence outlined in the PGD has proved to be a challenge. The slow progress of results of the PGD and the fact that poverty and inequality still exist in the world further formed the reason for the current Government to re-launch the PGD as a new start. Nevertheless, as shown in the Government Communication in 2010 as well as in the DAC Peer Review of 2009 (p. 12) and the DAC mid-term review in 2011 (p.2), the basic problems still remain. This was likewise conveyed in many of the interviews. Several of the respondents, both from civil society and the government officials claimed that internationally compared, Sweden has made some or much progress in the implementation of the PGD (Respondent, 1, 2, 4, 11). The same respondents however expressed the opinion that compared to Swedish standards and the goals established, there is still a lot to be done. There were several points made regarding various difficulties which have been highlighted in the previous two sections on migration and trade and will be shown further on. One of the respondents questioned if the PGD has to a certain extent become no more than a paper product as it still hasn't reached the intended goals (Respondent 3). Another respondent was of the opinion that the PGD to a large extent has passed its expiry date as a steering document and that the Government Communications were not enough as reminders (Respondent 1). Because of this, the respondent considered that a new, sincere, commitment needs to be done in order to truly reinstall its position as a strong document. To

do this requires, according to the respondent, that the Government is courageous enough to challenge itself to tackle the conflicts of interest highlighted by for instance the civil society. Yet another respondent raised the opinion that having a whole-of-a-government approach might render the position of the PGD weak, especially in regards to working towards the EU (Respondent 4). The later respondent compared with the position of the Netherlands which has concentrated more particularly on trade and has consequently been able to focus resources and capacities to one area rather than spreading the efforts.

#### **4.3.1 Strong political commitment**

The DAC Peer Review claims that the political commitment is strong both in parliament and at the ministerial levels (DAC 2009, p.33). When asked about whether a strong political commitment exists to fulfill the objectives and apply the perspectives of the PGD, the respondents expressed somewhat different views. They all admit that it is crucial to have a political commitment to implement the PGD and the majority agreed that there is a strong commitment by the current Minister for International Development Cooperation Gunilla Carlsson to adhere to the concept of coherence. However, several of the respondents expressed that it remains difficult to achieve a broad political interest of the issue and thereby in the end to truly achieve awareness and commitment by all relevant actors. As expressed by one of the respondents: “The political will exists on one level in that we actually have a stated policy through the PGD but then it might be more difficult in reality to get any actual response at the other departments” (Respondent 1). As will be shown further on, the reasons for this are believed to be multiple.

As previously described, the PGD was initiated under the former Social Democratic Government even though the final adoption was reached through consensus with all the political parties. However, reaching a consensus on such an overarching policy does also imply that the policy has to be formulated to accommodate for a wide range of political parties and standpoints. The policy thus becomes quite generally formulated and not very specified which opens up for interpretations both on a political as well as an implementation level. The PGD has therefore since its adoption undergone various changes, mostly in structure but to a certain extent also in direction. As previously mentioned, the communication of 2007/08 was launched as a “new start” by the current coalition Government. The goals were then reformulated into six global challenges within which certain focal areas were highlighted. In relation to this, one of the respondents raised the issue that the current Government might not be

”(...) always so very keen to highlight a product that really isn't theirs to begin with, but it [the PGD] is rather something that you agree with on principle. It is not the original document from 2003 that is pushed forward but rather the document from 2007” (Respondent 1).

This development might however not be negative since several of the respondents reflected on that the original PGD was too comprehensive and too difficult to apply in reality. Furthermore, the implementation or rather lack of implementation had already been criticized by DAC and a new start might thus be a way of “picking up the pieces” as well as an attempt by the current Government to put a mark of their own on the PGD. What is clear is that the structure of the PGD has undergone changes with the new six challenges. One of the respondents claimed that the perspectives themselves had also been somewhat modified due to political changes, and that especially the poor peoples’ perspective on development had now been slightly downplayed (Respondent 4). The same respondent continued that one of the greatest effects of the PGD, and especially with the new start, has been a more politicized development assistance. By this, the respondent claimed that not only has development aid affected the other policy areas, as it was expected and intended to do, but that other policy areas has also influenced development aid. The same opinion was expressed by one of the interviewed from the CSOs. The respondent articulated that the main advantage of the PGD is that the other policy areas should adjust to become developmentally friendly, but that political signals and interests has reversed this intention so that the development assistance should instead also adjust to other policy areas, something which the respondent found to be of great concern (Respondent 9). A similar apprehension has been brought forward before, for instance in the report *Where is Swedish Aid Heading?* (Odén 2009, p. 28-31). According to the first respondent, this might create a potential conflict between the Paris declaration which aims to give more policy space to the developing countries and a supply-driven development aid in the name of the PGD (Respondent 4). In relation to this, the respondent argued that the critique often put forward by the Swedish CSOs, that the current Minister of International Development Cooperation does not take the PGD seriously and puts too much emphasis on Swedish interests, is a mistake as the adjustments of the development assistance is instead a sign of the Minister taking the principle of policy coherence very seriously (Respondent 4).

As argued by several of the respondents, one of the reasons why there still appears to be difficulties in reaching a whole of government interest and implementation of the PGD’s perspectives might be the hierarchies between different policy fields, between Ministers and between departments. Even though Gunilla Carlsson, the Minister for International

Development Cooperation, is vice president of the largest party in the coalition government and therefore holds a fairly strong position, the issue of international development for developing countries does not always have the upper hand over other national interests.

“The Government takes decisions collectively so that is a good pre-requisition that all perspectives are included, but to be realistic, the Minister for International Development Cooperation does not have the most power in the Government so if the Financial Department has strong opinions (...) unfortunately, that is how it is in the harsh reality. So I do believe that the ownership really exist but she can only do so much in telling the other Ministers what they should do” (Respondent 2).

The difficulty in achieving political interest for the PGD and strength of the developmental perspective is however acknowledged by the respondents as not being limited only to the current government, but a rather a result from structural hierarchies and differences between national and international priorities and interests. “Politics is always about short-term national interests of being re-elected versus long-term [interests]” (Respondent 2). As previously mentioned, the current government is also a coalition between four right-wing parties. One of the respondents therefore planted the idea that having a coalition government made up of several parties might lead to an increased difficulty to handle conflicting interests and that more compromises have to be made (Respondent 1). Nevertheless, another of the interviewed reflected that despite the fact that there are different political interests involved, leading to that the development perspective is not always put first, at least the issue is on the agenda.

“Questions about international development assistance never used to be on the agenda during Cabinet Meetings, no one was interested. Yes, we might still lose some battles but at least we are part of the conversation now and that is thanks to the PGD” (Respondent 4)

Several of the respondents also pointed to the fact that there is still a lack of resources for implementing the PGD, leading to that the institutions and the analytical competence are still too weak. The lack of resources were by some claimed to be a result of a lack of political will on a general level. When asked about this, one respondent replied: “(...) the answer is really no, the institutions and the competence are too weak. Why? Well, because the political will is too weak. If it is important, then arrangements are made.” (Respondent 4)

#### **4.3.2 Institutional co-ordination**

The Department for Development Policy at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs holds the responsibility for coordinating the PGD which implies contributing with developmental aspects and inputs to the other departments when required, as well as compiling the

Government communication to the Parliament every two years. Apart from this, their mission is also to provide the development minister or the cabinet with foundation material for political decisions. Simultaneously, the unit also holds the responsibility for the development assistance of the Government which entails that each administrative official is responsible for both the development assistance as well as the coherence with the other political areas, within their specific thematic field. This is highlighted by the respondents as both an advantage and a disadvantage. As one respondent put it, the department, its minister and the administrative officials within their mission often have a “tilt” towards development assistance and its recent reforms (Respondent 1). Ever since the initiation of the PGD, discussions have been raised about whether it is appropriate to keep the responsibility for the PGD at the Department for Development Policy or to transfer it to for instance the Prime Minister’s Office. (Respondent 1,2,3 & 4) A transfer to the Prime Minister’s Office would both give the issue more credit as well as detach it from development aid.

“(…) maybe it is a little unfortunate that the responsibility for the PGD is with the Minister for development cooperation. Perhaps it would be another ministry or the Prime Minister’s Office or something else, which should actually have the overall responsibility, because it indirectly creates… a link with the development assistance that perhaps is part of the explanation of why it is also understood as if it is all about aid money.” (Respondent 3)

However, other respondents argued that even though there might be disadvantages with keeping the responsibility of the PGD at the Department for Development Policy, it is the unit in which most capacity and knowledge lies (Respondent 2 & 4). One respondent also argued that, “(…) if we claim that our issues should be there [at the Prime Minister’s Office], then the gender equality issues should be there as well and the environmental issues and then eventually all cross-cutting issues” (Respondent 2).

The majority of the respondents agreed that the responsibility for fulfilling the policy coherence for development lies within each department, the responsibility is not restricted to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs or more specifically at its Department for Development Policy. “The responsibility must be at each department concerned” (Respondent 1). Despite this agreement, there is still often a direct connection made between development aid and policy coherence. Regardless of this misconception, the development cooperation side does not hold any actual control over the other policy areas. The confusion acknowledged by several of the respondents often become complicated as the ministry and department working with development assistance hold the steering control over the development aid as well as the

budget, but in terms of policy coherence they only have a guiding role. The development cooperation side is inclined to coordinate the policy coherence but others are supposed to implement it (Respondent 2).

”The main problem with the PGD is related to a pedagogical challenge (...) because, after almost 10 years, we still have the notion that the PGD is about things that we do with development aid money at other departments. And that is a fundamental misconception of what this is all about which I don’t think we have been clear enough about. But then, every department has their own defined budget with its restrictions which makes the idea of extra resources through aid a welcome thought. But then when we say that you have to use your own resources to be part of the development co-operation, that makes it another kind of discussion, so to speak, and not as relevant anymore.” (Respondent 3)

Several of the respondents returned to the importance of highlighting the relevance of the PGD to all other departments’ policies as well as how the different policy areas can benefit from the PGD. To show “what’s in it for them” (Respondent 2) and that there has to be some sort of incentives or momentum among the involved actors themselves (Respondent 3) were argued to be of crucial value. In order to avoid the PGD to become a process by its own, a process that nobody is really involved in, it is important to “adapt it to reality” and to find the synergies as well as the conflicts of interests in the issues that the different departments are already involved in (Respondent 1&2). ”(...) the most important is that it becomes relevant in the reality for those working with matters of substance” (Respondent 1). This is particularly vital in more nationally oriented policy areas where the developmental aspects might be more difficult to identify.

All the respondents highlighted the institutional system of institutionalized inter-ministerial consultation<sup>1</sup> as one of the keys to a coherent policy and an institutional tool which is quite unique to Sweden. Inter-ministerial consultation implies that all departments affected by a decision, a government bill, etc. should take part in the preparation of this issue. Parallel to this institutionalized dialogue and preparation, there are in addition several informal processing channels for communication between the different departments which are highlighted by the respondents as equally important. As stated by several of the respondents, the advantage of both the formal and the informal preparation channels is particularly evident when negotiating on EU-level or in other international forums.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gemensam beredning

“We have a great advantage there and we are not such a big country either. It is a great advantage that this is something well-established and you notice it when you talk about the PGD and policy coherence, that there is [in Sweden] a much greater level of coherence than in many other countries, even though this doesn’t mean that it is always successful” (Respondent 5)

The same opinion was expressed by another respondent when asked about the greatest challenges and possibilities for influencing the EU. “The greatest possibility for Sweden is probably, and this might sound technical and bureaucratic, (...) that we have good bureaucrats and that we have the ability to go down to Brussels with well prepared and joint decisions” (Respondent 4). However, as pointed out by some of the respondents, an institutionalized form of inter-ministerial consultation does not always guarantee that everything is thoroughly worked through with everyone who should be involved. One respondent argued that when an issue reaches the point of inter-ministerial consultation, it is sometimes too late in the process as much of the positions have already been prepared (Respondent 1). Another respondent said that

”What you may not always have time for are the decisions that need to be taken quickly because then some people might not know that the department for development should be involved in the process or if they know, they don’t have the time.” (Respondent 2)

The establishment of focal-points responsible for the PGD at each department has also been highlighted as progress by the governmental official respondents, the DAC and the reports and interviews with the CSO’s. How active these are however to a large extent still depend on the personal interest of that particular person as well as the overall interest at the political level of that ministry. Nonetheless, the establishment of focal points is still seen as a great improvement. ”At least we have one entry point at the departments who knows about this and sometimes they are several. It has surely evolved from nothing to actually having this framework” (Respondent 2)

### **4.3.3 Analytical capacity**

One of the respondents underlined that the original PGD document of 2003 itself is not as important as the perspectives that it conveys (Respondent 4). Another highlighted its importance as a set of values and a vision (Respondent 2). A majority of the respondents expressed that global perspectives and development aspects were much more present today than previously, but that this does not necessarily derive from the new start of the PGD but from a general discourse increasingly focused on globalization and a general awareness on the

interconnectedness of political decisions and actions around the world. As one respondent expressed it:

”I believe that there are often more global perspectives [today] and development perspectives in different issues that are not necessarily referred to as PGD, which does not by definition has to be a problem. It’s not as if everyone needs to be able to say PGD. It is thanks to that the political has been reformulated but also thanks to globalization.” (Respondent 2)

Another respondent argued very much along the same line, saying that “it [the PGD] has existed since 2003 and probably carried more weight then, was more well-known as a policy in the beginning, but the principle in itself has probably become more and more established now within the Government Offices” (Respondent 1). The same respondent made the reflection that this was a natural progress as more knowledge exist today about that development aid is not the sole solution to reach an equitable and sustainable global development. Instead, there is a general process towards working more together with other actors in society such as businesses and together with various actors and policies create synergy effects.

As already established, the perspectives of the PGD are meant to permeate all policy areas and progress has been made to facilitate this such as focal points at the different departments and through the inter-ministerial consultation processes. A greater overall discourse of globalization and the interconnectedness of the world has also evolved. Some departments have in addition more outspokenly demanded that all their administrative officials should apply a development perspective. However, lack of knowledge about the PGD and the perspectives that guide it is still brought up as fundamental problems by the respondents as these are complicated issues. Knowledge about different policy areas and their effect on development for the poor is acquired through different channels such as the OECD, academic research reports, CSOs and additionally to a large extent through the authorities such as the Migration Board, the National Board of Trade, the Swedish Board Agriculture, etc. who have the role as expert authorities on their specific topics. “Many of the authorities are actually almost better than us at the Government Offices to analyze and they work closer to the issue as they work more hands-on” (Respondent 2). The Government officials highlighted the civil society as an important actor, and the CSOs have appreciated the dialogue taking place during the years. However, the CSOs were in the same time critical of the perceived lack of continuous discussions as most dialogue takes place in time of a Communication to be published.

“(...) it has been said that a wide range of actors should be part of consultations so that it is not only the Government but also the Parliament, the civil society, the private sector as well as researchers. There were quite ambitious goals made initially that we believe should be observed to a higher degree, for instance to have forums and ways to achieve the multi-stakeholder approach of the PGD.” (Respondent 11)

The PGD-perspectives are however still not integrated among everyone but rather up to the focal points at each department, who themselves have various degrees of interest and knowledge about the development perspectives (Respondent 2). There are furthermore inter-departmental groups consisting of the various focal-points from the different departments who meet to discuss a specific topic or in relation to the PGD for instance in the preparation for a Government Communication. To what extent these groups are up to functioning is however still rather unclear. To see the contribution of that particular policy area to development in developing countries can be a daunting task.

”I can understand that someone at another department who has to think about ‘how does my policy affect the developing countries’ can find it difficult. You’re often an expert at certain things and then to add the development perspective to that is hard. It can definitely improve even though I believe a lot has happened when it comes to awareness. And to some extent when it comes to knowledge”. (Respondent 2)

Another respondent argued that even though it is difficult to demand a full comprehension on development aspects by everyone working at the Government Offices, they should at least know that it is relevant, as decided by the Government and Parliament, and that they should know who to turn to for input on the issue (Respondent 1). Nevertheless, this implies that the message about the existence and relevance of the PGD has actually been sufficiently brought forward (Respondent 1). However, the need for greater understanding of the perspectives of the poor and a rights perspective is not only restricted to other departments but also to the administrative officials working at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

“A lot of people at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs also lack experience from developing countries so it is not as we as a group know how it feels like to be poor in Tanzania. (...) Many have never been out [in developing countries]. But other departments have absolutely no idea what this is about and that makes it even harder. There are a lot of conceptions that ‘this will probably be good for development’ (...) but these are complicated issues” (Respondent 10)

The Government Communications on result and progress of the PGD to the Parliament have in themselves become a tool for communication around the issues as they are highlighted by

several of the respondents as opportunities for the different departments to evaluate the process made and discussions are held between the different departments, secretary of states and the focal points (Respondent 2&4). The renewed model of reporting has been welcomed by the OECD-DAC (2009) as well as Swedish CSOs (Concord 2011b, p. 1) as it improves the possibilities for the Government itself as well as others to monitor the progress and the results. Especially in the interviews with the CSOs, it was pointed out that even though there are positive actions towards evaluation and adjustments, the indicators established are more connected to the process of the PGD rather than results which decreases the incentives and possibilities for achieving any actual results (Respondent 11). Nevertheless, as emphasized by the DAC Peer Review (2009, p. 41) and also by some of the respondents both on the Government side and the CSO's, the Government Communications are not really sufficient as evaluations, and most importantly not politically free, as they are in fact self-assessments of the Government's work by the Government itself. It has been suggested that an external research institute such as SADEV should have the mandate to do these evaluations. This subject was not really touched upon by the interviews at this stage apart from some of them agreeing that this could be valuable.

A great part of the critique planted by CSOs is that the Government Communications have focused too much on making visible the potential synergies but not so much the conflicts of interest (Respondent 9&11, Concord 2011b, p. 2). "(...) we believe that synergies have been looked for to a far too great extent and that the sensitive and apparent conflicts that actually exist between different areas have not been tackled" (Respondent 11). By this, the whole idea of the PGD is being missed out on. "(...) the idea [with the PGD] was to make visible the conflicts of objectives, to bring them into light so that they could be settled at the political level" (Respondent 9). One of the respondents argued that there is a difference between conflicts of objectives and conflicts of justice because "(...) a Government has a policy and if that has created conflicts of objectives within it, the Government has done wrong. However, there may be conflicts of interest and conflicts in the way the policy is being implemented" (Respondent 4). According to the same respondent, the greatest conflict of interest has been the role of development aid, that the development aid was perceived to be the one to pay for, in the worst cases, policy failures in other areas. In the next Government Communication, it is said that conflicts of interests will be more explicitly dealt with which is considered a positive step forward and a courageous measurement as well (Respondent 1, 2&4).

#### 4.4 The EU

As previously described, the work for policy coherence has evolved also within the EU with the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty and more specifically in the Policy Coherence for Development (PCD). Several of the respondents bring up Sweden's role in this progress as the Swedish PGD and its process has worked as somewhat of a model for the work within the EU. Quite a few of the interviewed concur that Sweden has, together with a few other like-minded countries, pushed hard for the development of the European PCD. "[Sweden's role in the EU PCD] is something I believe we should feel really proud of and it is something that I don't think we understand how big that is" (Respondent 4). A large number of the respondents claimed that Sweden has pushed hard for the acknowledgment of policy coherence for development generally within the EU as well as within different policy areas, especially during the Swedish EU-presidency in 2009 (Respondents 1,2,4,5,6 &7). The latest restructuring of the EU PCD into five global challenges is also said to be inspired by the Swedish structure and took place during the Swedish presidency. Furthermore, several of the respondents highlighted that as the effects of decisions and policies taken within the EU are so much greater for developing countries than the effect of a single country like Sweden, it is really the crucial forum in which policy coherence issues must be brought up high on the agenda. As one respondent explained it: "The EU is an important arena and (...) it doesn't matter if we have a perfect policy here in Sweden, it doesn't affect as far, but if we influence the EU it has so much greater effect" (Respondent 2). In order for Sweden to act upon this, a lot more knowledge and capacity must be acquired. One respondent claims that the most important contribution to Swedish policy coherence work "(...) would probably be to invest in a substantial expansion of knowledge about how the EU's policies may particularly affect conditions in poor countries" (Respondent 1). Another respondent argued that one problem when negotiating on an EU-level is that Sweden is still too small of a country:

"Maybe we are slightly naive. We are a small country within the EU and when it comes down to it, it is the big players who decide, which means that it is about realpolitik and then these issues [international development] come second. (...) We are small, nice and naive. Maybe we are still not so great at forming alliances, we think that if we are well prepared everything will be alright but we haven't really talked it through beforehand with the others [countries]."  
(Respondent 4)

The recent civil society report *Spotlight on Policy Coherence for Development* argues that progress has been made within the EU for the Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) but

that “more solid and proper implementation of PCD” is needed in all EU policies (Concord 2011, p. 7) as there are still “a huge gap between stated intentions and the reality of EU policies and their impact on people living in poverty in developing countries” (Concord 2011, p. 14). Greater awareness as well as political will are needed to increase the importance of the EU PCD and for the implementation to be successful, strengthening the capacity, the mechanisms, the instruments and the tools is crucial (Concord 2011, p. 14). The latest EU Commission report on PCD also acknowledges the need for moving beyond the “ ‘do no harm’ mindset” by looking for more pro-active integration of development objectives into EU policies” (EU 2011, p. 102)

The sheer size and structural framework of the EU as well as the multitude of stakeholders involved obviously pose great challenge for coherence at EU-level, something which has been indicated by previous evaluations and was also confirmed by several of the respondents.

(...).The EU has been built on successively with different financial instruments, different General Directorates, different agencies covering different geographical areas and so on. (...) In many areas it is so much more difficult than on a Swedish level, because the structure is so complex and has an in-built incoherence for example with regard to its common agricultural policy which makes it so much more of a challenge” (Respondent 11).

The numerous stakeholders involved, 27 member countries organized into various governing bodies, also pose many challenges. Among these countries, the interest and orientation for international development varies.

“There are many countries that up until very recently have had a low development level with many poor, and there are still many poor living in these countries. So they have their own problems to deal with. Of course, that immediately makes it more difficult to work with policy coherence for development. I believe that this poses the really great challenge, that despite having internal problems themselves, to be able to work in the broader developing perspective” (Respondent 6)

The challenges of great differences between different member countries have also been highlighted in previous evaluation reports.

“External evaluations as well as the two EU biennial reports on PCD that have been published in 2007 and 2009 have shown important variations between member states in the efforts they make to promote PCD both at home and in Brussels. This pattern results from highly differing degrees of political importance attached to development cooperation in general and PCD in particular across the different member states, and has hampered progress made in European policy processes.” (Keijzer 2010, p. v)

The European development policy is currently being reformulated; or rather an amendment to the current “European Consensus on Development” is being elaborated. Sweden is therefore working for the EU to highlight the policy coherence perspective. Sweden is also part of an informal working group for policy coherence and development co-operation that is open to all member countries but where only a limited amount of countries participate according to their interest in the issue. Normally, it is the Nordic countries plus Great Britain and the Netherlands who participate most actively. The European Commission also opens up for input from this working group regarding policy coherence for development.

The role of the new European External Action Service (EEAS) is still a bit unclear regarding the mandate for policy coherence for development. Sweden is advocating for the inclusion of these issues in the role of the new (EEAS) as it already holds the position of coordinating the foreign policy and security issues of the European Union (Respondent 2). If this is realized, the orientation of the policy coherence aspect still needs to be under constant vigilance.

”It is an interesting development now that the EU has a new External Action Service that aims for the EU to act with one voice and coherently to a much greater extent. However, this does not necessarily mean that the EU becomes more coherent with the development goals, but just more coherent which could mean coherent with the EU’s own interests. We believe that this new external action service could do much good and make the EU a much more powerful actor but it still remains to see if this is the case. Especially in times of economic crises, there is a tendency that there are stronger forces wanting to ensure that the EU’s own economic interests are put first” (Respondent 11)

## **5 Analysis and final discussion**

The aim of this research has been to investigate *what relevance and impact the Swedish Policy for Global Development has had on Swedish policies and the implementation thereof, in general and in particular on migration and trade, since its initiation until today*. To answer the research question, interviews with Government officials as well as experts from civil society organizations have been made and secondary material in the form of reports and evaluations have been studied. The study confirms and develops the positions in other reports by bringing more empirical data to show that even though great challenges still exist, the Swedish Policy for Global Development has been and is today still relevant and creates impact. This especially accounts for the general awareness of the importance of all policy areas contributing to the development of developing countries.

## 5.1 Migration

Migration is a transverse issue, perhaps to an even greater extent than trade, with impact from and on many different policy areas. The limitations of a research like the one conducted can never make this complexity justice but has instead tried to focus on a few overarching aspects related to the regulatory framework.

The results indicate an apparent increased focus on the developmental aspects of migration since it was chosen as one of the six global challenges in the new start of the PGD. The attention has proved positive as it has augmented the focus on the contributions of migration to the development people living in poverty. However, the inducements for the increased focus on migration, especially the areas highlighted in the PGD, might also be interpreted as an increased self-interest in confronting the future demographic challenges of Sweden. National self-interest is of course natural and often a prerequisite for achieving engagement in developmental issues, but it is important to ensure that the focus is continuously on the aim of the PGD which is to achieve an equitable and sustainable global development with a poor peoples' perspective and a rights perspective. Even though it might not be necessary to adopt a particular policy on migration and development cooperation, views on this differ, the fact that the issue was raised might be an indicator of the need for greater clarity on migration and development cooperation. The reason would be to facilitate the detection of the possible synergies as well as conflicts of interest with other policy areas, especially those with a more national focus. Such an effort would be especially important in order to address both push and pull factors as reasons for migration.

Several interesting processes can be seen as related to a generally increased engagement in development aspects of migration on an international level but also as a result from the PGD. For instance, the Committee report on Circular migration can be seen as an important and progressive step towards achieving greater policy coherence for development among many different stakeholders. As presented in the *Theoretical framework*, there is a constant cooperation and competition between different stakeholders with contrasting values and interests within political systems and subsystems (Forster & Stokke 1999, p. 3&17). The complexity of the issue of migration and the many different stakeholders involved, carrying with them various and sometimes conflicting interests, therefore provide the greatest challenge for the implementation of the PGD. As will also be further discussed regarding the PGD in general, this highlights the importance of a constant communication on the point of

departure or the “here” of what is to be achieved and how (Piciotto 2004, p. 4, Forster & Stokke 1999, p. 25), something which was also highlighted by the respondents as the need for a constant communication on what constitutes an equitable and sustainable development for the poor.

It appears as if the impact of the PGD has first and foremost been an increased engagement and awareness on developing issues within the area of migration, as well as positive steps towards an actual implementation. However, many challenges still remain. Overall, the challenges relate to increasing the knowledge and engagement among both administrative officials as well as politicians beyond focal points on each side. If this can be achieved, there is also a greater possibility in the end for a “(..) correlation between the statements and declarations and the actual policy performance (..)” (Molina, p. 244), to be achieved on all levels and with all stakeholders involved.

## **5.2 Trade**

The results from the interviews together with previous evaluations demonstrate that the PGD has had a sincere impact on the policy area of trade. There appear to be well-established forms of cooperation between the different departments and much effort has been placed on increasing the institutional framework as well as analytical capacity. Trade furthermore comes forth as the policy area in which related development assistance (aid) is the most integrated. However, the discrepancy between the opinions of the Government and the civil society, both in regards to to the dialogue between the two as well as the developmental effects of the Swedish positions on trade, is rather striking. For instance, the implied direct connection made by the Government between trade, economic growth and poverty reduction is not shared by CSOs and there are widely differing opinions on the impact of the trade agreements. As agreed upon by both the Government officials as well by the CSOs, the policy area of trade is in many respects in coherence with the directions established in the PGD. A clear consistency between the *objectives, the strategies and mechanisms, and the outcome* can therefore be argued for, which constitutes policy coherence (Forster & Stokke). Nevertheless, as claimed by the respondents from the CSOs, this position does not imply that the perspectives of the poor people and the rights perspective are always first at hand. The message that comes across is therefore rather a systematic incoherence within the PGD itself as it preaches both a very strong free trade position as well as the need for poor peoples’ perspective on development. At least it appears as if there is not a common agreement on what constitutes development.

Trade is by far one of the policy areas mostly regulated at an EU-level and the EU, rather than organizations such as the WTO, appears to a large extent have become the most important playing field for Swedish trade positions. Even though the EU position is decided based on the bargaining between positions of its member countries, there is no doubt that the influence of a small country like Sweden is highly restricted and the position of the EU therefore becomes the position of Sweden. The focus on the EU also place high demands on the government officials as well as politicians to grasp the complexity of the many decisions and compromises made on different levels. The need for greater knowledge therefore implies an even greater necessity for dialogue with different actors in society about what constitutes equitable and sustainable global development and the perspectives meant to permeate the Swedish position. The trade area has to a great extent fulfilled what has been the aim of the PGD, namely that each policy area should be responsible for the implementation of the PGD on its particular field. This is underlined by the fact that the trade department also manages much of the policy guidance of aid efforts related to trade and can therefore contribute to both the *effectiveness* and *quality* of aid (see *Theoretical Framework*). However, the fact that the development assistance is so closely related and managed within the area of trade, requires high analytical competence to ensure that the development assistance retains its main aim of supporting poor people rather than become a tool for the enhancement of Swedish and European trade interests.

As argued in the *Theoretical framework*, political options have to be weighed in and short term gains versus long term gains have to be considered (Piciotto 2004, p. 4). Nonetheless, particularly in times of economic crises and under the competition with new economic actors, it is important that self-interests are not allowed to overshadow the need for international equitable and sustainable development for the poor. One of the greatest foundations of policy coherence is that decisions in one policy area have repercussions in another and will consequently have effects for both developing as well as developed countries. For example, how the issue of trade and its interrelated policy areas of agriculture and raw material are dealt with will have implications for instance on peoples' necessity to migrate.

With the established institutional framework, the analytical capacity and the political interest, the policy area of trade holds great potential for achieving even greater policy coherence for development in line with the PGD. As with the policy area of migration, this however requires a constant vigilance and dialogue regarding the impact of the decisions made and what constitutes development for the poor.

### 5.3 PGD in general

The fact that the policy still exists and is apparently being used, though at a varying degree, is in itself a sign of a regular conduct and a consistency with previous politics. This thereby constitutes an argument for the continued impact and relevance of the PGD. A reference can thereby be made to the argument by Molina that there is a temporal dimension of policy coherence which means that policy coherence entails a “(...) regular behavior” during a period of time and that new policy initiatives should promote, or at least not conflict with, past political initiatives (Molina, p.244). The structure of the PGD has undergone changes with the refocusing on six challenges. If the content of the policy is still in line with the original is however somewhat difficult for this thesis to judge upon without doing a more thorough textual analysis of the original PGD and the new start. Even though there are arguments made by some of the respondents, as well as some previous research indications, that there have been some changes even in the content and direction, there appear to be a general consistency with the aim of policy coherence for development of the original PGD.

The respondents’ arguments that the development perspectives are seen as naturally more included in different issues today, even without the reference to the PGD, can on the one hand be seen as positive and an indication that the impact as well as the implementation of the PGD has been successful. On the other hand, as previously described in the theoretical framework, policy coherence in itself pose a challenge to navigate between diverse political interest and thus a challenge to identify the ”here” of what is to be coherent about (Piciotto 2004, p.4) or the “point of departure” (Forster & Stokke 1999 p. 25). Without referring to the PGD, the development perspective integrated in different policy areas as well as throughout implementation, can therefore stand the risk of losing the “here”. In the striving towards an equitable and sustainable world, the perspectives said to guide this development are the rights perspective and the poor peoples’ perspective on development, which I interpret as the “here” of the policy coherence. Without establishing the developmental perspectives applied in different policy areas on the agreed upon consensus on the rights perspective and poor peoples’ perspective on development, there is a risk of undermining the “here” which might lead to an even more fragmented view on development. Who then bears the right of definition of the “here” and how is a coherent policy to be achieved without a common point of departure? This especially becomes relevant in relation to that more actors, both within and outside the Government Offices, authorities, civil society and businesses are involved in the realization of the development perspective. Development is not a static concept and there are

many different opinions on how to reach it. As one of the respondents puts it, it might be a utopia to ever be able to incorporate the perspective of the poor or very difficult to apply the rights perspective on each decision as another respondent argued. However, there is a danger of losing the focus and a risk of greater incoherence if you prevaricate on what you agree upon as the goals and perspectives of development. It is therefore important to retain the relevance of the PGD in order to maintain a common perspective of how to achieve the goal of an equitable and sustainable global development.

As previously shown, there appears to be complex and to a certain extent contradictory answers to the question regarding the achievement of policy coherence for development between different policy areas and also the relationship to development aid. The Communication of 2008 states that the Swedish policy for global development consists of two pillars: policy coherence and development aid. A similar perception is communicated by the respondents, that all policy areas should contribute to development within their related fields and that aid does not constitute the sole achiever of development for developing countries. In spite of the outlined perception, the majority of the respondents also clearly stated that there is prevalent misperception that policy coherence is the responsibility of development aid and that the resources used should be taken from this budget. As highlighted by one of the respondents, the degree of policy coherence could even be related to the priorities or capacity that the Minister for International Development Cooperation and the Department of Development Policy place on the issue. It can be argued that the areas which appear to be most coherent are also the areas that have the most clearly outlined development aid policies as this make it possible to compare and control it. This might seem like an obvious and perhaps a natural result, that the policy areas that have clearly outlined development assistance policies are also the ones with the most impact on development. Consequently they would be the areas which are considered most important to ensure coherence with development assistance policies. Problematically enough, this presents a mixed message. On the one hand, it is said that policy coherence should be a subject on its own and on the other hand that it is always dependent on development aid. As demonstrated in this research, the engagement and will can be ever so strong of the Minister for International Development Cooperation and the Department for Development Policy but the impact of the PGD will be low if there are not enough incentives for the other ministries or departments, neither the manpower nor authority within the former to exercise any evaluation or sanction over the later. The mixed communication of messages regarding the ownership of the issue might

contribute to slowing down the progress of implementation of policy coherence within all policy areas and also contribute to the risk of development aid contributing to the goals of other policy areas rather than the other way around.

As observed by the DAC Peer review and the Swedish CSO's, not much effort has been exercised on highlighting the conflicts of interest in the Government communications but instead much focus has been set on the synergies. Even though it is important to emphasize the positive synergies as positive connections very much constitutes what is coherence (Molina p. 242), there is a risk of undermining the value of the PGD by not paying attention to the complexity of the issue. By not officially acknowledging the conflicts of interest and how these have been or can be tackled, a problem of transparency and thereby credibility is easily created. The objective for a government of having a coherence policy is to gain voter's trust and confidence by coming appearing as strong and firm (Piciotto 2004, p. 4). However, by not bringing to light issues of incoherence, the field is also opened up for critique by the opposition and civil society when incoherent decisions are discovered. In the end, voters' trust is thereby in the risk of being undermined. As pointed out in the theoretical framework, one of the most important aspects when trying to achieve policy coherence is to keep the decision process transparent so that other actors are able to monitor the Government's decisions (Molina p. 245). In the end, a transparent politics is of course a question of democracy but also diminishes the risk of unintended incoherent decisions being made. (*see Theoretical Framework*). To add to the body of knowledge, it is therefore equally important to draw upon the experiences of civil society and other actors. In addition to this, the entire Government loses the opportunity to increase knowledge among the elected politicians and the administrative officials by not sharing the experiences and lessons learned. Clearly, a great deal of information and knowledge is created through the inter-ministerial consultations of different issues and through the informal channels described by the respondents. Nevertheless, the Government Communications lose its value as a tool for analytical competence and development knowledge within and across the different ministries and departments. This opportunity should instead be truly valued, especially as several of the respondents has pointed out that there are still great gaps of knowledge both in terms of the objective of the PGD and of how development is achieved. However, as pointed out by some of the respondents, to confront these conflicting interests would require courage and a willingness to tackle difficult issues. It might furthermore open up for insights in the possible hierarchies of power within the Government offices that have been recognized by the respondents, which is

also part of the constant competition and co-operation between different stakeholders with contrasting values and interests (Forster and Stokke 1999, p.17). If the plan for the next Government Communication due in 2012 is realized, where the intent is also to include conflicts of interests, this would be a very positive progress for the above mentioned reasons.

Policy coherence for development is a complex matter and the “whole of a government”-approach adopted in the Swedish PGD makes this a particularly challenging task. To make matters even more complicated, the Swedish policies do not operate in a vacuum but are particularly influenced and decided upon by the discourses and regulatory frameworks within the EU. To demonstrate exactly which policy decision has a direct influence on a particular outcome, especially in an international context with multiple stakeholders and policies, remains difficult and not the task of this study. The theoretical framework outlined previously in the study demonstrates that policy coherence for development is not static but a process in which choices are made within different political system involving numerous stakeholders holding different political interests. The advancement of the concept itself and the political connotations attached to this, shows a progress from the original standpoint on primarily focusing on synergies to also acknowledging conflicts of interests. This is as previously shown a challenging step which needs to be further enhanced in the Swedish position. All in all, the general conclusions I draw based on the results presented in this research is that, despite the many challenges that still exist for such a broad, ambitious policy as the PGD to be truly implemented, it appears as if it has had real impact and relevance, not the least in starting to create a general awareness on development issues across many policy areas. What would have been the current status on development perspectives if the PGD had not existed is not possible to know. The PGD is a result of the general global discourse on increased awareness of the impact on all political decisions on developing countries, but it is itself also a contributor to the advancement of this discourse. Nevertheless, as shown in the results the need for improvement for a greater awareness on development issues as well as a need for further reinforced structures for the implementation and the analytical capacity, seems to be apparent across both trade and migration as well as on a general note. However, as pointed out by this research as well as other reports, many challenges still remain in all the above mentioned aspects and particularly to ensure that the engagement is maintained as well as enhanced on a political level across all policy areas.

## 5.4 Future research

As the Swedish Policy for Global Development covers such a broad spectra of policies, actors and consequences, the field of future research is immense. One area that has caught my interest is the relationship with the EU. The importance of the EU is highlighted in the PGD itself and Swedish policies are today to a large extent affected by, or to a certain extent controlled by, the EU regulations. How does this affect the outcomes of the PGD and how do the perspectives of the EU influence the PGD itself? What perspectives are allowed to dominate Swedish positions in areas such as trade and migration given the strong trade and security issues of the EU? Of interest would also be to do a discourse analysis comparing for instance the European Development Policy with the European Trade Policy or Global Approach on Migration.

As previously demonstrated, the foundation of the PGD is built on a structure of consensus across all policy fields and across all parties. However, as demonstrated in the results and analysis, this does not divert from that power structures and hierarchies prevail. To perform a power analysis on for example a particular policy and the impact thereof, taking a standpoint in the PGD, would therefore be interesting for a future research topic.

The importance of the PGD is in the end a political decision. However, as these are complicated, often technical, issues transcending across policy areas as well as different political systems and levels both on Swedish, European and global level, it is often difficult to grasp the consequences of policy decisions. As discussed in the study, there are also sometimes questions about the political commitment in other policy areas besides international development cooperation. It would therefore be interesting for further research to investigate the knowledge and interest of the PGD and its perspectives among elected politicians both in the Government as well as in the Parliament.

## List of References

- Barometer (2008), *Folkrörelser mäter trycket på Sveriges politik för global utveckling*, En rapport av ActionAid, Afrikagrupperna, Diakonia, Forum Syd, Kristna Fredsrörelsen, Kvinna till Kvinna, Plan Sverige, Rädda Barnen, Svenska Freds- och skiljedomsföreningen, Svenska Kyrkan, Svenska Missionsrådet
- Barosso, J.M.D (2007), Opening remarks of president Barosso – Legal immigration, President of the European Commission, Press conference, Strasbourg, 23 Oct 2007, Available at <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/07/650&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en> [Accessed 2012-01-23]
- Bryman, A. (2008), *Social research methods (3<sup>rd</sup> ed)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Concord Sverige (2010), *Mini-Barometern 2010 – Folkrörelser mäter trycket på Sveriges Politik för global utveckling*
- Concord Europe (2009), *Spotlight on Policy Coherence Report 2009*, Brussels: Concord
- Concord Europe (2011), *Spotlight on EU Policy Coherence for Development – A Lisbon Treaty provision, A Human Rights obligation*, Brussels: Concord
- Concord (2011), *Spotlight on EU Policy Coherence for Development – Country Profile: Sweden*
- Danielsson, A. & Wohlgemuth, L. (2005), Swedish Development Co-operation in Perspective, in Hoebink, P. & Stokke, O (eds.) (2005), *Perspectives and Performance of individual donor countries and the EU*, London: Routledge Research EADI Studies in Development
- EDCPM (European Centre for Development Policy Management, Maastrich) & ICEI (Instituto Complutense de Estudios Internacionales, Madrid) (2006), *EU Mechanisms that promote policy coherence for development – A scoping study*, Studies in European Development Co-operation Evaluation No 2, Maastricht: European Union
- Esiasson, P., Giljam, M., Oscarsson, H. & Wängnerud, L. (2009), *Metodpraktikan*, Vällingby: Nordstedts Juridik
- European Think-tank group (2010), *New Challenges, New Beginnings – Next Steps in European Development Cooperation*, Overseas Development Institute

- European Commission (2011), *Commission Staff Working Paper – EU 2011 Report on Policy Coherence for Development*, Ref. Ares (2011)1363399 - 15/12/2011, Brussels
- Forster, J. & Stokke, O. (eds), (1999), *Policy coherence in development co-operation*, EADI Book Series 22, London: Frank Cass Publishers
- The Government Offices of Sweden (2003), *Gemensamt ansvar – Sveriges politik för global Utveckling*, Prop. 2002/03:122, Stockholm: Regeringskansliet
- The Government Offices of Sweden (2008), *Globala utmaningar – vårt ansvar. Skrivelse om Sveriges politik för global utveckling*, Skr 2007/08:89, Stockholm: Regeringskansliet
- The Government Offices of Sweden (2010), *Meeting global challenges – Government communication on policy coherence for development 2010*, Skr. 2009/10:129, Stockholm: Regeringskansliet
- Kanbur, R & Sumner, A. (2011), *Poor Countries or Poor People? Development Assistance and the New Geography of Global Poverty*, Working paper, Charles H Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management, Cornell University: Ithaca, New York
- Keijzer, N. (2010), *EU Policy Coherence for Development: from moving the goalposts to Result-based management?*, Discussion Paper 101, Maastricht: ECDPM, Available at [www.ecdpm.org/dp101](http://www.ecdpm.org/dp101) [Accessed 2012-01-23]
- Molina, P. A (Undated), Enlargement, coherence and development policy, in Barbé, E & Johansson-Nogués, El (eds) (2003), *Beyond Enlargement: The new members and new frontiers of the enlarged European Union*, Institut Universitari d'Estudis Europeus IUEE Available at <http://www.iuee.eu/pdf-publicacio/117/pWMGTulfsYyIVt3WqKBv.PDF> [Accessed 2012-01-23]
- Odén, B & Lundquist, O. (2007), Policy coherence – vital for global development, in *Perspectives no. 5*, Centre for African Studies, Gothenburg: Gothenburg University
- OECD (2005), *The Development Dimension: Policy Coherence for Development – Promoting institutional good practice*, OECD Publishing
- OECD-DAC (2009), *Sweden – Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Peer review*, OECD Publishing, Available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/27/37/43278517.pdf> [Accessed 2012-01-23]
- OECD (2011) *DAC Mid-term Review of Sweden*, The Head of Division, Development Co-

Operation Directorate, Review, Evaluation & Engagement, OECD-DAC  
Available at <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/17/30/39/415ec365.pdf>  
[Accessed 2012-01-23]

OECD (2011), *Recruiting immigrant workers: Sweden 2011*, Summary, OECD Publishing,  
Available at <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/18/28/67/fd2ab163.pdf>  
[Accessed 2012-01-15]

Picciotto, R. (2004) Global Policy Project, Background Paper: *Policy Coherence and Development Evaluation* in OECD Workshop: Policy Coherence for Development, Paris May 18-19

Picciotto, R (2005), Introduction – Key Concepts, Central Issues, in *Fostering Development in a Global Economy*, OECD Publishing

Repstad, Pål (1999): *Närhet och distans*, Lund: Studentlitteratur

SOU 2001:96, Globkom (2001) *En ny svensk politik för global utveckling*, Statens offentliga utredningar, Stockholm

SOU 2011:28 *Cirkulär migration och utveckling – förslag och framåtblick*, Kommittéen för Cirkulär migration och utveckling, slutbetänkande. Stockholm

*Sveriges Politik för Global utveckling – i praktiken. Folkrörelseutvärdering 2006* (2006), Afrikagrupperna, Diakonia, Forum Syd, Kristna Fredsrörelsen, Kooperation utan Gränser, Svenska Freds- och Skiljedomsföreningen

UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) (2011), *The Least Developed Countries Report 2011 – The Potential Role of South-South Cooperation for Inclusive and Sustainable Development*, New York and Geneva: United Nations

### ***Internet sources***

European Commission: *Policy Coherence for Development*, Official web-site, Development and cooperation – EuropeAid, [Updated 2011-12-22] Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/policy-coherence/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/policy-coherence/index_en.htm) [Accessed 2012-01-23]

European Commission Home Affairs (a): *Towards a common European Union migration policy*, Official website, Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/immigration/immigration\\_intro\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/immigration/immigration_intro_en.htm) [Accessed 2012-01-23]

European Commission Home Affairs (b): *Cooperation with non-EU countries: the Global*

*Approach to migration*. Official web-site, Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/external/external\\_ga\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/external/external_ga_en.htm) [Accessed 2012-01-23]

Europa: *Lissabonfördraget – Ett fördrag för framtidens EU*, Official website.  
[http://europa.eu/lisbon\\_treaty/take/index\\_sv.htm](http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/take/index_sv.htm) [Accessed 2012-01-23]

The Government Offices of Sweden: *Sweden's policy for global development*, Available at official web-site <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/14232> [Updated 2011-08-12] [Accessed 2012-01-23]

The Government Offices of Sweden (2010): *The Swedish Trade Policy Declaration* (Regeringens handlingspolitiska deklARATION), Stockholm: The Government Offices, Available at <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/14/37/94/f1b3d0ff.pdf> [Accessed 2012-01-23]

The Government Offices of Sweden: *Bistånd och utveckling – den svenska utvecklingspolitiken* <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/2355> [Accessed 2012-01-02]

International Organization for Migration: *Facts and figures*, Website  
<http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/about-migration/facts-and-figures/lang/en> [Accessed 2012-01-23]

International Organization for Migration: *About the GCIM*, Official Website  
<http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/policy-research/migration-policy/gcim/about-gcim/cache/offonce;jsessionid=84151186C1FE3FB4644ADC48842D093B.worker02> [Accessed 2012-01-23]

Nilsson, E-C (2006) Presentation paper: *Role of NGO's in Policy Coherence*, Conference on Policy Coherence for Development 'Call for Coherence' 2-3 October 2006 Helsinki [Online] Available at [http://maailma.net/artikkelit/presentation\\_eva\\_christina\\_nilsson](http://maailma.net/artikkelit/presentation_eva_christina_nilsson) [Accessed: 2012-01-09]

OECD (29 April 2010) "Recommendation of the Council on Good Institutional Practices in Promoting Policy Coherence for Development"  
<http://acts.oecd.org/Instruments/ShowInstrumentView.aspx?InstrumentID=260&InstrumentPID=260&Lang=en&Book=False> [Accessed 2011-11-07]

OECD, *Better Policies for Development: International Platform on Policy Coherence for development*, Available at <https://community.oecd.org/community/pcd> [Accessed 2012-01-23]

### **Interviews**

11 interviews with Government officials and CSO representatives between the 21<sup>st</sup> of November 2011 and 12<sup>th</sup> of January 2012.