The Search for Policy Coherence

Analyzing the coherence between the EU's development policy and foreign policy

Elianne Kjellman

Abstract

The European Union is one of the world's most impactful development actors. As such, it has adopted the Policy Coherence for Development framework in order to minimize contradictions between policies that affect developing countries. The ultimate goal of the framework is to increase development effectiveness to the benefit of partners. However, the existing literature is rich in doubts of the framework's feasibility, and in arguments that the EU's development policy has come to execute the union's foreign interests rather than the interests of developing countries. This thesis contributes to the literature by conducting an in-depth analysis on the coherence between the thematic objectives in European Union's development policy and its foreign policy. As a double case study, thematic coding analysis is conducted to uncover the policies' objectives and main themes. A framework that conceptualizes policy coherence in terms of overlaps and contradictions then guides the analysis. The findings show the complexity of the Policy Coherence for Development framework, and demonstrate the many ways in which both overlaps and contradictions between the two policies can be identified. Ultimately, the thesis argues for the importance of in-depth studies that illustrate the complexity of policy coherence to underpin the larger debate.

Key words: European Union, Policy Coherence, Development Policy, Foreign Policy, Policy Coherence for Development

Word count: 9470

Acknowledgements

Table of contents

1. Introduction

Policy coherence can be defined as the systematic reduction of contradictions and promotion of synergies between policies in order to reach the outcomes associated with jointly agreed objectives (Nilsson et al., 2012:396). In other words, the coherence between two separate- but related- policies is advantageous in order for the objectives of the respective policies to be achieved. Conversely, incoherence between policies obstruct the achievement of policy objectives. For this reason, studying policy coherence is the first vital step to improving policy effectiveness, ergo the effectiveness of a given institution. A number of major institutions have implemented Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) frameworks to increase their effectiveness and minimize contradictions between policies that affect developing countries (European Commission, 2017a; OECD, 2018; UN General Assembly, 2015:27/35). The European Union is one of these institutions. As the world's largest donor of development assistance (€66.8 billion in 2020), as well as the largest donor of humanitarian aid (€2.1 billion in 2020) (EEAS, 2022a), the union is arguably one of the world's most influential development actors. Thus, the union's PCD framework has significant implications for the developing world.

However, PCD is a contested subject. While agreeing that the goal of policy coherence is desirable, scholars are generally doubtful as to its feasibility (Barry et al., 2010; Bossuyt et al., 2018; Carbone, 2008; May et al., 2006). In the literature, the commitment is often deemed too ambitious. Development policy has been said to be particularly prone to incoherence with other policies, as it oftentimes is at odds with the donor country's own short term interests (Ashoff, 2005:36). Contending objectives, heterogeneity between developing countries, and institutional constraints are further examples of obstructions that stand in the way of PCD. Simultaneously, several scholars have in recent years argued that the European Union's development policy has all-too-much come to reflect the union's own foreign interest, rather than the interests of developing nations (Babarinde, 2019; Delputte & Lightfoot, 2019; Furness et al. 2020). In official policy documents, the EU itself calls for the development policy to become more aligned with the union's strategic priorities (EEAS, 2016:11). The development policy, according to some, has evolved into an instrument of the union's foreign policy.

This thesis contributes to the literature on policy coherence within the European Union. Specifically, it seeks to explore the overlaps and potential contradictions between the EU's development policy and its foreign policy. In doing this, it demonstrates the complexity of the concept of policy coherence. The following subsection details the purpose and scope of the thesis. Section two provides a background by outlining the central concepts and summarizing the existing literature on the relevant topics. Section

three describes the chosen framework, which provides both the conceptual and theoretical grounds of the thesis. Section four details the methodology, and reflects on the thesis' limitations. The chunk of the thesis is section five in which the analysis is carried out. Finally, the conclusion summarizes the analytical findings, ties it back in with the existing literature, and makes some brief suggestions for future research within the area.

1.1 Purpose and scope

This project seeks to investigate the coherence between the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and its development policy (EUDP). While numerous scholars have weighed in on the coherence between the EU's external policies, the literature lacks in-depth studies to support the discussion. Additionally, much of the existing literature on the two policies in question is from before their current versions were published in 2016 and 2017 respectively. Therefore, it could use an update. Studying policy coherence is a complex task, which this thesis demonstrates. The intention is to contribute to the literature by exploring the thematic overlaps and potential contradictions between the two policies. Importantly, the goal is not to definitively determine this (in)coherence. Rather, in its research and analysis, the thesis highlights the nuances and intricacies that can be found in the policies' many interactions. In this way, it intends to contribute to the literature on policy coherence by demonstrating the complexity of the EU's PCD framework.

Specifically, the thesis aims to outline the objectives of the policies in order to uncover their main themes, and follow this up with an in-depth look into some of the overlaps and potential contradictions between the themes. Due to the scope of the thesis, not every theme can be explored. Rather, some themes are selected for a closer analysis to demonstrate the potential for both overlap and contradiction. The thesis thus takes its starting point in policy objectives, derived directly from official policy documents. Indeed, the observable practical work and policy implementation practices are perhaps what come across as the most impactful factors when defining the union's foreign relations and development work. However, this work is guided by its external policies. Policy objectives have been deemed the root cause of policy incoherence (Barry et al., 2010). Studying the coherence between policy objectives then, is the initial step to improving coherence, and by extension, the effectiveness of an institution (Morales, 2018). The less coherence there is between policy objectives, the less coherence there will subsequently be at the implementation stage. Thus, one way of promoting the effectiveness of an institution is to explore and improve its policy coherence. For these reasons, the thesis takes its starting point in policy objectives, which the analysis expands upon. The discussion on the EU's PCD could greatly benefit from an in-depth study that explores the coherence between the objectives of the union's foreign policy and

development policy. In order to achieve its goal, the thesis is anchored in a framework by Nilsson et al. (2012) that measures policy coherence by how much overlap and contradiction exists in the interactions between two policies. The research question is as follows:

What are the thematic overlaps and potential contradictions between key objectives in the EU's foreign policy and development policy?

Finally, it is important to note that the study of policy is deeply intertwined with politics. Politics are what create policy, and policy further shapes the political landscape. Policy documents contain a myriad of potential interests and motives behind their stated objectives. The words that make up any given policy document are seldom just words. Instead, they carry political implications. The political nature of policy can be analyzed from a number of perspectives and ideological convictions. However, the political nature of policy is not the principal research focus of the thesis, since it takes its starting point in policy objectives as they are presented in official documents. This being said, while politics is not the main focus of the thesis, the policies' political nature is considered and reflected upon in the analysis.

2. Background and previous research

The thesis grounds itself in the previous literature on the debated topics of Policy Coherence for Development as well as the European Union's development and foreign policies. For this reason, it is important to present a summary of the topics in question and the relevant literature surrounding them. The following sections will present the brief background and relevant previous literature which this thesis builds upon.

2.1 Policy Coherence for Development

Since the 1990's, Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) has been a catchword in the development discourse (Sianes, 2013). Although the literature lacks a common definition, a general understanding of the concept is the desire to promote mutually reinforcing policies that create synergies between agreed objectives which affect developing countries (OECD, 2003). The literature primarily discusses three types of coherence in regards to PCD (Nilsson et al., 2012). Horizontal coherence concerns the coherence between different policy areas. Vertical coherence concerns the coherence between different institutions, e.g. between the EU's development policy and its member states' (MSs) development policies. Finally, internal coherence refers to the coherence within one single policy. This thesis maintains a focus on horizontal coherence. PCD frameworks have been widely adopted by institutions in efforts to streamline external policies between sectors, levels of government and executive bodies (European Commission, 2017a; OECD, 2018; UN General Assembly, 2015:27/35). The European Union was one of the first to introduce such a framework. Its commitment to PCD was presented in the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 which states "The Union shall in particular ensure the consistency of its external activities as a whole in the context of its external relations, security, economic and development policies" (Treaty on European Union, 1992, Article 3 p.6). According to the European Commission (2017a), the purpose of the commitment is to minimize contradictions and create synergies between EU policies that affect developing countries. The EU's MSs have since reiterated their commitment to PCD on several occasions, notably in the Lisbon Treaty in 2008 and in the new European Consensus on Development in 2017.

Two of the main EU policies that directly affect developing countries are the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Development Policy (EUDP), which are the current subject of research. While they are two separate policies, they share much in common. The CFSP is mainly concerned with resolving conflict and fostering peace, as well as touching on topics such as trade, aid, and development cooperation (European Union, 2023). The EUDP has the main aims of fostering sustainable development and

stability in developing countries, with the number one goal of eradicating poverty (European Commission, 2017b). Organizationally, they are both part of the European External Action Service (EEAS), which is the union's diplomatic service. Furthermore, the CFSP is the main vehicle of the Global Strategy, which is the union's most recent doctrine intended to guide its external action in regards to security and defense (EEAS, 2016). The EUDP also shares the aim of implementing the Global Strategy (European Commission, Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development, 2017). Ostensibly, even though they are two separate policies, the two overlap in both organization and focus.

2.1.1 Challenges to PCD

Among scholars, the aspirations of PCD are generally deemed desirable (Ashoff, 2005:11; May et al., 2006). However, the desirable nature of its objectives has been theorized to be too ambitious to feasibly be achieved. Carbone (2008) has branded the commitment a 'mission impossible' for several reasons. Firstly, the EUDP has evolved into a broad, catch-all problem solver of sorts that is tasked with taking on enormous economic, political and social problems. Not only does the policy tackle massive challenges such as global poverty and climate change, but it has also come to be responsible for addressing the root causes of these challenges (Furness et al., 2020). Secondly, development objectives are the first to hit the chopping board when times get tough. Under financial or political strain, these objectives will quickly be deprioritized to make room for policies that are more likely to satisfy the public. Hence, PCD is obstructed. Thirdly, PCD at the vertical level will not be achieved in the EU while MSs maintain varying degrees of commitment to international development. The final of Carbone's arguments is the inconsistency of the EU's institutional architecture. A clear hierarchy at the decision-making level in regards to the union's external policies is required in order to ensure that development objectives do not become deprioritized. The lack of such a hierarchy is to the detriment of PCD (Carbone, 2008).

However, since Carbone's branding of PCD as a 'mission impossible', the EU has undergone significant institutional changes in regards to its external policies. The Lisbon Treaty of 2008 instituted considerable reforms to the organizational structure of the EU, with one of the purposes being to further PCD (Furness & Gänzle, 2016). One major change was the creation of the previously mentioned European External Action Service (EEAS). This diplomatic service, which was principally tasked with carrying out the CFSP, combined previously separate external action services in an attempt to create greater coherence in the EU's foreign relations through collective action. Furness and Gänzle (2016) examined whether or not the reforms of the Lisbon Treaty improved coherence in regards to the EU's security-development nexus. They found that the EEAS indeed has increased collective action, which in turn is beneficial for policy coherence.

However, in order to truly facilitate PCD, an institutional decision-making hierarchy that can prioritize development interests would still be required. Otherwise, development objectives are likely to continuously be deprioritized. According to Furness and Gänzle, the Lisbon Treaty reforms failed to institute such a hierarchy. The institutional makeup of the EU is thus still unlikely to ensure the prioritization of development objectives and, by extension, achieve PCD, despite major reforms such as the creation of the EEAS (Carbone & Keijzer, 2015; Furness & Gänzle, 2016).

2.2 The evolution of EU development policy

In addition to the institutional evolution of the EU, the EUDP has undergone an evolution that reflects the development discourse at large. From the 1990's into the 2000's, the development agenda was guided by a moral focus on poverty alleviation. The introduction of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals in 2015 greatly broadened the scope of development, and expanded the very definition of the word itself (Potter et al., 2018:34). While the main goal of the EUDP remains to eradicate poverty, some authors argue that this shift in the discourse allowed for the European Union to increasingly veer its development policy from a commitment of altruism to an opportunity for instrumentalism (Delputte & Lightfoot, 2019; Furness et al. 2020; Holden, 2020). Instrumentalism is in this regard referring to the usage of development policy to further one's own interests (Asongu & Jellal, 2016). Specifically, it is argued, the EUDP has become an instrument through which the union can pursue its CFSP objectives. In the CFSP, it is stated:

> *"Development policy also needs to become more flexible and aligned with our strategic priorities."*
> (EEAS, 2016:11)

The EUDP further reiterates this sentiment:

> *"In addition, the Global Strategy for the EU's Foreign and Security Policy (the Global Strategy) provides an overall vision for a joined-up, credible and responsive engagement in the world."*
> (European Commission, Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development, 2017:4)

Seemingly, the union itself expresses an interest to converge the two policies. The aim to align the EUDP with the strategic goals of the CFSP is explicitly stated. Hence, the two separate policies have the same overarching desire of carrying out the EU's Global Strategy. Furness et al. (2020) argue that the evolution of the EUDP into an instrument of

the CFSP is further apparent when observing how the union turns to its development policy in response to international challenges. An example of how international challenges have come to shape the EUDP is the 2015 migration crisis. The rise of populist anti-migrant rhetoric in countries such as Hungary and Poland changed development policy at the state level, which set in motion changes at the EU level (Szent-Iványi & Kugiel, 2020). The EUDP is thus tasked with much more than it was originally intended to. In addition to pursuing its own objectives, it also acts as an instrument of the CFSP, carrying out the foreign interests of the European Union and its MSs (Furness et al., 2020). Moreover, the evolution of the policy is increasingly allowing for development aid to be used as a tool for economic, political and social instrumentalism, rather than nurturing an altruistic focus (Holden, 2020). As demonstrated by the excerpts above, the policy documents themselves express the desire to align the EUDP with the union's strategic priorities.

However, some authors describe this dichotomy between the 'all-altruistic' or 'all-instrumental' development policy as misleading (Delputte & Lightfoot, 2019; Herceg Kolman & Bandov, 2022). It is argued a third perspective is needed to accurately illustrate its evolution. The policy is dynamic, and it is capable of being mutually selfish and selfless. Indeed, international challenges such as the 2015 migrant crisis have increasingly tasked the EUDP with carrying out the union's foreign interests, and the two policies seem to be converging. Yet, while altering the policy to respond to such crises, the union has not abandoned its main purpose of aiding developing countries. In fact, it maintains such a focus in a plethora of areas. The complexity of the EUDP reflects the complexity of the real world, and it is an oversimplification to bypass this in the literature by presenting a conclusive dichotomy of altruism versus instrumentalism (Delputte & Lightfoot, 2019; Herceg Kolman & Bandov, 2022).

In summary, while scholars are generally positive regarding the ambitions of PCD frameworks, they are simultaneously skeptical regarding their viability. Furthermore, while the European Union's development policy and foreign policy always have existed within the same domain of external policies, their latest versions seemingly see them approaching one another. However, authors discuss the instrumentalism of the EUDP to varying degrees. This thesis takes its starting point against the backdrop of the presented background and complex interpretation of the European Union's development policy and foreign policy. In the wake of their increasing proximity to one another, it has perhaps never been more relevant to conduct an in-depth study of their coherence, and to demonstrate the complexity of the EU's PCD framework.

3. Theoretical framework

This section presents the conceptual and theoretical framework that guides the research and the analysis. The overarching framework that is relevant to the thesis is undoubtedly the concept of Policy Coherence for Development. However, as mentioned previously, the concept of PCD has been utilized and interpreted in a number of ways. The EU's development and foreign policies that are the current subject of research were themselves created against the backdrop of the union's own PCD framework. This section will present a framework that provides both a conceptual and a theoretical foundation for analyzing policy coherence.

Prior to presenting the chosen framework, it is again important to note that policy is rooted in politics. The political aspects of policy, such as possible underlying interests, real-world consequences or the 'real meaning' behind diplomatically chosen words, can all be subject to research and interpreted from a number of theoretical perspectives or ideological convictions. For example, the EUDP has previously been analyzed using a postcolonial perspective (Orbie, 2021; Weldeab Sebhatu, 2020), and the CFSP using a critical feminist perspective (Haastrup et al., 2019; Kalland Aarstad, 2015). Much can be said for the political facets of EU policy. The purpose of this thesis, though, is to explore within which themes of the policy documents their objectives overlap, and where there is potential for contradiction. In doing so, the analysis in section 5 is not naive to the political nature of the policy objectives. However, the politics of the policies are not the main focus. The chosen framework that is presented in the following paragraphs reflects this, as it is suitable for this type of theoretical analysis.

3.1 The coherence framework

The chosen theoretical framework builds on an article by Nilsson et al. (2012) that presents a conceptualization of policy coherence, as well as an analytical framework for analyzing it. For simplicity's sake, this will henceforth be referred to as the coherence framework. The conceptualization of policy coherence that underpins the thesis is based in the coherence framework. The definition that opened the introduction was adapted from Nilsson et al., i.e: policy coherence can be defined as the systematic reduction of contradictions and promotion of synergies between policies in order to reach the outcomes associated with jointly agreed objectives (Nilsson et al., 2012:396). The framework hence conceptualizes policy coherence as the interaction between two policies. These interactions are measured in terms of synergies and contradictions. While utilizing the framework, the thesis will use the word 'overlap' instead of 'synergy', to better reflect its intended purpose and research question. The more overlap, the better

coherence exists between two policies. Conversely, the more potential contradictions can be identified, the lesser coherence exists. It follows then, that if one hopes to increase coherence, the amount of contradictions need to be reduced and the amount of overlap should increase (Nilsson et al., 2012).

Furthermore, the framework builds on the work of Hall (1993), who conceptualizes policy coherence at three levels: policy objectives, policy instruments and policy implementation. These three levels are all part of the coherence framework as levels at which policy interactions take place. As described previously, this thesis utilizes policy objectives as its principal unit of analysis, which it then elaborates further on in the analysis. In doing so, the framework maintains the same level of functionality, which will be outlined below. Additionally, the framework is ideal for analyzing policy coherence at the horizontal level, as this is where the article's illustrative analyses take place. Furthermore, while Nilsson et al. maintain an environmental perspective in their own analyses, they stress that the framework can be utilized to investigate the coherence between any two interacting policies. The coherence framework presents three analytical steps for analyzing policy coherence, which sequentially build upon each other. The empirical research takes place within the first and second analytical steps. The third step follows in the subsequent analysis of the results. The next three subsections will outline these three analytical steps.

3.1.1 Inventory of policy objectives

The first analytical step of the coherence framework is an inventory of all policy objectives in both policies, derived directly from official documents. The goal is to get a broad overview of all policy objectives as they are stated in the documents, sorted by their overarching themes. Policy documents are thus gathered, coded, the final objectives summarized, sorted by theme and compiled in intelligible tables. This inventory provides the initial grounds upon which the following two steps build. The chosen methodology for this straightforward but sizable task is outlined in section four.

3.1.2 The screening matrix

The goal of the coherence framework's second analytical step is to form an overview of the interactions between the two policies. Such an overview is generated through the creation of a screening matrix. Here, Nilsson et al. place the objectives of one policy along the rows and the objectives of the other along the columns. With the help of an expert panel, the interactions between all objectives are then determined as being overlapping, contradictory, or neutral. The matrix in this way serves as a map in which an overview of the potential interactions between all policy objectives is presented. In this

thesis, the screening matrix is adapted somewhat to better fit the scope, aims, and limitations. Firstly, no panel of experts is available to score every potential interaction between the policy objectives. Furthermore, it is not the purpose of the research to definitively determine all interactions as being overlapping or contradictory. Thus, rather than placing all objectives in the matrix, the overarching themes that emerged during the inventory of policy objectives are placed along the rows and columns. The end result is instead a screening matrix that presents the policy objective themes of both policies, and demonstrates how they all interact with each other. Further, instead of definitively determining the interaction between the themes as being overlapping or contradictory, the analysis selects and elaborates on the potential interactions of a few of these themes. The creation of the screening matrix is further elaborated in section four.

3.1.3 Closer analysis of selected themes

Based on the screening matrix, the potential interactions between a number of themes are then selected to be analyzed further in the third analytical step. This third step largely comprises the analysis in section five. The selected themes could be themes that stand out as particularly overlapping or contradictory, or that for some reason seem especially complex. The coherence framework provides an analytical template for this step (Nilsson et al., 2012:405). However, considering the scope, parts of the analytical template are unrelated to this research. For example, the original template includes a section on concrete recommendations for policy makers, which is beyond the scope of this thesis. Table 1 presents an adapted version of the template that has excluded the parts of the original one that were deemed irrelevant. The analytical template provides a basis for the closer analysis of the potential interactions between the selected themes. Not every aspect of the template has to be answered in detail for every chosen interaction, as it rather provides the general footing to base the continued analysis in.

Table 1. Analytical template	
Overall assessment of interactions	**1. What are the main types of interaction?** What components within the policy domains interact?
	2. Interactions of the policy objectives Describe the main interactions.
	Assess (but do not score) level of coherence: strong overlap, weak overlap, neutral, weak conflict or strong conflict (may be several combinations due to objectives, instruments, implementation revealing differential patterns of overlap and contradiction).
	3. Outcomes and impacts Supporting data, assessments or modeling results that describe the sector policy's actual outcomes and impacts (Basic data to be collected for the entire EU. When it comes to specific interactions, it is often necessary to go into specific member states as examples or case studies).
Key overlaps and conflicts (drilling down in more specific interactions)	What are the key policy interactions, where is there overlap or conflict?
	What is the nature of these interactions?
	What is the strength and conditionality of these interactions?
	What is the level of confidence in the analysis?
Opportunities for overlap enhancement and conflict mitigation	Where are the opportunities for mitigation to reduce policy conflict and develop a more overlapping interaction?
	Where are the opportunities to enhance, develop and achieve stronger policy coherence?

Source: Adapted from Nilsson et al. (2012:405).

4. Methodology

4.1 Research design

The research design takes the form of two qualitative case studies, parts of which are selected for closer comparison. The cases in question are the European Union's foreign policy and its development policy. These policies were selected as cases since they operate within the same domain of EU external policy, and since their coherence has hitherto been subject to debate. The research aims to provide a perspective on this coherence, and explore its complexity. The following sections describe how and why the chosen data was selected, what method was chosen for the empirical research, as well as describe the creation of the screening matrix of the policy objective themes. The final subsection reflects on the limitations of the research.

4.2 Data selection

The empirical material consists of official policy documents released by the EU. The objectives of the CFSP are presented in the 2016 document 'A Global Strategy for the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy' (EEAS, 2016). The objectives of the EUDP are presented in the 2017 document 'The New European Consensus on Development' (European Commission, Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development, 2017). Both documents are the latest available version of the respective policies, and are described by the union itself as being the main documents that provide a comprehensive summary of the policies. Additional follow-up documents have been published to update on the progress of the union's work in each area. There are also mentions of the policies in the Treaty on European Union. However, close examination found that this additional material adds nothing beyond what is already outlined in detail in the main policy documents.

In the research, objectives regarding specific geopolitical conflicts were omitted from the CFSP on two grounds. Firstly, no specific conflicts were mentioned in the EUDP. It was deemed unjust, and somewhat misleading, to interpret the possible overlap or contradiction between generally stated and specifically targeted objectives. Secondly, the CFSP document itself is from 2016. The general objectives in the document can be analyzed as this is the latest available version of the policy. However, the status of several geopolitical conflicts, such as the one between Russia and Ukraine, have changed since publication. As a result, the EU's official stance has in some of these specific cases been subject to change (European Council, 2023a; European Council, 2023b). Therefore, it was deemed irrelevant and unfair to include objectives that were published several years

ago in regards to specific conflicts. In total, the two policy documents amount to circa 120 pages. The paragraphs that were omitted from the CFSP on the aforementioned grounds account for approximately two pages.

4.3 Research method

4.3.1 Thematic coding analysis

The main empirical research takes place within the first analytical step of the coherence framework, namely the inventory of policy objectives. Thematic coding analysis was chosen as an appropriate method to complete the inventory as it is a flexible approach to coding, suitable for different types of research designs and theoretical frameworks (Robson & McCartan, 2016:467). It was deemed ideal since it results in overarching themes under which policy objectives can be clustered. The method commences with coding of the data. Here, the parts of the data that are identified as expressing similar ideas are clustered under the same code. In the case of this research, all parts of the policy documents that expressed a policy objective were inductively coded. Examples of codes are 'malnutrition' and 'democracy'. After all the data underwent coding, similar codes were grouped into a smaller number of overarching themes. Examples of themes are 'poverty' and 'governance'. The coding and creation of themes can and should occur somewhat concurrently, as possible themes should be considered during the initial coding. Finally, the researcher can revisit the data again and summarize that which pertains to each theme (Robson & McCartan, 2016:467). The thematic coding analysis was conducted twice, once for each case (i.e. once for the CFSP, and once for the EUDP). The final results are presented in Appendix Table 1 and Appendix Table 2 which present the summarized policy objectives, organized by theme. To facilitate the analysis, each objective was given a code in the tables that can be used to refer to the specific objectives.

4.3.2 Creation of the screening matrix

Following the thematic coding analysis, Table 2 presents the screening matrix of the policy objective themes that was created in order to gain an overview of their potential interactions. The themes from the CFSP have been placed along the columns, and the themes from the EUDP along the rows. Thus, the matrix acts as a map that displays all potential interactions between the themes. Each cell is the interaction between a CFSP objective theme and an EUDP objective theme. As noted previously, the coherence framework recommends using a panel of experts to then score each interaction as overlapping, contradictory, or neutral. However, since the aim is not to definitively score the policies' coherence, and no such expert panel is available regardless, this research does not score the interactions in the screening matrix as overlapping or contradictory.

Instead, the analysis will comment on the matrix's general overlaps and potential contradictions, as well as select three of them for an in-depth exploration.

Table 2. Screening matrix of interactions between CFSP and EUDP themes

		CFSP themes				
		Security	Defense	Governance	Peace	Cooperation
EUDP themes	Poverty					
	Health					
	Environment					
	Migration					
	Prosperity					
	Equality					
	Governance					

4.4 Limitations

The overarching aim of the research is to add to the literature on the EU's PCD by exploring some of the potential overlaps and contradictions between the objectives in the EUDP and the CFSP. The goal is not to generalize the findings. The study's findings purely provide a perspective on the coherence between the chosen policies, and those policies alone. It adds to the literature on policy coherence, and engages with the general debate, but it does not generalize its findings beyond its scope. Regarding the reliability of the research, the clarity with which the policy objectives are stated in the policy documents is beneficial. Taking on large documents and condensing them into a smaller number of themes is a substantial and tedious task. This being said, it is possible that the inventory of policy objectives could differ due to the interpretive nature of the methodology, should the thematic coding analysis be recreated. For example, the themes 'environment' and 'prosperity' might be combined into one theme of 'sustainability'. However, the general clarity of the policy documents make it likely that different researchers would arrive at fairly similar policy objective tables.

Regardless, it is important to recognize that while a scientific methodology is conducted, the final outcome is the result of the researcher's interpretation and possible biases

(Robson & McCartan, 2016:462). The thesis maintains an awareness of this fact, and the political nature of the policies should also be acknowledged in this regard. It is possible that the results would differ if another researcher or team of experts conducted the research. It is likely they would differ if they were interpreted from theoretical perspectives such as world-systems theory, feminist theory or dependency theory, which are commonly used in development studies (for example by Bhavnani et al., 2016; Ciplet et al., 2022; Lisimba & Parashar, 2021). However, as stated previously, the purpose of this research is to add one in-depth perspective to the literature on policy coherence, by utilizing the coherence framework. As described in section two, the existing literature and research is not in full agreement in regards to the topics of PCD, EUDP and CFSP. The purpose of this research is thus to add a perspective to the literature. Furthermore, an already discussed limitation of the research in regards to the theoretical framework is the lack of an expert panel to score all interactions between the policy objectives as overlapping or contradictory. However, the coherence framework's usage of an expert panel is a recommendation, not a demand. The thesis addresses this through its limited scope, and by having specific aims that do not require definitive scoring of the policy interactions.

5. Analysis

In this section, the analysis of the results from the empirical research is carried out. Firstly, some reflections are made on the inventory of policy objectives. The general coherence of the interactions between the policy objective themes as they are presented in the screening matrix are explored. Following this, three interactions from the screening matrix are selected for closer analysis. Here, the thesis goes in further depth to investigate the overlaps and potential contradictions between the themes, and by this demonstrates their intricacies. These analyses are carried out with the help of the adapted version of the coherence framework's analytical template (Table 1). Due to the given scope of the thesis, it is not possible to elaborate on and explain every interaction in the screening matrix.

As established previously, the EUDP and the CFSP are within the same domain of external EU policies, and therefore naturally have some overlap in regards to the topics they touch upon (European Commission, 2017b; European Union, 2023). The themes that emerged in the thematic coding analysis seemingly reflect the main focuses of the policies' respective policy areas, e.g. 'security' and 'cooperation' in the CFSP and 'poverty' and 'environment' in the EUDP. The subsequent screening matrix provides an overview of the interactions between the themes. The main overarching themes that emerged in the thematic coding analysis largely differ between the policies. The only exception is the theme 'governance' which is represented in both policy tables. In the screening matrix, there is therefore an interaction between 'governance' and governance'. Looking at the specific objectives under the theme 'governance' in Appendix Table 1 and Appendix Table 2, they appear to have significant overlap. For example, they both call for the upholding of democracy and human rights. They both promote accountable institutions, and they both support civil society space. Under this theme, the CFSP has two objectives that are not reflected in the EUDP governance theme. One concerns migration, and the other concerns prosperity (objectives 3.4 and 3.5 in Appendix Table 2). However, as the EUDP has its own themes of prosperity and migration, there is still overlap between the policies in this regard. These topics were seemingly not prominent enough to warrant their own theme in the CFSP.

Moreover, the interactions between the remaining themes do not necessarily stand out as being distinctly overlapping or contradictory upon a general overview, without going into an in-depth analysis. For some of them, this is true even when the specific objectives are considered. For example, it is difficult to say whether or not the interaction between the CFSP theme of 'cooperation' and the EUDP theme of 'equality' are either overlapping or contradictory. Upon a brief overview of their respective objectives, it is still difficult to

determine them as being one or the other. Thus, in-depth analyses of few selected interactions are needed in order to further uncover what the overlaps and potential contradictions in the policy interactions could be, and to show their complexity. The following subsections will analyze three interactions using the coherence framework's analytical template. To illustrate which interactions are chosen, Table 3 presents the screening matrix with the interactions that are selected for closer analyses highlighted. The first subsection details a closer analysis within the frame of the CFSP's security theme in relation to the EUDP's environment theme. The second subsection discusses parts of the CFSP's governance theme in relation to the EUDP's poverty theme. The third and final elaboration is within the CFSP's security theme and the EUDP's prosperity theme. All interactions were considered for in-depth analyses, but these three were finally selected as they were deemed appropriate for demonstrating the complexity of policy coherence, and for displaying the potential for both overlap as well as contradiction. In the analyses, the thesis considers the objectives as they are stated in the policy documents, but in order to further problematize and investigate the complexity of their interactions, moves beyond the objectives to consider some practical implications.

Table 3. Screening matrix of interactions between CFSP and EUDP themes with chosen interactions highlighted

		CFSP themes				
		Security	Defense	Governance	Peace	Cooperation
EUDP themes	Poverty			2nd analysis		
	Health					
	Environment	1st analysis				
	Migration					
	Prosperity	3rd analysis				
	Equality					
	Governance					

5.1 Energy supply and environmental protection

The first in-depth analysis takes place within the interaction between the EUDP's environment theme and the CFSP's security theme. Specifically, it explores the coherence of European energy investment and diversification in relation to environmental protection, a circular economy and sustainable energy production. The analysis commences by outlining the possible overlap between the objectives, and progresses with an exploration of how they could simultaneously be contradictory. The specific objectives that will be particularly considered are the following.

From the EUDP's environment theme (Appendix Table 1):

E1. Support the protection and sustainable management of all natural resources and ecosystems.

E3. By means of public and private investment promote a circular economy which decouples economic growth from environmental degradation.

E4. Promote sustainable practices in areas such as agriculture, fisheries, energy-production and infrastructure, particularly in regards to urban development.

E5. Promote sustainable consumption, production and waste management.

From the CFSP's security theme (Appendix Table 2):

1.7. Diversify European energy sources, maintain good communications with producer and transit countries, and promote sustainable energy globally.

The principal overlapping aspect between the objectives is the promotion of sustainability. In regards to sustainable energy sources, the EU officially promotes the European continent's transition to become a low-carbon society. The union's Green Deal initiative which was approved in 2020 sets the goal of achieving European climate neutrality by 2050 (European Commission, 2019). The Green Deal promotes a circular economy that is resource-efficient and sustainable. By this, it aims to preserve biodiversity in forests, lakes, rivers and seas, and efforts are intended to ensure clean energy that is affordable to all. Furthermore, the Green Deal aims to mobilize research and innovation within the area, and its 'Farm to Fork' initiative promotes an environmentally conscious food industry (European Commission, 2019). In this way, the Green Deal represents the overlap between European energy supply objectives and environmental preservation objectives. However, despite the Green Deal's ambitious goals, progress in some areas is lacking thus far. Indeed, the total production, import and consumption of solid fossil fuels in the EU declined between the years 2000 and 2019. However, in some areas, such as the import of natural gas, there has been a sharp increase

during the same time period (European Commission, Directorate-General for Energy, 2021:180).

The European Union's initiative towards sustainable energy supply stretches beyond the continent's own borders. For example, the Africa-EU Green Energy Initiative (AEGEI) is estimated to fund €15 billion from EU public and private investors to promote renewable energy sources in sub-Saharan Africa (European Union, 2022). The goals of the AEGEI are to increase African sustainable energy production, particularly by supporting sector reforms and fostering market integration. Particular focus is placed on making the energy sources accessible, as the initiative plans to supply 100 million people with electricity. Another example of the union's global promotion of sustainable energy is its participation in the World Bank-led Central Asia Water and Energy Program (World Bank, 2022). This program seeks to ensure water and energy security in six Central Asian countries. Some recent achievements as a result of the program include renewable energy developments in the Kyrgyz Republic and hydropower programs in Uzbekistan. While the program is administered by the World Bank, the EU provides financing. Additionally, the union has in more general terms promoted sustainable energy in developing countries. For example, it has provided technical assistance to eleven developing countries in regards to energy development (Radovanović et al., 2021).

However, the policy overlap within the topic of sustainable energy can be related to the previous literature that argues the EUDP is an instrument through which the CFSP can be exercised. To exemplify, several authors argue that there is a dual interest for the EU to promote and partake in the sustainable energy transition in Africa (Masina, 2022; Medinilla et al. 2022; Teevan & Domingo, 2022). Initiatives such as the AEGEI are part of larger geopolitical strategies. Medinilla et al. (2022) state that for the European Union, "[...] Africa's energy trajectory is seen as an opportunity as much as a developmental challenge" (Medinilla et al., 2022:1). Investments in energy infrastructure and transitions in Africa and other continents can be wielded as geopolitical tools by the EU. In particular, these investments are in opposition to China's growing involvement in the developing world through strategies such as the Belt and Road Initiative. The African continent has extensive access to renewable energy sources of solar, wind and hydropower. Financing projects that provide affordable access to this energy for millions of Africans can be seen as an altruistic development objective. But, it can also be viewed as an instrumental opportunity for the EU to challenge the growing Chinese involvement in Africa and sustain its own influence over the continent (Masina, 2022; Medinilla et al. 2022; Teevan & Domingo, 2022).

In their research on the challenges of PCD, Barry et al. (2010) identify the interaction between environmental protection and industrial processes as one where tensions are

likely to arise, and trade-offs of the objectives of one or the other likely have to be made. Furthermore, they bring up the Environmental Kuznets Curve which suggests that as a country becomes more rich, the initial response can be an increase of environmental degradation as a result of industrialization. However, as the country develops and adopts new technologies (such as transitioning to sustainable energy sources), this effect can be reversed.

Furthermore, another possibility for contradiction in this policy interaction is in regards to energy diversification and sustainable energy sources which are also mentioned in the specific objectives that were put forward at the beginning of the subsection. Energy diversification with the purpose of promoting European energy security has been a topic of debate for several years (Baran, 2007; da Graça Carvalho, 2012). Some of this discussion emphasizes the shift towards renewable energy sources and the path of carbon-neutrality, but some of it concerns alternative sources for importing oil and gas. For over a decade, the reliance on Russia for these types of energy sources has been contested, and recent geopolitical events have propelled the European need for alternative sources. In 2022, the European Commission presented a proposal to accelerate the union's clean energy transition as a way to faster decrease dependency on Russian energy (European Commission, 2022). The goal is to be completely independent from Russian energy by 2030. However, in addition to accelerating the transition to clean energy, the proposal also calls for diversification of oil and gas imports. As previously mentioned, the European imports of natural gas significantly increased between the years 2000 and 2019 (European Commission, Directorate-General for Energy, 2021:180). While this proposal was presented after the current versions of the CFSP and EUDP were published, it exemplifies the broader debate of European energy diversification that has been ongoing for well over a decade. The debate promotes the transition to clean energy, but also supports the diversification of oil and gas imports. Thus, the interaction between the objectives of energy supply and environmental preservation in the EUDP and CFSP can be said to be both overlapping as well as possibly contradictory.

5.2 Prosperity and poverty alleviation

The second in-depth analysis takes a closer look at the coherence between the EUDP's poverty theme and the CFSP's governance theme. Two main perspectives will be considered; prosperity as a vehicle for poverty alleviation, and prosperity as opposed to poverty alleviation. The following specific objectives are the ones that are particularly considered in this analysis.

From the EUDP's poverty theme (Appendix Table 1):

P1. Eradicate extreme poverty.

P2. Pursue an end to hunger and malnutrition and work to ensure access to affordable, safe and nutritious food for all.
P3. Support the provision of basic services in health, nutrition, water, sanitation and hygiene, especially in the poorest communities.

From the CFSP's governance theme (Appendix Table 2):

3.5. Advance prosperity in Europe and globally.

During large parts of the 20th century, the development discourse was dominated by the pursuit of economic growth (Potter et al., 2018:10). The dominance of the United States carried the liberal economic idea that economic growth and prosperity will trickle down throughout society and eventually reach those at the bottom. While trickle-down economics has faced criticism, the idea remains that what benefits one part of society will eventually come to benefit all. Panagariya (2019) argues that trade liberalization, a staple of liberal economic theory, is a vehicle to growth and poverty alleviation in developing countries. He finds that developing countries which maintained high trade-to-gross domestic product ratio were the countries that achieved sustained economic growth. Following this, the economic growth in these countries had positive effects on poverty reduction. Panagariya suggests that it is the resource reallocation that came as a result of trade openness that eventually changed the earnings of the poor (Panagariya, 2019). The reverse can also be said to add to the argument. Decreased trade, lower rates of growth and economic stagnation negatively affect the poor. To exemplify, the COVID-19 pandemic severely resulted in these types of economic effects, which led to millions of people around the world reversing back into poverty (World Bank, 2020). If this line of thinking is applied, then the objectives of prosperity and poverty alleviation can be said to be overlapping.

However, the argument that poverty alleviation follows prosperity is challenged. Rather, some argue the growing global wealth inequality demonstrates that prosperity for some does not mean prosperity for all (Davies et al., 2017; Zucman, 2019). The global wage gap has increased significantly in the last several decades. The poorer half of the global population only possess around 2% of the global wealth (Chancel et al., 2023). Prosperity then, generates more riches for the rich, rather than resulting in poverty alleviation. This inequality is additionally intersectional, as it varies greatly between regions, gender, race, etc. Furthermore, wealth inequality has conversely been found to have adverse effects on economic growth, as it has significant effects on cross-country prosperity (Islam & McGillivray, 2020). The indication for policymakers then, is that decreasing the wealth gap by promoting more equitable income distribution is beneficial for economic growth and prosperity.

21

If this rather critical line of thinking is adopted, questions emerge regarding the possibility of creating overlap between prosperity and poverty alleviation objectives. Considering that Europe comprises one of the richest regions in the world, is it possible to increase prosperity in the EU and globally while combating poverty? Is it possible for the EU's development policy to remain altruistic and work to eradicate poverty, or does it act as an instrument of the foreign policy that creates prosperity for the European continent? Again, the analysis ties back into the existing literature. This time, to the skepticism regarding the ambitious nature of PCD frameworks. As discussed in the background in section two, development objectives run the risk of becoming deprioritized, largely due to a lack of an institutional hierarchy to ensure their prioritization (Furness & Gänzle, 2016). Domestic interests thus persist. Particularly in times of financial distress, European prosperity is placed higher on the agenda than poverty eradication (Carbone, 2008). Finally, it should be noted that 'prosperity' emerged as an EUDP theme in its own right in the thematic coding analysis. This specific in-depth analysis, though, has focused on the coherence between the CFSP prosperity objective, and the EUDP poverty objectives. Had the analysis been on the coherence between CFSP prosperity and EUDP prosperity, it is likely that more overlap would have been found. It is also possible that an analysis of the internal coherence of the EUDP would have found potential contradiction between its poverty and prosperity objectives. Thus, this further demonstrates the complexity of the interaction between and within the policies. The final in-depth analysis will explore the EUDP's prosperity theme a bit closer.

5.3 Arms control and military exports

The third and final in-depth analysis takes place within the interaction between the EUDP's prosperity theme and the CFSP's security theme. It explores the overlap and potential contradiction between promoting arms control, and engaging in arms trade. The specific objectives that are particularly considered are listed below.

From the EUDP's prosperity theme (Appendix Table 1):

Pr1. Promote trade, investment and regional integration in developing countries.
Pr2. Support responsible business practices in developing countries with respect
to human rights, labor rights, transparency, due diligence requirements,
sustainable value chains and environmental standards.

From the CFSP's security theme (Appendix Table 2):

1.6. Support arms control.

The European Union actively works with disarmament and arms export control in several regards (EEAS, 2022b). Its special envoy for non-proliferation and disarmament leads the

work to restrict nuclear, biological, chemical and conventional weapons. The special envoy also works with landmines, as the union is the biggest donor of landmine and cluster munition removal. In 1998, the EU and its MSs signed the Code of Conduct, a document that was created in an effort to create greater coherence between arms export policies. In 2008, the Code of Conduct was updated to the current EU Common Position on Arms Export (European Council, 2008). This agreement presents a list of eight criteria that must be considered by MSs when issuing licenses for arms exports. One criteria states that the recipient country must respect human rights and international humanitarian law. This means that MSs must deny license for arms export if an assessment of the recipient country deems it likely that the arms will be used for internal repression and/or violation of human rights and international humanitarian law. Another criteria states that licenses should be denied if there is a risk that the arms could prolong or aggravate conflict in the recipient country, and a third one states that they should be denied if there is a risk that the arms could be used to forcibly claim territory. Seemingly, the EU Common Position on Arms Export is an extensive effort to ensure the responsible export of arms by the MSs (European Council, 2008).

However, the issue of ethics and arms export is not quite that simple. The question if there exists an equilibrium between arms trade and responsible business practices is a complicated one, which the extensive debate surrounding the topic shows (see for example; Maitland, 2002; Peartree, 2023; Perkins & Neumayer, 2010). On the one hand, the international arms trade is seen as the worst of Western capitalism, where economic profits come well before human rights considerations and non-proliferation. On the other, the arms trade provides countries with the means to protect themselves against aggressors and safekeep their territories. In 2022, EU members France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland were all within the top 15 countries that exported the largest amount of major arms (Wezeman et al., 2023). According to some, the domestic economic and security interests of major export countries are far more compelling than protecting human rights and preventing conflict in recipient countries (Perkins & Neumayer, 2010; Wisotzki & Mutschler, 2021). This echoes the previous literature presented in section two that argues development objectives are likely to become deprioritized to make room for donor countries' short term interests. Even though the Common Position on Arms Exports is a legally binding document, there is a lack of institutional mechanisms to ensure compliance with the agreement's criteria. In fact, rather than by means of institutional authority, it is civil society that has found the most success in holding governments accountable in regards to their arms exports. Despite EU efforts to promote arms control by means such as the extensive criteria in the Common Position on Arms Exports, the national authority of its MSs throws spokes in the wheel for the criteria to be met (Perkins & Neumayer, 2010; Wisotzki & Mutschler, 2021). It has even been argued that it is detrimental for the EU's PCD to be spending resources on development,

while simultaneously undermining this development work because of the human rights violations its arms exports contribute to (Hudson, 2006).

In essence, the three preceding analyses have demonstrated the complexity of the European Union's PCD framework in regards to its development policy and foreign policy. It has done so by exploring some of their overlaps and potential contradictions. Although the thesis has referred to the analyses of the selected interactions as 'in-depth', one could go into much more detail than has been possible here. This further demonstrates the incredibly wide range of topics that the EU's external policies are tasked with undertaking, the multitude of ways they interact, and the many possibilities for both overlap and contradiction.

6. Conclusion

This thesis has demonstrated the complexity of the Policy Coherence for Development framework. It has done so by investigating the overlaps and potential contradictions between key objectives in the European Union's development policy and foreign policy. By utilizing the coherence framework's conceptualization of policy coherence as the identification of overlaps and contradictions, the paper has problematized the interlinkages between the policies in question. A general overview of the policy themes that emerged in the empirical research did not overwhelmingly indicate either overlap or contradiction, but the in-depth analyses showed the opposite as they illustrated the potential for both. The thesis thus demonstrates the need for in-depth analyses on the topic of policy coherence to underpin the larger debate.

Largely, the findings echo scholars' previous claims that the goals of PCD may be too ambitious to feasibly be achieved. Given the sizable scopes of both policies and the potential for both overlap and contradiction, it is perhaps a 'mission impossible' to achieve perfect policy coherence. Additionally, previous claims that donor countries' short term interests may indeed receive priority before development objectives was demonstrated by the in-depth look at arms control and military exports. Speculation that the EU's development policy is evolving as an instrument of its foreign policy was further demonstrated in the analysis on energy supply and environmental protection. However, the thesis ultimately agrees with some scholars' rejection of a dichotomous branding of the development policy as 'all-altruistic' or 'all-instrumental', as it has not found grounds to eliminate either one. Instead, it found that the European Union's investments in sustainable energy production in Africa can be seen as both an act of selfishness and of selflessness. Thus, the development policy cannot be said to undoubtedly be executing the foreign interests of the EU, if in doing so it is simultaneously pursuing stated development objectives.

Finally, several areas where there is potential for future research have been identified. As discussed, the complexity of policy coherence should underpin the larger debate. Similar studies would additionally add to the ongoing discussion regarding the evolution of the EU's development policy, and to what extent it is evolving as an instrument of the union's foreign policy. As this thesis only had the capacity to undertake a closer analysis of three thematic interactions between the two policies, future research could explore the rest in order to problematize their coherence further. Moreover, there is great potential for future research to further explore the vertical coherence between the foreign and development policies of the EU and its MSs, as well as their internal coherence. In summary, this thesis has shown that research demonstrating the complexity of policy coherence is beneficial to underpin the larger debate on the topic.

Bibliography

Ashoff, G. (2005) *Enhancing policy coherence for development: justification, recognition and approaches to achievements*, Bonn: German Development Institute

Asongu, S. & Jellal, M. (2016) "Foreign Aid Fiscal Policy: Theory and Evidence" *Comparative Economic Studies,* 58(2):279–314

Babarinde, O. (2019) "New Directions in EU-Africa Development Initiatives" in Beringer, S., Maier, S. & Thiel, M. (eds) *EU Development Policies: Between Norms and Geopolitics*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.111–134

Bahgat, G. (2009) "The geopolitics of energy: Europe and North Africa" *The Journal of North African Studies,* 15(1):39–49

Baran, Z. (2007) "EU Energy Security: Time to End Russian Leverage" *Washington Quarterly*, 30(4):131–144

Barry, F., King, M. & Matthews, A. (2010) "Policy Coherence for Development: Five Challenges" *Irish Studies in International Affairs,* 21:207–223

Bhavnani, K-K., Foran, J., Kurian, P.A. & Munshi, D. (2016) *Feminist futures : reimagining women, culture and development,* London: Zed Books

Carbone, M. (2008) "Mission Impossible: the European Union and Policy Coherence for Development" *Journal of European Integration*, 30(3):323–342

Carbone, M. & Keijzer, N. (2015) "The European Union and Policy Coherence for Development: Reforms, Results, Resistance" *The European Journal of Development Research*, 28:30–43

Ciplet, D., Falzon, D., Uri, I., Robinson, S., Weikmans, R. & Roberts, J.T. (2022) "The unequal geographies of climate finance: Climate injustice and dependency in the world system" *Political Geography,* 99, article no.102769

da Graça Carvalho, M. (2012) "EU energy and climate change strategy" *Energy,* 40(1):19–22

Davies, J.B., Lluberas, R. & Shorrocks, A.F. (2017) "Estimating the level and distribution of global wealth 2000–2014" *Review of Income and Wealth,* 63(4):731–759

Delputte, S. & Lightfoot, S. (2019) "Three ways of looking at the EU's Development Policy" EADI/ISS Blog Series, 13 Dec, available online: http://www.developmentresearch.eu/?p=558 [accessed 3 May, 2023]

EEAS [European External Action Service] (2016) *Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy*, June, Brussels

EEAS [European External Action Service] (2021) "About the European External Action Service" available online: https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/about-european-external-action-service_en [accessed 12 May, 2023]

EEAS [European External Action Service] (2022a) "The EU as a global actor" available online: https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/eu-global-actor_en [accessed 22 January 2023]

EEAS [European External Action Service] (2022b) "Disarmament, Non-Proliferation and Arms Export Control" available online: https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/disarmament-non-proliferation-and-arms-export-control-0_en#11202 [accessed 19 May, 2023]

European Commission (2017a) "Policy coherence for development" available online: https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/policies/european-development-policy/policy-coherence-development_en [accessed 2 Jan, 2023]

European Commission (2017b) "European Development Policy" available online: https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/policies/european-development-policy_en [accessed 12 May, 2023]

European Commission (2019) *The European Green Deal*, COM(2019) 640 final, 11 December, Brussels

European Commission (2022) *REPowerEU Plan*, COM(2022) 230 final, 18 May, Brussels

European Commission, Directorate-General for Energy (2021) *EU energy in figures – Statistical pocketbook 2021*, Publications Office of the European Union

European Commission, Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (2017) *The new European consensus on development 'our World, our Dignity, our Future' : joint statement by the Council and the representatives of the governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, the European Parliament, and the European Commission,* Publications Office of the European Union

European Council (2008) *Defining common rules governing control of exports of military technology and equipment,* COUNCIL COMMON POSITION 2008/944/CFSP, Official Journal of the European Union

European Council (2023a) "EU response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine" available online: https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/eu-response-ukraine-invasion/ [accessed 9 May, 2023]

European Council (2023b) "Sudan: Statement by the High Representative on behalf of the European Union on the latest developments" 19 April, 2023, available online: https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2023/04/19/sudan-statement-by-the-high-representative-on-behalf-of-the-european-union-on-the-latest-developments/ [accessed 9 May, 2023]

European Union (2022) *EU-Africa: Global Gateway Investment Package – Green Energy Initiative,* November, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union

European Union (2023) "Foreign and Security Policy" available online: https://european-union.europa.eu/priorities-and-actions/actions-topic/foreign-and-security-policy_en [accessed 12 May, 2023]

Furness, M., Ghica, L-A., Lightfoot, S. and Szent-Iványi, B. (2020) "EU development policy: evolving as an instrument of foreign policy and as an expression of solidarity" *Journal of Contemporary European Research,* 16(2):89–100

Furness, M. & Gänzle, S. (2016) "The Security–Development Nexus in European Union Foreign Relations after Lisbon: Policy Coherence at Last?" *Development Policy Review,* 35(4):475–492

Haastrup, T., Wright, K.A.M & Guerrina, R. (2019) "Bringing Gender In? EU Foreign and Security Policy after Brexit" *Politics and Governance,* 7(3):62–71

Hall P. (1993) "Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: the case of economic policymaking in Britain" *Comparative Politics,* 25:275–296

Herceg Kolman, N. & Bandov, G. (2022) "Evolution of the EU development policy - from altruism to the interest instrumentalism and beyond" *Medunarodni Problemi,* 74(3):433–453

Holden, P. (2020) "Irreconcilable tensions? The EU's development policy in an era of global illiberalism" *Journal of Contemporary European Research,* 16(2):101–119

Hudson, A. (2006) *Case Study: EU code of conduct on arms exports* London: Overseas Development Institute

Islam, Md R. & McGillivray, M. (2020) "Wealth inequality, governance and economic growth" *Economic Modeling,* 88:1–13

Kalland Aarstad, A. (2015) "Critical Approaches to European Foreign Policy" Jørgensen, K.E., Kalland Aarstad, A., Drieskens, E., Laatikainen, K & Tonra, B. (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of European Foreign Policy,* London: Thousand Oaks pp.121–133

Lisimba, A.F. & Parashar, S. (2021) "The 'state' of postcolonial development: China–Rwanda 'dependency' in perspective" *Third World Quarterly,* 42(5):1105–1123

Maitland, G. (2002) "The Ethics of the International Arms Trade" *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility,* 7(4):200–204

Masina, P. (2022) *Challenging the Belt and Road Initiative: The American and European alternatives*, RSC PP 2022/09, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

May, P.J., Sapotichne, J. & Workman, S. (2006) "Policy Coherence and Policy Domains" *Policy Studies Journal,* 34(3):381–403

Medinilla, A., Sergejeff, K. & Domingo, E. (2022) *The geopolitics of African renewable energy european and chinese investments in a global green transition,* European Centre for Development Policy Management

Morales, E. S. (2018) "Why is policy coherence essential for achieving the 2030 Agenda?" UNSSC, available online: https://www.unssc.org/news-and-insights/blog/why-policy-coherence-essential-achieving-2030-agenda/ [accessed 9 May, 2023]

Nilsson, M., Zamparutti, T., Petersen, J.E., Nykvist, B., Rudberg, P. & McGuinn, J. (2012) "Understanding Policy Coherence: Analytical Framework and Examples of Sector–Environment Policy Interactions in the EU" *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 22:395–423

OECD (2003) *Policy Coherence: Vital for Global Development*, OECD: Paris

OECD (2018) *Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development 2018: Towards Sustainable and Resilient Societies*, OECD Publishing, Paris

Orbie, J. (2021) "The graduation of EU development studies: towards a postcolonial turn?" *Global Affairs,* 7(4):597–613

Panagariya, A. (2019) *Free Trade and Prosperity: How openness helps developing countries grow richer and combat poverty,* New York: Oxford University Press

Peartree, C.E. (2023) "What ethical dilemmas? The U.S. Defense Industry and Foreign Arms Sales" in Schoeni, D. & Vestner, T. (eds) *Ethical Dilemmas in the Global Defense Industry,* pp.105–125

Perkins, R. & Neumayer, E. (2010) "The organized hypocrisy of ethical foreign policy: Human rights, democracy and Western arms sales" *Geoforum,* 41(2):247–256

Potter, R., Binns, T., Elliott, J.A., Nel, E. & Smith, D.W. (2018) *Geographies of Development*, 4th edn, London: Routledge

Radovanović, M., Filipović, S. & Andrejević Panić, A. (2021) "Sustainable energy transition in Central Asia: status and challenges" *Energy, Sustainability and Society,* 11 art.no. 49

Robson, C. and McCartan, K. (2016) *Real World Research. A Resource for Users of Social Research Methods in Applied Settings*, 4th ed, Chichester: Wiley

Sianes, A. (2013) "Shedding Light On Policy Coherence for Development: A Conceptual Framework" *Journal of International Development,* 29(1):134–146

Szent-Iványi, B. & Kugiel, P. (2020) "The Challenge from Within: EU Development Cooperation and the Rise of Illiberalism in Hungary and Poland" *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 16(2):120–138

Teevan, C. & Domingo, E. (2022) *The Global Gateway and the EU as a digital actor in Africa*, European Centre for Development Policy Management

Thomas, A. (2000) "Poverty and the 'end of development'" in Allen, T. & Thomas, A. (eds) *Poverty and Development into the 21st Century*, Oxford University Press pp.1–22

Treaty on European Union (1992), Official Journal of the European Communities, C 325/5

UN General Assembly (2015) *Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, A/RES/70/1

Weldeab Sebhatu, R. (2020) "Applying postcolonial approaches to studies of Africa-EU relations" in Haastrup, T., Mah, L. & Duggan, N. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of EU-Africa Relations,* London: Routledge pp.38–50

Wezeman, P.D., Gadon, J. & Wezeman, S.T. (2023) *Trends in International Arms Transfers, 2022,* Stockholm: SIPRI

Wisotzki, S. & Mutschler, M. (2021) "No common position! European arms export control in crisis" *Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung,* 10:273–293

World Bank (2020) *Reversals of Fortune: Poverty and shared prosperity,* World Bank

World Bank (2022) *Central Asia Water and Energy Program: Annual Report 2021*, Washington, D.C.: World Bank

Zucman, G. (2019) "Global Wealth Inequality" *Annual Review of Economics*, 11(1) 25462

Appendix

Appendix Table 1

Appendix Table 1. Objectives in the EU's New Consensus on Development (EUDP)	
Theme	Objective
Poverty (P)	P1. Eradicate extreme poverty.
	P2. Pursue an end to hunger and malnutrition and work to ensure access to affordable, safe and nutritious food for all.
	P3. Support the provision of basic services in health, nutrition, water, sanitation and hygiene, especially in the poorest communities.
	P4. Contribute to universal access to reliable and sustainable energy services while avoiding negative effects to the environment.
Health (H)	H1. Support partner countries' efforts toward high quality health systems in order to promote universal health coverage and the right of physical and mental health for all.
	H2. Address and increase resilience to global health threats, combat diseases and secure essential medicines and vaccines for all.
	H3. Protect the right to sexual and reproductive health free from discrimination, and reduce child and maternal mortality.
Environment (E)	E1. Support the protection and sustainable management of all natural resources and ecosystems.
	E2. Tackle illegal activities that contribute to environmental degradation.
	E3. By means of public and private investment promote a circular economy which decouples economic growth from environmental degradation.
	E4. Promote sustainable practices in areas such as agriculture, fisheries, energy-production and infrastructure, particularly in regards to urban development.
	E5. Promote sustainable consumption, production and waste management.
	E6. Enhance resilience against natural or man-made disasters, especially for the most vulnerable.
Migration (M)	M1. Prevent the smuggling and trafficking of migrants.

Appendix Table 1. (Continued)

	M2. Contribute to the sustainable socioeconomic integration of migrants in host countries as well as the socioeconomic integration of returning migrants in their country of origin.
Prosperity (Pr)	Pr1. Promote trade, investment and regional integration in developing countries.
	Pr2. Support responsible business practices in developing countries with respect to human rights, labor rights, transparency, due diligence requirements, sustainable value chains and environmental standards.
	Pr3. Support digital literacy, particularly for women and marginalized peoples.
	Pr4. Increase uptake of responsible business models by EU companies that have supply chains in developing countries, and promote ethical trade.
	Pr5. Promote economic transformation that creates decent jobs, increased productivity, diversification, resilience against economic shocks, boosts local services and engages MSMEs.
Equality (Eq)	Eq1. Address inequalities and tackle discriminations of gender, sexual orientation, age, ethnicity, religion, etc.
	Eq2. Promote the rights of children and young people, particularly girls, and encourage their participation in social, civic and economic activities.
	Eq3. Eliminate sexual and gender-based violence.
	Eq4. Protect and empower women and girls in regards to educational access, health services, decent work and equal pay.
Governance (G)	G1. Promote transparent and accountable institutions.
	G2. Promote impartial courts and legal access to all.
	G3. Support governance that encourages participation for all, especially marginalized peoples.
	G4. Promote democratic governance that ensures human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.
	G5. Promote sufficient social protection.
	G6. Support civil society space.
	G7. Prevent, manage and help resolve conflicts to build lasting peace.
	G8. Support the democratic governance of the security sector and promote close cooperation between political and development actors.

Appendix Table 2

Appendix Table 2. Objectives in the Global Strategy for the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)	
Theme	**Objective**
Security (1)	1.1. Guarantee the security of European citizens and territory.
	1.2. Enhance European land, air and maritime military capabilities.
	1.3. Strengthen technological capabilities and enhance the focus on cybersecurity.
	1.4. Increase the EU's security role in Asia.
	1.5. Ensure maritime security globally.
	1.6. Support arms control.
	1.7. Diversify European energy sources, maintain good communications with producer and transit countries, and promote sustainable energy globally.
Defense (2)	2.1. Foster defense cooperation horizontally and vertically within the EU and create a firm European defense industry capable of responding rapidly to threats.
	2.2. Foster and develop defense cooperation with partners.
Governance (3)	3.1. Promote a rules-based global order underpinned by multilateralism with the UN at the center.
	3.2. Support accountable and inclusive governance that upholds and promotes international law, democracy, human rights, sustainable development and provides public services.
	3.3. Promote and engage civil society.
	3.4. Effectivize migration policies and enhance support of migrants in countries of origin and transit.
	3.5. Advance prosperity in Europe and globally.
Peace (4)	4.1. Enhance capabilities to rapidly respond to crises, build peace and guarantee security globally- particularly for civilians- in times of conflict or after newly agreed upon peace.
	4.2. Bridge the support of local ceasefires with long-term recovery.
	4.3. Invest in African peace.

Appendix Table 2. (Continued)	
Cooperation (5)	5.1. Promote regional cooperation and partnerships.
	5.2. Maintain and develop good cooperation with neighbors.
	5.3. Deepen cooperation with Latin America and the Caribbean in areas such as migration, peace and climate change.
	5.4. Improve information sharing with EU citizens, between EU agencies and to partners.