Welcome to the third HLF-4 Newsletter. Here and in future editions you’ll find announcements, key resources and aid effectiveness news and views from development leaders and stakeholders.

Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in Implementing the Paris Declaration

To what extent have the Paris commitments been realized? Is aid being delivered in a more effective way than five years ago? This report provides some of the answers.

‘Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in Implementing the Paris Declaration’ draws on the results of the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, building on similar surveys undertaken in 2006 and 2008. A total of 78 countries and territories volunteered to participate in the final round of surveys, which look at the state of play in 2010.

The results are sobering. At the global level, only one out of the 13 targets established for 2010 – co-ordinated technical co-operation (a measure of the extent to which donors co-ordinate their efforts to support countries’ capacity development objectives) – has been met, albeit by a narrow margin. Nonetheless, considerable progress has been made towards many of the remaining 12 targets.

For more please see the Full Report or the Executive Summary at: http://tinyurl.com/3to7w7y
The view from Afghanistan

Mr Hamid Jalil is Aid Management Director in the Ministry of Finance of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Why is taking part in the Paris monitoring survey important for Afghanistan?

The monitoring survey is a tool to measure the progress on the Paris Declaration commitments on aid effectiveness. Afghanistan has participated in the Paris monitoring Process since 2006. Our country is the largest recipient of development aid globally and we are highly dependent on external aid. The surveys have helped let us know how well we’ve followed the aid effectiveness principles in the delivery of our aid. The evidence from these surveys has also helped us in developing policies related to aid management.

What were the key benefits for your country?

The survey directly supports us in our efforts to develop effectively by providing useful details. The solid information base it provides also helps in discussions with development partners in bilateral and multilateral forums. With a shared understanding of aid effectiveness progress we build more trust, deepen our partnerships and ultimately manage our aid better to improve people’s lives.

Did you learn anything new from the survey?

The survey gave us the facts that confirmed the themes we already understood. A major one of these is alignment. The survey has shown the extent to which donors programmes are in line with Government priorities.

It’s important to say that the survey methodology is not perfect. It is very much donor driven. Donors are expected to ‘self-assess’ on their progress towards the Paris Declaration indicators while the verification of such evidence is very challenging for recipient countries.

What are the three most important things your country wants from Busan?

The findings from the Paris Declaration Evaluation and Monitoring Survey show slow progress, particularly by donors. There is still much unfinished business from Paris and Accra, so the first priority is to develop a suitable mechanism for reviewing progress on a regular basis. This mechanism should hold all parties to account in meeting their commitments.

Secondly, as Afghanistan is a country in conflict and a member of the G7+, we expect the specific G7+ demands to be considered in Busan, with firm commitments to support them.

Thirdly, it’s very important that global commitments are fully implemented on the ground. Commitments must be translated into aid programmes and country programmes. Donors need strong political will. They must also enhance their own capacity in country missions.
Why is taking part in the survey important for Zambia?

To my mind, the Survey aimed to review progress towards greater country ownership, more robust development management systems, reduced management burdens and pro-reform environments for more harmonized, accountable and results based workspaces across the development assistance community.

Zambia’s participation allowed for a comparative assessment of its performance, but more importantly an opportunity for objective agenda setting and dialogue. The survey, coupled with the Paris Declaration Evaluation, provided considerable scope for this.

What were the key benefits for Zambia?

Like a mirror the survey allowed for reflection on the good the bad and the ugly. By this I mean the progress, the problems and the politics.

A single survey alone has limited benefit, but collected together, the three surveys and PD Evaluations have allowed for a code to emerge by which we and our partners have constant reference to in regular policy dialogue and formulation.

The survey contributed to our understanding of how multilateral and bilateral partners alike have interacted with us, as an aid recipient. But more importantly, it has contributed to developing our agenda on:

- The development of a country owned Aid Policy;
- Customizing a Direct Budget Support framework;
- Advancing a government oriented Division of Labor process;
- Supporting donor driven Joint Assistance Strategy;
- Main-streaming national climate change financing; and
- Strengthening Gender in development national plans; amongst others.

Did you learn anything new from the survey?

The study reinforced the fact that no matter how simple ideas seem, policy advocacy that brings about structural change is a major challenge. The intended policy change must go beyond a statement; it must become a shared institutionalized norm. Arriving at this norm requires costs to be met and political championing. For the two to be simultaneously possible is a challenge.

Second, again not necessarily new but certainly important, is that developing culture of managing for development results requires greater prioritization in Zambia’s development programming. We recognized this in our reviews and it was reiterated in the Survey.

What are the three most important things your country wants from Busan?

1. The need to focus on what was not achieved in Paris Declaration Implementation and to commit to finishing unfinished business.
2. The inclusiveness agenda should further emphasize strengthening the role of decentralization and Parliaments in development programming to deepen ownership.
3. The outcome statement must not be fluffy; it should not suffer from ‘policy creep’ and become too ambitious. It must not over-dilute stake holding, cohesion and accountability.
Why has taking part in the survey been important for your country?

El Salvador signed the Paris Declaration in 2009, so this was the first time we participated in the Survey. Participating gave us an opportunity to establish a national aid effectiveness baseline. It also provided empirical information that underpins other efforts. Participation also strengthened national leadership in dialogue with donors, helped in updating aid databases and generating greater awareness of points where improvement is required.

We found it helpful to participate in the Optional Module on Inclusive Ownership. This provided an excellent opportunity to involve civil society, the academic world, foundations and the trade union sector in discussing participation in national planning processes and on general issues concerning aid effectiveness and development.

What were the key benefits for your country?

El Salvador is a middle income country, yet continues to face significant challenges. We are still a major ODA recipient but it now accounts for less than 2% of GDP. Despite this, we recognize its value in promoting development and supporting national efforts.

A key benefit lies in providing evidence of the government’s achievements in improving funding, planning and accounting systems. It also enabled us to identify the extent to which national systems are used by donors. Unfortunately these are far short of the commitments made. It highlighted the necessity of improving aid management; a central issue given the importance our country attributes to developing capacities and strengthening national institutions.

Did you learn anything new from the survey?

It provided a solid empirical base for our conclusions and generated good information exchange within government, and between the government and donors. Despite this, some indicators need improvement. One point we learned as a middle income country is the unsuitability of the formula for measuring the level of loans issued in comparison to current market loan conditions.

What are the three most important things your country wants from Busan?

Middle income countries observe that despite progress, commitments are a long way from being met. One of the virtues of the Paris commitments was their specificity. The invitation to ‘open the umbrella’ to more participants and issues is too vague to establish shared but distinct responsibilities within a verifiable framework.

At Busan the role of middle income countries should be recognized as promoters of growth and development. The aid effectiveness commitments and the desire to achieve them should be reaffirmed with particular emphasis on greater progress in the effectiveness of interventions by the multilateral system and the need for policy issues to be addressed in more democratic and inclusive forums for dialogue.

‘At Busan the role of middle income countries should be recognized as promoters of growth and development’

part gave us access to a global dialogue we were not previously part of.
Why is taking part in the Paris monitoring survey important for Timor-Leste?

We are a small country of 1.1 million with 41 active development partners, so coordination is a big job. The survey has been useful in terms of facts and statistics. Results were mixed.

But what we really want to know is - are development partners really up to the job?

We’ve shown leadership; we have a comprehensive 20-year development plan. Donors have been asked to subscribe to it. We hope that alignment and harmonization will improve in future.

What were the key benefits for your country?

The main benefit is that it provides the evidence we need for evidence-based policymaking. It also has some benefits in holding donors to account. We now have more capacity for planning and are moving from fragility to stability. This is giving us more space to enhance cooperation - and we expect reciprocity.

Did you learn anything new from the survey?

Regarding the Fragile States Survey, the second time we received mixed results. But it must be said that these Principles are too inflexible for unstable environments. One size does not fit all. Donors also lack capacity in dealing with fragility. Flexibility is vital and flexibility is missing. Recognizing this, with donors and partners, we developed a set of commitments; the fragility spectrum. We feel this is better suited to these environments.

What are the most important things your country wants from Busan?

We want an endorsement for the Peace-building and State-building Goals (PSGs). These could be used by many countries as interim goals instead of the MDGs, which are unobtainable for many fragile states. After endorsement at the HLF-4 we aim to submit a resolution to the UN General Assembly with the aim of making the PSGs the global peace and state-building framework.

It’s also important to mention trust. Trust is fundamental and we should work to build it. Transparency and sharing risks builds trust. Making aid predictable builds trust. Capacity Development builds trust.
Why is taking part in the survey important for Madagascar?

Taking part in the Survey was particularly important for Madagascar in the context of the political crisis which has disrupted the official dialogue between the Government and its development partners. We learnt that any kind of technical relationship can continue between the Government and development partners during such times – and can even be better than in a ‘normal’ situation. This was shown by the commitment and interest of the development partner’s technical focal points during the realization of the survey.

What were the key benefits for Madagascar?

First, we could see how far the country has come regarding the Paris Principles and the political crisis has set the country back compared with 2008. Second, it has enhanced the quality of our national aid database as development partners have shared more data with the Government through the database and the Survey data has confirmed the reliability of the information stored on the database for all DAC donors.

Did you learn anything new from the survey?

We, as Government technicians, should be in the driver seat of the process. We were during the 2011 Survey. Donors should not be considered as ‘in charge’ because they are giving money.

What are the three most important things your country wants from Busan?

We expect the commitment of both the Government and development partners to enhance and improve the Paris Principles. One of the key points that may need reinforcing is aid transparency and predictability, as well as the establishment of a compulsory rule or mechanism for development partners to work within.

Register attendance and book accommodation for HLF-4

Invited parties are requested to register attendance through the registration pages as soon as possible. Please visit: http://www.hlf4-registration.org/r/ Please do read through the registration guidelines before registering.

To book accommodation please visit: http://www.hlf4-registration.org/r/accommodation_en.php
International HLF-4 essay contest – submit your entry!

Young people from around the world are invited to submit a maximum of 2000 words on ‘Building a new global partnership for effective aid and development.’ 1st prize and 2nd prize winners will be invited to the Youth Forum, which will be held during the HLF-4 as one of the special events. Travel expenses and accommodation will be covered by the Government of Korea.

The deadline for submissions is October 7th so do make sure you get your submission in soon! For more information visit: www.busanhlf4.org

Leveraging Development lessons from the Republic of Korea

In a new research project in the run up to HLF-4 the UN Research institute for Social Development (UNRISD) and the Korean International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) will share lessons from Korean development to support development around the world.

The project titled ‘Making International Development Cooperation Effective’ will assess the Korean development experience from a wider perspective, including political, social and economic dimensions, rather than simple economic growth. It will draw insights and policy lessons that will be useful for developing countries and donors in the 21st Century.

More details are available on the UNRISD website (http://www.unrisd.org/). A large volume of documents related to the research are available on the Eldis Community website. A group has been created by UNRISD to make available for the first time at: http://community.eldis.org/.59ebc0bc/ under the group name: Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Busan, 2011

The project conference organized by KOICA will be held at the Alumni Association Building, Yonsei University, Seoul, on October 13th from 08.30 to 17.30. Registration is free and can occur on the day.

For questions contact: yi@unrisd.org or cocoman@unrisd.org

Ilcheong Yi is Research Coordinator at the UNRISD. Olive Cocoman is a Research Analyst at the UNRISD.
The world faces interlinked political, financial, economic, food, climate and energy crises, the brunt of which are being borne by impoverished and marginalised communities. Governments across the world are failing to address development challenges as more and more people are being forced into poverty. Change is imperative.

Existing development assistance budgets are under threat. People in the global south and north are questioning the motivation behind development budgets that are increasingly linked to considerations of domestic advantage, trade and security. With global decision making concentrated in the hands of a few, many believe it is time to rethink global power relations. The lack of adequate representation and democratic decision making in multilateral institutions and the architecture of a post-Second World War world are widening inequalities and increasing the marginalisation of the world’s poorest communities.

Progress on the achievement MDGs is sadly lagging. The international community is failing to assist those most in need. This decade the world needs an urgent shift from the old aid concept of charity and patronage to one of working together towards a common good. It is essential to redefine development cooperation by ushering in a new paradigm where the vulnerable and marginalised are not left behind.

HLF-4 is a key moment in getting global civil society’s voice heard and defining what we want from development cooperation. We’ve come a long way since the days of the technocratic agenda of the Paris Declaration in 2005. Partner governments and civil society are recognised as development actors in their own right. This is shifting the focus away from the provision of direct aid to governments, to development partnerships that directly address people’s needs.

At Busan, the agenda for democratic and inclusive ownership must put the intended beneficiaries of aid at the centre of development policies and strategies. This means that local communities, civil society and Parliaments must be involved in the processes by which aid is secured, prioritised and disbursed. They must also have a say in the formulation and implementation of national development plans. Moreover, there must be an emphasis on development cooperation practices that promote human rights standards and focus on addressing the root causes of poverty and inequality. National ownership of development must not be read as state ownership.

Civil society is central to sustainable development, yet our ability to come together, speak out and hold others to account is increasingly under threat. An emphasis on the creation of an enabling environment for civil society is essential.

Civil society in the North must continue to push governments to live up to their commitments and ensure aid predictability. Far too many governments around the world are failing to uphold their Paris Declaration and other key aid related commitments.

Lastly, in many cases development cooperation is worryingly contingent on the narrow strategic and geopolitical interests of the governments giving and receiving aid. This must change. Greater independence of aid agencies from donor governments is vital.
International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness finalized

At the Open Forum Global Assembly 2011 in Cambodia, delegates agreed on the final edits to the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness in what is now referred to as the Siem Reap CSO Consensus. The product of over 70 consultations worldwide, the International Framework is a consolidated statement from CSOs globally on their own effectiveness as development actors and contains:

- 8 Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness and Implementation Guidelines
- Statement on CSO Accountability
- Critical Conditions required from Partner and Donor Governments

The Framework will:

- Provide key inputs to HLF4 as point C of the CSO Key Messages and Proposals
- Serve as a long-term reference for CSOs across the globe in their development work

For more information, visit www.cso-effectiveness.org or contact info@cso-effectiveness.org.
Contact us

To share your comments and feedback or suggest future articles please contact Editor@busanhlf4.org

For more information visit www.busanhlf4.org

The HLF-4 web pages and the Busan Bulletin Newsletter have been set up as collaboration between the OECD, the Government of the Republic of Korea and UNDP, guided by an Advisory Group of key stakeholders to the HLF-4 event.