

# MAKING INTERNATIONAL MA MECHANISMS FIT FOR PURPOSE

---

Matthew Martin  
Development Finance International Group  
DCF High-Level Symposium  
Luxembourg, 17 October 2011

# INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- MA is one key thematic focus area for DCF, with particular focus on providers to ensure “mutual”
- Earlier studies (2009) examined global, regional and national MA and transparency mechanisms
- Surveys of national mechanisms (2010+2011) allow track whether national use global/regional
- Consultations with providers/developing countries
- Did not include sector mechanisms eg EFA, IHP, because they focus less on providers, though eg Campaign for Global Education Bamako)
- Two major omissions – PWYF and Real Aid
- Aim: practical suggestions to improve global and regional mutual accountability (MA) mechanisms

# FINDINGS (1)

- Multiple global mechanisms, but few promote systematic behaviour change by providers, because:
  - ◆ Several key stakeholder groups (parliaments, local government, Southern civil society) do not have sufficient voice
  - ◆ Programme countries are not major sources of analysis and concerns such as conditionality, flexibility, predictability are not often reflected
  - ◆ Southern providers are often not analysed, and concerns such as appropriate technology, speed/value for money are not covered
  - ◆ Parliaments are rarely engaged – in provider or programme countries
  - ◆ The agenda is dominated by provider concerns, and consensus between providers and programme countries
  - ◆ Most mechanisms – and stakeholders - lack sufficient analysis and information on practices by individual providers at the national level.

## FINDINGS (2)

- Several good regional MA mechanisms but do not:
  - ◆ cover all global regions or sub-regions;
  - ◆ engage with all stakeholders; or
  - ◆ connect sufficiently to global or national mechanisms.
- Behaviour change varies with the degrees to which stakeholders concerns are reflected in mechanisms
  - ◆ Independent non-official assessments by think tanks or CSOs tend to lack ownership by development actors
  - ◆ Intergovernmental forums which have higher government ownership tend not to provide enough analysis to hold individual providers to account
- Nevertheless, key mechanisms such as Paris Declaration (and lesser extent DCF MA reviews) are vital to open door for providers to sign up to MA at country level – so essential to continue them beyond Busan

# GLOBAL MA (2): RECOMMENDATIONS

## 1. Need to increase:

- i. balance in stakeholder representation - reinforce programme country, Southern provider, parliament, other stakeholder voices and agenda-setting role
- ii. coordination/rationalisation of mechanisms;
- iii. integrate independent assessments in official processes (WP-EFF, DCF);
- iv. practicality to help national MA, esp. evidence on provider behaviour;
- v. Impact on stakeholder behaviour change
- vi. evidence quality (esp. on providers in specific countries);
- vii. ownership/participation by non-executive stakeholders and grassroots monitoring initiatives

## 2. Review progress of international MA annually <sup>5</sup>

# TRANSPARENCY (1)

- Global initiatives (eg IATI) will change behaviour to extent that are:
  - ◆ aligned with programme country budgeting, M&E systems so aid results can be linked to national development goals;
  - ◆ collected from all providers (including developing countries, foundations, CSOs; and all the main DAC/S-S providers);
  - ◆ encouraging programme country governments to increase transparency on use of aid;
  - ◆ collected also from stakeholders (incl. parliaments, audit office and grassroots monitoring) as cross-checks;
  - ◆ accessible and widely disseminated to stakeholders;
  - ◆ going beyond data to include conditions, policies, procedures
  - ◆ Most important, are used to analyse provider and programme country behaviour, and thereby to increase MA. Thence a sharp increase in capacity-building support for analysis by programme country governments, Northern and Southern parliaments, audit offices, local government representatives and CSOs, to ensure transparency promotes accountability

# LINKS TO NATIONAL MA

- If are to help national-level MA more, need to:
  - ◆ Provide info/analysis useful to inform national aid policy
  - ◆ Provide best practices on national leadership, including on locally-driven aid quality and results monitoring with annual targets for individual providers
  - ◆ Include independent input from civil society and monitors;
  - ◆ Be accessible to all stakeholders (parliaments, CSOs, local governments) eg in multiple languages, web-based, disseminated in cooperation with their global structures
  - ◆ Facilitate global and therefore national peer pressure among providers; and
  - ◆ Be linked to programmes to build country capacity to implement MA, with particular focus on fragile states where more problematic
- Key political/facilitating role of PD/AAA processes