Strengthening the Impact of International Initiatives on the Ground

2012 DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION FORUM
2ND HIGH- LEVEL SYMPOSIUM

LUXEMBOURG, 18 – 19 OCTOBER 2011

PRESENTED BY
DR. SERVACIUS LIKWELILE,
DEPUTY PERMANENT SECRETARY,
MINISTRY OF FINANCE, TANZANIA

Outline

1. Background
2. Progress since Paris Declaration in 2005
3. How does Mutual Accountability Work at Country level
4. Evidence of Mutual Accountability mechanisms in African countries
5. Challenges
6. Conclusion

1. BACKGROUND

<u>Role of Aid in Development</u>

- Aid is an important source of development finance for developing countries.
- Aid constitutes between 5% to 40% of least developed countries annual budgets.
- The experience of aid and development cooperation over the past 50 years clearly indicates that aid has contributed significantly to the development of most developing countries.
- Examples can be cited in many areas ranging from education, infrastructure and health.

Background (cont)

- The same experience also reveals some serious weaknesses:

  (i) Inadequate ownership and leadership by Partner countries.

  (ii) Inadequate accountability of Governments to citizens both in partner and donor countries.

  (iii) Tying of aid

  (iv) Ineffective aid delivery modalities

  (v) Multiple conditionalities

Backgound (cont)

(vi) Inadequate use of country systems for management of aid resources.

(vii) Inadequate transparency in the delivery of aid.

(viii) Inadequate alignment of aid to partner country priorities.

2. PROGRESS SINCE PARIS 2005

- Despite pledges by both DPs and PCs to the principles of the Paris Declaration and other international commitments, progress has been painfully slow.
- At the Accra High Level Forum in September 2008, 2010 PD evaluation and survey it was evident that:
  - Partner Countries were still not in the driving seat of the development process in their respective countries,
  - Most Donor countries were still far below the target of 0.7 % of GDP for their ODA,
  - There was still little progress on harmonization of delivery and aid management procedures,
  - Inadequate use of country systems.

Mutual Accountability

What is Mutual Accountability?

- Mutual accountability is a process by which two (or multiple) partners agree to be held responsible for the commitments that they have voluntarily made to each other.
- It relies on trust and partnership around shared agendas, rather than on 'hard' sanctions for non-compliance, to encourage the behaviour change needed to meet commitments. It is supported by evidence that is collected and shared among all partners.

3. How does Mutual Accountability Work at the Country level?

Three core elements contribute to the process of mutual accountability:

1. ***Generating a shared agenda*** (e.g. through joint assistance strategies, partnership declarations, harmonisation and alignment action plans and aid policies which define "how" aid is provided, as well as national development strategies and sector strategies which define "what" aid will be used for).
2. ***Monitoring and reviewing mutual commitments*** (e.g. through donor performance assessment frameworks (donor PAFs),results frameworks, aid databases like the Aid Management Platform in Tanzania and independent evidence from civil society and independent monitoring groups).

How does Mutual Accountability Work at the Country level (cont)

3. ***Providing space for dialogue and negotiation*** (e.g. through development partner fora, joint working groups and consultative groups which include donors and partner government executives, parliamentarians, civil society and Private Sector).

4. Evidence of Mutual Accountability mechanisms in African countries

Tanzania

- In December 2006,Tanzania launched the Joint Assistance Strategy for Tanzania (JAST). The JAST is a country-based framework for aid effectiveness which defined the principles and roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders in development co-operation. The JAST was accompanied with a Memorandum of Understanding which stated clear commitments for both parties and signed jointly by the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania and its 19 development partners.
- The JAST continues the spirit of the Tanzania Assistance Strategy (2000),with stronger emphasis on aid effectiveness through strengthened national ownership, government leadership and joint efforts to enhance capacity for effective development management.
- It also builds on the mutual accountability framework, supported by an Independent Monitoring Group (IMG) which was institutionalised in 2001. Several IMG assessments have been undertaken in 2002, 2005 and 2010.

Evidence of Mutual Accountability mechanisms in African countries (cont)

Mozambique

- The **Mozambique "donor PAF"** which operates within the budget support framework has provided donor country offices and their respective HQs with a useful tool.
- The "donor PAF" has improved donor compliance with the principles of the Paris Declaration, in particular as regards to improved predictability, portfolio composition and limiting the number of missions. "Naming and shaming" pressures have provided incentives for behaviour change and greater acceptance of the principle of shared accountability against commonly agreed aid effectiveness commitments.

Evidence of Mutual Accountability mechanisms in African countries (cont)

Rwanda

- Government of Rwanda and DP meetings - regular high-level meetings including representations from donor headquarters and high level political authorities of Rwanda.
- Country performance assessment framework, donor performance assessment framework, PEFA, PD survey and other surveys.

5. Challenges

- Stakeholders focus on Government accountability more than donor accountability;
- Sensitivity of the ‚Mutual Accountability Agenda (highly political);
- Institutional memory of development partners field offices which is important in building on progress;
- Involvement of other stakeholders to enhance mutual accountability;and
- Power imbalance in development cooperation relations
  - ✓ GoT/PCs – little or no influence over DPs policies, decisions
  - ✓ Few and weak mechanisms for monitoring DPs performance
  - ✓ Few or no mechanisms for enforcing DPs compliance

6. Conclusion

- Effective and strengthened mutual accountability requires political level commitment on both sides and broader engagement of stakeholders.
- Translating the recommendations of IMG into a compact of agreed actions and responsibilities facilitates constructive dialogue and engagement of both sides;
- Establishing channels for technical and high-level dialogue is crucial for discussing and agreeing on key issues;
- Involvement of other stakeholders enhances mutual accountability and supporting domestic accountability;
- Strengthening institutional memory of development partners in field is important in building on progress and sustaining agreed commitments; and
- Confidence, commitment and mutual trust is critical for effective mutual accountability.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION