Preparing for the 2014 Development Cooperation Forum
DCF GERMANY HIGH-LEVEL SYMPOSIUM

Accountable and effective development cooperation in a post-2015 era

Policy Brief
Effectiveness of Regional and Global Mutual Accountability Mechanisms to Promote Sustainable Development Results: Mapping Update for the 2014 DCF

prepared by Alison King (consultant) [1]

Executive Summary

This policy brief updates a 2010 mapping of the effectiveness of regional and global mutual accountability mechanisms to promote sustainable development results. It reviews the extent to which such mechanisms support mutual accountability at national level, and aims to give practical suggestions for a global accountability architecture that takes them into account as source of information and catalyst of behaviour change. The desk review finds that existing and more recently established mechanisms make visible efforts to close identified knowledge gaps. More specifically, it concludes that, in 2014, their data sourcing and analysis are more balanced; they better represent different development cooperation actors than they did in 2010; they provide sufficiently frequent assessments; and their efforts to engage civil society organizations (CSOs) and parliamentarians in dialogue on development cooperation are growing. Yet, they still lack evidence of recipient country concerns and room remains for more day-to-day cooperation between regional and global mechanisms. Assessments are also insufficiently used at country level.

The policy brief identifies a range of challenges, namely to: consolidate the landscape of mechanisms; produce more evidence for decision-making; enhance relevance and usefulness of assessments in a changing development cooperation landscape; and facilitate a vibrant engagement of non-executive stakeholders. It recommends the following actions: to undertake a mapping of existing mechanisms with a narrow focus on development cooperation flows; facilitate more structured and independent research on the nexus of mutual accountability and evidence-based decision making; make better use of the data revolution and the potential of technology to establish which information is relevant and to effectively share data; and assess capacity needs and enhance dialogue on effective development cooperation between provider and recipient country parliaments and between CSOs.

1. Background

One key way to improve the effectiveness of international development cooperation and, in turn, to increase and reinforce sustainable development results, is to ensure that development partners are accountable and their activities are transparent. Accountability and transparency have been a key focus of the ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) work since its inception. The DCF has focused on mutual accountability between providers and recipients of development cooperation. This is rooted in the 2002 Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development. It is also a key principle of the Paris Declaration, the Accra Agenda for Action, the 2010 Millennium Development Goal (MDG) Summit and the Busan Partnership Document. Enhancing mutual accountability requires targeting three mutually reinforcing facets:

- improved global and regional mutual accountability (MA) mechanisms;
- improved national-level MA mechanisms; and
- improved transparency of development cooperation.

There is a multiplicity of global and regional mechanisms aiming to promote mutual accountability in development cooperation, ranging from independent "spotlights", multi-stakeholder initiatives, and inter-governmental arrangements. Their effectiveness has been found to depend on four factors:

- the quality of their evidence;
- the level of ownership by all stakeholders;
- the degree of debate they provoke; and
- their ability to change behaviour.

Most recently, in March 2014, the DCF Germany High-level Symposium underscored several key messages, two of which pertain to global accountability for development cooperation. First, global accountability for development cooperation is about providing incentives to meet voluntary commitments, with the promise of sustainable development results as the most powerful motivation. Second, while no one-size-fits-all approach exists, there is need for an inclusive, robust global monitoring and accountability framework for development cooperation, to accelerate progress at all levels. Such a framework should engage all actors on a level playing field and enable them to contribute, including through existing national and regional mutual accountability mechanisms.

2. Objectives and Purpose

The objectives of this policy brief are:
- to update a 2010 review conducted for the DCF of global and regional mechanisms that promote mutual accountability in international development cooperation;
- to examine progress towards increased effectiveness of these mechanisms in terms of their contribution to behavioural change of providers and recipients of development cooperation;
- to identify challenges to the effectiveness of global and regional MA mechanisms[1]; and
- to revisit and adjust earlier recommendations on how to strengthen their impact.

Its original purpose was to inform and stimulate the debate among participants of the DCF Germany High-level Symposium in Berlin, 20-21 March 2014. This final version takes into account pertinent messages that came out of the said Symposium.

3. Scope and Methodology

The 2010 International Development Cooperation Report (IDCR) provides the analytical framework for updating the status and progress of global and regional MA accountability mechanisms. For the first time, the 2010 IDCR analysed the effectiveness of global and regional MA mechanisms as a whole, based on assessments of 20

---

[1] A 2011 Expert Group Meeting on reinforcing international mutual accountability (here) addressed four deficits: stakeholder representation; breadth and relevance of evidence; impact on individual provider behaviour; and coordination among mechanisms and linkages to national level mechanisms.

individual mechanisms. This policy brief asseses changes in the effectiveness of these mechanisms since 2010.[2] Selected new mechanisms established since then have also been included.

The present update is based on a desk review of publicly available documentation and information. Views pronounced at the DCF Germany High-level Symposium have helped shape the present final version of the policy brief for the 2014 DCF.

The policy brief does not update earlier DCF findings on global and regional processes related to international transparency.

4. Recent Developments at Global and Regional Levels

Since the 2010 review, the global dialogue on aid effectiveness and efforts to promote mutual accountability have shifted and gained further traction. New global and regional MA mechanisms have emerged and external evaluations of existing mechanisms have shown that all that glitters is not gold. Some recent developments with much prominence in the literature are listed forthwith.

Recently-established global and regional MA mechanisms

- The *Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation* (GPEDC) was launched in July 2012, succeeding the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF). The GPEDC was established to support and help ensure accountability for implementing the Busan Partnership Document, the outcome document of the 4th High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. The Busan Partnership Document sets out principles, commitments and actions that offer a wide range of governmental, civil society and private sector actors a framework for dialogue and efforts to enhance the effectiveness of development cooperation. While the Busan Partnership Document was not defined through a UN process and is not inter-governmentally agreed, 161 countries and 56 organizations have associated themselves with the GPEDC to date.
- The *New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States* was initiated by the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, including the g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected states, at the Busan High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in November 2011, in view of accelerating progress towards the MDGs in fragile and conflict-affected states. Supporters commit, inter alia, to using Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs) to guide their work. Experience with the New Deal is expected to inform the post-2015 development agenda on the needs and vulnerabilities of conflict-affected countries.
- Despite receiving the highest per capita ODA worldwide, Pacific Islands are also lagging far behind in terms of MDG achievement. At the regional level, the *Cairns Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific* was adopted by Pacific Island country governments and endorsed by key development partners in August 2009, establishing a series of review and reporting processes for Pacific Islands Forum countries and their providers to undertake in line with international best practices, including as expressed in the Pacific Principles on Aid Effectiveness.
- In 2009, the *Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness* came into existence to define a mutually shared framework of common standards for CSO Development

---

[2] The Strategic Partnership for Africa (SPA) has not been included in the assessments because its website was unavailable.

Effectiveness. In September 2010, the Open Forum endorsed the Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness (Istanbul Principles), which formed the foundation for the 2011 International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness, and as such the voluntary basis for defining and improving CSO effectiveness work worldwide. The Busan Partnership Document "encourages CSOs to implement practices that strengthen their accountability and their contribution to development effectiveness, guided by the Istanbul Principles and the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness". Having achieved its goal, the Open Forum process came to an end in 2012.

Recent evaluations of global and regional MA mechanisms

- 2010: Multilateral Development Bank Common Performance Assessment System (COMPAS);
- 2011: Second phase of the evaluation of the Paris Declaration;
- 2013: Multilateral Organizations Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN); and
- 2013: Africa Partnership Forum (APF).

Relevant findings from these evaluations are reflected in the following update.

5. Closing the Gaps

In 2010, the IDCR showed that in general, aid recipients had implemented more of their commitments under MA mechanisms than providers. Provider performance was largely disappointing, though the performance of individual donors varied widely. Poor provider performance partly reflected eight systemic gaps, all linked to the above-mentioned questions of quality of evidence, degree of ownership and degree to which MA mechanisms provoke debate and behaviour change. The present section assesses the extent to which those systemic gaps inhibiting effective development cooperation have been addressed.

i) Sources of data and analysis

The IDCR found that OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) data and direct donor publications were virtually the only sources of data and analysis used by global and regional MA mechanisms. It suggested that mechanisms make greater efforts to source data and analysis from recipient countries, and use independent analysis from other stakeholders such as parliaments, local governments and civil society groups.

More balanced sourcing of data and analysis

The present desk review did not find any mechanisms that used exclusively OECD DAC data or direct donor publications. All but the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) utilized data and analysis from a range of information sources, with varying

combinations of official and non-governmental sources from provider and/or recipient countries (annex). In some instances, mechanisms have drawn on each other's data and analysis.[3]

ii) Stakeholder involvement in design and implementation

The IDCR found that recipient governments and other stakeholders were woefully underrepresented in global and regional MA mechanisms, and that providers, (largely Northern) CSOs and academic institutions were the dominant stakeholders choosing indicators, designing assessment tools and processes, and generating and presenting results. It suggested that mechanisms make greater efforts to involve recipient governments, non-DAC donors such as the BRICS, and Southern non-executive stakeholders.

More inclusive representation of development cooperation actors

The present desk review shows that governing structures of global and regional MA mechanisms are largely designed to be multi-stakeholder in nature, combining, in different variations, government and/or non-executive stakeholders, including "eminent persons", from recipient and provider countries (annex). Recipient and provider government representatives collaborate in several mechanisms, including the newer ones (Cairns Compact, GPEDC and New Deal). Formal involvement of business leaders is particularly apparent in the case of numerous independent MA mechanisms (e.g. APPR, CDI and ONE); private sector engagement is also encouraged in the Cairns Compact, the DCF and the GPEDC. Specific efforts to engage non-DAC donors are seen in the DCF (through its High-level events and meetings of the group of Southern partners) and the GPEDC Steering Committee, but are hardly visible in any other mechanisms.[4]

iii) Content of assessments

The IDCR found that the content of assessments was dominated by provider concerns and issues on which DAC donors and recipient governments had reached consensus, including multi-year predictability and transparency. It suggested a need for more analysis of those aid effectiveness issues of most concern to recipient country governments. Much less attention was paid to policy coherence for development.

Lack of evidence on specific recipient government concerns

The present desk review was unable to ascertain whether this has changed. Some, but not all, aid effectiveness issues of particular concern to recipient country governments, such as related to reducing conditionality, capacity development, using country partner systems, providing budget support and untying aid, are covered in accountability mechanisms such as the Busan Partnership Document, the Cairns Compact, the DCF and OECD DAC Peer Reviews, but it is unclear how progress on some or all of these areas is effectively reviewed. For example, while conditionality is mentioned in the Busan Partnership Document, it is not reviewed in the GPEDC Global Monitoring Report.

---

[3] E.g. the EU FfD Report has drawn on AidWatch and vice versa in the recent past; GMR and MOPAN have drawn on COMPAS; and the MRDE has drawn on the APRM, the APF, the APPR, the GMR and ONE. Furthermore, preparations for the 2011 DSM reportedly included consultations with ONE. On the other hand, the 2013 APF evaluation found that the MRDE had been insufficiently used by the APF.

[4] DCF 2012 High-level Segment: Trends and progress in international development cooperation - Report of the Secretary-General, E/2012/78, 29 May 2012. Reference is made to the Group of Southern Partners and DCF High-level Events.

Limited research capacities did not permit an in-depth analysis of the contents of numerous reports published by global and regional MA mechanisms to reveal the extent to which they actually address such issues. However, aforementioned findings that, today's global and regional MA mechanisms have a broader underpinning, both in terms of their governance structures and information sources, are positive, and could present a "golden opportunity" for recipients of development cooperation to influence the content of assessments.

The current desk review also established that, while efforts to ensure effective aid remain important, there is consensus that it is necessary to focus on quantitative commitments, especially vis-à-vis aid-dependent countries, and to look beyond aid effectiveness to focus on broader public policy and development finance areas that affect sustainable development prospects and outcomes such as trade, taxation, debt relief, investment, agriculture and technology. This is done in the context of the Financing for Development process, which is expected to host another review conference in 2015. A range of MA mechanisms (e.g. CDI, DAC Peer Reviews, DCF, MRDE and RoA) reflect this evolution.

iv) Coverage of assessments

The IDCR found that another factor limiting the effectiveness of MA mechanisms is their relatively narrow coverage. Most assessments only covered DAC donors and major multilaterals, or a subset of these. No mechanism provided a "mutual" assessment in the sense of analysing the performance of both provider and recipient countries. In addition, while all mechanisms published data or analysis on the global performance of individual providers, virtually none published analysis of the performance of individual providers in particular recipient countries, which can be a powerful tool to incentivize good behaviour.

Stakeholder coverage and mutuality has improved

The present desk review found that while the extent to which providers deliver on their promises remains newsworthy, a number of MA mechanisms are making efforts to include both provider (including non-DAC donors) and recipient governments in their analysis of the effectiveness of development cooperation (annex). The only mechanism to focus exclusively on recipient governments is the APRM, and this more in view of members' domestic accountability for economic and political governance. In fact, there is no known peer review among recipient countries of their aid management and effectiveness progress. In addition, some mechanisms include CSOs and/or the private sector in their monitoring (e.g. APPR, GPEDC and SOHS). On the other hand, the situation remains where only few mechanisms (Cairns Compact and MOPAN) provide basic information on individual provider performance in particular programme countries.

v) Frequency and timeliness of assessments

The IDCR found that most assessments are updated annually, although heavy reliance on the relatively infrequent Paris Declaration surveys meant that some data could be two to three years out of date. It suggested that assessments be updated as frequently as possible (preferably annually) and with maximum timeliness.

> ### *Sufficiently frequent assessments*
>
> The present desk review shows that assessments can take various forms. They range from qualitative narratives to quantitative statistics. Some mechanisms apply a standard methodology to monitoring and reporting, while others are less rigorous. Some, but not all, measure against concrete commitments/indicators associated with particular international political processes (e.g. Cairns Compact, DCF, GPEDC, HRI, New Deal); some collect primary data and others rely on secondary data. And while some mechanisms allow for comparison over time, others take a topical or geographical approach. Assessments are called "joint statements", "reviews" and "reports". They are generated with varying frequencies, but with the great majority of mechanisms producing an assessment at least on an annual basis (annex). In an attempt to facilitate accessibility and usefulness, at least three independent mechanisms (AidWatch, CDI and HRI) provide for interactive online statistics. The producers of APRM Progress Reports, DATA Reports and the SOHS have made available translations into different languages other than English.

vi) Cooperation among global and regional MA mechanisms

The IDCR found that there had been a considerable amount of cooperation among global and regional MA mechanisms in the sense of using one another's data. In contrast, most official processes did not draw on independent mechanisms' analysis and results. In addition, instead of discussing mergers and rationalizations, there had been a proliferation of mechanisms. It suggested a strong need for mechanisms to cooperate more closely.

> ### *Still room for more cooperation*
>
> The present desk review suggests that day-to-day cooperation among global and regional MA mechanisms is largely limited to references to one another's accountability frameworks/assessments as well as to hyperlinks between webpages. The accountability frameworks most often mentioned are the Paris Declaration and the Busan Partnership Document respectively. The little evidence available does not endorse the earlier finding that a considerable amount of cooperation exists; nor does it confirm that official processes are more likely to draw upon each other. For example, reviewed documentation suggests potential for stronger links between the MRDE and the APF and DSM respectively, between the EU FfD Report and AidWatch, and between the DCF and the GPEDC. The 2013 MOPAN evaluation suggested that the MOPAN and EvalNet approaches to assessing multilateral organizations' development results be merged into one and led by MOPAN. The 2010 COMPAS evaluation found that COMPAS reports had not been successful in providing a counterweight to organized assessments of MDB managing for development results performance such as MOPAN. In fact, rather than seeing any mergers, further new global and regional MA mechanisms have been created (Cairns Compact, New Deal, Open Forum), albeit each of them addressing context-specific aspects of effective development cooperation, and as such welcome

additions. The WP-EFF has been succeeded by the GPEDC. Possibly only the Guide to Donors has been discontinued. At least six MA mechanisms[5] are active in the Africa region, putting a burden on the administrative and diplomatic systems, and raising the question how they interact and create synergies.

vii) Interplay with national-level mutual accountability mechanisms

Global and regional MA mechanisms can drive change at the national level. However, the IDCR found that very few of the existing mechanisms were used to provoke change at national level in programme countries. It suggested a need to make much stronger efforts to ensure assessments are used in national-level MA mechanisms to increase behaviour change.

Assessments remain insufficiently used at country level

The present desk review suggests that the situation has not changed. As per their design, very few global and regional MA mechanisms envisage explicit linkages to programme country-level MA mechanisms, amongst them three new mechanisms (Cairns Compact, GPEDC and New Deal) (annex). MOPAN has also built country dialogues into the assessment process. However the 2013 MOPAN evaluation found that country dialogues had either not taken place or that their benefits were limited. For all others, including all independent mechanisms covered by this update, it is not evident how they intend to feed into national MA mechanisms to reinforce national-level dialogue and promote best practices.

In practice, respondents to the 2011 DCF 2nd Global Accountability Survey most commonly mentioned the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action as having the strongest connection, and there was reportedly a growing reference to the regional Cairns Compact. Responding to the 3rd DCF Global Accountability Survey in 2014[6], 34 countries indicated that they used regional or global MA mechanisms to reinforce good practices and learn from other countries. The GPEDC Monitoring Framework was mentioned most often, followed by the Paris Declaration. Countries also made reference to OECD Development Cooperation Reports. Furthermore, the survey showed that the use of regional mechanisms for reinforcing MA through sharing knowledge and experiences appears to be under-exploited. Only four countries identified regional mechanisms, i.e. the APRM, the Pacific Island Forum and CARICOM.

---

viii) Role of civil society representatives and of parliamentarians

The IDCR found that most non-provider stakeholders lacked sufficient analysis and information on provider aid policies and practices to advocate and negotiate for change. This was because much analysis was not presented in a way designed to identify how to improve each individual provider's programmes; but also because there was little scope

---

[5] APF, APPR, APRM, DSM, MRDE and ONE.
[6] 3rd Global Accountability Survey Interim Report.

for dialogue between provider and recipient country institutions beyond the executive branches of government. It suggested that global and regional MA mechanisms promote dialogue on aid effectiveness between provider and recipient country CSOs on the one hand and parliamentarians on the other.

> ***Growing efforts to engage CSOs and parliamentarians in dialogue on development cooperation***
>
> As already seen, global and regional MA mechanisms have generally become more inclusive of civil society representatives and, to a lesser extent, private sector. Besides including non-executive development actors in the governance of global and regional MA mechanisms to trigger more effective mutual accountability, mechanisms are also called upon to facilitate North-South dialogue among CSOs and parliamentarians respectively on issues related to the effectiveness of development cooperation. Important platforms for such exchanges are in place at the global level. The Open Forum was run by and for CSOs worldwide to improve the impact of their own development cooperation work and to advocate for more favourable government policies and practices for CSOs. CSO participation is one of the hallmarks of the DCF; and they are involved in the GPEDC. The only evidence found of a targeted engagement of parliamentarians is in the DCF[7] and the GPEDC Steering Committee, in collaboration with the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU). The IPU Aid Policy Paper is a concrete example of engaging parliamentarians in the DCF.

6. Effectiveness of Global and Regional MA Mechanisms

The 2010 review found that only few MA mechanisms had had much impact on provider behaviour, first and foremost the Paris Declaration and its surveys, but also COMPAS and MOPAN on multilateral organizations and AidWatch on EU donors. On the other hand, it found that similar mechanisms had had a much stronger influence on the behaviour of recipient countries, "partly because their outcomes were often used as the basis for matrices of conditionality for improving government performance in policy-based lending".

Since then, the second phase of the evaluation of the Paris Declaration confirmed that the Declaration had made several definite and verifiable differences to aid effectiveness by clarifying and strengthening norms of good practice, contributing to movement toward the eleven outcomes set in 2005, improving the quality of aid partnerships, and supporting rising aid volumes. While the evaluation traced positive contributions of aid reforms to more focused aid efforts and better development results in specific sectors, areas such as giving higher priority to the needs of the poorest, strengthening institutional capacities and social capital, and improving the mix of aid modalities were found to have benefited less. Documentation also suggests that - in the Pacific region - aid quality and coordinated partnerships have advanced since the creation of the Cairns Compact.[8]

On the other hand, external evaluations have concluded that the effectiveness of MOPAN, COMPAS and the APF has been limited. The 2013 MOPAN evaluation found

---

[7] Based on A/RES/63/24 of 22 January 2009: Cooperation between the United Nations and the Inter-Parliamentary Union.
[8] Report of the 2012 ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum.

little evidence that multilaterals used MOPAN assessments within their own internal processes of organisational reform to enhance their effectiveness. The 2010 COMPAS evaluation found little evidence that COMPAS was used by senior management for internal management and accountability on management for development results. It concluded that, on balance, COMPAS reports, in their then form, were not effective in meeting the central objectives of monitoring implementation, jointly reporting on progress and identifying strengths and areas of improvement of MDBs in managing for development results. Lastly, the 2013 APF evaluation noted that the APF had not been sufficiently effective in taking up contentious issues, in launching joint initiatives, and in arriving at forward-looking conclusions. Furthermore, it had not engaged in an honest mutual review of commitments and the creeping decline of the level of attendance at Forum meetings was rather a result than a cause of such developments.

Limited research capacities did not allow for an analysis of the behaviour of policy makers and practitioners and to what extent any changes can be directly attributed to the work of individual global and regional MA mechanisms. However, above findings on the extent to which earlier-identified gaps have been closed allow some conclusions regarding the contribution of MA mechanisms to behavioural change. Encouraging developments include:

- broader-based debates on the effectiveness of development cooperation, going "beyond aid";
- emergence of new targeted global and regional MA mechanisms;
- more inclusive governing structures;
- a broader range of data and analysis sources;
- more mutual assessments of provider and recipient governments; and
- increased accountability of non-executive development partners.

7. Challenges Ahead

This review also seeks to identify remaining challenges to the effectiveness of the increasingly multifaceted landscape of global and regional MA mechanisms in international development cooperation, and how they can be addressed. This section identifies challenges that (continue to) hamper the potential of such mechanisms to influence the delivery of development cooperation and makes recommendations for consideration.

- *Consolidate the currently complex web of global and regional MA mechanisms:* The post-2015 development agenda, to be agreed upon by UN member states in 2015, is underpinned, inter alia, by the notion of strengthened engagement of all development actors and greater accountability to deliver on quantitative and

qualitative development cooperation commitments. As part of a multi-level architecture comprising national, regional and global MA mechanisms, a global, multi-stakeholder umbrella framework is expected to be designed that encapsulates post-2015 commitments that may apply either to all or groups of actors in development cooperation. Today, it is still premature to speak of a "system" of international mutual accountability mechanisms. The current set-up is a reflection of numerous parallel international political processes. It is not sufficiently coherent to ensure rigorous and efficient bottom-up reporting to a global monitoring and accountability framework in the near future. With global challenges increasing, the number and diversity of mechanisms could grow even further. In the context of the post-2015 development agenda, the challenge will be to clarify the division of labour among existing global and regional MA mechanisms in order to identify scope for increased coordination, harmonization and rationalization, in order to ascertain any gaps in the global and regional landscape, and to ensure better linkages to programme country-level MA mechanisms.

Recommendation: Undertake a mapping of global and regional MA mechanisms with a narrow focus on development cooperation flows, including sectoral ones, to ensure that a future multi-layered global monitoring and accountability architecture, through a participatory bottom-up approach, and possibly housed at the United Nations, draws upon and reinforces existing accountability mechanisms and data sources.

- *Produce more evidence for decision-taking:* The 2010 IDCR reviewed for the first time the effectiveness of global and regional MA mechanisms as a whole, based on assessments of 20 individual mechanisms. Full-fledged external evaluations have assessed the effectiveness of a few individual global and regional mechanisms. CSOs and academic institutions have provided their own views. Nonetheless, the wealth of experience of development actors at the global and regional level to strengthen accountability to deliver on development cooperation commitments remains a largely unexplored territory, important evidence remains unearthed and a number of forward-looking questions unanswered, such as how different mechanisms help aid-dependent country governments source the information they require, how they support the integration of economic, social and environmental dimensions of development, or how the behaviour of policy makers and practitioners can ultimately be directly attributed to the work of global and regional MA mechanisms.

Recommendation: More structured and independent research and evaluations are required to assess key aspects of global and regional MA mechanisms in view of building on lessons learned and taking evidence-based decisions on their future.

- *Enhance relevance and usefulness of accountability assessments in a changing development cooperation landscape:* Overall, assessments of progress made produced at the global and regional level are insufficiently used to support national-level mutual accountability processes, where they exist. By making them more relevant, accessible and user-friendly for policy makers and practitioners, assessments are more likely to be used in national-level MA mechanisms to allow for fact-based exchanges and to increase provider and recipient behaviour change. Enhancing the relevance of assessments requires paying more attention to the particular concerns of recipient countries and including an extension of their scope to include discussions on accountability for other types of development financing than ODA based on the demand of programme countries.

Recommendation: Make better use of the data revolution and the potential of technology to establish which information is relevant and to effectively share data in a timely, reliable, easily accessible and comprehensive manner, also for the public.

- *Facilitate a vibrant engagement of non-executive stakeholders:* Encouragingly, national parliaments, civil society and private actors are more visible in multi-stakeholder global and regional MA mechanisms today. They are a source of information, members of governing structures and their performance is being increasingly subjected to monitoring. The participation of non-executive stakeholders in global and regional MA mechanisms is essential to strengthen and complement domestic and mutual accountability, both North and South, and to connect national and international accountability platforms. This cannot be sufficiently stressed. Governments, civil society organizations, the private sector, parliamentarians, Southern partners and multilateral organizations increasingly work in unison to deliver sustainable development results and support an enabling environment for such outcomes.

Recommendation: Assess capacity needs, support and enhance dialogue on effective development cooperation between provider and recipient country parliamentarians and between CSOs, especially with voices from recipient countries informing counterparts from provider countries of realities on the ground.

Annex: Mapping of Global and Regional MA Mechanisms

To what extent do global and regional MA mechanisms source data and analysis from stakeholders other than from the OECD DAC and DAC donors?		
Predominantly recipient country sources	Range of information sources	Predominantly OECD DAC and DAC donor data and analysis
APRM	APF, Cairns Compact, DCF, EU FfD Report, GMR, MOPAN, MRDE, New Deal, DAC Peer Reviews AidWatch, APPR, CDI, DATA Report, DSM, HRI, RoA, SOHS	

* Without COMPAS, which uses internal MDB information; without GPEDC for lack of publications.

To what extent are stakeholders other than from OECD countries involved in design and implementation of global and regional MA mechanisms?		
Predominantly recipient country stakeholders	Range of stakeholders	Predominantly OECD country stakeholders
APRM DSM	APF, Cairns Compact, DCF, GPEDC, MRDE, New Deal APPR CDI, DATA Report, HRI, RoA, SOHS	EU FfD Report, MOPAN, DAC Peer Reviews AidWatch

*Without COMPAS or the GMR, which are managed by multilateral organizations.

To what extent do global and regional mechanisms assess both recipient and provider governments?		
Predominantly recipient governments	"Mutual assessment"	Predominantly DAC donors and major multilaterals
APRM	APF, Cairns Compact, DCF, GMR, GPEDC, MRDE, New Deal APPR, DATA Report, DSM, RoA, SOHS	COMPAS, EU FfD Report, MOPAN, DAC Peer Review CDI, AidWatch, HRI

To what extent do assessments include individual provider performance at programme country level?	
Yes	No
Cairns Compact, MOPAN	APF, APRM, COMPAS, DCF, EU FfD Report, GMR, GPEDC, MRDE, New Deal, DAC Peer Review AidWatch, APPR, CDI, DATA Report, DSM, HRI, RoA, SOHS

Which global and regional mechanisms produce at least annual "assessments"?
APF, APRM, Cairns Compact, COMPAS, EU FfD Report, GMR, MOPAN, MRDE, DAC Peer Reviews AidWatch, APPR, CDI, DATA Report, DSM, HRI, RoA

*Without GPEDC, New Deal for lack of publications; DSM, HRI and RoA included although no known assessment in 2013.

To what extent do global and regional MA mechanisms link up to national-level MA mechanisms (where they exist)?

Not evident	Envisaged
APF, APRM, COMPAS, DCF, EU FfD Report, GMR, MRDE, DAC Peer Reviews AidWatch, APPR, CDI, DATA Report, DSM, HRI, RoA, SOHS	Cairns Compact, GPEDC[9], MOPAN, New Deal

IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER

AidWatch	• Range of information sources • Predominantly OECD country stakeholders • Predominantly assessment of DAC donors and major multilaterals • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
APF	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
APPR	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
APRM	• Predominantly recipient country sources • Predominantly recipient country stakeholders • Predominantly assessment of recipient governments • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
Cairns Compact	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Mutual assessment • Includes individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms envisaged
CDI	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Predominantly assessment of DAC donors and major multilaterals • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
COMPAS	• Predominantly assessment of DAC donors and major multilaterals • Predominantly assessment of DAC donors and major multilaterals • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments

---

[9] According to its design.

	• Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
DAC Peer Reviews	• Range of information sources • Predominantly OECD country stakeholders • Predominantly assessment of DAC donors and major multilaterals • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
DATA Report	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
DCF	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Has not produced at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms by serving as knowledge hub analysing their status and progress.
DSM	• Range of information sources • Predominantly recipient country stakeholders • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
EU FfD Report	• Range of information sources • Predominantly OECD country stakeholders • Predominantly assessment of DAC donors and major multilaterals • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
GMR	• Range of information sources • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
GPEDC	• Range of stakeholders • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Links to national-level MA mechanisms envisaged
HRI	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Predominantly assessment of DAC donors and major multilaterals • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
MOPAN	• Range of information sources • Predominantly OECD country stakeholders • Predominantly assessment of DAC donors and major multilaterals • Includes individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms envisaged
MRDE	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
New Deal	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders

	• Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Links to national-level MA mechanisms envisaged
RoA	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Produces at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident
SOHS	• Range of information sources • Range of stakeholders • Mutual assessment • No assessment of individual provider performance at programme country level • Has not produced at least annual assessments • Links to national-level MA mechanisms not evident

Abbreviations

APPR	Africa Progress Panel Report
APRM	Africa Peer Review Mechanism
CARICOM	Caribbean Community and Common Market
CDI	Commitment to Development Index
COMPAS	Common Performance Assessment System
CSO	Civil society organization
DCF	Development Cooperation Forum
DSM	African Monitor (AM) Development Support Monitor
EvalNet	OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation
GMR	Global Monitoring Report
GPEDC	Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation
EU	European Union
FfD	Financing for development
HRI	Humanitarian Response Index
IDCR	International Development Cooperation Report
IPU	Inter-Parliamentary Union
MA	Mutual accountability
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MOPAN	Multilateral Organizations Performance Assessment Framework
MRDE	Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness in Africa
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OECD DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
PSGs	Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals
RoA	Reality of Aid
SOHS	State of the Humanitarian System
SPA	Strategic Partnership for Africa
WP-EFF	Working Party on Aid Effectiveness