

3rd GLOBAL ACCOUNTABILITY SURVEY IN PREPARATION FOR THE 2014 DCF

MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT PARTNER-SHIPS AT COUNTRY LEVEL

Few existing national mechanisms effectively hold actors accountable for development cooperation commitments. Those that do have shown an ability to solidify trust between central governments and their development partners. This has, in turn, made financial resources more adequate, predictable and targeted towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It has also led to greater use of country systems, budget support, predictability and transparent use of funding. Achieving such changes in behaviour, and their lasting impact on development results, is the key objective of mutual accountability (MA).

In times of growing diversity of actors, flows and modalities in development cooperation, MA is critical to strengthen development partnerships at country level. These partnerships aim to support implementation of national development strategies and goals. They are increasingly shaped by multiple sets of commitments and common but differentiated responsibilities.

The emergence of a post-2015 development agenda – focused on poverty eradication and sustainable development – will only put an even higher premium on MA as an essential ingredient to support implementation. The range of development cooperation actors at country level will have to make a more concerted effort to promote MA, to adapt MA mechanisms to these new conditions and to ensure that MA entails more robust monitoring. This may be particularly challenging in countries emerging from conflict.

THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION FORUM: PROMOTING GLOBAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Strengthening MA lies at the heart of efforts to achieve the MDGs and implement the Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development. The "aid effectiveness" process, although more narrowly focused on a set of technical issues, has also helped to keep the momentum for greater accountability and transparency in development cooperation.

The 2010 MDG Summit and 2008 Doha Review Conference on Financing for Development called for greater mutual accountability and for the UN Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) to act as focal point within the UN system to carry out a holistic consideration of issues related to international development cooperation. The DCF serves as a hub for candid and inclusive exchange on these issues.

The Busan Partnership Agreement for Effective Development Co-operation puts transparency and accountability at the fore and calls for deepening efforts to put in place inclusive mutual assessment reviews in all developing countries.

THE GLOBAL ACCOUNTABILITY SURVEY: PURPOSE AND PAST FINDINGS

The objectives of the UN DCF global accountability survey are to: (i) review progress made in implementing national MA with participation of all key stakeholders; (ii) identify how to implement enablers of MA, such as partnership policies, results frameworks and dialogue platforms; (iii) promote inclusive national dialogue and accelerate progress in strengthening MA mechanisms and iv) promote global policy dialogue on MA.

The first two rounds of the survey, summarized in two publications, showed only limited progress in most countries and outlined key steps to enhance MA and transparency. They clearly indicated that progress on all enablers is key to have a lasting impact on behaviour and results. Past surveys have also shown the need to: enforce delivery on commitments by building on existing structures; respond to capacity needs; collect adequate information; and gradually involve a range of partners.

THE 2013 GLOBAL ACCOUNTABILITY SURVEY

UN DESA, supported by UNDP, is rolling out a third survey on global accountability, between now and December 2013. The questionnaire was reviewed and lightly adapted in view of past findings. It should contribute to positioning global accountability as a critical pillar of a renewed global partnership for development in the post-2015 setting.

The survey will make space for all stakeholders to provide quantitative and qualitative details on the nexus of MA enablers, including transparency and development results. It will allow for an in-depth analysis that will also inform the assessment of progress in implementing Busan commitments on mutual accountability.

Survey findings and initial analysis will be made publicly available by the time of the DCF High-level Symposium on "Accountable and effective development cooperation in a post-2015 era" (Berlin, 20-21 March 2014). Together with those from other processes, the results will provide the basis for a comprehensive UN report on global accountability to inform the ministerial meeting of the DCF to take place in New York during the first week of July 2014.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING OUT THE SURVEY

The government entity responsible for the management and coordination of development cooperation flows is invited to coordinate the survey process. UNDESA and UNDP will make all efforts to provide support for the completion of the questionnaire.

It is suggested that the government entity bring together the key stakeholders for an informal consultation to generate inputs to the survey. Stakeholders could include other government representatives, e.g. local and regional governments and those involved in sectoral working groups, representatives from partner governments, parliament, the private sector, foundations and civil society organizations. Stakeholders should be given adequate time in advance to consult on the survey within their respective constituencies. The multi-stakeholder consultation would serve to reach consensus on responses to specific questions or to identify different viewpoints, which could be indicated in the space for comments at the end of each question. All participants in the consultation are to be listed in the space provided on the last page of the survey. The government entity is requested to submit only one survey per country to DESA.

Government representatives are encouraged to liaise closely with the UNDP Resident Representative's Office to explore opportunities for embedding the process of discussing and filling out the UN DCF Global Accountability Survey in the validation/consultation for the Busan Global Monitoring survey or other multi-stakeholder meetings on development cooperation. UNDP Resident Representative's Office and aid effectiveness focal points (if applicable) will be available to assist in facilitating consultations and finalizing the questionnaire.

Government representatives are kindly requested to submit the completed survey online by **Monday, 20 January 2014**. Individual responses will be treated as strictly confidential.

For further questions, please contact Mr. Thomas BOEHLER, DCPB/OESC/UNDESA (boehler@un.org, +1 917 367 9452) or Ms Yuko Suzuki Naab, UNDP (yuko.suzuki@undp.org).

criterion in question:			
r	1:		
F	Please provide any additional comments in the indicated spaces.		
1. NATIONAL AID/PARTNERSHIP POLICY: a. Is there an aid/national partnership policy document that defines the government's priorities on developm cooperation (either a stand-alone document or part of a national action/development plan)? [This reflects the first criterion of indicator 7 of the Busan Monitoring framework.]			
	If yes, please provide the name of the document (and attach an electronic copy to this questionnaire, if available). b. To what extent does the aid/partnership policy go beyond general principles, and contain clear annual targets for effective development cooperation:		

[This reflects the second criterion of indicator 7 of the Busan Monitorina framework.]

¹ These include targets for effective development co-operation as mentioned in the Busan Partnership agreement and its association monitoring framework of 10 indicators. They can also include other aspects of quality of development cooperation as outlined by different stakeholders.

	4 0 2 0 2 0 4 0 5 0
i) for individual providers of development cooperation	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
ii) for all providers development cooperation collectively	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
iii) for all DAC donors of aid collectively	1: 🔲 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🔲
iv) for the recipient government	1: 🔲 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🔲
c. Does any other document contain specific provider targets? If so, please provide	
copy to this questionnaire, if available):	
copy to this questionnaire, if available):	
d. Is the aid/partnership policy consistent with the <i>national development strategy</i> pr	iorities?
a. is the did/partitership policy consistent with the national acretophicit strategy pr	
	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
e. Does the aid/partnership policy define <i>clear institutional responsibilities</i> within the	government
	-
for development cooperation management/negotiation?	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
f. Does it include targets for providers/donors (such as on reporting on flows and	
	1. 🗆 2. 🗆 2. 🗆 4. 🗆 5. 🗆
transparency)?	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
g. Does it contain gender-specific targets?	1.
g. Does it contain genuer-specific targets:	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
i. Were any of the following actors consulted in the design of the aid/partnership pol	icv?
i) Poor and vulnerable populations	1:
ii) Non-governmental / Civil society organizations	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
iii) Representatives of local governments	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
v) Trade Unions	1: 🔲 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🔲
vi) Private Sector ⁱⁱ	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
vii) Philanthropic organizations / private foundations	1: 🗆 2: 🗆 3: 🗆 4: 🗆 5: 🗀
vii) i illiantinopie organizations / private roundations	1 2 3 4 3
j. Was the aid/partnership policy <i>reviewed by parliament</i> in a public hearing before c	oming into effect?
,,, p, p, p	1: 🗆 2: 🗀 3: 🗀 4: 🗀 5: 🗀
	1 2 3 4 3
	14. E 2. E 2. E 4. E 5. E
k. Does it call for <i>progress reports</i> on implementation to be submitted to parliament?	1: [2: [3: [4: [5: [
Comments:	
·	
	·····
2. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY COORDINATION FORUMS IN THE RECIPIENT COUNTRY	' :
a. What is the most influential forum for discussing overall progress in meeting	
commitments and results targets by providers and national stakeholders in your cou	
forum supported by a working-level technical forum, please answer the question	is below in relation to the political
forum.)	
h le this forum country lad in .	
b. Is this forum <i>country-led</i> , i.e.:	V50
chaired by the country government:	YES: ☐ NO: ☐
with the secretariat in the country government:	YES: ☐ NO: ☐
drawing on recipient government analysis of progress?	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🗎 5: 🗍
c. To what extent are key national stakeholders involved in interactive dialogue in the	-
Parliamentarians	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🗎 5: 🗍
Representatives of local government agencies	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
Non-governmental / Civil society organizations	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍

ⁱⁱ This includes local and foreign, small, medium and large enterprises, business associations, chamber of commerce

Local Communities	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
Women's organizations	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
Trade Unions	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🔲
Private sector	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
Philanthropic organizations / private foundations	1: 🔲 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🔲
[This reflects the fourth criterion of indicator 7 of the Busan Monitoring framework.]	
Comments:	
d. Has an assessment of progress towards the targets been undertaken by both re	cipient and provider countries in the
last two years and discussed in this forum?	YES: ☐ NO: ☐
[This reflects the third criterion of indicator 7 of the Busan Monitoring framework.]	
• Specifically, to what degree does this forum <i>review comprehensively recipient poof</i> :	erformance and policy implications ⁱⁱⁱ
the ministry in charge of development cooperation management	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
other relevant line ministries	1: 🗆 2: 🗀 3: 🗀 4: 🗀 5: 🗀
local government agencies	1: 🗆 2: 🗆 3: 🗆 4: 🗆 5: 🗆
implementing agencies, especially Non-governmental Organizations	1: 🗆 2: 🗆 3: 🗆 4: 🗆 5: 🗆
 To what degree does it review comprehensively provider performance and policy is 	implications of
OECD-DAC donors	1:
Southern partners	1:
Sub-national government agencies in provider countries	1:
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Non-governmental / Civil Society Organizations	1:
Global Funds	1:
Private Sector	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
Private foundations / philanthropic organizations	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
Please list any key providers which do not participate in these forums:	
• To what degree does it <i>review comprehensively provider performance individually</i>	<i>i</i> ? 1: □ 2: □ 3: □ 4: □ 5: □
e. Is there an agreed process for setting annual targets and tracking progress against	st them?:
for the recipient government?	YES: ☐ NO: ☐
for individual providers?	YES: ☐ NO: ☐
Please name and if necessary briefly describe this process	
rieuse nume una ij necessary briejty describe tins process	
f. To what degree are results of such exercises made public?	1: 🗆 2: 🗀 3: 🗀 4: 🗀 5: 🗀
[This reflects the fifth criterion of indicator 7 of the Busan Monitoring framework.]	
g. To what extent are the discussions based on <i>independent analytical inputs</i> :	
from independent monitoring groups	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
from parliaments	1: □ 2: □ 3: □ 4: □ 5: □
from civil society organisations	1: 🗆 2: 🗆 3: 🗆 4: 🗆 5: 🗆
Please specify the independent analytical input documents discussed at the most real attach electronic copies of the documents to this survey response:	ecent forum meeting, and if possible
h. Please list the two <i>mutual accountability mechanisms at the sectoral level</i> which recipient country to account for sectoral results targets:	ch best hold individual providers and
Sectoral mechanism 1 (please give name)	
Tracks recipient progress YES: NO: Tracks individual provide	r progress YES: NO:

iii Question is about assessing ability to live up to commitments and implications of coming short of commitments or similar.

		December 2015
Sectoral mechanism 2 (please give name)		
Tracks recipient progress YES: ☐ NO: ☐	Tracks individual provide	r progress YES: NO:
i. Do you make use of any regional or global me		
reinforce the national-level dialogue and learn be	•	
Mechanism 1 used (please give name)		
Mechanism 2 used (please give name)		
How used		
	0.1 0.51/5/ 0.01/5/17 60.0050 4.7/0.1/	TI CHIC AND THEIR CHANTY
a. Is there a freedom-of-information act or mech		
to development cooperation?	anishi requesting the government t	o make available imormation related
to development cooperation:		YES: ☐ NO: ☐
b. Does an <i>information system</i> for tracking devel	opment cooperation flows exist in y	our country? YES: ☐ NO: ☐
If yes, please provide the name of the system: If no, please describe the tools you use to collect	information from providers:	
	•	
c. Which central Ministry is in charge of the mana	, ,	
d. Does the system also <i>track provider progress</i> a	against effectiveness targets?	YES: □ NO: □
If yes, please specify which targets are tracked: _		
e. Does the system also track government progre	ess against effectiveness targets?	YES: □ NO: □
If yes, please specify which targets are tracked: _		
f. To what extent is the system fully accessible ar	d easy to use for the following stak	eholders?
	Accessible	Easy to Use
providers	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
executive government agencies	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🔲	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
local governments	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
parliamentarians	1: 🔲 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🔲	1: 🔲 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
civil society organizations	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🗎 5: 🗍	1: 🗆 2: 🗀 3: 🗀 4: 🗀 5: 🗀
the general public	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🗎 5: 🗍
g. To what extent is it tracking comprehensive in		
current disbursements by sectors and thema		1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
projected disbursements based on firm comr	nitments	1: 🔲 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
indications or pledges of future flows		1: 🔲 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍
delivery modalities used		1:
Progress on untying development cooperatio	n	1:
funding gaps for projects or programmes		1:
off-budget flows		1:
on-budget flows		1:
all providers (please specify any major providers omittee	4	1:
progress/implementation of projects and pro		1:
results of projects and programmes for the IA		1: 2: 3: 4: 5: 4
gender-disaggregated expenditures and result		1:
project and/or programme conditionalities		1:
Other (please specify):		1: 🗆 2: 🗆 3: 🗆 4: 🗆 5: 🗆
h. How frequent and <i>timely</i> do providers update	information on development coope	
Frequency: Annual Semi-annual	Quarterly Month	
Other (please specify)		, ш
Timeliness: Within months of	the reference date	
i. To what extent is the <i>system used for</i>		

monitoring and evaluation of development cooperation flows in specific sectors	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
monitoring and evaluation of individual programmes / projects	1: 🗆 2: 🗀 3: 🗀 4: 🗀 5: 🗀		
budget preparations	1:		
macro-economic planning?	1: 2: 3: 4: 5:		
assessments of mutual progress towards aid effectiveness commitments	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
j. To what extent is the system aligned with coding used for the recipient			
country's budget	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
, -			
k. To what extent is information from the system <i>proactively disseminated</i> by the re	cipient government		
in the budget	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
in the national development plan progress reports	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
in other documents (please specify)	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🔲		
I. To what extent is information on development cooperation disseminated by:			
the media	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
non-governmental organizations	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
m. To what extent is the information system regularly used by:			
	1.		
providers	1:		
executive government agencies	1:		
local governments	1: 🔲 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
parliamentarians and/or relevant parliamentary committees	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
civil society organizations	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
the general public	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
. To what autout doos a mational mantual accountability as all an issue triange			
n. To what extent does a national mutual accountability mechanism trigger			
greater demand for information related to development cooperation?	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
o. To what degree are documents relating to development cooperation freely availal	ple to stakeholders and the public?		
loan and grant agreements	1: 🗆 2: 🗆 3: 🗆 4: 🗆 5: 🗀		
conditionalities (policy or procedural)	1:		
procurement contract bidding and award documents	1:		
·			
monitoring and evaluation reports	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
Comments:			
4. SUPPORT FOR CAPACITY-DEVELOPMENT AT COUNTRY LEVEL:			
a. To what extent are programs of support in place for building capacity to enhance	e mutual accountability and facilitate		
networking within and across stakeholder groups, for:			
National executive government agencies	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
Local government agencies	1:		
Parliament:	1: 2: 3: 4: 5:		
Civil society organizations:	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
b. To what extent are programs of support in place for building capacity to enhance	transparency, for:		
National executive government agencies	1: \(\) 2: \(\) 3: \(\) 4: \(\) 5: \(\)		
Local government agencies			
	1:		
Parliament:	1:		
Civil society organizations:	1: 🗌 2: 🔲 3: 🔲 4: 🔲 5: 🗍		
Comments:			
5. IMPACT OF NATIONAL MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESSES:			
	es in terms of meeting the terms for		
a. To what degree have national MA processes produced <i>major behavioural changes</i> in terms of meeting the targets for			
effective development cooperation (see footnote 1):			
- by the government:	1: □ 2: □ 3: □ 4: □ 5: □		

If appropriate, please specify the two major behavioural changes by government:	
1)	
2)	
- by providers: 1: ☐ 2: ☐ 3: ☐ 4: ☐ 5: ☐	
If appropriate, please specify the two major behavioural changes by providers:	
1)	
2)	
b. In what way has each of these behavioural changes contributed to better development results?	
Government change 1)	-
Government change 2)	_
Provider change 1)Provider change 2)	-
	-
c. What are good practical steps, tools or processes which best promote mutual accountability ("enablers for n accountability") you would like to share with stakeholders in other countries? (If relevant, please attach the supporting documents or provide a web reference where they can be accessed).	
	<u> </u>
d. What were the three main explanatory factors for behavioural change	
within the government? among providers in your country	
1	
2.	
3.	
f. If no behavioural change has occurred, what are the major barriers to change?	
for the government: for providers:	
1.	
2	
3	
Comments:	
6. OVERALL EVALUATION:	
a. How strong is <u>mutual</u> accountability in your country between providers and government?	
1: 🗆 2: 🗀 3: 🗀 4: 🗀 5: 🗀	
b. How much <i>improvement</i> have you seen in mutual accountability since the Paris Declaration in 2005?	
1: 🗆 2: 🗀 3: 🗀 4: 🗀 5: 🗀	
Please describe briefly the key areas of improvement	
c. Please describe briefly the <i>most important practice in your country that is producing major behavioural char</i> make development cooperation more effective in producing development results:	ige to
d. Please share any other issues you consider relevant in moving forward the mutual accountability agenda at collevel?	ountry
e. Please share any other issues raised in your discussions that you deem relevant for a better understanding of sprogress and obstacles in making development cooperation more accountable and transparent	

f. To what extent has this global survey been influential in your country in promoting dialogue on mutual accountability 1: ☐ 2: ☐ 3: ☐ 4: ☐ 5: ☐	,
g. To what extent has this global survey been influential in your country in facilitating action to promote or enhanmutual accountability? 1: \square 2: \square 3: \square 4: \square 5:	
Comments:	_

ANNEX LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE SURVEY PROCESS

Name	Organisation	Job Title	Email Address	
Recipient Government Coordinator				
UNDP Support Person				
Other Participants				