

The European Union's ENPI Programme for Belarus

Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation



**Support to the Coordination of Technical Assistance
of the European Union in Belarus**



Minsk 2012

Project is financed by the
European Union

Project is implemented by the European
Expert Organization (Belgium)

The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the EU FWC project 'Interim Technical Assistance to the National Coordinating Unit in Belarus' implemented by the European Consultants Organisation and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

Contents

1 Millennium Development Goals

2 Forming the Global Partnership for Development

2.1 International initiatives and documents

3 Results achieved and recommendations

3.1 Official Development Assistance

4 Post- Busan Period

4.1 Concept of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation for 2012-2015

4.2 Mechanisms of forming and management of the Global Partnership

4.3 Support to the implementation of the Global Partnership

4.4 Monitoring of the Global Partnership

4.4.1 Tasks and structure of the global monitoring

4.4.2 Indicators of the Global Partnership and their tasks

5 Position of Belarus on financing the development cooperation

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

WB	World Bank
TPBG	Temporary Pos-Busan Group
EU	European Union
DAC OECD	Development Assistance Committee
ITA	International Technical Assistance
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
UN	United Nations Organization
ODA	Official Development Aid
PIB	Project Implementation Body
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
WG IEAE	Working Group on Increase of External Aid Effectiveness
MDG	Millennium Development Goals

The issue of the Global Partnership for Effective Development was formulated in the *Millennium Declaration* by the United Nations Organization and currently is one of the eight Millennium goals. Lets us analyze approaches and state of its implementation.

1. Millennium Development Goals

During the 90-es of the XX century during a set of international conferences held by the UN a set of goals and tasks for global development were set. In September 2000 at the meeting of the UN General Assembly (the Millennium Summit) the *Millennium Declaration* was adopted [1] which was signed by representatives of 189 countries including 147 Heads of State. From the Republic of Belarus the *Millennium Declaration* was signed by the President of the Republic of Belarus Alexander Lukashenko. This declaration states concern about the threats for the future world development and states that further progress may be achieved only based on the sustainable development principles with economic growth concentrated at solving the problem of poverty and with observation of basic human rights. Several interrelated development goals have been selected to be included into the world development agenda. They were later called the *Millennium Development Goals*. The Heads of State agreed to set measurable and scheduled tasks focused to combat poverty, hunger, sicknesses, illiteracy, environment problems and gender discrimination. All the UN Member-States (191 countries) undertook obligations to achieve these goals by 2015.

The list of the Millennium Development Goals is provided in the Table 1 [1].

Table 1 - The List of the Millennium Development Goals

Number	Name
Goal 1	Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger
Goal 2	Achieving universal primary education
Goal 3	Promoting gender equality and empowering women
Goal 4:	Reducing child mortality rates
Goal 5:	Improving maternal health
Goal 6:	Combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
Goal 7:	Ensuring environmental sustainability
Goal 8	Developing a global partnership for development

The development goals set by the *Millennium Declaration* define the framework for all the UN divisions to steadily and jointly achieve the common goals. The UN bears unique opportunity to act locally in practically each developing country to promote the changes and provide access to the knowledge and resource for each country as well as to assist the more coordinated wider work on country level. The progress achieved in the area of the *Millennium Declaration* goals all over the world seems to be evident but the process goes uneven and quite slowly. Many countries succeed to solve those tasks only in case they receive substantial external assistance, be it in the form of promotion, knowledge or resources. The main task for the World community, including both developed and developing countries is to mobilize financial support and political will, strengthen the work of the Governments, changing the development priorities and policies, creation of potential and attracting partners from civil society and private sector.

To monitor the progress in achievement of the main goals on global, national and local levels specific tasks have been appointed and indicators set for measuring their solving. The Table 2 contains the tasks to be solved to reach the first seven Millennium Goals and the Table 3 those for the goal No. 8, Developing a global partnership for development.

Table 2 – Tasks appointed for the first seven Millennium Goals

The first Millennium Goals	Tasks to be solve to achieve the first Millennium Goals
1. Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger	1. Halve the proportion of people living on less than \$1 a day
2. Achieving universal primary education	2. By 2015, all children can complete a full course of primary schooling, girls and boys
3. Promoting gender equality and empowering women	3. Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015
4. Reducing child mortality rates	4. Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate
5. Improving maternal health	5. Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio
6. Combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases	6. Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS
7. Ensuring environmental sustainability	7. Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs; reverse loss of environmental resources

2 Forming the Global Partnership for Development

The main responsibility to achieve the MDG lies on the developing countries as the UN Millennium Declaration foresees the common responsibility principle for implementing the principles of human dignity, fairness and equality on international level (Art. 2) and this is why international support and aid from the developed countries is of high importance especially for the poorest countries. The goal N. 6 includes six tasks (see Table 3). Achieving those tasks must in some way promote implementation of other goals of the MDG.

2.1 International initiatives and documents

Importance of the Global partnership for the MDG is described in details in the speech of the UN Secretary General at the 63rd meeting of the UN General Assembly, *The Role of Globalization in Achievement of Internationally Agreed Development Goals Including those formulated in the Millennium Declaration*. The global tasks have also been confirmed by the Governments at various international conferences and other events held after the Millennium Summit, including such as the opening of the Doha trade negotiations (2001), the World Summit on HIV/AIDS (2001), Brussels Action Plan for ther least developed states (2001), International Conference on Development Financing (2002), World Summits on Information Society (2003 and 2005), World Summit in 2005, Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) [2], Group of Eight Gleneagles Summit (2005) and the WTO Minister Conference in Hong Kong (2005). To attract the private businesses to the global initiative the Global Treaty was adopted in 200o, with the goal of joining efforts of companies, the UN Agencies, citizens and civil society to the implementation of the ten universal social and ecologic principles.

Accra Agenda for Action (2008) [3] widened the partnership tasks having included the provision for *creation of stronger and more effective partnerships* (Art 16 of the Accra Agenda for Action [3]). Creation of stronger and more effective partnerships foresees interaction of a partner-state with civil society organizations and development of state-private partnership. By this in Accra the donors and Governments recognized that solving the first partnership task of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, i.e. Country Ownership, demands wider dialogue which must include Parliaments, local authorities and civil society, as well as cooperation South-South and assistance provided by the states with average income levels. The final document on Busan Partnership for effective development [4] has confirmed the principles stated in Paris and Accra and proposed to “Create *new Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation to support implementation on political level*. This Partnership will offer an open platform that embraces diversity, providing a forum for the exchange of knowledge and the regular review of progress”.

Annex 1 joins as a single document all the three above-mentioned declarations to raise the effectiveness of external assistance: the Paris Declaration, Accra Agenda for Action and the Final Document on Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. The Annex 2 contains schematic diagram of this joint document.

3 Results achieved and recommendations

In 2007 by the proposal of the Secretary General of the United Nations Organization the Target Group was formed to improve the systematic control over implementation of the commitments set as the eight MDG. Since its forming the Target Group held the evaluation of the progress of the implementation of the commitments to increase the official development assistance, to increase access to the international markets for export from developing countries, strengthening cooperation to achieve and preserve sustainable situation with external indebtedness of developing countries and as well as provision of access of the developing countries to basic cheap medicines and new technologies. Besides reporting on achievements in these areas starting from the first report in 2008 the Target Group uncovered gaps in the implementation of the commitments and appealed the world community to remove those.

Each of the annual reports evidenced moving forward and necessity to put more efforts to achieve the MDG in set time terms. Even during the world financial crisis the Target Group stated in its reports further progress and concluded that the international community moved towards achievements of the goals. But the 2012 Report [5] seems to be not so optimistic. The Target Group had difficulties to select the areas where sufficient further progress had been achieved and for the first time the signs of loss of some achievements were stated. When till 2015 there is less than three years the Governments do not demonstrate evident resolution to return to the necessary movement direction in time. As result less MDG would be achieved in lesser states.

Weaker support to global partnership may be explained by the conditions of lasting world financial and economic crisis. But the global development partnership should be seen as mutually beneficial play. Stable economic growth in the partner countries and setting dynamically developing markets there would lead to positive effect for world trade and investments. The heavy burden on natural resources of the planet is also one of the reasons to see the global partnership as the opportunity to achieve positive results. Wide-scale investments are necessary to overcome climate change and adaptation to it, as well as to solve other environmental problems of global importance. Such investments are possible only in case of collective actions on naturally national and, even more important, international levels. The UN Sustainable Development Conference (Rio+20) in this connection has adopted commitments to strengthen the international cooperation to solve the tasks in the area of sustainable development for all. The international community may not afford to fail implementation of these commitments. But is this plan worth trusting if we fail to implement the previous obligations in the area of the MDG? It will be trusted only in case the commitments are implemented and realized in real actions.

3.1 Official Development Assistance

Having reached its peak in 2010, the volume of the ODA decreased almost 3% in 2011 first of all because of limited budgets of donor states. The countries-members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC OECD) have provided within the ODA in 2011 133.5 bln USD which makes 0.31% of their joint GNI. As result of this decrease the gap between the real payments and the sums foresaw by the target level set by the UN as 0.7% of

the GNI of a donor state, increased to approximately 167 bln USD. Besides that, in the period of 2013-2015 one expects cease of growth of basic ODA as the result of delayed global crisis effect on the budgets of donor states.

The inflows of the ODA to the least developed states (LDS) from the DAC states in 2010 increased to the sum of 44 bln USD and made 0.11% of their joint GNI. Non-implementation of the level set by the UN in the scope of 0.15-0.2 GNI, reached 17-38 bln USD. According to preliminary calculations, the DAC donors have cut volumes of bilateral ODA some 2% in 2011. The volume of bilateral assistance to Sub-Saharan States in 2011 decreased some 1% while assistance to the Northern Africa states increased because of political changes caused by the Arabic Spring. Assistance to land-locked states in 2010 decreased for the first time during a decade while assistance to small island states increased significantly.

Notwithstanding the progress in achieving the 13 targets set by the Paris Declaration only one target has been implemented globally, the one on coordinating technical cooperation. Some progress has been achieved on some other targets, especially by the recipient states. From the other side the volumes of the assistance remain quite unstable and the success of the donors to increase agreed targets to increase predictability and transparency as well as increasing mutual responsibility are not sufficient or absent. The High-Level Busan Forum to increase aid effectiveness has shifted the accent from evaluating only effectiveness of aid to more complex approach having reviewed the issue of the input which the real aid cooperation might make to the overall effectiveness of such aid. The agreed framework of development aid cooperation was set. This framework for the first time embraces traditional donors, donors in the area South-South, developing states as well as civil society and private sponsors. The UN Forum for Development Cooperation (FDC) could play key role in providing opportunities for wider dialogue within the ongoing official forum to implement the agreements achieved in Busan and the ways to assist the development financing through cooperation.

Although the ODA remains the main source of financing development cooperation, the volume of other sources grows. This includes ODA provided outside of the DAC, as well as private charity. Although the innovative sources of international financing collected and distributed the greatest volumes, there are proposals able to mobilize even greater sums for development cooperation. Each of these additional sources is able to make additional investment into development financing but there is a problem of their real targeting for the national development priorities [5].

Recommendations on strategy

The Governments of the donor-states are to implement their commitments to increase the ODA they provide notwithstanding the short resources they have.

All the bilateral and multilateral donors are strongly recommended to draft multiannual plans for allocation of resources for country assistance programs and provide for open access to those drafts so that to increase transparency and avoid instability in aid provision.

The partner states are advised to use UN FDC for discussion of measures to increase the development aid effectiveness, for increasing joint ownership of the development results based on existing commitments as well as to widen dialogue in the area of development financing.

Countries and organizations providing ODA outside of the DAC framework as well as financing charity actions and innovative development financing are offered to increase mobilization of development resources and also provide for stability of their provision in accordance with the priorities and strategies of a recipient country [5].

4 Post-Busan period

The final document of Busan forum states: "...We will, in 2012, review our plans to achieve this. In addition to increasing value for money, untying can present opportunities for local procurement, business development, employment and income generation in developing countries. We will improve the quality, consistency and transparency of reporting on the tying status of aid. [4, Art 18 e]". For these purposes a Temporary Post-Busan Group (TPBG) was set up. This group was created with agreement of the Working Group on Increase of External Aid Effectiveness (WG IEAE) of the OECD [6]. The TPBG worked under chairmanship of the WG IEAE and with support of the Aid Effectiveness Bureau. Its tasks were:

- draft Global Partnership Concept;

- set up managing structures for the Global Partnership;
- define control indicators for the Global Partnership.

The last meeting of the Post-Busan Group took place on 28-29 June 2012. After this it ceased to exist. Let us briefly review results of its activity.

4.1 Concept of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation for 2012-2015

The period of 2012-2015 is limited with the deadlines for Millennium Goals [1]. After 2015 the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation will be reviewed and this concept will be modernized in accordance with the analysis of the results of the achievements of these Goals

Goals and main tasks of the Global Partnership

According to the Final Document of the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, “Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation *sets shared principles and various agreements on raising development cooperation effectiveness*”, and also “Establish a new, inclusive and representative Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation to support and ensure accountability for the implementation of commitments at the political level” (§36 [4]) TPBG formulated the overall goal of the Global Partnership as ***concentration on implementation of agreements and actions consolidated in the Busan Partnership Agreement.***

To achieve this goal the following tasks should be solved:

- form and strengthen political motivation for more effective development cooperation;
- form responsibility for implementation of the Busan agreements;
- promote exchange of know-how and experience on the lessons learned;
- promote implementation of Busan agreements on country level;
- promote opening of the Global Partnership for all the recipients of Development Aid, supporters of effective development cooperation (both bilateral and multilateral), civil society organizations, MPs and representatives of private sector having signed the Busan Partnership Agreement;
- countries and organizations willing to participate in the Global Partnership may be represented directly or through regional organizations and/or other country/organization.

As long as the Global Partnership gathers a wide circle of stakeholders with shared responsibility for common principles and agreements,, it is expected that various participants would play active role in defining and drafting their respective agreements and actions within the Busan Partnership Agreement. Defining the efforts to make the cooperation more effective and diverse, the Global Partnership will promote the dialogue to exchange knowledge.

The role of the regional organizations in promotion of implementation of the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, including promotion of exchange of know-how is widely recognized by the Global Partnership. Moreover the potentially important role of the thematic structure entities and other groups which have been formed as result of the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in the implementation of the Busan Agreements is widely recognized. It is expected that in the implementation of the agreements of the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness the regional organizations as well as other stakeholders would coordinate their efforts within each region to avoid duplications.

The Global Partnership is a key international forum for political dialogue on the issues of effective development cooperation. It will interact with other forums such as the UN Development Cooperation Forum. It will also ensure cooperation with other groups supporting such cooperation, for example, the G20. These efforts are directed at promoting constructive dialogue on effective development cooperation and forming corresponding complementarity.

Thus the Global Partnership should be seen as the strategy to implement the Busan Agreements.

4.2 Mechanisms of forming and management of the Global Partnership

Forming and management of the Global Partnership is done on two levels: interministerial and country [7].

Meetings on ministerial level must be held every 18-24 months with high-level representatives from NGOs to promote political dialogue and making decisions within the Global Partnership.

The main tasks of the meetings on the ministerial level are as following:

- overview of the results of implementation of the Busan Agreements, providing for political responsibility;
- reviewing the key issues arising on country level;
- exchange of experience on various types of development cooperation;
- use of arising opportunities in the area of development cooperation;
- approval of membership in the Executive Committee.

Management on country level will be done through the Executive Committee which is created on ministerial level and is to provide for strategic management, coordination and control necessary to organize the ongoing work of the Global Partnership.

The Executive Committee has been created by now and consists of three Global Partnership Co-Chairmen and Members of the Committee (see Table 3). The Global Partnership Executive Committee will take decisions based on the results of the ministerial level meetings and will perform the following functions:

- organization of the ministerial level meetings, including defining the agenda and the strategic priorities;
- acting as the Global Partnership Ambassadors during other international and regional events with the aim to ensure that the priorities and main ideas of the Global Partnership would be present in discussions on these forums;
- organization of the work of the Secretariat, including support to reporting on ministerial level;
- solving other issues which may be defined during ministerial level meetings.

Table 3 - Structure and members of the Executive Committee

Position	Representatives	No of positions	Name	Position on country level
Co-Chairmen				
	Recipient	1	Ms. Armida Alisjahbana,	Minister of State for National Development Planning, Indonesia
	Recipient and donor	1	Ms. Justine Greening	Secretary of State for International Development, United Kingdom
	донора ОПР	1	Ms. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala	Minister of Finance, Nigeria
Members				
	Recipients	5	Mr. Brahim Adoum Bachar, Mr. Luis Fernando Carrera Castro. Mr. Iqbal Mahmood, Ms. Noumea Simi,	Secretary General, Ministry of Economy and Planning, Chad. Secretary for Planning and Programming, Presidency, Guatemala Senior Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Bangladesh. Ministry of Finance, Samoa.

	representing the g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected states		Mr. Helder da Costa,	Director of the International Secretariat of the g7+, Ministry of Finance, Timor-Leste
	Recipients and donors	1	Mr. Luis Olivera,	Peruvian Agency for International Cooperation (APCI), Peru.
	Donors	3	Mr. Gustavo Martin Prada, Ms. Enna Park Mr. Donald Steinberg,	Director, European Commission. Director General for Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Korea. Представитель администрации Американское агентство международного развития (США)
	Private sector	1	Mr. John Sullivan	Center for International Private Enterprise
	MPs	1	Mr. Martin Chungong	Director, Division of Programmes, Inter-Parliamentary Union.
	Civil Society	1	Ms. Mayra Moro-Coco	BetterAid
	Multilateral development banks	1	Ms. Sophie Sirtaine,	Director, Corporate Reform and Strategy, Operations Policy and Country Services, World Bank
	UNDP	1	Ms. Sigrid Kaag,.	Assistant Secretary General and Assistant Administrator, Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy, UNDP
	OECD/DAC	1	Mr. Brian Atwood,	Chair, Development Assistance Committee, OECD

Co-Chairs of the Global Partnership will represent its ideas on external level, organize its implementation and share responsibility for achievement of its goals. They will chair the ministerial level meetings and manage the work of the Executive Committee by taking organizational decisions.

Members of the Executive Committee implement the task of expressing the views of corresponding members of the Global Partnership as well as to help find compromise between efficiency and representativeness. This Executive Committee is elected till 2015. It is supposed that the composition of the Executive Committee may be reviewed in accordance with the review of the Global Partnership after 2015.

The members of the Executive Committee will be playing key role in:

- promoting political dialogue;
- transfer of their know-how and experience during drafting the Global Partnership Agenda;
- communicating the ideas of the Global Partnership to other international and regional organizations acting as the Global Partnership Ambassadors.

Simultaneously promotion of the ideas of the Global Partnership to provide effective development aid remains the key idea to implement on international level.

The Co-Chairs of the Executive Committee are elected and approved at the inter-ministerial level. The present composition of the Executive Committee is approved by the OECD Working Group on External Aid Effectiveness in June 2012.

Rotation of the members of the Executive Committee and its Co-Chairs is expected.

Meetings of the Executive Committee members will be held once or twice a year or more often if necessary. The work of the Executive Committee must be based on the consultations and transparent decision making process and accountability to all the participants of the Global Partnership.

4.3 Support to the implementation of the Global Partnership

The Agreement on the Busan Partnership calls the OECD and the UNDP “to support the effective functioning of the Global Partnership, building on their collaboration to date and their respective mandates and areas of comparative advantage” ([4] §36d). As long as both OECD and the UNDP are supposed the Global Partnership as a part of their main functions, both the organizations will promote joint actions of their respective structures to implement these functions efficiently.

It is supposed that the participants of the Global Partnership and the Executive Committee will play leading role in implementation of agreements and promoting the tasks solving within the Global Partnership. At the same time there is a set of spheres where both OECD and UNDP will have to implement global functions and these in particular are:

- drafting, detalization and use of the global methodology to monitor implementation of agreements set in the document on Busan Partnership;
- analytical work including providing periodical global reports based on monitoring the Busan Partnership document, to distribute information on political dialogue and promoting knowledge exchange;
- providing consultation support on requests to implement *предоставление консультационной поддержку согласно имеющимся запросам, по реализации партнерства и структуре отчетности в развивающихся странах;*
- organizing ministerial level meetings of the Global Partnership;
- consulting the Executive Committee and its Co-Chairs to support their work.

The OECD and the UNDP are to organize a joint programming framework for the Global Partnership, thus providing for rational approach to planning, financing and implementation of its activity. The OECD and the UNDP will jointly report to the Executive Committee of the Global Partnership about the implementation of corresponding components of the joint programme and the Executive Committee in its turn will manage the work of these two organizations in their support to the Global Partnership.

The OECD and the UNDP will also coordinate their efforts in the area of mobilization of a joint support programme, taking into account that their ability to correspond to the requirements of the Global Partnership depends on corresponding financing of these two organizations. The resources for executive actions of the OECD will be allocated through Work and Budget Programme of the OECD Committee while the executive activity of the UNPD will be financed based on Financing agreements signed with interested parties.

4.4 Monitoring of the Global Partnership

4.4.1 Tasks and structure of the global monitoring

The global monitoring process will deliver information on the dialogue on the ministerial level within the Global Partnership. Basing on the previous experience of monitoring the Paris Declaration and Accra Action Plan it is expected that this global structure tied with the Busan partnership will:

- promote ownership of implementation of Busan agreements and actions through delivering brief overview of results achieved on international level;
- stimulate wider dialogue both on country and international levels on the issues of efficiency of cooperation including obstacles and opportunities for further progress.

These international efforts will be directed at forming potential in progress of monitoring on country level and increase of mutual responsibility. Informing from the side of partners presupposes that the developed countries have created a global structure and the tasks which are the necessary to achieve more detailed and actual in-country structure which promotes country ownership.

As long as the indicators provide information about achievements of individual states and organizations during the implementations of their agreements it should be stressed that they are directed at acting as an input into a wider political dialogue on development cooperation and its efficiency rather than act as a narrow evaluation system for countries and organizations. This is the primary task of the indicators with which the results may be clearly tied to a partner. Various institutional mandates of the supporters of the development cooperation must be recognized. This also may explain differences on the way of implementation.

As long as the Busan Partnership calls to stress more attention at the development results, the task of the global structure is promotion of an international level of ownership through “achieving results on the agreements done in Busan” (Busan Partnership §35 [4]). Thus this stresses changes in the development cooperation which is also expected to be oriented at results.

4.4.2 Indicators of the Global Partnership and their tasks

Agreement on Busan Partnership obliges the WG IEAE OECD to draft by June 2012 indicators and other instruments which are to be used to monitor the Global Partnership. And in particular corresponding set of indicators to measure the progress of implementation of the commitments. This job was done by the WG IEAE OECD by request of the TPBG. A set of ten indicators was proposed (see Table 4). The results of this work were approved at plenary meeting of the WG IEAE OECD on 28-29 June 2012.

The proposed ten indicators are elements for global monitoring of achievements of the goals of the Global Partnership. The experience of drafting monitoring reports on the Paris Declaration and recommendations of experts of various international organizations including the UNDP and the World Bank were used in drafting this set of indicators (see Table 4).

The Table 4 provides overview of the indicators to be used to monitor the implementation of the Busan agreements. It should be stressed that participation in monitoring is on voluntary basis both on country and international levels. The number of countries and organizations embraced by the global monitoring system is defined on ad hoc basis and the number of participants may grow in the future.

The list of the global indicators is limited per se. the indicators first of all play the role of the base for a wider political dialogue and they are not targeted at overall embracement of all the principles and agreements in the area of development cooperation. Efforts have been done to preserve those indicators from the Paris Declaration monitoring system which the developing states defined as the most important for them. The Paris indicators have been accompanied by a limited number of new indicators which embrace some wider areas covered by the Busan Partnership agreement (inter alia, transparency, gender equality, involvement of private sector and other).

The global system consists from both indicators evaluated locally in some developing countries and used for over viewing the global progress and those evaluated only on global level (i.e. used in another global process). Use of the existing data and indicators will allow to lower the entry level for the developing countries participating in the Global Partnership. At the same time some of the data are on free access on country level and expenses to obtain and systematize them may be lowered. For each of the indicators there is a Global Task. This does not hinder agreeing various tasks on country level. The offered tasks are based whether on the texts of the Busan agreements (for example, indicators 2, 3 and 4) or on the statements done as the result of the Paris Declaration (for example, indicators 5-7 and 9-10).

Table 4 – Global Partnership progress indicators

<i>No</i>	<i>NAME OF INDICATOR/ DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>TASK FOR 2015</i>	<i>Source</i>	
			<i>Country</i>	<i>International</i>

No	NAME OF INDICATOR/ DESCRIPTION	TASK FOR 2015	Source	
			Country	International
1	Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities/ % of providers of development co-operation using country results frameworks	All providers of development co-operation use country results frameworks.	•	
2	Civil society operates within an environment that maximises its engagement in and contribution to development/CIVICUS Enabling Environment Index (or selected components of the Index)..	Continued progress over time		•
3	Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development / (measure to be defined based on actual sources. See Annex A)	Continued progress over time		To be defined
4	Transparency: information on development co-operation is publicly available / Quantitative measure of state of implementation of the common standard by each provider of development co-operation (exact measure to be determined)	<i>Implement the common standard – All providers of development co-operation are on track to implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation.</i>		•
5a	Development co-operation is more predictable (annual predictability) / Percentage of aid for the government sector disbursed in the year for which it was scheduled by providers of development co-operation	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled. (Based on 2010 baseline).	•	
5b	Development co-operation is more predictable (medium-term predictability) / Estimated proportion of development co-operation covered by indicative forward expenditure and/or	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of aid not covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level. (Baseline year: 2011).	•	

No	NAME OF INDICATOR/ DESCRIPTION	TASK FOR 2015	Source	
			Country	International
	implementation plans covering at least three years ahead			
6	Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny / % of aid scheduled for disbursement that is recorded in the annual budgets approved by the legislatures of developing countries.	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of aid flows to the government sector not reported on government’s budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget). (Baseline year 2010).	•	
7	Mutual accountability among co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews / % of countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments.	All developing countries have inclusive mutual assessment reviews in place.	•	
8	Gender equality and women’s empowerment / Proportion of developing countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment.	All developing countries have systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment.	•	
9a	Quality of developing country PFM systems / Quality of developing country PFM Index	Half of developing countries move up at least one measure (i.e. 0.5 points) on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance. (Baseline year: 2010).		•
9b	Use of country PFM and procurement systems / % of aid disbursements for the government sector using the developing country’s PFM and procurement system	Country target depends on score for indicator 9a above (quality of PFM systems): - Reduce the gap by two thirds – a two-thirds reduction in % of aid not using country PFM and procurement systems for countries with a score of >=5 on indicator 9a; - Reduce the gap by one third – a one-third reduction in % of aid not using country PFM and procurement systems for countries with a score between	•	

No	NAME OF INDICATOR/ DESCRIPTION	TASK FOR 2015	Source	
			Country	International
		3.5 and 4.5 on indicator 9a.		
10	Aid is untied / % of aid that is fully untied	Continued progress over time. Rationale: Paris target.		•

The proposed figures on the initial period are provided for the indicators where they are available. For the majority of indicators the year of 2010 may be used as the initial period. For those indicators which are based on Paris Declaration the initial period is the one with the progress achieved since signing of this Declaration and taking into account wider number of countries. In the questionnaire on the monitoring of Paris Declaration in 2011 number of countries participants made 78.

The Table 5 provide for comparison of indicators of the Paris Declaration with the indicators of the Global Partnership. As it is seen from this table, indicators 2, 3, 4 and 8 are introduced for the first time. Indicator 1 is also considered to be relatively new but it seems to us it has been created based on indicators 3 and 4 of the Paris Declaration. This is why the authors think that indicators 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8 must be improved. And after their trial use in 2012 the Executive Committee will draft a corresponding manual. As it is seen in the Table 5, during drafting of the Global indicators the main principles of the Paris Declaration were observed. At the same time the principle of Country Ownership remains unclear, as long as the Global monitoring system does not take into account *Ownership*, though reflecting it in indicator 1.

Comparison of Paris indicators with the Global ones lets conclude that the principles of Paris Declaration have been increased from 5 (1. Ownership; 2. Alignment; 3. Harmonization; 4. Managing for Results; 5. Mutual Accountability) to 7 after Busan having added two more (6. More Effective Partnerships and 7. Transparency and Mutual Accountability) (See annexes and Table 5)

Table 5 – Comparison of the Paris Declaration indicators with the Global Partnership indicators

<i>PARIS DECLARATION PRINCIPLES</i>				<i>ACCRA AND BUSAN BASED PRINCIPLES</i>			
Paris indicators				Global Partnership indicators			Note
No.	Name	2010 target	Target reached by 2010 (% of planned)	No.	Name	2015 target	
I. OWNERSHIP							
1	Ownership	At least 75% of partner countries have operational development strategies	62 – not implemented			Not included	
II. ALIGNMENT							
2	Reliable country systems	(a) Public financial management - Half-*£ partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., 0.5 points) on the PFM/ CPIA ¹		9a	Quality of developing country PFM systems; and Use of country PFM and procurement systems (a) Quality of PFM in developing countries	Half of developing countries move up at least one measure (i.e. 0.5 points) on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance. (Baseline year 2010).	

¹ PFM - Public Finance Management; CPIA - Country Policy and Institutional Assessment

		(b) Procurement - One-third of partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., from D to C, C to B or B to A) <w the four-point scale used to assess performance for this indicator.			Not included		
3	Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	Halve the gap — halve the proportion of aid flows to government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget).	56 – not implemented	6	Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny	(% of aid scheduled for disbursement that is recorded in the annual budgets approved by the legislatures of developing countries.) Halve the gap – halve the proportion of aid flows to the government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget). (Baseline year 2010).	
				1	Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities	Extent of use of country results frameworks by co-operation providers (specific criteria to be finalised) All providers of development co-operation use country results	New (based on 3 and 4 indicators of the GP) To be improved

						frameworks.	
4	Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	50% of technical co-operation flows are implemented through co-ordinated programmes consistent with national development strategies.	107% - implemented		Not included		
5a	Use of country public financial management systems	All the donor use PFM of partner states A two-thirds reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems.		96	Effective institutions: developing countries' systems are strengthened and used (6) Use of country PFM and procurement systems	Reduce the gap [use the same logic as in Paris – close the gap by two-thirds where CPIA score is >=5; or by one-third where between 3.5 and 4.5] (Baseline year 2010).	
5b	Use of country procurement systems	All donors use partner countries' procurement systems. 90% of donors use partner countries' procurement systems. A two-thirds reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems.			Not included		
6	Strengthen capacity by avoiding parallel implementation structures	Reduce by two-thirds the stock of parallel project implementation units (PIUs).	547* - not implemented		Not included		

7	Aid is more predictable	Halve the gap — halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	72 – not implemented	5	Development co-operation is more predictable: (a) annual: proportion of aid disbursed within the fiscal year within which it was scheduled by co-operation providers	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled (baseline year 2010).	
					(b) medium-term: proportion of aid covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of aid not covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level. (Baseline to be determined).	
8	Aid is untied	Continued progress over time		10	Aid is untied	Untied aid fully available	
III. HARMONIZATION							
9	Use of common arrangements or procedures	66% of aid flows are provided in the context of programme-based approaches	79 - not implemented		Not included		
10	Encourage shared analysis	(a) 40% of donor missions to the field are joint.	79 - not implemented		Not included		
		(b) 66% of country analytic work is joint.	77 - not implemented				
IV. MANAGING FOR RESULTS							
11	Results-oriented	Reduce the gap by one-third	84 - not		Not included		

	frameworks	— Reduce the proportion of countries without transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks by one-third	implemented				
V. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY							
12	Mutual accountability	All partner countries have mutual assessment reviews in place	38 - not implemented	7	Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews	% of countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments (<i>All developing countries have inclusive mutual assessment reviews in place</i>)	
VI. SETTING MORE EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS **							
				2	Civil society operates within an environment which maximises its engagement in and contribution to development	Enabling Environment Index. Continued progress over time	Busan based. To be detailed
				3	Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development	Measure to be identified, subject to relevant existing data source.	Busan based. To be detailed
VII. TRANSPARENCY AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY **							

				4	<p>Transparency: information on development co-operation is publicly available</p>	<p>(Measure of state of implementation of the common standard by co-operation providers to be elaborated based on broad approach set out in Annex A.)</p> <p><i>Implement the common standard – All development co-operation providers are on track to implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation.</i></p>	<p>Busan based. To be detailed</p>
				8	<p>Gender equality and women’s empowerment</p>	<p>% of countries with systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment.</p> <p><i>All developing countries have systems that track and make public resource allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment.</i></p>	<p>Busan based. To be detailed</p>

* - absolute figure; ** - added by the authors of this

Indicator 8 of the Global Partnership *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment* stands a bit aside. It is hardly correlated with other seven principles but this principle is a direct logical conclusion from No. 3 Millennium Goal: *Promoting gender equality and widening rights and opportunities of women* (see Table 1) as well as from the basic principles of foundation and functioning of the EU [8].

5 Position of Belarus on financing the development cooperation

The position of Belarus on financing the development cooperation was stated on 22 October 2012 during the discussion of the issues of development aid before the Second Committee of the 67th session of the UN General Assembly. This position was stated by the Deputy Head of the Department for Global Politics and Humanitarian Cooperation of the Main Department of Multilateral Diplomacy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Mr. Vadim Pisarevich. He described the development cooperation as the key element in achieving the Millennium Development Goals formulated in the Millennium Declaration and called to provide for implementation of all corresponding international obligations in the area of provision of financial resources notwithstanding non-favorable economic conditions.

According to Mr. Pisarevich difficult conditions must not be used as excuse to ignore interests of some groups of states, for example of those with average income level. Mr Pisarevich also stressed the necessity of further implementation of global development partnership, undertaking active measures on all directions defined by the Monterrey consensus and in particular – mobilization of internal and external resources for development financing, increase of the volumes of the Official Development Aid, growth of investments, strengthening of international trade, solving the indebtedness problem.

The representative of Belarus supported the idea of integration of two processes: development financing and sustainable development financing. Importance of this task is supported by growing understanding all over the world that sustainable development must become the ground for the UN Agenda in the area of development after 2015 [9].

List of used documents

1. Millennium Declaration http://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/summitdecl.shtml
2. Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/36/63/35023545.pdf>,
3. Accra Agenda for Action
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT/Resources/47007901217425866038/AAA_Russian.pdf
4. Outcome document of the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness
http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/images/stories/hlf4/OUTCOME_DOCUMENT_-_FINAL_EN.pdf
5. Global Millenium Goal No8. Global Development Partnership: From Words to Action. UNO, NY, 2012, p. 101.
http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/mdg_gap/mdg_gap2012/mdg8report2012_ruw.pdf
6. Global Partnership web-page: Proposed mandate for the global partnership for effective development co-operation; proposed indicators, targets and process for global monitoring
<http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/en/about/global-partnership.html>
7. The Global Partnership Executive Committee
http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=748
8. Treaty of Lisbon (2009), Chapter 1 «General Provisions on European External Action Service», Art 10 A. http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/full_text/index_en.htm.
9. Belarus views financing for development as key for Millennium Development Goals. BELTA news agency http://www.belta.by/ru/all_news/politics/Belarus-schitaet-finansirovanie-razvitija-kljuhevym-elementom-v-dostizhenii-Tselej-tysjacheletija_i_612732.html

Annex 1 – Tasks of the partnership and the commitments on their solving for the partner-states and donors based on Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action (*italics*) and the Outcome document of the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (bald**)**

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
<p><u>1. Ownership.</u> Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions.</p>	<p>- Exercise leadership in developing and implementing their national development strategies through broad consultative processes.</p> <p>- Translate these national development strategies into prioritised results-oriented operational programmes as expressed in medium-term expenditure frameworks and annual budgets (Indicator 1).</p> <p>– Take the lead in co-ordinating aid at all levels in conjunction with other development resources in dialogue with donors and encouraging the participation of civil society and the private sector.</p> <p>– <i>Developing country governments will work more closely with parliaments and local authorities in preparing, implementing and monitoring national development policies and plans. They will also engage with civil society organisations (CSOs);</i></p> <p>– <i>Developing countries and donors will ensure that their respective development policies and programmes are designed and implemented in ways consistent with their agreed international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability.</i></p>	<p>– Respect partner country leadership and help strengthen their capacity to exercise it.</p> <p>– <i>Donors will support efforts to increase the capacity of all development actors— parliaments, central and local governments, CSOs, research institutes, media and the private sector—to take an active role in dialogue on development policy and on the role of aid in contributing to countries’ development objectives;</i></p> <p>– <i>Donors’ support for capacity development will be demand-driven and designed to support country ownership. To this end, developing countries and donors will i) jointly select and manage technical co-operation, and ii) promote the provision of technical co-operation by local and regional resources, including through South-South co-operation</i></p>	<p>– <i>Developing countries and donors will ensure that their respective development policies and programmes are designed and implemented in ways consistent with their agreed international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability.</i></p> <p>– <i>Developing countries and donors will work together at all levels to promote operational changes that make capacity development support more effective.</i></p> <p>– Over time, we will aim to increase independence from aid, always taking into account the consequences for the poorest people and countries. In this process, it is essential to examine the interdependence and coherence of all public policies ‘ not just development policies ‘ to enable countries to make full use of the opportunities presented by international investment and trade, and to expand their domestic capital markets;</p> <p>– We will sustain our high level political leadership to ensure that the commitments made here in Busan are implemented. Within this context, those of us that endorsed the mutually agreed actions set out in Paris and Accra will intensify our efforts to implement our respective commitments in full. A growing range</p>

			of actors ' including middle-income countries, partners of South South and triangular cooperation and civil society
Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
			organisations ' have joined others to forge a broader, more inclusive agenda since Paris and Accra, embracing their respective and different commitments alongside shared principles; – Accelerate and deepen the implementation of existing commitments to strengthen the role of parliaments in the oversight of development processes, including by supporting capacity development ' backed by adequate resources and clear action plans; – Further support local governments to enable them to assume more fully their roles above and beyond service delivery, enhancing participation and accountability at the sub-national levels.
<i>2. Alignment.</i> The aid provided by donors must be based on the national development strategies, institutes and procedures of the partner-states.		– Base their overall support — country strategies, policy dialogues and development co-operation programmes — on partners' national development strategies and periodic reviews of progress in implementing these strategies ³ (Indicator 3). - Draw conditions, whenever possible, from a partner's national development strategy or its annual review of progress in	– <i>Beginning now, donors and developing countries will regularly make public all conditions linked to disbursements;</i> – <i>Developing countries and donors will work together at the international level to review, document and disseminate good practices on conditionality with a view to reinforcing country ownership and other Paris Declaration Principles by increasing emphasis on harmonised, results-based conditionality. They will be receptive to</i>

<p>2.1. Coordinating the donor aid with the strategy of a partner state.</p>		<p>implementing this strategy. Other conditions would be included only when a sound justification exists and would be undertaken transparently and in close consultation with other donors and stakeholders;</p>	<p><i>contributions from civil society;</i> – Developing countries efforts and plans to strengthen core institutions and policies will be supported through approaches that aim to manage rather than avoid ' risk, including through the development of joint risk</p>
--	--	--	---

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
		<p>– Link funding to a single framework of conditions and/or a manageable set of indicators derived from the national development strategy. This does not mean that all donors have identical conditions, but that each donor’s conditions should be derived from a common streamlined framework aimed at achieving lasting results..</p> <p>– <i>Donors will work with developing countries to agree on a limited set of mutually agreed conditions based on national development strategies. We will jointly assess donor and developing country performance in meeting commitments.</i></p>	<p>management frameworks with providers of development co-operation;</p> <p>– Providers of development co-operation will minimise their use of additional frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that are not Consistent with countries national development strategies;</p> <p>– Use country systems as the default approach for development co-operation in support of activities managed by the public sector, working with and respecting the governance structures of both the provider of development co-operation and the developing country.</p>
2.2. Donors to use strengthened national systems.	<p>– Carry out diagnostic reviews that provide reliable assessments of country systems and procedures.</p> <p>- On the basis of such diagnostic reviews, undertake reforms that may be necessary to ensure that national systems, institutions and procedures for managing aid and other development resources are effective, accountable and transparent.</p> <p>- Undertake reforms, such as public management reform, that may be necessary to launch and fuel sustainable capacity development processes.</p>	<p>– Use country systems and procedures to the maximum extent possible. Where use of country systems is not feasible, establish additional safeguards and measures in ways that strengthen rather than undermine country systems and procedures (Indicator 5);</p> <p>– Avoid, to the maximum extent possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of aid-financed projects and programmes (Indicator 6);</p>	<p>– Work together to establish mutually agreed frameworks that provide reliable assessments of performance, transparency and accountability of country systems (Indicator 2).</p> <p>- Integrate diagnostic reviews and performance assessment frameworks within country-led strategies for capacity development.</p> <p>– <i>Developing countries and donors will jointly assess the quality of country systems in a country-led process using mutually agreed diagnostic tools. Where country systems require further strengthening, developing countries will lead in defining reform</i></p>

			<i>programmes and priorities. Donors will support these reforms and provide capacity development assistance.</i>
--	--	--	--

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Adopt harmonised performance assessment frameworks for country systems so as to avoid presenting partner countries with an excessive number of potentially conflicting targets. – <i>Donors agree to use country systems as the first option for aid programmes in support of activities managed by the public sector;</i> – <i>Should donors choose to use another option and rely on aid delivery mechanisms outside country systems (including parallel project implementation units), they will transparently state the rationale for this and will review their positions at regular intervals. Where use of country systems is not feasible, donors will establish additional safeguards and measures in ways that strengthen rather than undermine country systems and procedures;</i> – <i>Donors will immediately start working on and sharing transparent plans for undertaking their Paris commitments on using country systems in all forms of development assistance; provide staff guidance on how these systems can be used; and ensure that internal incentives</i> 	

		<p><i>encourage their use. They will finalise these plans as a matter of urgency;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>- Donors recollect and reaffirm their Paris Declaration commitment to provide 66% of aid as programme-based approaches. In addition, donors will aim to channel 50% or more of government-to-government assistance through country fiduciary systems, including by increasing the percentage of assistance provided through programme based approaches.</i>	
--	--	--	--

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
2.3. Partner countries strengthen development capacity with support from donors	– Integrate specific capacity strengthening objectives in national development strategies and pursue their implementation through country-led capacity development strategies where needed.	– Align their analytic and financial support with partners’ capacity development objectives and strategies, make effective use of existing capacities and harmonise support for capacity development accordingly (Indicator 4)	
2.4. Strengthen public financial management capacity.	– Intensify efforts to mobilise domestic resources, strengthen fiscal sustainability, and create an enabling environment for public and private investments. - Publish timely, transparent and reliable reporting on budget execution. - Take leadership of the public financial management reform process.	– Provide reliable indicative commitments of aid over a multi-year framework and disburse aid in a timely and predictable fashion according to agreed schedules (Indicator 7). - Rely to the maximum extent possible on transparent partner government budget and accounting mechanisms (Indicator 5).	– Implement harmonised diagnostic reviews and performance assessment frameworks in public financial management..
2.5. Strengthen national procurement systems.	– Take leadership and implement the procurement reform process.	– Progressively rely on partner country systems for procurement when the country has implemented mutually agreed standards and processes (Indicator 5). - Adopt harmonised approaches when national systems do not meet mutually agreed levels of performance or donors do not use them.	– Use mutually agreed standards and processes ⁴ to carry out diagnostics, develop sustainable reforms and monitor implementation. - Commit sufficient resources to support and sustain medium and long-term procurement reforms and capacity development. - Share feedback at the country level on recommended approaches so they can be improved over time.
2.6. Untie aid: getting better value for money.	– Reducing transaction costs for partner countries and improving country ownership and alignment	– Continue to make progress on untying as encouraged by the 2001 DAC Recommendation on Untying Official Development Assistance to the Least Developed Countries (Indicator 8).	

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
		<p><i>a) OECD-DAC donors will extend coverage of the 2001 DAC Recommendation on Untying Aid to non-LDC HIPC's and will improve their reporting on the 2001 DAC Recommendation.</i></p> <p><i>b) Donors will elaborate individual plans to further untie their aid to the maximum extent.</i></p> <p><i>c) Donors will promote the use of local and regional procurement by ensuring that their procurement procedures are transparent and allow local and regional firms to compete. We will build on examples of good practice to help improve local firms' capacity to compete successfully for aid-funded procurement.</i></p> <p><i>d) We will respect our international agreements on corporate social responsibility.</i></p>	
3.2.Complementarity: more effective division of labour	– Provide clear views on donors' comparative advantage and on how to achieve donor complementarity at country or sector level.	– Make full use of their respective comparative advantage at sector or country level by delegating, where appropriate, authority to lead donors for the execution of programmes, activities and tasks. - Work together to harmonise separate procedures..	

		<i>– We will start dialogue on international division of labour across countries by June 2009.</i>	
3.3. Incentives for collaborative behaviour.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Reform procedures and strengthen incentives—including for recruitment, appraisal and training—for management and staff to work towards harmonisation, alignment and results. – <i>Improve forms of interaction of all parties involved into development cooperation.</i>
Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual

<p>3.4. Delivering effective aid in fragile states.</p>	<p>– Make progress towards building institutions and establishing governance structures that deliver effective governance, public safety, security, and equitable access to basic social services for their citizens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engage in dialogue with donors on developing simple planning tools, such as the transitional results matrix, where national development strategies are not yet in place. - Encourage broad participation of a range of national actors in setting development priorities. 	<p>– Harmonise their activities. Harmonisation is all the more crucial in the absence of strong government leadership. It should focus on upstream analysis, joint assessments, joint strategies, co-ordination of political engagement; and practical initiatives such as the establishment of joint donor offices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Align to the maximum extent possible behind central government-led strategies or, if that is not possible, donors should make maximum use of country, regional, sector or non-government systems. - Avoid activities that undermine national institution building, such as bypassing national budget processes or setting high salaries for local staff. - Use an appropriate mix of aid instruments, including support for recurrent financing, particularly for countries in promising but high-risk transitions. <p><i>Donors will conduct joint assessments of governance and capacity and examine the causes of conflict, fragility and insecurity, engaging developing country authorities and other relevant stakeholders to the maximum extent possible;</i></p> <p><i>Donors will provide demand-driven, tailored and co-ordinated capacity-development support for core state functions and for early and sustained recovery. They will work with developing countries to design interim measures that are</i></p>	<p><i>– At country level, donors and developing countries will work and agree on a set of realistic peace- and state-building objectives that address the root causes of conflict and fragility and help ensure the protection and participation of women. This process will be informed by international dialogue between partners and donors on these objectives as prerequisites for development;</i></p> <p><i>– At country level and on a voluntary basis, donors and developing countries will monitor implementation of the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations, and will share results as part of progress reports on implementing the Paris Declaration.</i></p>
---	--	---	---

		<i>appropriately sequenced and that lead to sustainable local institutions;</i>	
--	--	---	--

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
		<p>– Donors will work on flexible, rapid and long-term funding modalities, on a pooled basis where appropriate, to i) bridge humanitarian, recovery and longer-term development phases, and ii) support “specialized”, inclusive peace building, and the building of capable, accountable and responsive states. In collaboration with developing countries, donors will foster partnerships with the UN System, international financial institutions and other donors</p>	
3.5. Promoting a “specialize approach to environmental assessments			<p>– Strengthen the application of EIAs and deepen common procedures for projects, including consultations with stakeholders; and develop and apply common approaches for “strategic environmental assessment” at the sector and national levels. - Continue to develop the “specialized technical and policy capacity necessary for environmental analysis and for enforcement of legislation..</p>
<p><u>4. MANAGING FOR RESULTS.</u> Managing resources and improving decision-making for results.</p>	<p>– Strengthen the linkages between national development strategies and annual and multi-annual budget processes. - Endeavour to establish results-oriented reporting and assessment frameworks that monitor progress against key dimensions of the national and sector development strategies; and that</p>	<p>– Link country programming and resources to results and align them with effective partner country performance assessment frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that are not consistent with partners’ national development strategies. - Work with partner countries to rely, as far as possible, on partner countries’ results-oriented</p>	<p>– Work together in a participatory approach to strengthen country capacities and demand for results based management. – We will strengthen incentives to improve aid effectiveness. We will systematically review and address legal or administrative impediments to implementing international</p>

	these frameworks should track a manageable number of indicators for which data are cost-effectively available (Indicator 11).	reporting and monitoring frameworks. - Harmonise their monitoring and reporting requirements, and, until they can rely more extensively on partner countries' statistical, monitoring and evaluation systems, with partner	<i>commitments on aid effectiveness. Donors will pay more attention to delegating sufficient authority to country offices and to changing organisational and staff incentives</i>
Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
	<p>– <i>Developing countries will strengthen the quality of policy design, implementation and assessment by improving information systems, including, as appropriate, disaggregating data by sex, region and socioeconomic status.</i></p> <p>- <i>Developing countries and donors will work to develop cost-effective results management instruments to assess the impact of development policies and adjust them as necessary. We will better co-ordinate and link the various sources of information, including national statistical systems, budgeting, planning, monitoring and country-led evaluations of policy performance.</i></p>	<p>countries to the maximum extent possible on joint formats for periodic reporting.</p> <p>– <i>Donors will align their monitoring with country information systems. They will support, and invest in strengthening, developing countries' national statistical capacity and information systems, including those for managing aid;</i></p>	<p><i>to promote behaviour in line with aid effectiveness principles.;</i></p> <p>– <i>We will be judged by the impacts that our collective efforts have on the lives of poor people. We recognise that greater transparency and accountability for the use of development resources—domestic as well as external—are powerful drivers of progress.</i></p>
		<p>– <i>We will strengthen incentives to improve aid effectiveness. We will systematically review and address legal or administrative impediments to implementing international commitments on aid effectiveness. Donors will pay more attention to delegating sufficient authority to country offices and to changing organisational and staff incentives to promote behaviour in line with aid effectiveness principles;</i></p>	<p>– As we partner to increase and reinforce development results, we will take action to facilitate, leverage and strengthen the impact of diverse sources of finance to support sustainable and inclusive development, including taxation and domestic resource</p>

		<p>- Donors will align their monitoring with country information systems. They will support, and invest in strengthening, developing countries' national statistical capacity and information systems, including those for managing aid;</p> <p>– Beginning now, donors will provide developing countries with regular and timely information on their rolling three- to five-year forward expenditure and/or implementation plans, with at least indicative resource allocations that developing countries can integrate in their medium-term planning and macroeconomic frameworks. Donors will address any constraints to providing such information.</p>	<p>mobilisation, private investment, aid for trade, philanthropy, nonConcessional public funding and climate change finance. At the same time, new financial instruments, investment options, technology and knowledge sharing, and publicCprivate partnerships are called for.</p>
--	--	--	--

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
<p><u>5. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY</u> _ Donors and partners are accountable for development results.</p>	<p>– Strengthen as appropriate the parliamentary role in national development strategies and/or budgets.</p> <p>- Reinforce participatory approaches by systematically involving a broad range of development partners when formulating and assessing progress in implementing national development strategies.</p>	<p>– Provide timely, transparent and comprehensive information on aid flows so as to enable partner authorities to present comprehensive budget reports to their legislatures and citizens..</p> <p>– <i>We will make aid more transparent;</i></p> <p>– <i>We will step up our efforts to ensure that—as agreed in the Paris Declaration—mutual assessment reviews are in place by 2010 in all countries that have endorsed the Declaration. These reviews will be based on country results reporting and information systems complemented with available donor data and credible independent evidence.</i></p>	<p>– Jointly assess through existing and increasingly objective country level mechanisms mutual progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness, including the Partnership Commitments. (Indicator 12)..</p> <p>– <i>To complement mutual assessment reviews at country level and drive better performance, developing countries and donors will jointly review and strengthen existing international accountability mechanisms, including peer review with participation of developing countries. We will review proposals for strengthening the mechanisms by end 2009.</i></p>

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
		<p><i>They will draw on emerging good practice with stronger parliamentary scrutiny and citizen engagement. With them we will hold each other accountable for mutually agreed results in keeping with country development and aid policies.</i></p>	<p><i>– Effective and efficient use of development financing requires both donors and partner countries to do their utmost to fight corruption. Donors and developing countries will respect the principles to which they have agreed, including those under the UN Convention against Corruption. Developing countries will address corruption by improving systems of investigation, legal redress, accountability and transparency in the use of public funds. Donors will take steps in their own countries to combat corruption by individuals or corporations and to track, freeze, and recover illegally acquired assets..</i></p> <p>- Implement fully our respective commitments to eradicate corruption, enforcing our laws and promoting a culture of zero tolerance for all corrupt practices. This includes efforts to improve fiscal transparency, strengthen independent enforcement mechanisms, and extend protection for whistleblowers.</p> <p>- Accelerate our individual efforts to combat illicit financial flows by strengthening anti money laundering measures, addressing tax evasion, and strengthening national and international policies, legal frameworks and institutional arrangements for the tracing,</p>

			freezing and recovery of illegal assets. This includes ensuring enactment and implementation of laws and practices that facilitate effective international co-operation..
--	--	--	--

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
<p><u>6. More Effective and Inclusive Partnerships for Development</u></p> <p><u>Engagement with civil society organisations.</u></p> <p><u>Private-State Partnership</u></p>	<p>– We invite CSOs to reflect on how they can apply the Paris principles of aid effectiveness from a CSO perspective.</p> <p>- We welcome the CSOs’ proposal to engage with them in a CSO-led multistakeholder process to promote CSO development effectiveness. As part of that process, we will seek to i) improve co-ordination of CSO efforts with government programmes, ii) enhance CSO accountability for results, and iii) improve information on CSO activities.</p> <p>- We will work with CSOs to provide an enabling environment that maximises their contributions to development.</p> <p>-Developing countries will lead consultation and co-ordination efforts to manage this diversity at the country level, while providers of development assistance have a responsibility to reduce fragmentation and curb the proliferation of aid channels. We will ensure that our efforts to reduce fragmentation do not lead to a reduction in the volume and quality of resources available to support development.</p> <p>- We will, by 2013, make greater use of country-led co-ordination arrangements, including division of labour, as well as programme-based approaches, joint programming and delegated co-operation.</p>		<p>- We can and must improve and accelerate our efforts. We commit to modernise, deepen and broaden our co-operation, involving state and non-state actors that wish to shape an agenda that has until recently been dominated by a narrower group of development actors. In Busan, we forge a new global development partnership that embraces diversity and recognises the distinct roles that all stakeholders in co-operation can play to support development.</p> <p>- Implement fully our respective commitments to enable CSOs to exercise their roles as independent development actors, with a particular focus on an enabling environment, consistent with agreed international rights, that maximises the contributions of CSOs to development.</p> <p>- Encourage 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.</p> <p>- Establish a new, inclusive and representative Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation to support and ensure accountability for the implementation of</p>

			commitments at the political level. This Partnership will offer an open platform that embraces diversity, providing a forum for the exchange of knowledge and the regular review of progress.
--	--	--	--

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual

	<p>- We will improve the coherence of our policies on multilateral institutions, global funds and programmes. We will make effective use of existing multilateral channels, focusing on those that are performing well. We will work to reduce the proliferation of these channels and will, by the end of 2012, agree on principles and guidelines to guide our joint efforts. As they continue to implement their respective commitments on aid effectiveness, multilateral organisations, global funds and programmes will strengthen their participation in co-ordination and mutual accountability mechanisms at the country, regional and global levels.</p> <p>- We will accelerate efforts to address the issue of countries that receive insufficient assistance, agreeing ' by the end of 2012 ' on principles that will guide our actions to address this challenge. These efforts will encompass all development co-operation flows.</p> <p>- Providers of development co-operation will deepen and accelerate efforts to address the problem of insufficient delegation of authority to their field staff. They will review all aspects of their operations, including delegation of financial authority, staffing, and roles and responsibilities in the design and</p>		<p>- Agree, by June 2012, on light working arrangements for this Global Partnership, including its membership and opportunities for regular ministerial level engagement that complements, and is undertaken in conjunction with, other fora.</p> <p>- Call on the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) to convene representatives of all countries and stakeholders endorsing this document with a view to reaching agreement on the working arrangements for the Global Partnership ' and the indicators and channels through which global monitoring and accountability will be supported ' in preparation for the phasing out of the WPCEFF and its associated structures in June 2012.</p> <p>- Invite the Organisation for Economic CoOperation and Development and the United Nations Development Programme to support the effective functioning of the Global Partnership, building on their collaboration to date and their respective mandates and areas of comparative advantage.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>implementation of development programmes; and they will implement measures that address the remaining bottlenecks. Developing countries will lead in integrating resilience to shocks and measures for disaster management within their own policies and</p>		
--	--	--	--

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
	<p>strategies.</p> <p>- Responding to the needs articulated by developing countries, we will work together to invest in shock resistant infrastructure and social protection systems for at risk communities. In addition, we will increase the resources, planning and skills for disaster management at the national and regional levels.</p>		
<p><u>7. Transparency and accountability to each other.</u></p> <p>Mutual accountability and accountability to the intended beneficiaries of our co-operation, as well as to our respective citizens, organisations, constituents and shareholders, is critical to</p>		<p>- Make the full range of information on publicly funded development activities, their financing, terms and conditions, and contribution to development results, publicly available subject to legitimate concerns about commercially sensitive information.</p> <p>- Focus, at the country level, on establishing transparent public financial management and aid information management systems, and strengthen the capacities of all relevant stakeholders to make better use of this information in decision-making and to promote accountability.</p> <p>- Implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-</p>	

delivering results. Transparent practices form the basis for enhanced accountability		looking information on resources provided through development Co-operation, taking into account the statistical reporting of the OECD-DAC and the complementary efforts of the International Aid Transparency Initiative and others. This standard must meet the	
---	--	---	--

Tasks	Commitments to solve the tasks		
	Partner-states	donors	mutual
		<p>information needs of developing countries and nonCstate actors, consistent with national requirements. We will agree on this standard and publish our respective schedules to implement it by December 2012, with the aim of implementing it fully by December 2015.</p> <p>- Those of us who committed, through the Accra Agenda for Action, to improve medium-term predictability will implement fully our commitments in this area, introducing reforms where needed. By 2013, they will provide available, regular, timely rolling three to five year indicative forward expenditure and/or implementation plans as agreed in Accra to all developing countries with which they co-operate. Other actors will aim to provide developing countries with timely and relevant information on their intentions with regard to future co-operation over the medium term.</p>	

