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MANAGING FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE WORK

DRAFT

This note sets out proposals related to thematic tasks for future work, links to regional learning networks and an institutional structure for learning and exchange of best practices related to Managing for Development Results (MfDR) and Mutual Accountability. It aims to facilitate consultations among partner countries and donors active in Accra HLF Roundtables 4 and 5 and the JV MfDR and to inform the initial discussion of the WP-EFF at its meeting on 25-26 November 2008.

The note reflects preliminary thinking only. Annual meetings of Communities of Practice, a workshop facilitating partner country consultation (South Africa, January 2009) and a meeting of the JV MfDR (February 2009) will shape the content of this paper into a final draft to be submitted to the WP-EFF for decision-making on content, institutional structure and budget of the work at its next meeting in spring 2009.

KEY LESSONS FROM ACCRA

1. Some key lessons emerged from the Accra HLF immediately addressing future work on Managing for Development Results and Mutual Accountability.

Managing for Development Results:

- Progress in meeting the commitments and targets for effective aid that have been agreed in Paris has been slow; in particular regarding indicator 11 “Countries develop frameworks for monitoring development results” and indicator 12 “Mechanisms for mutual accountability are established at country level”.
- All domestic and external resources available for development need to be properly managed in a partner-led process. Without results management there will be no development results. MfDR has moved beyond an aid management instrument and became part of the core agenda for public sector reform to pursue development and growth.
- Strong results management systems need to be in place to manage the political change process. The challenge lies not only with the implementation of tools, but first and foremost with the change of deep-rooted patterns of behaviour. This requires political leadership, capacity development and the involvement of broader constituencies such as parliamentarians, civil society, the private sector and the media.
- Harmonised donor support and strengthened South-South and donor-partner learning mechanisms stand out as important drivers.
Mutual Accountability:

- Strong and credible mutual accountability mechanisms are crucial to support behaviour change and to contribute to development results.
- There is wide acceptance that delivering and accounting for development results is a mutually agreed agenda for both partner countries, donors and other stakeholders.
- Mutual Accountability needs to respect and complement domestic accountability. The best mutual accountability mechanisms and development results come from countries with the strongest domestic accountability mechanisms.
- Independent review and evidence, most importantly by parliaments and civil society, can strengthen mutual accountability.
- Mutual accountability has a broader remit that includes international obligations on gender, governance and human rights, environment and donor commitments on aid volumes.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE?

2. The JV MfDR and other groups have delivered useful products to support the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the AAA. We know how to assess MfDR capacity; we know what good practice is in MfDR; how to assess the incentives structure in donor agencies and what effective mutual accountability mechanisms and systems at the national and international levels entails. What is necessary now is to implement, monitor and support the existing tools and know-how in practice.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE NEXT?

3. Future work now has to address remaining bottlenecks and to focus on advocacy, on communication and dissemination; on applying tools and their amendment if needed; on structured dialogue, mutual learning and exchange of experience; on real system wide capacity development and support of champions. Complementary to the implementation at country level it is imperative to strengthen peer-to-peer learning, in particular at regional levels, and to establish a platform at the international level where partner countries, donors and other development players come together to advance the MfDR and Mutual Accountability agendas. Key is to address and support the meaningful involvement of political leadership and behaviour change which is necessary for MfDR and Mutual Accountability implementation. In this regard, work has to address a whole range of adverse management and staff incentives, institutional disincentives and administrative impediments at both partner and donor level.

WHO HAS TO DO WHAT?

Implementation at country level and peer-to-peer learning:

4. Since MfDR and MA at the country level should be partner-led there is an overwhelming rationale for bringing the whole MfDR and MA implementation to country level and to strengthen South-South learning at country and regional levels. Peer-to-peer learning mechanisms (such as Communities of Practice) have proven to be excellent platforms for capacity development in relation to MfDR. Donor support without strings attached remains necessary to continue funding them since these processes need time. Overloading these mechanisms with tasks and expectations that are too high has to be avoided. In relation to Mutual Accountability it is important to strengthen collaborative mechanisms to address the problem of inequality of power and the lack of ‘hard enforcement’ mechanisms available to partner countries as well as strengthening linkages to domestic accountability fora.
Joint dialogue, agenda pushing, learning and advocacy at the international level:

5. At the same time there is an acknowledged need to further institutionalize the dialogue at the international level. To complement the efforts at country and regional levels, a strong forum is necessary for donor-partner dialogue, inter-regional exchange among developing countries, involvement of other stakeholders and debate of donor-specific issues around MfDR and Mutual Accountability. It still remains to be decided whether one single platform or two separate platforms for MfDR and Mutual Accountability will serve as the most effective working environment. Such a platform (or platforms) will provide space for joint dialogue, agenda pushing, learning and advocacy; it/they will have to work on three levels:

- On the practical level it/they will serve as clearing houses to support implementation at country and agency levels. It/they will identify good practice and provide for its dissemination. It/they will also support the use of existing tools, provide for evidence-based quality control and amendment if needed.
- On the conceptual level it/they will develop guiding principles to move the agenda forward.
- On the political level it/they will act as a prime advocate for Results and Mutual Accountability Issues. It/they will advocate for the change process and serve as the platform for structured dialogue with donors, partner country governments and broader constituencies to facilitate, exchange and change initiation.

6. It will also be important to avoid duplication and link the work of such an international platform with other related work such as the Evaluation Network, the Capacity Development work stream, PARIS21 and the new GOVNET task team on aid and accountability.

AAA COMMITMENTS GUIDE THE DIRECTION OF FUTURE TASKS

7. The direction of future tasks is immediately based on the AAA commitments around MfDR and Mutual Accountability:

- **A1 Strengthening MfDR Country Systems**: Developing countries will systematically identify capacity gaps (§14a) and will, jointly with donors, assess the quality of country systems in a country-led process using mutually agreed diagnostic tools (§15c). They also will, with support from donors, improve statistical capacity and information systems, including disaggregating data by sex, region and socioeconomic status (§23a,c). Developing countries and donors will jointly develop results management instruments and coordinate/link the various sources of information (§23b).
- **A2 Guidance on Incentives**: Developing countries and donors agreed to strengthen incentives for aid effectiveness and systematically review legal or administrative impediments (§23d). In addition, donors agreed to 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 (§23d).
- **B1 Good Practice in Mutual Accountability at the Country Level**: The AAA includes a commitment to step up efforts to ensure that mutual assessment reviews are in place by 2010 in all countries that have endorsed the Paris Declaration, based on country results reporting and information systems and drawing on emerging good practice with stronger parliamentary scrutiny and citizen engagement (§24b).
- **B2 Review of Mutual Accountability at the International Level**: Developing countries and donors agreed to jointly review and strengthen existing international accountability mechanisms, including peer review with participation of developing countries, and review proposals for strengthening the mechanisms by end 2009 (§24c).
Institutional Structure for Future Work on MfDR and Mutual Accountability

**Donor agencies (incl. IFIs)**

- Donors meet donors
- Joint Platform (Donors - partner countries - other development actors)
- Partner countries meet partner countries

**Dialogue, agenda pushing, learning and advocacy**

**Peer-to-peer learning at regional level**

- CoP Asia-Pacific
- CoP Africa
- CoP Latin America

**Implementation at the country level**
# MfDR and Mutual Accountability Work Program 2009 – 2010: Results Framework

The overarching objective: making a difference in the lives of poor people in the partner countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAA / Paris Declaration Tasks</th>
<th>A: Managing for Development Results</th>
<th>B: Mutual Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2: Guidance on Incentives</td>
<td>B: Mutual Accountability</td>
<td>B2: Review of Mutual Accountability at the International Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Objectives

- Donors and partners manage development resources for results more effectively to achieve development outcomes.
- Donors and partners work together to strengthen mutual and domestic accountability mechanisms and make more effective use of development resources.

## Expected Outcomes

- Vibrant national, regional and global advocacy; structured learning and dialogue (amongst partner countries, between partner countries and donors, amongst donors) providing vigilance on progress on AAA/PD commitments on MfDR
- High quality MfDR instruments are used in and by partner countries, donor agencies and IFIs, incl. the MDBs
- Incentives for development effectiveness are strengthened in both partner countries and donor agencies
- Strengthened MfDR capacity amongst all ranks including “senior executives” to become effective change agents
- Support for MfDR champions in both partner countries and donor agencies
- Mutual accountability frameworks at country level lead to increased transparency, accountability and responsiveness in donor and partner countries.
- More effective international accountability mechanisms complement and strengthen mutual and domestic accountability at country level
- A stronger role played by parliaments and civil society in mutual accountability
- Credible independent evidence is used to strengthen the results focus of accountability mechanisms at the country and international levels.
- Mutual Accountability mechanisms routinely cover broader issues, including those of gender, human rights, environmental sustainability and donor commitments on aid volumes.

## Outputs

- Use of MfDR capacity & quality assessment tools (Cap Scan etc.), including evidence based quality control and improvements
- Assessment of donor incentives against good practice principles
- Development of good practice tools on incentives in partner countries
- Distilling good MfDR practice in and technical guidance for developing countries and donor agencies (Sourcebooks, Technical Guidance Notes etc.); e.g. demonstrating the successful strengthening of results focused country systems, in particular results based planning, performance budgeting, results based monitoring and evaluation, performance audits and feedback mechanisms
- Advocacy for country led joint evaluations and strengthening of existing guidelines on joint evaluations by actively involving partner countries
- Harmonisation of donor evaluation guidelines, approaches and methods
- Regional and/or cross agency training facilities
- A lively and sustainable dialogue platform for partner countries, donors and other development actors
- Review of proposals for strengthening international accountability mechanisms (by end 2009)
- Strengthened capacity in partner countries to generate, analyse and make publicly available comprehensive data on development resources, including donor funds, and use of such data for policy development, planning and advocacy.
- Country and international level ratings show effective use of strengthened mutual accountability mechanisms.
- Parliaments, media, civil society and communities are capacitated and effectively engaged in mutual accountability mechanisms; parliaments debate the use of aid and the results achieved.
- Country level mutual accountability reports published and debated.
- Common understanding of mutual accountability and good practice promoted through sharing of experience, south-south learning, peer review mechanisms, support facilities etc. at country, regional and global levels.
- International and national support mechanisms in place (including financial support) to document and spread good practice on mutual and dom. accountability.

## Inputs

- Budget and means to be worked out after agreement on the basics
- Budget and means to be worked out after agreement on the basics