

Strengthening the Poverty Impact of the Paris Declaration: Aid Effectiveness evidence gathering project on gender equality, human rights and social exclusion
Phase One

Literature Review

Sue Fleming, Marcus Cox, Kasturi Sen, Katie Wright-Revolledo
June 2007

Executive Summary

Key points for strengthening the poverty impact of the Paris Declaration through integration of gender, rights and social exclusion issues

List of acronyms

- A. Background to the report
- B. Human rights, social exclusion and gender equality as cross-cutting issues
- C. The Paris Declaration and human rights, social exclusion and gender equality
- D. The Paris Declaration Principles
 - D.1 Ownership
 - D.2 Alignment
 - D.3 Harmonisation
 - D.4 Managing for results
 - D.5 Mutual accountability
- E. Monitoring and evaluating the Paris Declaration

Annex 1. Terms of Reference for scoping Phase One

Annex 2. Literature consulted

The views expressed in this report represent those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of DFID.

Executive Summary

1. The DFID Country Led Approaches and Results Team and Equity and Rights team, in discussion with DAC networks, the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) and Nordic + colleagues, are commissioning an evidence gathering exercise on aid effectiveness and gender equality, human rights and social exclusion. The aim is to ensure that the aid effectiveness agenda contributes to the overall outcome of poverty and inequality reduction.

2. This report is a first step, and provides a review of existing literature, looking at each of the Paris Declaration principles in turn, highlighting the relevance to gender equality, human rights and social exclusion issues to the Paris Declaration, and vice versa. It also highlights what needs to be done to ensure the Paris Declaration has a positive impact on poverty reduction and inequality, and makes a real difference to the lives of poor women and men. In doing so it identifies possible entry points for the evidence gathering exercise and analysis to see the extent to which the Paris Declaration is integrating these issue or not.

3. This report is complemented with a series of background papers for the next phase of the evidence work, which outline a conceptual framework, gaps in evidence for further work, a stakeholder and events map, along with a partnership and influencing strategy for situating and communicating the findings.

4. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness was signed in March 2005 by more than a hundred official agency donors and developing countries. It is remarkable for the high level of political commitment, and the momentum it has developed at implementation level. It lays down a practical, action-oriented roadmap intended to improve the quality of aid and its impact on development and to shift the balance of power away from donors to create a fairer and more effective development partnership based on mutual accountability between donors and with partner countries.

5. The cross cutting issues of human rights, social exclusion and gender equality are all intrinsic to aid and development processes, and necessary for positive outcomes for poor women and men. Human rights are understood to encompass political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights. Social exclusion is the exclusion of people from society, the economy and political participation. Gender deals with equality between men and women. As discrimination is overwhelmingly experienced by women, the focus on gender equality has long been associated with women's empowerment.

6. The literature on the relevance of the Paris Declaration to gender, rights and exclusion points to the new opportunities and platforms the aid effectiveness agenda provides. These opportunities are facilitated by the synergies between the principles of the Paris Declaration, and cross-cutting issues. Both are holistic visions of development processes, covering policy, systems and results, both emphasise local, country and context specific approaches, both go beyond government to include wider society, and other state and civil society actors, and both work towards the goal of poverty and inequality reduction.

7. The Paris Declaration commitment to broad-based country **ownership** is better served through the development of social consensus, through an engaged citizenship across society that recognises difference and includes the voices of the poor and excluded. This national ownership goes beyond the boundaries of a particular government and provides a sustainable basis for change. **Alignment** on the policy of an integral cross-cutting policy is supported through mutually agreed international commitments, and useful experience of systems change as a response to human rights and gender mainstreaming, for example, in support of effective, accountable and transparent resource management.

8. The measurement of impact, essential to **managing for results**, benefits from attention to distributional issues, and transparency on outcomes that come with mainstreaming gender, rights and inclusion. **Mutual accountability** is supported through citizens' engagement and in-country accountability mechanisms. Donor **harmonisation** on gender equality, human rights and social exclusion issues draws on the comparative advantage of different agencies, as well as supporting joint approaches. More evidence is required on how these key cross-cutting issues are integrated into the mainstream work of the Paris Declaration, and the costs for poor women and men if they are not.

Key points for strengthening the poverty impact of the Paris Declaration through integration of gender, rights and social exclusion issues

Generally

- Strong synergies between Paris Declaration principles, gender, rights, exclusion
- Both with goals of poverty and inequality reduction, holistic, country and context specific, work across state and civil society
- Paris Declaration commitments will work better *with* gender equality, human rights and social exclusion issues integrated and vice versa
- Paris Declaration principles are about change, are transformative not just technocratic
- Paris Declaration process in danger of alienating civil society allies if there is not meaningful engagement

Ownership

- The Paris Declaration calls for broad consultative processes, and encouraging the participation of civil society
- Broad ownership requires political support across parliaments, civil society and government at local as well as national levels
- Ownership recognises power and political dimensions of development

Alignment

- The Paris Declaration is more than technical analysis, and is to be responsive to the broader social political and economic environment
- International/regional commitments on gender, rights, exclusion already aligned
- Local and national systems are important for resource flows to poor and excluded
- Processes around assessment and information are key entry points
- Capacity support on gender, rights, exclusion required for policy coherence and implementation

Harmonisation

- Harmonisation on gender equality and other cross cutting issues is in the Paris Declaration
- Donor harmonisation on these cross-cutting issues needs monitoring

Managing for Results

- Importance of multi-stakeholder dialogue and broad ownership at all phases,
- Disaggregated statistics are a prerequisite to monitor and evaluate impact on poor and excluded men and women
- Positive examples exist of empowerment, voice and accountability in managing for results

Mutual Accountability

- The Paris Declaration is committed to strengthen the role of parliament and broad based participatory approaches
- Recognition of importance of role of civil society in securing transparency and accountability
- Downward accountability to society needed in addition to upward accountability to donors
- Efforts needed to secure accountability to poor and marginalised women and men

List of acronyms

AER	World Bank's Aid Effectiveness Review
AfDB	African Development Bank
CCIC	Canadian Council for International Co-operation
CDF	Comprehensive Development Framework
CDF	Country development framework
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
COMESA	
CPIA	World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment
CSO	Civil society organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EC	European Commission
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
EU	European Union
GADN	Gender and Development Network
HLF	High Level Forum
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INTRAC	International NGO Training and Research Centre
JV	Joint venture
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PEFA	Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability
PFM	Public Financial Management
PRS	Poverty reduction strategy
PRSP	Poverty reduction strategy paper
PSIA	Poverty and Social Impact Assessment
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
APRODEV	Association of World Council of Churches-related Development organisations in Europe
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WB	World Bank
WP-EFF	Working Party on Aid Effectiveness
WTO	World Trade Organisation

A. Background to the report

9. The DFID Country Led Approaches and Results Team and the Equity and Rights team, in discussions with DAC networks, the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) and Nordic + colleagues, are commissioning an evidence gathering exercise on aid effectiveness and cross cutting issues. The aim is to ensure that issues central to poverty reduction: human rights, social inclusion and gender equality, are integral to the aid effectiveness agenda, contributing to the overall outcome of poverty and inequality reduction. Evidence is needed on the role of the Paris Declaration commitments in furthering cross cutting issues as well as the potential these issues have in contributing to the implementation and review of the Paris Declaration.

10. DFID is seeking to complement on going work and develop shared analysis in the spirit of the Paris principles. DFID aims to attract other partners to co-sponsor the project, particularly among the Nordic + group. A joint workshop of three DAC Networks (Gendernet, Govnet and Environet) and the WP-EFF in Dublin in April present an early opportunity for identifying case studies, themes and partners, and ensuring that the project fits within a DAC-led process.

11. This report is a scoping exercise as a first step towards developing this evidence base. It covers a synthesis of relevant literature and evidence work to date on aid effectiveness and cross cutting issues. This report is complemented with a separate report containing background papers for the next phase of the evidence work: an analytical framework and approach for evidence gathering, key questions for further evidence work, and a partnership and influencing strategy and stakeholder and events map, outlining key opportunities, partners and processes leading up to Ghana 2008. It also includes draft terms of reference for the second phase.

B. Human rights, social exclusion and gender equality as cross-cutting issues

12. Human rights are understood to encompass political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights. They are legally guaranteed by human rights law, consisting of treaties and declarations, guidelines and principles agreed under the auspices of the UN with the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human rights as a starting point. There are seven major conventions that set out what human rights mean in more detail. These include the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Convention of the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. They are based on international government and civil society discussion and agreement, and every country in the world has ratified at least one of the seven core UN human rights treaties, and 80% have ratified four or more.

13. DFID promotes three main operational human rights principles: people's

access to decision-making processes, building of social inclusive societies and strengthening government and other institutions to deliver their human rights obligations.

14. Social exclusion is the exclusion of people from society, the economy and political participation. It is a result of discrimination, whose nature and rationale varies in different contexts, and can be based on factors such as age, disability, race and ethnicity. Socially excluded groups are more likely to be poor, and because they cannot access income, assets and services make the goal of poverty reduction even harder. Social inclusion is one of three cross-cutting principles in DFID's human rights strategy.

15. Gender deals with equality between men and women. Gender inequality is a particularly significant and harmful form of social exclusion, it is present in all societies, and has been a challenge to address. As discrimination is overwhelmingly experienced by women, the focus on gender equality has long been associated with women's empowerment. There is international agreement on actions for gender equality; the current commitments in the Beijing Platform of Action of 1995 were reaffirmed by the international community in 2005. These commitments form part of the family of human rights conventions, and are built on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, agreed in 1979. DFID, and many other development agencies, recognise the importance of gender equality and the empowerment of women as critical factors for poverty reduction, the upholding of human rights, and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

16. The three cross-cutting dimensions, human rights, social exclusion and gender equality, are inter-connected in their concerns and approaches. They relate to important global agreements, are all concerned with different relations, access and use of power, are critical for sustainable and equitable development and poverty reduction and are holistic in their approach to development. These issues cut across the range of different policies, processes and structures put in place by donor and partner governments, and the international system. It is for this reason that cross-cutting approaches have focused on mainstreaming these issues across all development actions. Measurements of mainstreaming are found in the content of policy and policy change, voice and influence over policy choices and their implementation, institutional changes to integrate delivery of human rights obligations as well as equity in services and resources, and resulting impact on poverty and inequality outcomes.

C. The Paris Declaration and human rights, social exclusion and gender equality

17. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness was signed in March 2005. It represents widespread agreement across aid donor and recipient governments as well as multi-lateral development institutions as to how to improve the delivery and

management of aid. It is remarkable for the high level of political commitment, and the momentum it has developed at implementation level. It represents a unique opportunity to transform the nature of the partnership between donors and developing countries, correct discredited past practices, and shift the balance of power within the aid relationship in favour of partner countries. Donors relinquish control over the policy agenda and the management of aid funds, in order to achieve greater country ownership and ultimately higher impact.

18. The purpose of the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness has an intended goal, to *'increase the impact aid has in **reducing poverty and inequality, increasing growth, building capacity and accelerating achievement of the MDGs*** (OECD DAC 2005:para 2). It is important to keep this end-goal in mind when interpreting the principles and commitments of the Paris Declaration itself. As well as specific mention of gender equality and cross-cutting issues under the harmonisation commitments, gender equality, human rights and social exclusion are fundamental to achieving these overall goals and integral to how all the commitments are realised.

19. Concern to link the Paris Declaration to advancing gender equality and human rights has come from within the DAC itself. The gender network (Gendernet), the governance network (Govnet) plus the environmental concerns of Environet, have joined hands with the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) and the DAC Secretariat to secure cross-cutting linkages. They argue that improving the effectiveness of aid delivery is a necessary condition for positive impact, which requires attention to the content of policies and actions, and integration of cross-cutting issues (OECD DAC 2006a). These networks have supported key thinking about these interconnections, such as the work of Gaynor (2006) on gender and aid effectiveness (OECD DAC 2006c), the initial ideas of Bartsch (2007) building on OECD DAC sponsored work of Foresti et al (2006) on human rights as well as the new DAC policy paper on human rights and development (OECD DAC 2007a).

20. DAC members are also keen to reinforce the mutuality of the Paris Declaration, its principles and those of cross-cutting issues. Ausaid states that *'the principles of the Paris Declaration apply equally to efforts to reduce gender inequality'* (AusAID 2007:22). CIDA regard the aid effectiveness agenda as an opportunity for gender equality, arguing that both are priorities for their government (McCullagh 2006). UNIFEM states that *'gender equality outcomes will be important signs of the effectiveness of the new approach to aid delivery and partnership'* (UNIFEM march 2006). DANIDA asks that attention be paid as to how human rights can help the mechanics of the Paris Declaration to work better (Poulsen 2006).

21. The two way synergy or 'mutual reinforcement' between the Paris Declaration principles and cross-cutting issues is clearly expressed in the recently approved DAC policy paper on human rights. *'There is much potential for the international human rights framework and the Paris Declaration to reinforce and*

benefit from each other. The application of the partnership commitments of the Paris Declaration can help advance human rights – and ways of working with human rights- in a changing context of more aligned and harmonised aid and new aid modalities. At the same time, experience and approaches from human rights practice may be useful in achieving the Paris Declaration’s partnership commitments – which is most obvious with respect to ownership and mutual accountability’. (OECD DAC 2007, para 35). The same two way benefits have also been expressed in the context of gender equality and social exclusion. All these cross-cutting issues are concerned with structural inequalities, whose resolution is essential to positive and sustainable development outcomes.

22. Civil society voices in general are supportive of the principles of the Paris Declaration, arguing that they are not new, and form part of civil society agenda for reform of the aid system (CCIC 2006, UK Aid Network 2006, GADN 2006). Their critique has more to do with the interpretation of the principles, as insufficiently transformative and focused on technocratic and mechanistic dimensions of development (Sjöblom 2006). This conclusion is echoed by other analysts, who stress that aid effectiveness is more than tools and modalities (Burrall et al. 2006), that it is contextualised by specific country realities and horizontal inequalities (Brown and Stewart 2006) and are subject to local interpretations (Beloe 2005).

23. The main civil society critique relates to the Paris Declaration process itself and quality (or lack) of civil society engagement. The predominant view is that there has been little formal and effective civil society participation in the aid effectiveness negotiations to date (INTRAC 2007), particularly one that includes civil society as equal partners (Sjöblom 2006). Whilst some civil society actors and networks actively seek a strong dialogue with governments and donors (GADN 2006), others take the view that exclusion to date points to the need for civil society to set up an alternative dialogue between civil society organisations, and a parallel system to monitor the Paris agenda (CCIC 2006, Sjöblom 2006, INTRAC 2006).

24. The summary of key points on the overall links between the Paris Declaration principles and cross cutting issues is outlined in the box below.

Summary of key points

- Strong synergies between Paris Declaration principles and cross cutting issues
- Both with goals of poverty and inequality reduction, holistic, country and context specific, work across state and civil society
- Cross-cutting issues will work better *with* the Paris Declaration commitments and vice versa
- Paris Declaration principles are about change, are transformative not just technocratic
- Paris Declaration process in danger of alienating civil society allies if there is not meaningful engagement

D. The Paris Declaration principles

25. The Paris Declaration contains both a set of specific commitments and targets on aid effectiveness, and a more general set of norms and principles to govern the aid relationship. These principles are not fully defined in the Paris Declaration, and need to be interpreted and elaborated in practice. They provide an opportunity for bringing gender equality, human rights and social exclusion issues into the aid-effectiveness agenda, without adding new commitments. This section looks at each of the five main principles in turn, looking at how the term is used in the Paris Declaration and aid effectiveness literature. The five overarching principles and partnership commitments are ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for development results and mutual accountability.

D.1 The principle of ownership

26. **Ownership** is defined as partner country leadership over policies, strategies and the coordination of development actions. It is the foundational principle of the Paris Declaration, and reflects the conviction that policies and programmes imposed from the outside are rarely successful. It locates agency on the partner country side, while placing donors in a supportive role. The Paris Declaration is also committed to a broad base to this ownership, through “*broad consultative processes*” *and encouraging the participation of civil society*” (OECD DAC 2005:para14).

27. At the same time countries are not single actors, but complex constellations of individuals, organisations and political processes. Whether national development goals reflect a genuine commitment across society is usually contested. This has led to demands for wider support across a spectrum of stakeholders. The delegates to five regional workshops on the Paris Declaration concluded that ownership requires high-level political support from both donor and partners countries, that must extend beyond government to include parliaments and civil society (OECD DAC (2006d). UNIFEM (2006b) and civil society raise the importance of local levels of government and organisation, particularly as they are often closer to, and can have a greater impact on, poor and marginalised groups.

28. The Burundi Communiqué from African governments, politicians, women’s organisations as well as donor agencies states clearly that ‘*political space and leverage must be created and consultations as well as decision making processes must include poor women and men for true citizen ownership of the development agenda*’ (UNIFEM 2006c). UNIFEM cite the need for investment and donor support to ensure that this ‘*meaningful ownership*’ takes place (UNIFEM 2006b:4). Human rights analysts further define the political nature of broad country ownership. ‘*From a human rights perspective, ownership must rest on a range of institutions that*

ensure the legitimacy of the social contract between state and citizenry and that citizens are able to participate in decision-making processes and hold their government to account for these' (Foresti et al 2006:18).

29. The politics of decision-making affects involvement and support across different government departments, as well as that relating to parliament and civil society. Recent experience drawn from Poverty Reduction Strategy formulation highlights the high level of fragmentation in many developing country administrations, and the absence of a strong policy making or cabinet function at the centre of government, making cross-government ownership difficult to establish (Bedi et al 2006).

30. A recent survey of experience in Latin America and the Caribbean concluded that national development plans were still basically government plans, and that civil society participation was "very limited", although civil society involvement in social auditing was more developed (Inter-American Development Bank 2006). A review of development effectiveness in Africa, recognising shortfalls in civil society engagement, called for greater capacity building support for civil society to enable it to play a more effective role in policy making and accountability (Economic Commission for Africa and OECD-DAC 2005).

31. Parliamentary involvement has also been partial. Taking past experience, the IMF found that, of 29 PRSPs completed to July 2003, only 13 were sent to Parliament (although not necessarily debated), and only three were reviewed by a parliamentary committee (IMF IEO 2004). Yet on the rare occasions when parliament intervened in development policy, it was rarely to advance the interests of the poor, as is also likely to be the case for other excluded groups. One study concluded that, when parliaments insist on changes to budgets, it is usually in order to increase the allocation to non-priority sectors (Alonso et al. 2005).

32. This experience reinforces civil society opinion that power relations and the politics of development are ignored, that agreement with states does not mean agreement and consensus across the citizenry, and that ownership needs to take into account internal democratic debates about policy process in each country (CCIC 2006). It also supports analysts who argue for a broad consensus in society about the legitimacy of national institutions and processes of decision-making (Leftwich in Foresti 2006). A dialogue about good ownership that goes beyond '*social consensus about development goals and how to pursue them*' to include '*the mechanisms of representation, interest aggregation (rather than just a consultation/participation) and accountability that underpin such a consensus*' (Foresti et al. 2006:29). Within this debate, Eyben (2007) points out the importance of recognising the diversity of voices, and space for discussion and contestation.

33. Recognising relations of power points to the importance of a rights based approach to national policy (APRODEV 2006), and the instituting of a series of rights: the '*the right to vote, the right to association, the right to information,*

freedom of expression.... (Foresti et al. 2006:28) to secure this engaged citizenship. The legal framework is not enough. Uvin (cited in Foresti 2006) talks of the danger of human rights approaches neglecting non-legal and non-state mechanisms of change. Attention to social exclusion dimensions stresses the importance of the empowerment of the poor (CCIC 2006), necessary for sustainable impact for and by poor men and women.

34. A summary table, drawn from the literature, outlining opportunities of actively linking cross cutting issues in promoting ownership, and risks of ignoring them is included below.

<p>Summary of key points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Paris Declaration calls for broad consultative processes, and encouraging the participation of civil society• Broad ownership requires political support across parliaments, civil society and government at local as well as national levels• Ownership recognises power and political dimensions of development <p>Opportunities with cross cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Promoting models of partnership across government, between government, other state actors and civil society.• Promoting engaged citizenship, voice, developing social consensus on policies for sustainable national ownership, and buy in across society <p>Risks of ignoring cross cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Threat to ongoing policy dialogue on gender equality, human rights and social exclusion issues• Closing down of political space for wider government and civil society actors, particularly those most concerned with gender, rights and securing interests of marginalised, and excluded social groups
--

D.2 The principle of alignment

35. **Alignment** refers to donor alignment with country partners' **strategies**, and cites Poverty Reduction Strategies as an example. Alignment through strengthened country **systems** includes reference to assessments and diagnostics, and transparency and accountability around public financial management. The Declaration itself recognises the need for donors to go beyond "*sound technical analysis*" and also "*be responsive to the broader social political and economic environment*" in strengthening partner capacity (OECD DAC 2005:para 25).

Strategy alignment

36. At the global level, strategic alignment that integrates gender equality, human rights and social exclusion issues is best realised in the international

conventions and commitments, of which most, if not all, donor and recipient countries are signatories. The OECD DAC policy on human rights draws on the link between these commitments and development dialogue. *'Human rights constitute a unique, internationally shared and accepted normative framework, reflecting global, moral and political values'* (OECD DAC 2007a:para 5). *'The links between human rights obligations and development priorities should be a regular feature of dialogue with partner governments at a political level as well as the development level'* (OECD DAC 2007a:para 40(1)).

37. Foresti et al see the human rights framework as defining moral, personal as well as political perspectives on the world. *'Human rights have value in themselves and that they embody international consensus on certain core objectives and attributes of what it is to be human'* (Foresti et al 2006:p7). Applying this framework can define parameters of engagement. *'The human rights framework is a good place to start a political dialogue between donors and partners defining the 'inner' and 'outer' boundaries of acceptable behaviour in respect of political governance issues'* (Foresti et al 2006:20).

38. Alignment on international commitments on gender is one of the recommendations of the DAC sponsored paper by Gaynor, on gender equality and the Paris Declaration. *'Alignment requires that donors who have gender equality policies and who have made international commitments align with the gender equality policies and commitments of partners and strengthen capacity for coordinated action;* (OECD DAC 2006c:para 3) a recommendation echoed by the Burundi Communique from African government and civil society (UNIFEM 2006c:2). This comment that would equally apply to international commitments on other forms of social exclusion such as those related to age and disability.

39. Alignment is with regional as well as international commitments. UNIFEM's strategy for the lobbying and advocacy of governments by women's organisations, goes beyond CEDAW and Beijing commitments, to include those of the WTO, NEPAD, The Africa Union and COMESA (UNIFEM 2006a).

40. Lack of donor alignment, particularly in macroeconomic policy, is an issue that continues to be raised by civil society, concerned with continuing conditionality despite the principle of country ownership (CCIC 2006). These concerns include poverty impacts of constraints in government expenditure. Oxfam International takes the experience of Poverty Reduction Strategies as an example, of 20 Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) completed by March 2003, 16 had IMF Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility programmes agreed before PRSP completion, with macroeconomic policy choices that were not subject to meaningful dialogue (Oxfam International 2004). This is compounded by the fact that most countries are still unable to assess the poverty implications of their macroeconomic policy choices (Agulhas 2006a).

41. Shortfalls in policy coherence across government, and integration of gender rights and exclusion issues into national strategies, limit the impact of dialogue on

international commitments and hence the impact they can have on the lives of the poor. This points to the importance of attention to implementation, capacity and systems support that also forms part of the Paris Declaration commitments on alignment.

System alignment

42. The use of national level country systems and procedures has dominated thinking around systems alignment. In terms of impact on the poor and excluded groups, funding flows to local government and organisations are extremely important. UNIFEM raise the concern that the Paris Declaration does not measure flow of resources to local levels (UNIFEM 2006b), and ask for clarity as to alignment with or fiscal transfers to these levels.

43. The literature stresses that capacity building of country systems is necessarily a long-term process. There are often strong vested interests in established practices. There is also considerable concern about the quality of technical assistance. The DAC has produced extensive guidance on various aspects of systems alignment (OECD DAC 2006b). Among its key messages is the importance of avoiding template approaches to institution building, or solutions that are technically too complex for the country context. It also stresses the importance of understanding the political environment, and of building relationships with and developing consensus among stakeholders.

44. Assessments are an area of systems development that has considerable scope for securing linkages with gender, rights and exclusion issues. Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA) at one level has the potential to generate better understanding of the distributional impact of development policies, so as to improve outcomes for the poor and marginalised. More importantly it can provide a practical, inclusive and more transparent approach to policymaking, as evidenced in Ghana and Tanzania (Jones 2007). However, the use of PSIA has not been well institutionalised. Poverty Reduction Strategies are not yet progressive in their pattern of expenditure and service delivery, sectoral analysis pays limited attention to distributional and equality issues (Agulhas 2006a, World Bank OED 2004). The World Bank has stressed the opportunities that assessment tools provide; PSIA are mandatory in the organisation, policy reforms must have a distributional impact on poverty, ethnicity and gender, and Poverty Expenditure Reviews analyse distributional impact of public expenditures in terms of income and gender (UNIFEM 2006a:14).

45. Processes of assessment and information gathering have also had positive outcomes. Engagement with civil society and qualitative and participative evidence gathering has increased the amount of knowledge available on poverty. Drawing on past experience of PRSPs, involving a range of stakeholders, including CSOs, in investigating poverty has helped to trigger public debate on its multidimensional nature and causes. They have also raised awareness of government policies and

services and their impact on the poor. There is wider knowledge and growing perspectives on poverty, slowly moving away from the concentration in a few government sites and development agencies (Agulhas 2006a:para121-2). Such a model contributes to wider country ownership and NGOs are concerned to see a more demand driven process of assessment, such as PSIAs, that helps to strengthen accountability in country between government and its citizens as well as between government and donors (Jones 2007).

46. There is political support from development agencies for participative processes around assessment and design. *'Legislatures and citizens groups of the recipient countries should be adequately represented in the country assessment process'* (United Nations Economic and Social Council 2007:para 39), recognising that a major challenge is how *'civil society should play a more visible role in participating in the design and in monitoring the use of resources'* (United Nations Economic and Social Council (2007:para 48).

47. There are wider capacity building opportunities related to systems development that would support work around human rights, social exclusion and gender equality. These include the capacity of the government to fulfil its rights obligations, and support for civil society to enabling engaged citizenship across poor and excluded groups. In addition there is the potential for specific capacity support. Bartsch talks of *'capacity development for human rights responsive country systems'* (Bartsch 2007:5) and UNIFEM of *'capacity building for bureaucracies dedicated to advancing gender equality'* UNIFEM 2006b:5).

48. A summary table, drawn from the literature, outlining opportunities of actively linking cross cutting issues in promoting alignment, and risks of ignoring them is included below.

<p>Summary of key points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Paris Declaration is more than technical analysis, and is to be responsive to the broader social political and economic environment• International and regional commitments on gender, rights and exclusion issues are already aligned• Local as well as national systems are important for resource flows to the poor and excluded• Processes around assessment and information are key entry points• Capacity support on gender, rights and exclusion issues required for policy coherence and implementation <p>Opportunities with cross cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing consensus over international and regional commitments as basis of dialogue by donor, government departments and civil society.• Donors aligning with country (government, and civil society)

attention to gender, rights and exclusion policy issues through reviews and assessment of national policy, strategies, instruments and procedures, and subsequent capacity building.

Risks of ignoring cross cutting issues

- Donor dialogue excludes or marginalises gender equality, human rights and social exclusion issues
- Budgetary processes unrelated to impact on poor and disadvantaged social groups, and to mechanisms for accountability
- Political conditionality is perceived as a negative conditionality, not as intrinsic principle of international partnership dialogue

D.3 The principle of harmonisation

49. **Harmonisation** concerns common donor arrangements, and notes “*harmonisation efforts are also needed on other cross-cutting issues, such as gender equality*” (OECD DAC 2005:para 42). It commits donors to using their different comparative advantage, recognising complementarity across the donor community, and instituting lead donor responsibilities. Aid delivery in fragile states recognises the importance of equitable access to government services, and engagement with a broad range of actors including “*country, regional, sector or non-government systems*” (OECD DAC 2005:para 39) in the absence of central government-led strategies.

50. The reference to gender in the context of the Paris Declaration principle of harmonisation provides a clear entry-point for gender equality. For UNIFEM “*it may well be that it is under the rubric of ‘harmonization’ that the best opening exists for introducing gender equality assessments of aid effectiveness*” (UNIFEM 2006b:5), though they recognise that this may not be straightforward. “*For gender to survive as a central element of harmonized approaches, commitments to gender mainstreaming amongst donors must be robust*” (UNIFEM 2006b:5), and recent evaluations suggest this is not the case.

51. More generally, internationally agreed human rights provide a legal and political legitimacy for harmonisation, and can provide “*a starting point for agreeing on the substantive priorities to be addressed*” (Bartsch 2007:3) with human rights framework, principles and analysis supporting a common conceptual framework and methodology. This is particularly important in fragile states (Foresti et al 2006).

52. The importance of monitoring harmonised donor behaviour has been raised by UNIFEM, and the OECD DAC GENDERNET who specify that “*gender equality needs to be tracked in programme budget approaches, joint analytical work and joint gender assessment work*” (OECD DAC 2006c:Annex 1,3).

53. A summary table, drawn from the literature, outlining opportunities of actively linking cross cutting issues in promoting harmonisation, and risks of ignoring them is included below.

<p>Summary of key points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Harmonisation on gender equality and other cross cutting issues is in the Paris Declaration• Donor harmonisation on cross-cutting issues needs monitoring <p>Opportunities with cross cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gender, rights and exclusion issues to support criteria for prioritisation internationally across the donor community and with country partners• Use of joint working building on efforts with the environment• Use of comparative advantage in dimensions of cross-cutting approaches <p>Risks of ignoring cross cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Donor harmonisation excludes or marginalises attention to gender, rights and exclusion issues• Division of labour (e.g. Joint Assistance Strategies), which focuses on instruments or sectors rather than cross cutting themes, reduces donor presence and policy dialogue on these issues – and, potentially, agency capacity – in these areas.
--

D.4 The principle of managing for results

54. **Managing for results** aims to link partner country strategies with spending, measured through the use of results oriented frameworks. This means *‘results-oriented reporting and assessment frameworks that monitor progress against key dimensions of the national and sector development strategies’* (OECD DAC 2005:para44). Whilst none of the assessment frameworks described in the context of the Paris Declaration explicitly incorporate the monitoring of gender and social equity (UNIFEM 2006b), the measuring of impact and its use for policy and strategy design is of direct relevance for addressing gender equality, human rights and social exclusion issues, and there is a wealth of experience globally that can be drawn upon. In discussing the Paris Declaration, Foresti et al (2006) cite UNIFEM’s guidelines on the use results based management for processes of empowerment of the poor and excluded, as a useful way forward

55. Donor harmonising with partner country monitoring and reporting means a reliance on partner countries’ statistical monitoring and evaluation systems. This is problematic in many cases, not only in terms of availability and reliability but also in terms of relevance. It is not possible to monitor and evaluate impacts on poor and

excluded men and women if the information is not structured to collect and collate such data. The OECD DAC and UNIFEM call for disaggregated data, essential to support gender responsive indicators. Data is needed for the monitoring of human rights, and development of rights based indicators (Bartsch 2007). Disaggregation is also required to monitor other excluded groups, for example by race, ethnicity, age and disability.

56. OECD guidelines on managing for results stress the importance of multi-stakeholder dialogue and broad ownership at all phases, from identifying outcomes to developing and monitoring interventions. They also stress that results information is necessary, not just for mutual learning, but also for accountability. Information on results should be publicly available, but presented in a positive way to prevent managers from becoming risk averse (OECD DAC 2006f).

57. The World Bank has commented that results orientation is the hardest of the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) principles to implement (World Bank OED 2004). OECD members have been concerned about the way CDF principles have been applied asking for assessment criteria that prioritise stakeholder participation in national strategies, links to the Millennium Development Goals, and a clear relationship between strategies and medium term budgets (UNIFEM 2006b). There is a major gap between the ideal of evidence-based policy making promoted by donors, and the reality in most developing countries. In a recent study of PRS monitoring systems in 16 countries around the world, there were only two (Uganda and Tanzania) that had made any significant effort to incorporate results information into the budget process (Bedi et al. 2006).

58. Civil society are also disappointed with the approach taken for managing for results, arguing that there is a lack of learning from past approaches including civil society work with poverty (Sjöblom 2006). This includes valuable experiences, such as participative forums, that have taken place under Poverty Reduction Strategies (Reality of Aid Global Network 2007). At the same time a focus on managing for results could address concerns that the Paris Declaration does not deal with content (UK Aid network 2006).

59. The Managing for Results source book (OECD DAC 2006f) provides positive examples of dialogue, voice and accountability demonstrating that *'country-level participatory M&E systems can emerge successfully'* (Saide and Nhate 2006:1). Saide and Nhate use an example of a poverty observatory in Mozambique, proposed by civil society for mutual transparency, accountability and dialogue. Put in place by the government in 2003, their discussions are now taken into account in policy making and planning at provincial and national levels. Another example, the Open Society Forum, has supported public expenditure tracking and social auditing (participatively designed and implemented auditing) for participatory assessment and monitoring and a 'national development dialogue'. It enabled civil society to become active in public management reform, in the forming of policy as well as monitoring impact (Dambadarjaa 2006).

60. A summary table, drawn from the literature, outlining opportunities of actively linking cross cutting issues in promoting managing for results, and risks of ignoring them is included below.

<p>Summary of key points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Importance of multi-stakeholder dialogue and broad ownership at all phases,• Disaggregated statistics are a prerequisite to monitor and evaluate impact on poor and excluded men and women• Positive examples exist of empowerment, voice and accountability in managing for results <p>Opportunities with cross cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensuring that distributional impacts are captured and fed into policy and strategy design• Using of rights based indicators to monitor government obligations <p>Risks of ignoring cross cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focusing on systems does not lead to monitoring of content, and poverty and equality outcomes
--

D.5 The principle of mutual accountability

61. **Mutual accountability** calls for both donors and partners to be accountable for development. Of particular relevance to gender, rights and exclusion concerns are partner country commitments to *“strengthen as appropriate parliamentary role in national development strategies and or budgets.... reinforce participatory approaches by systematically involving a broad range of development partners”* (OECD DAC 2005:para48) and for donors to *“provide transparent and comprehensive information on aid flows to enable partners to present budget reports to legislatures and citizens”* (OECD DAC 2005:para49).

62. There is recognition in the DAC that civil society should play a greater role in building structures that facilitate accountability and transparency, with suggestions for integrating civil society in country strategy preparation and providing help with its capacity building (OECD DAC 2006d). Meanwhile there is a vocal civil society critique of current aid effectiveness practice pinpointing the absence of civil society voice and role in making governments accountable and transparent (Sjöblom 2006). This accountability is needed across the board, from design to implementation and monitoring. Drawing on experience of direct budget support, many African NGOs concluded that governments failed to take civil society voice sufficiently seriously in policy implementation, and civil society has demanded

scrutiny of accounting and budgeting processes (Action Aid International and Oxfam International 2005). One recent study found that the dialogue on aid mechanics, including preferred modalities, was purely between donors and government, with little civil society engagement (Aguilhas 2006b).

63. One issue raised in the literature is whether strengthening the accountability relationship between donors and government might displace domestic accountability processes and overshadow government's responsibility to parliament and the public. External accountability has been viewed as mostly input rather than outcome based, whilst internal accountability is the aid-recipient governments accountability to their own people on policy making and outcomes and means '*openness to parliaments, civil society organizations and the media*' (Mfunwa 2006:4). Civil society and other analysts see aid effectiveness as emphasising an upward accountability to donors and not enough downward accountability to civil society, thus reinforcing the power of the donor block in the country (Hussain et al. 2006, Eyben 2007). This, along with a focus on donor negotiation with the executive, has tended to marginalise the role of parliament. Civil society demand a public scrutiny, not only for donors and recipient governments but also of NGOs themselves (Hussain et al. 2006).

64. Internal and external accountability have mutual impact. There is a view that internal accountability is good for donors as it '*supposedly leads to long-term sustainability of projects, country ownership and support, lower monitoring and transactions costs*' (Mfunwa 2006:8), helps keep elected representatives in line, and helps reduce corruption. This is echoed by Lawson et al (2005) who argue that, by encouraging governments to generate information on their performance in a timely and accessible manner, donor harmonised conditionality on accountability, through the Performance Assessment Framework mechanism, ought to increase the capacity of parliament and civil society to hold government to account.

65. Civil society demands for effective accountability ask for a democratic participation, with transparency and accountability needed to secure human rights obligations of governments towards their citizens (CCIC 2006). CCIC are concerned to institute democratic negotiation, such as parliamentary process, to ensure participation and empowerment of poor people and not simply their representatives. Mfunwa (2006) similarly argues for new aid modalities to secure the participation of the poor, to collaborate with extra-govt state institutions such as parliaments, and civil society organisations that exercise budget oversight, and for donors to support capacity of these institutions in this role. The example of Gender Budget Initiatives link accountability systems with public expenditure (UNIFEM 2006b).

66. The power differentials between donor and recipient country are well acknowledged. In applying the dictum that power dictates priorities, Eyben recognises that '*both governments and donors, and their constituent organisations are subject to multiple accountability relationships, often with partners with divergent or conflicting expectations*' (Eyben 2007:2). Eyben argues for the

recognition and support for diverse diagnoses of problems, and need for contestation, deliberation and dialogue across these diverse opinions.

67. To put horizontal as well as vertical accountability in place requires specific human rights, such as the right to vote, to information, freedom of association and expression (Bartsch 2007). This points to the role international human rights standards can play in monitoring progress in accountability.

68. Capacity building in accountability covers both governments, with institutional strengthening of domestic accountability of government to citizens, and citizens, with strengthening of capacity of rights holders to claim their rights (Foresti et al 2006). UNIFEM (2006b) calls for the need for capacity building to ensure that accountability systems per se are gender sensitive. Gaynor's paper on gender and aid effectiveness recognises specifically that women have key role in strengthening the parliamentary role in national development strategies and budgets (OECD DAC 2006c). This is also true for other excluded groups. Eyben and Ladbury (2006) ask that donors support autonomous research institutions, funding spaces for debate and especially for strengthening the voice of marginalised peoples to participate.

69. A summary table, drawn from the literature, outlining opportunities of actively linking cross cutting issues in promoting mutual accountability and risks of ignoring them is included below.

<p>Summary of key points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Paris Declaration is committed to strengthen the role of parliament and broad based participatory approaches• Recognition of importance of role of civil society in securing transparency and accountability• Downward accountability to society needed in addition to upward accountability to donors• Efforts are needed to secure accountability to poor and marginalised women and men <p>Opportunities with cross cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support use and development of national accountability mechanisms between government and citizens• Support processes and capacities for citizens claiming rights and government responding to demand <p>Risks of ignoring cross cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accountability to citizens, and civil society relegated to a secondary and separate process
--

E. Monitoring and evaluating the Paris Declaration

70. Donor and partner countries have agreed a set of indicators, targets, timetables and processes to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Paris Declaration. The work programme on monitoring the Paris Declaration is well underway with a baseline survey of progress against the 12 Paris Declaration indicators complemented by other qualitative assessments. The DAC Network on Evaluation is overseeing donor, country and thematic based assessments. A number of activities are being planned in preparation for the Accra High Level Forum in 2008, which will take the form of a mid-term review of the implementation process.

71. A total of 37 countries agreed to participate in the 2006 baseline survey on aid effectiveness, managed by the DAC Secretariat. A further round of monitoring will be carried out in 2008, and will provide the main source for the progress report presented at Accra. Although the 12 indicators are decided upon, partner countries are encouraged to set their own targets, produce local definitions of key concepts such as programme based approaches, appropriate to the country context. Progress is agreed between the government and donors. As commented on by Gaynor *‘these indicators are of a highly technical nature and focused on delivery mechanisms and thus are not amenable to meaningful gender equality mainstreaming’* (OECD DAC 2006c:para 23). The paper sees better scope in a progress report looking at all 56 commitments, and how they have been interpreted.

72. In addition to the survey data, assessment of Public Financial Management systems will be taken from the World Bank’s Country Policy and Institutional Assessment CPIA while the assessment of procurement systems will be done by the DAC according to criteria developed by the Joint Venture on Procurement. The existence of an operational Poverty Reduction Strategy and a sound performance assessment framework will be taken from the World Bank’s Aid Effectiveness Review, a follow-on to the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF), although it is not clear if this will be repeated in the future as it is possible it will be merged with the DAC survey in 2008.

73. Sources of information for Paris Declaration indicators are outlined in the table below.

Sources of information for Paris Declaration Indicators			
	Indicators	DAC Questionnaire	Desk reviews
1	Ownership – operational PRS		CDF (WB)
2a	Quality of PFM systems		CPIA (WB)
2b	Quality of procurement systems		DAC JV Procurement
3	Aid reported on budget	■	
4	Coordinated capacity development	■	
5a	Use of country PFM systems	■	

5b	Use of country procurement systems	■	
6	Parallel Project Implementation Units	■	
7	In-year predictability	■	
8	Untied aid	■	DAC
9	Use of programme-based approaches	■	
10	Joint missions & analytical work	■	
11	Sound performance assessment framework		CDF (WB)
12	Reviews of mutual accountability	■	

74. A number of the CDF indicators are relevant to gender, rights and exclusion issues, such as the extent to which countries have a holistic strategy, civil society involvement, parliamentary involvement and stakeholder access to development information. But, as cited previously, OECD members have been concerned about the way CDF principles have been applied, asking for assessment criteria that prioritise stakeholder participation in national strategies, links to the Millennium Development Goals, and a clear relationship between strategies and medium term budgets (UNIFEM 2006b).

75. The sources of information for complementary indicators can be drawn from a wider net of existing reporting requirements. For example, UNIFEM has worked on finding indicators that link across different national commitments, for example supporting efforts to align Direct Budget Support, Poverty Reduction Strategy and Millennium Development Goal indicators with those tracking progress on CEDAW and the Beijing Platform for Action (UNIFEM 2006b:9). More generally civil society is critical of the indicators used, asking for wider definitions, including a qualitative assessment of performance, and a monitoring of relationships as well as results, across wider society not just government and donors (UK Aid Network 2006).

76. The evaluation of the Paris Declaration will begin in 2007, overseen by the DAC Network on Evaluation through the Danish Institute for International Studies. It will involve a series of evaluations of Paris Declaration implementation at country level, together with global evaluations of particular donors, focusing on changes in donor behaviour. The first round of subjects will be self-selected, with the evaluations taking place between May and December 2007.

77. The evaluation will include a series of thematic studies, still to be finalised, looking at issues such as the untying of aid, fragile states, civil society participation and the links between aid effectiveness and development effectiveness. There is potential for including a focus on gender, rights and exclusion issues, and ensuring that evidence gathering work that is being carried out is integrated into overall findings. There are concerns to ensure coherence between the different studies and ensure lessons learned are brought together. The findings will be summarised in a synthesis report, to be prepared in 2008.

78. To facilitate coherence and synergies between the different elements of the evaluation, the draft TORs for the first phase (OECD DAC Evaluation Network

2007), propose a theory-based results framework for the evaluation. This framework sets out 'inputs' (in the form of behavioural changes around Paris Declaration implementation), outputs (Paris Declaration targets), several levels of outcomes (e.g., increased country capacity, more efficient and equitable public expenditure, institutional development/coordination for private investment), and impacts (sustainable economic growth and transformation resulting in attainment of Millennium Development Goals and other national development goals). Several of these outcomes are not specified in the Paris Declaration. Currently the draft framework does not include poverty and inequality reduction as impacts, an oversight given their importance as the intended goal of the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for Scoping Phase One

AID EFFECTIVENESS AND SOCIAL POLICY EVIDENCE GATHERING PROJECT ON CROSS CUTTING ISSUES – GENDER EQUALITY, RIGHTS AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

Scoping Phase One

Terms of Reference

Background and rationale

1 In March 2005 over one hundred donors and developing countries agreed to undertake some landmark reforms in the way they do business together. The *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* marks an unprecedented level of consensus and resolve to reform aid and to make it more effective in combating global poverty.

2 The *Paris Declaration* is based on five overarching principles or partnership commitments – ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for development results and mutual accountability. It goes beyond previous agreements and lays down a practical, action-oriented roadmap intended to improve the quality of aid and its impact on development and to shift the balance of power away from donors to a greater emphasis on mutual accountability with partner countries. The Paris Declaration specifies indicators, time tables and targets and has an evolving agenda for clarification and dissemination on commitments and for implementation and monitoring of progress, up to 2010. This includes a **Third High Level Forum to take place in Ghana in autumn 2008**.

3 In their efforts towards implementation of the *Paris Declaration*, donors and partners have been primarily focusing on improving ownership by partner countries and the efficiency of financial and administrative arrangements. This focus on aid delivery modalities, strengthening country leadership, alignment behind country strategies and financial systems, appropriate mix of aid instruments, harmonisation of donor procedures and adoption of joint approaches, is an essential contribution to making aid more effective.

4 **However, the five overall principles of the *Paris Declaration* have broader implications than improvements in aid delivery per se and greater attention needs to be paid to ensuring development leads to improved poverty outcomes, especially for poor, vulnerable and excluded groups.** The principles are major reference points for strengthening broad based ownership, guiding policy dialogue, shaping the contents of development co-operation programmes and bringing about institutional and budgetary changes required to improve poverty outcomes and empower poor and excluded groups.

5 More attention is required on the ends as well as the means of channelling aid if we want to ensure the equitable and sustainable achievement of the

Millennium Development Goals. In particular, more evidence is needed on cross cutting social policy issues, such as human rights, social inclusion and gender equality, and these need to be brought into mainstream work on the Paris Declaration (see annex A for further rationale for this emphasis).

6 The work programme on monitoring the Paris Declaration is well underway. It will focus primarily on the baseline survey and the twelve indicators and corresponding targets in the Paris Declaration (see annex B for further details) and also the multi donor evaluation of the Paris Declaration which is likely to focus on donor behaviour and attitudes. However, the review of progress in Ghana in 2008 will not only focus on the monitoring survey and the indicators of progress and targets. There will be a progress report looking at all 56 commitments, and more generally at how the spirit of the commitments has translated.

7 DFID CLEAR and Equity and Rights team are commissioning an evidence gathering exercise on aid effectiveness and cross cutting social policy issues to fill this identified gap. We are seeking to develop some shared analysis, in the spirit of the Paris principles, across DFID's Global Development Effectiveness Division and Policy and Research Division, and other bilateral donors (e.g. Nordic +), civil society and partner country institutions. This work will complement on going work and fill an evidence gap both at the international level but also within DFID, including the work the Central Research Department is doing on the effectiveness of aid, our support to the baseline survey analysis and evidence based work on Aid Effectiveness and country led approaches¹.

Scope

8 The overall goal of the evidence gathering will be to improve the evidence base on social policy cross cutting issues, aid effectiveness, and poverty outcomes. It will explore the implementation of the Paris declaration through the social policy lens of human rights, social inclusion and gender equality to:

- Provide evidence on the experience to date of the Paris Declaration's key principles and partnership commitments in *advancing* cross cutting and social policy issues central to multi dimensional poverty reduction outcomes² – human rights, social inclusion and gender equality;
- the potential for cross cutting social policy issues *to contribute to and strengthen* the implementation and review of the Paris Declaration;
- propose recommendations for furthering cross cutting social policy issues; through the mainstream aid effectiveness agenda and debate, and

¹ In particular it will complement recent evidence work commissioned by DFID on Aid effectiveness and CLA e.g. Agulhas 2006 and ODI on CLA 2006

² E.g. impact and outcomes for poor, excluded and marginalised groups including women on e.g. socio economic impacts changes in livelihoods, voice and accountability, agency and decision making, access to goods and services etc

- map key opportunities and entry points, and develop and support implementation of a partnership and influencing strategy to build a receptive environment for the evidence and recommendations, which speaks to the mainstream aid effectiveness agenda, across partners and countries, and which ultimately influences the outcomes at Ghana.

9 This will include a focus on changes in policy content, institutional changes, funding flows, power relationships and poverty outcomes, resulting from the Paris Declaration. (Annex C & D provide examples of some of the issues and key questions we are seeking to address in phase 2).

10 The aim is to help to articulate a clear evidence-based position at *Ghana 2008* for strengthening the focus on social policy and poverty outcomes as part of the aid effectiveness agenda post Ghana and beyond. It will help to strengthen links with the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) and influence the mainstream aid effectiveness agenda. It will also contribute to the consolidated progress report, inform and influence donor positions, and feed into policy and practice to improve implementation and review of Paris, including how cross cutting social policy issues may be promoted and monitored as part of the aid effectiveness agenda in the future.

11 This project will be undertaken in two phases. Phase one is the scoping phase and phase two will be the evidence gathering, and partnership and influencing. **The focus of this consultancy is phase one.** Based on the outcome from phase one the aim is to go to tender for phase two.

Phase One Purpose

12 The purpose of this consultancy is to undertake the scoping work, and to produce a proposal and terms of reference in preparation for tender for phase 2.

Phase One Outputs

13 There are five key outputs for this phase:

- An analytical framework and approach on aid effectiveness and social policy including gender, rights and social inclusion. This should be based on a literature review, findings of the Paris baseline survey, recent synthesis reports³, NGO critiques and discussions with key stakeholders. It should bring together thinking on mainstream aid effectiveness issues and social policy.
- A partnership and influencing strategy which identifies and maps key opportunities, partners and processes for DFID and partners to engage with.

³ E.g. Agulhas April 2006, ODI CLA paper Nov 2006;

The aim is to build a receptive environment and broader understanding of the importance of cross cutting social policy issues, leading up to Ghana 2008. It has to speak to the mainstream aid effectiveness audiences, the joint ventures and DAC subsidiary bodies, as well as across partners and countries including civil society, and not just social policy experts. It should also identify opportunities for cross fertilisation, peer review and quality assurance with other relevant evidence gathering work.

- A synthesis of relevant literature and evidence work to date on aid effectiveness including social policy, and civil society engagement and perspectives, as well as the mainstream literature as short standalone documents
- Draft ToRs for phase two by end of February in preparation for the tender process for phase two
- A final proposal in the form of a consolidated report in draft by mid March and final by end March (maximum 30 pages), framed according to the Paris principles, outlining:
 - an executive summary
 - an analytical framework through which the Paris principles can be applied to cross cutting social policy issues and development outcomes
 - summary of the existing literature on the relevance of the Paris principles to the cross cutting issues of human rights, social inclusion and gender equality
 - gaps in evidence
 - criteria for selecting case study material
 - a partnership and influencing strategy which includes key milestones up to and including Ghana 2008, and beyond,
 - final ToRs detailing issues, outputs, timeframe, partners and a partnership and influencing strategy

14 It will be important to take on board the overall goal of this evidence gathering project as outlined above in paras 8 - 11. It is also important not to duplicate the more general evidence gathering work to date but to develop and build on this.

Suggested Tasks for Phase One

15 The different team members are responsible for undertaking the following tasks with a view to delivering on the five key outputs as outlined above ():

- Identify and interview key stakeholders
- Review and synthesise the aid effectiveness literature, from a social policy and civil society perspective

- Conduct a stakeholder analysis identifying key players and institutions and their interests and opportunities for partnership building, influencing, and synergies between this work and other ongoing work
- Synthesise the last 10 DAC peer reviews undertaken since 2005 to distil conclusions and lessons learnt about donor engagement with civil society by end February
- Input into the design phase brainstorming session
- Provide feedback and recommendations on draft ToRs, analytical framework and reports as requested by the team leader

16 The team will be made up of three consultants with expertise in aid effectiveness. This will include a social policy expert as team leader and team members including a governance expert and civil society expert. The team leader is responsible for leading and coordinating the team; for facilitating the cross fertilisation of ideas and ensuring a multi disciplinary approach; and for clarifying individual contributions, objectives and deliverables within the required timeframes. A suggested breakdown of tasks according to expertise is presented in Annex E.

17 The team leader has overall responsibility for bringing together the various team member contributions into the final analytical framework, a final consolidated report and ToRs, and for ensuring the team meets the ToRs within the specified timeframe and to good quality. The team leader is also responsible for providing the social policy analytical inputs including the literature review on AE and social policy. Team members are expected to maintain good communication with the team leader; and to feed into the consolidated report as agreed with the team leader at the beginning of the consultancy. Team members will be expected to feed into the initial brainstorming and to produce standalone documents to contribute to the overall report.

23 Phase 1 is to be lead by the Equity and Rights and CLEAR teams in DFID with reporting to Katja Jobes (CLEAR Team) and Rahul Malhotra (Equity and Rights Team, PRD). It is expected that Phase 2 will be supported by other DFID teams (e.g. DPP, FACT, DFI, CHASE) and other donors (e.g. Nordic

CLEAR team and Equity and Rights
Department for International Development

Annex 2: Literature consulted

- Action Aid International and Oxfam International (2005) *Millstone or Milestone: What Rich Countries Must do in Paris to Make Aid work for Poor People*, Action Aid London
- Agulhas (2006a) *Does the country-led approach deliver results? A synthesis of emerging evidence*, April 2006
- Agulhas (2006b) *Synthesis Report and 5 Thematic Reports* prepared for the Manila Forum on Aid Effectiveness, October 2006: <http://www.adb.org/Documents/Events/2006/Aid-Effectiveness/default.asp>
- Alonso, R. et al (2005) *PRSPs & budgets: a synthesis of five case studies*, by R. Alonso, L. Judge & J. Klugman, January 2005
- APRODEV (2006) *Workshop Budgeting the Rights Let's do it!* . Rights & Development Group
- Asian Human Rights Commission: (2006) *The State of Human Rights in Eleven Asian Nations*. Human Rights Report 2006.
- AusAID (2007) *Gender equality in Australia's aid programme – why and how*. Australian Government, March 2007
- Barder, O. (2006) *Are the Planned Increases in Aid too much of a Good Thing?* Centre for Global Development Working Paper no. 90
- Bartsch, S. (2007) *Forty-one ways to study and illustrate the links between human rights and the Paris Declaration*. Internal memo. DAC Secretariat, February 2007
- Bedi, T. et al. (2006) *Beyond the Numbers: Understanding the Institutions for Monitoring Poverty Reduction Strategies* by T.Bedi, A. Coudouel, M. Cox, M. Goldstein & N. Thornton, World Bank, 2006
- Beloe, T. (2005) *Moving towards local definitions of aid effectiveness: how is the OECD DAC Paris Declaration being interpreted in DFID South East Asia partner countries?* Draft. DFID November 2005
- BOND (2007) *All About Aid*. The Net worker. Bond, UK
- Booth, D. and Evans, A. (2006) *Evaluation network follow-up to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: An Options Paper*, March 2006
- Booth, D. et al. (2005) *Politics and Poverty Reduction Strategies: Lessons from*

- Latin American HIPC's*, D. Booth, A. Grigsby & C. Toranza, December 2005
- Brown, G. and Stewart, F. (2006) *The implications of horizontal inequality for aid*. CRISE Working Paper No.36. University of Oxford, December 2006
- Burall, S. & de Renzio, P. (2006) *Monitoring Aid: Experiences and Challenges*, London, Overseas Development Institute
- Burall, S. et al. (2006) *Brief review of the evidence on country-led approaches for updating DFID policy and operational notes*, by S. Burall, K. Christiansen, and V. Wheeler. Centre for Aid and Public Expenditure, Overseas Development Institute, December 2006
- Casson, K. (2001) *Governance and the PRSP process: a review of 23 PRSPs/IPRSPs* DFID, June 2001
- CCIC (2006) *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness - Donor Commitments and Civil Society Critiques*. A CCIC Backgrounder
- Collinson, H. et al. (2005) *Trends in Global Aid Architecture* by H. Collinson, M Hall & K Wiseman. Action-Aid International/CARE, Research Project Workshop Malawi
- Collinson, H. (2006) *Where to now? Implications of Changing Relations Between DFID, Recipient Governments and NGOs in Malawi, Tanzania & Uganda* Action Aid International
- Commonwealth Foundation (2006) *Civil Society Statement on the 2006 Commonwealth Finance Minister's Meeting: An Agenda for Growth and Livelihoods*: Prepared by Commonwealth representatives of civil society in collaboration with the Commonwealth Foundation, July 2006 http://www.commonwealthfoundation.com/uploads/documents/CIVIL_SOCIEITY_STATEMENT2006_24_July_-_Final.doc
- Commonwealth Secretariat (2007) *Update on the 8th Commonwealth Women's Affairs Ministers meeting*. Preparatory meeting of Commonwealth Heads of National Women's Machineries to plan 8WAMM, February 2007
- Dambadarjaa, J. (2006) *The role of civil society in MfDR*. Open Society Forum. Managing for Results, Third International Roundtable, sourcebook 2nd Edition, working draft
- Development Research Centre - Citizenship Participation and Accountability (2006) *Building effective states: taking a citizen's perspective*. June 2006 www.drc-citizenship.org

- DFID (2000a) *Target strategy paper: Realising human rights for poor people*. DFID
- DFID (2000b) *Target strategy paper: Poverty elimination and the empowerment of women*. DFID
- DFID (2005a) *Literature Review on Participation*, Governance Resource Centre, December 2005
- DFID (2005b) *Reducing poverty by tackling social exclusion: a DFID policy paper*. DFID, September 2005
- DFID (2005c) *Review of health and education progress in selected African countries: synthesis report*, Africa Policy Department April 2005
- DFID (2006) *Eliminating World Poverty – Making Governance Work for the Poor. A White Paper on International Development*.
- DFID (2007) Terms of reference to strengthen strategies for the promotion of gender objectives within aid effectiveness initiatives in SE Asia.
- Driscoll, R. with Evans, A. (2005) *Second-generation Poverty Reduction Strategies: new opportunities and emerging issues*, Development Policy Review, Issue 23(1), 2005
- Economic Commission for Africa and OECD DAC (2005) *Development effectiveness in Africa: Promise and Performance – Mutual Accountability*, prepared at the request of NEPAD, October 2005
- EURODAD (2006a) *Civil Society Sign on Donor Double Standards* Financial Times, 14 November 2006
- EURODAD (2006b) *Global civil society denounces aid definitions widening*. Press Release, December 2006
<http://www.eurodad.org/articles/default.aspx?id=749>
- EURODAD (2007) *Putting Donors under Surveillance: A Eurodad briefing on the aid effectiveness agenda* European Network on debt and development March 2007
- Eyben, R. and Ladbury, S. (2006) *Implications for aid practice: taking a citizen's perspective*. Citizenship DRC Synthesis Brief, June 2006
- Eyben, R. (2007) *Power and mutual accountability*. Institute of Development Studies, February 2007
- Foresti, M. et al. (2006) *Aid effectiveness an human rights: strengthening the implementation of the Paris Declaration*, by M. Foresti, D. Booth and T. O'Neil.

ODI, London, October 2006

GADN (2006) Gender equality, new aid modalities and civil society organisations: investigating the implications. UK Gender and Development Network Research Project October 2006 – February 2007. gadnetwork.org.uk, November 2006

Gaynor, C. (2006) *Paris Declaration Commitments and Implications for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment*. Paper for consideration by the OECD-DAC Network on Gender Equality. DCD/DAC/GEN (2006) 1

Greenhill, R. and Watt, P. (2005) *REAL AID an agenda for making aid work*, Action Aid International

GTZ (2003) *Parliaments in Sub-Saharan Africa: actors in poverty reduction?*, December 2003

Hermele, K. (2005) *The Poverty Reduction Strategies: A survey of the literature*, June 2005

Hussain, F. et al. (2006) *Open NGO Letter on Partnership General Budget Support*. Action Aid International, May 2006

IDD and Associates (2006) *Evaluation of General Budget Support: Synthesis Report*, May 2006

IMF IEO (2004) *Report on the evaluation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)*, July 2004

Inter-American Development Bank (2006) *Report on the Regional Workshop on Harmonization and Alignment for Latin America and the Caribbean: Exercising Leadership to Accelerate Change*, December 2006

INTRAC (2006) *Aid Harmonization: Challenges for civil society*, ONTRAC No 33. INTRAC, May 2006

INTRAC (2007) *Counter Terrorism Measures*, Ontrac 35 Special Issue, INTRAC, Oxford

Jones, S. (2007) *Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA) as country led, demand driven and supporting inclusive policymaking: A Summary*. Capacity Development Strategic Framework - summary March 2007.

Lavergne, R. and Wood, J. (2006) *Aid Effectiveness & Non-State Partnerships: Analytical Considerations*. CIDA Working Paper.

Lawson, A. et al. (2005) *Learning from experience with performance assessment frameworks for general budget support*, by A. Lawson, R. Gerster and D.

Hoole, November 2005

McCullagh, P. (2006) *Introductions and Context* to workshop on Gender Equality and Aid Effectiveness. CIDA International Cooperation Day 2006, Working Together for effective aid, November 2006

Menocal, A.R. and Rogerson, A. (2006) *Which Way for the Future of Aid: Southern Civil Society Perspectives on Current Debates on Reform to the International Aid System*. ODI, Working Paper 259, London

Mfunwa, M.G. (2006) *Strengthening internal accountability in the context of programme-based approaches in Sub-Saharan Africa*, German Development Institute Discussion Paper 4/2006. Bonn, March 2006

Mozammel, M. and Odugbemi, S. *With the support of multitudes: using strategic communication to fight poverty through PRSPs*, DFID/World Bank, 2005

ODI (2005) *Linking policies and budgets: implementing Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks in a PRSP context*, ODI Briefing Paper, London, June 2005

ODI (2006) *Promoting Mutual Accountability in Aid Relationships: Synthesis Report*, London, January 2006

OECD DAC (2003) *Harmonising donor practices for effective aid delivery*, DAC Guidelines & Reference Series, 2003

OECD DAC (2005) *Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness: ownership, harmonisation, alignment, results and mutual accountability*. March 2005, Paris <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf>

OECD DAC (2006a) *Development effectiveness in practice – applying the Paris Declaration to advancing gender equality, environmental sustainability and human rights. Concept Note*. December 2006

OECD DAC (2006b) *Harmonising Donor Practices for Effective Aid Delivery*, Vol. 2: Budget Support, Sector Wide Approaches and Capacity Development in Public Financial Management

OECD DAC (2006c) *Paris Declaration commitments and implications for gender equality and women's empowerment*. DAC Network on Gender Equality. DCD/DAC/GEN(2006)1 July 2006

OECD DAC (2006d) *Regional workshops on the Paris Declaration: emerging common themes and key messages*. DCD/DAC(2006)59, November 2006

OECD DAC (2006e) *Report on Implementing & Monitoring the Paris Declaration* DCD/DAC (2006) 56/REV1

- OECD DAC (2006f) *Sourcebook on Managing for Results*, Paris
http://www.oecd.org/document/9/0,2340,en_2649_15587075_36853833_1_1_1_1_00.html
- OECD DAC (2006g) *Survey on Harmonisation and Alignment of Donor Practices*, Paris
- OECD DAC (2006h) *The partnership commitments of the Paris Declaration – the challenges for gender equality work* extracted from the papers and presentations to the joint IANWGE/GENDERNET workshop on aid modalities, Nairobi, January 2006
- OECD DAC (2007a) *Action-oriented policy paper on human rights and development*. DCD/DAC(2007)15/FINAL February 2007
- OECD DAC (2007b) *Mutual accountability: a key driver for better results*; A Background Paper, Third International Roundtable on Managing for Development Results, Hanoi, 5-8 February 2007
- OECD DAC (2007c) Outlook for the high-level forum in Accra, 2008: Concept note and minutes of the first HLF3 steering committee meeting. CD/DAC(2007)17 February 2007
- OECD DAC Evaluation Network (2007) Draft Framework Terms of Reference for the First Phase of the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration. February 2007
- Oxfam International (2004) *From 'donorship' to ownership? Moving towards PRSP Round Two*, Oxfam Briefing Paper, January 2004
- Oxfam (2006) What we do on issue of debt and aid? Oxfam Briefing Paper
[http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what we do/issues/debt/aid/aid_millstone.htm](http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what_we_do/issues/debt/aid/aid_millstone.htm)
- PEFA Secretariat (2005) *Public financial management: Performance Measurement Framework*, June 2005
- Piron, L-H. (2004) *Politics and the PRSP approach: synthesis paper*, ODI Working Paper 237, London, March 2004
- Poulsen, K. (2006) Talking points: workshop on rights based approaches. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark. November 2006
- Pratt, B. (2006) *Aid Harmonisation: Challenges for Civil Society*. ONTRAC 33. Newsletter of the International Training and Research Centre. May 2006.

Reality of Aid Global Network (2007) *NGO Statement on Aid Effectiveness*. February 2007:

Reality of Aid Report (2006) *Focus on Conflict, Security and Development Cooperation* <http://www.realityofaid.org/themeshow.php?id=37>

Saide, M. and Nhate, V. *Mozambique: poverty observatory and the Program Aid Partnership (PAP): policy dialogue, civil society consultation and mutual accountability of donors and government* in *Managing for Results, Third International Roundtable Sourcebook 2nd edition*. Working Draft.

Sen, K. (2007) *The War on Terror and the Appropriation of Development* Ontrac 35 Newsletter of the International Training and Research Centre, January 2007.

Sigamany, I. (2006) *Aid Harmonisation and Gender Matters*. ONTRAC 33 Newsletter of the International Training and Research Centre May 2006

Sjöblom, L. (2006) *Transcript of presentations and discussions, 29th-31st August 2006 International Dialogue Conference: After the Paris Declaration*. SIDA. <http://www.sida.se/shared/jsp/download.jsp?f=Dokumentation+int+konf.pdf&a=23824>

Thornton, N. and Cox, M. (2005) *Developing Poverty Reduction Strategies in Low-Income Countries Under Stress (LICUS) - Final Report*, January 2005

UK Aid Network (2006) *UK Aid Network comments on the 2006 Survey on monitoring the Paris Declaration*. Letter to OECD DAC, April 2006

UNIFEM (2006a) *Owning development: promoting gender equality in new aid modalities and partnerships*. Conference sponsored by the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and the European Commission (EC) 9-11 November 2005, Brussels. Final Conference Report 15 February 2006

UNIFEM (2006b) *Promoting Gender Equality in New Aid Modalities and Partnerships*. UNIFEM Discussion Paper, March 2006

UNIFEM (2006c) *The Burundi communiqué on promoting gender equality and women's human rights in the context of new aid modalities and partnerships*, 11th – 14th July 2006

United Nations Economic and Social Council (2007) *Coherence, coordination and cooperation in the context of the implementation of the Monterrey Consensus*. Note by the Secretary-General for the Special high-level meeting with the Bretton Woods institutions, the World Trade Organisation and the United Nations Conference of Trade and Development, New York 16 April 2007. March 2007

- VANI (2006) *Foreign Contributions Regulations Act: Issues and Options*. Civil Society Voices, Voluntary Action Network India, December 2006
- VANI/INTRAC (2006) *Challenges to Development: Legislation and their effects on non governmental organisations* (unpublished) Final Report of Conference held in Delhi India. Published by Voluntary Action Network India, New Delhi 2006
- Wallace, T. et al. (2006) *The Aid Chain*, by T. Wallace, L. Bornstein and J Chapman, ITDG Publishing
- World Bank (2005) *Enabling country capacity to achieve results: 2005 CDF Progress Report*, 2005
- World Bank and IMF (2004) *Summaries of ten country case studies undertaken as part of the IEO evaluation of the PRSP/PRGF and OED review of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRSP) approach*, July 2004
- World Bank OED (2004) *The Poverty Reduction Strategy initiative: an independent evaluation of the World Bank's support through 2003*.