

## Annex 1 – Terms of Reference



### UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME NATIONAL INSTITUTION BUILDING PROJECT MID-TERM EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### I. Position Information

Job Code Title: International Consultant and Local Consultant for National Institution Building Project External Evaluation

Type of contract: Individual Contract (IC)

Pre-classified Grade:

Supervisor: UNDP Deputy Country Director (Programme)

#### II. Organizational Context

Building robust government institutions for effective governance and a professional and responsive civil service with the overall aim of improving service delivery to Afghan people is one of the top priorities of the Government of Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (GIRA). In the Afghanistan National Development Strategy (ANDS), Capacity Development (CD) has been identified as a cross-cutting issue and the improvement of public sector capacity in particular as the key challenge to development in Afghanistan. It has been recognized that unless adequate capacities are built, technical and financial support will remain underutilized to the detriment of the development process.

The National Institution Building Project (NIBP), to be implemented over four years (2010-2013), provides a comprehensive package of CD support required by the government at the national and sub-national levels. The primary objectives of the project is to enhance capacity within the ministries at all three levels, namely institutional, organizational and individual, which would ultimately result in improved service delivery through an efficient, organized and trained civil service. The visible impact would be better budget utilization, rationalized organization structures and well-trained civil servants.

The results of NIBP are achieved primarily through provision of services of Capacity Development Advisors (CDAs) in select government entities at national and sub-national level to provide coaching and advisory services for institutional strengthening, organizational reforms and skills development. At the sub-national level, the focus of CD under the project is to enhance the planning, implementation and monitoring capacity within the provincial departments of ministries/agencies.

Public administration in Afghanistan suffers from systemic problems of fragmented structures, lack of skilled professionals, recruitment and performance management as well as little delegation to provincial departments. While most government services are delivered at provincial and district levels, powers and responsibilities of sub-national administration are determined by the centre. Expenditures at provincial and local levels are made through national programmes carried out by provincial arms of central ministries. The GIRA has taken several steps towards strengthening sub-national governance and local administration in Afghanistan. CD at sub-national level in Afghanistan faces myriad challenges, which include factors such as institutional weaknesses, lack of talent pool and poor human capacities.

The overall goal of the government is to improve delivery of public services. However, wide disparities exist across Afghanistan at sub-national level in terms of capacity to deliver public services. Building capacity in terms of transfer of knowledge and skills at sub-national level in Afghanistan has largely suffered from the gap in demand and supply.

## **1. EVALUATION PURPOSE**

A mid-term evaluation will be conducted to measure qualitatively and quantitatively the project progress and will attempt to measure impact in terms of whether and how the CD support to different institutions, organizations and individuals resulted in the expected and needed impact at the enabling environment level, organizational level and individual level and whether and how the project is developing the public administration reform (PAR) management and coordination capacity of the Independent Administrative Reform and Civil Service Commission (IARCSC). The evaluation also aims at understanding the relevance of the project and its design. The result of the mid-term evaluation will be incorporated into the policies, strategies and plans of the project, and inform the future interventions of UNDP in the capacity building and national institutions building area.

## **2. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

The project initiated in January of 2010, is set to be completed by December, 2013. The scope of the mid-term evaluation shall have the following objectives:

- To examine to what extent the project has achieved the intended outputs, and in what specific areas the project excelled or failed in progress toward intended outputs.
- To indicate whether or not intended project impacts and outcomes are being met and/or, for specific outcomes, whether satisfactory progress was made.
- To analyse underlying factors that are influencing project impacts and outputs.
- To identify and analyse barriers and constraints that have delayed implementation, including challenges emanating from internal and external sources.
- To identify a list of 'lessons learned' and make recommendations for corrections, including in relation to i) the specific CD services provided by the project (are they appropriate for the client and do they respond to the demands and felt needs of the client?); and ii) the sourcing of capacity (what is the general experience and are steps be taken to source capacity from institutions and networks beyond those considered under the project?).
- Extract the lessons learned and best practices that can be considered in the planning and design of future support activities for government and recommendations for future direction and areas of focus for the next phase of project.
- To state whether or not targets are being achieved and whether current and planned outputs can be sustained, including determination of measures needed to ensure continued sustainability of results in the future.
- To recommend further interventions.

## **3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

Mid-term Evaluation questions include:

- Are the intended outputs being achieved?
- To what extent has NIBP outputs and assistance contributed to the relevant outcomes?
- What internal or external factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended results?
- Is the project design and intended outputs still consistent with the national priorities and in synergy with other similar interventions by other donors?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- What are additional recommendations to improve service delivery within respected ministries and departments?

- What should be the UNDP approach in similar interventions in the future?

#### **4. METHODOLOGY**

The Evaluation Team will be composed of one international and one national consultant not involved with the formulation, appraisal, approval and/or implementation of daily management of the project. The consultants will be selected by the UNDP/NIBP evaluation support team.

An Evaluation Inception Report is required, but a final decision about the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultations among the programme unit, the evaluators, and key stakeholders about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and extant data.

Key stakeholders are:

- Independent Administrative Reform and Civil Service Commission
- General Director of Programs' Design and Management

Ministries in which NIBP is engaged at the national level include:

- Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation & Livestock;
- Ministry of Education;
- Ministry of Labor, Social Affairs, Martyrs and Disabled;
- Central Statistic Organization
- Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation;
- Deputy Ministry of Youth Affairs

Subnational partnerships are occurring Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation & Livestock in the provinces of Bamyan, Herat, and Mazar e sharif; and in Labor, Social Affairs, Martyrs and Disabled in the province of Herat. NIBP's subnational presence with the Independent Administrative Reform and Civil Service Commission is in Jalalabad and Mazar e sharif.

#### **5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

The evaluation team will be composed of one international and one national consultant not involved with the formulation, appraisal, approval and/or implementation of daily management of the project. The team will be selected by an NIBP / UNDP Evaluation Support Team which will provide the logistical support during the evaluation.

The consultants are expected to be highly qualified in capacity development and governance. The consultants shall have minimum Masters level education from a accredited and recognized university in the field of international development, political science, public administration, public policy or governance, and at least 7 years' experience in capacity development, institution building and / or governance. At least one other should preferably be an evaluation specialist and be experienced in using the specific evaluation methodologies that will be employed for that evaluation. The evaluation team should also possess a broad knowledge and understanding of the major economic and social development issues and problems in Afghanistan. Background or familiarity with conflict and post conflict situations may also be required, both for the conduct of the exercise itself, and for understanding the particular context of the evaluation.

## **6. EVALUATION ETHICS**

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.' Evaluations should be carried out in a participatory and ethical manner and the welfare of the stakeholders should be given due respect and consideration (human rights, dignity and fairness). Evaluations must be gender and culturally sensitive and respect the confidentiality, protection of source and dignity of those interviewed.

Evaluation procedures should be conducted in a realistic, diplomatic, cost-conscious and cost-effective manner; must be accurate and well-documented and deploy transparent methods that provide valid and reliable information. Evaluation team members should have an opportunity to disassociate themselves from particular judgments and recommendations. Any unresolved differences of opinion within the team should be acknowledged in the report.

Evaluations should be conducted in a complete and balanced manner so that the different perspectives are addressed and analyzed. Key findings must be substantiated through triangulation. Any conflict of interest should be addressed openly and honestly so that it does not undermine the evaluation outcome. Evaluators should discuss, in a contextually appropriate way, those values, assumptions, theories, methods, results, and analyses that significantly affect the interpretation of the evaluative findings. These statements apply to all aspects of the evaluation, from its initial conceptualization to the eventual use of findings.

The rights and well-being of individuals should not be affected negatively in planning and carrying out an evaluation. This needs to be communicated to all persons involved in an evaluation, and its foreseeable consequences for the evaluation discussed.

## **7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The mission is expected to take a total of four weeks. Two weeks field mission to conduct the evaluation in Kabul and to provinces deemed integral to the evaluation, however it is subject to flight availability, security risk management and subsequent travel restrictions. One week to produce the Draft Report and one week for finalizing the report.

Logistical support, security clearance, and travel arrangements will be made by the evaluation support team. Office space and necessary equipment will be provided in the NIBP office in UNOCA on Jalalabad Road.

## **8. TIME-FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation will take place in 31 working days over a period of three months, including 4 days for international travel.

- 4 days Desk Review and Inception Report/Work Plan
- 4 international travel days to and from Kabul
- 15 days (maximum) in-country beginning on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012.
  - includes in-country travel time to provinces which may take upwards of a day one-way
  - includes days where security risks may inhibit or restrict travel
- 5 working days on the first draft of the Mid-Term Evaluation Report, (Due September 24<sup>th</sup>)

- 3 working days on the finalization of the Report Due (October 11<sup>th</sup>)

### Evaluation Matrix

Activity	Number of days for the Evaluation Team	Dates for the Activity	By Whom
Desk Review	3 Days	17-20 August	Evaluation Team
Inception Report and Work Plan designed and submitted to NIBP/UNDP Evaluation Support Team	1 Day	21 August	Evaluation Team
Approval of Work Plan		23 August	NIBP/UNDP Evaluation Support Team
Notification of Stakeholders of the Evaluation Schedule		23 August	NIBP/UNDP Evaluation Support Team
Organizing the logistics and travel for the Evaluation Team		Ongoing	NIBP/UNDP Evaluation Support Team
Travel Days	2 Days	31 August – 1 September	International Consultant
Receiving the International Consultant		1 September	NIBP/UNDP Evaluation Support Team
Providing a Security Briefing for the Evaluation Team		1 September	NIBP/UNDP Evaluation Support Team
In-country evaluation mission	15 Days	2 – 16 September	Evaluation Team
Travel Days	2 Days	17-18 September	International Consultant
Preparing the draft report	5 Days	19-23 September	Evaluation Team
Submit Draft Report		24 September	Evaluation Team
Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance)		24 September – 6 October	NIBP/UNDP Evaluation Support Team
Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report	3 Days	8-10 October	Evaluation Team
Submit Final Report		11 October	Evaluation Team

In addition, the Evaluators may be expected to support UNDP efforts in knowledge sharing and dissemination.

### 9. COST

Consultants are requested to submit a proposal to conduct the Mid-term Evaluation of NIBP. In-country flights will be covered by the project.

### III. Impact of Results/Deliverables:

The evaluation team will be accountable for producing the following:

- **Evaluation inception report**—an inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member

with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. See Evaluation Matrix below.

- **Draft evaluation report** — the programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

**Final evaluation report:** Recommendations on future support to the counterparts and strategic partners and stakeholders for enhancing the institutional capacity development at national and sub-national level to enable institutions to deliver services

For the purposes of providing effective support to the covering line ministries, the areas of focus in the current phase should be evaluated and areas of future support with modified emphasis on the above-mentioned components should be highlighted

A reporting template can be found at:

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/Annex7.html>

- **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge sharing events, if relevant.

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

**Table A. Sample Evaluation Matrix**

#### **IV Competencies:**

The evaluation team will be composed of one international and one national consultant not involved with the formulation, appraisal, approval and/or implementation of daily management of the project. The team will be selected by an NIBP / UNDP Evaluation Support Team which will provide the logistical support during the evaluation.

The evaluation team should also possess a broad knowledge and understanding of the major economic and social development issues and problems in Afghanistan. Background or familiarity with conflict and post conflict situations may also be required, both for the conduct of the exercise itself, and for understanding the particular context of the evaluation.

<b>V. Recruitment Qualifications:</b>	
Education:	The consultants shall have minimum Masters level education from an accredited and recognized university in the field of international development, political science, public administration, public policy or governance,
Experience:	The consultants are expected to be highly qualified in capacity development and governance with at least 7 years' experience in capacity development, institution building and / or governance. At least one other should preferably be an evaluation specialist and be experienced in using the specific evaluation methodologies that will be employed for that evaluation.
Language Requirements:	English with excellent written and analytical skills

# **National Institution Building Project**

## **External Evaluation**

UNDP

## Proposal

Name: Dr. Mathias Maria Pius van Asseldonk  
Nationality: Netherlands  
Address: 137 Old Nawala Road, Nawala, Sri Lanka  
Tel. nr (mobile): 0094 71 01 001 02  
E-mail: [mv@mdf.nl](mailto:mv@mdf.nl), [mmpvanasseldonk@hotmail.com](mailto:mmpvanasseldonk@hotmail.com)



## **Table of Contents**

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. EVALUATION SCOPE: RESULT CHAIN AND EFFECTIVENESS.....	3
3. METHODOLOGY.....	8
4. EVALUATION PRINCIPLES: ETHICS AND LEARNING.....	9
5. COMPETENCY STATEMENT .....	9
6. TIME-FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS.....	14
7. BUDGET .....	15

### **ANNEX 1:      Curricula Vitae**

## 1. Introduction

UNDP is supporting the strengthening of the capacity of the Government of Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (GIRA). The National Institution Building Project (NIBP), is implemented over four years (2010-2013), and provides a comprehensive package of CD support at the national and sub-national levels. The results of NIBP are achieved primarily through provision of services of Capacity Development Advisors (CDAs) in select government entities at national and sub-national level to provide coaching and advisory services for institutional strengthening, organizational reforms and skills development.

UNDP is organizing a mid-term evaluation to measure progress and impact at the enabling environment level, organizational level and individual level, and how the project is developing the public administration reform (PAR) management and coordination capacity of the Independent Administrative Reform and Civil Service Commission (IARCSC).

The evaluation also aims at understanding the relevance of the project and its design. The result of the mid-term evaluation will be incorporated into the policies, strategies and plans of the project, and inform the future interventions of UNDP in the capacity building and national institutions building area.

## 2. Evaluation scope: Result chain and Effectiveness

The mid-term evaluation will focus on and analyze the Result chain and effectiveness:

- To examine to what extent the project has achieved the intended outputs, and in what specific areas the project excelled or failed in progress toward intended outputs.
- To indicate whether or not intended project impacts and outcomes are being met and/or, for specific outcomes, whether satisfactory progress was made.
- To analyze underlying factors that are influencing project impacts and outputs.
- To identify and analyze barriers and constraints that have delayed implementation, including challenges emanating from internal and external sources.
- To identify a list of 'lessons learned' and make recommendations for corrections, including in relation to i) the specific CD services provided by the project (are they appropriate for the client and do they respond to the demands and felt needs of the client?); and ii) the sourcing of capacity (what is the general experience and are steps be taken to source capacity from institutions and networks beyond those considered under the project?).
- Extract the lessons learned and best practices that can be considered in the planning and design of future support activities for government and recommendations for future direction and areas of focus for the next phase of project.
- To state whether or not targets are being achieved and whether current and planned outputs can be sustained, including determination of measures needed to ensure continued sustainability of results in the future.
- To recommend further interventions.

## Evaluation Matrix

The following matrix is a draft which will be discussed and developed further during the inception phase of the assignment.

CDA: UNDP Capacity Development Advisor

GO: Government official being advised by CDA

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis
Output of UNDP CDA's (direct measurable result of activities: # persons coached, advised, trained on # issues)	Clarity on roles and responsibilities	CDA: Can you define what your concrete "output" has been.	CDA	Personal interview	Has clear understanding	Scoring on scale 1-4
		Does that match with your ToR / mandate / job description?	CDA	Personal interview	-	Scoring on scale 1-4 Yes –to some extend - largely – no
		If adaptations made sense, why?	CDA	Personal interview	Is rational about adptations	Scoring on scale 1-4
		Did you discuss these changes with the relevant GIRA officials? When and how?	CDA	Personal interview	Is transparant about adptations	Scoring on scale 1-4 No, inform, consult, decide together
		According your understanding what is the task of the CDA.	GO	Personal interview/FGD	Can describe fairly accurate	Scoring on scale 1-4
		Can you describe more precisely what he/she is supposed to achieve (like indicators)	GO	Personal interview/FGD	Can describe fairly accurate	Scoring on scale 1-4
Output	Achievements	To what extend did	CDA	Personal interview	Copmpare with project	Scoring on scale 1-4

		you achieve your output targets?			indicators	
		What do you believe has been the most meaningful part of your task so far	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		Describe why	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		What do you believe has been the most difficult part of your task so far	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		Describe why	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		What was the best contribution of the CDA to your work	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
		In what sense can the CDA more effective	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
		What else can UNDP do to help you to perform excellent	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
Outcome (use of outputs)	Clarity	What are the outcomes as defined by the project document	CDA	Personal interview	Has clear understanding	Scoring on scale 1-4
		How do you remain "in touch" with progress in terms of outcomes?	CDA	Personal interview	Has clear understanding	Scoring on scale 1-4
	Achievements	To what extent have the targets	CDA	Personal interview	project indicators	Scoring on scale 1-4

		been met?				
		What was helpfull in meeting the targets	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		What can be dome to make better use fo these helpfull factors	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		What can be done to improve use of your outputs by GOs?	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		If outputs were not used effectively by GOs, why did that happen	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		What can be done to overcome negative factors	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		How do you build rapport with the GOs	CDA	Personal interview	-	Classify: 1) structural rapport 2) attributed rapport 3) job performance
		Do you discuss use of outputs by GOs with GOs. If yes, how?	CDA	Personal interview	-	Scale 1-4 no – ad-how – regulrly informal – formal progress meetings
		Can you give an example of a good advise of the CDA which you find difficult to implement	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
		Why was it	GO	Personal	-	List responses

		difficult		interview/FGD		
		What is needed to deal with the difficulties	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
		What can you do	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
		Where do you need support	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
		Which support within the GIRA can you mobilize	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
		Do you need any help with doing that	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
		Which support from outside HIRA and UNDP would be usefull	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
		Why so?	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses
Impact (improved good and respnsive governance)		Please describe your contribution to “better governance” of the government department you have been advising directly. Give examples of changes	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		Why did these changes happen?	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		WHat were desired changes that did not happen?	CDA	Personal interview	-	List responses
		Why not?	CDA	Personal	-	List responses

				interview		
		Could you describe "good governance"	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	categories: responsive to citizens honesty commitment professionalism inclusive / gender etc
		Can you give examples how the CDA helped you to contribute to good governance	GO	Personal interview/FGD	-	List responses

### 3. Methodology

The Evaluation Team will be composed of one international and one national consultant not involved with the formulation, appraisal, approval and/or implementation of daily management of the project.

An Evaluation Inception Report will be submitted, and the final decision about the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultations among the programme unit, the evaluators, and key stakeholders about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and extant data.

Key stakeholders are:

- Independent Administrative Reform and Civil Service Commission
- General Director of Programs' Design and Management

Ministries in which NIBP is engaged at the national level include:

- Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation & Livestock;
- Ministry of Education;
- Ministry of Labor, Social Affairs, Martyrs and Disabled;
- Central Statistic Organization
- Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation;
- Deputy Ministry of Youth Affairs

Sub national partnerships are occurring Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation & Livestock in the provinces of Bamyan, Herat, and Mazar e sharif; and in Labor, Social Affairs, Martyrs and

Disabled in the province of Herat. NIBP's sub national presence with the Independent Administrative Reform and Civil Service Commission is in Jalalabad and Mazar e sharif.

Reporting will be done as per requirement of UNDP.

#### **4. Evaluation principles: ethics and learning**

The overarching goal is learning, both for UNDP as well as for the GIRA. An analysis will be made of the interplay between individual, organizational, network and policy factors. Institutional capacity development requires an understanding of and an ability to deal with:

- Larger forces, incentives and dynamics that drive the present situation and the ways that these can be influenced (political-economy, social and cultural understanding).
- Relevant organizational and institutional arrangements at different levels and the ways that they can be better adjusted, including the nature of the primary process and supporting processes concerned and the ways that these can be improved (technical knowledge).
- Learning processes in order to facilitate successful change management by the actors of the organizational development process.
- Individual motivation and abilities and change dynamics of actors and between actors (change and facilitation skills).

Such a will provide the basis for learning. Another questions which will be answered is: how can this understanding been translated into actual performance? What role can UNDP play in this regard?

The evaluation will adhere to the UNDP ethics outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.' The evaluations will be carried out in a participatory and ethical manner and the welfare of the stakeholders will be given due respect and consideration (human rights, dignity and fairness). The evaluation will be gender and culturally sensitive and respect the confidentiality, protection of source and dignity of those interviewed.

The evaluation procedures will be conducted in a realistic, diplomatic, cost-conscious and cost-effective manner; will be well-documented and deploy transparent methods that provide valid and reliable information. Any conflict of interest will be addressed openly and honestly so that is does not undermine the evaluation outcome. The will discuss, in a contextually appropriate way, those values, assumptions, theories, methods, results, and analyses that significantly affect the interpretation of the evaluative findings.

#### **5. Competency statement**

##### **5.1 The consultant**



The consultant, Dr. Martien van Asseldonk, has a PhD in public administration. He is currently employed by MDF, a world-wide operating consultancy and training company, The relevant experience of Dr. Van Asseldonk include:

In Afghanistan:

- From 2001 till 2003 he was country-representative for Cordaid in Afghanistan. As such he was overseeing offices in Kabul, Kandahar and Peshawar, responsible for developing and maintaining the security protocol, HRM, overseeing financial management and administration and logistics, strategic planning, project identification, monitoring, liaison with government agencies and other (I)NGOs.
- From 2003 till 2011 Dr. Van Asseldonk undertook 30 short-term mission to Afghanistan for various international organizations:
  - o 4 missions in 2009-2011 were supporting DCU2 consortium of Dutch NGOs for Uruzgan (assess management capacity of Afghan partners, support capacity building efforts, facilitating a DCU planning meeting.)
  - o 9 missions were focusing on organizational and institutional assessments of local NGOs (AITM, DACAAR, VARA, IbnSina, ADA, AWRC, NPO/RRAA, AHDS)
  - o 2 missions were held for facilitating strategic planning workshops for local NGOs (NPO/RRAA, VARA) and one mission for facilitating the strategic planning process of Oxfam Novib.
  - o 8 missions were for providing training (Advanced Management training, ID/OS training, training on Monitoring and Evaluation, training on OOPP and Logical Frameworks, Project Cycle Management Training, Training of Trainers, training in conducting Base-line surveys)
  - o The remaining 6 missions were for: designing a Management Information system for DACAAR, facilitating the annual meeting of DACAAR, facilitating an exposure visit for AITM, mid-term review of an educational project, acquisition mission, and facilitating a workshop for Cordaid partners.

This extensive work experience in Afghanistan has given him an in-depth knowledge and understanding of Afghan culture and security situation. His work made him familiar with insecure operating environments and rural contexts, not only in Afghanistan, but also in Pakistan, the North and East of Sri Lanka and Sudan. He is conceptually strong and has extensive and excellent writing skills.

Other relevant experience include:

- Supporting the MfDR process of the Government of Cambodia, organized by UNDP, including training, and coaching the formulation of result chains, goals at various levels, indicators and monitoring systems for various line ministries, both at national and sub-national levels.
- A number of project mid-term reviews and project evaluations (2010 Thailand, 2008 Sri Lanka, 2008 Indonesia, 2006 Afghanistan, 2004 Bangladesh)
- Strengthening the Bangladesh Administrative Public Training Centre and design effective training and training methodologies for civil servants in Bangladesh.
- Assessing the National Institute for Local Governance, BARD and RDA, all Bangladesh government research and training institutes, and giving recommendations for improvement.

- Designing curricula and a training course for dealing effectively with power relations in organizations.
- Training in Sri Lanka 10 senior manager of Swedish Committee for Afghanistan in principles of Management for Development Result and Result Based Management
- Numerous training-courses for consultants and development managers, including evaluation methodologies.

For more details, see attached curriculum vitae.

## **5.2 MDF-Competency Statement**

MDF-Training & Consultancy is a worldwide operating management training and consulting firm. MDF was established because it was felt that in development co-operation much attention was given to technical issues while little attention was paid to the organisation and management of projects and programmes. Since its establishment in 1984, MDF has provided courses, workshops and consulting services for individuals and organisations, especially designed to strengthen the managerial and organisational capacity required to perform effectively and to achieve set objectives. Its articles of association are certified and registered as a notarial deed with the office of Notary Van Putten & Van Apeldoorn, Stationsweg 36, 6710 BB Ede, The Netherlands.

MDF Training & Consultancy is registered by the Chamber of Commerce ("Kamer van Koophandel") in Arnhem under Trade Registration number 09073461.

MDF-Training & Consultancy Private Limited is a politically and financially independent organisation established in 1984. MDF headquarters is based in Ede, the Netherlands, with offices in the hotel and training centre "De Bosrand". MDF has branch offices in Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Belgium, Congo (RDC), Ghana, Colombia, Indonesia and Vietnam. MDF employs about 115 full-time staff. MDF has been certified for ISO 9001:2000.

MDF trainer-consultants are all development experts, specialised in their own particular fields and holding a lot of practical experience. The staff is involved both in training and consulting activities to ensure that they maintain a close link with day-to-day practice in the field. This way of working enriches the training courses and keeps MDF staff always at the forefront of development ideas and informed of best practices. MDF staff members are professional people with initiative who are able to create good and sincere working relations with course participants and clients in the field. They all represent the key qualities of MDF: they are practical, open-minded, and eager to share experiences and to listen to the ideas, opinions and wishes of our clients and end users.



**Figure 1: Regional offices, staff and annual turnover**

### ***Vision***

The preparation and implementation of development interventions frequently lack a profound analysis of their environment and of the availability of organisational capacity for proper implementation. In other words, there is no realistic assessment of the chances to indeed achieve the formulated objectives. In development co-operation, more attention should be paid to change processes. These change processes can be deliberate, being formulated as part and parcel of an intervention. Yet also if no deliberate change process has been formulated, by its nature every intervention will always induce change in one form or another.

The process of change has as its ultimate goal to achieve improved performance. Yet, improvement is a subjective concept. All actors involved will have different opinions on what exactly is to be achieved. They will also have different views on the way in which the desired outcome should be attained. MDF listens to all these different actors: to policy makers and funding agencies, but also to middle management, executive staff, clients and other groups who are affected by the interventions. We aim to act as an intermediary between policy ideals and field practice. In our view, capacity building has two crucial dimensions: strengthening organisations in terms of systems and procedures on the one hand, and enhancing skills of management and staff to improve their performance on the other.

### ***Clients***

MDF delivers its services to a wide variety of clients. They include donor organisations, co-funding agencies, national and regional government organisations, projects, international and national non-government organisations and consulting firms. MDF has carried out assignments in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Central and Eastern Europe and of course in the Netherlands.



Figure 2: Some of MDF's major clients

### ***MDF areas of expertise***

MDF Training & Consultancy mainly works in three areas related to management, all in the context of development co-operation:

- 1. Strategic Steering of institutions and organisations in their sector**  
This includes:
  - Organisational and institutional analysis
  - Organisational Strengthening
  - Strategy design and strategic planning
  - Structure and system analysis
- 2. Managing for Development Results and Operational Management**

This includes:

- Managing for Development Results (MfDR) for the Public Sector
- Results-Based Management and Project Cycle Management (PCM)
- Logical Framework Analysis;
- Result-Based Monitoring and monitoring systems
- Evaluations of very different kinds/levels
- Financial management and budgeting

### **3. Personal Skills, Human Relations and Human Resources Management**

This includes:

- HRM systems
- Individual managers' skills: Conflict management, negotiation skills, chairing meetings, coaching and supervision etc.
- Training of Trainers
- Teambuilding

Further general details of MDF's work can be found at [www.mdf.nl](http://www.mdf.nl)

## **6. Time-frame for the evaluation process**

The following time-frame is taken from the ToR. A more detailed and adjusted schedule will be developed in consultation during the inception phase of the project.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>International consultant</b>	<b>National consultant</b>	<b>NIBP / UNDP</b>	<b>Dates for the Activity</b>
Visa application in Dubai and desk review	4	-		August
Inception Report and Work Plan designed and submitted to NIBP/UNDP Evaluation Support Team	1	1		21 August
Approval of Work Plan	-	-	x	23 August
Notification of Stakeholders of the Evaluation Schedule	-	-	x	23 August
Organizing the logistics and travel for the Evaluation Team	-	-	x	Ongoing
Travel Days	1	-		31 August – 1 September
Receiving the International Consultant	-	-	x	1 September

Providing a Security Briefing for the Evaluation Team	1	1	x	1 September
In-country evaluation mission	15	15		2 – 16 September
Travel Days	1	-		17-18 September
Preparing the draft report	3	1		19-23 September
Submit Draft Report	-	-		24 September
Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance)	1	1	x	24 September – 6 October
Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report	1	-		8-10 October
Submit Final Report	-	-		11 October
	28	20		

## 7. BUDGET

	Unit	Nr of units	costs / unit	Total USD
1 Fees international consultant	days	28	800	22400
2 Fees national consultant	days	20	p.m.	p.m.
3 Flight Colobo - Kabul vv	Flight	1	500	500
4 Incountry flights	lumpsum	1	500	500
5 Visa	Visa	1	80	80
6 Hotel	days	15	60	900
7 DSA intetnational consultant Lodging and DSA national	days	15	40	600
8 cons.	days	15	p.m.	p.m.
				24980

## 6 Contact Details

Name: Dr. Mathias Maria Pius van Asseldonk  
 organization: MDF (South Asia office)  
 Nationality: Netherlands  
 Address: 137 Old Nawala Road, Nawala, Sri Lanka  
 Tel. nr (mobile): 0094 71 01 001 02  
 E-mail: [mv@mdf.nl](mailto:mv@mdf.nl), [mmpvanasseldonk@hotmail.com](mailto:mmpvanasseldonk@hotmail.com)



### Annex 3 - Persons Interviewed

Date	Name	Function
9 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. David Akopyan	Deputy Country Director programmes
9 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Mitch Teberg	Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor
10 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms. Malavika	CDA GDPDM
10 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms. Serwat Perwaiz	CDA Advisor to the DG of IARCSC
10 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Foshanji	Acting DG IARCSC
10 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Waqif	Recruitmanager GDPDM
10 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms Salma	Head of M&E GDPDM
12 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Sultan Hajiyev	NIBP Chief Capacity Building Expert and acting Programme Director
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Khushwant Seti	CDA MAIL
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms. Muzghan Sadet	GD of Policy and Planning, Pillar head Economic regeneration and value addition
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Hakum Khan Habibi	DG of Extension & Agricultural Development
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Masood Ludin	Deputy to Chief of Staff, MAIL
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Abdul Wasi Ibrahimi	CDO MAIL
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Hujjatullah Fazly	CDO MAIL
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Hajji Zainullah Atash	Head of Dairy Food / Animal Husbandry section MAIL (trainee)
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Dr. Shafiq Ahmad Ahmai:	Veterinary / Animal Husbandry section MAIL. (trainee)
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Mirwais Khogiani	Technical Plant Protection Change Management Specialist CBCMP (Participated in a workshop organized by NIBP for 25 MAIL staff in Kabul)
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Mirwais Niazi	Plant Protection Section of MAIL
13 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Azim Khan Habib	Plant Protection Section of MAIL
14 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Anindo Majundar	CDA Ministry of Education
14 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Hasibullah Saroush	CDO MoTCA
15 <sup>th</sup> October	H.E. Abdul Rahman Khafoori	Minister CSO
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Dr. Prafulla Mishra	CDA, CSO
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Nasir Ahmad	Deputy of NA, CSO
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Mohammad Ambia	Head of Price Statistics
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Asadullah	Head of Service Sector, CSO
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. M'd Abriahim Naimi	Head of NMA & PC, CSO
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Azizullah	Head of Economy Statistics
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Esmatullah Ranzi	Statistical advisor, CSO coordinator for NIBP
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Fageeri	Head of Department of Economic



		Statistics
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Mohammad Ibrahim Naimi	Head of the Department
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Naseer Ahmad Sharafat	Deputy Head of the Department
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Mohammad Anbia Noori	Director of Price Statistics
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Asadullah Yousufi	Director of Service Section
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Qasim Kabari	Deputy Head of the Department
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Ismail	General Director for Transport and Communication
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Rohullah	General Director for Trade
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Faiz Mohammad Rashid	General Director for Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Mohammad Rafi:	Deputy Director for Mine and Energy
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr Shah Mahmood Haroon	CDO MoLSMD
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms. Gulghutai Samsoor	CDO MoLSMD
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr Siddharth Deverman	CDA MoLSMD
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. M'd Yousuf Walizada	Finance Associate NIBP
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Dr. Nilofar Barikzai	Gender Analyst
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Barry Greville Eyres	CD advicor NIBP
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Ibrahim Amarkhail	Director, MoLSAMD
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Abdul Waheed Poopal	Manager Human Resources, MoLSAMD
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms. Monija Ahmadi	Manager Need Assessment, MoLSAMD
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms. Fakhria Sami	Monitoring and Evaluation, MoLSAMD
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Hussain Khan	Manager Capacity Development, MoLSAMD
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. David Akopyan	Deputy Country Director programmes
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Abdul Jabbar	Manager Social Affairs
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Mirwais Niazi	Member of Implementing and Analysis of Strategic Plan
16 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Ahmad Jamshid Azizi	Manager Service Commission/M&E
17 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Ahmad Javid Karimi	Deputy Chief of Staff MAIL
17 <sup>th</sup> October	Sohaila Abhar	NIBP Project Associate
17 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Larry	CDA MoLSAMD, Herat
19 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Wahid Nasty	CDO Ec. Directorate Herat (IT)
19 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Farhang Farhangt	CDO Dolsa Herat
19 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Sayed Asadullah	CDO Ec. Directorate Herat
19 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Saed Aref Asimi	CDO Dept of Education Herat
19 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms. Sudaba Parnian	CDO DAIL Herat
19 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Canisius Sovis	CDA DAIL Mazar-e-Sharif
19 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Thomas Limpo	CDA DAIL Herat
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Faqirahmad Biangar	Director of DAIL, Herat

20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Bashirahmad Ahmadi	Head of Agricultural Programs
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Aziz-ur-Rahman Sarwary	Deputy Director of Education, Herat
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Abdul Zahir Chupan	Education M&E Advisor DoEd, Herat
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Manzoor Salamyar	Head of School Unions DoEd, Herat
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Sayed Ali Hussaini	I.T Manager DoEd, Herat
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Enayatullah Rahmani	Head of Communication and Planning DoEd, Herat
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms. Naheed Naqshbandi	Head of Gender Awareness DoEd, Herat
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Aziz-ur-Rahman Sarwary	DoEd Herat, Deputy Director of Education
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Abdul Zahir Chupan	DoEd Herat, Education M&E Advisor
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Manzoor Salamyar	DoEd Herat, Head of School Unions
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Sayed Ali Hussaini	DoEd Herat, I.T Manager
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Mr. Enayatullah Rahmani	DoEd Herat, Head of Communication and Planning
20 <sup>th</sup> October	Ms. Naheed Naqshbandi	DoEd Herat, Head of Gender Awareness
21 <sup>st</sup> October	Ms. Basira Mohammady	Head of DoLSAMD, Herat
21 <sup>st</sup> October	Mr. Ghulam Rasool Omari	Child Protection Action Network Technical Assistant, DOLSA
21 <sup>st</sup> October	Ms. Khalida Afzali	Manager of Social Affairs, DOLSA
21 <sup>st</sup> October	Ms. Munira Fizzada	Executive and communication officer CPAN – TA, DOLSA
21 <sup>st</sup> October	Mr. Ghulam Rasool Omari	Executive Manager and Communication Advisor, DOLSA
22 <sup>nd</sup> October	Mr. Abdal Salam	Regional Director, IARCSC Herat
22 <sup>nd</sup> October	Ms. Asila	TC manager, IARCSC Herat
22 <sup>nd</sup> October	Mr. Waheed Ahmad Kamrani	CD), IARCSC Herat

CDAs who attended the workshop on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2012 in Kabul

Name	Function
Ms. Serwat Perwaiz	CDA Advisor to the DG of IARCSC
Dr. Prafulla Mishra	CDA in CSO
Mr. Khushwant Seti	CDA in MAIL
Mr. Bibhu	CDA in MoEc
Mr. Sanoja Kumar	CDA in Commerce and Industries
Mr. Anindo Majundar	CDA in MoEd
Mr. Barry Greville Eyres	CD advisor NIBP

CDOs who attended the workshop on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012 in Kaul

Name	Function
Mr. Shafiquallah	CDO in National Capacity Development Office
Mr. Ahmad Naweed Ghanizada	CDO in MoC, PSD
Dr. Sardar M. Kohistani	CDO in MoFA
Mr. Sha Mahmood Haroon	CDO in MoLSAMD
Dr. Humaira Farzeen	CDO in MoPH
Ms. Gulghutai Samsoor	CDO in MoLSAMD
Mr. Farhad I Karmans	CDO in DMOYA
Mr. Rahim Shir Del	CDO in MoC
Mr. Hasibullah Saroush	CDO in MoTCA
Mr. Abdul Wassy Ebrahimi	CDO in MAIL
Mr. Hojatullah Fazly	CDO in MAIL

People present at the meeting at DAIL in Herat on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2012 in Kaul

Name	Function
Mr. Haji Bashir Ahmad	Manager Agriculture
Eng. Fakhrudding	Manager Agriculture
Mr. Haji Jeelani	General Manager Admin/Finance
Mr. Aqa Mir Jehsh	Specialist Animal Husbandry
Mr. Haji Mohammad Nasim	General Manager Lands
Mr. Basir Ahmad Tabib	General Manager Plant Protection
Dr. Khalil Waiz	General Manager Veterinary
Mr. Mohammad Yaar	General Manager Agri-Cooperatives
Mr. Abdullah Haidari	General Manager Quality Control
Mr. Nasir Ahmad	General Manager Animal Husbandry
Mr. Hameedullah	General Manager Extension
Mr. Abdul Aziz Saghari	General Manager Forest Development
Eng. Israel Jamshedyar	General Manager Agriculture Mechanisms
Eng. Khalil Intizari	General Manager Irrigation
Mr. Muhyouddin Saifi	General Manager M&E
Mr. Habibullah Sabri	Head of Research Forms
Mr. Younas Afshar	Team Leader Change Management
Mr. Mohammad Ibrahim	Head of Human Resources
Ms. Sudaba Parnian	CDO UNDP/NIBP
Mr. Mohammad Tariq	General Manager Program and Planning

#### **Annex 4 - Written sources**

United Nations Development Programme Afghanistan, National Institution Building Project (NIBP)

- Capacity for Afghan Public Service (CAP) project II (January 2010 / December 2013) (project document)
- Annual Progress Report 2010 (Kabul 2011)
- Annual Progress Report 2011 (Kabul 2012)
- First Quarter Progress Report 2012 (Kabul 2012)
- Second Quarter Progress Report 2012 (Kabul 2012)
- Third Quarter Progress Report 2012 (draft) (Kabul 2012)
- Minutes 5<sup>th</sup> Board meeting 5<sup>th</sup> July 2012
- Ministry of Transport and Aviation, Capacity Development plan 2011-2013 (Kabul, April 2011)
- Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock, Capacity Development plan 2011-2013 (Kabul, April 2011)
- Ministry of Information & Culture, Capacity Development Plan 2011-2013 (Kabul, March 2011)
- Office of Deputy Minister of Youth Affairs, Capacity Development plan 2011-2013 (Kabul, April 2011)
- Central Statistics Organisation, Capacity Development plan 2011-2014 (Kabul, February 2012)
- Deputy Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, Capacity Development plan 2011-2013 (Kabul, 2011)
- Minutes of the brainstorming session with GDPDM, CO (Serena Hotel, 20 April 2012)
- LIST of NIBP staff (September 2012)
- NIBP Organogram (September 2012)
- List of CDOs and CDAs (September 2012)
- Brief on deliverables (Dr. Mishra, October 2012)
- Minutes of staffmeeting 12 April 2012
- Minutes of staffmeeting 5 July 2012
- Minutes of staffmeeting 26 July 2012
- Minutes of staffmeeting 27 August 2012
- Action points of meeting September 13
- Mission Report to Bamyan 28 June – 1 July 2012
- Mission Report to Kandhar 12 - 15 July 2012
- Mission Report to Ghazni 28 – 30 August 2012

Wall Street Journal, 10<sup>th</sup> September 2012

## Annex 5 - Itinerary

Monday 8 <sup>th</sup> October	4.00 pm	Arrival in Kabul, checking in GV
Tuesday 9 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am 5.00 pm	UNDP country office:  Meet with Noorullah and Arif (National Consultant); Evaluation Planning; security brief; rec'v ID card;
	6.00 pm	Meeting with DCD David Akopayan
Wednesday 10 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am 5.00 pm	Meetings at IARCSC and GDPDM
Thursday 11 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am 4.00 pm	Workshop with CDAs
Friday 12 <sup>th</sup> October	6.00 am	6.00 am Skype meeting with Sultan
	9.00 am 4.00 pm	Writing inception report working out interview notes
	6.00 pm	Meeting with DCD David Akopayan
Saturday 13 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am 4.00 pm	Interviews at MAIL
Sunday 14 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am	Interviews at Ministry of Education
	2.00 pm	Interviews at MoTCA
Monday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am 4.00 pm	Interviews at CSO
Tuesday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am 4.00 pm	Interviews at MoLSAMD
Wednesday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	am	Working out fieldnotes
	1.00 pm 5.00 pm	FGD with Kabul based CDOs
Thursday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am	Travel to Herat Security briefing
	2.00 pm	Meeting with Tom (CDA)
Friday 19 <sup>th</sup> October	8.30 am 12.00 pm	Meeting with the Herat CDO's
	1.00 pm 4.00 pm	Interviews with Herat and Mazar-based CDAs
Saturday 20 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am 4.00 pm	Interviews at DAIL Interviews at Department of Education
Sunday 21 <sup>st</sup> October	9.00 am 4.00 pm	Interviews at DoLSAMD Interviews at Department of Economy
Monday 22 <sup>nd</sup> October	9.00 am	Interviews at IARCSC
	2.00 pm	Working out field notes / interviews

Tuesday 23 <sup>rd</sup> October	10.30 am	Flight to Kabul
Wednesday 24 <sup>th</sup> October	11.00 am	Meeting with JJ
	2.00 pm	Data analysis
Thursday 25 <sup>th</sup> October	9.00 am	Preparation for debriefing
	2.00 pm	Debriefing
Friday 26 <sup>th</sup> October	7.00 am	Departure from Kabul



# PARIS DECLARATION ON AID EFFECTIVENESS

## Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability

### I. Statement of Resolve

1. We, Ministers of developed and developing countries responsible for promoting development and Heads of multilateral and bilateral development institutions, meeting in Paris on 2 March 2005, resolve to take far-reaching and monitorable actions to reform the ways we deliver and manage aid as we look ahead to the UN five-year review of the Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) later this year. As in Monterrey, we recognise that while the volumes of aid and other development resources must increase to achieve these goals, aid effectiveness must increase significantly as well to support partner country efforts to strengthen governance and improve development performance. This will be all the more important if existing and new bilateral and multilateral initiatives lead to significant further increases in aid.

2. At this High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, we followed up on the Declaration adopted at the High-Level Forum on Harmonisation in Rome (February 2003) and the core principles put forward at the Marrakech Roundtable on Managing for Development Results (February 2004) because we believe they will increase the impact aid has in reducing poverty and inequality, increasing growth, building capacity and accelerating achievement of the MDGs.

#### Scale up for more effective aid

3. We reaffirm the commitments made at Rome to harmonise and align aid delivery. We are encouraged that many donors and partner countries are making aid effectiveness a high priority, and we reaffirm our commitment to accelerate progress in implementation, especially in the following areas:

- i. Strengthening partner countries' national development strategies and associated operational frameworks (e.g., planning, budget, and performance assessment frameworks).
- ii. Increasing alignment of aid with partner countries' priorities, systems and procedures and helping to strengthen their capacities.
- iii. Enhancing donors' and partner countries' respective accountability to their citizens and parliaments for their development policies, strategies and performance.
- iv. Eliminating duplication of efforts and rationalising donor activities to make them as cost-effective as possible.
- v. Reforming and simplifying donor policies and procedures to encourage collaborative behaviour and progressive alignment with partner countries' priorities, systems and procedures.
- vi. Defining measures and standards of performance and accountability of partner country systems in public financial management, procurement, fiduciary safeguards and environmental assessments, in line with broadly accepted good practices and their quick and widespread application.

4. We commit ourselves to taking concrete and effective action to address the remaining challenges, including:

- i. Weaknesses in partner countries' institutional capacities to develop and implement results-driven national development strategies.
- ii. Failure to provide more predictable and multi-year commitments on aid flows to committed partner countries.

- iii. Insufficient delegation of authority to donors' field staff, and inadequate attention to incentives for effective development partnerships between donors and partner countries.
  - iv. Insufficient integration of global programmes and initiatives into partner countries' broader development agendas, including in critical areas such as HIV/AIDS.
  - v. Corruption and lack of transparency, which erode public support, impede effective resource mobilisation and allocation and divert resources away from activities that are vital for poverty reduction and sustainable economic development. Where corruption exists, it inhibits donors from relying on partner country systems.
5. We acknowledge that enhancing the effectiveness of aid is feasible and necessary across all aid modalities. In determining the most effective modalities of aid delivery, we will be guided by development strategies and priorities established by partner countries. Individually and collectively, we will choose and design appropriate and complementary modalities so as to maximise their combined effectiveness.
6. In following up the Declaration, we will intensify our efforts to provide and use development assistance, including the increased flows as promised at Monterrey, in ways that rationalise the often excessive fragmentation of donor activities at the country and sector levels.

### **Adapt and apply to differing country situations**

7. Enhancing the effectiveness of aid is also necessary in challenging and complex situations, such as the tsunami disaster that struck countries of the Indian Ocean rim on 26 December 2004. In such situations, worldwide humanitarian and development assistance must be harmonised within the growth and poverty reduction agendas of partner countries. In fragile states, as we support state-building and delivery of basic services, we will ensure that the principles of harmonisation, alignment and managing for results are adapted to environments of weak governance and capacity. Overall, we will give increased attention to such complex situations as we work toward greater aid effectiveness.

### **Specify indicators, timetable and targets**

8. We accept that the reforms suggested in this Declaration will require continued high-level political support, peer pressure and coordinated actions at the global, regional and country levels. We commit to accelerate the pace of change by implementing, in a spirit of mutual accountability, the Partnership Commitments presented in Section II and to measure progress against 12 specific indicators that we have agreed today and that are set out in Section III of this Declaration.
9. As a further spur to progress, we will set targets for the year 2010. These targets, which will involve action by both donors and partner countries, are designed to track and encourage progress at the global level among the countries and agencies that have agreed to this Declaration. They are not intended to prejudice or substitute for any targets that individual partner countries may wish to set. We have agreed today to set five preliminary targets against indicators as shown in Section III. We agree to review these preliminary targets and to adopt targets against the remaining indicators as shown in Section III before the UNGA Summit in September 2005; and we ask the partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC to prepare for this urgently<sup>1</sup>. Meanwhile, we welcome initiatives by partner countries and donors to establish their own targets for improved aid effectiveness within the framework of the agreed Partnership Commitments and Indicators of Progress. For example, a number of partner countries have presented action plans, and a large number of donors

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with paragraph 9 of the Declaration, the partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC (Working Party on Aid Effectiveness) comprising OECD/DAC members, partner countries and multilateral institutions, met twice, on 30-31 May 2005 and on 7-8 July 2005 to adopt, and review where appropriate, the targets for the twelve Indicators of Progress. At these meetings an agreement was reached on the targets presented under Section III of the present Declaration. This agreement is subject to reservations by one donor on (a) the methodology for assessing the quality of locally-managed procurement systems (relating to targets 2b and 5b) and (b) the acceptable quality of public financial management reform programmes (relating to target 5a.ii). Further discussions are underway to address these issues. The targets, including the reservation, have been notified to the Chairs of the High-level Plenary Meeting of the 59th General Assembly of the United Nations in a letter of 9 September 2005 by Mr. Richard Manning, Chair of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC).



have announced important new commitments. We invite all participants who wish to provide information on such initiatives to submit it by 4 April 2005 for subsequent publication.

### **Monitor and evaluate implementation**

10. Because demonstrating real progress at country level is critical, under the leadership of the partner country we will periodically assess, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, our mutual progress at country level in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness. In doing so, we will make use of appropriate country level mechanisms.

11. At the international level, we call on the partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC to broaden partner country participation and, by the end of 2005, to propose arrangements for the medium term monitoring of the commitments in this Declaration. In the meantime, we ask the partnership to co-ordinate the international monitoring of the Indicators of Progress included in Section III; to refine targets as necessary; to provide appropriate guidance to establish baselines; and to enable consistent aggregation of information across a range of countries to be summed up in a periodic report. We will also use existing peer review mechanisms and regional reviews to support progress in this agenda. We will, in addition, explore independent cross-country monitoring and evaluation processes – which should be applied without imposing additional burdens on partners – to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how increased aid effectiveness contributes to meeting development objectives.

12. Consistent with the focus on implementation, we plan to meet again in 2008 in a developing country and conduct two rounds of monitoring before then to review progress in implementing this Declaration.

## **II. Partnership Commitments**

13. Developed in a spirit of mutual accountability, these Partnership Commitments are based on the lessons of experience. We recognise that commitments need to be interpreted in the light of the specific situation of each partner country.

### **OWNERSHIP**

**Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions**

14. **Partner countries** commit to:

- Exercise leadership in developing and implementing their national development strategies<sup>2</sup> through broad consultative processes.
- Translate these national development strategies into prioritised results-oriented operational programmes as expressed in medium-term expenditure frameworks and annual budgets (**Indicator 1**).
- Take the lead in co-ordinating aid at all levels in conjunction with other development resources in dialogue with donors and encouraging the participation of civil society and the private sector.

15. **Donors** commit to:

- Respect partner country leadership and help strengthen their capacity to exercise it.

<sup>2</sup> The term 'national development strategies' includes poverty reduction and similar overarching strategies as well as sector and thematic strategies.

## ALIGNMENT

Donors base their overall support on partner countries' national development strategies, institutions and procedures

### Donors align with partners' strategies

16. **Donors** commit to:

- Base their overall support — country strategies, policy dialogues and development co-operation programmes — on partners' national development strategies and periodic reviews of progress in implementing these strategies<sup>3</sup> (**Indicator 3**).
- Draw conditions, whenever possible, from a partner's national development strategy or its annual review of progress in implementing this strategy. Other conditions would be included only when a sound justification exists and would be undertaken transparently and in close consultation with other donors and stakeholders.
- Link funding to a single framework of conditions and/or a manageable set of indicators derived from the national development strategy. This does not mean that all donors have identical conditions, but that each donor's conditions should be derived from a common streamlined framework aimed at achieving lasting results.

### Donors use strengthened country systems

17. Using a country's own institutions and systems, where these provide assurance that aid will be used for agreed purposes, increases aid effectiveness by strengthening the partner country's sustainable capacity to develop, implement and account for its policies to its citizens and parliament. Country systems and procedures typically include, but are not restricted to, national arrangements and procedures for public financial management, accounting, auditing, procurement, results frameworks and monitoring.

18. Diagnostic reviews are an important — and growing — source of information to governments and donors on the state of country systems in partner countries. Partner countries and donors have a shared interest in being able to monitor progress over time in improving country systems. They are assisted by performance assessment frameworks, and an associated set of reform measures, that build on the information set out in diagnostic reviews and related analytical work.

19. **Partner countries** and **donors** jointly commit to:

- Work together to establish mutually agreed frameworks that provide reliable assessments of performance, transparency and accountability of country systems (**Indicator 2**).
- Integrate diagnostic reviews and performance assessment frameworks within country-led strategies for capacity development.

20. **Partner countries** commit to:

- Carry out diagnostic reviews that provide reliable assessments of country systems and procedures.
- On the basis of such diagnostic reviews, undertake reforms that may be necessary to ensure that national systems, institutions and procedures for managing aid and other development resources are effective, accountable and transparent.
- Undertake reforms, such as public management reform, that may be necessary to launch and fuel sustainable capacity development processes.

21. **Donors** commit to:

- Use country systems and procedures to the maximum extent possible. Where use of country systems is not feasible, establish additional safeguards and measures in ways that strengthen rather than undermine country systems and procedures (**Indicator 5**).

---

<sup>3</sup> This includes for example the Annual Progress Review of the Poverty Reduction Strategies (APR).

- Avoid, to the maximum extent possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of aid-financed projects and programmes (**Indicator 6**).
- Adopt harmonised performance assessment frameworks for country systems so as to avoid presenting partner countries with an excessive number of potentially conflicting targets.

### Partner countries strengthen development capacity with support from donors

22. The capacity to plan, manage, implement, and account for results of policies and programmes, is critical for achieving development objectives — from analysis and dialogue through implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Capacity development is the responsibility of partner countries with donors playing a support role. It needs not only to be based on sound technical analysis, but also to be responsive to the broader social, political and economic environment, including the need to strengthen human resources.

23. **Partner countries** commit to:

- Integrate specific capacity strengthening objectives in national development strategies and pursue their implementation through country-led capacity development strategies where needed.

24. **Donors** commit to:

- Align their analytic and financial support with partners' capacity development objectives and strategies, make effective use of existing capacities and harmonise support for capacity development accordingly (**Indicator 4**).

### Strengthen public financial management capacity

25. **Partner countries** commit to:

- Intensify efforts to mobilise domestic resources, strengthen fiscal sustainability, and create an enabling environment for public and private investments.
- Publish timely, transparent and reliable reporting on budget execution.
- Take leadership of the public financial management reform process.

26. **Donors** commit to:

- Provide reliable indicative commitments of aid over a multi-year framework and disburse aid in a timely and predictable fashion according to agreed schedules (**Indicator 7**).
- Rely to the maximum extent possible on transparent partner government budget and accounting mechanisms (**Indicator 5**).

27. **Partner countries** and **donors** jointly commit to:

- Implement harmonised diagnostic reviews and performance assessment frameworks in public financial management.

### Strengthen national procurement systems

28. **Partner countries** and **donors** jointly commit to:

- Use mutually agreed standards and processes<sup>4</sup> to carry out diagnostics, develop sustainable reforms and monitor implementation.
- Commit sufficient resources to support and sustain medium and long-term procurement reforms and capacity development.
- Share feedback at the country level on recommended approaches so they can be improved over time.

<sup>4</sup>

Such as the processes developed by the joint OECD-DAC – World Bank Round Table on Strengthening Procurement Capacities in Developing Countries.

29. **Partner countries** commit to take leadership and implement the procurement reform process.
30. **Donors** commit to:
- Progressively rely on partner country systems for procurement when the country has implemented mutually agreed standards and processes (**Indicator 5**).
  - Adopt harmonised approaches when national systems do not meet mutually agreed levels of performance or donors do not use them.

### Untie aid: getting better value for money

31. Untying aid generally increases aid effectiveness by reducing transaction costs for partner countries and improving country ownership and alignment. **DAC Donors** will continue to make progress on untying as encouraged by the 2001 DAC Recommendation on Untying Official Development Assistance to the Least Developed Countries (**Indicator 8**).

## HARMONISATION

Donors' actions are more harmonised, transparent and collectively effective

### Donors implement common arrangements and simplify procedures

32. **Donors** commit to:
- Implement the donor action plans that they have developed as part of the follow-up to the Rome High-Level Forum.
  - Implement, where feasible, common arrangements at country level for planning, funding (e.g. joint financial arrangements), disbursement, monitoring, evaluating and reporting to government on donor activities and aid flows. Increased use of programme-based aid modalities can contribute to this effort (**Indicator 9**).
  - Work together to reduce the number of separate, duplicative, missions to the field and diagnostic reviews (**Indicator 10**); and promote joint training to share lessons learnt and build a community of practice.

### Complementarity: more effective division of labour

33. Excessive fragmentation of aid at global, country or sector level impairs aid effectiveness. A pragmatic approach to the division of labour and burden sharing increases complementarity and can reduce transaction costs.

34. **Partner countries** commit to:
- Provide clear views on donors' comparative advantage and on how to achieve donor complementarity at country or sector level.
35. **Donors** commit to:
- Make full use of their respective comparative advantage at sector or country level by delegating, where appropriate, authority to lead donors for the execution of programmes, activities and tasks.
  - Work together to harmonise separate procedures.

### Incentives for collaborative behaviour

36. **Donors** and **partner countries** jointly commit to:
- Reform procedures and strengthen incentives—including for recruitment, appraisal and training—for management and staff to work towards harmonisation, alignment and results.

## Delivering effective aid in fragile states<sup>5</sup>

37. The long-term vision for international engagement in fragile states is to build legitimate, effective and resilient state and other country institutions. While the guiding principles of effective aid apply equally to fragile states, they need to be adapted to environments of weak ownership and capacity and to immediate needs for basic service delivery.

38. **Partner countries** commit to:

- Make progress towards building institutions and establishing governance structures that deliver effective governance, public safety, security, and equitable access to basic social services for their citizens.
- Engage in dialogue with donors on developing simple planning tools, such as the transitional results matrix, where national development strategies are not yet in place.
- Encourage broad participation of a range of national actors in setting development priorities.

39. **Donors** commit to:

- Harmonise their activities. Harmonisation is all the more crucial in the absence of strong government leadership. It should focus on upstream analysis, joint assessments, joint strategies, co-ordination of political engagement; and practical initiatives such as the establishment of joint donor offices.
- Align to the maximum extent possible behind central government-led strategies or, if that is not possible, donors should make maximum use of country, regional, sector or non-government systems.
- Avoid activities that undermine national institution building, such as bypassing national budget processes or setting high salaries for local staff.
- Use an appropriate mix of aid instruments, including support for recurrent financing, particularly for countries in promising but high-risk transitions.

## Promoting a harmonised approach to environmental assessments

40. Donors have achieved considerable progress in harmonisation around environmental impact assessment (EIA) including relevant health and social issues at the project level. This progress needs to be deepened, including on addressing implications of global environmental issues such as climate change, desertification and loss of biodiversity.

41. **Donors** and **partner countries** jointly commit to:

- Strengthen the application of EIAs and deepen common procedures for projects, including consultations with stakeholders; and develop and apply common approaches for “strategic environmental assessment” at the sector and national levels.
- Continue to develop the specialised technical and policy capacity necessary for environmental analysis and for enforcement of legislation.

42. Similar harmonisation efforts are also needed on other cross-cutting issues, such as gender equality and other thematic issues including those financed by dedicated funds.

## MANAGING FOR RESULTS

### Managing resources and improving decision-making for results

43. Managing for results means managing and implementing aid in a way that focuses on the desired results and uses information to improve decision-making.

---

<sup>5</sup> The following section draws on the draft Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States, which emerged from the Senior Level Forum on Development Effectiveness in Fragile States (London, January 2005).

44. **Partner countries** commit to:
- Strengthen the linkages between national development strategies and annual and multi-annual budget processes.
  - Endeavour to establish results-oriented reporting and assessment frameworks that monitor progress against key dimensions of the national and sector development strategies; and that these frameworks should track a manageable number of indicators for which data are cost-effectively available (**Indicator 11**).
45. **Donors** commit to:
- Link country programming and resources to results and align them with effective partner country performance assessment frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that are not consistent with partners' national development strategies.
  - Work with partner countries to rely, as far as possible, on partner countries' results-oriented reporting and monitoring frameworks.
  - Harmonise their monitoring and reporting requirements, and, until they can rely more extensively on partner countries' statistical, monitoring and evaluation systems, with partner countries to the maximum extent possible on joint formats for periodic reporting.
46. **Partner countries** and **donors** jointly commit to:
- Work together in a participatory approach to strengthen country capacities and demand for results based management.

## MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Donors and partners are accountable for development results

47. A major priority for partner countries and donors is to enhance mutual accountability and transparency in the use of development resources. This also helps strengthen public support for national policies and development assistance.
48. **Partner countries** commit to:
- Strengthen as appropriate the parliamentary role in national development strategies and/or budgets.
  - Reinforce participatory approaches by systematically involving a broad range of development partners when formulating and assessing progress in implementing national development strategies.
49. **Donors** commit to:
- Provide timely, transparent and comprehensive information on aid flows so as to enable partner authorities to present comprehensive budget reports to their legislatures and citizens.
50. **Partner countries** and **donors** commit to:
- Jointly assess through existing and increasingly objective country level mechanisms mutual progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness, including the Partnership Commitments. (**Indicator 12**).

### III. Indicators of Progress

To be measured nationally and monitored internationally

OWNERSHIP		TARGET FOR 2010
1	<i>Partners have operational development strategies</i> — Number of countries with national development strategies (including PRSs) that have clear strategic priorities linked to a medium-term expenditure framework and reflected in annual budgets.	<b>At least 75% of partner countries</b> have operational development strategies.
ALIGNMENT		TARGETS FOR 2010
2	<i>Reliable country systems</i> — Number of partner countries that have procurement and public financial management systems that either (a) adhere to broadly accepted good practices or (b) have a reform programme in place to achieve these.	<p><b>(a) Half of partner countries</b> move up at least one measure (i.e., 0.5 points) on the PFM/ CPIA (Country Policy and Institutional Assessment) scale of performance.</p> <p><b>(b) One-third of partner countries</b> move up at least one measure (i.e., from D to C, C to B or B to A) on the four-point scale used to assess performance for this indicator.</p>
3	<i>Aid flows are aligned on national priorities</i> — Percent of aid flows to the government sector that is reported on partners' national budgets.	<b>Halve the gap</b> — halve the proportion of aid flows to government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget).
4	<i>Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support</i> — Percent of donor capacity-development support provided through co-ordinated programmes consistent with partners' national development strategies.	<b>50% of technical co-operation flows</b> are implemented through co-ordinated programmes consistent with national development strategies.
5a	<i>Use of country procurement systems</i> — Percent of donors and of aid flows that use partner country procurement systems which either (a) adhere to broadly accepted good practices or (b) have a reform programme in place to achieve these.	<b>PERCENT OF DONORS</b>
		Score* Target
		A <b>All donors</b> use partner countries' procurement systems.
		B <b>90% of donors</b> use partner countries' procurement systems.
		<b>PERCENT OF AID FLOWS</b>
		Score* Target
5b	<i>Use of country public financial management systems</i> — Percent of donors and of aid flows that use public financial management systems in partner countries, which either (a) adhere to broadly accepted good practices or (b) have a reform programme in place to achieve these.	<b>PERCENT OF DONORS</b>
		Score* Target
		5+ <b>All donors</b> use partner countries' PFM systems.
		3.5 to 4.5 <b>90% of donors</b> use partner countries' PFM systems.
		<b>PERCENT OF AID FLOWS</b>
		Score* Target
5b		5+ <b>A two-thirds reduction</b> in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems.
		3.5 to 4.5 <b>A one-third reduction</b> in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems.



6	<i>Strengthen capacity by avoiding parallel implementation structures</i> — Number of parallel project implementation units (PIUs) per country.	<b>Reduce by two-thirds</b> the stock of parallel project implementation units (PIUs).
7	<i>Aid is more predictable</i> — Percent of aid disbursements released according to agreed schedules in annual or multi-year frameworks.	<b>Halve the gap</b> — halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled.
8	<i>Aid is untied</i> — Percent of bilateral aid that is untied.	<b>Continued progress over time.</b>
<b>HARMONISATION</b>		<b>TARGETS FOR 2010</b>
9	<i>Use of common arrangements or procedures</i> — Percent of aid provided as programme-based approaches <sup>6</sup>	<b>66% of aid flows</b> are provided in the context of programme-based approaches.
10	<i>Encourage shared analysis</i> — Percent of (a) field missions and/or (b) country analytic work, including diagnostic reviews that are joint.	<b>(a) 40% of donor missions</b> to the field are joint.
		<b>(b) 66% of country analytic work is joint.</b>
<b>MANAGING FOR RESULTS</b>		<b>TARGET FOR 2010</b>
11	<i>Results-oriented frameworks</i> — Number of countries with transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks to assess progress against (a) the national development strategies and (b) sector programmes.	<b>Reduce the gap by one-third</b> — Reduce the proportion of countries without transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks by one-third.
<b>MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY</b>		<b>TARGET FOR 2010</b>
12	<i>Mutual accountability</i> — Number of partner countries that undertake mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness including those in this Declaration.	<b>All partner countries</b> have mutual assessment reviews in place.

**Important Note:** In accordance with paragraph 9 of the Declaration, the partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC (Working Party on Aid Effectiveness) comprising OECD/DAC members, partner countries and multilateral institutions, met twice, on 30-31 May 2005 and on 7-8 July 2005 to adopt, and review where appropriate, the targets for the twelve Indicators of Progress. At these meetings an agreement was reached on the targets presented under Section III of the present Declaration. This agreement is subject to reservations by one donor on (a) the methodology for assessing the quality of locally-managed procurement systems (relating to targets 2b and 5b) and (b) the acceptable quality of public financial management reform programmes (relating to target 5a.ii). Further discussions are underway to address these issues. The targets, including the reservation, have been notified to the Chairs of the High-level Plenary Meeting of the 60th General Assembly of the United Nations in a letter of 9 September 2005 by Mr. Richard Manning, Chair of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

**Notes on Indicator 5:** Scores for Indicator 5 are determined by the methodology used to measure quality of procurement and public financial management systems under Indicator 2 above.



## Appendix A:

### Methodological Notes on the Indicators of Progress

The Indicators of Progress provides a framework in which to make operational the responsibilities and accountabilities that are framed in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. This framework draws selectively from the Partnership Commitments presented in Section II of this Declaration.

**Purpose** — The Indicators of Progress provide a framework in which to make operational the responsibilities and accountabilities that are framed in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. They measure principally **collective behaviour at the country level**.

**Country level vs. global level** — The indicators are to be **measured at the country level** in close collaboration between partner countries and donors. Values of country level indicators can then be statistically aggregated at the **regional or global level**. This global aggregation would be done both for the country panel mentioned below, for purposes of statistical comparability, and more broadly for all partner countries for which relevant data are available.

**Donor / Partner country performance** — The indicators of progress also provide a **benchmark against which individual donor agencies or partner countries can measure their performance** at the country, regional, or global level. In measuring individual donor performance, the indicators should be applied with flexibility in the recognition that donors have different institutional mandates.

**Targets** — The targets are set at the global level. Progress against these targets is to be measured by aggregating data measured at the country level. In addition to global targets, partner countries and donors in a given country might agree on country-level targets.

**Baseline** — A baseline will be established for 2005 in a panel of self-selected countries. The partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC (Working Party on Aid Effectiveness) is asked to establish this panel.

**Definitions and criteria** — The partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC (Working Party on Aid Effectiveness) is asked to provide specific guidance on definitions, scope of application, criteria and methodologies to assure that results can be aggregated across countries and across time.

**Note on Indicator 9** — Programme based approaches are defined in Volume 2 of Harmonising Donor Practices for Effective Aid Delivery (OECD, 2005) in Box 3.1 as a way of engaging in development cooperation based on the principles of co-ordinated support for a locally owned programme of development, such as a national development strategy, a sector programme, a thematic programme or a programme of a specific organisation. Programme based approaches share the following features: (a) leadership by the host country or organisation; (b) a single comprehensive programme and budget framework; (c) a formalised process for donor co-ordination and harmonisation of donor procedures for reporting, budgeting, financial management and procurement; (d) Efforts to increase the use of local systems for programme design and implementation, financial management, monitoring and evaluation. For the purpose of indicator 9 performance will be measured separately across the aid modalities that contribute to programme-based approaches.

## APPENDIX B:

### List of Participating Countries and Organisations

#### Participating Countries

Albania	Australia	Austria
Bangladesh	Belgium	Benin
Bolivia	Botswana	[Brazil]*
Burkina Faso	Burundi	Cambodia
Cameroon	Canada	China
Congo D.R.	Czech Republic	Denmark
Dominican Republic	Egypt	Ethiopia
European Commission	Fiji	Finland
France	Gambia, The	Germany
Ghana	Greece	Guatemala
Guinea	Honduras	Iceland
Indonesia	Ireland	Italy
Jamaica	Japan	Jordan
Kenya	Korea	Kuwait
Kyrgyz Republic	Lao PDR	Luxembourg
Madagascar	Malawi	Malaysia
Mali	Mauritania	Mexico
Mongolia	Morocco	Mozambique
Nepal	Netherlands	New Zealand
Nicaragua	Niger	Norway
Pakistan	Papua New Guinea	Philippines
Poland	Portugal	Romania
Russian Federation	Rwanda	Saudi Arabia
Senegal	Serbia and Montenegro	Slovak Republic
Solomon Islands	South Africa	Spain
Sri Lanka	Sweden	Switzerland
Tajikistan	Tanzania	Thailand
Timor-Leste	Tunisia	Turkey
Uganda	United Kingdom	United States of America
Vanuatu	Vietnam	Yemen
Zambia		

\* To be confirmed.

#### Participating Organisations

African Development Bank	Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa
Asian Development Bank	Commonwealth Secretariat
Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest (CGAP)	Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB)
Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)	Education for All Fast Track Initiative (EFA -FTI)
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)	European Investment Bank (EIB)
Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria	G24
Inter-American Development Bank	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
International Monetary Fund (IMF)	International Organisation of the Francophonie
Islamic Development Bank	Millennium Campaign
New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)	Nordic Development Fund
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)
OPEC Fund for International Development	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
United Nations Development Group (UNDG)	World Bank

#### Civil Society Organisations

Africa Humanitarian Action	AFRODAD
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundations	Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC)
Comité Catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement (CCFD)	Coopération Internationale pour le Développement et la Solidarité (CIDSE)
Comisión Económica (Nicaragua)	ENDA Tiers Monde
EURODAD	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)
Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation (JANIC)	Reality of Aid Network
Tanzania Social and Economic Trust (TASOET)	UK Aid Network



부산 세계개발원조총회  
**4<sup>th</sup> High Level Forum  
on Aid Effectiveness**  
29 Nov – 1 Dec 2011, Busan, Korea

**BUSAN PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION**  
**FOURTH HIGH LEVEL FORUM ON AID EFFECTIVENESS, BUSAN, REPUBLIC OF KOREA,**  
**29 NOVEMBER-1 DECEMBER 2011**

1. We, Heads of State, Ministers and representatives of developing and developed countries, heads of multilateral and bilateral institutions, representatives of different types of public, civil society, private, parliamentary, local and regional organisations meeting here in Busan, Republic of Korea, recognise that we are united by a new partnership that is broader and more inclusive than ever before, founded on shared principles, common goals and differential commitments for effective international development.
2. The nature, modalities and responsibilities that apply to South-South co-operation differ from those that apply to North-South co-operation. At the same time, we recognise that we are all part of a development agenda in which we participate on the basis of common goals and shared principles. In this context, we encourage increased efforts to support effective co-operation based on our specific country situations. The principles, commitments and actions agreed in the outcome document in Busan shall be the reference for South-South partners on a voluntary basis.
3. The world stands at a critical juncture in global development. Poverty and inequality remain the central challenge. The Millennium Declaration sets out our universal mandate for development and, with the target date for the Millennium Development Goals less than four years away, the urgency of achieving strong, shared and sustainable growth and decent work in developing countries is paramount. Moreover, the Declaration identifies that promoting human rights, democracy and good governance are an integral part of our development efforts. Nowhere are our development goals more urgent than in fragile and conflict-affected states. Political will is vital if these challenges are to be addressed.
4. As we reaffirm our development commitments, we realise that the world has changed profoundly since development co-operation began over 60 years ago. Economic, political, social and technological developments have revolutionised the world in which we live. Yet poverty, inequality and hunger persist. Eradicating poverty and tackling the global and regional challenges that have adverse effects on the citizens of developing countries are central to ensuring the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and a more robust and resilient global economy for all. Our success depends on the results and impact of our joint efforts and investments as we address challenges such as health pandemics, climate change, economic downturns, food and fuel price crises, conflict, fragility and vulnerability to shocks and natural disasters.

5. We also have a more complex architecture for development co-operation, characterised by a greater number of state and non-state actors, as well as co-operation among countries at different stages in their development, many of them middle-income countries. South-South and triangular co-operation, new forms of public-private partnership, and other modalities and vehicles for development have become more prominent, complementing North-South forms of co-operation.

6. International development co-operation has achieved many positive results. When we met in Monterrey a decade ago, we recognised that increases in volumes of financing for development must be coupled with more effective action to generate sustainable and transparent results for all citizens. Our dialogue in Busan builds on the foundations laid by previous High Level Fora, which have been proven to remain relevant, and which have helped to improve the quality of development co-operation. Yet we recognise that progress has been uneven and neither fast nor far-reaching enough. We each reaffirm our respective commitments and will implement in full the actions to which we have already agreed.

7. We can and must improve and accelerate our efforts. We commit to modernise, deepen and broaden our co-operation, involving state and non-state actors that wish to shape an agenda that has until recently been dominated by a narrower group of development actors. In Busan, we forge a new global development partnership that embraces diversity and recognises the distinct roles that all stakeholders in co-operation can play to support development.

8. Our partnership is founded on a common set of principles that underpin all forms of development co-operation. At the same time, we recognise that the ways in which these principles are applied differ across countries at various stages of development, and among the different types of public and private stakeholders involved. Lessons should be shared by all who participate in development co-operation. We welcome the opportunities presented by diverse approaches to development co-operation, such as South-South co-operation, as well as the contribution of civil society organisations and private actors; we will work together to build on and learn from their achievements and innovations, recognising their unique characteristics and respective merits.

9. Sustainable development results are the end goal of our commitments to effective co-operation. While development co-operation is only part of the solution, it plays a catalytic and indispensable role in supporting poverty eradication, social protection, economic growth and sustainable development. We reaffirm our respective commitments to scale up development co-operation. More effective co-operation should not lead to a reduction in resources for development. Over time, we will aim to increase independence from aid, always taking into account the consequences for the poorest people and countries. In this process, it is essential to examine the interdependence and coherence of all public policies – not just development policies – to enable countries to make full use of the opportunities presented by international investment and trade, and to expand their domestic capital markets.

10. As we partner to increase and reinforce development results, we will take action to facilitate, leverage and strengthen the impact of diverse sources of finance to support sustainable and inclusive development, including taxation and domestic resource mobilisation, private investment, aid for trade, philanthropy, non-concessional public funding and climate change finance. At the same time, new financial instruments, investment options, technology and knowledge sharing, and public-private partnerships are called for.

### *Shared principles to achieve common goals*

11. As we embrace the diversity that underpins our partnership and the catalytic role of development co-operation, we share common principles which – consistent with our agreed international commitments on human rights, decent work, gender equality, environmental sustainability and disability – form the foundation of our co-operation for effective development:

- a) *Ownership of development priorities by developing countries.* Partnerships for development can only succeed if they are led by developing countries, implementing approaches that are tailored to country-specific situations and needs.
- b) *Focus on results.* Our investments and efforts must have a lasting impact on eradicating poverty and reducing inequality, on sustainable development, and on enhancing developing countries' capacities, aligned with the priorities and policies set out by developing countries themselves.
- c) *Inclusive development partnerships.* Openness, trust, and mutual respect and learning lie at the core of effective partnerships in support of development goals, recognising the different and complementary roles of all actors.
- d) *Transparency and accountability to each other.* Mutual accountability and accountability to the intended beneficiaries of our co-operation, as well as to our respective citizens, organisations, constituents and shareholders, is critical to delivering results. Transparent practices form the basis for enhanced accountability.

12. These shared principles will guide our actions to:

- a) Deepen, extend and operationalise the democratic ownership of development policies and processes.
- b) Strengthen our efforts to achieve concrete and sustainable results. This involves better managing for results, monitoring, evaluating and communicating progress; as well as scaling up our support, strengthening national capacities and leveraging diverse resources and initiatives in support of development results.
- c) Broaden support for South-South and triangular co-operation, helping to tailor these horizontal partnerships to a greater diversity of country contexts and needs.
- d) Support developing countries in their efforts to facilitate, leverage and strengthen the impact of diverse forms of development finance and activities, ensuring that these diverse forms of co-operation have a catalytic effect on development.

13. We recognise the urgency with which these actions must be implemented. Beginning implementation now – or accelerating efforts where they are ongoing – is essential if our renewed approach to partnership is to have the maximum possible impact on the realisation of the Millennium Development Goals by 2015, as well as on development results over the longer term. We will hold each other accountable for implementing our respective actions in developing countries and at the international level. As we focus on implementing our commitments at the country level, we will form a new, inclusive Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation to support implementation at the political level.

## Realising change: Complementary actions to reach common goals

### *Inclusion of new actors on the basis of shared principles and differential commitments*

14. Today's complex architecture for development co-operation has evolved from the North-South paradigm. Distinct from the traditional relationship between aid providers and recipients, developing nations and a number of emerging economies have become important providers of South-South development co-operation. They remain developing countries and still face poverty at home. As such, they remain eligible to benefit from development co-operation provided by others, yet they have increasingly taken upon themselves the responsibility to share experiences and co-operate with other developing countries. The Paris Declaration did not address the complexity of these new actors, while the Accra Agenda for Action recognised their importance and specificities. While North-South co-operation remains the main form of development co-operation, South-South co-operation continues to evolve, providing additional diversity of resources for development. At Busan, we now all form an integral part of a new and more inclusive development agenda, in which these actors participate on the basis of common goals, shared principles and differential commitments. On this same basis, we welcome the inclusion of civil society, the private sector and other actors.

### *Improving the quality and effectiveness of development co-operation*

15. Progress has been made in advancing the aid effectiveness agenda, yet major challenges persist. Evidence has shown that – despite the challenges encountered in the implementation of our respective commitments – many of the principles underpinning the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action have contributed to higher quality, more transparent and effective development co-operation.

16. We will sustain our high-level political leadership to ensure that the commitments made here in Busan are implemented. Within this context, those of us that endorsed the mutually agreed actions set out in Paris and Accra will intensify our efforts to implement our respective commitments in full. A growing range of actors – including middle-income countries, partners of South-South and triangular co-operation and civil society organisations – have joined others to forge a broader, more inclusive agenda since Paris and Accra, embracing their respective and different commitments alongside shared principles.

17. Drawing on the evidence generated through periodic monitoring and the independent evaluation of the Paris Declaration, we will be guided by a focus on sustainable results that meet the priority needs of developing countries, and will make the urgently needed changes to improve the effectiveness of our partnerships for development.

### *Ownership, results and accountability*

18. Together, we will increase our focus on development results. To this end:

- a) Developing countries' efforts and plans to strengthen core institutions and policies will be supported through approaches that aim to manage – rather than avoid – risk, including through the development of joint risk management frameworks with providers of development co-operation.

- b) Where initiated by the developing country, transparent, country-led and country-level results frameworks and platforms will be adopted as a common tool among all concerned actors to assess performance based on a manageable number of output and outcome indicators drawn from the development priorities and goals of the developing country. Providers of development co-operation will minimise their use of additional frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that are not consistent with countries' national development strategies.
- c) We will partner to implement a global Action Plan to enhance capacity for statistics to monitor progress, evaluate impact, ensure sound, results-focused public sector management, and highlight strategic issues for policy decisions.
- d) As we deepen our efforts to ensure that mutual assessment reviews are in place in all developing countries, we encourage the active participation of all development co-operation actors in these processes.
- e) Pursuant to the Accra Agenda for Action, we will accelerate our efforts to untie aid. We will, in 2012, review our plans to achieve this. In addition to increasing value for money, untying can present opportunities for local procurement, business development, employment and income generation in developing countries. We will improve the quality, consistency and transparency of reporting on the tying status of aid.

19. The use and strengthening of developing countries' systems remains central to our efforts to build effective institutions. We will build on our respective commitments set out in the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action to:

- a) Use country systems as the default approach for development co-operation in support of activities managed by the public sector, working with and respecting the governance structures of both the provider of development co-operation and the developing country.
- b) Assess jointly country systems using mutually agreed diagnostic tools. Based on the results of these assessments, providers of development co-operation will decide on the extent to which they can use country systems. Where the full use of country systems is not possible, the provider of development co-operation will state the reasons for non-use, and will discuss with government what would be required to move towards full use, including any necessary assistance or changes for the strengthening of systems. The use and strengthening of country systems should be placed within the overall context of national capacity development for sustainable outcomes.

20. We must accelerate our efforts to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of women through development programmes grounded in country priorities, recognising that gender equality and women's empowerment are critical to achieving development results. Reducing gender inequality is both an end in its own right and a prerequisite for sustainable and inclusive growth. As we redouble our efforts to implement existing commitments we will:

- a) Accelerate and deepen efforts to collect, disseminate, harmonise and make full use of data disaggregated by sex to inform policy decisions and guide investments, ensuring in turn that public expenditures are targeted appropriately to benefit both women and men.



- b) Integrate targets for gender equality and women's empowerment in accountability mechanisms, grounded in international and regional commitments.
- c) Address gender equality and women's empowerment in all aspects of our development efforts, including peacebuilding and statebuilding.

21. Parliaments and local governments play critical roles in linking citizens with government, and in ensuring broad-based and democratic ownership of countries' development agendas. To facilitate their contribution, we will:

- a) Accelerate and deepen the implementation of existing commitments to strengthen the role of parliaments in the oversight of development processes, including by supporting capacity development – backed by adequate resources and clear action plans.
- b) Further support local governments to enable them to assume more fully their roles above and beyond service delivery, enhancing participation and accountability at the sub-national levels.

22. Civil society organisations (CSOs) play a vital role in enabling people to claim their rights, in promoting rights-based approaches, in shaping development policies and partnerships, and in overseeing their implementation. They also provide services in areas that are complementary to those provided by states. Recognising this, we will:

- a) Implement fully our respective commitments to enable CSOs to exercise their roles as independent development actors, with a particular focus on an enabling environment, consistent with agreed international rights, that maximises the contributions of CSOs to development.
- b) Encourage CSOs to implement practices that strengthen their accountability and their contribution to development effectiveness, guided by the Istanbul Principles and the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness.

#### *Transparent and responsible co-operation*

23. We will work to improve the availability and public accessibility of information on development co-operation and other development resources, building on our respective commitments in this area. To this end, we will:

- a) Make the full range of information on publicly funded development activities, their financing, terms and conditions, and contribution to development results, publicly available subject to legitimate concerns about commercially sensitive information.
- b) Focus, at the country level, on establishing transparent public financial management and aid information management systems, and strengthen the capacities of all relevant stakeholders to make better use of this information in decision-making and to promote accountability.
- c) Implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on resources provided through development co-



operation, taking into account the statistical reporting of the OECD-DAC and the complementary efforts of the International Aid Transparency Initiative and others. This standard must meet the information needs of developing countries and non-state actors, consistent with national requirements. We will agree on this standard and publish our respective schedules to implement it by December 2012, with the aim of implementing it fully by December 2015.

24. We will also work to make development co-operation more predictable in its nature. To this end:

- a) Those of us who committed, through the Accra Agenda for Action, to improve medium-term predictability will implement fully our commitments in this area, introducing reforms where needed. By 2013, they will provide available, regular, timely rolling three- to five-year indicative forward expenditure and/or implementation plans as agreed in Accra to all developing countries with which they co-operate. Other actors will aim to provide developing countries with timely and relevant information on their intentions with regard to future co-operation over the medium term.

25. We welcome the diversity of development co-operation actors. Developing countries will lead consultation and co-ordination efforts to manage this diversity at the country level, while providers of development assistance have a responsibility to reduce fragmentation and curb the proliferation of aid channels. We will ensure that our efforts to reduce fragmentation do not lead to a reduction in the volume and quality of resources available to support development. To this end:

- a) We will, by 2013, make greater use of country-led co-ordination arrangements, including division of labour, as well as programme-based approaches, joint programming and delegated co-operation.
- b) We will improve the coherence of our policies on multilateral institutions, global funds and programmes. We will make effective use of existing multilateral channels, focusing on those that are performing well. We will work to reduce the proliferation of these channels and will, by the end of 2012, agree on principles and guidelines to guide our joint efforts. As they continue to implement their respective commitments on aid effectiveness, multilateral organisations, global funds and programmes will strengthen their participation in co-ordination and mutual accountability mechanisms at the country, regional and global levels.
- c) We will accelerate efforts to address the issue of countries that receive insufficient assistance, agreeing – by the end of 2012 – on principles that will guide our actions to address this challenge. These efforts will encompass all development co-operation flows.
- d) Providers of development co-operation will deepen and accelerate efforts to address the problem of insufficient delegation of authority to their field staff. They will review all aspects of their operations, including delegation of financial authority, staffing, and roles and responsibilities in the design and implementation of development programmes; and they will implement measures that address the remaining bottlenecks.

### *Promoting sustainable development in situations of conflict and fragility*

26. Fragile states are for the large part off-track to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Achieving these goals will depend on our collective ability to understand the unique challenges facing fragile states, overcome these challenges, and promote foundations for lasting development. We welcome the New Deal developed by the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, including the g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected states. Those of us who have endorsed the New Deal will pursue actions to implement it and, in doing so, will use:

- a) The Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs) – which prioritise legitimate politics, people's security, justice, economic foundations and revenues and fair services – as an important foundation to enable progress towards the MDGs to guide our work in fragile and conflict-affected states.
- b) FOCUS – a new country-led and country-owned way of engaging in fragile states.
- c) TRUST – a set of commitments to enhance transparency; manage risk to use country systems; strengthen national capacities; and improve the timeliness and predictability of aid – to achieve better results.

### *Partnering to strengthen resilience and reduce vulnerability in the face of adversity*

27. We must ensure that development strategies and programmes prioritise the building of resilience among people and societies at risk from shocks, especially in highly vulnerable settings such as small island developing states. Investing in resilience and risk reduction increases the value and sustainability of our development efforts. To this end:

- a) Developing countries will lead in integrating resilience to shocks and measures for disaster management within their own policies and strategies.
- b) Responding to the needs articulated by developing countries, we will work together to invest in shock resistant infrastructure and social protection systems for at-risk communities. In addition, we will increase the resources, planning and skills for disaster management at the national and regional levels.

## From effective aid to co-operation for effective development

28. Aid is only part of the solution to development. It is now time to broaden our focus and attention from aid effectiveness to the challenges of effective development. This calls for a framework within which:

- a) Development is driven by strong, sustainable and inclusive growth.
- b) Governments' own revenues play a greater role in financing their development needs. In turn, governments are more accountable to their citizens for the development results they achieve.
- c) Effective state and non-state institutions design and implement their own reforms and hold each other to account.
- d) Developing countries increasingly integrate, both regionally and globally, creating economies of scale that will help them better compete in the global economy.

To this effect, we will rethink what aid should be spent on and how, in ways that are consistent with agreed international rights, norms and standards, so that aid catalyses development.

29. Effective institutions and policies are essential for sustainable development. Institutions fulfilling core state functions should, where necessary, be further strengthened, alongside the policies and practices of providers of development co-operation, to facilitate the leveraging of resources by developing countries. Developing countries will lead in efforts to strengthen these institutions, adapting to local context and differing stages of development. To this end, we will:

- a) Support the implementation of institutional and policy changes led by developing countries, resulting in effective resource mobilisation and service delivery, including national and sub-national institutions, regional organisations, parliaments and civil society.
- b) Assess country institutions, systems and capacity development needs, led by developing countries.
- c) Support the development of improved evidence on institutional performance to inform policy formulation, implementation and accountability, led by developing countries.
- d) Deepen our learning on the determinants of success for institutional reform, exchanging knowledge and experience at the regional and global levels.

## *South-South and triangular co-operation for sustainable development*

30. The inputs to sustainable development extend well beyond financial co-operation to the knowledge and development experience of all actors and countries. South-South and triangular co-operation have the potential to transform developing countries' policies and approaches to service delivery by bringing effective, locally owned solutions that are appropriate to country contexts.

31. We recognise that many countries engaged in South-South co-operation both provide and receive diverse resources and expertise at the same time, and that this should enrich co-operation without affecting a country's eligibility to receive assistance from others. We will strengthen the sharing of knowledge and mutual learning by:

- a) Scaling up – where appropriate – the use of triangular approaches to development co-operation.
- b) Making fuller use of South-South and triangular co-operation, recognising the success of these approaches to date and the synergies they offer.
- c) Encouraging the development of networks for knowledge exchange, peer learning and co-ordination among South-South co-operation actors as a means of facilitating access to important knowledge pools by developing countries.
- d) Supporting efforts to strengthen local and national capacities to engage effectively in South-South and triangular co-operation.

#### *Private sector and development*

32. We recognise the central role of the private sector in advancing innovation, creating wealth, income and jobs, mobilising domestic resources and in turn contributing to poverty reduction. To this end, we will:

- a) Engage with representative business associations, trade unions and others to improve the legal, regulatory and administrative environment for the development of private investment; and also to ensure a sound policy and regulatory environment for private sector development, increased foreign direct investment, public-private partnerships, the strengthening of value chains in an equitable manner and giving particular consideration to national and regional dimensions, and the scaling up of efforts in support of development goals.
- b) Enable the participation of the private sector in the design and implementation of development policies and strategies to foster sustainable growth and poverty reduction.
- c) Further develop innovative financial mechanisms to mobilise private finance for shared development goals.
- d) Promote “aid for trade” as an engine of sustainable development, focusing on outcomes and impact, to build productive capacities, help address market failures, strengthen access to capital markets and to promote approaches that mitigate risk faced by private sector actors.
- e) Invite representatives of the public and private sectors and related organisations to play an active role in exploring how to advance both development and business outcomes so that they are mutually reinforcing.

### *Combating corruption and illicit flows*

33. Corruption is a plague that seriously undermines development globally, diverting resources that could be harnessed to finance development, damaging the quality of governance institutions, and threatening human security. It often fuels crime and contributes to conflict and fragility. We will intensify our joint efforts to fight corruption and illicit flows, consistent with the UN Convention Against Corruption and other agreements to which we are party, such as the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention. To this end, we will:

- a) Implement fully our respective commitments to eradicate corruption, enforcing our laws and promoting a culture of zero tolerance for all corrupt practices. This includes efforts to improve fiscal transparency, strengthen independent enforcement mechanisms, and extend protection for whistleblowers.
- b) Accelerate our individual efforts to combat illicit financial flows by strengthening anti money laundering measures, addressing tax evasion, and strengthening national and international policies, legal frameworks and institutional arrangements for the tracing, freezing and recovery of illegal assets. This includes ensuring enactment and implementation of laws and practices that facilitate effective international co-operation.

### *Climate change finance*

34. Global climate change finance is expected to increase substantially in the medium term. Recognising that this resource flow brings with it new opportunities and challenges, we will endeavour to promote coherence, transparency and predictability across our approaches for effective climate finance and broader development co-operation, including to:

- a) Continue to support national climate change policy and planning as an integral part of developing countries' overall national development plans, and ensure that – where appropriate – these measures are financed, delivered and monitored through developing countries' systems in a transparent manner.
- b) Continue to share lessons learned in development effectiveness with those entities engaged in climate activities and ensure that broader development co-operation is also informed by innovations in climate finance.

## The road ahead: Partnering for progress towards and beyond the MDGs

35. We will hold each other accountable for making progress against the commitments and actions agreed in Busan, alongside those set out in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action. To this end, we will:

- a) At the level of individual developing countries, agree on frameworks based on national needs and priorities for monitoring progress and promoting mutual accountability in our efforts to improve the effectiveness of our co-operation and, in turn, development results. Developing countries will lead in the elaboration of such frameworks which, together with any indicators and targets agreed, will respond to their specific needs and will be grounded in their aid and development policies. The results of these exercises will be made public.
- b) Agree, by June 2012, on a selective and relevant set of indicators and targets through which we will monitor progress on a rolling basis, supporting international and regional accountability for the implementation of our commitments. We will build on the initiatives led by developing countries and learn from existing international efforts to monitor aid effectiveness. We will review these arrangements in the context of the post-MDG framework. We will periodically publish the results of these exercises.
- c) Support initiatives at the national and regional levels led by developing countries that strengthen capacities to monitor progress and evaluate the impact of efforts to improve development effectiveness.

36. We accept that the strengthening of our co-operation and the adherence to both common goals and differential commitments calls for continued high-level political support, as well as an inclusive space for dialogue, mutual learning and accountability at the global level. Regional organisations can and should play an important role in supporting implementation at the country level, and in linking country priorities with global efforts. The UN Development Cooperation Forum is also invited to play a role in consulting on the implementation of agreements reached in Busan. To this end, we will:

- a) Establish a new, inclusive and representative Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation to support and ensure accountability for the implementation of commitments at the political level. This Partnership will offer an open platform that embraces diversity, providing a forum for the exchange of knowledge and the regular review of progress.
- b) Agree, by June 2012, on light working arrangements for this Global Partnership, including its membership and opportunities for regular ministerial-level engagement that complements, and is undertaken in conjunction with, other fora.
- c) Call on the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) to convene representatives of all countries and stakeholders endorsing this document with a view to reaching agreement on the working arrangements for the Global Partnership – and the indicators and channels through which global monitoring and accountability will be supported – in preparation for the phasing out of the WP-EFF and its associated structures in June 2012.
- d) Invite the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the United Nations Development Programme to support the effective functioning of the Global Partnership, building on their collaboration to date and their respective mandates and areas of comparative advantage.